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TO SEPARATE OR NOT SEPARATE?: TWO SURVEYS ON ASIAN COLLECTIONS (PART II)

1. THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA USER SURVEY
2. NORTH AMERICAN ASIAN STUDIES LIBRARIAN SURVEY

Tadanobu Suzuki,* Ying Liu,† Chelsea Garside,** Shailoo Bedi,** and Lisa Hill**
University of Victoria

This article is the continuation of our two-part report of two surveys regarding the idea of separating Asian materials from the general collections in academic libraries in North America. The University of Victoria (UVic) libraries conducted the surveys in February and March 2007, and the general introduction and the results of the first survey, the UVic user survey, were published in the previous issue of JEAL (No. 147, February 2009, pp.13-30). The following are the results of our second survey of the Asian studies librarians in North America, as well as the general discussions of the two surveys and the general conclusions.

5.0 North American Asian Studies Librarian Survey - Results and Discussion

This section details the analysis of the data collected in the UVic Libraries’ survey of Asian studies librarians in North America. An acceptable overall number of responses was received (n=70). Considering that the number of Asian studies librarians who received the invitation for the survey probably does not exceed 500, the response rate was likely higher for the librarian survey than for the UVic user survey. However, it is not possible to estimate accurate response rates for either survey, since both were sent to populations of people of unknown sizes, rather than to a specific sample of people.

5.1 Respondent Profiles

In order to better understand our respondents, we asked a series of questions regarding the respondents’ work profiles, including geographic region, primary language area(s), and primary areas of responsibility.

The majority of respondents (83%) indicated that they work in the United States, while 10% indicated that they work in Canada. The largest group of respondents was from the U.S. Northeast (33%), while the smallest percentage of respondents (6%) was from the U.S. South.

Question: “Where is your university/college located?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>US Northeast</th>
<th>US West / Pacific</th>
<th>U.S. Midwest</th>
<th>U.S. South</th>
<th>No response / Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>23 (33%)</td>
<td>18 (26%)</td>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Regional Representations of the Respondents

We also asked respondents to identify all of their primary language responsibilities. Of all the respondents, 43% indicated that their primary language responsibility was Chinese, 44% indicated that it was Japanese, and 24% said it was Korean. Responses also indicated that there were 43% respondents who were
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responsible for East Asia in general. Note that because respondents were able to choose more than one primary language responsibility, the percentages calculated do not sum to 100%.

Question: “What are your primary language responsibilities?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian General</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Primary Language Responsibility of the Respondent.

* Note that respondents were able to choose more than one language responsibility, thus the percentages do not sum to 100%.

In terms of the primary area(s) of professional responsibility of the respondent, the majority said that they were either involved in reference (70%) or in collections (71%). About half the respondents chose cataloguing as their primary responsibility, while only 9% said that they were involved in shelf management (stack maintenance) or circulation. Again, respondents were able to choose more than one area of responsibility, and as such the percentages calculated do not sum to 100%.

Question: “What are your areas of responsibility at your institution?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloguing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelf Management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Primary Area(s) of Professional Responsibilities

* Note that respondents were able to choose more than one language responsibility, thus the percentages do not sum to 100%.

5.2 Profiles of the Respondents’ Academic Institutions and Associated Degree Programs

To gather information about the institutions with which the respondents were associated, we asked a series of questions regarding the characteristics of universities the respondents were affiliated with, and what level of degrees were offered in Asian studies at these institutions.

The majority of respondents (86%) were affiliated with a 4-year university with graduate studies; only 4% were affiliated with a 4-year primarily undergraduate college/university.

Question: “What type of institution are you affiliated with?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Yr University with Grad Studies</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Yr College / Univ. with Undergrad Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26. Types of Academic Institutions.

In terms of institution size, the majority of respondents were from institutions with larger student populations. The combined results from several categories show that 81% of the respondents were from institutions with more than 10,000 students, while 57% were from institutions with student populations greater than 20,000 students.

Question: “What is your approximate student population?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-20,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27. Student Populations of the Respondents’ Institutions.

The majority of respondents (64%) were affiliated with institutions established prior to 1900, while 30% were affiliated with institutions established between 1900 and the present.
Question: “When was your university/college established?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Establishment</th>
<th>Before 1900</th>
<th>1900-1925</th>
<th>1926-1950</th>
<th>1951-1975</th>
<th>After 1975</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>45 (64%)</td>
<td>12 (17%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28. Respondents’ Institutions’ Year of Establishment.

The majority of respondents worked at institutions which offered PhD degree programs in Asian studies (70%). Only 6% of the respondents worked at institutions with only undergraduate Asian studies programs.

Question: “What is the highest degree offered in Asian Studies (or specifically Chinese, Japanese, and/or Korean) at your institution?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>49 (70%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29. Highest Degree Offered in Asian Studies

We also asked about the highest degree offered at the respondents’ institutions in interdisciplinary programs related to Asian studies. As expected, a high percentage of respondents (76%) selected PhD programs as their institution’s highest degree related to Asia.

Question: “What is the highest degree offered in other disciplines related to Asia at your institution?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>53 (76%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30. Highest Degree Offered in Other Disciplines Related to Asia.

Another area we were interested in knowing about was the size of the respondents’ Asian collections. Just over half (51%) of respondents indicated that their institution’s Asian collection was larger than 100,000 volumes. The vast majority of respondents’ institutions (91%) had Asian collections larger than 20,000 volumes.

Question: “What is the total size of your institution’s Asian materials (CJK) collection (in volumes)?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>&gt;100,000</th>
<th>50,001-100,000</th>
<th>20,001-50,000</th>
<th>10,001-20,000</th>
<th>&gt;10,000</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>36 (51%)</td>
<td>15 (21%)</td>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31. Size of Asian collections at the Respondents’ Institutions.

The majority of respondents (79%) worked at libraries where Asian materials are separated from the general collections in some manner. Those working at physically separate Asian libraries accounted for 27%, while 51% worked at institutions which had separate Asian collections within the main libraries. The respondents who reported that Asian materials were intershelfed with the general collections in their libraries represented 16% of the total respondents. The finding is consistent with Chui’s comment that the traditional practice is to have a separate East Asian Collection if the library wants to have one (2001:1).

Question: “What is the physical setting of the Asian language materials in your library?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stand alone library physically separate from the main library</td>
<td>19 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of main library but in a separate room or floor</td>
<td>29 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of main library but in a separate shelving space</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfiled with other materials in the library</td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32. Physical Configuration of the Respondent’s Asian Collections/Libraries.
Three further questions were asked as a subset to the previous question. Two questions were put to those respondents whose library had Asian materials in either a separate library, a separate room, or floor (n=48), and one question was asked of the other set of respondents whose Asian collections are either part the main library but in a separate shelving space, or are completely intershelfed with other (general) materials in the library (n=18).

The first question covers the intersheling of Western language materials in Asian libraries. The results show that the majority (58%) of respondents indicated that Western materials on Asia were indeed interfiled with the Asian language materials. We did not ask what degree of Western language materials were part of the Asian collections or libraries.

**Question:** "If Asian materials are in a separate library, room or floor, are there western materials on Asia interfiled in the Asian collection?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 32a. Intersheling of Western Language Materials in Asian Libraries*

The second question was also for those respondents whose library had Asian materials in a separate library, room or floor. This question asked if the Asian collections included Asian language materials other than CJK. A majority (56%) indicated that in their libraries, the Asian collection included only CJK language materials, while 35% of the respondents indicated that other Asian language materials were also part of their Asian libraries.

**Question:** "If Asian materials are in a separate library, room or floor, does the collection include Asian languages other than Chinese, Japanese or Korean?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 32b. Inclusion of Asian Language Materials Other Than CJK*

The third and the last of the subset of questions was for those respondents (n=18) whose Asian language materials were either located in a separate shelving space in the main library or completely intershelfed with the general collections. For this group, we asked if there was an Asian language-only reference area in the library.

One half of the respondents (50%, or 9 individuals) indicated that there were no Asian language-only reference areas in their libraries. However, 44% (8 individuals) indicated that a specialized Asian reference area in their libraries was present.

**Question:** "If Asian materials are interfiled or in a separate shelving space, is there an Asian-language-only Reference area in the library?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 32c. Presence of Asian Language Reference Area in the Main Libraries*

Another important general question was on the presence of specialized language-based libraries other than Asian libraries on campus (e.g., Spanish, Slavic, Arabic libraries, etc.). The majority (61%) indicated that there were no other specialized language libraries at their institutions. Just over one-third (34%) indicated that their institution did have separate libraries for materials in other languages. Examples of other language or “special” libraries listed by respondents include, but are not limited to, Arabic, Slavic, Tibetan, Judaic, Latin American, and Russian libraries.
Question: “Are there other special language libraries or distinct collections on your campus?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 (34%)</td>
<td>43 (61%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33. Presence of Other Special Language Libraries on Campus.

5.3 Opinions Regarding a Separate Asian Collection and Ease of Browsing

The majority of respondents (76%) felt that a separate Asian collection or library would ease browsing. Only 7% of respondents felt that this would not ease browsing. Overall, 'ease of browsing' appears to be a strong argument for separating Asian materials from the regular collection.

Question: “Agree or Disagree: A separate Asian collection would ease browsing”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 (37%)</td>
<td>27 (39%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. Opinions Regarding a Separate Asian Collection/Library and Ease of Browsing.

5.4 Opinions on Separating Asian and English Language Books on the Same Topics

Answers to this question were mixed, with over one-third of respondents (36%) feeling that separating Asian and English language books on the same topics was not beneficial to library users, and others (33%) disagreeing and essentially indicating that they thought the separation would be beneficial to library users. Neither side showed a large number in the “strongly agree / disagree” categories. Another 24% indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. These results indicate that there is no clear consensus on this issue.

Question: “Agree or disagree: Separating Asian language books from English books on the same topic is not beneficial to library users.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>16 (23%)</td>
<td>17 (24%)</td>
<td>20 (29%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35. Opinions Regarding Separating Asian and English Language Books on Same Topics.

5.5 Opinions Regarding the Difficulty of Searching Online Catalogues for Asian Books

A large portion of the respondents (44%) felt that it was not too difficult for users to search for Asian books in the regular (English) online catalogue system, while 31% felt that it was too difficult for library users to locate Asian materials using this catalogue. These responses are important to note, because the catalogue is a major gateway to accessing library materials.

Question: “Agree or disagree: Searching Asian books in the regular (English) catalogue system is too difficult for Library users.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>17 (24%)</td>
<td>12 (17%)</td>
<td>22 (31%)</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36. Opinions Regarding the Difficulty of Online Searching for Asian Books.

5.6 Opinions Regarding the Need for Specialized Asian Language Skills for Library Staff

The majority of respondents (53%) indicated that they believe that a separate Asian collection is necessary because library staff need specialized Asian language skills to be able to fully assist library patrons with Asian-related research. Only 16% of the respondents disagreed, indicating that specialized language skills,
as important as they may be, do not alone call for change in organizational structure. It should be noted, however, that nearly a quarter of the respondents (23%) indicated that they neither agree nor disagree with the statement. This may be a further indication that these respondents feel that the physical separation of Asian materials from the general collection is not very important in influencing the organizational structure of the workplace.

Question: “Agree or disagree?: A separate Asian collection / library is necessary because staff need specialized Asian language skills.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 (17%)</td>
<td>25 (36%)</td>
<td>16 (23%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37. Opinions Regarding Asian Language Skills for Staff as a Reason for Separating Asian Libraries.

5.7 Opinions About a Separate Asian Library as a Cause of Friction Among Library Staff

Approximately one quarter (24%) of respondents agreed that a separate Asian collection or library would create friction and divisions between Asian library staff and main library staff, while 37% disagreed and felt it would not be an issue. A large portion (30%) of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, indicating that this is not a question about which most librarians have strong opinions. This is supported by the fact that numbers for Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree, 7% and 9% respectively, were also relatively low, indicating that the respondents generally do not have strong opinions on this question.

Question: “Agree or disagree?: A separate Asian collection/Library creates divisions and friction among Asian studies Library staff and the rest of the main Library staff.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>12 (17%)</td>
<td>21 (30%)</td>
<td>20 (29%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38. Opinions Regarding a Separate Asian Library as a Cause of Friction among the Staff.

5.8 Opinions Regarding a Specialized Asian Library and the Prestige of the Institution

There was a consensus among the Asian studies librarians (55%) that an Asian studies library contributes to the prestige of the institution, while 34% indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed. Only 3% disagreed that a specialized Asian library or collection would contribute to the prestige of the institution. This question thus provides information that the added prestige may be another selling point for a separate Asian collection.

Question: “Agree or disagree?: A specialized Asian collection / library contributes to the prestige of the institution.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
<td>27 (39%)</td>
<td>24 (34%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39. Opinions Regarding a Specialized Asian Library and the Prestige of the Institution

5.9 Opinions Regarding the Visibility of a Separate Asian Collection or Library

A strong majority of respondents (70%) were in agreement that the visibility of an Asian collection is important to users, while only 4% of respondents thought that the visibility of the collection was not important. For example, the visibility of a separate Asian collection could also serve other purposes than simply increasing interest in the collection. There usually is a reading area in a separate Asian Collection, which can serve as a good meeting place for faculty and students who share similar interests, as proposed by Chui (2001:4).
Question: “Agree or disagree?: Visibility of a specialized Asian collection/Library as a distinct entity (i.e., stand-alone, separate, designated space) is important to Library users.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
<td>36 (51%)</td>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40. Opinions Regarding Visibility of an Asian Collection/Library.

5.10 Opinions Regarding Importance of an Asian Library for Fundraising and Marketing

Again, there was a very strong consensus (74%) among the respondents that a specialized Asian collection or library is important for fundraising and marketing. Only 1% disagreed, while 17% answered “neither agree nor disagree.” This issue appears to be another strong reason for the separation of Asian language materials from the regular collection, which could benefit the library in a financial manner.

Question: “Agree or disagree?: Having a specialized Asian collection/library is important for fundraising or marketing for the institution.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 (23%)</td>
<td>36 (51%)</td>
<td>12 (17%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41. Opinions Regarding Importance of an Asian Library/Collection in Fundraising and Marketing.

5.11 Opinions Regarding the Perceived Faculty Demand for a Specialized Asian Collection/Library

A strong majority of respondents (68%) are of the opinion that there is a strong demand for a specialized Asian collection among faculty members. Only 6% disagreed and felt that faculty members do not demand a separate Asian collection. Note that the level of “strong demand” among faculty members in this question is what is perceived by the librarians who responded in the survey, and the current result should not be taken as a direct reflection of faculty opinions.

Question: “Agree or disagree?: There is a strong demand for a specialized Asian collection/library among faculty members.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 (27%)</td>
<td>29 (41%)</td>
<td>12 (17%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42. Opinions Regarding the Perceived Faculty Demand for a Specialized Asian Collection/Library.

5.12 Opinions Regarding the Separation of Asian and English Books Being a Disservice to Multi-lingual Users

The results were almost evenly split on the question of whether or not separating Asian language books from English books on the same subjects would be disservice to the multi-lingual users. Those who thought that the separation of the collection was not a disservice to the users had a slight edge (35%) over those who thought it was a disservice to users (28%). 27% of the respondents indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, indicating that for nearly 1/3 of the respondents, this was not an issue about which they felt strongly.

When a similar statement was put to respondents (“Separating Asian language books from English books on the same topic is not beneficial to library users”) in 5.4, those who answered “agree” were 36%, compared to 28% who answered “diservice” in this question, while the support for the opposing views in the two questions held similar levels (33% vs. 35%). The discrepancy of 8% between the two questions (5.4 and 5.12) can be explained by at least two possibilities. First, the use of the phrase “multi-lingual users” in the current question (5.12), vis-à-vis “general users” (5.4), might have signaled the respondents felt that it was more likely that the general users would experience disservice with a separate Asian collection. Second,
the use of “not” in the 5.4 statement might have confused some respondents, who might have taken the entire sentence in positive terms.

If the former was the case, the current result simply shows that the librarians perceive a splitting of Asian and English language materials does not bother the multi-lingual users as much as the general users. This is interesting given that our expectation was that it would be more of an inconvenience to multilingual users.

Question: “Agree or disagree?: Separating Asian language books from English books is a disservice to our multilingual library users.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>12 (17%)</td>
<td>19 (27%)</td>
<td>17 (24%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43. Opinions on Separating Asian and English Books as Disservice to Multilingual Users.

5.13 Opinions Regarding Separate Libraries for Other Languages as a Matter of Fairness

A small percentage of the respondents (15%) agreed that there should be specialized libraries for other language groups as well as an Asian collection or library, in order to ensure fairness and equality. More than a double the number (33%) thought that it was not necessary to have other separate language collections simply because there was an Asian collection. More than one half (51%) of the respondents did not answer one way or the other, indicating that this is not a pivotal issue for Asian studies librarians.

Question: “Agree or disagree?: If there is a specialized Asian collection/library, there should also be specialized libraries for other language groups (e.g. Slavic, Spanish, etc.) to ensure fairness and equality.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>29 (41%)</td>
<td>21 (30%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44. Opinions Regarding Separate Libraries for Other Language as a Matter of Fairness.

5.14 Opinions Regarding Whether or Not There is No Obvious Benefit in Separating the Collections by Language

Only 14% felt that there was no obvious benefit to separating collections along language lines, while 51% thought there was a benefit to this action. Nearly a quarter of the respondents indicated that they neither agree nor disagree with the statement.

There are some discrepancies between the results of this question and other questions. Regarding the ease of browsing (5.3), for example, only 9% indicated that a specialized Asian collection would not ease the browsing for the users. Given that result, we were surprised that only 51% of respondents felt that there was an obvious benefit to separating the collection along language lines.

Question: “Agree or disagree?: There is no obvious benefit for separating or dividing the library collection along language lines.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>17 (24%)</td>
<td>32 (46%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45. Opinions Regarding No Obvious Benefit in Separating the Collections along Languages.
5.15 Opinions Regarding an Asian Collection / Library as a Solution to Space Problems

Only 11% of the respondents saw the existence of a specialized Asian collection or library as a solution to space problems within the main library. Of the rest of the respondents, 50% neither agreed nor disagreed, 30% disagreed, and 9% did not respond to the question. Overall this can be seen to indicate that nearly 90% of respondents either do not think that a separate Asian collection would help solve space issues or do not think that this is a reason for which separating collections should be considered. Responses were not different by library collection size, indicating that this is a non-issue for libraries of any size.

Question: “Agree or disagree?: A specialized Asian collection/library contributes to solving space problems in our library system.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>35 (50%)</td>
<td>17 (24%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46. Opinions Regarding an Asian Collection / Library as a Solution to Space Problems

5.16 Opinions Regarding the Need for a Robust Catalogue System with Asian Language Search Capabilities and the Needs for a Separate Asian Library

The majority of respondents (66%) did not believe that a robust catalogue system with Asian language search capabilities would trump the need for a separate Asian collection. Only 13% of respondents felt that such a catalogue system would make a separate Asian collection unnecessary. This result is broadly consistent with respondents’ opinions regarding the perceived difficulty with online searching for Asian language titles (see section 5.5). The general consensus between those two results is that the level of ease or difficulty with online catalogue searching for Asian language materials is mostly irrelevant to the question of whether an Asian collection should be separated or not. In other words, technological improvements in online catalogues’ abilities to search of Asian language do not alone present a sufficient argument against the need for separate Asian libraries.

Question: “Agree or disagree?: If we have a robust catalogue system with Asian language search capability, we should not need a specialized Asian section or library.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>41 (59%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 47. Opinions Regarding Robust Catalogue System with Asian Language Search Capability and the Needs of Separate Asian Library

5.17 Opinions Regarding a Separate Asian Collection / Library and the Circulation Rate of Associated Asian Materials

Of all the respondents, 47% indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed that the circulation rate for Asian materials would increase if they were housed in a separate area or a specialized library. The second largest group (36%) of the respondents believed that a separate Asian collection would increase the circulation rate. The smallest group (9%) felt that a separate Asian collection would not increase the circulation of Asian materials. The high percentage of the “neither-or” responses, coupled with “no response” (9%), indicates that the majority of Asian studies librarians feel that there is no strong relationship between the creation of specialized space for Asian materials and the circulation rate.
Question: “Agree or disagree?: I believe that the circulation rate for Asian materials is higher if the Library has a separate Asian collection/Library rather than all books interfiled in the main collection.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>19 (27%)</td>
<td>33 (47%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 48. Opinions Regarding a Separate Asian Collection / Library and the Circulation Rate.

5.18 Opinions Regarding the Number of Asian Language Materials and a Corresponding Need for Creation of a Separate Space

Close to one half of the respondents (47%) felt that a specialized Asian language space should be created once an institution’s collection of Asian language materials reaches a certain size. Only 16% disagreed, feeling that collection size should not influence the implementation of the separation of Asian materials from the general collection. However, a relatively large percentage neither agreed nor disagreed (29%), indicating that many respondents do not feel strongly either way regarding separation based on the collection size of Asian materials.

Question: “Agree or disagree?: When the number of Asian language materials grows to reach a certain level, we must create specialized language space.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>24 (34%)</td>
<td>20(29%)</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49. Opinions Regarding the Number of Asian Language Materials and Creation of a Separate Space.

When the respondents were asked how large an Asian language collection should be before they would consider separating it from the general collection, the largest percentage of the respondents (29%) chose “greater than 50,000”. The responses show that the general tendency is that the larger the Asian collection, the more respondents feel that it is necessary to separate them from the general collections. However, if we exclude the “Should never be separated” and “No response” figures, and only focus our attention on those respondents who selected one of the “number range columns,” about one-third (16 individuals) chose “10,001-20,000” or less, indicating that some respondents believe that even smaller collections should be separated.

There was also a relatively high percentage of “neither agree nor disagree” (23%) answers to the question. This may be accounted for by the possibility that some respondents believe that Asian materials should always be separated from the general collection, no matter how small the number may be. Our original question did not include this option; therefore, it is difficult to determine if this was one of the true reasons for the high rate of “no response.”

Question: How large should an Asian language collection be before you consider separating it from the rest of the library collection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should never be separated</th>
<th>&lt;5,000</th>
<th>5,001-10,000</th>
<th>10,001-20,000</th>
<th>20,001-50,000</th>
<th>&gt;50,000</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>10 (14%)</td>
<td>20 (29%)</td>
<td>16 (23%)</td>
<td>70 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50. How Large an Asian Collection Should Be Before Being Separated.

5.19 Conclusions for the North American Asian Studies Librarian Survey

The majority of the respondents were reference and collections librarians responsible for the collection in at least one of three CJK languages in large, well-established research universities with graduate programs [Tables 25-30]. Half (51%) of the respondents work in libraries with more than 100,000 items in their Asian
collections [Table 31]. The vast majority (78%) of the Asian collections in the respondents’ institutions are housed in some kind of “separate” space, with only 16% of the respondents working in libraries with Asian materials fully intershelfed in the general collection [Table 32]. Close to two thirds reported that there are no other language-based collections on their campuses other than the “Asian” library, while 34% indicated that there are other language libraries on their campuses (e.g. Arabic, Slavic, Russian, etc.) [Table 33].

While some Asian studies librarians acknowledge that there are drawbacks to separating English and Asian language materials on the same topic [see for example Tables 34 & 35], most respondents generally feel that the merits of a separate collection outweigh the demerits. Highlights of our findings are as follows:

1) ‘Ease of browsing’ for library users is one of the strongest reasons for separating an Asian collection from the general collection, supported by 76% of the respondents [Table 34]. A perceived faculty demand for a separate Asian collection was also a reason for separation cited by the majority of respondents (68%).

2) Other strong reasons for a separate Asian collection are among the public relations and strategic aspects of library operations. The “prestige,” “visibility,” and “fundraising / marketing potential” factors, associated with a separate Asian collection, all scored highly with respondents [5.8, 5.9, 5.10]. Although high visibility scored high in the survey, the prospect of a potential increase in circulation rate scored weakly in our survey [5.19].

3) Difficulty or ease of online searching of Asian titles was not considered a deciding factor for separating Asian materials from the general collection [5.5, 5.18]. Neither was using a separate Asian collection as a solution to space problems [5.17].

4) Close to half (47%) of the respondents thought it was a good idea to separate an Asian collection from the general collection when the collection grows to be a certain size. More than half (60%) thought this size was 20,000 volumes or more.

5) Only 15% of the respondents felt the presence of a separate Asian collection necessitated the presence of other language-based libraries to ensure fairness and equality (5.15).

6) “Specialized Asian language skills for staff” scored moderately high (53%) as a reason for a separate library, while a separate Asian library as a possible cause of “friction among staff” between the Asian library and the main library scored relatively low (24%).

6. General Discussions

6.1 The Two Surveys and the Respondents.

As discussed previously, we conducted two online surveys:

1. The user survey on the UVic campus; and
2. The librarian survey for East Asian studies librarians in universities and colleges across North America.

These surveys are personal opinion surveys, and not institutional surveys. That is to say, although some questions, particularly in the librarian responses, asked a number of questions to identify institutional features (e.g., size of the library, student population size, etc.), the opinions expressed throughout the survey questions are strictly personal opinions and should not be considered to be the official positions of the institutions. Moreover, there were no restrictions as to how many librarians from one institution should respond; therefore, we have no way of drawing any conclusions regarding one institutional feature vis-à-vis another institutional feature, based on our librarian survey (e.g., Questions such as, “what percentage of pre-1900 established libraries hold more than 50,000 books?” etc., are out of scope in our methodology). It should be also noted that the librarian survey was advertised and conducted under the auspices of the CEAL Listserv, and therefore, the respondents are members of the Council of East Asian Libraries. Their
opinions on Asian libraries / collections do not necessarily represent academic librarians at large. On the other hand, our UVic campus survey for the users was advertised widely on campus, regardless of departmental affiliation or academic majors. Although a vast majority of the respondents were interested in Asian library collections and indeed were able to read an Asian language(s), many others responded strictly to express their views on our library’s future.

6.2 Reasons for Separating the Collection.

Among those who were surveyed, the strongest reason for physically separating the Asian collection from the general collection was the ease of browsing. This factor scored highest among both the campus users (86%) and the Asian studies librarians (76%). Perceived faculty demand was also high in the librarian survey with 68%. However, in our campus user survey, only 54% of the faculty wanted the Asian collection separated, with 25% opposing the idea outright, and the rest indicated that they had no preference. The 25% opposition against separating the collection among the faculty respondents, coupled with moderate support for the separation (54%) among the faculty, partly supports Gonnami’s anecdotal claim that some faculty may not necessarily like the idea of splitting the collection (Gonnami 1994:1). Chiu also points out the importance of browsability in academic libraries, especially in the LC classification environment, where Asian materials on different but related topics are shelved far apart (2001:4). Even for the users who have limited knowledge of the languages, a separate Asian language collection will increase their exposure to the original language context and their opportunity to access the potentially useful resources. In addition, one of the key recent trends in area studies is that more scholars are now involved in interdisciplinary cooperation, and as such need to look beyond their original specialty areas. Consequently, these scholars’ browsing needs may increase.

Difficulty or ease of online searching for Asian materials was not a deciding factor one way or the other for separating the collection. This was true in both the user survey and the librarian survey. The librarian survey, however, demonstrated that a moderately high percentage of the librarians (53%) believe that the need for specialized Asian language skills required for Asian library staff warrants an existence of a separate Asian library. From the users’ perspective, 33% of them admitted that it is not easy to find the Asian materials by searching online catalogue. Through the literature review, we found that the failure of the OPAC to provide useful access was a main reason cited by some authors to have a separate Asian collection (e.g. Dunkle 1993). The present situation may have improved due to the use of Unicode in OPAC records. But how it is improved and to what extent are worth further investigating.

Increasing the visibility of Asian materials was another strong reason for separating among both the users and the librarians, but for different reasons. The users tended to see the separate Asian collection as a way to stimulate research interest in Asian studies among students, while the librarians saw the visibility as an important aspect of marketing and fundraising. The users also tended to see the separate collection with increased visibility leading to increased circulation of Asian materials, while the librarians did not consider increasing circulation as a major reason for separating the collection. The librarians, however, thought that the existence of a visible Asian collection (or “library”) would increase the prestige of the institution, whereas the issue of prestige did not seem to resonate with respondents to the user survey.

6.3 Reasons for Not Separating the Collection.

Among the users who opposed the idea of separating the Asian materials from the general collection, the most-often cited reason (61%) was that separating English and Asian language books on the same topic does not serve multi-lingual users well; 33% of the librarians also recognized this as a potential issue. This concern was actually reflected in the arrangement of some of the “separate” Asian collections; 58% of the librarians indicated that some Western materials on Asian topics were interfiled in their separate Asian collections. The second strongest reason cited by users who did not want the collection separated (58% of these respondents) was that they were already accustomed to the way the collection is currently set up (being inter-shelved).
6.4 Other Factors for Consideration.

Our UVic user survey found that 43% of the users consider that the establishment of a separate Asian collection would legitimize arguments for possible other language-based library collections. Only 15% of the Asian studies librarians shared this view; that is, about one-third of the Asian studies librarians (33% - Section 5.13, Table 44) thought that having an Asian library on campus does not necessarily call for the establishment of other language libraries. This view is consistent with the historical background of East Asian libraries in general. Asian studies libraries in North America always held “different,” if not “special,” status among other language-based libraries (Chiu 2001:1). Yet, again, 57% of the users felt that the establishment of an Asian library would create an impression that the library was placing a “special focus” on Asian studies.

Depending on the library and hosting institution, the view on a separate Asian collection as a “special focus” or a bias towards Asian language over other languages may be, by itself, neither a negative or positive factor in relation to the separation. A “special focus” on Asian collections may be a positive development under certain circumstances, such as for serving an underserved community, or for meeting the institution’s strategic goals. However, it may also present a risk of tipping the balance of demands from other identifiable constituencies on campus. Either way it is paramount to engage many levels of the user community (as well as the university administrative structure) in the strategic planning of the collection.

The current surveys did not draw a significant conclusion regarding the placement of non-CJK Asian language materials (eg., Indonesian, Cambodian, etc.), although this issue came up in the initial discussion between the lead investigator (Suzuki) and the UVic Department of Pacific and Asian Studies, indicating that there is some concern on campus regarding the placement of other Asian language materials. At UVic, Indonesian is another major Asian language of instruction other than Chinese and Japanese. However, our Indonesian collection outside “languages and literature” is very small. That is, we do not widely collect Indonesian books on history and culture in the original tongue, and as such, the placement of these languages may not be as much of an issue at our institution.

In the surveys, we used the inclusive term “Asian language materials” in primary questions throughout the UVic user survey, reserving the term “CJK materials” for secondary questions (that is, the “sub-”questions following a major question). Only in the Asian studies librarian survey did we use “Asian materials” and “CJK” almost interchangeably, due to the fact that CEAL members tend to represent CJK collections. We asked only one inconsequential profile question regarding non-CJK materials, in which only 35% of the respondents with separate Asian collections said that there are non-CJK materials filed in their Asian collections.

The issue of inclusion of non-CJK materials in an Asian collection seems to be mainly a matter of local circumstances and the strategic decisions of each library and institution. Considerations of collection structure and size, and also the institution’s departmental structures, may reflect on the final decision.

7. General Conclusions

Some of the highlights of our two surveys were as follows:

1. Not surprisingly, both the campus users and the Asian studies librarians showed strong support for the idea of separating Asian language materials from the general collection. The ease of browsing was the strongest reason for both the users and the librarians. However, only 54% of the faculty users supported the idea of separating the collection.
2. Difficulty (or ease) of online searching was not a deciding factor for preference in separating the Asian collection.
3. Increasing visibility was another strong reason for the users and the librarians, though for different reasons: research motivation for the users; a marketing tool for the librarians.
4. Among the negative reasons against separation, the strongest opinion was *disruption of research* in having to search for relevant materials in two separate locations.

5. The users and the Asian studies librarians were split on views of a separate Asian collection vis-à-vis other specialized language collections on campus. A higher number of the users (43%) thought that it was fair to have other language collections separated out as well, should an Asian collection be established, while only 15% of the Asian studies librarians shared this view.

It should be noted again that the current surveys were personal opinion surveys, and do not reflect institutions’ official positions on given issues. It should be also noted that some of the strong responses may not necessarily apply in a particular local situation. For example, 29% of the librarians thought the Asian materials should be separated once the number of the materials reaches over 50,000; significantly more than those who answered “less than 5000” (only 6%). Yet it may be logistically easier and more cost effective to separate the collection while it is still small in number. In the end, we believe that separating the collection or re-integrating it should very much reflect local circumstances.

There are some academic libraries in North America which have more recently separated Asian materials from their general collections, and others which recently integrated two collections. Qualitative surveys (of historical nature, perhaps) may be necessary to document each location’s circumstances and local decision-making process. There also seems to be a lack of information regarding the situations in mid-size universities and colleges with only undergraduate level or masters level programs in Asian studies, which may or may not have an Asian studies specialist librarian; our survey was not particularly successful in documenting those circumstances. We believe that further studies are in order for those areas.
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**Appendix 2** - The Asian Studies Librarian Survey

### UVic Asian Collection Survey for Librarians

#### Institution and Collection Information

1. **What type of institution are you affiliated with?**
   - [ ] Community College
   - [ ] 4 year College/University (with primarily undergraduate programs)
   - [ ] 4 year University (with graduate studies)
   - [ ] Other (please specify):  

2. **Where is your university/college located?**
   - [ ] Canada
   - [ ] United States (Northeast)
   - [ ] United States (Midwest)
   - [ ] United States (South)
   - [ ] United States (West and Pacific)
   - [ ] Other (please specify):  

3a. **What is your primary language(s) responsibility in your position at the Library?**
   (Please check all that apply.)
   - [ ] East Asia general
   - [ ] Chinese
   - [ ] Japan
   - [ ] Korean
   - [ ] Other (please specify):  

3b. **What is your area(s) of responsibility at the Library? (Please check all that apply.)**
   - [ ] Management
   - [ ] Collections
   - [ ] Reference
   - [ ] Cataloguing
   - [ ] Circulation/Shelf management
   - [ ] Other (please specify):  

---

*Appendix 1 - The UVic User Survey was published in the PART I of this article in the previous issue of JEAL.*
### UVic Asian Collection Survey for Librarians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. What is your approximate student population?</td>
<td>Less than 5000, 5001-10,000, 10,001-20,000, Greater than 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When was your university/college established?</td>
<td>Before 1900, 1900 - 1925, 1926 - 1950, 1951 - 1975, After 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. What is the highest degree offered in Asian Studies (or Chinese, Japanese and/or Korean studies) at your institution?</td>
<td>PhD, MA, BA, Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. What is the highest degree offered in other disciplines related to Asia at your institution. (Please use the space provided to specify the disciplines)</td>
<td>PhD, MA, BA, Other, Please specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What is the total size of your institution’s Asian materials collection? (please include Chinese, Japanese and Korean materials)</td>
<td>Less than 10,000, 10,001-20,000, 20,001-50,000, 50,001-100,000, Greater than 100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UVic Asian Collection Survey for Librarians

8a. What is the physical setting of the Asian language materials in your Library?
- Stand alone Asian Library - physically separate from the main Library
- Part of main Library, but in a separate, designated room or floor
- Part of main Library, in a separate shelving space - not in a distinct room or floor
- Part of the main Library, with no special shelving area - Asian materials interfiled with other materials

8b. If you have either a stand-alone Asian Library OR a designated room/floor for the Asian collection, do you have any Western language materials on Asia in your Asian collection?
- Yes
- No
- N/A

8c. If you have your Asian collection either interfiled with the regular collection OR in a separate shelving space (not a distinct room or floor), do you have Asian language-only Reference area in your Library?
- Yes
- No
- N/A

8d. For those who DO have a stand-alone or separate, designated space for Asian materials, do you include any Asian language materials other than those in Chinese, Japanese or Korean?
- Yes
- No
- N/A

9. Are there other special Libraries or distinct collections on your campus distinguished by languages, other than small departmental reading rooms? (e.g. Slavic Library, Arabic Library, etc.)
- No
- Yes, please list those Libraries below:

[Blank space for listing]
**UVic Asian Collection Survey for Librarians**

### General Questions

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please select the "Neither agree or disagree" option if you don’t have an opinion or know the answer to the question.

Please note: this is an opinion survey for individual librarians and your answer does not necessarily have to coincide with or represent your library’s official position on the topics raised in the survey.

There is an area to enter any comments you have at the end of the survey.

10. A separate Asian collection/Library would ease browsing, thus beneficial to Library users.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree or Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

11. Separating Asian language books from English books on the same topic is not beneficial to Library users.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree or Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

12. Searching Asian books in the regular (English) catalog system is too difficult for Library users.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree or Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

13. A separate Asian collection/Library is necessary because staff need specialized Asian language skills.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree or Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

14. A separate Asian collection/Library creates divisions and friction among Asian studies Library staff and the rest of the main Library staff.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree or Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

15. A specialized Asian collection/Library contributes to the prestige of the institution.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree or Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

16. Visibility of a specialized Asian collection/Library as a distinct entity (i.e., stand-alone, separate, designated space) is important to Library users.
   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree or Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
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17. Having a specialized Asian collection/Library is important for fundraising or marketing for the institution.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

18. There is a strong demand for a specialized Asian collection/Library among faculty members.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

19. Separating Asian language books from English books is a disservice to our multilingual Library users.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

20. If there is a specialized Asian collection/Library, there should also be specialized Libraries for other language groups (e.g. Slavic, Spanish, etc.) to ensure fairness and equality.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

21. There is no obvious benefit for separating or dividing the Library collection along language lines.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

22. A specialized Asian collection/Library contributes in solving space problems in our Library system.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

23. Separating the Asian collection/Library from the rest of the Library collection is an important academic tradition.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

24. If we have a robust catalog system with Asian language search capability, we should not need a specialized Asian section or Library.

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree
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25. I believe that the circulation rate for Asian materials is higher if the Library has a separate Asian collection/Library rather than all books interfiled in the main collection.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

26. When the number of Asian language materials grows to reach a certain level, we must create specialized language space.

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

27. How large should an Asian language collection be before you consider separating it from the rest of the library collection?

- [ ] Should never be separated
- [ ] Less than 5000
- [ ] 5001-10,000
- [ ] 10,001-20,000
- [ ] 20,001-50,000
- [ ] Greater than 50,000
- [ ] Other (please specify) [ ]

28. Please add any comments or thoughts you may have regarding the advantages or disadvantages of creating a separate Asian collection in an academic library system.

[ ]