

American Archivists and Their Society: A Composite View

By FRANK B. EVANS and ROBERT M. WARNER

SOME 15 years ago Ernst Posner, for his presidential address to the Society of American Archivists, chose as his theme: "What, Then, Is the American Archivist, This New Man?" With his characteristic blend of wisdom and wit Dr. Posner discussed the problems inherent in various approaches to the topic. He finally chose to describe "*homo archivalis Americanus*" in terms of the "environment and the forces that have shaped" him and to explore the "historical foundations of archival endeavor in this country and the conditioning effect they have had on our profession."¹ Before deciding upon "a deductive-philosophical mode and mood," however, Dr. Posner first attempted a quantitative approach to his basic question. He had drawn certain conclusions from replies to questionnaires used in compiling the Society's first membership *Directory*, but he readily admitted his figures were "subject to considerable question." Some 20 percent of the individual members had failed to return their questionnaires, and a significant number of those who had replied were "singularly reticent" in response to questions about their "academic underwear" and their publications. In addition an analysis of respondents' principal activities was difficult to make, especially, he noted, among the "migratory workers" who moved between archives and "record work" and those associated with records centers. Dr. Posner finally decided to identify separately one troublesome group of Society members—troublesome at

Dr. Evans, Deputy Assistant Archivist for the National Archives, NARS, is a Fellow and Council Member of the Society, editor of the Abstracts Department of the *American Archivist*, director of the Archives Institute, and adjunct professor at American University. He is the author of articles on several aspects of archives administration in the *American Archivist* and the recent *The Administration of Modern Archives: A Select Bibliographic Guide*. Dr. Warner, Director of the Michigan Historical Collections, is a Fellow and Council Member of the Society, chairman of the Society Committee on Education and Training, and associate professor of history at the University of Michigan. Among his publications is *The Modern Manuscript Library*.

¹ Ernst Posner, "What, Then, Is the American Archivist, This New Man?" in *American Archivist*, 20:6 (Jan. 1957).

least from a classification point of view—that “*bouillabaisse* consisting of history professors [including himself], librarians, and other noncatalogable units.”²

Having thus qualified his statistics, Dr. Posner announced his most newsworthy conclusion—that “*homo archivalis Americanus*” was “33% of the female sex.” Women numbered 44 of the 183 members principally engaged in archival work, 31 of the 112 in “record work,” 13 of the 36 in “manuscript work,” and 16 of the 86 engaged in “other work.” “Not even the French,” he observed, could “beat this very complimentary ratio.” After expressing concern about the Society’s lack of success in gaining members among those engaged in manuscript work, Dr. Posner, exhibiting his lifelong interest in education and professional development, turned his attention to members’ educational backgrounds and scholarly activities, as reflected by earned degrees and numbers of publications. He noted that 84.5 percent of those engaged in archival and manuscript work held academic degrees and that nearly 65 percent had advanced degrees. Those “laboring in the record management vineyard,” he observed, had been “exposed to less academic contamination”; the corresponding figures were, respectively, 52.7 percent and 26.8 percent. For each membership category Dr. Posner had compiled the total number of published books, articles, and reviews, but he attempted no analysis or evaluation of the figures. The publications to which they referred, he explained, differed “too much in size as well as substance to permit any valid conclusions.”³

This initial and tentative attempt to describe the American archivist by analyzing Society membership provides a useful and unique background for the present study. Although our total membership has grown significantly during the past decade and a half, no sys-

² *Ibid.*, p. 4-6.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 5-6. Dr. Posner’s analysis was accompanied by the following table (p. 5 n.), in which the M.A. degree was “interpreted to include a degree from a major library school”:

	PERSONS PRINCIPALLY ENGAGED IN				HOLDING DEGREE OF			PUBLI- CATIONS
		MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	B.A.	M.A.	PH. D.	
I	Archival work	139	44	183	37	78	40	115
II	Record work	81	31	112	29	29	1	31
III	Manuscript work	23	13	36	2	20	8	27
	Total	243	88	331	68	127	49	173
IV	Other work	70	16	86	26	29	26	59
	Grand total	313	104	417	94	156	75	232

tematic study of that membership had been made.⁴ Consequently, when a proposal was made several years ago for a session at our annual meeting on the topic "Who Is an Archivist?" the idea got no further than preliminary discussion. Everyone agreed such a session would be both interesting and valuable, but in the absence of essential basic data the proposal was simply not feasible. As members of the Society's Committee on Education and Training, the authors of this article were fully aware of the lack of basic information in the area. To further the work of their committee they developed a select questionnaire, but they soon agreed to expand the questionnaire to provide a wider range of basic data on Society members. In an effort to make the project as useful as possible the secretary circulated the draft questionnaire among committee chairmen for criticism and suggestions. Few responded, but among those who did the authors are indebted to Vernon B. Santen for valuable suggestions regarding the questionnaire's format. The project was approved by the SAA Council in December 1968 but was deferred until the projected reorganization of the Society's committee structure was completed. Following further revision, the questionnaire, with a covering letter, was reproduced by the secretary and mailed to all individual members in March 1970.

Viewed in retrospect, the questionnaire undoubtedly could have been improved. In some respects it was cumbersome and difficult to complete. Not all of the implied questions were models of clarity, nor were all listed categories mutually exclusive. Some of the data requested proved to be essentially irrelevant or did not reveal significant characteristics. The request for a preferential listing of areas of major professional specialization or interest was largely ignored by most respondents and was therefore omitted from the final tabulations. It should also be noted that the questionnaire was not accompanied by a stamped, addressed return envelope. Notwithstanding these inadequacies and limitations, the authors were convinced that the 423 returns received from a total mailing of about 1,060 questionnaires provided useful information in a number of areas and would help establish a basis for future investigation and study of the profession. The replies were entrusted to another member of the Committee on Education and Training, John Colson of the University of Maryland School of Library Science, who in turn secured the services of one of his graduate students, Regina

⁴ Note the joint survey made by Philip P. Mason, as SAA secretary, and Director William T. Alderson, Jr., of the American Association for State and Local History, of the salary structure of historical and archival agencies; see Philip P. Mason, "Economic Status of the Archival Profession, 1965-66," in *American Archivist*, 30:105-122 (Jan. 1967).

Robbins. In accordance with the authors' guidelines and under Professor Colson's direction, Mrs. Robbins coded the responses, prepared all of the data for machine processing, and tabulated the results as a course project. For the invaluable assistance of Professor Colson and Mrs. Robbins the authors are most grateful. What follows is an admittedly limited attempt to formulate a group portrait of our professional society and to describe and compare certain characteristics of the major groups comprising the SAA. The authors, who are neither statisticians nor social scientists, recognize that it is virtually impossible to delineate precisely the features of any group of persons, whether it be a professional organization or an ethnic or social group. Nevertheless, it is possible to gather sufficient data to create portraits, which, though not precise in detail, can provide outlines and reasonable basis for description. Behavioral scientists have long used this approach effectively in characterizing contemporary segments of society or in describing the composition and characteristics of a group that existed in the past.

Before outlining and commenting on the principal findings of the survey, some words of caution are necessary. The returns make the archival⁵ profession look significantly better than it actually is, for they probably reveal a higher degree of education and training, higher salaries, and more professional involvement than is actually the case. There are at least two reasons for this result. In the first place, an unknown number of full-time and particularly of part-time archivists, manuscript curators, and records managers are not represented in the findings since they are not Society members and did not receive the questionnaire. Second, only about 40 percent of those who received questionnaires returned them, and about 47 percent of the respondents identified themselves as either the administrative head of an agency (22 percent) or as the administrative head of a program (25 percent). An additional 32 percent stated that they held subordinate administrative positions or were professional staff members. The obvious conclusions are that the top echelon of archival agencies holds membership in the Society and responded to the questionnaire and that those in the intermediate range and at the bottom of the scale generally did not return their questionnaires. These conclusions are reinforced by the average age and tenure of the respondents. One final qualification is that not all respondents completed the entire questionnaire, with the result that percentages do not always total 100. The responses given were for the most part straightforward, but there were some exceptions—

⁵ In this report the terms "archival" and "archivists" are intended to include manuscript curators and records managers.

a marital status described as "ménage à trois," a cryptic "wide experience" reply to the questions on education and training, and a listing of "pornographic movies" as an area of special interest, to cite but three examples. The omission of such responses from the totals, however, produced no perceptible change in the findings.

Projecting our 40 percent "sample" of the Society's total membership, we found that the majority—65 percent—of the members were male and that women constituted 28 percent of the membership. The remaining 7 percent were, by default or by choice, nondescript. Compared with the 33 percent of females reported in Dr. Posner's 1956 study, our survey seems to indicate a relative decline in female membership during the past 15 years, but this is offset by the regrettable facts that women too frequently are unable to advance beyond lower and median-range positions in many agencies and that many of these women either do not belong to the Society or else did not return their questionnaires. All in all the ratio between males and females remains, to use Dr. Posner's term, "very complimentary." Colleges and universities employed the largest number of women—33 percent of the 141 respondents in this category—and churches the least—8 percent of the 25 respondents. More than 64 percent of our members are married, and an additional 7 percent are either divorced or widowed. (We invite your comment on the professional, social, or other significance of the data on marital status.) Reflecting the extent to which the senior members of the Society responded to the questionnaire, the average age of respondents was 45, and their average years of service with their present employer was nearly 13. A comparison of the results in terms of present employer is given in Table 1.

In terms of areas of major activity (see Table 2), the survey revealed that less than 61 percent of our members identify themselves as concerned exclusively or even primarily with archives (34.3 percent), manuscripts (14.4 percent), or records management (12.1 percent). Nearly 13 percent reported their areas of primary activity as archives and manuscripts (5 percent); archives and records management (4.3 percent); archives, manuscripts, and records management (3.3 percent); and manuscripts and records management (0.2 percent). The results indicate the direct relationship that exists between the type (and thus the size) of the agency and the extent of professional specialization of its staff. They also underscore the need for records management programs in many areas, particularly in universities and colleges and in church organizations.

For equally interesting results of questions relating to current position and status see Table 3. As previously stated 21.5 percent of

TABLE 1
GENERAL DATA

PRESENT EMPLOYER	TOTAL NUMBER IN SURVEY	% MALE	% FEMALE	AVERAGE AGE	AVERAGE NUMBER YEARS, PRESENT EMPLOYER
University and college	141	61.7	33.3	45.5	7.5
Federal					
Government	92	75.0	15.2	44.9	15.3
State government	57	66.7	26.3	42.8	8.4
Miscellaneous*	56	60.7	35.7	48.2	10.5
Business	25	60.0	16.7	46.6	16.6
Church	25	56.0	8.0	51.0	9.8
Historical society	17	64.7	23.5	41.2	7.4
Municipal/local government	10	50.0	30.0	53.2	11.1
Composite	423	65.2	27.7	44.9	12.7

* Includes retirees and respondents who listed research agencies, foundations, medical and professional associations, public utilities, and similar institutions and organizations as their present employer.

the respondents indicated they were the administrative head of their agency (how 10.9 percent of those in Federal service could make this claim defies explanation); another 24.6 percent identified themselves as administrative head of a program area within the agency; and 3.3 percent indicated they occupied subordinate administrative positions. A total of 29.3 percent listed themselves as professional staff members, but only 0.7 percent—all in the Federal Government—listed themselves as technicians. The category “nonprofessional staff member” drew a complete blank. The relatively high percentage of agency and program “heads” reflects not only the small size of a number of private archival agencies—frequently only one or two persons—but also highlights the need for the Society to undertake a major recruitment effort aimed at the nonadministrative staff of all agencies, particularly government archives at every level.

Salary structures of professional groups are always of interest, but unfortunately the structure that emerges from the returns of this survey varies significantly from reality. For example, if we take the results at face value, we may conclude that business archivists have an average salary of \$17,300, that nearly 42 percent of them earn more than \$20,000 annually, and that nearly 17 percent receive more than \$30,000 a year. We may also conclude that archival and records management employees of the Federal Government earn an

TABLE 2
AREAS OF PRIMARY ACTIVITY

PRESENT EMPLOYER	TOTAL NUMBER IN SURVEY	ARCHIVES	MANU-SCRIPTS	RECORDS MANAGE-MENT	ARCHIVES AND MSS.	ARCHIVES AND RECORDS MANAGE-MENT	MSS. AND RECORDS MANAGE-MENT	ARCHIVES, MSS., AND RECORDS MANAGE-MENT
University and college	141	52 (36.9%)	28 (19.9%)	2 (1.4%)	9 (6.8%)	7 (5%)	2 (1.4%)
Federal								
Government	92	42 (45.7%)	9 (9.7%)	18 (19.6%)	2 (2.2%)	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.2%)
State government	57	21 (36.8%)	4 (7%)	7 (12.3%)	3 (5.2%)	4 (7%)	8 (14%)
Miscellaneous	56	12 (21.4%)	6 (10.7%)	7 (12.5%)	6 (10.7%)	4 (7.4%)	1 (1.8%)
Business	25	5 (20%)	12 (48.8%)	1 (4%)
Church	25	12 (48.8%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)
Historical society	17	1 (5.9%)	10 (59.3%)	1 (5.9%)	1 (5.9%)
Municipal/local government	10	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)
Composite	34.3%	14.4%	12.1%	5.0%	4.3%	0.2%	3.3%
Totals	423	(145)	(61)	(51)	(21)	(18)	(1)	(14)

TABLE 3
CURRENT POSITION AND STATUS

PRESENT EMPLOYER	AGENCY HEAD	PROGRAM HEAD	ADMINIS- TRATIVE SUBORDI- NATE	SIGNAL STAFF	TECHNI- CIAN	OTHER*
University and college	18.4%	28.4%	3.5%	25.6%	...	19.9%
Federal						
Government	10.9	23.6	5.4	45.7	3.3%	10.9
State government	35.1	21.1	3.5	29.8	...	8.8
Miscellaneous	25.0	23.2	...	23.2	...	19.6
Business	12.0	32.0	...	12.0	...	36.0
Church	44.0	12.0	8.0	8.0	...	24.0
Historical society	23.5	24.1	...	35.3	...	5.9
Municipal/local government	30.0	10.0	...	50.0	...	10.0
Composite	21.5%	24.6%	3.3%	29.3%	0.7%	16.8%

* Includes those who identified themselves as teachers, editors, management analysts, graduate assistants, etc.

average of \$15,900 annually, that nearly 25 percent receive more than \$20,000 a year, that 5.4 percent of them receive more than \$30,000, and that none of them earn less than \$9,000 annually. We know this salary structure does not exist in either business or the Federal Government; thus the survey findings are useful chiefly for comparing the salaries of those in the upper echelons of the profession. Years of service would normally constitute a significant variable in the pattern, but except for those employed by business and the Federal Government (averaging 16.6 and 15.3 years, respectively, with their present employers), the groups involved in the survey have been with their present employer between 7.4 and 11.1 years. Among the latter groups average salaries by type of employers were: municipal and local government, \$12,500; miscellaneous, \$11,900; State government, \$10,700; university and college, \$10,300; historical society, \$10,200; and, not surprisingly, churches, \$8,500. The full tabulation from the returns is presented in Table 4.

Although the overall average of \$12,100 is presentable for a professional organization, nearly 16 percent of those in the employ of State governments, about 24 percent of those in historical societies, and more than 50 percent of those in the church archives field earn less than the beginning salary for bus drivers in the District of Columbia. We are convinced that had the full membership returned questionnaires, the group averages and the overall average would

TABLE 4
SALARY STRUCTURE

SALARIES	UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	STATE GOVERNMENT	MISCELLANEOUS	BUSINESS	CHURCH	HISTORICAL SOCIETY	MUNICIPAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT	COMPOSITE
Over \$30,000	5.4%	1.9%	16.7%	2.4%
25,000-30,000	1.4%	5.4	1.9	12.5	10.0%	3.0
20,000-24,999	3.6	14.1	7.6	12.5	5.6%	5.9%	6.7
18,000-19,999	2.9	10.9	5.3%	7.6	4.2	11.8	10.0	6.2
16,000-17,999	2.9	13.0	5.3	5.8	10.0	5.7
14,000-15,999	10.0	15.2	17.6	7.6	12.5	5.6	10.0	11.5
12,000-13,999	18.6	20.2	14.1	7.6	12.5	16.7	11.8	20.0	16.5
10,000-11,999	22.9	10.9	21.1	19.2	16.7	16.7	17.7	20.0	16.7
9,000-9,999	11.4	4.4	10.5	3.8	4.2	5.6	11.8	7.8
8,000-8,999	11.4	10.5	7.6	4.2	17.7	7.4
7,000-7,999	8.5	7.0	5.8	4.2	16.7	11.8	10.0	7.6
6,000-6,999	5.7	5.3	5.9	3.0
5,000-5,999	1.8	1.9	11.1	1.0
Under 5,000	6.4	1.8	11.5	22.2	5.9	10.0	1.4
AVERAGE ANNUAL SALARY*	\$10,300	\$15,900	\$10,700	\$11,900	\$17,300	\$8,500	\$10,200	\$12,500	\$12,100

* To determine the average the lowest figure in each range was used; in the "under \$5,000" range, \$1,000 was used.

have been substantially lower and a heavier concentration of those earning less than \$8,000 annually would have occurred.⁶

One significant finding of the survey as shown by Table 5 is that many Society members engage in a wide range of professional and nonprofessional activities in addition to their regular responsibilities and that more than 27 percent of the respondents supplement their salaries in this manner. The range is from 16.3 percent of those employed by the Federal Government to a readily understandable 48 percent of church archivists.

In keeping with the relatively high degree of mobility that characterizes modern life, the survey shows (see Table 6) that in our profession there is mobility in a number of areas. Since most of the respondents occupy high positions in their agencies, fewer than 30 percent hold their original positions. Among those who work for the Federal Government over 48 percent have never worked for any other employer, but among those in the employ of business agencies and municipal and local governments only 12 percent and 10 percent, respectively, are with their original employer. Of the total number of respondents, 32.4 percent have held at least one other position and another 38.7 percent have held at least two earlier positions.

In some respects the pattern of professional society membership that emerged from the survey is one of the most revealing and unusual sections of this report. As most respondents are in the upper levels of the profession it is not too surprising that they display an active interest in a wide variety of professional organizations. The respondents averaged slightly more than four professional memberships, with those working for historical societies the most (5.4 percent) and those employed by the Federal Government the fewest (3.1 percent). Somewhat surprising is the fact that all respondents averaged less than 9 years of membership in the SAA. Those in the miscellaneous category led with an average of 10.2 years, followed by those in the Federal service with a 9-year average. At the opposite end of the scale were those with universities and col-

⁶ Comparisons between the findings of the salary study cited in note 4 and this survey are difficult to make because data collected in the earlier study were on an institutional- not an individual-membership basis. The overall \$12,100 average annual salary can be compared with the 1966 average of \$10,884 for heads of archival agencies, \$10,080 for assistant heads, \$9,732 for division heads, \$8,724 for advanced professionals, and \$6,516 for beginning professionals for a composite average of \$9,187; see Mason, in *American Archivist*, 30:106-110 (Jan. 1967). A recent survey of special librarians and "information personnel" revealed a "mean basic annual salary" in 1970 of \$11,800, which represented a 33 percent increase over the 1967 mean for the same groups; see Special Libraries Association Personnel Committee, "SLA Salary Survey 1970," in *Special Libraries*, 61:333 (July-Aug. 1970).

TABLE 5
ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND SUPPLEMENTARY INCOME

PRESENT EMPLOYER	SUPPLEMENT SALARY	WRITE	SPEAK	TEACH	CONSULT	OTHER*	RECEIVE PAYMENT†	AVERAGE ANNUAL PAYMENT
University and college Federal	31.9%	48.9%	20.6%	26.9%	15.6%	5.7%	50.0%	\$2,900
Government	16.3	32.7	19.6	13.0	12.0	4.3	38.5	1,800
State government	19.3	38.6	17.5	10.5	17.5	10.5	39.3	1,300
Miscellaneous	33.9	55.4	37.5	33.9	39.3	8.9	66.1	3,100
Business	20.0	32.0	40.0	8.0	36.0	16.0	41.7	2,700
Church	48.0	44.0	20.0	36.0	12.0	12.0	75.0	2,600
Historical society	35.3	29.4	29.4	17.7	17.7	5.9	60.0	600
Municipal/local government	30.0	50.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	43.0	1,700
Composite	27.4%	42.8%	23.6%	21.5%	19.1%	7.8%	48.5%	\$2,100

* Includes such activities as ministry, photography, and Armed Forces reserves.

† Represents the percentage of those engaged in one or more of the enumerated activities who receive payment for such activities.

TABLE 6
OCCUPATIONAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL MOBILITY

PRESENT EMPLOYER	ORIGINAL POSITION (EMPLOYER)	SECOND POSITION (EMPLOYER)	THREE OR MORE POSITIONS	SECOND STATE/ PROVINCE*	THREE OR MORE STATES/ PROVINCES*
University and college Federal	21.3%	39.0%	39.7%	38.3%	29.8%
Government	48.7	19.6	32.6	39.1	18.5
State government	37.0	33.3	29.7	24.6	19.3
Miscellaneous	23.2	28.6	48.2	41.1	21.3
Business	12.0	36.0	52.0	36.0	24.0
Church	24.0	44.0	32.0	40.0	20.0
Historical society	23.5	35.3	41.2	41.2	17.6
Municipal/local government	10.0	30.0	60.0	10.0	20.0
Composite	28.9%	32.4%	38.7%	36.4%	23.1%

* Includes the State or Province given as place of birth.

leges (averaging 6 years) and those employed by historical societies (averaging only 3.9 years). Reflecting the profession's basic historical interests and close relationship with the historical community is the fact that the most frequently reported type of professional organization membership was that in a State historical association. Some 32.6 percent of the respondents indicated such membership, followed closely by 32.1 percent who are members of the American Association for State and Local History and 30.9 percent who belong to a local history association. Only 21.1 percent of our respondents are members of the American Historical Association, and an even smaller number, 17.9 percent, belong to the Organization of American Historians. Other closely related professional interests are indicated by the nearly 19 percent of respondents who are members of their State library association (led by those in historical societies, 47.9 percent, and in State government, 29.8 percent), the 11.6 percent who belong to the American Library Association, and the 5.2 percent who are in the ranks of the Special Libraries Association. Rounding out the picture, 8.3 percent of our respondents hold membership in the Manuscript Society, 7.1 percent are on the rolls of the National Microfilm Association, and several belong to one or more of a wide variety of other local, State, national, and international professional organizations and associations.

Professional membership among some groups of respondents reflects well-defined areas of interest. For example, though only

about 14 percent of the total number of respondents belong to the American Records Management Association, 60 percent of the business archivists and 58 percent of the municipal archivists belong to the organization. Those two groups, on the other hand, reported no memberships in either the American Historical Association or the Organization of American Historians. Some 32 percent of the Federal archivists, however, belong to the AHA, which was second only to the SAA in their membership in professional organizations. Though we should not read too much significance into this data, it may help explain the apparent divergence of interests that is manifest on occasion in the archival profession. In any event there is a real and immediate need to strengthen the relationship between those in positions of leadership in our profession and the major organizations of academic historians, librarians, and records managers.

Perhaps the most important part of the questionnaire, at least in the authors' opinion, was that providing basic data on the educational background and training of SAA members. The survey (see Table 7) revealed that nearly half of our respondents hold a master's degree (35.5 percent either an M.A. or an M.S. and 12.1 percent an M.L.S.). Another 16.6 percent are Ph. D.'s, and 21.9 percent hold either a B.A. or a B.S. In addition to the college graduates, 8.5 percent report business school, extension courses, or similar formal education. Among the college graduates 47.7 percent reported an undergraduate major in history; among those with advanced degrees 63.8 percent reported their graduate major was history. The significant exceptions to this general historical orientation are persons employed by business and municipal and local government. The findings that 86 percent of the respondents hold academic degrees and that 64.2 percent hold advanced degrees compare favorably with the 84.5 percent and 64.9 percent in the same categories of Dr. Posner's 1956 study. Our ability to attract and hold academically qualified people during the intervening decade and a half, a period when archival salaries were generally falling behind those in the academic community, suggests that even higher standards can be attained now that college and university teaching positions are becoming increasingly more difficult to obtain.

However creditable our academic underpinnings, our record of professional education and training leaves much to be desired. In only three areas did more than 50 percent of our respondents have even a single course or any formal training in archives administration. Because the Federal Government pioneered such training, it will come as no surprise that it leads the list with a total of 64.3 percent, exclusive of separate records management or library school training. Of those in the service of church organizations 52 per-

TABLE 7
FORMAL EDUCATION

PRESENT EMPLOYER	PH. D.	M.A. OR M.S.	M.L.S.	B.A. OR B.S.	OTHER*	UNDER- GRADUATE HISTORY MAJOR	GRADUATE HISTORY MAJOR
University and college	24.1%	36.2%	21.9%	57.4%	2.1%	51.5%	63.8%
Federal							
Government	18.5	42.4	1.1	20.2	12.0	57.9	70.2
State government	14.1	40.1	8.8	22.8	7.0	53.1	66.7
Miscellaneous	17.9	23.2	23.2	19.6	10.7	36.2	55.6
Business	20.0	12.0	44.0	20.0	15.8	37.5
Church	8.0	40.0	16.0	24.0	43.8	50.0
Historical society	17.7	35.3	11.8	29.4	50.0	100.0
Municipal/local government	10.0	50.0	20.0	10.0	16.7
Composite	16.6%	35.5%	12.1%	21.9%	8.5%	47.7%	63.8%

* Includes business schools, extension courses, and others.

TABLE 8
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

PRESENT EMPLOYER	RECORDS					(1), (2), AND (3)	OTHER*
	ARCHIVAL TRAINING (1)	MANAGEMENT TRAINING (2)	LIBRARY SCIENCE (3)	(1) AND (2)	(1) AND (3)	(2) AND (3)	
University and college	31.2%	2.9%	14.2%	3.5%	13.5%	2.1%	3.5%
Federal							
Government	37.0	6.5	3.3	19.6	3.3	4.4
State government	24.6	8.8	7.0	14.1	7.0	1.8
Miscellaneous	7.9	10.7	14.3	16.1	7.4	1.8
Business	16.0	36.0	8.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Church	28.0	12.0	8.0	16.0	8.0
Historical society	17.7	5.9	11.8	17.7	5.9	5.9
Municipal/local government	10.0	30.0	20.0

* Includes those who indicated internships only, "appropriate courses," and similar training.

cent reported having received archival training, followed by 50.3 percent of those in the university and college field. Results for the remaining areas were: State government, 45.7 percent; historical societies, 41.3 percent; the miscellaneous group, 33.2 percent; municipal and local government, 30 percent; and business, 28 percent. The extent to which archival training has been supplemented by records management and library science training is indicated in Table 8. Without belaboring the point, it should be obvious that much remains to be done in the matter of education and training and that the solution is not simply a proliferation of introductory courses. The above findings should be of value to the Society and its Committee on Education and Training as it wrestles with this basic challenge facing our profession.

Many of the findings of this survey will merely appear to confirm previous assumptions, but even when the facts and figures serve only this purpose they can be of value. It is always useful to determine which of our impressions and presuppositions are supported by facts and which are based on error. A wider and more complete response from SAA members, both in questionnaires returned and fully completed questionnaires, would have added still more to the value of the findings. To those who did respond, however, the authors express appreciation for aiding the development of the archival profession.

Survey data comparable with Dr. Posner's observations of a decade and a half ago show little change. The lack of change is itself a significant fact, however, indicating a degree of inertia in the profession. A rough comparison of the salary area with the Mason-Alderson survey of 1965-66 indicates some improvement, but this may be illusory when one takes into account the rise in the cost of living and the disproportionately large number of upper-level professionals who answered the questionnaire. The most basic generalization we can make from the survey is that the archival profession is still in the formative stage. Its members are drawn from a variety of educational and occupational backgrounds, and they reveal significantly divergent professional training, experience, and interests. The bounds of the profession still remain undefined, and the professional identity of the members is uncertain. With the development of new institutes, courses, and curricula to provide essential archival training, the "identity crisis" may be resolved. Hopefully, this report will stimulate a more comprehensive and sophisticated survey, which will provide more definitive answers to the questions of who we are and where we are going.