A Look at a Bigger Picture: The Demographic Profile of Archivists in Canada based on a National Survey*

BARBARA L. CRAIG

RÉSUMÉ Cet article présente les résultats d'un sondage national effectué en 1998 auprès des membres de *l'Association of Canadian Archivists*. Selon la méthode de Salant et Dillman pour la tenue de sondages postaux, un taux élevé de soixante-dix pour cent permet de dresser un portrait fidèle de la situation. Le profil démographique qui est présenté ici découle des questionnaires retournés de toutes les provinces et territoires. Des tableaux de fréquences sont offerts dans l'article. Les résultats obtenus démontrent la valeur des sondages et indiquent le besoin de la profession quant à la collecte régulière de données ; cela permet de conserver les connaissances à jour sur cette profession et de contrôler la façon dont ses traits et besoins sont représentés dans le cadre d'initiatives professionnelles et institutionnelles.

ABSTRACT This article is a report of the results of a national survey of members of the Association of Canadian Archivists undertaken in 1998. Following the method of Salant and Dillman for mail surveys, a high response of seventy per cent provides an accurate picture. The demographic profile of archivists that is discussed is based on returns from all provinces and territories. Frequency tables are provided. The results underscore the value of surveys and point to the profession's need for regular data collection to keep its knowledge up-to-date and to control the ways professional characteristics and needs are represented in professional and institutional initiatives.

A hallmark of the archive profession is its focus on records in context. Archivists endeavor to increase that knowledge in every way they can to meet the demands of creating a historical memory that is plural, lasting, and useful. By contrast, archivists have an imperfect knowledge about themselves as a profession in Canada and have yet to devise a regular way of building useful profiles of their members, work duties, and education needs. Efforts to enhance our sources of data and expand our understanding of the profession's demographics are irregular and capricious. On a general level, we know how many claim membership by counting paying affiliates to archives associations or by adding the numbers reported by institutions employed as archivists. On a personal level, archivists are familiar with the skills and strengths of their close professional colleagues. But if we were asked to describe the characteristics of the profession as a body of practitioners with experiences, training, education,

professional responsibilities, and special needs, we would be hard pressed to do so. From a bird's-eye view, the big picture is most often hidden, while from an immediate personal perspective on the profession, the contours of the landscape as a whole are veiled by myriad personal details.

Occasional surveys undertaken for specific purposes illuminate portraits of archives and archivists in Canada, but their light, however penetrating, is always brief.[1] Moreover, these sources all fail to give a complete or clear picture of the archivists' collective demographics. Fragmentary information about the profession and its workplaces is acknowledged as a handicap, but, even more worrying, it seems to me, is the lack of any agreed procedures for regularly gathering consistent data. Apart from Statistics Canada reports which largely combine data about archivists, librarians, and museum workers into a single population, no public authority in Canada has regular procedures for gathering detailed data either about archival institutions or about the people who work in them as archivists.[2] The last surveys specific to archives were done in the 1980s as special one time data gathering exercises to support special studies.[3] In fact, no national professional body regularly collects and publishes statistics about archives and archivists.[4] Whenever statistics about the profession or its workplaces are needed for lobbying, professional initiatives, or institutional planning, we are unable to respond with either up-to-date or clear information.

The national survey done between April and June 1998 makes no claim to be exhaustive and complete in its classification of information about Canadian archivists. However, at the very least, its questionnaire and results provide baselines from which future surveys can be undertaken and their results compared.[5] As respondents selected to receive questionnaires, we may grumble at the time they take to complete and may be puzzled by the peculiarities of their questions and style. Nevertheless, a well-designed and carefully administered survey is the best method of establishing the characteristics of a given population which would be otherwise indiscernible, either because the group is too dispersed for the patterns to be evident or because their numbers are too large for information to be easily acquired.

The Survey of Canadian Archivists

The population for the Canadian survey was the membership of the Association of Canadian Archivists (ACA) as of March 1998. At that time, the total membership in all categories was 701. Although the members of the ACA are not the sum of practising archivists in Canada, they are a reasonably good approximation of the profession.[6] The universe for the survey was established by stripping the foreign, institutional, and general members from the list, leaving 450 professional, student, honorary, and sustaining members. A sample of 420 was drawn randomly from the modified list.[7]

The method followed the format recommended by Salant and Dillman for self-administered mail surveys. Each randomly selected person was sent an initial letter informing them of the survey and asking for their cooperation. About ten days later the survey package was sent. This included the questionnaire, a temperament sorter (KTS) purchased from the owners of the Keirsey copyright, a covering letter, and a stamped, addressed envelope to return the questionnaire.[8] The letter explained the Canadian survey in the context of a partnership with researchers in Australia and the United States and announced our intention of reporting results at the ACA annual meeting in Halifax in May 1998. Confidentiality of information was assured and the voluntary nature of participation was reiterated.[9] A reminder was sent to those who did not respond and, following a further period, a second package was sent.

The questionnaire was developed in cooperation with Ann Pederson, Senior Lecturer in Archives at the University of New South Wales in Australia. We wanted to use the same instrument to get results that could be compared; consequently, we cooperated in developing a form that could be administered in Canada and Australia. Our aim was to begin moving towards developing common core profiles of the profession. The Canadian version of the survey instrument, entitled "Canadian archivists: what types of people are they?" has two parts and nine main questions seeking information about the respondent and his or her workplace.[10] Our survey included the Kiersey Temperament Sorter as a separate document. Respondents were asked to enter the results of this exercise as Part A of the survey instrument.[11] The remainder of the questionnaire, Part B, addressed characteristics of the respondent's education, job, knowledge, and future education preferences. For Part B we tried to frame questions to probe matters of fact in the knowledge of the respondent rather than his or her opinions or judgements.

Part B of the survey comprises nine questions, many with a number of distinct parts. The first question asked for gender and age, the latter divided into blocks of six years from under twenty-one to seventy-five years or older. Question two aimed to establish the nature of the respondent's current job and the number of years they have been working in the field. We provided nine common job titles, encouraged broad definitions of these, and left space for respondents to write a title they believed more accurately described their duties. The third question offered three sets of descriptors which are often used to identify the environment in which archivists work. Respondents could choose one from the choices offered in each of "sector of endeavour," "geographic scope of authority/activity," and "type of organization." The survey offered twenty choices for "organization" and provided space for others to be specified where appropriate. Question four asked for information about the respondent's responsibilities, including level of management, number of staff directly supervised, archives functions performed, percentage of time spent on

non-archival tasks, and type of activities which take up the most time. We asked respondents to estimate the extent and use of electronic tools in their work. The question also asked respondent's to "characterize" the level of their "understanding of electronic records-keeping principles and issues." Question five asked for details of the respondent's education and training, including information about any additional professional development they had taken in the previous three years. Questions six through nine asked respondents to indicate the level of support provided by the workplace for professional activities, including education, conferences, and research. We also asked their preference for topics and delivery of continuing education.[12] We initially planned to do a substantial pretest of the survey. Unfortunately, we were unable to do this because we did not have sufficient time to complete all steps before the conference at which preliminary results were to be reported.[13] A pretest is an excellent way to uncover ambiguities and unclear questions; faults with our instrument, which we fully accept, are largely the result of this failure.

Finally, a word about the administration of the survey and its ongoing analysis. Uppermost in our minds were our respondents and the responsibilities we have to them. Our subjects had to be willing participants and confident that their response would be confidential. We stressed the voluntary nature of participation in the announcement letter sent in advance of the survey package. At every point thereafter respondents were assured that they could withdraw at any time or decline to participate. Participants were selected randomly. The list linking names to a survey number is known only to two people. The numbered list of names along with the original returns are kept only as long as these are needed to enter the data and to edit it for accuracy. All respondents are truly anonymous, known only by the characteristics present in the database. We entered returns in statistical analysis programme SPSS for Windows and used the software to generate frequencies and some cross-tabulations.

Response by Archivists in Canada

The survey was sent to 420 members selected at random from the professional, honourary, student, and sustaining members of the ACA. We received responses from 302, or about seventy per cent (71.90%). This strong return guarantees the reliability of the data and the picture it forms. Ninety-five people (22.62%) did not respond to the survey while twenty-three people (5.48%) declined to participate. More than two-thirds of the returns were fully completed, including the KTS (282/302 or 67.14%).[14] The response indicates significant interest in the Canadian archival community about the current profile of the profession. The response rate also confirms that the results are statistically valid and provide a high level of confidence in making a generalization to the professional population at large.

Location of Respondents and ACA Membership Category

We received responses from every province and territory in Canada. Our response rates closely reflect the current geographic distribution of members and membership types within the ACA, as described in the following table:

Table 1

Region	% of ACA Members (1998–1999)	% of Survey Respondents	ACA Membership Type	%of ACA Members (1998–1999)	% of Survey Respondents
AB	6.0	7.3	Honorary	1.0	1.3
BC	14.4	19.9	Professional	50.0	74.2
MB	7.0	8.3	Student	9.8	17.2
NB	3.1	3.0	Sustaining	8.8	7.3
NF	2.1	1.7			
NS	5.1	3.3			
NT	0.6	0.7			
ON	49.4	43.0			
PE	0.4	0.7			
QC	7.2	7.6			
SK	3.7	3.6			
YT	1.0	1.0			

Over seventeen per cent of respondents were from student members of the ACA, suggesting a strong interest in the profession among the emerging generation. We included their responses and were careful to bear this in mind when reviewing the results to questions relating to continuing education, management level, and professional functions.

Collective Profile of Archivists in Canada

A significant number of respondents (81/302 or 26.9%) are young (thirty-six years or younger) and in early career while only twelve per cent are older, that is fifty-five years or over (37/302), and in late career. The young profile of the profession confirms long-range health through renewal. However, given the likelihood of significant retirements in the next few years, the community and its professional associations should seek to minimize the effects of an inevitable loss of knowledge and of membership dues.

Table 2: Respondent Gender

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Male	123	40.7	40.7
Female	179	59.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table 3: Respondent Age (in years)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	1	.3	.3
Under 25	9	3.0	3.3
25–30	35	11.6	14.9
31–36	37	12.3	27.2
37–42	53	17.5	44.7
43–48	64	21.2	65.9
49–54	66	21.9	87.7
55–64	26	8.6	96.4
65–74	8	2.6	99.0
75 or Older	3	1.0	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Women are the larger number of respondents at just under sixty per cent (179/302 or 59.3%). Women also dominate in the younger grouping, thirty-six years of age or younger (53/81 or 65.4%), indicating that a gender bias to women will most likely continue in the future.

The survey offered a number of alternative job titles which, experience suggested, most likely would embrace the majority of ACA members. However, job titles are not stable and will change in the course of a career.[15] The questionnaire recognized this possibility by providing a place for respondents to insert the actual title of their job where it was not a good fit with any of the ones offered. "Archivist" is the employment designation of choice for the plurality of respondents (133/302 or 44%). A cross-tabulation between age and job title indicates the strength of the "archivist" designation across the spectrum of respondents covering 45.5% in all age categories and dipping below forty per cent only within the 49–54 group (37.9%).[16] A significant number are employed as records managers or in a dual capacity as records managers/archivists undertaking joint responsibilities and duties (42/302 or 13.9%). By contrast, only six respondents (2.0%) identified their work as purely in the

Table 4: Gender/Age Cross-Tabulation

	Under 25	25–30	31–36	37–42	43–48	49–54	55–64	65–74	75 or Older	Total
Male Count	3	12	13	20	33	25	13	2	2	123
% within Gender	2.4%	9.8%	10.6%	16.3%	26.8%	20.3%	10.6%	1.6%	1.6%	100.0%
% within Age	33.3%	34.3%	35.1%	37.7%	51.6%	37.9%	50.0%	25.0%	66.7%	40.7%
% of Total	1.0%	4.0%	4.3%	6.6%	10.9%	8.3%	4.3%	.7%	.7%	40.7%
Female Count	6	23	24	33	31	41	13	6	1	179
% within Gender	3.4%	12.8%	13.4%	18.4%	17.3	22.9%	7.3%	3.4%	.6%	100.0%
% within Age	66.7%	65.7%	64.9%	62.3%	48.4%	62.1%	50.0%	75.0%	33.3%	59.3%
% of Total	2.0%	7.6%	7.9%	10.9%	10.3%	13.6%	4.3%	2.0%	.3%	59.3%
Total Count	9	35	37	53	64	66	26	8	3	302
% within Gender	3.0%	11.6%	12.3%	17.5%	21.2%	21.9%	8.6%	2.6%	1.0%	100.0%

area of records management. A cross-tabulation of age with job title does not indicate that the management of current records is of greater importance in the jobs of the younger segment of the ACA's members. Among respondents twenty-five years or older, records managers or archivists/records managers represent more than ten per cent of total respondents in only two age categories: 37–42 (17%) and 43–48 (20.3%). The designation of "archives/records consultant" is favoured by only a small minority (13/302 or 4.3%), none of whom are younger than thirty or older than fifty-five.

Table 5: Respondent Job Title

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	3	1.0	1.0
Archivist	133	44.0	45.0
Records Manager/Archivist	36	11.9	57.0
Archives/Records Consultant	13	4.3	61.3
Student	36	11.9	73.2
Professional Educator	8	2.6	75.8
Manuscript Curator	4	1.3	77.2
Records Manager	6	2.0	79.1
Information Manager	16	5.3	84.4
Not Employed	10	3.3	87.7
Other	37	12.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Drawing conclusions about jobs from titles is problematic and at best impressionistic. Job titles are only generally indicative of job tasks. Moreover, the survey did not address the extent of current records work by exploring in detail the actual tasks undertaken by respondents. The growing diversity of functions and responsibilities, perhaps as much as an instability of title, is suggested by the significant number of respondents (37/203 or 12.3%) who placed their job in the survey's category of "other." The eight options provided by the survey did not seem to fit their work. Moreover, nearly half of all respondents (144/302 or 47.7%) supplied an alternative job title. Of these 144, only fourteen alternative designations occur more than once, and only three occur more than three times: "reference archivist" (seven instances), "archivist/historian" (five instances), and "information specialist" (four instances). Manuscript curator was selected by only a few (4/302 or 1.3%) and no respondent using this job title was younger than forty-nine (see **Table 5**). Overall, the survey suggests that persons with responsibilities for manuscripts in galleries,

museums, and libraries are not members of the ACA, perhaps telling us as much about the attractions of the association than the actual field of employment. (See **Appendix A**, **Table A1**.)

As might be expected, the majority of respondents work in the public sector (223/302 or 73.8%). Just under a quarter declared that they worked in a private organization (65/302, 21.5%). A cross-tabulation of organization with age and gender of respondent indicated that age was not a factor in sector of employment but that men exceed women in the public sector (83.7% men; 67% women) and women exceed men in the private sector (16.3% men, 25.1% women).

Table 6: Work Sector

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	14	4.6	4.6
Public	223	73.8	78.5
Private	65	21.5	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Responses to the questions relating to the geographic scope of work authority were strong in the category of local or regional responsibilities which, at thirty per cent of respondents (93/302), just about matched those whose responsibilities have a national, provincial, or territorial scope (66/302 or 21.9% national, 89/302 or 29.5% provincial/territorial). A few respondents indicated that they were unable to specify the scope of their work authority (20/302 or 6.6%) while about an equal number indicated that the scope of their work and responsibilities were international or multinational (21/302 or 7%) (**Table 7**). Globalization has yet to make any appreciable impact on Canadian archivists at their work. This underscores the rather weak representation of archives and ACA members in businesses.

Table 7: Geographic Scope of Work

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	13	4.3	4.3
National	66	21.9	26.2
Provincial/Territorial	89	29.5	55.6
International/Multinational	21	7.0	62.6
Local/Regional	93	30.8	93.4
Unable to Specify	20	6.6	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

The type of organization in which respondents work, their level of management responsibility, and the number of staff they supervise provides some interesting results. National/provincial archives are the type of organization which predominates (110/302 or 36.4%), but there is a strong showing from college and university organizations (62/302 or 20.5%). Church/religious bodies (26/302 or 8.6%) and municipal/regional archives (28/302 or 9.3%) were about equal. Although we were confident that the types of organizations offered as choices (fifteen) covered all possibilities, a category of "other" was included to allow differences to emerge – sixteen respondents chose this representing just over five per cent of the responses received (5.3%)[17] (**Table 8**).

Table 8: Type of Organization

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	14	4.6	4.6
National/Provincial Archives	110	36.4	41.1
Municipal/Regional Archives	28	9.3	50.3
Library	3	1.0	51.3
University/College	62	20.5	71.9
Museum/Gallery	8	2.6	74.5
School – Primary, Secondary	1	.3	74.8
Other Educational Body	4	1.3	76.2
Occupational/Professional Body	8	2.6	78.8
Banking/Finance/Insurance	15	5.0	83.8
Retail Business	1	.3	84.1
Church/Religious Body	26	8.6	92.7
Historical Society	2	.7	93.4
Performing Arts	1	.3	93.7
Hospital/Medical	2	.7	94.4
Print Media	1	.3	94.7
Other	16	5.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

A large number of returns came from archivists who are the "sole responsible professional" in their organization (59/302 or 19.5%). This situation affects the ratio of employees to supervisors. Of survey respondents, 135/302 or 44.6% report that they occupy a supervisory or administrative position as opposed to 86/302 or 28.5% who responded that they are an ordinary employee. This weighting is perhaps best understood by recognizing that the work of the "sole responsible professional" would inevitably involve some

administrative duties. Gender cross-tabulation indicates that men are more likely than women to be mid-level administrators (section/programme managers 24.4% men, 11.7% women) while women are more likely than men to be the "sole responsible professional" (23.5% women, 13.8% men). A large number of respondents (53/302) did not answer the question which asked for the number of staff supervised (53/302 or 17.5%). This may be related to the large number of returns in the category "sole responsible professional" (**Table 9**).

Table 9: Level of Management Responsibility

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	22	7.3	7.3
Ordinary Employee	86	28.5	35.8
Unit/Project Manager	43	14.2	50.0
Section/Programme Manager	51	16.9	66.9
CEO	23	7.6	74.5
Work Team Head	14	4.6	79.1
Sole Responsible Professional	59	19.5	98.7
Region/Division Head	4	1.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Respondents were asked to provide information about the archival functions they undertook as part of their professional responsibilities. It is important to recall that nearly twenty per cent of respondents are the only professionals in their institution. Nearly seventy per cent indicate that they do acquisition, appraisal, and disposal (210/320, 69.5%); arrangement and description (208/320 or 68.9%); and provide reference and access services (307/302 or 68.5%). The other functions provided as options were almost equally divided between those who responded "yes" and "no" to the questions of performance – preservation and storage (153/302 or 51.3% yes, 147/302 or 48.7% no); publications/exhibitions/public relations (145/302 or 48% yes, 157/302 or 52% no); and teaching and training (149/302 or 49.3% yes, 153/302 or 50.7% no). Records management and electronic record-keeping fell into a third tier of professional functions with about forty per cent of respondents performing those functions and sixty per cent having no involvement (records management 131/302 or 43.4% yes, 171/302 or 56.6% no; electronic record-keeping 110/302 or 39.4% yes, 183/302 or 60.6% no). The survey onfirms that, despite the diversity of activities in the archival workplace, the customary professional archival functions of reference, arrangement and

description, acquisition and appraisal, and programme administration feature largely in the work of the majority.[18]

Table 10: Professional Functions Performed

Professional Function	% Who Perform Function	% Who Do Not Perform Function
Acquisition, Appraisal, and Disposal	69.5	30.5
Arrangement and Description	68.9	31.1
Reference and Access	68.5	31.5
Preservation and Storage	51.3	48.7
Records Management	43.4	56.6
Publications/Exhibitions/Public Relations	48.0	52.0
Teaching/Training	49.3	50.7
Electronic Record-Keeping	39.4	60.6

Understanding and Use of Information Technology in the Workplace

The survey question on the uses of computers in the workplace was not worded clearly. However, bearing its awkward nature in mind, the responses suggest that most respondents either have access to or use computers in their places of work (7/302 or 2.3% have no use of computers in their workplace). (See **Appendix A**, **Table A5.**) The next questions asked respondents to rank, from "minimal" to "extensive," the types of computer applications they use. Responses to the six options arrange themselves into two tiers of popularity in use. The first rank includes word processing (176/302 or 58.8% extensive, 5/302 or 1.7% none), e-mail (132/302 or 43% extensive, 3/302 or 1% none), and Internet/intranet (89/302 or 29.5% "regular," 5/302 or 1.7% "none"). The second tier comprises "data entry/retrieval" (57/302 or 18.9% "extensive," 11/302 or 3.6% "none"), "advise and decide on IT issues" (20/302 or 6.6% "extensive," 13/302 or 4.3% "none"), and "database management" (28/302 or 9.3% "extensive," 15/302 or 5% "none"). (See **Appendix A**, **Tables A6-A11.**) A large number of respondents (131/302 or 43.4%) ranked their understanding of electronic record-keeping principles and practices as "good," "very good," or "expert" (**Table 11**).

Education and Training Received, Support for Opportunities in the Workplace, and Preferences for Topics and Delivery

The section on education exposes the extent to which formal archival education has penetrated the workplace. A relatively high number of respondents

Table 11: Understanding of Electronic Record-Keeping

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	7	2.3	2.3
Non-Existent	7	2.3	4.6
Some Idea	51	16.9	21.5
Basic Competence	101	33.4	55.0
Good	75	24.8	79.8
Very Good	47	15.6	95.4
Expert	9	3.0	98.3
Not Applicable	5	1.7	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

have no professional education or post-appointment training (85/302 or 28.1%). A cross-tabulation by gender indicates that a larger proportion of women in the profession have taken professional training (yes, 132/174 or 73.7%, no, 42/179 or 23.5%) than the proportion of men in the profession (yes, 74/123 or 64.2%, no, 43/123 or 35%). The master's programme at the University of British Columbia (UBC) has educated about twenty per cent of those with a professional education (65/302 or 19.5%). The post-appointment training course of the National Archives of Canada (NA) is the qualification reported by about ten per cent of respondents (36/302 or 11.9%). About four per cent reported training by their provincial association (11/302 or 3.6%). A cross-tabulation by age indicates that the NA qualification dominates the older generation of archivists over the age of forty-two (29/36 or 80%). The majority of respondents has taken post-graduate or post-appointment training or

Table 12: Respondents' Level of Professional Training or Education

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	6	2.0	2.0
Respondents reporting completion of directly relevant professional training or education	211	69.9	71.9
Respondents who have not attempted or not completed relevant professional training or education	85	28.1	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

education (215/302 or 71.2%) and attend conferences and seminars during work time (240/302 or 79.5%), indicating a strong commitment among institutions and persons to professional and continuing education. (See **Table 12** and **Appendix A**, **Tables A12-A15**.)

The continuing education options we provided ranked in order of use by respondents from attending seminars and conferences (240/302 or 79.5%), through taking short courses to develop particular skills (209/302 or 69.2%), researching and writing articles for professional publications (132/302 or 24.2%) to taking paid research/study leave (73/302 or 24.2%), and distance education/independent study programmes (53/302 or 17.5%). (See **Appendix A**, **Tables A22-A26**.) The relatively low response to distance learning more than likely reflects opportunity rather than preference since a clear majority of respondents expressed an interest in and a willingness to undertake further education and training in distance learning courses. A number of topics for courses were suggested as options: the spread of responses was large but concentrated in topics related to technology. (See **Appendix A**, **Table A31**.)

Conclusion

Although more cross-tabulations and analysis of this survey's data would undoubtedly suggest further areas to explore, in the end, whatever insights we gained would not be as important as the exercise of data collection itself which, if repeated regularly, will accumulate comparable data over a long period of time. A regular survey, perhaps this one or another modified according to the needs of the profession, has lasting value beyond the specific data it collects. Surveys designed and undertaken by the archives and records community allow them to "call the tune" by controlling their own classification and the point of view through which the profession is seen by others. We would be better able to make comparisons with our peer groups, currently and historically, if we had core statistics about our collective self. When circumstances require up-to-date information about archivists practising in Canada, we would be able to cite specific data instead of general impressions. The impression of first-hand knowledge may be accurate, but the prevailing management discourse privileges the truth from "hard" data. Statistics accumulated regularly should help us in other ways, such as pinpointing specific needs and problems that are better grasped at a level of abstraction. Up-to-date statistics are also vital supports for our participation in discussions that are pertinent to the profession when these are carried out in larger political arenas. Certainly the current profiles from Statistics Canada are inadequate for our needs. Controlling the way information is accumulated about the profession is a big step to professional maturity. We should soon take another formative step in our development as a profession by assuming responsibility for our own identity.

Notes

* This is the first of two essays which report the results of a national survey of Canadian archivists. The second essay, "Canadian Archivists: What Types of People are They?" will analyse the temperament profile of Canadian archivists.

1 For example, see T.H.B. Symons, *To Know Ourselves: Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies* (Association of Canadian Archivists, 1975); *The Symons Report and Canadian Archives* (1978); and the *Canadian Council of Archives Needs Assessments*, including those undertaken by each province and territory, from 1985-1987. Marcel Caya, General Editor and Marion Beyea and Stan Hanson, Associate Editors, *Canadian Archives in 1992* (Ottawa, 1992) provides a narrative overview of the archives landscape with some isolated statistics included within the narrative.

2 A number of Statistics Canada publications contain data about archives and archivists. Generally this data is subsumed in a larger classification of cultural or heritage institutions and professionals. *Labour Force Information* (Statscan catalogue #71-001-PPB) appears monthly from October 1976. It provides summary tables on the characteristics of the labour force nationally, provincially, and for metropolitan areas. Archivists are lumped into a category called "information, culture and recreation." *Culture Counts: Cultural Labour Force Survey* (Statscan catalogue #87f0012xpe) appears occasionally beginning in September 1995. The data covers 1993 and includes archivists with librarians. The categories include number of jobs, highest level of education, gender, average and median income, perceptions of technological impact, training taken as a result of technological impact, education and training methods, education and training wanted, and reasons education or training not taken. *Focus on Culture* (Statscan catalogue #87-004-xpb) is a quarterly publication which may contain articles pertinent to archives and archivists. For example, "Selected culture workers - a ten year perspective," in vol. 10, no. 7 (Winter 1998), treats archives as part of a subgroup with museums and libraries. *Heritage Institutions* (Statscan catalogue #87f0002xpe) is an occasional publication first issued in April 1995 under that title. It appeared from 1985-1995 under the title of *Culture Statistics*. There is a section which contains statistics about institutions by type, including archives. Information includes operating and capital revenues and expenditures, number of visits, type of visitor, number of paid staff, and number of volunteers. *Culture Labour Force Survey* (Statscan catalogue #87c0032) was first issued in 1995 and is available on a fee for service basis. This Statscan publication collates libraries, archives, and museum workers. Statistics Canada informed me that "due to the small number of archivists captured in the CLFS, the data are suppressed because of confidentiality and reliability reasons." The best route for acquiring data about archivists would be to request a "target group profile for archivists (based on 1991 Standard Industrial Classification code F013 [5113]) for those who identified themselves as [archivists] on the Census questionnaire. For geographies where there were more than 250 persons, [Statistics Canada] can produce demographic & socio-economic data. The cost of [the] profile is $275 plus $3.00 per additional area." *Canada's Culture, Heritage and Identity: A Statistical Perspective* (Statscan catalogue #87-211-xpe) appears biennially. Archives are grouped with museums, galleries, and other heritage institutions.

3 Two were general views undertaken as initiatives of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Consultative Group on Canadian Archives, *Canadian Archives: Report to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada* (1980). Chapter 3, pp. 29-50 contains detailed tables and charts with a variety of statistical profiles. This document is known colloquially as the "Wilson Report." Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Advisory Committee on Archives, *Report of the Advisory Committee on Archives* (c. 1985). This document, a sequel to the "Wilson Report," does not contain any demographic statistics. Also see Public Archives of Canada, *Canadian Archives in 1982: Survey of Heritage Institutions* (1985) for some statistical summaries and tables.

   Two were national surveys of Canadian college and university archives done by the late Don Baird. Don Baird's Surveys were reported in the ACA Newsletter. Other special purpose

surveys have been done in connection with graduate work in archives courses. A recent example is the *Twenty-First Century Agora: A Survey of Heads of Repository on Attitudes to Charging Fees for Services in Canadian Archives* (1995). It was undertaken by Steve Zoltai in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree in the Faculty of Information Studies at the University of Toronto.

4 Statistics about archivists and archival activities are also collected as part of the regular work of national, provincial, and territorial institutions but these are not published or accessible. The ACA's Ad Hoc Committee on Salaries and Job Descriptions is currently completing a job description and salary survey of members.

5 The frequency charts of responses are provided in Appendix A. The survey was a research proposal prepared for consideration by the Internal SSHRCC Grants Committee at the Faculty of Information Studies in the University of Toronto. The funds awarded ($2800) paid for the purchase of the Keirsey Temperament Sorter, printing, postage, data entry, and analysis. I am grateful for the support of the faculty for this professional undertaking. The cost of doing subsequent surveys would be considerably less, I believe, because the basic questionnaire and programme for data entry and analysis have already been developed and are in place to be used. Postal costs would be negligible if the survey were undertaken electronically.

6 I am grateful to the ACA for providing the membership list for the survey.

7 To determine the appropriate sample size, we used a chart in Robert V. Krejcie and Daryle W. Morgan, "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities," *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 30 (Autumn 1970), p. 608. To determine a minimum response rate we used Priscilla Salant and Don A. Dillman, *How to Conduct Your Own Survey* (New York, 1994). Their chart indicates that from a sample of 420, we needed 287 valid responses to satisfy a 95 per cent confidence level (with +/- 3 per cent margin of error). This works out to a minimum response rate of 68.33%.

8 Keirsey Temperament Sorter. 8 Keirsey 1995. PN Books, Box 2748, Del Mar, CA, 92014, USA; 800-754-0039.

9 The protocol for the survey, the questionnaire, and letters were submitted to the university's ethics review committee to ensure that the process met the high standards of the research community in dealing with human subjects. This approval was received.

10 The questionnaire used for Canada is the same in virtually all respects to that administered by Ann Pederson in Australia in April-June 1998. I am grateful to Stephen Francom for assistance in the survey and the analysis. Stephen helped refine the questionnaire and administer the Canadian survey. He did the data entry and produced the frequency and cross-tabulation reports.

11 The temperament profile of Canadian archivists will be analysed in a paper, "Canadian Archivists: What Types of People are They?" which will be published in *Archivaria* 50.

12 The questions were especially pertinent to the Australian situation but were included to maintain consistency in the surveys.

13 A preliminary report of this survey was presented in the session "Cross, Type, and Match" at the ACA annual conference in Halifax, May 1998. Ann Pederson's extensive analysis of the Australian temperament data was presented at the Australian Society of Archivists conference in 1999. Her paper, "Understanding Ourselves and Others: Australian Archivists and Temperament," is unpublished but is available from the author.

14 Experts in the field find that the four-part mail survey achieves high rates of response and our experience bears out this conclusion.

15 In retrospect, we would amend this question to distinguish the respondent's job/employment title from the profession to which they attribute their continuing affiliation.

16 A total of 33.3 per cent of respondents in the seventy-five-or-older age group chose archivist as the title for their employment; on balance, this more than likely reflects their preference for a professional affiliation as opposed to employment.

17 In retrospect we would provide a way for these special situations to be more precisely identified.

18 Further questions asked in support might reveal the extent to which specialization has begun to penetrate the workplace.

Appendix A
Table A1: Alternative Job Titles Supplied By Respondents

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	158	52.3	52.3
Acquisition and Control Archivist	1	.3	52.6
Appraisal Archivist	1	.3	53.0
Archival Educator, Consultant, Writer and Historian	1	.3	53.3
Archival Information Manager	1	.3	53.6
Archival Scholar and Educator	1	.3	54.0
Archives Administrator	1	.3	54.3
Archives Adviser	1	.3	54.6
Archives Consultant	1	.3	55.0
Archives Manager	3	1.0	56.0
Archives Supervisor	1	.3	56.3
Archives Technician	1	.3	56.6
Archives/Information Management Consultant	1	.3	57.0
Archivist and Recorded Information Consultant	1	.3	57.3
Archivist and Records Advisor	1	.3	57.6
Archivist, Preservation Management	1	.3	57.9
Archivist/Curator	1	.3	58.3
Archivist/Fundraiser/Administrator	1	.3	58.6
Archivist/Historian	5	1.7	60.3
Archivist/Information Access Facilitator	1	.3	60.6
Archivist/Librarian	3	1.0	61.6
Archivist/Librarian/Documentalist	1	.3	61.9
Archivist/Public Relations Officer	1	.3	62.3
Archivist/Records Management Advisor	1	.3	62.6
Archivist/Records Manager/ Researcher/Librarian	1	.3	62.9
Archiviste Regional	1	.3	63.2
Art Archivist	2	.7	63.9
Assistant Archivist	2	.7	64.6
Assistant University Librarian	1	.3	64.9
Audio-Visual Archivist	1	.3	65.2
Chief Archivist	3	1.0	66.2
Chief, Political Archives	1	.3	66.6

Table A1: (continued)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Collections Archivist	1	.3	66.9
Collections Manager	1	.3	67.2
Consulting Archivist	1	.3	67.5
Contract Archivist/Records Manager	1	.3	67.9
Contractor	1	.3	68.2
Coordinator, Services and Administration	1	.3	68.5
Corporate Information Manager	1	.3	68.9
Corporate Records Officer	1	.3	69.2
Department Head, Special Collections	1	.3	69.5
Descriptive Standards Officer	1	.3	69.9
Director	1	.3	70.2
Director of Archives	2	.7	70.9
Director of Archives and Records Management	1	.3	71.2
Director of Archives and Records Management Program	1	.3	71.5
Director, Information Management	1	.3	71.9
Director, Strategic Planning and Policy Coordination	1	.3	72.2
Director/Archivist	1	.3	72.5
Director/Curator	1	.3	72.8
Doctoral Candidate	1	.3	73.2
Doctoral Student	1	.3	73.5
Document Historian	1	.3	73.8
Editor	1	.3	74.2
Education, Outreach, Network and Administrative Archivist	1	.3	74.5
Educational Consultant	1	.3	74.8
Electronic Records Archivist	1	.3	75.2
Executive Director	1	.3	75.5
Executive Director/ Archivist	1	.3	75.8
General Archivist	2	.7	76.5
Grants Manager	1	.3	76.8
Head of Archives Section	1	.3	77.2
Head, Private (Textual) Records/ Public Service	1	.3	77.5
Head, Reference and Researcher Services	1	.3	77.8

Table A1: (continued)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Historian	1	.3	78.1
Historical Resources Manager	1	.3	78.5
Image and Reference Database Manager	1	.3	78.8
Information Analyst/Info Systems			
Support/Archivist	1	.3	79.1
Information Specialist	4	1.3	80.5
Interpreter/Mediator	1	.3	80.8
Librarian	1	.3	81.1
Librarian/Manuscript Curator	1	.3	81.5
Manager	1	.3	81.8
Manager of Archival Projects	1	.3	82.1
Manager of Archival Services	3	1.0	83.1
Manager, Archival Information Services	1	.3	83.4
Manager, Archives and Recorded Info			
Management	1	.3	83.8
Manager, Collections Development and			
Management	1	.3	84.1
Manager, Corporate Archives	1	.3	84.4
Manager, Corporate Publishing and Info			
Management	1	.3	84.8
Manager, Records, Information and			
Privacy	1	.3	85.1
Manager, Special Collections	1	.3	85.4
Manuscript Librarian	1	.3	85.8
Manuscripts Archivist	1	.3	86.1
Municipal Archivist, Records Manager			
and Historian	1	.3	86.4
Municipal Records Archivist	1	.3	86.8
Preservation Manager	1	.3	87.1
Private Manuscripts and Reference			
Archivist	1	.3	87.4
Professor	3	1.0	88.4
Professor of Archival Studies	1	.3	88.7
Project Archivist	2	.7	89.4
Project Manager: Automation &			
Software Development	1	.3	89.7
Provincial Archivist	1	.3	90.1
Recent MLIS Grad looking for work	1	.3	90.4
Recorded Information Manager	2	.7	91.1

Table A1: (continued)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Records and Information Management			
Specialist	1	.3	91.4
Records and Information Manager	1	.3	91.7
Records Coordinator	1	.3	92.1
Records Manager/ FOI Officer/			
Archivist	1	.3	92.4
Records Professional/Record-Keeper	1	.3	92.7
Reference Archivist	7	2.3	95.0
Reference Archivist/FOI Coordinator	1	.3	95.4
Reference Manuscript Curator	1	.3	95.7
Research Consultant/Analyst	1	.3	96.0
Senior Archivist	1	.3	96.4
Senior Archivist and Systems Developer	1	.3	96.7
Senior Records Analyst and Archivist	1	.3	97.0
Student Archivist	1	.3	97.4
Student in Archives Technician Programme	1	.3	97.7
Supervisor, Corporate Services	1	.3	98.0
Technical Describer and Arranger	1	.3	98.3
University Archivist and FOI/Privacy			
Coordinator	1	.3	98.7
University Archivist and Records/			
Information Manager	1	.3	99.0
University Archivist/Information and			
Privacy Coordinator	1	.3	99.3
Vice President and Corporate Archivist	1	.3	99.7
Vice President, Archival Operations	1	.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A2: Time Worked in Archives/Records (in years)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	4	1.3	1.3
Under 1	30	9.9	11.3
1–3	32	10.6	21.9
4–7	34	11.3	33.1
8–12	66	21.9	55.0
13–19	66	21.9	76.8
20–29	49	16.2	93.0
30–35	19	6.3	99.3
More Than 35	2	.7	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A3: Number of Staff Supervised

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	53	17.5	17.5
1	34	11.3	28.8
2	35	11.6	40.4
3–5	36	11.9	52.3
6–10	31	10.3	62.6
11–24	16	5.3	67.9
25–49	1	.3	68.2
50–74	1	.3	68.5
100 or More	2	.7	69.2
Variable	3	1.0	70.2
None	90	29.8	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A4: Per Cent of Time Spent on Functions Other Than Those in Table 10

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	113	37.4	37.4
1–10	64	21.2	58.6
11–20	25	8.3	66.9
21–30	23	7.6	74.5
31–40	3	1.0	75.5
41–50	15	5.0	80.5
51–60	12	4.0	84.4
61–70	4	1.3	85.8
71–80	11	3.6	89.4
81–90	9	3.0	92.4
91–100	10	3.3	95.7
0	13	4.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A5: Extent of Respondents' Computer Usage in Work

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Respondent Uses Computers in Work	295	97.7	97.7
Respondent Does Not Use Computers in Work	7	2.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A6: Respondents' Use of Computers for Word Processing

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	30	9.9	9.9
None	5	1.7	11.6
Minimal	13	4.3	15.9
Regular	21	7.0	22.8
Frequent	54	17.9	40.7
Extensive	176	58.3	99.0
Not Applicable	3	1.0	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A7: Respondents' Use of Computers for Data Entry/Retrieval

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	93	30.8	30.8
None	11	3.6	34.4
Minimal	40	13.2	47.7
Regular	53	17.5	65.2
Frequent	31	10.3	75.5
Extensive	57	18.9	94.4
Not Applicable	17	5.6	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A8: Respondents' Use of Computers for E-Mail

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	44	14.6	14.6
None	3	1.0	15.6
Minimal	14	4.6	20.2
Regular	37	12.3	32.5
Frequent	66	21.9	54.3
Extensive	132	43.7	98.0
Not Applicable	6	2.0	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A9: Respondents' Use of Computers to Access Internet/ Intranets

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	56	18.5	18.5
None	5	1.7	20.2
Minimal	69	22.8	43.0
Regular	89	29.5	72.5
Frequent	39	12.9	85.4
Extensive	33	10.9	96.4
Not Applicable	11	3.6	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A10: Respondents' Use of Computers for Database Design and Management

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	117	38.7	38.7
None	15	5.0	43.7
Minimal	55	18.2	61.9
Regular	41	13.6	75.5
Frequent	30	9.9	85.4
Extensive	28	9.3	94.7
Not Applicable	16	5.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A11: Respondents' Use of Computers for Electronic Record-Keeping/ Systems Management

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	113	37.4	37.4
None	13	4.3	41.7
Minimal	59	19.5	61.3
Regular	51	16.9	78.1
Frequent	28	9.3	87.1
Extensive	20	6.6	94.0
Not Applicable	18	6.0	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A12: Title of Respondents' Degree/Professional Credential

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	106	35.1	35.1
Ph.D.	6	2.0	37.1
M.L.S./M.L.I.S./M.I.St.	27	8.9	46.0
M.A. (History)	13	4.3	50.3
Archives Technician Diploma	10	3.3	53.6
M.A. (Archival Studies)	9	3.0	56.6
Archives/RM Certificate	6	2.0	58.6
B.F.A.	1	.3	58.9
M.A.S.	57	18.9	77.8
Diploma in Archives Administration (N.A.C.)	36	11.9	89.7
Post-Appointment Core Workshops (AA0)	2	.7	90.4
B.A.	2	.7	91.1
Archives Society Education Programme	7	2.3	93.4
M.A.	3	1.0	94.4
B.A. (Administration)	1	.3	94.7
Archives Administration	1	.3	95.0
M.Sc. (Education)	1	.3	95.4
Core Curriculum Programme	1	.3	95.7
Certificate in Museum Studies	1	.3	96.0
B.A. (History)	1	.3	96.4
B.A. (Library Studies)	1	.3	96.7
Curatorial Education Programme	1	.3	97.0
Bodleian Archives Course (Oxford)	1	.3	97.4
Certificat en archivistique	2	.7	98.0
Archives Administration Certificate (U. Alberta)	2	.7	98.7
B. Ap. Sci. (Lib. & Info.)	1	.3	99.0
M.S. (Information)	1	.3	99.3
M.F.A.	1	.3	99.7
Diploma in Librarianship	1	.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A13: Institution Awarding Respondents' Degree/Professional Certification

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	106	35.1	35.1
University of London (U.K.)	2	.7	35.8
University of Toronto	13	4.3	40.1
University of Windsor/Wayne			
St. University	2	.7	40.7
Algonquin College	11	3.6	44.4
Wilfrid Laurier University	1	.3	44.7
University of Manitoba	11	3.6	48.3
George Brown College	3	1.0	49.3
University of Western Ontario	11	3.6	53.0
University of British Columbia	59	19.5	72.5
National Archives of Canada	36	11.9	84.4
Archives Association of Ontario	2	.7	85.1
Carleton University	3	1.0	86.1
University of Montreal	4	1.3	87.4
Association of Manitoba Archivists	5	1.7	89.1
University of Windsor	3	1.0	90.1
Georgia State Archives Institute	1	.3	90.4
University of Alberta	4	1.3	91.7
University of Quebec at Montreal	2	.7	92.4
City University of New York	1	.3	92.7
Archives Society of Alberta	3	1.0	93.7
Ontario Museums Association	1	.3	94.0
McGill University	2	.7	94.7
University of Calgary	1	.3	95.0
University of Rome (Italy)	1	.3	95.4
Fanshawe College	1	.3	95.7
Concordia University	1	.3	96.0
National Archives (U.S.)	1	.3	96.4
Scottish Record Office	1	.3	96.7
Dalhousie University	2	.7	97.4
Oxford University	1	.3	97.7
Memorial University	1	.3	98.0
Laval University	2	.7	98.7
Curtin University of Technology	1	.3	99.0
University of Michigan	1	.3	99.3
University of Wales (Aberystwyth)	1	.3	99.7
Saskatchewan Council of Archives	1	.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A14: Year Respondents' Degree/Professional Certification Awarded

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	146	48.3	48.3
In Progress	26	8.6	57.0
1958	1	.3	57.3
1959	1	.3	57.6
1966	1	.3	57.9
1969	1	.3	58.3
1971	1	.3	58.6
1972	3	1.0	59.6
1973	1	.3	59.9
1974	3	1.0	60.9
1975	1	.3	61.3
1976	1	.3	61.6
1977	1	.3	61.9
1978	5	1.7	63.6
1980	3	1.0	64.6
1981	4	1.3	65.9
1982	2	.7	66.6
1983	4	1.3	67.9
1984	5	1.7	69.5
1985	5	1.7	71.2
1986	5	1.7	72.8
1987	4	1.3	74.2
1988	3	1.0	75.2
1989	7	2.3	77.5
1990	6	2.0	79.5
1991	4	1.3	80.8
1992	4	1.3	82.1
1993	6	2.0	84.1
1994	11	3.6	87.7
1995	14	4.6	92.4
1996	8	2.6	95.0
1997	7	2.3	97.4
1998	8	2.6	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A15: Respondents' Reporting Completion of Post-Graduate/Post-Appointment Training/ Education in Last Three Years

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	16	5.3	5.3
Yes	215	71.2	76.5
No	71	23.5	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A16: Respondents' Reasons for not Pursuing Further Education or Training – No Need for Further Training

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Respondents Citing Reason	10	3.3	3.3
Respondents Not Citing Reason	292	96.7	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A17: Respondents' Reasons for not Pursuing Further Education or Training – No Relevant Courses Offered Locally

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Respondents Citing Reason	28	9.3	9.3
Respondents Not Citing Reason	274	90.7	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A18: Respondents' Reasons for not Pursuing Further Education or Training – Too Busy at Work

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Respondents Citing Reason	30	9.9	9.9
Respondents Not Citing Reason	272	90.1	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A19: Respondents' Reasons for Not Pursuing Further Education or Training – Too Busy at Home

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Respondents Citing Reason	17	5.6	5.6
Respondents Not Citing Reason	285	94.4	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A20: Respondents' Reasons for Not Pursuing Further Education or Training – Employer Won't Pay Expenses

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Respondents Citing Reason	8	2.6	2.6
Respondents Not Citing Reason	294	97.4	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A21: Respondents' Reasons for Not Pursuing Further Education or Training – Employer Won't Provide Paid Time Off

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Respondents Citing Reason	8	2.6	2.6
Respondents Not Citing Reason	294	97.4	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A22: Further Education/Professional Training Options Available to Respondents at Work – Attend Seminars/Conferences on Work Time

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Option Available	240	79.5	79.5
Option Not Available	62	20.5	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A23: Further Education/Professional Training Options Available to Respondents at Work – Paid Study/Research Leave

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Option Available	73	24.2	24.2
Option Not Available	229	75.8	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A24: Further Education/Professional Training Options Available to Respondents at Work – Short Courses to Develop Skills

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Option Available	209	69.2	69.2
Option Not Available	93	30.8	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A25: Further Education/Professional Training Options Available to Respondents at Work – Writing Articles for Professional Publications

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Option Available	132	43.7	43.7
Option Not Available	170	56.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A26: Further Education/Professional Training Options Available to Respondents at Work – Distance/ Independent Study

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Option Available	53	17.5	17.5
Option Not Available	249	82.5	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A27: Respondents' Willingness to Take Further Formal Education Via Distance Learning

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	11	3.6	3.6
Respondents Willing	165	54.6	58.3
Respondents Not Willing	126	41.7	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A28: Respondents' Estimates of Appropriate Cost Per Academic Credit Via Distance Learning (Cdn$)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	189	62.6	62.6
Less Than $250	27	8.9	71.5
$250–$499	44	14.6	86.1
$500–$749	29	9.6	95.7
$750–$1000	11	3.6	99.3
More Than $1000	2	.7	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A29: Respondents' Willingness to Take Further Professional Training Via Distance Learning

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	14	4.6	4.6
Respondents Willing	211	69.9	74.5
Respondents Not Willing	77	25.5	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A30: Respondents' Estimates of Appropriate Cost Per Training Course Via Distance Learning (Cdn$)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No Response	152	50.3	50.3
Less Than $250	40	13.2	63.6
$250–$499	79	26.2	89.7
$500–$749	23	7.6	97.4
$750–$1000	4	1.3	98.7
More Than $1000	4	1.3	100.0
Total	302	100.0	

Table A31: Respondents' Suggested Topics for Distance Learning

	Frequency
No Response	151
Appraisal and Acquisition Issues	
Appraisal & acquisition: basic concepts & theory	11
Advanced appraisal of large collections	1
Appraising for tax reasons	1
Appraising and scheduling financial records	1
Administration/Management Issues	
Archives administration: basic concepts & theory	23
Strategic planning	5
Grant seeking & fundraising	4
Project management	3
Managing human resources	4
Budget management	1
Automation/Information Technology Issues	
Introduction to automation/computer programming	12
Database design & management	18
Web site design & management	6
Creating & managing Web-based finding aids	3

Table A31: (continued)

	Frequency
Records management systems/ EDMS	9
Creating & managing computerized finding aids	1
Electronic Records Management Issues	
Electronic records management: basic concepts & theory	68
Appraisal & acquisition of electronic records	7
International standards for electronic records	1
Arrangement & description of electronic records	2
Indexing & thesaurus construction for electronic records	1
Scheduling electronic records	2
Preservation & conservation of electronic records	2
Legal Issues	
Introduction to legal issues in archives administration	3
FOI/ Privacy	8
Copyright	6
Access to vital statistics records	1
Preservation and Conservation Issues	
Preservation & conservation: basic concepts & theory	12
Preservation & conservation of special media	6
Advanced training in preservation & conservation	1
Special Media Issues	
SMI records: acquisition/arrangement & description	5
Maps & plans:acquisition/arrangement & description	1
Miscellaneous Issues	
RAD: applications & updates	18
EAD/MARC	6
Arrangement & description: basic concepts & theory	6
Management of one-person archives	4
Public programming/outreach/marketing	5
Descriptive standards: basic concepts & theory	1
Basic concepts & theory of archival science	3
Archives technician training & certification	1

Table A31: (continued)

	Frequency
Masters-level courses	3
Information management consulting	1
Retention	1
Business information analysis	1
Reference services: basic concepts & theory	1
Records management: basic concepts & theory	6
Accounting for archivists and records managers	1
History of archives	2
Diplomatics	2
Disaster planning	1
Cataloguing & indexing	1
Digital conversion/conservation	3
Recruiting & managing volunteers	1
Advanced arrangement & description	1
Records scheduling: basic concepts & theory	1
Disposal scheduling of financial documents	1