Treatment of Mutilated Art Books: A Survey of Academic ARL Institutions

Elizabeth H. Smith and Lydia Olszak

Mutilation is an enduring problem faced by librarians worldwide. The authors in this study investigate how both main and departmental art libraries at academic ARL institutions in the United States handle one specific type of damaged materials—mutilated art books. Findings reveal that librarians at surveyed ARL libraries report a problem with mutilated art books almost universally. These librarians have developed a number of strategies for dealing with damaged art books, ranging from ignoring the mutilation to replacing the book to restricting future access to the item. Factors such as cost, importance of the work, and amount of mutilation help librarians decide what actions will be taken on mutilated art materials. Few libraries have color photocopiers available for patron use and rely more heavily on black-and-white photocopies than color photocopies for replacement pages.

Mutilation of library materials has been a perennial problem since the inception of libraries (Aungerville 1907; Thompson 1968, Almagro 1985). When mutilated materials are discovered, librarians have several options. They can repair, replace, or discard mutilated materials. They can ignore the mutilation and return the material to the collection, or they can restrict future access to the material by placing it in a special collection.

At East Carolina University's Joyner Library, we too are confronted with our share of mutilated material. However, we were especially concerned with the mutilation we discovered in art-related books, particularly the N and TR Library of Congress (LC) classification areas. In order to learn how other libraries deal with mutilated art materials, we surveyed academic institutions in the United States that are also members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) about their procedures with art materials. In this article, we describe the situation at Joyner Library that prompted the survey. We also discuss the survey and its results. Finally, we summarize the findings and suggest areas for further research.

East Carolina University (ECU) is one of 16 universities that form the University of North Carolina System. Student enrollment at ECU tends to fluctuate between 17,000 and 18,000 students. This figure includes approximately 2,500 graduate students and 300 students pursuing their

ELIZABETH H. SMITH (elismi@joyner.lib.ecu.edu) is Head of Preservation and Conservation, and LYDIA OLSZAK is Art Subject Librarian, Joyner Library, East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina. Manuscript received July 25, 1996; accepted for publication November 6, 1996.

first professional degree. More than 1,000 faculty members are affiliated with the university.

ECU houses two distinct campuses. The first is the original campus that contains many of the administrative offices and the programs affiliated with the Academic Affairs Division. Joyner Library supports the programs of this division, including the schools of Art, Business, Education, Health and Human Performance, Human Environmental Sciences, and Industry and Technology, as well as 17 departments and 7 interdisciplinary programs of the College of Arts and Sciences. Joyner's branch Music Library supports the School of Music. The second campus houses the Health Sciences Division, which administers the medical school and allied health programs. The Health Sciences Library provides services to the Health Sciences Division.

ECU's School of Art is nationally recognized for its strong arts program. The school is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Approximately 550 undergraduate and 35 graduate students are enrolled in art programs such as art education, art history, metal design, painting, and sculpture. Currently, 43 faculty members teach in the School of Art. The school has a media center that houses a large slide collection, a small videocassette collection, and a limited collection of books and periodicals. Most printed art materials are housed in Joyner Library. At the present time, Joyner has just over a million volumes. With few exceptions, the art collection (approximately 30,000 volumes) is shelved in open stacks with other circulating materials. Joyner's art books are heavily used, not only by art students, but also by students in a variety of subjects such as literature, education, and history. Unfortunately, our automated system does not allow us to compare the circulation of art materials to that in other subject areas. However, it is generally accepted that art materials are well used. Given the usage and the nature of many art books (beautiful plates as well as black-and-white and color illustrations), it is not surprising that art materials become mutilated.

In 1993 Joyner Library created the Preservation and Conservation Department to assess the condition of the library's collections and to develop a systematic program for protecting and repairing the library's holdings. Before this department was created, identifying and repairing mutilated books was handled by several units on an ad hoc basis and included such activities as tipping in replacement pages obtained through interlibrary loan, taping torn spines, and preparing materials for commercial binding. The circulation staff presently discovers most mutilation when materials are returned or are picked up for reshelving in the library. When staff members discover a book with missing or mutilated pages, they insert a slip noting the problem and send the item to the Preservation and Conservation Department. Mutilated books are then placed on a shelf for subject librarians to review and recommend action to be taken, based on the book's value to the collection. As the process of reviewing books developed, it soon became apparent that art books are mutilated in ways that differ from mutilation in other subject areas. For instance, tearing out single, isolated pages or removing complete chapters or sections of books tend to be the typical ways in which nonart materials are mutilated. Although a nuisance, such mutilation can be dealt with simply by obtaining the missing pages through interlibrary loan and tipping them in or rebinding the book.

"Of all the manifold materials in a general research library, art books are probably the most vulnerable to destruction" (Samuel 1981, 141). Mutilation of art materials takes on a slightly different character than mutilation of books in other areas, perhaps because art books frequently contain numerous illustrations and photographs. It also appears to happen more frequently to art books than to materials in other subjects. Often patrons use razor blades or similar implements to cut out entire pages or specific pictures on part of

a page. When using a razor blade, the patron will frequently cut through several pages, thus mutilating many pages at once. Many of the missing or mutilated pages contain color illustrations or plates.

Replacing color pictures adds another dilemma to the process. If color illustrations are to be replaced, librarians must decide whether to pay the extra cost of color photocopies. Additionally, at our institution books must be borrowed through interlibrary loan and then transported to a color photocopier outside of the library.

The situation becomes even more complex when mutilation is too extensive to add replacement pages in a cost-effective manner. Moreover, by the time such mutilation is discovered, the title is often no longer in print. We are faced with the choice of keeping an item with some, but limited, usefulness or withdrawing the item completely and then not having any of its information readily available to patrons. In some instances, Preservation and Conservation staff members check OCLC and make discard decisions based on the number and location of copies that might be available through interlibrary loan. If OCLC lists few holdings, the staff members keep the title no matter what its condition and make the book a higher priority for preservation treatment. While the title may be available from an out-of-print dealer, the cost will undoubtedly be high (Samuel 1981), which affects the library's ability to replace such titles.

Literature Review

We turned to the literature for assistance on how to deal with the special problems art materials presented. Although we found little that addressed our specific concerns, we did discover a variety of related materials in our search.

A number of researchers have investigated the problem of mutilated library materials. However, none appear to address the particular problems associated with the mutilation of art books. Griffin (1993) addresses the issue of conservation and preservation of materials in fine arts libraries, but does not mention mutilation at all. Samuel (1981) identifies mutilation as one of the special problems librarians face in preserving art materials; however, she does not provide much guidance for dealing with it. In an earlier article, Samuel (1978) outlines steps taken at New York University's Institute of Fine Arts to limit theft and mutilation. By describing a specific experience with mutilation, Reed (1991) alerts readers to the value of older art publications and warns that many libraries do not adequately protect their collections. Dane (1991) laments the paucity of library literature dealing with art mutilation, while Birney and Williams (1985) comment on the lack of research studies on mutilation in general. Others describe a particular incident or related incidents detailing the facts involving the theft of valuable art plates (Theft 1991).

Writing about art books, not general books, in libraries, Worman (1988) argues that removing plates from books can have benefits when the text of the book is readily available and the individual book itself is in poor condition. Saving plates and discarding the text can preserve the most valuable components of such books.

The common thread in the articles about mutilated art materials is that most offer opinions or provide basic information. The lack of research studies addressing mutilation of art materials is surprising considering the importance the profession has placed on conservation and preservation of materials in the past few decades (Dane 1991). The mutilation research that has been conducted has dealt with other types of materials. A number of these studies are discussed below.

According to many researchers, mutilation is a pervasive problem that occurs worldwide (Prasad 1968; Souter 1976; Nawe 1988; Msuya 1991; Adewoye 1992; Alemna 1992; Obiagwu 1992) and in all types of libraries: school (Marshall 1960; Baine 1993), public (Kamm 1995), academic (Mast 1983; Pedersen 1990; Lilly, Schloman, and Hu 1991), law (Richmond 1975; Edwards 1986), and medical (Culp 1976). Library materials of every category are vulnerable to mutilation (Ragains 1975; Richmond 1975; Weiss 1981; Edwards 1986; Otness 1988; Atwood and

Wall 1990). Also, mutilation is not a new phenomenon. Librarians have attempted to deal with the issue since libraries have been in existence (Thompson 1968; Almagro 1985). Most researchers addressing the issue of mutilation tend to examine why patrons mutilate materials (Hendrick and Murfin 1974; Souter 1976; Gouke and Murfin 1980; Baine 1983; Mast 1983; Lilly, Schloman and Hu 1991) or to examine the extent of periodical mutilation (Luke 1991; Schumm 1992; Constantinou 1995).

Presently, we are unable to pinpoint a specific cause for mutilation. Research suggests that a variety of elements play a role in patrons' decisions to mutilate: negative attitudes toward the library (Hendrick and Murfin 1974), pressure to succeed academically (Weiss 1981; Varner 1984; Obiagwu 1992; Baine 1993), lack of concern for others (Souter 1976; Varner 1984; Pedersen 1990; Msuya 1991; Baine 1993), belief that they will not get caught or will suffer only minor penalties (Weiss 1981; Pedersen 1990; Obiagwu 1992), and lack of awareness of the costs involved in repairing or replacing damaged materials (Hendrick and Murfin 1974; Pedersen 1990; Obiagwu 1992) all contribute to the mutilation problem.

Library policies and practices themselves may inadvertently encourage mutilation. For example, lack of quality photocopiers has been cited as a possible contributor to the mutilation problem. Poor-quality photocopies, an inadequate number of photocopiers, and the lack of color photocopiers can create a situation in which patrons feel compelled to mutilate library materials (Hendrick and Murfin 1974; Samuel 1978; Msuya 1991). Library facilities (Dane 1991; Msuya 1991), inadequate collections (Obiagwu 1992), unaware staff (Dane 1991; Adewoye 1992), and restrictive borrowing privileges (Edwards 1986; Obiagwu 1992) can also increase the amount of mutilation that occurs.

Failure to educate patrons about the costs of mutilation (Gouke and Murfin 1974; Kesler 1977) and to enforce disciplinary action (Mast 1983; Kamm 1995) can also contribute to the problem. Additionally, Hendrick and Murfin (1974), as well as Gouke and Murfin (1980), report that patrons are more likely to mutilate an item that is already damaged than an item that is in perfect condition. Consequently, failure to identify and repair mutilated materials may lead to subsequent mutilation.

On the other hand, some writers suggest that mutilation is not a significant problem (Atwood and Wall 1990). Collver (1990), for instance, contends that 60% of mutilated items are never used again and thus concludes that mutilation does not necessarily have a negative effect on service. Hines (1975) argues that the impact of mutilation cannot be assessed unless librarians have calculated a loss-to-use ratio. Furthermore, Schumm (1994) claims that demand for mutilated periodical articles decreases over time. As a result, repairing mutilated items may not be a high priority for every library.

Compounding the situation is the fact that some actions taken to decrease book theft and mutilation might, in some instances, actually increase mutilation. Cossar (1975), Kesler (1977), Sleep (1982), Watstein (1983), and Edwards (1986), for example, report that installing electronic sensing devices to curb book theft can lead to increased mutilation. However, Gouke and Murfin (1980) maintain that installing a detector did not increase the rate of mutilation at their institution.

Even when mutilation is a problem, several writers warn librarians to make sure that the cost of controlling mutilation and repairing damaged materials is overall the best use of library resources. For instance, while prosecuting mutilators can be a deterrent, librarians should "consider whether it is worth the time and cost to take this course of action" (Bloom and Stern 1994). Each library must decide whether the negative reaction of patrons is worth risking an escalated rate of mutilation.

Even when libraries plan to punish mutilators, it is often difficult to apprehend the culprits in the act. Staff cannot keep every patron under constant surveillance. Individual pages, removed from books, generally will not set off electronic

detection systems. Libraries unfortunately cannot even rely on patrons to report witnessed acts of mutilation. In an attempt to assess patrons' reactions to mutilators, Hoppe and Simmel (1969) planted "stooges" to mutilate what appeared to be library materials. Many patrons simply ignored another patron whom they witnessed damaging materials.

Researchers have investigated mutilation of periodicals more than monograph mutilation. Hendrick and Murfin (1974) suggest that patrons are more apt to mutilate current periodicals than book materials, but no study appears to substantiate this belief. Perhaps librarians study periodical mutilation because it is the simplest to discover and track. As periodicals are prepared for binding, it is easy to identify mutilated or missing pages. In addition, many libraries have established formal procedures for replacing mutilated periodical pages or for making copies of them available to patrons (Lightfoot 1970; Collver 1990); thus, investigating this type of mutilation is easier.

The literature cited above does lend insight to the problem of mutilation in general. However, little is available that specifically addresses the extent of mutilation of art books or the ways in which libraries deal with these materials. One may suspect that art materials with plates and numerous illustrations are prime targets for mutilation. Zimmerman (1961) and Alemna (1992) report that art books with plates and photographs are among those most prone to mutilation.

For several years, the Preservation and Conservation Department at ECU, in consultation with the art subject librarian, made decisions about mutilated art materials on a case-by-case basis. Eventually, the Head of Preservation and Conservation, along with the art subject librarian, began to explore ways of improving the decision-making process. We decided to investigate how other librarians handle mutilation of their art books.

Survey

In the fall of 1995, we conducted a survey to learn how other libraries deal with mutilated art books. We wanted to select libraries that had a significant number of art books and also might have had a preservation program at the time of the survey. If a library had a preservation program, we reasoned that it might have a more formalized process for dealing with mutilated materials. As a result, we targeted academic ARL libraries in the United States —a total of 95 libraries. According to the 1993–94 ARL preservation statistics, 71 of the libraries (75%) reported having preservation units (Association of Research Libraries 1995).

Most of the schools offer degrees in art. Eight institutions (8%) offer the bachelor's degree as the highest art degree; 41 (43%) offer the master's as the highest degree in art, while 43 schools (45%) have art programs at the doctorate level (*The College Blue Book* 1995). Three institutions do not award art degrees. Twenty-six institutions (27%) are accredited by NASAD (National Association of Schools of Art and Design 1995). According to a membership list supplied by the Art Libraries Society/North America (ARLIS/NA), 61 institutions (64%) are members of this organization.

We were uncertain about who in each library department should receive the surveys. At first, we considered the head of the preservation unit to be the most logical recipient. However, many of the targeted libraries had separate art libraries on their campuses. Not knowing how institutions handle the preservation of departmental library materials, we called several art libraries to inquire about preservation policies. Unfortunately, no clear pattern emerged. Some departmental libraries handled all repairs of art materials. At other institutions, all repairs were sent to the preservation unit at the main library. In the end, we sent a survey to the unit handling preservation or conservation responsibilities (in some cases, not a formal department by that name) at each of the 95 libraries we had identified. In addition, we sent surveys to librarians in the art libraries if we could identify them using *The American Library Directory* (1995). We color-coded the questionnaires to keep the responses separate.

White questionnaires were sent to librarians in preservation units at main libraries while yellow questionnaires were sent to those in art libraries. Forty-three art librarians were sent questionnaires. A total of 138 questionnaires were mailed. We expected to receive only one response from each of the 95 targeted institutions, although that turned out not to be the case.

The questionnaire was intentionally kept brief. We limited the survey to a maximum of one sheet of paper, in the hope that the recipients would be more inclined to respond. The questions focused on points we wanted to clarify in our own setting. We inquired whether problems with the removal of pages, plates, or illustrations from art books were experienced. We then inquired how mutilated materials were handled and by whom. We also asked what type of replacement pages were used. Finally, we asked respondents to supply statistics, decision trees, policies, procedures, and any other related data they might wish to share with us. Before sending out the survey, another librarian, a member of our library's Preservation Committee, reviewed the questionnaire and made suggestions.

The survey response rate was better for art librarians than for those in main libraries. Thirty art librarians (70%), and 38 librarians in main libraries (40%) replied, for a total of 68 responses, representing a cumulative response of 49%. We received a questionnaire from both main and art librarians at 9 institutions, which means that 59 of the 95 targeted institutions responded to the survey for a nonduplicative response rate of 62%. A number of respondents included additional documents such as policies, procedures, and forms.

Results

The survey responses parallel our experiences at Joyner Library. Most libraries have a problem with mutilated art materials. Thirty-seven main librarians (97%) and 29 art librarians (97%) report problems with pages, plates, or illustrations being removed from art books. Only one main librarian and one art librarian report that mutilation is not a problem.

In spite of the problem, few libraries keep statistics about the amount of mutilation they encounter. Seven main librarians (18%) and 2 art librarians (6%) keep mutilation statistics. The type of statistics kept are rather general and not very informative. Librarians gathering statistics are most apt to tally the total number of replacement pages. These frequently do not distinguish among the reasons the replacement pages are requested. One librarian responded to the question about keeping statistics in the following way: "What's the point? It keeps happening." This resignation to the inability to control the situation may shed some light on why so few libraries keep mutilation statistics. Even so, "a library must determine the nature and extent of losses before knowing whether corrective measures should be considered" (Edwards 1986).

Missing pages are discovered in a variety of ways. Librarians most frequently become aware of mutilation from patron reports of missing pages, plates, or illustrations. This finding is in line with what other librarians have reported (Varner 1983; Birney and Williams 1985; Collver 1990). Discoveries by the circulation staff occur almost as frequently. Over half of all respondents indicate that the reference department sometimes notifies them of missing pages. Sometimes, shelvers and other library staff refer mutilated materials for repairs. In addition, when examining books for other projects or for routine repairs, the preservation staff may discover mutilation.

Librarians employ a variety of strategies for dealing with mutilated art materials. Most replace missing pages with black-and-white photocopies (92% of main libraries and all art libraries). Replacing the book is another popular option. Seventy-nine percent of main libraries and 83% of art libraries replace books whenever possible.

When examining the other methods for dealing with mutilation, we discovered some differences between art and main libraries. At main libraries, the third

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF MAJOR FACTORS INFLUENCING THE DECISION ON TREATMENT

Priority	Main Libraries	Art Libraries
1	Amount of mutilation	Amount of mutilation
2	Intellectual content	Intellectual content
3	Intrinsic value	Intrinsic value
4	Other*	Cost of replacement
5	Cost of repair	Other*
6	Cost of replacement	Cost of repair

*Availability of replacement; bibliographer's input; circulation statistics; embrittlement; if book can be repaired; other copies owned.

through fifth most popular ways of dealing with mutilation are: replacing pages with color photocopies (55%); discarding the book (42%); and ignoring the mutilation (34%). For art libraries, methods 3 through 5 are: discarding the book (43%); replacing pages with colored photocopies (33%); and ignoring the mutilation (27%).

Other ways of dealing with the problem include placing replacement pages at a reserve desk, adding a note to books about missing pages or plates; transferring the item to a secure location; or asking librarians to make a decision about discarding or replacing the book if the damage is excessive. One art librarian commented that mutilated illustrations are no longer replaced; only damaged text is replaced. Similarly, a main librarian replied that a note is included in certain books indicating that the library will not obtain replacement pages due to repeated mutilation. Another art librarian mentioned that preservation photocopying is considered for important mutilated art titles that are out of print. One deterrent to theft related by a respondent was to place a security stamp on all plates in new and previously mutilated materials, while another respondent plans to scan replacement pages digitally in the future.

Librarians were asked to prioritize factors that influence their treatment decisions (see table 1). The amount of mutilation ranks the highest for both types of libraries with 11 main librarians (29%) and 13 art librarians (43%) rating it as the number one factor. Intellectual content and intrinsic value rank as the second and third highest priorities respectively by both types of librarians. Few librarians at any library selected the cost of repair and replacement as their number one factor in making treatment decisions. However, cost of repair and cost of replacement rank high as second and third priorities in the main libraries. Consequently, repair and replacement costs may play a larger role in main libraries.

One art library does not have black-and-white photocopiers available for patrons on the premises. While $.10 appears to be the most frequently cited charge for photocopies, the charges range from $.03 to $.15. Several respondents report that photocopying charges are $.02 to $.05 less for patrons using copy cards than for those using cash. Color photocopiers, on the other hand, are much less accessible. Only 8 main librarians (21%) and 6 art librarians (20%) indicate that color photocopiers are available on the premises. Several librarians report that color copiers are available at other facilities on campus. Color photocopies cost more than black-and-white photocopies, with charges ranging from $.25 (one main library) to $2.00 (another main library).

Only a small number of librarians identify the specific brand or model of copier(s) used either by patrons or for replacement pages. For replacement pages, a number of librarians indicate that they accept whatever copy is sent via interlibrary loan. Presently, no standard copier brand or model appears to be employed at a majority of the libraries. As might be expected, Xerox, Canon, and Sharp copiers are mentioned frequently as the copier used by the respondents.

Preservation units handle all of the repairs to art books at 22 main libraries (58%) and 7 art libraries (23%). At the main libraries, only a small percentage of repairs is done at circulation or in techni-

cal services, and a few repairs are made by other units. In art libraries, repair responsibilities are dispersed more widely.

In order to manage mutilation, libraries sometimes restrict access to particular materials. Items believed to be targets of mutilation are frequently placed in special collection areas. Twenty-six main libraries (68%) and 23 art libraries (77%) restrict access by placing materials in special collections. A number of librarians responded that they would like to transfer many more items to special collections, but space limitations prevent them from doing so. Also, 15 main libraries (39%) and 15 art libraries (50%) restrict access by placing art materials in closed stack areas. Twelve main libraries (32%) and 11 art libraries (37%) place books on reserve as a means of controlling mutilation. Finally, 2 main libraries (5%) and 4 art libraries (13%) have limited access to items that they consider targets of mutilation.

Librarians decide to restrict access to items based on various factors (see table 2). An item's value and its subject matter are the two most important factors in limiting availability. For instance, several librarians mentioned controlling access to items containing erotic art. One library limits the accessibility of certain books with original artworks and all books by selected artists, in addition to restricting erotica. Value and subject matter tie as the number one factor for main librarians. Value is the number-one factor for art librarians with subject matter being the second most important factor. An item's condition and past mutilation also play a role in decisions to restrict access, but are less significant.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF MAJOR FACTORS DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT TO RESTRICT ACCESS TO ART BOOKS

Priority	Main Libraries	Art Libraries
1	Subject matter	Value
2	Value	Subject matter
3	Past mutilation	Condition
4	Condition	Past mutilation
5	Other+	Other+

+Age of book; availability in other library; bibliographer's input; difficulty of replacement; format: size, loose plates; importance to scope of collections; intellectual content, i.e., catalogues raisonnés; LC classification; monetary value; original art work; rarity; unique holdings; type of mutilation; value for research; very erotic.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Several survey findings were much as we expected. Specifically, mutilation of art books appears to be a problem encountered by most libraries. Mutilation occurs at both main and art libraries. The majority of mutilation is discovered and reported by patrons and circulation staff members. Frequently, preservation units attend to mutilated art materials.

The survey responses did provide a few surprises, however. For instance, while most libraries have black-and-white photocopiers available for patron use, a much smaller number of libraries have color photocopiers. It is surprising that so few art libraries have color photocopiers available. Given the importance patrons are likely to place on having color photocopies of color illustrations, this was an unexpected finding. A similar surprise was that a number of librarians reported requesting replacement copies via interlibrary loan rather than requesting the book and making their own copies. These libraries have placed the quality of the replacement pages in the hands of others, rather than controlling the quality of the replacements by photocopying the pages themselves.

We were also surprised to discover that so few librarians keep statistics on the amount of mutilation that they encounter. While the survey focused on mutilation statistics, the respondents' comments seem to indicate that few statistics of any kind are being collected. This raises the question of how well librarians are able to plan or budget for repairs if no accurate information is available. How can librarians assess whether or not the detection rate of mutilation is increasing without accurate statistics? How can they tell whether steps taken to limit mutilation are

successful? Moreover, how can librarians determine whether the cost of the "cure" is more than the cost of the damage (Birney and Williams 1985)? Statistics on mutilation routinely encountered by patrons and staff can only measure the rate of detection. In order to assess the rate of actual mutilation, librarians would need to conduct regular random samples of the collection. Statistics of encountered mutilation may help identify areas of the collection to target for random sampling.

As preservation units become a more standard feature in libraries, especially larger libraries, it would be instructive to resurvey the respondents to see whether more libraries will begin to gather statistics in the future. If so, we may have a better understanding of the extent and the amount of mutilation of art books that actually occur. It will be interesting to see whether more libraries install color photocopiers for patron use and to assess the impact color photocopiers may have on mutilation. Moreover, as the availability of electronic images increases, librarians may see a change in the pattern of mutilation. Bloom and Stern (1994) suggest that electronic resources may help limit the amount of mutilation to paper materials, only to be replaced by mutilation and tampering of electronic files. Additionally, it might be informative in future surveys to query libraries about the disciplinary actions they take toward mutilators as well as steps taken to educate patrons about mutilation.

Presently, it appears that no one method for dealing with mutilation of art collections, or any collection, will be successful in all instances. "The most any librarian can expect to do to lessen both thefts and mutilations is to remain constantly vigilant and to utilize whatever controls seem practical for him to adopt in his own particular situation" (Zimmerman 1961, 3440).

Works Cited

Adewoye, Alice Ayanrinola. 1992. Librarians' attitudes towards theft and mutilation of library materials in academic libraries in Nigeria. *Library review* 41, no. 2: 29–36.

Alemna, Anaba. 1992. Library security, book theft and mutilation: A study of university libraries in Ghana. *Library & archival security* 11, no. 2: 23–35.

Almagro, Bertha R. 1985. The curse-a-book security system. *Library & archival security* 7, nos. 3/4: 49–53.

American library directory 1995–96. 1995. 48th ed. New Providence, N.J.: Bowker.

Association of Research Libraries. 1995. *ARL preservation statistics 1993–94.* Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.

Atwood, Thomas, and Carol Wall. 1990. A case study of periodical mutilation in a university serials collection. *Library & archival security* 10, no. 1: 35–41.

Aungerville, Richard, known as Richard de Bury, bp. of Durham, 1287–1245. 1907. *The love of books: The philobiblon of Richard de Bury.* Trans. E. C. Thomas. London: Chatto & Windus.

Baine, Martha S. 1993. Causes and prevention of theft and mutilation in a high school library media center: A survey of students' attitudes and practices. *School library media quarterly* 21: 221–26.

Birney, Ann E., and Sara R. Williams. 1985. Mutilation and the folklore of academic librarianship. *Library & archival security* 7, nos. 3/4: 41–47.

Bloom, Beth, and Richard E. Stern. 1994. Mutilation of library materials: Campus concerns. *New Jersey libraries* 27, no. 4: 15–17.

The college blue book: Degrees offered by college and subject. 1995. 25th ed. New York: MacMillan Library Reference.

Collver, Mitsuko. 1990. Subsequent demand for ripped-off journal articles. *The reference librarian,* nos. 27/28: 347–66.

Constantinou, Constantia. 1995. Destruction of knowledge: A study of journal mutilation at a large university library. *College & research libraries* 56: 497–507.

Cossar, Bruce. 1975. 3-M tattle-tape: The eye that never sleeps. *Canadian library journal* 32: 213–15.

Culp, Robert W. 1976. Thefts, mutilations, and library exhibits. *Special libraries* 67: 582–84.

Dane, William J. 1991. A major challenge to security: The theft/mutilation of art materials or the triumph of art over betrayed trust, rampant medacity [sic], and vanished guilt. *Art documentation* 10: 179–80.

Edwards, John D. 1986. Book losses and mutilation in law school libraries. *Law library journal* 78: 443–64.

Gouke, Mary Noel, and Marjorie Murfin.

1980. Periodical mutilation: The insidious disease. *Library journal* 105: 1795–97.

Griffin, Carolene Perry. 1993. A study of conservation/preservation treatment of materials in fine arts libraries. *The Georgia librarian* 30, no. 2: 41–43.

Hendrick, Clyde, and Marjorie E. Murfin. 1974. Project library ripoff: A study of periodical mutilation in a university library. *College & research libraries* 35: 402–11.

Hines, Theodore C. 1975. Theft, mutilation, and the loss-to-use ratio. *Library security newsletter* 1, no. 3: 1–4.

Hoppe, Ronald A., and Edward C. Simmel. 1969. Book tearing and the bystander in the university library. *College & research libraries* 30: 247–51.

Kamm, Sue. 1995. A rose is not necessarily a rose: Issues in public library security. *Library & archival security* 13, no. 1: 41–45.

Kesler, Elizabeth Gates. 1977. A campaign against mutilation. *The journal of academic librarianship* 3, no. 1: 29–30.

Lightfoot, Robert M., Jr. 1970. "Project mutilation": An attempt at a solution to a growing problem. *Illinois libraries* 52: 946–49.

Lilly, Roy S., Barbara F. Schloman, and Wendy Hu. 1991. Ripoffs revisited: Periodical mutilation in a university research library. *Library & archival security* 11, no. 1: 43–70.

Luke, Joan M. 1991. The mutilation of periodicals in a mid-size university library. *The serials librarian* 20, no. 4: 95–110.

Marshall, Goldie. 1960. Troubled by page slashers? *Library journal* 85: 4199.

Mast, Sharon. 1983. Ripping off and ripping out: Book theft and mutilation from academic libraries. *Library & archival security* 5, no. 4: 31–51.

Msuya, Jangawe. 1991. Serials mutilation hazard at the University of Dar es Salaam Library in Tanzania. *Library & archival security* 11, no. 1: 109–16.

National Association of Schools of Art and Design. 1995. *Directory*. Reston, Va.: National Association of Schools of Art and Design.

Nawe, Julita. 1988. The impact of a dwindling budget on library services in Tanzania. *Library review* 37, no. 2: 27–32.

Obiagwu, Marcel C. 1992. Library abuse in academic institutions: A comparative study. *International information & library review* 24: 291–305.

Otness, Harold. 1988. "Going plating": Stealing maps from libraries. *Information bulletin (Western Association of Map Libraries)* 19: 206–10.

Pedersen, Terri L. 1990. Theft and mutilation of library materials. *College & research libraries* 51: 120–28.

Prasad, Badri. 1968. *Problems of misplacement, mutilation and theft of library books*. N.p.: B. P. Goswami.

Ragains, Patrick. 1991. Availability and mutilation of U.S. Geological Survey publications: An analytic study. *The reference librarian*, no. 32: 247–57.

Reed, Marcia. 1991. "To catch these thieves": The librarian as protector of the books. *Art documentation* 10: 175–77.

Richmond, Michael L. 1975. Attitudes of law librarians to theft and mutilation control methods. *Law library journal* 68, no. 1: 60–70.

Samuel, Evelyn. 1978. Protection of library and archival materials: A case study—New York University's Institute of Fine Arts. *Library & archival security* 2, nos. 3/4: 1–6.

———. 1981. Special libraries—special problems: Preservation of art library materials. *ARLIS/NA newsletter* 9: 141–45.

Schumm, Robert W. 1992. Patterns of periodicals mutilation at three academic libraries. *The serials librarian* 21, no. 4: 147–56.

———. 1994. Periodicals mutilation revisited: A two-year follow-up study. *The serials librarian* 25: 201–5.

Sleep, Esther L. 1982. Periodical vandalism: A chronic condition? *Canadian library journal* 39, no. 1: 39–42.

Souter, G. H. 1976. Delinquent readers: A study of the problem in university libraries. *Journal of librarianship* 8, no. 2: 96–110.

Theft at Huntington. 1991. *AB bookman's weekly* 87: 543, 554.

Thompson, Lawrence S. 1968. *Bibliologia comica or humorous aspects of the caparisoning and conservation of books*. N.p.: Archon Books.

Varner, Carroll. 1983. Journal mutilation in academic libraries. *Library & archival security* 5, no. 4: 19–29.

Watstein, Sarah Barbara. 1983. Book mutilation: An unwelcome by-product of electronic security systems. *Library & archival security* 5, no. 1: 11–33.

Weiss, Dana. 1981. Book theft and book mutilation in a large urban university library. *College & research libraries* 42: 341–47.

Worman, Eugene C., Jr. 1988. Print collecting and the problem of breaking. *AB bookman's weekly* 81: 1609–19.

Zimmerman, Lee. 1961. Pilfering and mutilating library books. *Library journal* 86: 3437–40.