
This study describes a questionnaire survey of seven university libraries across the country. The study was conducted to determine the perceptions of librarians in regards to unaffiliated users, and how well librarians understand the policies at their institutions. The results show that while affiliated patrons are seen most in instructional sessions and at the reference desk, there is no dominating area of interaction with unaffiliated patrons. And despite the multitude of opinions surrounding how unaffiliated users are and should be treated compared to those associated with an institutions, librarians still show a strong desire to treat all patrons as fairly as possible.
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Introduction

University libraries contain a wealth of information and knowledge in order to further the studies of the students and faculty of a university. The resources that are available to students and faculty are available mostly free of charge and with little restriction on use. However, there are many people in and around the university that could potentially make use of materials. Unaffiliated users can be grouped into many categories: general public, government workers, employees, businesspersons, non-profit employees, high school students, K-12 teachers, students from other colleges and universities, faculty from other colleges and universities, visiting scholars, part-time and continuing education students, and family members of faculty and students. These unaffiliated persons are not necessarily part of the stated clientele of a library, so their needs may be pushed to the side and restrictions placed on their library use.

There are restrictions on who can use materials and what sort of resources will be available to unaffiliated users: how unaffiliated users will be able to use materials (many are not given borrowing privileges); and there are restrictions on how and what electronic materials unaffiliated users can access (some libraries require a registered user login at all terminals, or to access electronic resources remotely). The purpose of these restrictions is to make sure that primary users have first access to materials\(^1\). But when there are libraries with the stated goal of reaching out to the wider community\(^2\), this leads to questions of what exactly are the stated policies in academic libraries towards unaffiliated
users, how much do librarians who interact with unaffiliated users know about these policies, and what are their attitudes towards unaffiliated users?

There is some literature that addresses the issue of accessibility of collections to unaffiliated users, but much of this is generalized, and is not specific about academic libraries, unaffiliated users, or even the types of restrictions that are placed on users. None of it discusses that there could be a difference about access to materials even within an academic library system. It is not uncommon for a large research university to have a main library, a law library, a health sciences or medical library, and an archives or special collections. These sets of problems lead to the question of what the restrictions are, and how might those restrictions be different for different types of users visiting the different divisions of university libraries in public and private institutions. Looking at policies towards access and users may help to clarify those policies for librarians and may potentially reduce restrictions. Nearly all of the literature at this point in time is focused on the access policy document or on the interpretation of this document by librarians at the institution. Policies concerning services and use can be interpreted users in many different ways by librarians who serve unaffiliated if the policies are not written clearly. This ambiguity can lead to questions about whether users are treated fairly, whether both librarians and patrons are aware of the policies, and what exactly the policies dictate for different user groups.

The proposed study will look at both the policies of academic libraries in regard to unaffiliated users, and also at the perceptions and opinions of the academic librarians who have contact with unaffiliated users. In doing so, I believe that the research will show some difference between how librarians believe they should treat unaffiliated users,
and how access policies describe the rights and privileges of unaffiliated users. If there is a difference between policy and practice, it will reaffirm the need for more research in the area of unaffiliated users and their access to academic libraries. This research may inform future policies with respect to unaffiliated users.
Literature Review

Unaffiliated users have long been an issue in the world of academic libraries. Ever since the growth of the college-aged population in the 1960s and the resultant growth in universities, their libraries and holdings, the resources available in the academic setting have seemed more accessible for members of the public not associated with the university. The first major survey of academic library use by the public was done in the 1960s by Academic and College Research Library (ACRL) \(^3\), and other similar surveys have been done since – the most recent taking place in 2001 \(^4\). However, the climate in academic libraries continues to change as the types of resources available shift, and the public need shifts as well. In recent years, many journals – the main resource unavailable to users in public or K-12 libraries – have switched to electronic versions which can have their access screened. Most libraries have computer labs with machines containing up-to-date versions of software that may be too expensive for personal purchase or unavailable anywhere else. The libraries themselves have been undergoing budget cuts – be they for staff or resources. Whatever the issue, the unaffiliated user is an important constituency that needs to be taken into consideration through policy and procedure, and this research will attempt to discover what policies are in place in public and private academic libraries across the nation.

The first major article written on the topic of unaffiliated users was presented at a symposium led by E.J. Josey during one of the ACRL committees on community use of academic libraries. A survey was sent out to member libraries of ACRL asking about
policies and attitudes towards use of the academic library by unaffiliated users, and their responses were the basis of discussion. The most important part of the survey is that the number of libraries who responded to the survey was so great – nearly 800 institutions of varying size and academic focus. The results were then discussed by different members of the committee. The survey covered nearly every topic and asked almost every question that would be pertinent to libraries serving community users in the mid-1960s.

The most general piece of information received was that about 95% of all institutions surveyed allowed for in-house use of their materials by unaffiliated users\(^5\). The other generally agreed-upon idea was that high-schoolers were the group most unwelcome in academic libraries. Many survey takers indicated that this subset of unaffiliated users were the most likely to abuse the privilege.

After Josey's article appeared in 1967, a few other articles appeared in a similar vein. A survey was conducted of academic law libraries to determine attitudes and policies towards users who were unaffiliated with the law school. The survey divided the libraries by the location and status (public or private) of their parent institutions. Because of the specialty of this type of library, the groupings of unaffiliated users were also specialized and highly detailed. The data seemed to indicate that the unaffiliated users most likely to be admitted to the law library were first those associated with the parent institution, and secondly those who were more closely associated with law in their everyday life (such as lawyers)\(^6\).

A joint survey was conducted in 1982 by the Library Association of the City University of New York (LACUNY) and the State University of New York Librarians Association (SUNYLA). This survey took general ideas from the ACRL survey and
examined at them more closely. They determined that nearly all libraries that denied borrowing privileges to unaffiliated members were located in urban areas, and that this was the major factor in determining if the privilege was available. The study also confirmed that nearly all institutions allow for community in-house use, and that there was a general feeling of awareness of the fact that state support derived from taxes was a reason to provide services to the public.

The next survey of academic libraries occurred in Virginia in 1987. This was the first survey in the area of unaffiliated user access that addressed the topic of electronic resources. At the time, only about half of the universities surveyed offered online searching to their public users, and nearly all of this searching was fee-based. This survey also re-addressed the issue of categorizing user groups, and high school students were ranked the second most frequent type of user overall, but they were ranked the most frequent by more libraries than any other group, indicating that even though this survey took place 20 years later, high school students were still a factor in the unaffiliated user issue. However, the idea was brought up later in the article that providing access to library services for high-schoolers was a good recruitment tool. This was also the first article to discuss the actual laws that may govern community use of publicly supported libraries by the state-government. The findings did not indicate that state-supported schools had to provide service to the community, based on the law. It was determined that many of the institutions providing access to the community were probably doing so because of assumptions about what was required by receiving state funds.

A survey conducted a little more than a year later in Georgia indicated that state-wide surveys of community access to libraries were not as well cited in the literature as
they could have been. The article goes as far to say, "…there is little hard data but more opinion and viewpoint" when this was the third article of its kind in the 1980s. This shows that the researchers for this survey either did not have access to the other statewide surveys of unaffiliated user policy, or that these other surveys were not being cited in journals available outside the state of research. The most important findings of this survey were the explicit categorization of the unaffiliated users into 14 groups, and the discussion of the access and services provided to each of these groups. Another important discussion is that of electronic materials – survey respondents discussed online searching, CD-ROM usage, online catalogs and the access to their use by unaffiliated users.

A 1992 book, "Academic libraries in urban and metropolitan areas: a management handbook", devoted an entire chapter to the discussion of external access. Their chapter was based on a survey of 26 diverse academic libraries in urban settings. The chapter gives explicit data on the different categories of unaffiliated users in those institutions and the access to different library services taking those categories from the Georgia article. This article reinforces the idea that the access given to different groups varies widely even across institutions in similar settings.

Also in 1992 was an article in the *Law Library Journal*, based on a survey exploring policies towards unaffiliated users during exam times in law libraries. This survey was very different from the others in that it looked at how many libraries were restricting access at certain points in the year, and the criteria that would be used to determine if an unaffiliated user would be able to use the collections at that time. The survey indicated that private libraries were more likely to restrict their collections against
unaffiliated users during the entire year, while public academic libraries were more likely to only restrict unaffiliated usage during peak times such as exams. The data also implied that there are a significant number of libraries without written policies towards restricting use.

An article from 1993\textsuperscript{11} discusses community use of academic libraries in North Carolina. This article is different because it approaches the topic from the angle of providing services to members of the business community. Unlike Virginia, North Carolina mandates that state-supported institutions give full library services to business professionals and other citizens who are within a 35 mile radius of the campus\textsuperscript{12}. Even with this mandate, the extent to which the services are rendered, and the possible remuneration for these services varies from library to library, even though all are within the University of North Carolina (UNC) system.

The most recent American survey was done by Nancy Courtney in 2003. The survey was slightly different in that it sought to discover how academic libraries perceived their own accessibility to non-affiliated users. The survey was most likely the largest of its kind since the original Josey survey in 1964, since it was sent out to librarians at over 800 academic libraries randomly selected from the Carnegie classification list. The findings for in-house use were similar to those from the Josey survey, but because this was a modern survey, it also included questions about use of electronic resources. Computer access appeared to be more restricted, with many institutions requiring authentication for all computer users\textsuperscript{13}. Libraries have varying reasons for why they provide access to unaffiliated users, and that may explain the different types of access offered.
An even more recent survey conducted in Nigeria was slightly different in that it took the point of view of the part-time user, a group that is sometimes labeled as "unaffiliated" because they are not necessarily on the campus using the main library, and may have changing enrollment status. While the part-time student does not fit into the definition of “unaffiliated user” as used in this paper, this group is one which faces difficulties similar to those of the in the study, and so literature that deals with their difficulties in library use should be considered as related to the literature of unaffiliated users. Questionnaires were administered to more than 200 students who were enrolled in courses through a satellite campus. The students surveyed were all enrolled in a course required before graduation, and since enrollment for at least three semesters is a requirement for the course, it was assumed that all the students who filled out the survey would have at least three semesters of experience at the college. The results presented in the article indicate that the part-time students did not feel that the library was accommodating their needs. The majority felt that the library was far away and not in a good location for use by part-time students, that the opening hours were not convenient for them, and results also showed that part-time students did not think that they could regularly borrow books from the library.

Nearly all of the surveys in these articles are based on self-reporting, and as such, have the potential to be biased. But they also all show nearly the same results – that academic libraries are allowing use of materials in-house, but are much more likely to restrict unaffiliated borrowing of materials through policy or fees. Very few of the articles discuss the merits of certain plans, but the ones that do seem to indicate that the
fee-based plan is sometimes done as a deterrent for users without a significant need, which in some cases, may be the same as completely restricting the material from use.

The next set of articles do what the survey articles lack – they talk about the relative merits of plans to deal with unaffiliated users, and show that librarians are trying to find ways to improve the way that unaffiliated user policies are created or handled. They also discuss the problems created by having unaffiliated users in the academic library. For example, the article "Unaffiliated Users of Academic Libraries" discusses the fact that a public library in Mississippi asked an academic library to stop serving community users. This was because the community users were not using the public library as much, and using the college library. Because the academic library was more able to suit their needs, these community users were less likely to support plans for the development of the public library, which reinforced the use of the academic library\(^\text{15}\).

Situations such as this are good for neither library – the academic, which wants to provide better service to its primary customers, or the public, which wants to develop enough to be able to suit the needs of its community. This same article discusses the different types of approaches that could be used in restricting community use of the academic library. The article believes that one of the first restrictions that should be implemented is borrowing privileges, since taking the materials home is a "convenient bonus" to the unaffiliated user, and because the materials could be accessed and used in the library itself\(^\text{16}\). Other measures such as referral slips, reference appointments, increased bibliographic instruction, fees, and the possibility of closing one library with a majority of duplicate holdings are discussed along with their relative pros and cons.
A 1998 article by Peggy Johnson discusses the fact that academic libraries may not even accurately know how many unaffiliated users they have. She says that until libraries have hard numbers of how many unaffiliated users are in-house, borrowing materials, and using reference services, there is no way to put a monetary value on the services rendered, and the “wear and tear” on materials. She suggests that with the prevalence of automated systems that are now available that libraries would be better able to track the different types of unaffiliated users.

A 2001 article from *Art Documentation* discusses access in cultural heritage institutions. While not addressing exactly the same issues as academic libraries, the article does discuss important issues such as electronic access – which gets very little discussion in the empirical studies because most of them are outdated – and generally defining access parameters for different categories of users. The ideas are a little different since the articles are focused more on archival material, but the idea of providing access to digital collections and deciding what sort of fee to charge for electronic versus paper copies of images have similar themes.

The last non-survey article was one written by Nancy Courtney in 2001. This article was a general overview of the situation surrounding the unaffiliated user since the 1950s. While not necessarily stating opinions or making judgments on the different policies used for academic library use by the community over time, the reader is able to see what the different policies have been, and how they changed the way that the library worked for and against the unaffiliated user. The article is also an excellent source of other articles on the subject, since it does a general survey of all research and opinion done on community users since the 1950s. What it does best, though, is to highlight the
issues that are changing the most, and to show how different policies have been put in place to reflect those changes.

There have been many changes in libraries in recent years. While the basic idea of the library remains the same – a place where users can come to find information – the format of how that information is found has changed. Because there have been so many unaffiliated users in the libraries, it is imperative that libraries address their needs and the needs of the library through policy and procedure. Whether this is by restricting the amount of books that can be checked out or the types of electronic journals and databases that can be accessed, libraries need to be more proactive. This can only be done by first assessing what is in place, what all the possible options are for providing access, and which ones will serve all the user communities to their fullest potential.
Methods

This study was done in stages. The first stage consisted of soliciting libraries at four year institutions in the “Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education” through an emailed letter for copies of their policies regarding access that pertained to users, specifically unaffiliated users, and any other policies that relate to unaffiliated users. Included in the solicitation letter was a copy of the introduction to the research proposal, and a request to either forward a short invitation letter containing a link to the online survey to librarians in the circulation and reference departments, or a request to allow me to send the email invitation to librarians myself. The librarians were asked to fill out the online survey and to submit it with the only identifying information being the state where the library is located. These surveys will include an option for librarians to indicate their willingness to be contacted for follow-up questions based on their answers.

The sample was intended to be a group of 10-15 libraries. Fifteen requests for policy statements were sent out initially, and the intention was if the first group did not reply within two weeks, that an appropriate number of replacement institutions would be contacted. However, due to time restrictions, this second round of requests was not sent out, and the study sample was limited to those who replied in the first round. In this case, seven institutions agreed to participate in the survey, all with at least two librarians completing the survey.
The second stage was composing the letter soliciting university libraries for copies of the access policy, policy towards unaffiliated users, or any other documented policy that would help determine the policies of the library as they affect the access rights of unaffiliated users. Letters were written to direct librarian participants to the survey website. The letters to library directors, to participants, the consent page, and the survey itself can be found in the Appendix.

The next stage was to obtain a small sample of four-year institutions from the Carnegie list, using the simple random sample method described by Babbie. All four-year institutions were selected from the data file, and assigned numbers as labels for the institutions. Numbers were randomly selected using a computer program, with any duplication counted as a “re-draw.” The first 15 institutions were the primary pool, and the other 15 were a back-up, in order to ensure adequate numbers of participants in the study. In order to preserve the privacy of the survey participants, it was decided that the state in which the institution was located would be the identifier in the survey so that the researcher would know which library was responding, but no one else looking at the results would know. Because of this, it was necessary to re-draw numbers many times in order to have only one institution per state in the initial participant pool. Duplicates of states were added directly to the back-up pool. It was decided that if an institution from one state dropped out and a back-up from that state existed, that institution would be contacted first. If no back-up from the same state existed, then the next available institution on the back-up list would be used.

The fourth stage consisted of emailing the libraries to determine if they would be willing to participate. If the library itself was not willing to participate, the institution
would be discarded and institutions from the backup pool would be contacted in the order that they were chosen. Once 10-15 institutions had agreed to participate, an email would be sent consisting of a letter addressed to the librarians, asking them to participate in the survey by following a link to the web survey.

The fifth stage was intended to take place four weeks after the surveys came in. This stage would have consisted in following up with participants who had provided interesting responses with an additional email survey. However, because of a lack of time and the thorough answers of those who responded to the survey, this step was skipped.

A separate step in the process was that of analyzing the policies of libraries relating to unaffiliated users. In the email sent to library directors, they were asked for copies of, or web addresses for any policies that dealt with access to collections and unaffiliated users. These documents were analyzed by using the list of services laid out in question 12 of the survey (Appendix D), and the two services that had more than two responses in the “other” category. Using the list of services, the documents were read carefully, and if a service was mentioned with regard to its access by different user groups, it was given a “Y” (for providing that service to unaffiliated users) or an “N” (if the service was not available to unaffiliated users). A question mark was entered in the table if the service was not mentioned or the terms of use were not expressly laid out.
Results

Seven categories were defined for analysis of policies. These were based on five privileges that were suggested in the survey, with two categories that were mentioned by multiple respondents when asked for suggestions of “other” services that unaffiliated users take advantage of in academic libraries. The results (found in Appendix E, table 13) show that policies are most likely to lay out conditions for in-house use of materials and for borrowing, with five schools having these topics covered in their policies. The service least likely to be mentioned in policies are printing/copying, where zero institutions mentioned this service, and references services, whose access by different user groups was addressed by only two of the seven institutions in the survey.

Survey invitations (which can be found in Appendix A) were sent out to library directors at 15 schools, nine of whom responded. Of these, one opted not to participate at all, one said it would participate, but then none of its librarians filled out the online survey, and seven institutions participated fully. From these institutions, 38 persons filled out at least part of the survey (found in Appendix D), with 35 completing the entire thing. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents were from public institutions, with the remaining percentage being from private schools (Appendix E, table 2).

In describing their positions in the libraries, 27 (about 75%) either worked only in public services, or had public services at the library as a main component of their job description (Appendix E, table 3). The remaining quarter of respondents worked in special collections, technical services or were library administrators. Nearly every person
surveyed was in a position where they had contact with patrons more than once a week, and 78% working with patrons daily (Appendix E, table 5).

The bulk of affiliated patron interaction came through regular reference work (83%), and library and bibliographic instruction (50%) (Appendix E, table 6). This trend of interaction at the reference desk continued when asked about interactions with unaffiliated users. The majority of respondents to the survey cited general reference as the place where unaffiliated users are interacting with librarians (Appendix E, table 8). Specific interactions such as those where patrons require assistance with technology, or for assistance in researching for a homework assignment were also cited heavily. Seventy-five percent of librarians are apt to ask patrons during the course of interaction whether or not they are affiliated with the university if there is a possibility of disparity in service level (Appendix E, table 7).

The perceived attitudes of the librarians about the unaffiliated users compared to those about users affiliated with the institution are in a bell curve, with the majority of librarians saying that there is no difference between the attitudes of affiliated and unaffiliated patrons. As the perception of user attitudes becomes more extreme on either end of the scale, there are fewer participants from the survey who report extreme behavior. Another curve is visible in the results from the questions about how much time librarians are spending and should be spending with unaffiliated patrons. Both sets of results have zero responses on the “1” end of a five point scale, but when the question changes from how much time is spent to how much time should be spent, the curve changes slightly – with more people saying that unaffiliated users should not get more or less time than those who are affiliated.
The final set of results from the survey is that of which services and library functions were available for use by unaffiliated users. The table showing the number of survey takers believing a service is available to unaffiliated users (Appendix E, table 12) is best used when in conjunction with the list of services created from policies either available to the public or given upon request that state what is actually available to unaffiliated patrons (Appendix E, table 13). A comparison of the two tables showed that in many cases nearly every at an institution surveyed understood which services were and were not available to those not belonging to the university. However, two other situations are made clear in the comparison of the two. The first is when librarians are completely divided on the availability of a certain service, and the second when none of the librarians at an institution know that a service is available to unaffiliated patrons that visit their institution.
Discussion

The issue of unaffiliated users is an important topic for research because the needs of the community are expanding and without funding for the needed materials in public libraries, there are few other places to turn. Needs of unaffiliated users are not dissimilar to those users who are associated with the university. Many persons use materials to do personal research, for homework (in the case of students), and for professional research. University libraries are the most likely and publicly known places to have access to the quality and quantity of information and materials that are necessary for serious or in depth research on a variety of topics.

This was not in any way a definitive study, as the sample size was small. Hopefully this study will be used as a jumping off point for further study into how much librarians know about the policies at their own libraries. If there is more that is known about how much librarians understand these policies, the administrations in libraries will be able to create better policies and to promote these policies in ways so that they are better understood by the faculty and staff, along with the users who come to libraries.

This method (an online survey) for discovering perceptions is appropriate because in order to discover the attitudes and opinions of librarians as they pertain to unaffiliated users, surveys and interviews must be done with those who actually work with unaffiliated users. The method of an online survey poses little to no risk to those who participate because there will be very little identifying information attached to their responses other than the state in which their institution is located, and their department
within the library system. It also allows for more privacy than a phone interview, because the survey can be taken from any computer location.

The reason for surveying reference and circulation librarians is because these are the people who are most likely to interact with patrons on a regular basis – by managing interlibrary loan and the charging and discharging of books and materials, or through the reference interactions. By having librarians who are out in the field answering the questions, the answers will (hopefully) not be idealized, but will be more accurate representations of what happens on a regular basis in academic libraries.

One ethical issue of this survey is the fact that in order for the surveys to work, there might be some form of identification that will tie the librarian to the department and the institution where she works. When an institution is not very large, there is a possibility that survey data and results could be studied in the future, and responses could be tied to specific librarians. However, the plan to mitigate this ethical risk is to remove all names and institutional information and to replace it with more general information about states (as a location) and job function that will make the information identifiable to only the researcher. After the survey is complete, information that ties librarians to the survey will be destroyed in order to protect the anonymity of the participants.

In the survey, of the librarians sampled, most spent about half to all of their time working with patrons. Only one person responded that her job did not require her to spend any time with patrons, which is interesting considering there was at least one technical services person, and four administrative librarians who took the survey. The reason for this may have been because in smaller institutions where there are fewer professional librarians on the payroll, anybody on the library staff may be asked to spend
time at the reference desk, including administrators and library directors. But when taken in consideration with the results of the next question about how much time is spent with patrons each week, the results become even more interesting. Nearly every respondent works with patrons more than once a week, with just one person responding “once a week”, which means that even those librarians in positions that may not traditionally be seen as having to work with patrons (those in library administration and technical services) have to come in contact with the people who use libraries, even if that contact is somewhat infrequent at best.

When asked about the attitudes of unaffiliated patrons as compared to the attitudes of those who are associated with the university, there does not seem to be a consensus. If librarians viewed unaffiliated patrons as being more or less patient than those affiliated than the university, there is a chance for a difference in level of service offered. For example, if a librarian believes that unaffiliated users as a group tend to be more patient than those affiliated with the university, they might be willing to spend more time with that group of users (this could also be a subject for future study). In this case, the majority believe unaffiliated patrons have the same patience as those affiliated with a university, with smaller, but equal sized groups on either side choosing the options for being more or less patient. Having this comparison of attitudes of affiliated and unaffiliated patrons in a bell curve indicates that the attitude of the user does not depend on whether she is affiliated or not, and thus, the chances of librarians treating this user group differently is more likely to be up to chance. Instead, it may show that there is a great deal of variation among all patrons, and that being extremely patient or impatient is
not limited to those who do not affiliate with library’s institution. One librarian described
an unusual situation that shows a lack of patience on the part of users:

“Most people are very pleased to have this free service. A few of our ‘regular’
unaffiliated patrons ask to be logged on to a specific pc, in other words, they have
their favorite spot. This has actually caused an incident when 2 patrons wanted the
same pc and were not happy that we asked one to sit elsewhere.”

While another participant characterized unaffiliated patrons in this way:

“They are usually polite but do not know how to use the library. They do not
know how to use the online catalog or indexes, do not readily recognize an
Internet connection, or may want to do email...I often spend considerable time
with these patrons. I consider it good public relations with the community to help
them and am are [sic] willing to assist Who knows, some day their son or
daughter may be one of our students if they've had a good impression of us.”

By realizing that the patron or patrons may need extra help, the librarian is able to
provide the best help possible. And while it is possible that not all unaffiliated users are
unfamiliar with a particular library, its services and technology, it is possible that those
who are in unfamiliar territory are impatient because they do not understand.

Another area that is ripe for discussion is that of who the targeted users are for a
university. While the faculty, students and staff of an institution are obvious choices,
there are librarians who believe that not everyone else should be blithely labeled as
unaffiliated. One respondent said of certain groups of patrons who could be classed as
unaffiliated:

“All of these people are considered as "affiliated" as our university's mission, as a
state institution, is also to serve the people of our state.”

Another respondent to the survey said,

“We are obliged to serve unaffiliated users, as we are a partial government
documents depository and also as recipients of subsidized [sic] state databases.”
Both of these are valid and common thoughts among state-funded schools, or those that accept government funding as a government depository. But government funding does not necessarily mean that the users not associated with the university are or should be allowed to use every resource that a library provides – merely those that are funded by federal dollars. However, when some of the resources funded by the government are databases or online journals, it becomes difficult to decide how to handle the situation. Libraries must decide to either restrict use of services bought with private money while still allowing public use of government funded-databases, or to allow full use of all online resources while in the library. A third option is described by one of the survey respondents:

“The most typical interaction is when an unaffiliated person approaches the desk and asks to be logged on to one of our pcs. Our policy is posted, that off-campus people must present an ID and ask to be logged on. Only staff members (not student aides) may do this. We do this many times each day.”

This solution of requiring patrons to log on to use computers is one that has grown in popularity in recent years. The positive side is that majority of computer use will be by persons who are a part of the university community, and those who are not will still be able to have access as long as they ask. The negative side is that unaffiliated users must go through an extra step and ask to be logged on which, while not a problem for the majority of people, may be difficult for those who are shy or easily intimidated. While not every decision regarding library policy can or should be made because of the way the shyest person who would use the library would react, it is at least a factor that should be considered in the process of decision making process and execution of library policies.

The way that librarians described interactions with unaffiliated users was done in two ways: the type of user they encountered, and a specific need. Many librarians cited
high school students coming in to work on assignments, others genealogists or those doing research of local history. This may partly explain why the librarians noticed a difference between those users who are affiliated and those who are not in how they use the library. More than 80% of the respondents to this survey said that they interact with patrons at the reference desk, but when the population of patrons is limited to those who are unaffiliated, that number drops to 57%. Another area of reference assistance that showed an unusual difference between patron types was that of casual reference assistance. This type of interaction was one that occurred when patrons recognized the librarian and asked for help, or any other interaction that was not initiated from behind the desk. Nearly one-quarter of respondents reported this with all patrons, but no one reported it when restricted to those users who are unaffiliated. If there had been more unaffiliated patrons coming to the reference desk with varied needs, specific user tasks would not necessarily have been highlighted in the unaffiliated user interactions.

Library or bibliographic instruction was an area that did not show up at all among unaffiliated user interactions, but showed strongly with the general user population. This may be because instruction is usually geared towards a class, else has a focus that would not necessarily be of interest to members of the general community outside of the university, or because users must be affiliated to participate in other instruction sessions. Also showing differences were those of interlibrary loan, circulation and borrowing. For the general user community, circulation was noted by a quarter of respondents as an area of interaction, while interlibrary loan was chosen by one-fifth. In comparison the broader term of “borrowing” applied to less than 15% of the response given in those of interactions with unaffiliated users. This difference is more obvious because in many
cases unaffiliated users are given much more restrictive terms of borrowing, if they are even allowed the privilege. In some cases they must even purchase a “Friends of the Library” card or similar credential in order to gain borrowing privileges. While the policies are restrictive, one respondent describes a unique situation:

“Our area has four colleges within a ten mile radius. All students have use and borrowing privileges at all four colleges. One of the other institutions is only a mile away and their library is not strong in the traditional liberal arts. We field many questions in English, History, etc. for students from these other colleges. Indeed, our statistics sheet for the reference desk specifically tracks our students relative to the other colleges.”

In this case, the libraries have set up a reciprocal system that allows for users who would normally be classified as unaffiliated to gain access to a broader range of materials than their own libraries hold.

But not all cases are this simple. Another librarian explains how they deal with patrons who want to use services that are not available to them in accordance with library policies:

“My most typical contact is an unaffiliated patron trying to submit an ILL request. We do not allow members of the community access to this service, and direct them to their local branch of the public library in these cases. If possible I explain this to the patron in person. If not I send them an email and a link to the public library's web site.”

One way to avoid unpleasant scenes that may arise because of the difference in library services is by having an explicit document that lays out the policies. This gives librarians something specific to point to in times of trouble, and if available publicly (especially online), users would be able to understand ahead of time what to expect in a library of an institution to which they do not belong. Unfortunately, many of the policies for the academic libraries in this study were not easy to find or decipher in terms of how they related to unaffiliated users. This could explain why the libraries with the fewest
unexplained areas in their policies were the most consistent in their answers (the institutions from North Carolina and Washington). There were other schools that had very consistent answers across the board as well, but the policies provided either through request, or found on the library website were not clear enough about what types of services could be expected by an unaffiliated user at these schools. Many times the problem was not that there were no policies, or that the policies that were present were not in-depth, but that they simply did not address unaffiliated users. The library from North Carolina was able to provide me with specific policies regarding borrowers, and because of this, there was only one service area where not all respondents were in agreement.

This study has limitations. Some changes had to be made to the original idea because of time, but other factors are at play as well. One bias of this survey is that this is a little intrusive. Librarians volunteered to answer the survey, and because of this, only those who chose to respond to the survey had a say, which may have been those librarians who had the strongest feelings towards the subject of unaffiliated users. Nothing could have been done to mitigate this bias other than to change the survey method, something that was not possible because of the scope. There is also the bias that happens in creating an online survey that only those who have access to a computer and the internet on a regular basis would be able to participate. However, because the survey conducted was of librarians in academic libraries, the respondents will all be much more likely to have access to the internet, and if this is not the case, then the library chosen to participate in the survey may have been chosen in error. The last bias is that the participants in the survey may decide to answer questions in the manner in which they
believed I wanted them answered. This may be an exaggeration of either positive or negative behaviors towards unaffiliated users, and while this could have had an effect on the data, the number of individuals changing their responses in this way is not likely to be very large.

Ideally, this study would have had many more institutions represented. I only contacted 15 institutions, and 9 responded, with only 7 institutions who actually participated. When I first conceptualized the study, I was thinking of trying to involve up to 50 institutions, which was not possible, given the time constraints. Having a larger sample population would have allowed for more comparisons between different groups based on characteristics that they all shared. I would have tried to make sure that all of the institutions within a comparison would be similar in size, or in the same type of setting (urban, suburban, or rural), comparing private versus public institutions, and any other factor that may have a difference in either the approach towards or supply of unaffiliated users. Having a larger sample would also make sure that the different areas of the country are represented, in accordance with the actual distribution of universities across the country. This study has a bias in that three of the institutions are located in states which are considered to be “The South” (Georgia, Mississippi, and North Carolina) and these three schools alone provided just under two-thirds (65.8%) of the responses in the survey. This may or may not have had anything to do with how the results turned out in the end, but would be a factor in a study of a larger size.

One of the changes to the survey that I most would want to do would be to talk to the librarians earlier. This would include giving them more time to respond, but also sending out reminders so that more people respond. Similarly, I would try to find out
exactly how many people work at the libraries so I have a better idea of how many possible total responses I would have, which would allow for me to track response rates. The main advantage of starting earlier would have been that I could have sent out invitations to replacement institutions in a timely manner, which would allow for a larger response especially in the case when there was no response at all from one of the initial choices.

However, a small sample is not inappropriate in this situation, because while there has already been a great deal of research that looks at unaffiliated users, it has focused mainly on the policies and the responses of those in administrative control in libraries. By focusing on a small group of working librarians, the results will pave the way for new and larger research that could be done by larger research groups.
Conclusions

As long as universities are not built in isolation from the rest of the world, there will be unaffiliated users at their libraries. If libraries are going to continue giving unaffiliated users certain privileges, these privileges should be made known, and the ones that they don't have should be explicitly stated as well. The literature currently available shows that different libraries have diverse policies, so unaffiliated users cannot expect the same treatment at every institution that they might visit.

The main idea gathered from this study is that librarians are committed to all of their patrons. Most of the respondents felt that unaffiliated users were similar to their affiliated patrons in many ways, and that this group should receive the same amount of time and focus during reference and circulation interactions. This may not always be a problem, but in smaller universities where funding and resources are limited, library administration may want to make changes in training and policy. In addition, the librarians had strong opinions about what services their institutions offered to patrons, but in many cases, these policies on access and use were not explicit enough concerning specific types of library use.

One action that to be taken as a result of this study would be to make sure that as much of the information concerning the library as possible should be easily accessible to users who are not familiar with the library, and should be placed in the library and on the internet in locations that are logical to users who are beginning their research. Librarians should be made more aware of what the policies of their library are in regard to this
population, and should be informed of any changes to the policies. In addition to keeping
the faculty and staff well informed of the library’s expectations of use, it should cut down
on the number of questions about policy that are presented to administrators.

Previous studies done in the area of unaffiliated user access focus on the written
policies, and not the people involved or how these policies are used. By comparing
policies and perceptions, we are be better able to understand how information about the
policy spreads through library organizations and how this affects the unaffiliated users
that come into contact with an institution. Future research should be done in this area in
order to discover more about the way that access and use policies are being put into effect
in academic libraries.
Notes

12 Ibid: 120.
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Appendix A: Initial Email to Library Directors

Dear [Library Director],

My name is Margaret Keller and I am a second year library graduate student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. I am conducting a study for my master’s thesis on unaffiliated users in academic libraries and am hoping to survey practicing academic librarians from around the country. Your institution was listed on the Carnegie Classification Guide as a Research Level 1 institution, and was also randomly selected by me for the study.

If you would be willing to help, I would only need a few things from you that should not take much time at all. The first would be either an electronic or hard copy (address upon your request) of your policy regarding unaffiliated users. If there is no specific policy towards unaffiliated users, a policy on library use will be sufficient.

The second would be to have an email sent to members of your library staff. If there is a staff listserv, or someone could send the email on my behalf to appropriate library staff and faculty, I would be most appreciative.

If these two things seem appropriate, please let me know as soon as possible. My email address is mskeller@email.unc.edu, and I am willing to send a telephone number if someone would like to talk to me. If your institution chooses not to participate, I would appreciate knowing as soon as possible as well so that I can update my list of participating institutions.

I am including a copy of the introduction to my research proposal so that you are aware of the nature of my study. Thank you for your consideration in participating.

Sincerely,

Margaret Keller

IRB Study # 07-0165

Title of Study: Perceptions of unaffiliated users in academic libraries and other issues associated with this user group

Principal Investigator: Margaret Keller

UNC-Chapel Hill Department: Information and Library Science

Email Address: mskeller@email.unc.edu

Faculty Advisor: Deborah Barreau

Study Contact email: mskeller@email.unc.edu
Appendix B: Survey Invitation to Librarian Participants

Subject: Survey of Librarian Opinions. Please Help!

My name is Margaret Keller and I am a second year library school graduate student at UNC Chapel Hill. As part of my master’s thesis, I am conducting an online survey of librarians across the country in the subject area of unaffiliated users in academic libraries.

If you are a librarian who works with patrons at all in your job, I would be grateful if you would participate in my survey. It should not take more than 20 minutes of your time, and should not be too difficult to answer. To complete the survey please follow this link http://www.unc.edu/~mskeller/survey.html.

Thank you!

Margaret

IRB Study # 07-0165

Title of Study: Perceptions of unaffiliated users in academic libraries and other issues associated with this user group

Principal Investigator: Margaret Keller
UNC-Chapel Hill Department: Information and Library Science
Email Address: mskeller@email.unc.edu
Faculty Advisor: Deborah Barreau
Study Contact email: mskeller@email.unc.edu
Appendix C: Consent Page

University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Adult Participants
Social Behavioral Form

IRB Study # 07-0165

Title of Study: Perceptions of unaffiliated users in academic libraries and other issues associated with this user group
Principal Investigator: Margaret Keller
UNC-Chapel Hill Department: Information and Library Science
UNC-Chapel Hill Phone number: (919) 966-5042
Email Address: mskeller@email.unc.edu
Faculty Advisor: Deborah Barreau

Study Contact telephone number: 571-338-1236
Study Contact email: mskeller@email.unc.edu

What are some general things you should know about research studies? You are being asked to take part in a research study. To join the study is voluntary. You may refuse to join, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any reason, without penalty. Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge. This new information may help people in the future. You may not receive any direct benefit from being in the research study. There also may be risks to being in research studies. Details about this study are discussed below. It is important that you understand this information so that you can make an informed choice about being in this research study. You will be given a copy of this consent form. You should ask the researchers named above, or staff members who may assist them, any questions you have about this study at any time.

What is the purpose of this study? The purpose of this research study is to learn about the attitudes of academic librarians as they relate to unaffiliated users and policies associated with these users.

Are there any reasons you should not be in this study? You should not be in this study if you have no interactions with users on a regular basis.
How many people will take part in this study?
If you decide to be in this study, you will be one of 50-100 people in this research study.

How long will your part in this study last?
The amount of time you should expect to participate in this study is about 10-20 minutes for answering the survey, and a possible additional half-hour if you elect to be contacted for follow-up questions.

What will happen if you take part in the study?
- You will find a link to the survey below. This will take you to the survey website.
- Once there, you will be asked to select from a list of factors which will allow the researcher to identify your institution of origin. You will then be sent to the survey.
- When you finish the survey, you will be given the opportunity to give contact information if you are interested in possibly being contacted for follow up information at the end of the study.

What are the possible benefits from being in this study?
Research is designed to benefit society by gaining new knowledge. You may not benefit personally from being in this research study.

What are the possible risks or discomforts involved from being in this study?
There are no expected risks for this study.

How will your privacy be protected?
Privacy will be protected because survey documents will have minimal personally identifying information initially attached. Any and all identifying information will be removed later, and any identifying information that needs to be kept will be stored on an external hard drive that is not networked. Although every effort will be made to keep research records private, there may be times when federal or state law requires the disclosure of such records, including personal information. This is very unlikely, but if disclosure is ever required, UNC-Chapel Hill will take steps allowable by law to protect the privacy of personal information. In some cases, your information in this research study could be reviewed by representatives of the University, research sponsors, or government agencies for purposes such as quality control or safety.

Will you receive anything for being in this study?
You will not receive anything for taking part in this study.

Will it cost you anything to be in this study?
There will be no costs for being in the study.

What if you have questions about this study?
You have the right to ask, and have answered, any questions you may have about this research. If you have questions, or concerns, you should contact the researchers listed on the first page of this form.
What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?
All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject you may contact, anonymously if you wish, the Institutional Review Board at 919-966-3113 or by email to IRB_subjects@unc.edu.

By clicking on the “next” button at the bottom of this page, you are implying your consent with the research process and terms of the study. If you choose to not participate in the study, please close your browser.

[Next]
Appendix D: Survey Questions

1) Please choose the state in which your university is located (drop-down menu of locations of participating institutions)

2) Is your institution public or private?

3) What is your position and area in the library?

4) How much contact do you have with patrons each day? (1= no contact, 5= I work mainly with patrons)

5) How often do you come into contact with patrons?
   * daily * more than once a week * once a week * less than once a week
   * rarely * never

6) Describe any interaction you have with patrons on a regular basis.

7) In the course of your interactions with patrons, do you ever ask whether or not they are affiliated with your institution?

8) What is the most typical kind of contact that you have with unaffiliated patrons?

9) How would you characterize the attitudes of unaffiliated users compared to affiliated users?
   * much more patient * slightly more patient * no difference * slightly less patient
   * much less patient

10) How much time do you typically spend with unaffiliated users compared to the affiliated users?
    * much more time * a little more time * no difference * slightly less time
    * much less time

11) How much time do you think you should spend with unaffiliated users?
    * much more time * a little more time * no difference * slightly less time
    * much less time
12) Without consulting a written policy, which services do you think your library extends to unaffiliated users?
   * in-house use of books/print journals  * internet access
   * access to online journals/databases  * reference services
   * borrowing privileges  * other (please specify) __________

13) Would you be willing to be contacted for a follow-up interview session over the phone? If yes, please provide an email address.
    (the portion containing contact information will be removed upon receipt)
Appendix E: Tables

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Respondents (Percentage of Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>11 (28.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>4 (10.53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>11 (28.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4 (10.53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3 (7.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3 (7.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2 (5.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Librarians from Each Institution Type</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 (68.42%)</td>
<td>12 (31.58%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Position Type</th>
<th>Number (and percentage of total) of Librarians in Survey Holding this type of Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>4 (11.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (Managerial Level)</td>
<td>7 (19.44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Focus: Public Service and Technical Services</td>
<td>10 (27.77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation and Public Services</td>
<td>6 (16.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>1 (2.77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives or Special Collections</td>
<td>4 (11.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Librarian</td>
<td>4 (11.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.</td>
<td>Amount of Contact with Patrons (1= no contact, 5= works mainly with patrons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (16.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14 (37.84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7 (18.92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9 (24.32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.</th>
<th>Frequency of Patron Contact</th>
<th>Responses (Percentage of Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>29 (78.38%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Once a Week</td>
<td>7 (18.92%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a Week</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less frequently than once a week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.</th>
<th>Type of Patron Interaction</th>
<th>Number of Responses (Percentage of Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Reference (including in-person and remote of any kind)</td>
<td>30 (83.33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
<td>7 (19.44%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Research Assistance</td>
<td>11 (30.56%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Instruction</td>
<td>18 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Casual” Reference Assistance (walking around, out in public)</td>
<td>8 (22.22%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>10 (27.78%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Assistance/Trouble-shooting</td>
<td>9 (25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Complaints/Policies</td>
<td>4 (11.11%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36 respondents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.</th>
<th>Do You Ask if Patrons are Affiliated?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28 (75.68%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9 (24.32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.  
**Typical Interactions with Unaffiliated Users**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks/Questions</th>
<th>Number of Responses (% of Total)</th>
<th>User Groups</th>
<th>Number of Response (% of Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Reference</td>
<td>20 (57.14%)</td>
<td>High School Students</td>
<td>12 (34.29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>5 (14.29%)</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1 (2.86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer or Technology Use/Assistance</td>
<td>10 (28.57%)</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1 (2.86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genealogy</td>
<td>2 (5.71%)</td>
<td>Local Residents</td>
<td>8 (22.86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Policy Questions</td>
<td>5 (14.29%)</td>
<td>Other College Students</td>
<td>8 (22.86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Assignment</td>
<td>7 (20%)</td>
<td>Independent Scholars</td>
<td>4 (11.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional</td>
<td>4 (11.43%)</td>
<td>Other User Group</td>
<td>2 (5.71%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. 
**Average patience of unaffiliated patrons compared to affiliated patrons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses (% of Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much more patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much less patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.  
**Amount of Time that is spent with Unaffiliated Users**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Time that should be spent with Unaffiliated Users</th>
<th>Number of Respondents (percentage of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much More</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>7 (19.44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Same</td>
<td>19 (52.78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>5 (13.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Less</td>
<td>5 (13.89%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services that Librarians Believe are Available to Unaffiliated Users</th>
<th>Number of Patrons Responding (Percentage of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-house use of materials</td>
<td>33 (91.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access</td>
<td>31 (86.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to online journals/databases</td>
<td>31 (86.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference services</td>
<td>31 (86.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing of materials</td>
<td>14 (38.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>10 (27.78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- ILL</td>
<td>4 (11.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Printing/Copying</td>
<td>4 (11.11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarian Beliefs about Unaffiliated User Privileges</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>NY</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>TX</th>
<th>WA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-house use of materials</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>8/11</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>9/11</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online journals/databases</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>7/11</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference services</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>8/11</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing privileges</td>
<td>0/11</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>6/11</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--ILL</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Printing/Copying</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unaffiliated User Privileges according to Library Policies</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>NY</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>TX</th>
<th>WA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-house use of materials</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online journals/databases</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference services</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing privileges</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--ILL</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>