PUBLIC LIBRARIES AND THE INTERNET 2009: STUDY RESULTS AND FINDINGS

John Carlo Bertot, Ph.D.
Professor and Director of
the Center for Library
Innovation, University of
Maryland

Charles R. McClure, Ph.D.
Director and Francis
Eppes Professor,
Florida State University

Carla B. Wright, M.S.
ALA Survey Manager

Elise Jensen, M.S.
Research Associate

Susan Thomas, M.L.S.
ALA Project Manager

142 Collegiate Loop, P.O. Box 3062100, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2100
Telephone 850.645.5683 Fax 850.644.4522

NATIONAL OUTLET-LEVEL DATA

The ensuing section presents select findings from national outlet-level data. A full set of data tables and analysis is available at http://www.ii.fsu.edu/plinternet. Figures 1-14 present data regarding survey data quality, average hours open, and basic public access technology infrastructure (i.e., average number of workstations and replacement schedules).

Figure 1: Public Library Outlets and Survey Responses

Metropolitan Status	Poverty Level						Overall	
	Low (Less than 20%)		Medium (20%-40%)		High (More than 40%)			
	Responding Facilities as a **Proportion of Survey Respondents**	Responding Facilities as a **Proportion of National Population**	Responding Facilities as a **Proportion of Survey Respondents**	Responding Facilities as a **Proportion of National Population**	Responding Facilities as a **Proportion of Survey Respondents**	Responding Facilities as a **Proportion of National Population**	Responding Facilities As a **Proportion of Survey Respondents**	Responding Facilities As a **Proportion of National Population**
Urban	8.3% (508 of 6,111)	10.2% (1,695 of 16,620)	5.7% (347 of 6,111)	6.6% (1,097 of 16,620)	0.7% (43 of 6,111)	0.9% (148 of 16,620)	14.7% (898 of 6,111)	17.7% (2,940 of 16,620)
Suburban	27.8% (1,698 of 6,111)	30.4% (5,060 of 16,620)	1.7% (106 of 6,111)	2.1% (353 of 16,620)	0.0% (1 of 6,111)	0.0% (8 of 16,620)	29.5% (1,805 of 6,111)	32.6% (5,421 of 16,6208)
Rural	49.7% (3,039 of 6,111)	43.2% (7,188 of 16,620)	5.9% (360 of 6,111)	6.3% (1,040 of 16,620)	0.2% (11 of 6,111)	0.2% (31 of 16,620)	55.8% (3,408 of 6,111)	49.7% (8,259 of 16,620)
Overall	85.8% (5,245 of 6,111)	83.9% (13,943 of 16,620)	13.3% (813 of 6,111)	15.0% (2,490 of 16,620)	1.0% (53 of 6,111)	1.1% (187 of 16,620)	**100.0%** (6,111 of 6,111)	**100.0%** (16,620 of 16,620)

Based on geocoding of 16,620 outlets.
Overall Response Rate = 72.8%*
*This response rate is calculated based on sampled library responses to the survey. Additional surveys from libraries that are Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Opportunity Online hardware grant recipients were also used in the data analysis; these libraries participated in the survey as a grant requirement.

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009; http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 1 shows the response rate distribution of the *Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study 2008-2009* national survey. As is illustrated, the overall distribution of the survey is representative of the total population of public libraries.

Figure 2: Average Number of Hours Open Weekly per Outlet, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty				
	Poverty Level			
Metropolitan Status	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Urban	51.3 (n=1,652)	48.6 (n=1,056)	51.1 (n=141)	50.3 (n=2,849)
Suburban	49.7 (n=4,913)	45.2 (n=346)	32.0 (n=8)	49.4 (n=5,268)
Rural	38.5 (n=7,027)	36.7 (n=1,005)	28.5 (n=31)	38.2 (n=8,063)
Overall	44.0 (n=13,592)	43.1 (n=2,407)	46.3 (n=180)	44.0 (n=16,180)

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009; http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Overall, the average number of hours that libraries are open remained similar to the hours reported in 2007-2008, although there has been a slight decline (Figure 2). On average, libraries report being open 44 hours per week in 2008-2009, compared to 45 hours per week in 2007-2008. Urban outlets in high poverty areas experienced the greatest decline in average hours open (51.1 hours in 2008-2009, compared to 59.1 hours last year). Rural high poverty outlets are open the fewest hours (28.5), and high poverty outlets report the greatest decrease in average hours open of any group, being open 46.3 hours this year versus 53.9 hours in 2007-2008.

Figure 3: Public Library Outlets Change in Hours Open, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Hours Open	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Hours increased since last fiscal year	11.0% (n=312)	10.0% (n=525)	9.7% (n=786)	10.3% (n=1,400)	8.7% (n=210)	7.8% (n=14)	10.0% (n=1,623)
Hours decreased since last fiscal year	7.4% (n=212)	5.1% (n=270)	3.0% (n=245)	4.1% (n=555)	6.6% (n=158)	7.8% (n=14)	4.5% (n=727)
Hours stayed the same as last fiscal year	80.9% (n=2,305)	84.5% (n=4,451)	86.5% (n=6,973)	85.1% (n=11,565)	83.6% (n=2,012)	84.5% (n=153)	84.9% (n=13,729)
Average number of hours increased	5.1 (n=312)	5.2 (n=525)	4.3 (n=786)	4.6 (n=1,400)	5.2 (n=210)	6.3 (n=14)	4.7 (n=1,624)
Average number of hours decreased	7.2 (n=212)	6.2 (n=270)	5.0 (n=247)	6.0 (n=557)	6.7 (n=158)	6.3 (n=14)	6.1 (n=729)

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009; http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

The extent to which library outlets' hours open changed since last year is illustrated in Figure C3. Only 10 percent of library outlets report an increase in hours open, down from 12 percent in 2007-2008. In 2008-2009 there is an average 6.1 hours' decrease in hours open for all public library outlets that reported an increase in hours open. For libraries that report an increase in the average number of hours open, the average number of hours increased is 4.7. Urban and medium poverty outlets report the largest decrease (7.2 and 6.7 hours, respectively). Suburban outlets (5.2 hours) and those in high poverty areas (6.3 hours) report the largest increase in hours open for those few libraries that indicate an increase in hours. The libraries with the largest percentages of increased hours in 2008-2009 are urban (11 percent) and low poverty (10.3 percent) outlets.

Figure 4: Public Library Outlets Closed by Metropolitan Status and Poverty.							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Reasons Closed	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Library branch is temporarily closed	1.3% (n=36)	*	*	*	*	*	*
Library branch is permanently closed	*	2.5% (n=135)	2.2% (n=183)	2.2%	1.9% (n=45)	--	2.1% (n=344)
Key: * : Insufficient data to report --: No data to report							

Figure 4 shows that very few library outlets reported being either temporarily or permanently closed during this survey cycle. In absolute numbers, rural libraries saw the largest number of permanent closures, with 183 outlets reporting their closing. As can be seen, less than one percent of all libraries reported being temporarily closed.

Figure 5: Public Library Outlets Offering Public Access to the Internet, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty				
	Poverty Level			
Metropolitan Status	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Urban	98.8% (n=1,628)	99.1% (n=1,043)	95.1% (n=134)	98.7% (n=2,806)
Suburban	99.3% (n=4,872)	100.0% (n=346)	100.0% (n=8)	99.3% (n=5,226)
Rural	98.9% (n=6,932)	96.2% (n=965)	100% (n=31)	98.5% (n=7,928)
Overall	99.0% (n=13.432)	98.0% (n=2,354)	96.2% (n=173)	98.7% (n=15,976)

As Figure 5 indicates, virtually all public library outlets (98.7 percent) provide public access to the Internet, corresponding with previous years. Although there is a slight drop in reported access from urban high poverty outlets (95.1 percent) in 2008-2009, this is within the survey's margin of error.

Figure 6: Public Library Outlets as the Only Provider of Free Public Internet and Free Public Computer Access, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Free public access	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Yes	61.1% (n=1,665)	66.2% (n=3,357)	78.6% (n=6,061)	72.5% (n=9,473)	65.8% (n=1,504)	63.5% (n=106)	71.4% (n=11,083)
No	28.1% (n=764)	19.7% (n=999)	16.1% (n=1,239)	18.5% (n=2,412)	23.8% (n=543)	28.3% (n=47)	19.4% (n=3,002)
Do not know	10.6% (n=288)	14.0% (n=708)	5.2% (n=401)	8.8% (n=1,152)	10.1% (n=231)	8.4% (n=14)	9.0% (n=1,397)
Other	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Weighted missing values, n=448							
Key: * Insufficient data to report							

Figure 6 shows the percentage of public libraries reporting that they are the only provider of free public Internet and free public computer access. As reported in the past two surveys, over 70 percent of libraries report that they are the only provider of free public Internet and public computer access in their communities. Most increases within metropolitan status and poverty categories from 2007-2008 are attributable to far fewer outlets reporting they do not know the answer. As an example, 63.5 percent of high poverty outlets report that they are the only free provider in 2008-2009, up from 44.5 percent in 2007-2008. However, 20.3 percent of these outlets reported that they did not know last year, whereas this was true for only 8.4 percent this year. Corresponding with 2007-2008 responses, rural (78.6 percent) and low poverty (72.5 percent) report the highest percentage of free access, and urban (28.1 percent) and high poverty (28.3 percent) report the lowest percentage.

Figure 7: Average Number of Public Access Internet Workstations, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty				
	Poverty Level			
Metropolitan Status	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Urban	16.2 (n=1,481)	18.5 (n=989)	28.4 (n=102)	18.7 (n=2,571)
Suburban	12.9 (n=4,414)	10.4 (n=318)	6.0 (n=8)	12.7 (n=4,741)
Rural	7.6 (n=6,692)	8.1 (n=914)	6.8 (n=36)	7.6 (n=7,643)
Overall	10.4 (n=12,591)	12.9 (n=2,218)	22.0 (n=146)	11.0 (n=14,955)

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009); http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 7 shows the average number of public access Internet workstations available in library outlets. Overall gains reported in 2007-2008 reverted to 2006-2007 levels in this year's reporting. As a group, high poverty outlets saw the largest decrease over last year (22 workstations versus 27.2 in 2007-2008 and 25.4 in 2006-2007), and suburban high poverty reported an average of six workstations, compared to 17 in 2007-2008 and four workstations the year before. Low poverty outlets saw the least fluctuation in the average number of workstations (10.4 versus 11 in 2007-2008). The reasons for these decreases are unclear, though responding libraries indicate that space, cost and the availability of electrical outlets and other infrastructure support are key factors that influence their ability to add workstations (see Figure C11).

Figure 8: Number of Public Access Internet Workstations, by Average Age, Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Average Age	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Less than 1 year old	8.5 (n=910)	7.1 (n=1,543)	3.5 (n=2,577)	5.2 (n=4,324)	7.0 (n=664)	11.8 (n=41)	5.5 (n=5,029)
1 year old	7.7 (n=647)	5.9 (n=1,236)	3.6 (n=2,022)	5.0 (n=3,304)	5.0 (n=577)	9.3 (n=24)	5.0 (n=3,905)
2 years old	9.5 (n=876)	6.3 (n=1,965)	3.9 (n=3,123)	5.2 (n=4,939)	6.4 (n=962)	14.0 (n=63)	5.5 (n=5,964)
3 years old	8.3 (n=863)	6.5 (n=1,868)	3.5 (n=2,748)	5.0 (n=4,636)	6.6 (n=796)	9.5 (n=49)	5.3 (n=5,480)
4 years old	10.9 (n=777)	6.4 (n=1,314)	3.3 (n=2,100)	5.5 (n=3,558)	6.4 (n=578)	11.7 (n=54)	5.7 (n=4,190)
5 years old	8.1 (n=966)	6.3 (n=1,536)	3.7 (n=3,444)	4.7 (n=5,119)	7.5 (n=784)	8.5 (n=43)	5.1 (n=5,946)

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009); http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

The average number of public access Internet workstations by age is shown in Figure 8. Overall, the average number of workstations in each age category is virtually identical. However, some fluctuations are evident within metropolitan status and poverty categories. Urban and high poverty outlets tend to have the largest number of workstations in each age group, and rural and low poverty outlets the least number of workstations. Note that these numbers are not directly comparable to the 2007-2008 survey results, as the workstation age categorizations are different.

Figure 9: Sufficiency of Public Access Internet Workstations, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Sufficiency of Public Access Workstations	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
There are consistently fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them throughout a typical day	37.7% (n=1,048)	15.5% (n=805)	14.2% (n=1,119)	17.2% (n=2,293)	26.3% (n=615)	36.8% (n=64)	18.8% (n=2,972)
There are fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them at different times throughout a typical day	54.6% (n=1,517)	66.2% (n=3,436)	62.6% (n=4,932)	62.9% (n=8,392)	60.1% (n=1,403)	52.6% (n=91)	62.4% (n=9,886)
There are always sufficient public Internet workstations available for patrons who wish to use them during a typical day	7.6% (n=211)	18.3% (n=952)	23.2% (n=1,824)	19.9% (n=2,650)	13.6% (n=318)	11.0% (n=19)	18.9% (n=2,987)

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009);
http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Given the average number of workstations reported by libraries, Figure 9 illustrates the sufficiency of public access Internet workstations available. There were no significant changes in the overall sufficiency in 2008-2009 compared to 2007-2008, although the percentage of high poverty outlets indicating there are consistently fewer workstations than needed doubled to 36.8 percent versus 18.2 percent last year. This may correspond to the reported drop in the average number of workstations reported by libraries in Figure 7. Overall, the largest issue facing outlets is being able to provide enough workstations at various times during the day, evidenced by the 62.4 percent of outlets reporting difficulties at different times of the day.

Figure 10: Public Library Outlets Public Access Internet Workstations Addition Schedule, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Workstation Addition Schedule	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
The library plans to add workstations within the next year	12.9% (n=346)	15.6% (n=794)	18.7% (n=1,453)	17.1% (n=2,237)	14.5% (n=329)	16.6% (n=27)	16.7% (n=2,593)
The library is considering adding more workstations or laptops within the next year, but does not know how many at this time	25.5% (n=683)	16.2% (n=824)	13.2% (n=1,022)	15.6% (n=2,044)	19.9% (n=452)	20.2% (n=33)	16.3% (n=2,529)
The library has no plans to add workstations within the next year	56.4% (n=1,511)	63.8% (n=3,236)	60.8% (n=4,713)	61.0% (n=7,987)	60.6% (n=1,373)	61.3% (n=100)	61.0% (n=9,460)
Other	5.3% (n=141)	4.4% (n=222)	7.3% (n=569)	6.2% (n=816)	5.0% (n=113)	1.8% (n=3)	6.0% (n=932)
The average number of workstations that the library plans to add within the next year	5.9 (n=346)	5.9 (n=794)	2.8 (n=1,453)	3.9 (n=2,237)	4.4 (n=329)	17.7 (n=27)	4.1 (n=2,593)
Weighted missing values, n=446							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009);
http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure C9 shows whether libraries plan to add workstations or laptops within the next year, as well as how many they plan to add. While the overall percentage of libraries that plan to add workstations within the next year (16.7 percent) is almost identical to last year (15.9 percent), there is a significant drop in the percentage of high poverty outlets planning to add workstations: 16.6 percent this year, compared to 31.5 percent in 2007-2008. This is again consistent with the reported drop in the average number of workstations by high poverty outlets, and also reflects the 83.2 percent of libraries that report being unable to afford more workstations (Figure 13). There is a slight increase (61 percent in 2008-2009 versus 56.1 percent last year) in the percentage of libraries that have no plans to add workstations within the next year. The decrease reported by high poverty libraries will require further exploration, as 31.5 percent of these libraries reported in 2007-2008 that they were likely to add workstations in the coming year. These additions did not occur; in fact, libraries report a decrease in the number of public access workstations (see Figure 7).

Figure 11: Public Library Outlets Public Access Internet Workstation/Laptop Replacement or Addition Schedules, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Replacement/Addition Schedule	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
The average replacement or addition schedule is every 1 year	*	*	*	*	*	-	*
The average replacement or addition schedule is every 2 years	*	*	*	*	*	-	*
The average replacement or addition schedule is every 3 years	15.3% (n=421)	19.8% (n=993)	13.6% (n=1.042)	16% (n=2,074)	15.9% (n=366)	9.4% (n=16)	15.9% (n=2,456)
The average replacement or addition schedule is every 4 years	31.0% (n=856)	21.3% (n=1,069)	12.0% (n=915)	17.0% (n=2,205)	24.0% (n=553)	48.8% (n=83)	18.4% (n=2,841)
The average replacement or addition schedule is every 5 years	20.2% (n=557)	15.0% (n=753)	11.5% (n=882)	14.4% (n=1,861)	13.5% (n=311)	12.4% (n=21)	14.2% (n=2,193)
The library has another replacement or addition schedule	10.1% (n=280)	10.3% (n=519)	9.6% (n=734)	10.1% (n=1,314)	9.2% (n=212)	4.1% (n=7)	9.9% (n=1,533)
The library does not know the average replacement or addition schedule	1.6% (n=43)	2.0% (n=99)	3.2% (n=246)	2.5% (n=324)	2.6% (n=61)	1.8% (n=3)	2.5% (n=388)
The library does not have a replacement or addition schedule	21.0% (n=580)	31.0% (n=1,557)	49.2% (n=3,761)	39.2% (n=5,076)	34.0% (n=782)	23.5% (n=40)	38.2% (n=5,898)
Weighted missing values, n=531 Key: * Insufficient data to report -- No data to report							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009); http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

The replacement or addition schedule for workstations and/or laptops is illustrated in Figure 11. Of the libraries that have such a schedule, less than 1 percent have a schedule that is every two years or less, down from 2.5 percent last year. The most common schedule overall is every four years (18.4 percent), and this is particularly the case for urban (31 percent) and high poverty (48.8 percent) outlets. Overall, 38.2 percent of libraries have no replacement or addition schedule at all, including 49.2 percent of rural libraries and 39.2 percent of low poverty outlets. These libraries also composed the highest percentage of libraries that did not have a replacement or addition schedule in 2007-2008, 56.4 and 43 percent, respectively.

Figure 12: Factors Influencing Addition of Public Access Internet Workstations/Laptops, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
Factors Influencing Workstation/Laptop Addition Decisions	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Space limitations	79.0% (n=2,176)	77.0% (n=3,930)	74.2% (n=5,806)	75.5% (n=9,973)	78.7% (n=1,820)	72.3% (n=120)	75.9% (n=11,912)
Cost factors	79.9% (n=2,202)	72.4% (n=3,695)	79.9% (n=6,252)	77.2% (n=10,193)	78.7% (n=1,822)	80.7% (n=134)	77.4% (n=12,149)
Maintenance, upgrade and general upkeep	10.7% (n=294)	17.8% (n=911)	24.0% (n=1,877)	19.8% (n=2,621)	18.9% (n=438)	13.8% (n=23)	19.6% (n=3,082)
Availability of public service staff	11.5% (n=316)	9.4% (n=479)	7.8% (n=609)	8.4% (n=1,111)	12.0% (n=277)	10.2% (n=17)	8.9% (n=1,404)
Availability of technical staff	13.9% (n=382)	10.3% (n=524)	12.7% (n=995)	11.9% (n=1,573)	13.0% (n=301)	16.3% (n=27)	12.1% (n=1,901)
Availability of bandwidth to support additional workstations	16.8% (n=462)	18.2% (n=929)	12.9% (n=1,007)	14.9% (n=1,967)	16.8% (n=389)	25.1% (n=42)	15.3% (n=2,398)
Availability of electrical outlets, cabling or other infrastructure	50.1% (n=1,380)	36.2% (n=1,846)	27.0% (n=2,114)	33.1% (n=4,366)	37.7% (n=873)	60.8% (n=101)	34.0% (n=5,340)
Other	1.6% (n=43)	2.9% (n=149)	3.2% (n=252)	3.0% (n=399)	1.9% (n=45)	*	2.8% (n=444)

Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive
Weighted missing values, n=270
Key: * Insufficient data to report

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009); http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 12 shows the factors that respondents indicate influence their decisions to add public access Internet workstations. As in the prior two years, lack of space and the cost of adding workstations are the two most influential factors: 77.4 percent report cost is a factor and 75.9 percent of outlets report space being an issue. The 2007-2008 survey asked how much influence the availability of technical staff had on this decision, to which 11.3 percent of libraries responded as being important. This year, respondents were asked about the availability of public service staff and technical staff as individual choices (8.9 and 12.1 percent of outlets indicate these as factors, respectively), with a total of 21 percent of libraries reporting that staff is an influential factor, an increase of almost 10 percent over last year. While the overall percentage of outlets reporting the availability of electrical outlets, cabling or other infrastructure is very close to that reported in 2007-2008 (36.4 percent versus 34 percent), the number of high poverty outlets citing this as a major factor increased significantly to 60.8 percent from 41.4 percent. Urban and high poverty outlets report having less trouble with maintenance, upgrade and general upkeep of workstations than last year, with 10.7 percent versus 19.8 percent of urban libraries responding to this category, and 13.8 percent versus 26.4 percent of high poverty outlets finding this to be a major factor. While only 2.8 percent of outlets report an additional factor than the options provided, nearly half of those (44.6 percent) report a lack of demand for adding workstations, and another 11.5 percent report that the library was then undergoing either a building remodel or expansion.

Figure 13: Factors Influencing Replacement of Public Access Internet Workstations/Laptops, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Factors Influencing Workstation/Laptop Replacement Decisions	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Cost factors	83.9% (n=2,245)	81.5% (n=4,001)	84.1% (n=6,437)	83.3% (n=10,699)	82.7% (n=1,851)	84.3% (n=134)	83.2% (n=12,683)
Maintenance, upgrade and general upkeep	2.8% (n=76)	5.4% (n=267)	4.7% (n=363)	4.8% (n=619)	3.6% (n=80)	4.4% (n=7)	4.6% (n=706)
Availability of staff	5.7% (n=153)	5.7% (n=281)	5.6% (n=430)	5.4% (n=691)	7.7% (n=173)	*	5.7% (n=864)
Other	7.7% (n=203)	7.4% (n=361)	5.6% (n=425)	6.5% (n=835)	6.1% (n=136)	11.3% (n=18)	6.5% (n=989)
Weighted missing values, n=717 **Key:** * Insufficient data to report							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009);
http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

The primary factors that influence libraries in their decisions to replace public access Internet workstations or laptops are shown in Figure 13. In 2008-2009, libraries were asked to mark the most important factor rather than marking more than one choice, as in previous surveys. As a result, it is not possible to directly compare responses. However, libraries continue to report cost factors as being the greatest influencer of the replacement of workstations/laptops this year (83.2 percent, compared to 89.6 percent in the 2007-2008 survey). Maintenance, upgrade and general upkeep, as well as staff availability, hover around 5 percent for all library types.

Figure 14: Public Library Outlets Internet Workstation/Laptop Replacement Approach, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Replacement Approach	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Staggered – the library replaces some workstations each year and replace all over the specified replacement schedule	71.4% (n=1,530)	67.0% (n=2,257)	67.1% (n=2,447)	67.7% (n=5,122)	68.9% (n=1,009)	81.7% (n=103)	68.1% (n=6,234)
Complete – the library replaces workstations all at one time	21.3% (n=457)	23.7% (n=798)	14.0% (n=509)	19.3% (n=1,462)	19.9% (n=292)	7.9% (n=10)	19.3% (n=1,764)
The library has another replacement approach	7.3% (n=156)	9.3% (n=315)	18.9% (n=690)	13.0% (n=985)	11.1% (n=163)	10.3% (n=13)	12.7% (n=1,161)
Weighted missing values, n=0							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009);
http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 14 identifies the replacement approach used by libraries that have an established workstation/laptop replacement method. The majority of outlets (68.1 percent overall) stagger the replacement of workstations, meaning a certain amount are replaced each year to combine into a total replacement within their established replacement schedule. Of those that stated they have another replacement approach (12.7 percent), 34.9 percent report that they replace workstations/laptops when needed, and 23.6 percent indicate that they replace them when funding is available.

Public Access Support

This section describes the data from the survey related to supporting the public access technology infrastructure in public libraries.

Figure 15: Public Library Outlets Length of Time to Get Computers Back in Service, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Length of Time	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Less than one day	15.4% (n=425)	20.3% (n=1,044)	14.7% (n=1,154)	17.2% (n=2,272)	14.4% (n=333)	10.0% (n=17)	16.7% (n=2,622)
One day	28.9% (n=796)	26.2% (n=1,349)	20.9% (n=1,639)	23.7% (n=3,133)	27.1% (n=628)	13.5% (n=23)	24.1% (n=3,784)
Two days	33.8% (n=931)	27.6% (n=1,420)	19.3% (n=1,510)	23.9% (n=3,164)	27.8% (n=643)	31.8% (n=54)	24.6% (n=3,861)
More than two days	15.0% (n=414)	17.7% (n=909)	31.2% (n=2,442)	24.3% (n=3,216)	21.3% (n=493)	33.5% (n=57)	23.9% (n=3,766)
Don't know	2.9% (n=79)	3.0% (n=153)	5.6% (n=438)	4.3% (n=570)	3.8% (n=87)	7.6% (n=13)	4.3% (n=670)
Other amount of time	4.0% (n=109)	5.2% (n=267)	8.3% (n=648)	6.7% (n=884)	5.7% (n=132)	4.1% (n=7)	6.5% (n=1,024)
Weighted missing values, n=234 **Key**: --: No data to report							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009); http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

In a question asked for the first time in the 2008-2009 survey, Figure 15 presents the length of time it takes for public access computers to get back into service. Most commonly, it takes libraries one (24.1 percent) or two days (24.6 percent) to get computers up and running again. Suburban and low poverty outlets are the most successful at getting computers back in service in less than one day (20.3 and 17.2 percent, respectively), whereas rural (31.2 percent) and high poverty (33.5 percent) outlets are the most likely to report that it takes more than two days to restore broken computers.

Source of IT Support	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Non-IT specialist public service staff	30.7% (n=849)	33.1% (n=1,701)	27.4% (n=2,154)	29.4% (n=3,894)	41.8% (n=71)	31.9% (n=739)	29.9% (n=4,704)
Non-IT specialist library director	6.1% (n=168)	25.7% (n=1,318)	47.2% (n=3,701)	35.5% (n=4,710)	20.0% (n=463)	8.2% (n=14)	32.9% (n=5,187)
Non-IT specialist other	6.4% (n=176)	10.3% (n=529)	12.5% (n=982)	10.7% (n=1,414)	11.5% (n=267)	3.5% (n=6)	10.7% (n=1,687)
Building-based IT specialist	11.4% (n=316)	13.7% (n=705)	7.6% (n=593)	10.2% (n=1,349)	10.4% (n=242)	13.6% (n=23)	10.2% (n=1,614)
System-level IT staff	72.2% (n=1,994)	47.1% (n=2,420)	28.7% (n=2,251)	40.4% (n=5,356)	50.5% (n=1,169)	81.7% (n=138)	42.3% (n=6,663)
Library consortia or other library organization	5.8% (n=161)	16.3% (n=835)	12.8% (n=1,005)	13.9% (n=1,841)	6.0% (n=140)	12.4% (n=21)	12.7% (n=2,002)
County/city IT staff	20.8% (n=574)	16.4% (n=843)	10.0% (n=784)	13.5% (n=1,794)	16.1% (n=374)	19.4% (n=33)	14.0% (n=2,201)
State tele-communications network staff	6.7% (n=185)	1.6% (n=84)	2.7% (n=213)	2.5% (n=338)	5.4% (n=125)	11.2% (n=19)	3.1% (n=482)
State library IT staff	7.2% (n=198)	2.1% (n=106)	6.5% (n=513)	4.3% (n=567)	10.0% (n=231)	11.2% (n=19)	5.2% (n=817)
Outside vendor/contractor	17.7% (n=489)	22.1% (n=1,138)	33.8% (n=2,651)	27.4% (n=3,636)	26.2% (n=608)	20.6% (n=35)	27.2% (n=4,279)
Volunteer(s)	1.6% (n=43)	5.2% (n=266)	13.2% (n=1,034)	9.3% (n=1,240)	4.4% (n=101)	1.8% (n=3)	8.5% (n=1,344)
Other source	*	1.6% (n=84)	2.9% (n=226)	2.2% (n=297)	1.5% (n=35)	*	2.1% (n=332)

Figure 16: Sources of IT and Computer Support Provided to Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty

Weighted missing values, n=209
Key: * insufficient data to report
Totals will not equal 100%, as respondents marked all that applied

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009); http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 16 presents the percentages of libraries that receive IT and computer support from various sources. The building-based non-IT public service staff, library director and other categories are separated in 2008-2009 to obtain more refined information on what type of staff provide these services. In 2007-2008, building-based non-IT staff was the largest category (39.6 percent), and the 2008-2009 responses indicate an even larger majority for various building based non-IT staff, as a total of 73.5 percent of libraries indicate that services are provided by these staff members. Urban and high poverty outlets continue to be most likely to have IT and computer support provided by system-level IT staff (72.2 and 81.7 percent, respectively), whereas rural outlets heavily rely on non-IT specialist library directors (47.2 percent) and outside vendor/contractors (33.8 percent) for help. Very few outlets depend on state telecommunications network staff (3.1 percent overall) for these services, and volunteers are not relied on often, although rural (13.2 percent) and low poverty (9.3 percent) outlets are the most likely to utilize volunteer services.

Figure 17: Number of FTE for IT and Computer Support Provided to Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Source of IT Support	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Non-IT specialist public service staff	3.2 (n=851)	2.1 (n=1,692)	1.2 (n=2,148)	1.8 (n=3,878)	1.7 (n=745)	5.6 (n=68)	1.9 (n=4,691)
Non-IT specialist library director	.75 (n=145)	.69 (n=1,136)	.68 (n=3,226)	.68 (n=4,077)	.73 (n=418)	.75 (n=11)	.69 (n=4,507)
Non-IT specialist other	.78 (n=124)	.71 (n=337)	.63 (n=541)	.67 (n=823)	.70 (n=177)	2.0 (n=3)	.68 (n=1,002)
Building-based IT specialist	1.6 (n=299)	1.1 (n=651)	1.0 (n=561)	1.2 (n=1,268)	1.1 (n=226)	2.2 (n=17)	1.2 (1,511)
System-level IT staff	6.0 (n=1, 924)	3.9 (n=2,226)	1.8 (n=2,042)	3.5 (4,907)	5.0 (n=1,154)	6.4 (n=131)	3.9 (n=6,192)
Library consortia or other library organization	3.5 (n=128)	1.5 (n=591)	1.3 (n=749)	1.5 (n=1,361)	3.0 (n=104)	5.0 (n=3)	1.6 (1,468)
County/city IT staff	1.9 (n=512)	1.5 (n=692)	1.3 (n=670)	1.5 (1,529)	1.6 (n=315)	2.2 (n=30)	1.5 (1,874)
State telecommunica-tions network staff	1.64 (n=10)	.36 (n=21)	1.0 (n=108)	.68 (n=113)	2.0 (n=21)	2.25 (n=6)	.95 (n=139)
State library IT staff	1.0 (n=16)	.90 (n=91)	.80 (n=419)	.82 (n=402)	.83 (n=124)	--	.82 (n=526)
Outside vendor/contractor	.96 (n=232)	.78 (n=846)	.65 (n=1,747)	.70 (n=2,493)	.84 (n=328)	.25 (n=3)	.72 (n=2,825)
Volunteer(s)	.89 (n=23)	.47 (n=197)	.54 (n=671)	.51 (n=829)	.80 (n=62)	--	.53 (n=892)
Other source	.92 (n=10)	.57 (n=54)	.50 (n=159)	.54 (n=193)	.50 (n=29)	--	.54 (n=222)

Key: -- No data to report

Note: Some of the library outlets have large support staffs due to their metropolitan status. This accounts for the higher averages of FTEs

Figure 17 shows the average number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff public libraries have for IT and computer support. In conjunction with Figure C15, a view of technology support in libraries emerges. While urban (3.2 FTE) and high poverty (5.6 FTE) outlets have a large average number of FTEs for building-based non-IT staff, the largest overall average number of FTEs is within system-level IT staff (3.9 FTE). With the exception of rural and high poverty outlets, who have an average of 2.5 and 8.4, respectively, FTEs for the three combined building-based non-IT specialists, the system-level IT staff make up the largest average for every outlet type. Library consortia or other library organizations also provide a relatively large amount of help, particularly for urban (3.5 FTE) and high poverty (5.0 FTE) outlets, whereas volunteers make up a very small percentage of overall staff (.53 FTE average).

Connectivity

This section presents survey data regarding the connection speeds and connectivity services, adequacy/sufficiency of computers and other issues reported by public libraries.

Figure 18: Public Library Outlets Maximum Speed of Public Access Internet Services, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Maximum Speed	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Less than 256 kbps	*	2.4% (n=114)	5.1% (n=371)	3.2% (n=398)	4.8% (n=107)	*	3.4% (n=505)
257 kbps - 768 kbps	3.2% (n=87)	5.8% (n=276)	13.7% (n=994)	9.4% (n=1,159)	8.5% (n=189)	5.5% (n=9)	9.2% (n=1,357)
769 kbps - 1.4 Mbps	3.9% (n=105)	7.8% (n=373)	12.2% (n=886)	9.7% (n=1,195)	7.6% (n=169)	*	9.3% (n=1,364)
1.5 Mbps (T1)	26.9% (n=723)	27.2% (n=1,297)	23.8% (n=1,733)	24.9% (n=3,065)	28.7% (n=638)	30.7% (n=50)	25.5% (n=3,753)
1.6 Mbps- 3.0 Mbps	8.0% (n=216)	9.5% (n=450)	11.1% (n=805)	10.0% (n=1,227)	10.5% (n=234)	5.5% (n=9)	10.0% (n=1,470)
3.1 Mbps- 6 Mbps	14.0% (n=375)	11.6% (n=551)	10% (n=727)	11.4% (n=1,400)	10.2% (n=226)	17.1% (n=28)	11.2% (n=1,654)
6.1 Mbps-10 Mbps	16.5% (n=442)	15.7% (n=746)	5.9% (n=432)	11.0% (n=1,352)	10.8% (n=240)	16.5% (n=27)	11.0% (n=1,619)
Greater than 10 Mbps	23.9% (n=641)	12.4% (n=592)	7.9% (n=571)	11.8% (n=1,456)	14.1% (n=314)	20.9% (n=34)	12.3% (n=1,804)
Don't Know	2.8% (n=76)	7.6% (n=361)	10.3% (n=752)	8.7% (n=1,076)	4.8% (n=107)	3.7% (n=6)	8.1% (n=1,189)
Weighted missing values, n=1,250 Key: * Insufficient data to report							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009); http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 18 shows the maximum speed of public Internet access offered by library outlets. Most notable is the increase in the percentage of libraries offering speeds greater than 1.5 Mbps (T1). In the current survey, 44.5 percent of libraries reported connection speeds greater than 1.5 Mbps, compared to 25.7 percent in 2007-2008. As a result, the percentage of libraries reporting 1.5 Mbps as their maximum connection speed decreased to 25.5 percent, compared to 38.9 percent in 2007-2008. There also is a reported drop in the percentage of libraries with connection speeds of less than 1.5 Mbps (21.9 percent in 2008-2009 versus 25.5 percent last year). One of the larger increases can be seen within suburban outlets; 15.7 percent versus 6.3 percent last year of these outlets provide between 6.1 and 10 Mbps speeds, and, similar to last year, urban and high poverty outlets are the most likely to provide connection speeds greater than 10 Mbps (23.9 and 20.9 percent, respectively). Rural outlets (13.7 percent) are still the most likely to report a maximum speed of only 257-768 kbps, whereas only 5.5 percent of high poverty outlets report speeds less than 1.5 Mbps. It should be noted that direct comparisons between these results and previous years' results are not possible in every case, as connection speed categories are different in the 2008-2009 survey.

Figure 19: Public Library Outlet Type of Public Access Internet Service by Metropolitan Status and Poverty.							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Type of connection	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
DSL	11.7% (n=324)	18.7% (n=935)	35.3% (n=2,762)	26.7% (n=3,509)	21.1% (n=485)	15.2% (n=27)	25.8% (n=4,031)
Cable	15.2% (n=422)	26.4% (n=1,322)	21.5% (n=1,684)	23.8% (n=3,129)	12.6% (n=290)	5.6% (n=10)	22.0% (n=3,429)
Leased Line	34.8% (n=967)	30.7% (n=1,538)	14.5% (n=1,131)	21.7% (n=2,853)	31.1% (n=716)	37.3% (n=66)	23.3% (n=3,635)
Municipal Networks (wireless or other)	6.7% (n=186)	3.7% (n=185)	1.4% (n=112)	2.9% (n=385)	4.1% (n=95)	1.7% (n=3)	3.1% (n=483)
State Network	7.4% (n=207)	12.0% (n=602)	14.5% (n=1,137)	12.9% (n=1,691)	10.5% (n=241)	7.9% (n=14)	12.5% (n=1,946)
Satellite	*	*	2.2% (n=174)	1.3% (n=166)	1.3% (n=29)	7.9% (n=14)	1.3% (n=209)
Fiber	34.7% (n=964)	21.5% (n=1,073)	8.9% (n=693)	16.3% (n=2,140)	23.1% (n=532)	32.2% (n=57)	17.5% (n=2,729)
Wireless	12.4% (n=344)	20.0% (n=998)	24.8% (n=1,941)	22.2% (n=2,911)	15.2% (n=350)	12.9% (n=23)	21.0% (n=3,284)
Other	6.0% (n=167)	2.0% (n=100)	2.7% (n=215)	2.8% (n=367)	4.1% (n=94)	11.3% (n=20)	3.1% (n=481)
Don't Know	--	*	*	*	*	--	*
Will not total to 100%, as respondents could select more than one option. Weighted missing values, n=359 Key: -- : No data to report * : Insufficient data to report							

The types of public access Internet services libraries provide to patrons are shown in Figure 19. DSL was reported as being the most common, with 25.8 percent of outlets reporting the use of DSL, which is also the most common in rural and low poverty outlets (35.3 and 26.7 percent, respectively). Satellite (1.3 percent) and municipal networks (3.1 percent) are the least commonly utilized services. Wireless is an additional category in the 2008-2009 survey, and a total of 21.0 percent of outlets reported wireless public access. Leased lines are most common in urban (34.8 percent) and high poverty (37.3 percent) outlets, whereas suburban and low poverty outlets use cable access more than any other type of library (26.4 and 23.8 percent, respectively).

Figure 20: Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity in Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Availability of Public Access Wireless Internet Services	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Currently available for public use	83.0% (n=2,276)	81.9% (n=4,153)	70.5% (n=5,482)	77.2% (n=10,135)	71.9% (n=1,656)	73.2% (n=120)	76.4% (n=11,911)
Not currently available, but there are plans to make it available within the next year	8.1% (n=223)	7.6% (n=385)	10.7% (n=829)	9.1% (n=1,196)	9.2% (n=212)	17.7% (n=29)	9.2% (n=1,437)
Not currently available and no plans to make it available within the next year	8.9% (n=244)	10.5% (n=532)	18.8% (n=1,464)	13.6% (n=1,790)	18.9% (n=435)	9.2% (n=15)	14.4% (n=2,240)
Weighted missing values, n=371							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009);
http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 20 shows the availability of public access wireless connections (Wi-Fi) to the Internet in public libraries. Public libraries continue to increase wireless, as 76.4 percent of libraries offer wireless connections (up from 65.9 percent in 2007-2008). Urban (83 percent) and suburban (81.9 percent) outlets are most likely to offer wireless connections, whereas rural and medium poverty outlets (70.5 and 71.9 percent, respectively) are the least likely to provide wireless Internet access. Just over 14 percent of libraries do not have wireless and have no plans to make it available within the next year, more than double that reported last year.

Figure 21: Public Library Outlets Shared Wireless-Workstation Bandwidth, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Shared Bandwidth connection	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Yes, both the wireless connection and public access workstations share bandwidth/connection; no management techniques	31.5% (n=708)	41.7% (n=1,678)	64.0% (n=3,385)	50.3% (n=4,944)	48.7% (n=781)	39.7% (n=46)	49.9% (n=5,771)
Yes, both the wireless connection and public access workstations share bandwidth/connection; but have management techniques	33.5% (n=753)	27.8% (n=1,119)	19.0% (n=1,003)	24.9% (n=2,448)	24.1% (n=387)	35.3% (n=41)	24.9% (n=2,875)
No, the wireless connection is separate from the public access workstation bandwidth/connection	34.2% (n=769)	28.5% (n=1,148)	14.0% (n=739)	22.5% (n=2,215)	25.8% (n=413)	23.3% (n=27)	23.0% (n=2,656)
Don't know	*	1.9% (n=78)	3.0% (n=158)	2.3% (n=231)	1.4% (n=22)	2.6% (n=3)	2.2% (n=255)
Weighted missing values, n=353 Key: * : Insufficient data to report							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009);
http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 21 outlines the level of sharing between wireless and public access workstation connections. New to the survey this year is a response option asking libraries if they employ bandwidth management techniques to alleviate traffic congestion when the connection is shared. A nearly identical percentage of libraries report sharing the wireless and public access workstation connections, but close to 25 percent use bandwidth management techniques to improve connection speeds. Rural and low poverty outlets (64 and 50.3 percent, respectively) are most likely to share the connections and utilize no management techniques to alleviate traffic congestion.

Figure 22: Adequacy of Public Library Outlets Public Access Internet Connection, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Adequacy of Public Access Internet Connection	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs	26.3% (n=723)	16.6% (n=843)	15.5% (n=1,208)	17.0% (n=2,238)	21.5% (n=499)	22.3% (n=37)	17.7% (n=2,774)
The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs at some times	44.7% (n=1,228)	41.9% (n=2,136)	40.9% (n=3,194)	41.5% (n=5,460)	43.6% (n=1,010)	52.4% (n=87)	41.9% (n=6,557)
The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs at all times	28.6% (n=786)	41.3% (n=2,106)	42.9% (n=3,348)	41.1% (n=5,407)	34.1% (n=791)	25.1% (n=42)	39.9% (n=6,240)
Don't know	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Weighted missing values, n=316 Key: * Insufficient data to report							

Figure 22 illustrates the adequacy of public access connection speeds to the Internet in library outlets. Although libraries reported increases in their connection speeds (see Figure C17), they continue to report that their connection speeds are insufficient to meet patron needs some or all of the time. Indeed, nearly 60 percent of libraries report that their connection speeds are insufficient to meet patron needs some or all of the time, compared to 57.5 percent reported in 2007-2008. Urban libraries report insufficient speeds some or all of the time (71 percent) as compared to 67 percent in 2007-2008. Rural libraries also report a slight drop in the percentage, indicating sufficiency access at all times (42.9 percent in 2008-2009 versus 46.3 percent last year).

Increasing Adequacy of Connections	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
No, the connection speed is already at the maximum level available	12.5% (n=339)	26.0% (n=1,281)	30.9% (n=2,339)	27.3% (n=3,480)	20.4% (n=465)	8.4% (n=14)	26.0% (n=3,959)
No, there is no interest in increasing the speed of public access Internet connection	10.8% (n=293)	17.7% (n=872)	18.3% (n=1,386)	17.4% (n=2,219)	13.3% (n=303)	16.9% (n=28)	16.8% (n=2,550)
Yes, there is interest in increasing the branch's bandwidth, but the library cannot currently afford to	22.1% (n=1,826)	21.5% (n=1,062)	24.1% (n=1,826)	22.5% (n=2,874)	26.2% (n=596)	10.2% (n=17)	22.9% (n=3,487)
Yes, and there are plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	26.8% (n=725)	13.0% (n=642)	8.0% (n=605)	11.4% (n=1,459)	19.3% (n=440)	44.0% (n=73)	13.0% (n=1,972)
It is possible to increase the speed; however, there are no plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	20.0% (n=541)	15.9% (n=786)	12.0% (n=910)	14.7% (n=1,871)	15.0% (n=342)	14.5% (n=24)	14.7% (n=2,237)
There is interest but the branch lacks the technical knowledge to increase the bandwidth in the library	*	*	1.2% (n=90)	1.0% (n=130)	*	*	1.0% (n=145)
Other	7.4% (n=201)	5.0% (n=244)	5.5% (n=416)	5.8% (n=735)	5.1% (n=115)	6.0% (n=10)	5.7% (n=860)

Figure 23: Possibility of Increasing Adequacy of Public Library Outlets Public Access Internet Connection, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty

Weighted missing values, n=750
Key: * Insufficient data to report

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009);
http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 23 summarizes the extent to which library outlets can increase their connection speeds to meet demand. A notable difference between this year's and the 2007-2008 survey is the increase in the overall percentage (26, up from 17.1 last year) of outlets responding that the connection speed is at the maximum level available. Rural (30.9 percent) and low poverty (27.3 percent) outlets are most likely to report that their connection speeds are at the maximum speeds available. Fewer libraries plan to increase their bandwidth within the next year, most notably in suburban (13 percent versus 21.3 percent last year) and medium poverty (19.3 percent versus 24.4 percent last year) outlets. Many more high poverty outlets plan to increase their bandwidth next year, 44 percent versus 28.1 percent last year.

Public Access Service Environment

This section presents the survey data regarding the service environment in which public libraries report offering public access computing and Internet access services.

Figure 24: Public Library Outlets Time Limits for Patron Use of Workstations, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Method	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
This library does not have time limits for public Internet workstations	2.2% (n=62)	5.2% (n=273)	7.4% (n=586)	6.0% (n=803)	4.8% (n=112)	3.5% (n=6)	5.8% (n=921)
This library does have time limits for public Internet workstations	97.8% (n=2,731)	94.6% (n=4,927)	92.4% (n=7,290)	93.8% (n=12,544)	95.2% (n=2,236)	96.5% (n=167)	94.1% (n=14,947)
Do not know if this library has time limits	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Weighted missing values, n=69 **Key**: * Insufficient data to report							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009);
http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

As illustrated in Figure 24, almost all public library outlets (94.1 percent) have time limits for patrons' use of workstations. Urban and high poverty outlets are the most likely to impose a time limit (97.8 percent and 96.5 percent, respectively), whereas rural and low poverty are the least likely to do so (92.4 percent and 93.8 percent, respectively). The 2008-2009 survey asked only if the library has time limits for workstation usage, as opposed to asking whether those time limits were the same or different for workstations last year. Nevertheless, the percent of outlets reporting that they use time limits this year is virtually identical to the 93.4 percent reporting some type of time limits imposed in 2007-2008.

Figure 25: Public Library Outlets With Time Limits for Internet Workstations per Day, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Time per Session	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Up to 30 minutes	21.2% (n=579)	18.9% (n=930)	25.2% (n=1,834)	22.2% (n=2,783)	22.9% (n=511)	28.7% (n=48)	22.4% (n=3,343)
31-60 minutes	51.8% (n=1,415)	49.0% (n=2,410)	40.1% (n=2,921)	44.8% (n=5,614)	47.2% (n=1,053)	46.7% (n=78)	45.2% (n=6,745)
Greater than 60 minutes	8.6% (n=234)	7.2% (n=352)	4.4% (n=317)	6.0% (n=746)	5.8% (n=129)	16.8% (n=28)	6.0% (n=903)
Unlimited as long as no one is waiting	9.1% (n=249)	15.5% (n=760)	20.9% (n=1,524)	17.3% (n=2,170)	15.8% (n=352)	6.0% (n=10)	17.0% (n=2,532)
Other time limit	9.3% (n=255)	9.5% (n=467)	9.4% (n=686)	9.7% (n=1,217)	8.4% (n=188)	1.8% (n=3)	9.4% (n=1,408)
Weighted missing values, n=17							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009);
http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 25 shows the time limits for patron use of workstations per day. The largest percent (45.2 percent) of outlets allow patrons to use the workstations between 31 and 60 minutes. A total of 9.4 percent of outlets report an "other" time limit is employed for workstations.

Figure 26: Public Library Outlets With Time Limits for Internet Workstations and Total Sessions per Day, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Number of Sessions	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
One session per day	17.5% (n=476)	21.9% (n=1,076)	20.9% (n=1,524)	20.7% (n=2,598)	20.4% (n=455)	13.8% (n=23)	20.6% (n=3,076)
Two sessions per day	30.6% (n=834)	18.6% (n=912)	12.0% (n=872)	16.3% (n=2,047)	23.3% (n=520)	30.5% (n=51)	17.5% (n=2,618)
Unlimited but must sign up for each session	8.8% (n=241)	10.4% (n=513)	12.7% (n=922)	11.7% (n=1,469)	8.1% (n=181)	15.6% (n=26)	11.2% (n=1,676)
Unlimited as long as no one is waiting	18.5% (n=504)	31.1% (n=1,527)	42.7% (n=3,112)	35.8% (n=4,486)	27.9% (n=623)	20.4% (n=34)	34.4% (n=5,143)
Other number of sessions	24.6% (n=672)	18.0% (n=887)	11.7% (n=856)	15.4% (n=1,929)	20.3% (n=454)	19.2% (n=32)	16.2% (n=2,415)
Weighted missing values, n=18							

For libraries with time limits, Figure 26 presents the total number of Internet sessions allowed per day. Most libraries (34.4 percent) allow an unlimited number of sessions as long as no other patrons are waiting. Limiting patrons to two sessions per day is most common in urban (30.6 percent) and high poverty (30.5 percent) outlets. A substantial number of outlets (16.2 percent) reported an "other number of sessions," and the highest percentage of these (43.1 percent) indicate sessions are limited by time usage per day, not by number of sessions.

Figure 27: Public Library Outlets Management of Public Internet Workstation Time Limits, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Method	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Remotely accessed or in-library computer reservation and time management software	13.4% (n=366)	7.4% (n=361)	3.5% (n=257)	6.3% (n=791)	7.8% (n=175)	10.2% (n=17)	6.6% (n=984)
Library access only computer reservation and time management software	63.9% (n=1,742)	51.3% (n=2,519)	20.8% (n=1,514)	36.8% (n=4,614)	47.2% (n=1,053)	64.7% (n=108)	38.7% (n=5,775)
Manual list of users managed by staff	17.6% (n=479)	32.7% (n=1,604)	60.5% (n=4,410)	45.0% (n=5,635)	36.9% (n=822)	21.6% (n=36)	43.5% (n=6,493)
"Honor system" — rely on patrons to end sessions voluntarily	1.9% (n=53)	5.4% (n=267)	10.3% (n=749)	7.8% (n=972)	4.0% (n=90)	3.6% (n=6)	7.2% (n=1,069)
Other time management	3.3% (n=89)	3.3% (n=161)	4.9% (n=357)	4.1% (n=516)	4.0% (n=90)	*	4.1% (n=606)
Weighted missing values, n=21 Key: * Insufficient data to report							

Since most outlets require a time limit for workstation use (Figure 24), respondents were also asked how they manage their time slots. The most common method is utilizing a manual list that the staff manages (43.5 percent this year), similar to that reported in 2007-2008 (45.9 percent). Rural and low poverty outlets are the most likely to manually manage time limits (60.5 percent and 45.0 percent, respectively), and urban and high poverty outlets the least likely to do the same (17.6 percent and 21.6 percent, respectively).

Figure 28: Public Library Outlets Offering Formal or Informal Technology Training, Availability by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Training Availability	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Offers formal technology training classes	52.5% (n=1,438)	42.1% (n=2,141)	24.1% (n=1,876)	33.8% (n=4,438)	39.7% (n=915)	60.8% (n=101)	35.0% (n=5,454)
Offers informal point-of-use assistance	38.0% (n=1,040)	48.4% (n=2,460)	60.6% (n=4,711)	54.0% (n=7,089)	47.0% (n=1,083)	24.1% (n=40)	52.6% (n=8,212)
Offers online training material	3.2% (n=89)	2.5% (n=128)	2.7% (n=212)	2.5% (n=328)	3.6% (n=82)	10.8% (n=18)	2.7% (n=428)
Does not offer any technology training	6.3% (n=173)	7.1% (n=359)	12.6% (n=976)	9.7% (n=1,276)	9.8% (n=225)	3.6% (n=6)	9.7% (n=1,507)
Weighted missing values, n=357							

Figure 28 shows the percentage of libraries that offer various types of technology training to patrons. The greatest percentage of outlets (52.6 percent) provide informal, point-of-use training, and 9.7 percent offer no technology training at all. Of the 35 percent of outlets that offer formal technology training classes, urban (52.5

percent) and high poverty (60.8 percent) outlets comprise the majority; 42.1 percent of suburban and 39.7 percent of medium poverty outlets also provide formal training. Online training material is rarely used (2.7 percent overall), although it is used by 10.8 percent of high poverty outlets.

Figure 29: Formal Technology Training Classes Offered by Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Technology Training Classes	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
General computer skills (e.g., how to use mouse, keyboard, printing)	93.9% (n=1,343)	88.7% (n=1,865)	92.3% (n=1,714)	90.5% (n=3,976)	94.5% (n=849	97% (n=98)	91.3% (n=4,923)
General software use (e.g., word processing, spreadsheets, presentation)	66.9% (n=957)	72.5% (n=1,524)	71.0%% (n=1,319)	70.3% (n=3,089)	71.8% (n=645)	66.3% (n=67)	70.5% (n=3,801)
General Internet use (e.g., set up e-mail, Web browsing)	94.7% (n=1,356)	93.2% (n=1,960)	91.0% (n=1,690)	92.5% (n=4,062)	94.9% (n=852)	90.2% (n=92)	92.8% (n=5,006)
General online/Web searching (e.g., using Google, Yahoo, others)	72.0% (n=1.030)	81.5% (n=1,715)	75.4% (n=1,401)	78.2% (n=3,433)	71.3% (n=640)	72.5% (n=74)	76.9% (n=4,147)
Using library's Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC)	44.2% (n=632)	52.3% (n=1,100)	47.3% (n=878)	50.4% (n=2,212)	39.5% (n=355)	42.6% (n=43)	48.4% (n=2,610)
Using online databases (e.g., commercial databases to search and find content)	51.0% (n=730)	51.1% (n=1,075)	41.1% (n=762)	48.7% (n=2,139)	42.8% (n=384)	42.6% (n=43)	47.6% (n=2,566)
Safe online practices (e.g., not divulging personal information)	24.8% (n=355)	23.7% (n=498)	26.1% (n=485)	24.2% (n=1,064)	27.8% (n=250)	22.8% (n=23)	24.8% (n=1,337)
Accessing online government information (e.g., Medicare, taxes, how to complete forms)	35.4% (n=507)	19.0% (n=399)	22.9% (n=426)	22.2% (n=974)	36.1% (n=324)	33.3% (n=34)	24.7% (n=1,332)
Accessing online job-seeking and career-related information	36.9% (n=528)	23.2% (n=488)	23.4% (n=434)	25.0% (n=1,099)	34.6% (n=311)	40.2% (n=41)	26.9% (n=1,451)
Accessing online medical information (e.g., health literacy)	20.5% (n=294)	15.0% (n=315)	19% (n=352)	17.4% (n=766)	20.6% (n=185)	9.9% (n=10)	17.8% (n=961)
Accessing online investment information	11.8% (n=169)	11.2% (n=236)	6.6% (n=123)	9.7% (n=424)	11.1% (n=100)	3.0% (n=3)	9.8% (n=527)
Digital photography, software and online applications (e.g., Photoshop, Flickr)	15.9% (n=228)	24.9% (n=524)	20.6% (n=383)	21.6% (n=948)	18.5% (n=166)	19.8% (n=20)	21.0% (n=1,134)
Web 2.0 (e.g., blogging, RSS)	16.4% (n=234)	10.4% (n=218)	8.3% (n=154)	10.1% (n=444)	15.5% (n=139)	22.8% (n=23)	11.2% (n=606)
Other technology-based training classes	4.3% (n=61)	6.7% (n=140)	5.8% (n=108)	6.1% (n=266)	4.8% (n=42)	-	5.7% (n=309)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive Weighted missing values, n=63 **Key:** -- No data to report							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009); http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 29 identifies the types of formal technology training classes offered by library outlets. Of those libraries that offer formal training, general Internet use classes are the most common (92.8 percent), followed by general computers skills (91.3 percent). More than three-quarters of libraries (76.9 percent) report training patrons on general online/Web searching and 70.5 percent offer general software classes. Relatively few outlets (9.8 percent) provide training on accessing online investment information. Web 2.0 training is also somewhat rare (11.2 percent of outlets), and are more likely to be offered in urban (16.4 percent) and high poverty (22.8 percent) outlets. Formal training in digital photography, software and online applications is most common in suburban (24.9 percent), while training on how to access online government information is more common in urban (35.4 percent) and medium poverty (36.1 percent) libraries. "Other" training classes cited by 5.7 percent

of outlets include genealogy research (31.6 percent), and how to use eBay and/or sell personal items online (19.7 percent).

Figure 30: Public Library Services Available to Users, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Services	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Digital reference/virtual reference	75.1% (n=2,059)	70.8% (n=3,601)	52.5% (n=4,066)	62.5% (n=8,194)	61.4% (n=1,412)	71.9% (n=120)	62.4% (n=9,726)
Licensed databases	96.6% (n=2,648)	95.2% (n=4,839)	83.4% (n=6,461)	89.3% (n=11,702)	91.0% (n=2,091)	93.4% (n=155)	89.6% (n=13,948)
E-books	79.4% (n=2,176)	64.1% (n=3,261)	41.2% (n=3,191)	55.5% (n=7,273)	54.3% (n=1,249)	64.1% (n=107)	55.4% (n=8,629)
Video conferencing	9.0% (n=246)	4.7% (n=237)	6.0% (n=465)	6.2% (n=809)	5.7% (n=130)	5.4% (n=9)	6.1% (n=948)
Online instructional courses/tutorials	52.1% (n=1,427)	44.2% (n=2,246)	39.6% (n=3,072)	42.9% (n=5,625)	45.4% (n=1,044)	45.8% (n=76)	43.3% (n=6,745)
Homework resources	90.5% (n=2,480)	83.4% (n=4,242)	73.3% (n=5,683)	79.1% (n=10,374)	82.1% (n=1,888)	86.7% (n=144)	79.6% (n=12,406)
Audio content (e.g., podcasts, audio books, other)	84.1% (n=2,305)	77.6% (n=3,948)	65.8% (n=5,098)	73.0% (n=9,566)	72.1% (n=1,657)	77.1% (n=128)	72.9% (n=11,351)
Video content	63.4% (n=1,738)	52.8% (n=2,687)	46.2% (n=3,578)	51.6% (n=6,768)	48.9% (n=1,124)	66.9% (n=111)	51.4% (n=8,003)
Digitized special collections (e.g., letters, postcards, documents, other)	65.9% (n=1,805)	35.0% (n=1,781)	26.3% (n=2,035)	34.3% (n=4,491)	44.9% (n=1,033)	58.4% (n=97)	36.1% (n=5,621)
Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option Weighted missing values, n=385							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009);
http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Figure 30 illustrates the range of Internet-based services that public libraries provide to their patrons. The overall percentage of libraries providing each of the services listed is very similar to the percentages indicated in 2007-2008, which showed a substantial increase over the previous year. Licensed databases (89.6 percent) are provided by the largest percentage of outlets, whereas video conferencing is the least likely to be offered. A slight increase in the availability of e-books was reported this year as compared to last year (55.4 percent versus 51.8 percent), whereas a slight decrease in the availability of homework resources was reported (79.6 percent in 2008-2009 versus 83.4 percent in 2007-2008).

Figure 31: Public Library Peripherals Available to Users, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Hardware	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Access and store content on USB/other devices (e.g., iPods, MP3, other)	87.4% (n=2,394)	84.4% (n=4,293)	77.4% (n=5,998)	81.0% (n=10,623)	83.9% (n=1,930)	79.0% (n=132)	81.4% (n=12,685)
Digital camera connections and manipulation of content	41.5% (n=1,138)	47.7% (n=2,424)	50.3% (n=3,903)	47.9% (n=6,284)	48.7% (n=1,120)	36.7% (n=61)	47.9% (n=7,465)
Burn CD/DVDs	36.5% (n=999)	43.9% (n=2,233)	44.5% (n=3,450)	43.6% (n=5,712)	40.3% (n=927)	25.9% (n=43)	42.9% (n=6,682)
Recreational gaming consoles, software or Web sites	57.2% (n=1,762)	59.1% (n=3,003)	53.4% (n=4,140)	57.7% (n=7,569)	53.9% (n=1,240)	57.8% (n=96)	57.2% (n=8,905)
Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009);
http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Computer peripherals that library outlets support are shown in Figure 31. There is a notable increase in the overall percentage of outlets providing access and the ability to store content on USB and/or other devices, up to 81.4 percent from 72 percent in 2007-2008, with the largest increases reported in rural (77.4 percent versus 67 percent in 2007-2008) and low poverty outlets (81 percent versus 71.3 percent last year). Digital camera connections and the ability to manipulate content also increased approximately five percent across each library metropolitan status and poverty level over last year. The ability to burn CD/DVDs saw the largest increase in urban (36.5 percent, up from 21.1 percent last year) and medium poverty (40.3 percent versus 28.9 percent) outlets. The overall availability of recreational gaming consoles, software or Web sites remain almost identical to last year's survey responses (57.2 percent in 2008-2009), although urban and high poverty outlets (57.2 and 57.8 percent, respectively, in 2008-2009) were less likely to provide this service than they were in 2007-2008 (66.8 and 70.9 percent, respectively).

Figure 32: Public Library Services That are Not Available to Users by Metropolitan Status and Poverty.							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Services	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Digital reference/Virtual reference	10.4% (n=288)	19.5% (n=995)	34.6% (2,685)	25.5% (n=3,362)	25.5% (n=581)	13.7% (n=25)	25.4% (n=3,968)
Licensed databases	*	2.7% (n=138)	10.5% (n=819)	6.4% (n=845)	5.3% (n=120)	6.1% (n=11)	6.2% (n=976)
E-books	16.1% (n=444)	31.6% (n=1,613)	51.9% (n=4,037)	38.8% (n=5,103)	41.7% (n=952)	21.0% (n=38)	39.0% (n=6,093)
Video conferencing	77.4% (n=2,135)	84.3% (4,301)	82.2% (n=6,389)	81.9% (n=10,791)	82.0% (n=1,873)	88.5% (n=161)	82.0% (n=12,825)
Online instructional courses/tutorials	42.3% (n=1,167)	43.7% (n=2,232)	43.1% (n=3,350)	43.2% (n=5,692)	42.3% (n=966)	50.5% (n=92)	43.2% (n=6,750)
Homework resources	6.4% (n=176)	8.5% (n=435)	11.1% (n=866)	9.2% (n=1,208)	11.2% (n=255)	7.2% (n=13)	9.4% (n=1,476)
Audio content (e.g. pod casts, audio books, other)	11.2% (n=310)	16.8% (n=856)	24.6% (n=1,914)	19.6% (n=2,579)	20.9% (n=478)	12.7% (n=23)	19.7% (n=3,080)
Video content	28.1% (n=775)	40.1% (n=2048)	40.7% (n=3,160)	38.0% (n=5,012)	40.7% (n=928)	24.2% (n=44)	38.3% (n=5,984)
Digitized special collections (e.g. letters, postcards, documents, other)	32.3% (n=893)	54.9% (n=2,805)	60.5% (n=4,700)	54.4% (n=7,170)	50.2% (n=1.145)	45.3% (n=82)	53.7% (n=8,397)
Will not total to 100%, as respondents could select more than one option. Key: * insufficient data to report							

Figure 32 shows the percentage of libraries that do not offer various services to library patrons. Video conferencing is the least likely to be offered (82.0 percent), followed by digitized special collections (53.7 percent), although rural outlets are almost twice as likely to not have these available (60.5 percent) than urban outlets (32.3 percent).

Figure 33: Public Library Peripherals That are Not Available to Users by Metropolitan Status and Poverty.							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Hardware	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Access and store content on USB/other devices (e.g. iPods, MP3, other)	7.6% (n=211)	15.5% (n=793)	20.7% (n=1,605)	17.2% (n=2,271)	14.3% (n=326)	7.2% (n=13)	16.7% (n=2,610)
Digital camera connection and manipulation of content	54.3% (n=1,501)	50.2% (n=2,565)	42.7% (n=3,322)	46.3% (n=6,094)	52.3% (n=1,193)	56.0% (n=102)	47.2% (n=7,389)
Burn CD/DVD's	69.9% (n=1,932)	54.1% (n=2,761)	46.7% (n=3,629)	51.8% (n=6,820)	60.1% (n=1,372)	71.8% (n=130)	53.2% (n=8,322)
Recreational gaming consoles, software or websites	24.2% (n=668)	26.5% (n=1,355)	29.4% (n=2,288)	27.4% (n=3,616)	29.1% (n=664)	17.0% (n=31)	27.6% (n=4,311)
Will not total to 100%, as respondents could select more than one option.							

The percentages of libraries that do not provide various computer hardware and peripherals are shown in Figure 33. The ability to burn CD's or DVD's is most commonly unavailable to patrons (53.2 percent), closely followed by the lack of digital camera connection and photo manipulation (47.2 percent). Urban and high poverty outlets are most likely to provide accessibility for USB and other devices (7.6 and 7.2 percent, respectively) and recreational gaming consoles, software or websites (24.2 and 17.0 percent).

Figure 34: Public Library Services That are Offered on a Limited Access Basis to Users by Metropolitan Status and Poverty.							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Services	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Digital reference/Virtual reference	7.8% (n=216)	7.7% (n=392)	8.8% (n=682)	8.2% (n=1,085)	8.4% (n=192)	7.2% (n=13)	8.3% (n=1,290)
Licensed databases	*	2.9% (n=150)	6.0% (n=464)	4.4% (n=582)	2.2% (n=51)	*	4.0% (n=633)
E-books	2.1% (n=57)	4.1% (n=210)	5.2% (n=404)	4.6% (n=611)	2.5% (n=57)	1.7% (n=3)	4.3% (n=671)
Video conferencing	3.9% (n=107)	3.4% (n=173)	3.5% (n=275)	3.5% (n=455)	4.0% (n=92)	3.8% (n=7)	3.5% (n=554)
Online instructional courses/tutorials	7.2% (n=199)	7.7% (n=391)	8.1% (n=629)	7.5% (n=991)	9.5% (n=216)	6.1% (n=11)	7.8% (n=1,218)
Homework resources	2.6% (n=72)	3.0% (n=152)	5.5% (n=427)	4.2% (n=556)	4.0% (n=91)	2.2% (n=4)	4.2% (n=651)
Audio content (e.g. pod casts, audio books, other)	5.8% (n=161)	3.1% (n=156)	6.6% (n=513)	5.0% (n=656)	6.7% (n=154)	11.0% (n=20)	5.3% (n=830)
Video content	6.0% (n=165)	6.6% (n=338)	8.2% (n=639)	7.4% (n=978)	6.5% (n=148)	9.3% (n=17)	7.3% (n=1,143)
Digitized special collections (e.g. letters, postcards, documents, other)	6.4% (n=176)	4.7% (n=238)	6.3% (n=487)	5.9% (n=778)	5.3% (n=120)	2.2% (n=4)	5.8% (n=902)
Will not total to 100%, as respondents could select more than one option. Key: * insufficient data to report							

Public library outlets were also asked to answer what services are offered on a limited basis to users, which is illustrated in Figure 34. None of the services are limited in more than 8.3 percent of libraries. Digital and/or virtual reference and online instructional courses and tutorials tend to be limited the most often (8.3 and 7.8 percent, respectively), whereas only 4 percent of libraries responded that licensed databases have limited access.

Figure 35: Public Library Peripherals That are Offered on a Limited Access Basis to Users by Metropolitan Status and Poverty.							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Hardware	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Access and store content on USB/other devices (e.g. iPods, MP3, other)	7.3% (n=203)	5.1% (n=254)	7.2% (n=558)	6.6% (n=866)	5.7% (n=131)	10.4% (n=18)	6.5% (n=1,015)
Digital camera connection and manipulation of content	10.3% (n=287)	8.4% (n=419)	10.0% (n=780)	9.6% (n=1,259)	8.3% (n=190)	21.4% (n=37)	9.5% (n=1,486)
Burn CD/DVD's	4.6% (n=129)	4.8% (n=242)	8.6% (n=669)	6.7% (n=884)	6.3% (n=144)	7.5% (n=13)	6.7% (n=1,041)
Recreational gaming consoles, software or websites	11.2% (n=313)	10.4% (n=521)	12.2% (n=956)	11.3% (n=1,489)	11.9% (n=274)	15.5% (n=27)	11.5% (n=1,790)
Will not total to 100%, as respondents could select more than one option.							

Figure 35 shows peripherals that public libraries offer on a limited basis to their users. Recreational gaming consoles, software or websites are the most likely to be offered on a limited basis (11.5 percent overall). High poverty outlets are the most likely to offer digital camera connections and manipulation of content only on a limited basis (21.4 percent) whereas rural libraries tend to limit CD/DVD burning (8.6 percent).

Figure 36: Factors that Prevent Public Libraries from Providing Services or Require Limited Access to Users, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
Factors	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Computer hardware/software will not support the services	50.3% (n=1,132)	51.5% (n=2,034)	59.6% (n=3,888)	56.4% (n=6,028)	51.5% (n=981)	33.3% (n=44)	55.4% (n=7,054)
Public access Internet connectivity speed will not support the service(s)	21.9% (n=494)	23.6% (n=934)	20.5% (n=1,338)	21.1% (n=2,258)	25.6% (n=488)	15.0% (n=20)	21.7% (n=2,766)
Library policy restricts offering or access	44.1% (n=994)	31.4% (n=1,239)	30.6% (n=1,998)	32.5% (n=3,475)	35.3% (n=673)	62.9% (n=83)	33.2% (n=4,231)
Library cannot afford to purchase and/or support service(s)	54.1% (n=1,219)	54.9% (n=2,169)	63.0% (n=4,111)	59.3% (n=6,342)	58.0% (n=1,104)	40.6% (n=54)	58.9% (n=7,500)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive							

Figure 36 identifies the factors that libraries report prevent them from either providing specific services or require limiting access to certain services. Similar to last year, the largest percentage of libraries report they are unable to afford the purchase and/or support of such services (58.9 percent versus 63.6 percent reported in 2007-2008). Having computer hardware/software that is unable to support the services is the second most likely reason (55.4 percent overall) and was particularly problematic for rural (59.6 percent) and low poverty (56.4 percent) outlets.

Figure 37: Public Access Internet Services Critical to the Role of the Public Library Outlet, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty

Public Internet Services	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Provide education resources and databases for K-12 students	81.9% (n=2,227)	81.4% (n=4,060)	75.5% (n=5,793)	78% (n=10,095)	81.2% (n=1,841)	89.4% (n=143)	78.6% (n=12,079)
Provide education resources and databases for students in higher education	38.5% (n=1,048)	34.3% (n=1,709)	38.9% (n=2,985)	36.1% (n=4,675)	43.3% (n=981)	54.4% (n=87)	37.4% (n=5,743)
Provide education resources and databases for home schooling	26.1% (n=709)	31.9% (n=1,591)	38.7% (n=2,965)	35.1% (n=4,544)	30.7% (n=695)	16.3% (n=26)	34.2% (n=5,265)
Provide education resources and databases for adult/continuing education students	53.1% (n=1,445)	45.1% (n=2,247)	51.2% (n=3,925)	49.6% (n=6,428)	48.6% (n=1,101)	55.0% (n=88)	49.5% (n=7,617)
Provide information for local economic development	21.4% (n=583)	22.9% (n=1,143)	19.7% (n=1,507)	20.5% (n=2,650)	23.1% (n=523)	36.3% (n=58)	21.0% (n=3,231)
Provide information for college applicants	7.2% (n=197)	9.3% (n=464)	15.8% (n=1,208)	11.8% (n=1,523)	14.2% (n=322)	14.4% (n=43)	12.2% (n=1,868)
Provide information about the library's community	30.3% (n=823)	25.2% (n=1,254)	23.3% (n=1,785)	25.2% (n=3,259)	25.0% (n=567)	23.1% (n=37)	25.1% (n=3,863)
Provide information or databases regarding investments	6.8% (n=184)	10.2% (n=508)	5.3% (n=403)	7.7% (n=1,003)	3.8% (n=85)	4.4% (n=7)	7.1% (n=1,095)
Provide access to government information (e.g., tax forms, Medicare, paying traffic tickets)	55.2% (n=1,502)	61.4% (n=3,060)	62.6% (n=4,797)	61.6% (n=7,972)	57.7% (n=1,306)	50.6% (n=81)	60.9% (n=9,359)
Provide computer and Internet skills training	48.2% (n=1,311)	38.4% (n=1,913)	29.2% (n=2,239)	34.8% (n=4,505)	38.9% (n=880)	48.8% (n=78)	35.5% (n=5,463)
Provide services for job-seekers	66.9% (n=1,820)	69.8% (n=3,478)	63.0% (n=4,830)	66.3% (n=8,582)	63.8% (n=1,445)	63.8% (n=102)	65.9% (n=10,129)
Provide services to immigrant populations	19.0% (n=517)	14.1% (n=704)	6.9% (n=526)	10.6% (n=1,372)	16.1% (n=364)	6.9% (n=11)	11.4% (n=1,747)
Other	16.2% (n=440)	16.1% (n=802)	16.0% (n=1,229)	16.7% (n=2,158)	13.0% (n=294)	12.5% (n=20)	16.1% (n=2,472)

Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option.
Weighted missing values, n=587

Figure 37 indicates the services that libraries report are the most critical for community members to access. Providing education resources is the most critical service libraries provide, particularly for K-12 students (78.6 percent overall) and adult/continuing education students (49.5 percent overall), similar to the 2007-2008 survey's results. High poverty outlets also indicated a large increase over last year in providing education resources and databases for students in higher education (54.4 percent versus 37.3 percent in 2007-2008), as well as providing these resources for adult/continuing education students (55.0 percent this year versus 45.6 percent last year).

Providing services for job-seekers continued to climb in importance, with nearly 66 percent of libraries reporting this was most critical, up from 62.2 percent last year and 44 percent in the 2006-2007 study. Providing access to government information, such as tax forms and Medicare, also increased this year,

particularly for suburban (61.4 percent, up from 52.5 percent last year) and low poverty outlets (61.6 percent up from 55.9 percent last year). Also of note is a substantial increase in outlets providing information for local economic development, with 21 percent reporting this role this year versus 7.1 percent last year. The largest increases are found in suburban (22.9 versus 7.2 percent last year) and high poverty outlets (36.3 versus 13.8 percent last year). Of outlets reporting an "other" critical role, 69.1 percent state that recreational/e-mail/personal use is important, and 11.8 percent report providing high-speed Internet access to those who are unable to afford it is critical.

Figure 38: E-Government Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlets, by Metropolitan Status and Poverty							
	Metropolitan Status			Poverty Level			
E-Government roles and services	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Low	Medium	High	Overall
Staff provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	59.3% (n=1,580)	53.7% (n=2,651)	52.6% (n=3,903)	54.0% (n=6,819)	55.3% (n=1,236)	48.8% (n=78)	54.1% (n=8,133)
Staff provide as-needed assistance to patrons for understanding and using e-government resources	83.5% (n=2,225)	81.8% (n=4,039)	78.6% (n=5,831)	80.5% (n=10,161)	80.6% (n=1,800)	83.8% (n=134)	80.5% (n=12,095)
Staff provide immigrants with assistance in locating immigration-related services and information	52.7% (n=1,405)	33.9% (n=1,675)	23.5% (n=1,742)	31.0% (n=3,911)	38.4% (n=859)	32.3% (n=52)	32.1% (n=4,822)
The library offers training classes regarding the use of e-government resources	21.8% (n=582)	6.8% (n=337)	4.6% (n=343)	7.4% (n=935)	13.1% (n=293)	21.2% (n=34)	8.4% (n=1,262)
The library is partnering with others to provide e-government services	17.8% (n=474)	14.0% (n=689)	11.5% (n=852)	13.3% (n=1,680)	14.3% (n=319)	10.6% (n=17)	13.4% (n=2,016)
The library has at least one staff member with significant knowledge and skills in provision of e-government services	33.1% (n=882)	18.3% (n=903)	18.4% (n=1,366)	20.1% (n=2,539)	25.4% (n=569)	26.7% (n=43)	21.0% (n=3,151)
Other	2.5% (n=66)	3.0% (n=149)	2.9% (n=213)	2.9% (n=365)	2.7% (n=60)	1.9% (n=3)	2.8% (n=428)
The library does not provide e-government services to its patrons on a regular basis	10.0% (n=266)	12.4% (n=613)	17.7% (n=1,316)	14.9% (n=1,880)	13.2% (n=295)	12.4% (n=20)	14.6% (n=2,195)
Will not total 100%, as categories are not mutually exclusive Weighted missing values, n=935							

Source: Libraries Connect Communities: Public Library Funding & Technology Access Study (ALA, 2009); http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/ors/plftas/0809report.cfm)

Continuing a trend first reported in the 2006-2007 survey, Figure 38 illustrates the increasing range of e-government services public library outlets provide patrons. Indeed, only 14.6 percent of all outlets indicate they provide no e-government services on a regular basis, a decrease from 25.9 percent in 2007-2008. Over three-quarters (80.5 percent) of all public libraries offer as-needed assistance in understanding and using e-government resources, and more than half (54.1 percent) provide assistance to patrons who are applying for or accessing e-government services. As-needed assistance shows the largest increase over last year, 80.5 percent up from 74 percent reported in the 2007-2008 survey.