

Original Publication Citation:

Adkins, D., & Bala, B. (2004, Summer). Public library outreach as a function of staffing and metropolitan location. *Library & Information Science Research*, 26(3), 338-350.

DOI: [doi:10.1016/j.lisr.2004.01.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2004.01.001)

Post-print: Below

Notes: Original file converted from Microsoft Word to PDF.

(Information in textbox added by MU Libraries, July 8, 2015)

Public Library Outreach as a Function of Staffing and Metropolitan Location

Denice Adkins

University of Missouri

Elizabeth Bala

Mazapan School

Correspondence should be directed to Denice Adkins, Assistant Professor, School of Information Science and Learning Technologies, 303 Townsend Hall, Columbia, Missouri, 65211.

Outreach as a Function of Staffing and Metropolitan Location:
Results from a Survey of Arizona Public Libraries

Abstract

Library literature suggests that staffing and metropolitan status may affect a public library's provision of outreach efforts. Data from a 1999 survey of Arizona public library service outlets do not support the role of metropolitan status in outreach provision, but does reaffirm the role of staffing. In this data set, Arizona public library service outlets had ongoing outreach efforts, with schools and preschools being the most popular venue for providing those services. Analyzing outlets' provision of outreach as a function of staffing revealed that there is a positive relationship between the number of librarians on staff and the odds that a library would conduct outreach. While metropolitan libraries were also associated with an increase in the odds of outreach and school visits, this was assumed to be a spurious correlation due to the lack of significance in models accounting for staff and metropolitan status.

1. Introduction

American public libraries were visited 1.1 billion times in 2000 (Chute, et al., 2002, p. vi), but in spite of the many visits made, a 2002 survey (American Library Association, 2002, ¶5) found that only 66 percent of respondents had reported using the public library within the past year. This suggests that a considerable percentage of the population does not visit public libraries. In order to draw non-users in, increase public awareness of library services, and to make services available outside the library's four walls, public libraries offer outreach services to their communities.

Outreach services literally reach out to non-users, to encourage them to use the library and its resources. These services range from the promotion of library services via radio or television to the provision of books and services outside the library, but all outreach services share the goal of attracting new patrons. Because outreach can take many forms, and the lack of uniform data gathered about outreach efforts, little is known about how many public libraries conduct outreach or the degree to which public libraries support one type of outreach over another. Library literature suggests that appropriate staff levels are necessary for outreach, but does not define those levels. Literature documenting outreach efforts primarily consists of narratives produced by librarians from metropolitan libraries. This article views outreach services as a function of staffing and metropolitan location. It also investigates two hypotheses: first, that an increase in the number of librarians on a public library staff will make that library more likely to conduct outreach or make school visits than libraries with fewer librarians on staff; and second, that metropolitan libraries are more likely to conduct outreach or visit schools than non-metropolitan libraries.

2. The Nature of Outreach

As described in the library literature, outreach service takes many forms. Writing about being an outreach librarian, Deborah DuBois (1995, p. 18) said that her job entailed “taking the library out into the community” in the specific guises of public speaking to community groups, the production of library promotional materials such as brochures and booklists, conducting programs at community events, and building alliances with community agencies. Another practitioner-author (Reese, 2002, pp. 6-7) describes outreach efforts as offsite provision of book

collections, programs, and library card promotions, presentations to community leaders and business clubs.

The word “outreach” has been used from the 1960s (Weibel, 1983, p. 5), but the practice of providing library services outside the library building has a longer history. To reach all the residents of New York, Melvil Dewey developed a traveling library service in 1893 (Watson, 2003, p. 73). Librarian Mary Lemist Titcomb adapted this idea to provide Maryland with the first traveling book wagon in the 1900s (Passet, 1994, p. 317). Between 1928 and 1938, Rebecca Rankin of the New York Public Library developed and broadcast informational programs over the radio (Seaver, 2003, p. 194). Public libraries in New York City and Boston were providing staffed collections in parks in the 1930s, while libraries in Illinois and New York provided beach-front collections (Greenberg, 2003, pp. 183-189). Baltimore’s Enoch Pratt Free Library held book discussions via a rock-and-roll radio station in the 1960s (Castagna, 1970, p. 18). Richard Moses of Rochester, New York used films to draw in nonusers, while Guy Bennette delivered library services on the streets of San Francisco (Colson, 1975, pp. 70-71). Librarians have been actively involved in creating outreach and extension programs for over a century.

Although library outreach has a long history, statistics on public libraries’ outreach efforts have not been collected systematically. The Public Library Statistics program collects no information other than bookmobile services, nor does the American Library Association provide statistics on public library outreach. Individual libraries, however, provide limited outreach service statistics. For instance, the New York Public Library (2001, ¶11) indicates the number of programs provided by its Outreach Services department in 2000, and the San Antonio Public Library (n.d., ¶3) indicates the number of school visits its staff made in one month. However, these statistics have not been collected in a uniform way among different library systems, and

may not be reliable for the purposes of comparison. The documentation of outreach services is generally left to authors such as DuBois and Reese, who write articles explaining what outreach services they provide at their libraries, and library historians, who write about the innovative efforts of years gone by.

The library literature produced by practitioners and historians suggests two factors that are influential in the provision of outreach services: staffing and metropolitan status. Librarians play a direct role in planning and goal-setting for outreach projects, and children's librarians have been at the forefront of providing services outside the building. The relationship between clerks and outreach is not explicit; however, at least one practitioner-author (Voss, 2002, pp. 41, 44) has written that clerks are used to perform the duties of outreach. Outreach is recognized as a time-intensive, staff-intensive undertaking. "More resources and staff are needed to deliver outreach services" (Reese, 2002, p. 5). In his survey of the profession, a library educator (Rubin, 1998, p. 317) wrote that outreach was "costly in terms of personnel and time."

While many accounts of public library outreach programs come from metropolitan libraries, library literature does not directly acknowledge metropolitan status as a contributing factor in public library outreach. Nonetheless, there are clues to suggest a relationship between the two. Historical studies of outreach services are populated with metropolitan public libraries. In addition to Baltimore (Castagna, 1970), Boston (Greenberg, 2003), San Francisco and Rochester (Colson, 1975), other cities mentioned in the literature have included Chicago, Cleveland, New York City, and St. Paul (Novotny, 2003, pp. 345, 347). Nauratil (1985, pp. 64-66, 140) mentions outreach and extension services in Brooklyn, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, and St. Louis. More recently, a 1999 survey of Alabama public libraries (Stephens, 2002) found that outreach occurs more frequently in libraries with service populations of 50,000 and above than in

those with smaller service populations. Another article (Boyce & Boyce, 1995, p. 114) suggests that rural libraries might not be able to afford “traditional library outreach mechanisms,” as a result of having a relatively small tax base spread over a large geographic area. Rural residents are likely to be “so dispersed as to make major use of a central facility difficult” (Boyce & Boyce, 2000, p. 50). By aggregating a population of potential users into a relatively small area, their needs become more noticeable. In this respect, metropolitan status can be seen as a contributing factor in the production of library outreach.

3. Method

In 1999, a survey was sent to 168 Arizona public library service outlets. These service outlets formed the population of stationary central and branch libraries at which patrons could receive library service. Tribal and prison libraries were not surveyed because they have different missions and service populations than do public libraries. Bookmobiles were also excluded from the survey. To ask bookmobile staff if they provide outreach would be meaningless, as bookmobiles are manifestations of outreach services. At the time of the survey, 18 bookmobiles provided library services in the State of Arizona. Six were administered by metropolitan library systems (Arizona Public Library Statistics, 2000, p. 1).

Usable results were returned by 104 (61.9%) of those libraries. The return rate for libraries in metropolitan areas was 56.8%, while non-metropolitan libraries’ return rate was 63.4%. Originally intended to provide a base measure for library services to Hispanic patrons, the survey also revealed information about Arizona public libraries’ outreach activities to the general population. Questions elicited information on outreach services, with the intent of comparing outreach provided to the general population to the outreach provided specifically to

Spanish-speaking patrons. For this article, the only questions used were those which addressed outreach to the general population. Additional variables chosen for analysis were number of librarians employed at the service outlet, number of clerks employed at the service outlet, and whether the service outlet was located in a metropolitan area. Consistent with data collection done by the State of Arizona, in this survey a “librarian” could have the title without having a Master’s degree accredited by the American Library Association.

Three of the variables had a hypothetically unlimited range of positive values: the number of librarians (Librarians), number of clerks (Clerks) on staff, and the combined number of librarians and clerk on staff (Staff). The variable identifying whether a library was metropolitan or not (Metro) was categorical and dichotomous. As defined by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1999a), a metropolitan area is one which includes at least one city with a population of 50,000 or an urbanized area of 50,000 inhabitants which has a total metropolitan population of 100,000 inhabitants. There are six metropolitan areas in Arizona: Flagstaff, Mesa-Phoenix, Scottsdale, Tempe, Tucson, and Yuma. (U.S. Census Bureau, 1999b). A library was either located in one of these areas or it was not; therefore, the values for this variable are either 1, for those libraries located in metropolitan areas, or 0, for those that were not.

When asked whether or not a library conducted outreach or made school visits, library respondents could answer either “yes” or “no.” The dependent variables resulting from these questions (Outreach and Visits respectively) were categorical and dichotomous. Again, values were limited to “1” for those libraries that did conduct outreach or make school visits, and “0” for those that did not. Because of the limitation on the dependent variable, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was not appropriate for this analysis. OLS regression assumes that errors are normally distributed and homogeneous. Working with a binary dependent variable violates those

assumptions. Logistic regression, on the other hand, estimates the odds of an independent variable affecting a dependent variable. Where OLS regression coefficients indicate the direct effect of an independent variable upon the dependent, logistic regression coefficients are used to predict the effect of the independent variable upon the odds of the dependent variable occurring. In this case, logistic regression estimates the probability of outreach or school visits occurring, divided by the probability of these events not occurring, based on a library's metropolitan status, number of librarians, and number of clerks.

Four measures of significance are used. The Wald statistic and likelihood ratio test demonstrate the significance of the independent variables; full models are compared by assessing the changes in the model chi-square and Nagelkerke's R^2 between models. The Wald statistic is produced by dividing the square of the regression coefficient by the square of the asymptotic variance of that coefficient. As the standard error increases, Wald statistics become less reliable, necessitating another measure of significance. In the likelihood ratio test, the deviance (-2 Log Likelihood) of the full model is subtracted from the deviance of a reduced model in which the pertinent independent variable has been dropped. The difference in deviance between these models is evaluated using a chi-square distribution, with the difference in the number of independent variables standing for degrees of freedom. The model chi-square statistic indicates the significance of the overall logistic regression model, but does not assess the effect of each variable separately. Logistic regression does not have an equivalent statistic to the R^2 statistic in OLS regression. SPSS (Version 11) calculates measures that are similar to the R^2 statistic, but do not measure the goodness of fit of the equation. Nagelkerke's R^2 is used in this analysis only to compare different specifications of the regression models.

An assumption of logistic regression is that no important variable is excluded from the equation. The only independent variables available at this point are metropolitan status, number of librarians, and number of clerks. However, it is possible that a library's commitment to outreach may be affected by other factors which have not yet been explored, such as the poverty level of the library community or library staff activism. This leaves the logistic regression models herein subject to specification error.

4. Results

Although the survey asked whether or not outreach was performed to the general community, it did not ask what form that outreach took, but merely whether or not outreach was conducted. Another question asked with which types of community agencies libraries interacted. Youth services agencies were widely represented, with 77 respondents (74%) reporting interaction with schools, 52 respondents (50%) reporting interaction with preschools, day care centers, or Head Start facilities. Fifty respondents (47%) indicated working with parks and recreation departments. Only 21 respondents (20%) said they worked with churches, mosques, synagogues, or other houses of worship. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics.

[Insert Table 1 about here.]

4.1. The Relationship between Librarians and Clerks

A significant correlation was found between librarians and clerks, Pearson's $r = .459$, $p < .01$. The mean number of librarians found in metropolitan libraries was 9.56, compared to a mean of 2.97 librarians in non-metropolitan libraries. In metropolitan libraries, the mean number of clerks was 8.85, while non-metropolitan libraries had a mean 4.28 clerks. To more precisely

define the relationship between librarians and clerks, these variables were analyzed with respect to library service population (Arizona Public Library Statistics, 2000, p. 1). The population intervals selected here mirror the intervals used by Stephens (2002). As shown by Table 2, all measures of staffing increased as library service population increases, but the increase in clerks was not proportional to the increase in librarians. Means and standard deviations indicate that libraries with service populations less than 20,000 were more likely to employ multiple clerks than multiple librarians, while libraries with populations 20,000 and over did the opposite. Although an increase in the number of librarians was associated with an increase in the number of clerks, library service population seemed to depress the number of clerks per librarian.

[Insert Table 2 about here.]

Since the independent variables were associated with each other, a test for collinearity was performed. In logistic regression, multicollinearity reduces the reliability of the independent variables' coefficients. To test for collinearity, all independent variables were included in a linear regression equation, and the Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) for those variables were computed. Tolerance is a measure of the variance in an independent variable that cannot be accounted for by the other independent variables included in an equation. Tolerance values range from "0" to "1", with larger values preferred. VIF is the inverse of the tolerance value. VIF values range from 1 to infinity, though lower values are preferred. Tolerance values for librarians, clerks, and metro were .646, .805, and .759 respectively; VIF values were 1.547, 1.242, and 1.318. It was concluded that these variables were not sufficiently associated to affect the logistic regression analyses.

4.2. Librarians, Clerks, and Metropolitan Status Predicting Outreach

The effect of each unique predictor variable upon the log-odds of the dependent variables was assessed at the outset. The model chi-square statistic produced for librarians predicting outreach was 20.10 and for metro predicting outreach, 8.16. A non-significant relationship was found between clerks and outreach, which produced a chi-square of .349. Table 3 presents three models assessing the effects of predictor variables librarians, clerks, and metro upon the log odds of the dependent variable outreach. Before any variables were added, the initial log likelihood statistic predicting the effect of the constant on outreach was 114.20. The first model showed the effect of the Librarians variable alone. The log likelihood for this model dropped to 94.05, and the overall model had a chi-square statistic of 20.10, significant at .05. The Wald statistic for Librarians is 10.48, significant at .05, and Nagelkerke's R^2 for this model is .281. These results suggest that as the number of librarians increases, so does the probability that the library will conduct outreach.

[Insert Table 3 about here.]

The second model presented in Table 3 includes clerks. Although clerks did not have a zero-order correlation with outreach, it was considered theoretically important enough to want to control for the effect of clerks while assessing the effect of librarians upon the odds of outreach. Once the effect of librarians was controlled, the number of clerks was found to have a significant partial correlation with outreach. The log likelihood drops to 88.79, with a block chi-square of 5.31, significant at .021. Nagelkerke's R^2 increased by 23% to .345. Results from this model suggested that it was preferable to the first for the purposes of predicting likelihood of outreach. Including the number of clerks made the model better able to predict the probability that the library will or will not conduct outreach. In this second model, the coefficient for clerks was -.09.

This negative coefficient suggested that an increase in clerks reduces the likelihood of outreach. The odds ratio for the clerks coefficient is .92; for every one-unit increase in Clerks, the odds of outreach decreased by approximately 8 percent.

The third model includes metro as well as librarians and clerks. Metro's large standard error makes the Wald statistic suspect, so a likelihood ratio test was used to compare the deviance of the model containing metro (105.00) to that of the previous model without metro (105.74). The difference between these models was not significantly different from zero, suggesting that this third model is not an improvement over the second. Metro, which had a zero-order correlation with outreach, does not have a partial correlation when librarians and clerks are taken into account. Neither does clerks have a partial correlation with outreach when controlling for Metro. This may be due to a relationship between metro and librarians which overpowers the effect of clerks.

4.3. Librarians, Clerks, and Metropolitan Status Predicting School Visits

Taking each independent variable as the sole predictor of school visits, the model chi-square for librarians was 8.51, 10.55 for clerks, and 4.73 for metro. Each model predicting the log-odds of visits was significant at the .05 level. Table 4 presents two models assessing the log odds for visits, using librarians and clerks as predictors. The initial log likelihood for visits, before adding predictors, was 118.027. The first model predicted the log odds of visits as a function of librarians. The Wald statistic for librarians was 4.98, significant at .05. The overall model had a chi square of 8.39, significant at .05, and Nagelkerke's R^2 is .121. The second model included clerks with librarians to predict the log odds of visits. The second model seemed

to be a slightly better fit than the first model. The log likelihood ratio found the models significantly different, and Nagelkerke's R^2 increased by 44%.

[Insert Table 4 about here.]

In this second model, however, the Wald statistics for neither librarians nor clerks were significant. Although they were not collinear, librarians and clerks were sufficiently correlated that controlling for one reduced the effect of the other to non-significance. To allow for this, librarians and clerks were combined to create one variable, staff. Table 5 presents two models using staff and metro to predict the log odds of visits. The initial log likelihood for this model was 118.02. The first model, in which staff alone predicts visits, was significant, with a model chi-square value of 12.28. Nagelkerke's R^2 for this model was .174, and the log likelihood of the staff model dropped to 109.64.

The second model contained both staff and metro. The overall model retained its significance, with a chi-square statistic of 13.01, significant at .05. Nagelkerke's R^2 for the expanded model increased by 5% to .183. However, the Wald statistic for metro was not significant, and the likelihood ratio test suggested that the difference between the first and second models was not significantly different from zero. These results suggest that if the total number of library staff have already been accounted for, the metropolitan status of a library adds nothing new to the likelihood that the library will conduct school visits.

[Insert Table 5 about here.]

5. Discussion

The metropolitan status of a library, when used as the only predictor variable, was a significant predictor of the likelihood of a library conducting outreach or school visits. Similarly,

when the number of librarians employed at a library was used as the sole predictor variable, it was also a significant predictor of a library's likelihood of conducting outreach and school visits. If these analyses were taken no further, the evidence would disprove the null hypotheses of no difference in outreach or school visits as a result of metropolitan status and number of librarians on staff.

As noted above, though, these two independent variables were related. Librarians were found in significantly more metropolitan areas than in non-metropolitan areas. The expanded logistic regression equations demonstrated a spurious relationship between librarians and metro. The variance in the independent variable metro was primarily accounted for by the variance of the librarians, clerks, and staff variables. In other words, outreach was more likely to happen in metropolitan libraries because they have more staff; to include the metropolitan variable after the number of staff had already been accounted for is "double-dipping." Because metropolitan libraries were more likely to have larger staffs, they were more likely to conduct outreach, but that likelihood was not based purely on the library's metropolitan status. The metro variable was directly related to the population within the library service area. It seems likely that the number of librarians and clerks employed at the library was also a product of a larger library service population. The metro variable was non-significant when combined with staff variables, suggesting that the second hypothesis, that metropolitan libraries are more likely to conduct outreach and school visits than non-metropolitan libraries, was supported only insofar as metropolitan libraries had more staff.

The number of librarians employed by a library was a powerful predictor of the likelihood of outreach. When combined with librarians, clerks had a negative effect on outreach. This seems counterintuitive – one would think that libraries with more clerks on staff would have

offered their librarians greater opportunities to conduct outreach. However, this association was explained by the staffing differences between the 67 libraries with service populations under 20,000 and the 14 libraries with service populations of 20,000 and over. Libraries with fewer librarians performed less outreach, and libraries with populations under 20,000 had fewer librarians. These libraries also had more clerks, relative to libraries with populations over 20,000. Therefore, a greater relative number of clerks, combined with a smaller relative number of librarians, was associated with less outreach. These results disprove the null hypothesis of no difference, suggesting that libraries with more librarians on staff are more likely to conduct outreach than libraries with fewer librarians on staff.

The number of librarians was also significant as the unique predictor of school visits. However, when the clerks variable was added, both librarians and clerks lost significance. The correlation between librarians and clerks was not particularly strong, but these variables may have had some collinear relationship. In order to reduce the effect of collinearity between these two variables, they were combined into one staff variable. Staff itself became a significant predictor of the odds of school visits. The hypothesis that an increase in the number of librarians would produce an increase in school visits was not rejected by these results. They may also suggest that school visitation was a duty shared among librarians and clerks, and one that happened in libraries regardless of service population size.

6. Conclusion

In looking at the factors that influence the likelihood of outreach occurring, this study makes two contributions. First, it introduces outreach as a valid topic for rigorous research. Outreach can be compared between the libraries that do practice it, and the relationship between

outreach and other public library services can be explored. The second contribution made by this article is the provision of meaningful data to support the idea that librarians make a difference (Kranich, 2000, p. 7). In the State of Arizona, the addition of one librarian at a public library service outlet makes it 52% more likely that outreach will occur, even when the number of library clerks and metropolitan status of the library are controlled. In the absence of other variables, and given historical evidence supporting their role in outreach, it can be concluded that librarians are a driving force behind outreach. A similar study could not assess the impact of staffing upon the likelihood of collection development happening, because collection development is a “universal” process, happening across all libraries (Evans, 1987, p. 18). Instead, a study would have to measure effects upon the quality of collection development, a more subjective measure than its presence or absence.

More attention needs to be paid to the factors which influence the provision of outreach services at the public library. This study eliminated one factor, metropolitan status of a library, that did not contribute to the provision of outreach and identified another, number of librarians on staff, that did. In suggesting that outreach occurs more frequently in libraries that have more staff members, these results support the theory that outreach is labor-intensive. By their very nature, libraries open to the public need to be staffed during their operating hours. A library staffed by a single person cannot simultaneously serve patrons in the building and make contact with non-users outside the facility. Even if library staff are not required to leave the building, and reach out to potential users through press releases to the newspaper or flyers mailed to the schools, time must be spent creating those outreach surrogates. Understaffed libraries, barely able to cope with current demands, may not have the means to draw in new library patrons. Further, while some library staff will be excited about going out of the building to reach

previously underserved populations, others will not. Understanding which librarians are energized by outreach may help administrators identify key staff for the provision of outreach services.

One area that demands further exploration is the role of youth services personnel. Public libraries' youth services staff have been on the forefront of outreach development, working with neighborhoods and schools since the 1880s to provide reading to children. To take but one example, playground story hours were happening in Milwaukee in 1905, almost 100 years ago (Thomas, 1990, pp. 114, 118). Due to limitations in data collection, this survey was not able to explore the contributions of youth services staff to the likelihood of outreach or school visitation.

Unfortunately, a uniform system for collecting outreach statistics is not in place. The variety of different approaches to outreach have not been categorized and collected. Large-scale empirical studies of outreach are hindered because national statistics on public library outreach are unavailable. A systematic vocabulary for outreach needs to be developed, and outreach efforts need to be included in major library data collection projects. Without this, librarians have no benchmarks against which to measure their provision of outreach services and administrators have no information on which to base their outreach-related decisions.

Other avenues to explore include the percentage of staff time that a library devotes to outreach projects, and how much of that time is contributed by professional and paraprofessional staff. Library usage statistics – patron visits, circulation, reference transactions – should be compared between high-outreach and low-outreach libraries. A clear understanding of how a library benefits from outreach in terms of usage statistics would make a compelling argument for increased funding of outreach services. Answering these questions may also explain why some outreach programs succeed and others fail. Outreach services have traditionally been viewed as

an add-on service, to be dropped during lean years and built up in times of plenty (Reese, 2002, p. 15). Library literature decries this situation, but without adequate documentation of the benefits of outreach services, in the kinds of hard numbers that administrators understand, the situation is not likely to change.

References

American Library Association. (2002, October). *Public library use: ALA library fact sheet number 6*. Retrieved February 1, 2003 from <http://www.ala.org/library/fact6.html>.

Arizona Public Library Statistics, 1998-1999. (2000). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records.

Boyce, J. I. & Boyce, B. R. (1995, Summer). Library outreach programs in rural areas. *Library Trends*, 44(1), 112-128.

Boyce, J. I. & Boyce, B. R. (2000, May). Far from the library, a special set of challenges. *American Libraries*, 31(5), 50-52.

Castagna, E. (1970). A troubled mixture: our attitudes toward the unserved as librarians in a professional capacity. In L. L. Sherrill (Ed.), *Library service to the unserved: papers presented at a library conference held at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee School of Library and Information Science, November 16-18, 1967* (pp. 15-24). New York: R. R. Bowker.

Chute, A., Kroe, E., Garner, P., Polcari, M., & Ramsey, C. J. (2002, July). *E. D. tab: Public libraries in the United States, fiscal year 2000*. Washington, D.C.: Dept. of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved February 3, 2003 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002344>.

Colson, J. C. (1975). The United States: an historical critique. In W. Martin (Ed.), *Library services to the disadvantaged* (pp. 61-82). Hamden, CT: Linnet Books.

DuBois, D. L. (1995, February). Taking it to the streets: the life and times of a children's outreach librarian. *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 69, 18-19.

Evans, G. E. (1987). *Developing library and information center collections* (2nd ed.). Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Greenberg, G. S. (2003). "On the roof of the library nearest you": America's open-air libraries, 1905-1944. In R. S. Freeman & D. M. Hovde (Eds.), *Libraries to the people: histories of outreach* (pp. 181-191). Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Kranich, N. C. (2000, October). Building advocates for 21st-century libraries. *American Libraries*, 31(9), 7.

Nauratil, M. J. (1985). *Public libraries and nontraditional clientele: the politics of special services*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

New York Public Library. (2001, October 31). *Systemwide Statistics, FY2000*. Retrieved February 3, 2003 from <http://www.nypl.org/admin/pro/stats00.html>.

Novotny, E. (2003, Summer). Library service to immigrants: the debate in the library literature, 1900-1920, and a Chicago case study. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 42(4), 342-352.

Passet, J. (1994). Itinerating libraries. In W. A. Wiegand & D. G. Davis, Jr. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Library History* (pp. 314-317). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Reese, N. (2002). The administration of outreach services. *Bookmobiles and Outreach Services*, 5, 5-16.

Rubin, R. E. (1998). *Foundations of library and information science*. New York: Neal-Schuman.

San Antonio Public Library. (n.d.). *Children's department, 3rd floor*. Retrieved February 3, 2003 from <http://www.sat.lib.tx.us/central/childrens.htm#STATISTICS>.

Seaver, B. W. (2003). The use of radio to promote the Municipal Reference Library of the City of New York. In R. S. Freeman & D. M. Hovde (Eds.), *Libraries to the people: histories of outreach* (pp. 192-202). Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Stephens, A. (2002). Formats and services currently provided by Alabama's public libraries. *Alabama Librarian*, 51(2), 5-12.

Thomas, F. H., comp. (1990). *Children's services in the American public library: a selected bibliography*. New York: Greenwood Press.

U. S. Census Bureau. (1999a, July 12). *About metropolitan areas*. Retrieved December 7, 1999 from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/estimates/aboutmetro.html>.

U. S. Census Bureau. (1999b, July). *Metropolitan areas and components, 1999, with FIPS codes*. Retrieved December 7, 1999 from <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/metro-city/99mfips.txt>.

Voss, J. (2002). Suburban library outreach services: challenges and opportunities. *Bookmobiles and Outreach Services*, 5(2), 39-52.

Watson, P. D. (2003). Valleys without sunsets: women's clubs and traveling libraries. In R. S. Freeman & D. M. Hovde (Eds.), *Libraries to the people: histories of outreach* (pp. 73-95). Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Weibel, K. (1982, December). *The evolution of library outreach 1960-75 and its effect on reader services: some considerations*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science.

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Dev.
Librarians	94	0	33	4.38	5.62
Clerks	92	0	60	5.27	8.36
Metro	94	0	1	.21	.41
Outreach	89	0	1	.65	.48
School	93	0	1	.66	.48

Table 2.

Mean Number of Librarians and Clerks by Library Service Population

	Service Population 0-4999 (n=49)		Service Population 5,000-19,999 (n=18)		Service Population 20,000-49,999 (n=9)		Service Population 50,000 and Over (n=5)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean.	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean.	Std. Dev.
Librarians	1.63	2.38	2.78	1.99	5.89	2.57	20.60	9.21
Clerks	2.12	5.18	5.40	13.78	8.17	4.14	16.5	6.32

Table 3.

Logistic Regression Results Estimating the Log-Odds for Outreach

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coefficient	Wald	Coefficient	Wald	Coefficient	Wald
Constant	-.549	2.256	-.574	2.258	-.561	2.149
Librarians	.407*	10.482	.562*	12.397	.525*	2.149
Clerks			-.087*	4.188	-.083	3.750
Metro					.470	.259
-2 Log Likelihood		94.096		88.787		88.519
Model chi-square (d.f.)		20.100 (1)		25.410 (2)		25.677
Block chi-square (d.f.)		20.100 (1)		5.310 (1)		.267 (1)
% Correct Predictions		67.0		68.2		68.2
Nagelkerke's R ²		.281		.345		.348

* Indicates that the coefficient is statistically significant at the .05 level.

Table 4.

Logistic Regression Results Estimating the Log-Odds for School Visits

Variable	Model 1		Model 2	
	Coefficient	Wald	Coefficient	Wald
Constant	-.019	.003	-.168	.256
Librarians	.180*	4.976	.104	1.432
Clerks			.107	2.602
Metro				
-2 Log Likelihood		109.639		105.737
Model chi-square		8.381 (1)		12.283 (2)
Block chi-square (d.f.)		8.381 (1)		3.901 (1)
% Correct		65.9		65.9
Nagelkerke's R ²		.121		.174

* Indicates that the coefficient is statistically significant at the .05 level.

Table 5.

Logistic Regression Results Using the Staff Variable to Estimate the Log-Odds for School Visitation

Variable	Model 1		Model 2	
	Coefficient	Wald	Coefficient	Wald
Constant	-.170	.271	-.181	.311
Staff	.106*	7.196	.092*	4.993
Metro			.618	.690
-2 Log Likelihood		105.738		105.013
Model chi-square (d.f.)		12.282 (1)		13.007 (2)
Block chi-square (d.f.)		12.282 (1)		.725 (1)
% Correct Predictions		65.9		65.9
Nagelkerke's R ²		.174		.183

* Indicates that the coefficient is statistically significant at the .05 level.