

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 099

IR 053 079

AUTHOR Ladner, Sharyn
 TITLE SLA Networking Committee Survey. Final Report.
 PUB DATE 89
 NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Special Libraries Association (80th, New York, NY, June 10-15, 1989).
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
 Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Computer Networks; *Information Networks; *Librarians; Library Associations; *Library Networks; Library Surveys; *Network Analysis; *Telecommunications; Use Studies

ABSTRACT

In 1988 the Special Libraries Association (SLA) Networking Committee conducted a survey of association members to identify important networking issues and concerns. The survey results, presented in this report, were intended to assist the SLA Board of Directors in determining future directions for the association to take with respect to networking. The questionnaire, which was designed to be self-administered, was mailed to SLA chapter presidents and "Bulletin" editors. Respondents were asked to list problems they had had with networking, what they would like SLA to do to improve networking opportunities, and related questions. A total of 113 questionnaires were received and entered into a VAX/VMS minicomputer for analysis. The analysis was designed to divide respondents from corporate, nonprofit, and government-related libraries from respondents in academic or public libraries. Results indicate that the vast majority of SLA members belong to at least one network. Special librarians belong to an average of 2.2 networks; respondents from academic libraries belong to an average of 3.2. Most frequently cited benefits of networking were related to interlibrary loan and cataloging. Although most respondents did not indicate problems associated with networking, those who did most often mentioned high costs as a concern. The committee recommends that SLA provide its members with more information and education on networking benefits and opportunities, and support network-related research. Eleven tables are attached and the survey instrument and verbatim responses to the question "Is there anything else about networking you would like us to know?" are appended. (SD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED315099

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SLA NETWORKING COMMITTEE SURVEY FINAL REPORT

By

Sharyn Ladner, Chair
SLA Networking Committee

Presented at the 80th Annual Conference of the Special Libraries Association, New York City, June 10-15, 1989.

For additional copies of this report contact: Sharyn Ladner, Otto G. Richter Library, University of Miami, P.O. Box 248214, Coral Gables, FL 33124 (305-284-4722).

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maria C. Barry

TR053079



SLA NETWORKING COMMITTEE SURVEY

FINAL REPORT

By

Sharyn Ladner, Chair

SLA Networking Committee

Presented at the 80th Annual Conference of the Special Libraries Association, New York City, June 10-15, 1989.

For additional copies of this report contact: Sharyn Ladner, Otto G. Richter Library, University of Miami, P.O. Box 248214, Coral Gables, FL 33124 (305-284-4722).

SLA NETWORKING COMMITTEE SURVEY

FINAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.1
Methodology1
Analysis.2
Results and Discussion.3
Network Participation.3
Benefits of Networking3
Problems and Barriers.4
Education and Leadership5
Members Speak Out.6
Recommendations7
Tables9
Appendix 1.	20
Appendix 2.	24

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Behavioral Science Research Corporation in Coral Gables, Florida, for donating data entry services and providing other technical assistance in support of the analysis of the SL Networking Committee survey data. I also want to acknowledge the efforts of Linda Wagenfeld and Beth Paskoff for their help in developing the survey instrument and members of the Networking Committee for help in collecting the questionnaires.

SLA NETWORKING COMMITTEE SURVEY

FINAL REPORT¹

INTRODUCTION

In 1988 the SLA Networking Committee conducted a survey of the members of SLA to identify important networking issues and concerns. The survey results would be used to advise the SLA Board of Directors as to what future directions SLA should take with respect to networking, in services to the membership, research efforts, and interaction with other library professional organizations and governmental units such as the Library of Congress' Network Advisory Committee (NAC).

The findings reported here are exploratory and should serve as a guide for further research into the networking issues and practices that affect special libraries and information centers.

METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire² was designed to be self-administered, and mailed to SLA Chapter Presidents and Bulletin Editors in the Spring of 1988 with instructions to disseminate the questionnaire in Chapter bulletins or newsletters. This first mailing generated a poor response, and a second mailing was made in the Fall and the deadline extended until November 1, 1988. On the basis of this distribution method, and since the survey was an exploratory investigation of networking activities by SLA members, the survey sample is a more valid

¹This report contains material from my article, "Networking by Special Libraries and the Role of the Special Libraries Association," Special Libraries, Spring 1989; (80(2): 118-124. Tables 3 and 6 are reprinted from the article; all other tables in this report have not previously been published.

²See Appendix 2 for a copy of the Networking Committee questionnaire.

profile of the SLA members already involved in networking than it is of the SLA membership in general.

Respondents were asked to list problems they have had with networking, what they would like SLA to do to improve networking opportunities, and anything else about networking that they considered important; in addition, respondents who stated their libraries did not belong to networks were asked for reasons why they did not belong. In a matrix of regional networks and the various benefits associated with network membership, respondents were asked to check the networks to which they belonged and the benefits associated with each network. Respondents were also given the opportunity to list local and other state-based networks in which their organizations held memberships.

ANALYSIS

A total of 113 questionnaires were received and entered into a VAX/VMS minicomputer for analysis. The analysis was designed to control by major type of library, dividing the respondents from corporate, non-profit, or government-related libraries from the respondents in academic or public libraries or who were otherwise employed.

Among the survey responses, 41% came from corporate libraries, 17% from non-profit organizations, 12% from government-related organizations, 26% came from academic institutions or affiliates, and 4% had other occupations (see Table 1). Ten percent of the respondents were in academic medical or hospital libraries; these surveys were assigned to either the academic or non-profit category. Because of the small sample size, all of the corporate, non-profit, and governmental libraries were aggregates into the special library category for analysis; data for respondents in academic libraries are reported separately.³

³Tables 10 and 11 list SLA Chapter and Division affiliations of respondents, providing geographic and subject interest distributions of the sample. They also serve to illustrate the non-representativeness of the sample.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Network Participation

The vast majority of the SLA members responding to the survey reported membership in at least one network. This included 77% of the respondents in special libraries and 90% of the academic librarians (Table 1). Respondents in special libraries holding network memberships belong to an average of 2.2 networks; respondents in academic libraries reported an average of 3.2 networks per library (see Table 2).

Table 3 lists the state/provincial and regional networks and bibliographic utilities reported by the special and academic library groups, as well as networks within the state or province and local cooperatives. As expected, a substantially higher proportion of respondents from academic libraries are members of state/provincial or regional networks and the bibliographic utilities than are the special libraries in the sample. Within a state or province, however, there is little difference between the two groups: about one-third of the respondents in each group reported membership in at least one local network.

Table 4 provides detailed itemizations of networks which comprise the network categories of OCLC regional networks, subject networks, E-mail networks, and other state-based or provincial networks listed in Table 3. This table is included only to illustrate the diversity of network memberships reported by survey respondents: it cannot be considered in any way representative of network participation by SLA members' libraries because of the non-representative response to the survey by the SLA membership.

Benefits of Networking

Table 5 displays the networking benefits listed by respondents whose libraries are members of networks. Among both special library and academic library respondents whose libraries hold memberships in the large state or regional networks, cataloging and interlibrary loan were most frequently cited as the two top benefits of networking. For both academic and special libraries in local and sub-state networks, interlibrary loan was the most frequently mentioned benefit.

There are interesting differences in perceived benefits of networking reported by the academic and special librarians

whose libraries are members of state or regional networks. Special librarians mentioned interlibrary loan (mentioned by 66%) as a benefit of networking more frequently than they did cataloging (mentioned by 52%); the academic librarians considered these two benefits about equal (81% mentioned ILL, 85% mentioned cataloging). Collection development and bibliographic information, benefits mentioned by 62% of the academic librarians, were mentioned by only 20% of the special librarians. Likewise, 42% of the academic librarians mentioned reference assistance as a benefit, but only 21% of the special librarians did.

The popularity of interlibrary loan as a benefit of network membership for both academic and special librarians is supported by the data displayed in Table 2, which shows the numbers of networks joined for specific benefits: special librarians report that they hold an average of 1.5 network memberships for ILL; their colleagues in academe report an average of 1.8 networks used for ILL. Note also that academic librarians report an average of 1.5 networks used for cataloging, compared to only 0.9 reported by special librarians.

If these perceived differences in benefits between academic and special librarians are real and not an artifact of the sample, this finding has serious implications for network participation by special libraries in the next decade. If special librarians see interlibrary loan as the primary benefit of networking, and there are other sources available for obtaining materials that compete successfully with resource-sharing networks and cooperatives, special libraries may be more likely to opt out of the system. Academic libraries, on the other hand, since they depend on their state/provincial or regional networks for shared cataloging, collection development activities, and for reference help in addition to ILL may be more likely to retain their network memberships.

Problems and Barriers

Tables 6-8 list networking problems experienced by respondents along with their recommendations for improvement. Over half the respondents in each group did not indicate that they had any problems, or specifically mentioned that they had not encountered any problems, indicating that on the whole; a majority of respondents appeared to be satisfied with their networks.

Costs, however, are a concern to 19% of the special librarians and 31% of those in academe (see Table 6). For example, a special librarian from the Philadelphia area wrote: "I responded to an OCLC ad targeted to small libraries and received a wealth of data from PALINET. The cost was far too high for a small library like mine (2,000 volumes)." An archivist mentioned the "cost of putting material . . . [into a] national database." A medical librarian stated: "We did not join until state grant funds became available to subsidize equipment and installation costs."

The high cost of networking was also the major reason for not joining a network, mentioned by 42% of the 19 special librarians whose libraries are not involved in a network.⁴ The other reason, mentioned by 26% of these respondents, was a perceived lack of need to network (see Table 9 for detail). Cost reduction measures, such as negotiating group discounts to OCLC or ALANET, or supporting legislation to reduce telecommunications costs, sponsoring local consortia to share costs, or making networking financially feasible for small special libraries, were suggested by about 10% of the respondents as something SLA could do to improve networking opportunities (see Table 8).

Technical problems, such as lack of facsimile communication or other delivery problems, poor response time, inadequate telecommunications or outdated records, were mentioned by 14% of the respondents in special libraries and 10% of those in academic libraries (see Table 7). Residual problems such as governance, legislative restrictions, or limited usefulness were mentioned by less than 10% of the respondents in each group.

Education and Leadership

In answer to the question, "What would SLA have to do to improve networking opportunities for you?", 46% of the special library cohort and 34% of the academic library group stated they wanted SLA to provide education or information on opportunities and benefits of networking, including articles in SLA publications (see Table 8 for detail). Some respondents' comments were quite specific: one special librarian suggested that SLA could "promote sharing of information between libraries in the Philadelphia metropolitan area for

⁴Only three respondents from academic libraries reported non-participation in networks, a number too small for meaningful analysis.

ILL purposes." Another recommended "a nationwide SLA network similar to FEDLINK's ALIX." The need for education was not limited to librarians: a respondent from academe proposed "education for government officials, who make dollars available for network activities, with relation to the benefits of networks."

Both academic and special librarians, incidentally, view education as a benefit of network membership. Educational services were mentioned by 39% of the special librarians and 42% of those in academic libraries as a benefit to belonging to state/provincial or regional networks (see Table 5).

Suggestions involving SLA's leadership role in network planning or research, both with existing networks as well as government agencies responsible for library networking functions, were made by about 12% of the respondents (see Tables 6 and 8). One academic librarian recommended that SLA "increase the profile of non-public, non-academic libraries in state network planning." A special librarian from Canada suggested SLA "explore/research/develop innovative networking in Canada" including alternatives to UTLAS.

Members Speak Out

The survey question, "Is there anything else about networking you would like us to know?" provided some thought-provoking comments.⁵ As one respondent who had recently moved to another city put it:

"I would like to be able to have a common database of local materials -- similar to what I had access to in Cleveland It was free access to OCLC through membership in the local library consortium. I'd settle for just knowing which materials are where!"

Another special librarian, however, cautioned:

"Networks offer/require yet another level of opportunities and necessities for participation. Networks compete for the time of members versus library organizations (national and local) and other networks. Networks offer significant professional development opportunities with relevance to daily operational issues -- and working with

⁵See Appendix 1 for additional responses to this question.

colleagues. In short, SLA must compete with networks for membership participation and attention."

Finally, we should pay attention to the following observations made by this special librarian:

"The world today becomes increasingly complex. Most people are being stretched to their limits at work, with family, social, civic and professional responsibilities adding another personal burden may be difficult to endure. Networking should be an aid in reducing stress, not an additional obligation or time constraint."

RECOMMENDATIONS

- * **Special librarians -- and SLA -- need to become more proactive in networking issues:**
 - * Locally, SLA Chapters can monitor networking activities within their geographic area as well as act as an advocacy group with their state or provincial agency responsible for networking.
 - * Nationally, SLA can serve as a more visible and effective voice in networking issues through representation on the NAC, by monitoring legislation, by supporting standards, and by coordinating efforts with other national library organizations such as ALA, CLA, ASCLA, ACRL, MLA and AALL.
- * **SLA must respond to the educational and information needs of its members.** The biggest need expressed by the survey respondents was for information and education on networking opportunities and benefits. SLA can fill this need through publications such as journal articles, information kits, or how-to manuals; through promotion of networking at both local meetings and annual conferences; by providing opportunities for continuing education; and perhaps also by providing direct consultation and technical expertise to network planning groups and agencies.

- * **SLA needs to support research on networking.** We still do not know how many special librarians participate in networks. We don't know very much about special library involvement in state-based and local networking. We don't know how the costs of networking can be controlled to the point where networking becomes economically feasible for the small, one-professional library. We need to find answers to these questions to more effectively serve our members.

Table 1
RESPONDENTS' ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION
AND NETWORK PARTICIPATION

Type of Library	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample	Percent in Network
Special Libraries	79	70%	77%
Corporate	46	41%	72%
Nonprofit	19	17%	79%
Government	14	12%	93%
Academic Libraries	29	26%	90%
Other Organizations	5	4%	100%

Table 2
AVERAGE NUMBERS OF NETWORKS JOINED
BY REGION AND BENEFIT

Network Characteristic	Special Libraries	Academic Libraries
<hr/>		
<u>Average number of networks:</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>3.2</u>
State or multi-state	1.5	2.4
Regional (within state)	0.2	0.3
Local (metro area)	0.5	0.5
(number of respondents)	(59)	(26)
<u>Average number of networks for:</u>		
Interlibrary loan	1.5	1.8
Cataloging	0.9	1.5
Electronic mail	0.4	0.7
Discounts	0.5	0.5
Gateways	0.1	0.3
Education	0.9	0.9
Reference assistance	0.4	0.9
Bibliographic information, collection development	0.5	1.0
Other benefits	0.4	0.4
(number of respondents)	(52)	(24)
<hr/>		

Table 3

**RESPONDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN NETWORKS AND
BIBLIOGRAPHIC UTILITIES - SUMMARY DATA^a**

Network ^b	Special Libraries	Academic Libraries

(Number of respondents)	(79)	(29)
Membership in any network	77%	90%
State/provincial or regional networks	63%	86%
OCLC	34%	59%
OCLC regional networks	35%	69%
FEDLINK	13%	3%
RLIN, RLG	4%	21%
CLASS	5%	3%
Medical or other subject networks	6%	14%
E-mail networks	2%	17%
Other state or multi-state	13%	21%
Networks within state or province	14%	21%
Local (metro area) networks	33%	31%

^aAdapted from Table 1 in Special Libraries, op cit., p. 120.

^bMultiple responses possible; percents may total more than 100%.

Table 4

**RESPONDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN NETWORKS AND
BIBLIOGRAPHIC UTILITIES - DETAIL**

Network^a	Special Libraries	Academic Libraries

(Number of respondents)	(79)	(29)
<u>OCLC regional networks</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>69%</u>
AMIGOS	2%	3%
CAPCON	2%	0
ILLINET	2%	3%
MLC	10%	14%
MLNC	2%	3%
OHIONET	2%	10%
PACNET	1%	3%
PALINET	9%	10%
SOLINET	1%	21%
WILS	1%	0
<u>Medical or other subject networks</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>14%</u>
ABANET	1%	3%
Regional medical library system	0	7%
DOCLINE	0	3%
Michigan Health Science Lib. Assn.	1%	0
Ohio Health Info. Network	1%	0
Canadian Inst. Sci-Tech. Union List	1%	0
Botanical & Horticultural Libraries	1%	0
<u>E-mail networks</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>17%</u>
Dialog	1%	0
BITNET	0	10%
ALANET	0	3%
ARPANET	1%	3%
<u>Other state/provincial/regional</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>21%</u>
UTLAS	2%	0
DOBIS	2%	0
MIDBUG	6%	3%
Mt. Valley Library System	0	3%
PHILSOM (serials control)	0	3%
LIAS	0	3%
MTS	0	3%
FCLA	0	3%
WLN	1%	0

^aMultiple responses possible; percents may total more than 100%.

Table 5

**NETWORKING BENEFITS
(PERCENT OF NETWORKERS ANSWERING "YES")**

Network^a	Special Libraries	Academic Libraries

(Number of respondents)	(61)	(26)
<u>State/Provincial or Regional Networks:</u>	<u>82%</u>	<u>96%</u>
Interlibrary loan	66%	81%
Cataloging	52%	85%
Electronic mail	23%	35%
Discounts	31%	31%
Gateways	5%	27%
Education	39%	42%
Reference assistance	21%	46%
Bibliographic information, collection development	20%	62%
Other benefits	20%	23%
<u>Within State/Province or Local Networks:</u>	<u>57%</u>	<u>46%</u>
Interlibrary loan	34%	35%
Cataloging	2%	0
Electronic mail	3%	12%
Discounts	13%	15%
Gateways	0	0
Education	25%	19%
Reference assistance	13%	12%
Bibliographic information, collection development	16%	8%
Other benefits	13%	8%

^aMultiple responses possible; percents may total more than 100%.

Table 6
NETWORKING PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR IMPROVEMENT^a

Category ^b	Special Libraries	Academic Libraries
(Number of respondents)	(79)	(29)
<u>Networking Problems:</u>		
Cost	19%	31%
Technical problems	14%	10%
ILL problems	8%	3%
Not useful, no need	6%	3%
Inflexible, too bureaucratic	5%	7%
External restrictions	5%	3%
No time to participate	4%	3%
Lack of training	2%	3%
<u>Recommendations for Improvement:</u>		
Education and information	46%	34%
Reduce or monitor costs	10%	7%
Planning, leadership	6%	10%
Innovations, research	5%	3%
Union lists, directories	2%	0
Other suggestions	4%	0

^aReprinted from Special Libraries, op cit., p. 121.

^bMultiple responses possible; percents may total more than 100%.

Table 7

NETWORKING PROBLEMS - DETAIL

Problem ^a	Special Libraries	Academic Libraries
(Number of respondents)	(79)	(29)
Cost	19%	31%
<u>Technical problems</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>10%</u>
Unresponsive to needs of sp. lib.	4%	0
Unavailable to special libraries	1%	0
Telecommunications, slow response	6%	0
Delivery problems (e.g., fax, mail)	2%	0
Records not up to date	0	3%
Library lacks technology	0	7%
<u>ILL problems</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>3%</u>
New ILL code	0	3%
Too many requests	1%	0
Confidentiality; ILL to competitors	5%	0
Borrow but get no requests	1%	0
<u>Not useful, no need</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>3%</u>
Limited need; get items elsewhere	4%	3%
Declining participation reduces use	2%	0
<u>No input, governance problems</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>7%</u>
Too bureaucratic and inflexible	4%	0
No input in decision making	1%	0
No direct access to holdings	0	3%
OCLC copyright restrictions	0	3%
<u>External restrictions</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>3%</u>
Legislative restrictions	2%	3%
Selling networking to management	1%	0
Cataloging requirements	1%	0
No time to participate	4%	3%
Lack of training	2%	3%
No problem mentioned	56%	59%

^aMultiple responses possible; percents may total more than 100%.

Table 8

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT - DETAIL

Improvement ^a	Special Libraries	Academic Libraries
(Number of respondents)	(79)	(29)
<u>Education/information about networking</u>	<u>46%</u>	<u>34%</u>
Education on opportunities, benefits	28%	24%
Information, publicity on networking	10%	3%
Report networking experiences	4%	3%
Provide technical expertise	1%	0
Facilitate communication	2%	0
Provide consulting support	0	3%
<u>Reduce or monitor networking costs</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>7%</u>
Sponsor local consortia to share cost	2%	0
Negotiate group discounts	2%	0
Legislation to reduce telecommuni- cations costs	2%	3%
Monitor costs under new ILL code	0	3%
Reduce costs for small libraries	2%	0
<u>Planning, leadership role</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>10%</u>
Encourage relevant legislation	2%	0
Increase special libraries in planning	0	3%
Provide leadership in state planning	1%	7%
Provide guidelines and policies	2%	0
<u>Innovations, research</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>3%</u>
Nationwide SLA network	1%	0
Develop innovative networking	1%	3%
Develop subject-based info. exchange	2%	0
Union lists, directories	2%	0
<u>Other</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>0</u>
Promote serials librarianship	1%	0
Fight privatization of federal libs.	1%	0
Provide equipment for networking	1%	0
Pick one e-mail system for SLA	1%	0
None mentioned	48%	52%

^aMultiple responses possible; percents may total more than 100%.

Table 9

REASONS FOR NOT JOINING A NETWORK

Improvement	Special Libraries	Academic Libraries
(Number of respondents)	(19)	(3)
Cost	42%	33%
No need to network; get what I need informally	26%	33%
Don't know of any networks	10%	0
Proprietary, confidential information	5%	0
Management won't let me join	5%	0
Things I need aren't available through networks	5%	0
Not sure what is meant by "networking"	0	33%
Percent of total sample not involved in networks:	23%	10%

Table 10
RESPONDENTS' SLA CHAPTER AFFILIATION^a

Chapter	# in Sample	% in Sample	% of Total Membership^b
Arizona	3	3%	0.7%
Boston	1	1%	5.8%
Central Ohio	5	4%	0.9%
Central Pennsylvania	3	3%	0.5%
Cincinnati	3	3%	0.6%
Cleveland	3	3%	1.6%
Eastern Canada	1	1%	2.2%
Florida	3	3%	1.8%
Illinois	4	4%	5.3%
Louisiana	5	4%	0.7%
Michigan	15	13%	2.9%
Mid-South	3	3%	0.3%
North Carolina	1	1%	1.8%
Pacific Northwest	2	2%	2.4%
Philadelphia	20	18%	3.2%
St. Louis Metro	4	4%	1.1%
San Francisco Bay	3	3%	5.1%
Sierra Nevada	3	3%	0.7%
Southern Appalachian	3	3%	0.5%
Southern California	5	4%	4.9%
Virginia	2	2%	0.9%
Washington, D.C.	10	9%	6.9%
Western Canada	2	2%	1.1%
Western Michigan	8	7%	0.5%
Wisconsin	1	1%	1.3%
Total	113	100%	--

^aThere were no respondents from the following Chapters, accounting for 43% of the membership in 1986: Alabama, Baltimore, Connecticut Valley, European, Fairfield County, Georgia, Hawaiian Pacific, Heart of America, Hudson Valley, Indiana, Kentucky, Long Island, Mid-Missouri, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York City, Oklahoma, Omaha Area, Oregon, Pittsburgh, Princeton-Trenton, Rhode Island, Rio Grande, Rocky Mountain, South Carolina, Texas, Toronto, Upstate New York.

^bChapter membership statistics were obtained from the 1986 SLA Member Survey Final Report (Washington, D.C.: SLA, September 1986).

Table 11

RESPONDENTS' SLA DIVISION AFFILIATION^a

Division ^b	# in Sample	% in Sample	% of Total Membership ^c
Advertising & Marketing	2	2%	4%
Aerospace	2	2%	2%
Biological Sciences	6	5%	4%
Business & Finance	18	16%	14%
Chemistry	3	3%	2%
Engineering	5	4%	4%
Environmental Information	2	2%	1%
Geography & Map	2	2%	2%
Information Technology	15	13%	12%
Insurance & Employee Benefits	3	3%	2%
Library Management	22	19%	9%
Military Librarians	4	4%	2%
Museums, Arts & Humanities	2	2%	4%
Natural Resources	1	1%	2%
News	4	4%	3%
Petroleum & Energy Resources	5	4%	2%
Pharmaceutical	3	3%	2%
Physics-Astronomy-Mathematics	5	4%	1%
Publishing	2	2%	2%
Public Utilities	1	1%	1%
Science-Technology	13	12%	9%
Social Science	5	4%	5%
Telecommunications	1	1%	2%
Transportation	1	1%	1%
None listed	22	19%	--
Total	113	100%	

^aThere were no respondents from the following Divisions: Education; Food, Agriculture & Nutrition; Metals/Materials; Nuclear Science; Picture.

^bMultiple responses possible; percents may total more than 100%.

^cDivision membership statistics were obtained from the 1986 SLA Member Survey Final Report (Washington, D.C.: SLA, September 1986).

APPENDIX 1

Following are verbatim responses to the question: "IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE ABOUT NETWORKING YOU WOULD LIKE US TO KNOW?"¹

TYPE	COMMENT
Special	I would like to be able to have a common database of local materials - similar to what I had access to in Cleveland, Ohio. [respondent now in D.C.] It was free access to OCLC through membership in the local library consortium. I'd settle for just knowing which materials are where!
Academic	Be encouraging to Archivist and allow us time to be comfortable with automation and the value of networking.
Special	The world today becomes increasingly complex. Most people are being stretched to their limits at work, with family, social, civic and professional responsibilities adding another personal burden may be difficult to endure. Networking should be an aid in reducing stress not an additional obligation or time constraint.
Special	Like apple pie, networking is a popular concept, but in practice, "what's in it for me" often leads to non-participation - networking seems to work better among similar types of libraries rather than multitype. ILL can be accomplished without belonging to a network (here, at least). reference assistance was our justification for joining BAYNET, but the closure of the reference center to all but public libraries erased that benefit.
Special	A real help in ILL activities even though speed sometimes requires using manual methods as does using organizations not part of our network (OCLC).
Special	Copyright of downloaded programs, etc.

¹Responses are edited to ensure respondent confidentiality.

TYPE	COMMENT
Special	FEDLINK provides us with the opportunity to acquire services and goods via one transfer of monies, bypassing the local contracting office and its rules, etc. Cataloging and using it for ILL to locate materials for loan has provided us a great service through OCLC. It provided us with records in machine readable form so we could extract them for our local system.
Special	Do you consider PRILL a network? If not, define networking?
Special	Respondent included photocopy of the last page of the SLA Salary Survey and asked: should Networking be included in this next time?
Special	I use low-cost or free services available locally - Arizona State Univ; Ariz. ILL Center; the low volume of requests from my library makes most fee-based networks impractical.
Special	I would like to have standard rates set for faxing. I am a net borrower of ILL services. I would like to pay so that I am not taking advantage of other libraries when I request an article by fax.
Special	I have been pleased with the networks I am presently involved in (FEDLINK, OCLC, MLC, etc.). As a one-person library manager, I have enjoyed the opportunities and help they have given. In the past I have been involved with the Missouri Network and MINITEX. Both provided services which I would never have been able to obtain on my own.
Academic	Believe they should be used more by librarians, but many who are not part of large, research institutions do not have access/are not aware of them.
Academic	We all should do more communicating through electronic mail.

TYPE	COMMENT
Special	Networks offer/require yet another level of opportunities and necessities for participation. Networks compete for the time of members versus library associations (national and local) and other networks. Networks offer significant professional development opportunities with relevance to daily operational issues - and working with colleagues. In short, SLA must compete with networks for membership participation and attention.
Academic	Not-for-profit networks are more beneficial to members at less cost.
Special	I have found that all networks are helpful and each one provides a valuable service which I otherwise would not have.
Special	I have not been too involved, but my limited involvement has been satisfactory.
Academic	How are "networks" defined here? They vary from very loose, informal cooperation to highly structured.
Special	Networks need to make their personal computer software available for the Apple Macintosh.
Academic	This library acts as a resource library for other area libraries in the area of medical and veterinary sciences.
Special	I do an incredible amount of "networking" by telephone, much more than I ever did in a univ. library. I use all the association and division directories - both library associations and petroleum ones too.
Special	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OCLC access for cataloging and ILL is important. 2. Directory of libraries and librarians in St. Louis area is excellent!

TYPE	COMMENT
Other	I am responsible for a multi-type library resource-sharing network of 130 libraries. If many restrictions are put on continued use of LSCA Title III funds for this purpose, who will pick up the slack? As we all know, there's "stretched" funding on all levels - state, local, individual. Let's hope we don't give our citizens a taste of great library service (i.e., document delivery) and then withdraw it.

APPENDIX 2

NETWORKING COMMITTEE SURVEY FORM

MEMO TO: SLA Members
FROM: SLA Networking Committee
SUBJECT: SLA Networking Survey

The SLA Networking Committee is charged with monitoring networking opportunities, challenges, and legislation on behalf of the SLA membership. To help us identify for the association things it can do to aid you, please take a few minutes to answer the following questions regarding your networking activities and mail the completed survey form before November 1, 1988, to:

Sharyn Ladner, Chair, SLA Networking Committee
Reference Department
University of Miami Richter Library
P.O. Box 248214
Coral Gables, FL 33124

=====

Name: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

SLA Chapter(s): _____

SLA Division(s): _____

1. Are you involved in any networks? _____ yes _____ no
If not, why? _____

2. What problems have you had with networking (e.g., costs, legislated restrictions, etc.)? Be as specific as possible.
(1) _____
(2) _____
(3) _____
(4) _____



3. What would the Special Libraries Association have to do for you to improve your networking opportunities (e.g., encourage enactment of relevant legislation, provide education regarding networking opportunities, etc.)? Be as specific as possible.

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

4. Is there anything else about networking you would like us to know?

5. Do you belong to any of the following formal networks or consortia and what are the chief benefits you realize from membership? (Check appropriate boxes in matrix below; see last page for Network Codes.)

NETWORK	BENEFITS									
	ILL	Cataloging	Electronic Mail	Discounts	Gateways	Education	Reference Assistance	Bib. Info.	Coll. Devp.	Other
_____ ILLINET										
_____ InCOLSA										
_____ MLC										
_____ MINITEX										
_____ MLNC										
_____ NEBASE										
_____ OCLC										
_____ OHIONET										
_____ PACNET										
_____ PALINET										
_____ PRLC										
_____ RLG										
_____ SOLINET										
_____ SUNY/OCLC										
_____ WLN										
_____ WILS										
_____ AMIGOS										
_____ BCR										
_____ CAPCON										
_____ CLASS										
_____ FEDLINK										

5. (CONTINUED) Do you belong to any of the following formal network or consortia and what are the chief benefits you realize from membership? Please write in name of network and check benefits.

NETWORK	ILL	Cataloging	Electronic Mail	Discounts	Gateways	Education	Reference Assistance	Bib. Info.	Coll. Info. Devp.	Other
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Other state or provincial networks (e.g., MIDBUG in Michigan):

-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Regional (within a state/province, e.g., LAKENET in Michigan):

-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Local (e.g., within a metro area):

-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

NETWORK CODES:

BCR - Bibliographical Ctr. for Research
 CAPCON - Capital Consortium
 CLASS - Coop. Lib. Agency for Systems & Services
 FEDLINK - Federal Lib. & Info. Netwk.
 ILLINET - Ill. lib. & Info. Netwk.
 INCOLSA - Indiana Coop. Lib. Svcs. Auth.
 MLC - Michigan Lib. Consortium
 MINITEX - Minn. Interlibrary Tele. Exch.
 MINC - Missouri Lib. Netwk. Corp.

NEBASE - Nebraska
 NELNET - New England Lib. & Info. Netwk.
 OCLC - Online Computer Lib. Ctr.
 PACNET - OCLC Pacific Netwk.
 PALINET - Phila. Area Lib. Netwk.
 PRLC - Pittsburgh Reg'l Lib. Ctr.
 RLG - Research Libraries Group
 SOLINET - Southeastern Lib. & Info. Netwk.
 SUNY/OCLC - State Univ. of New York
 WLN - Western Library Network
 WILS - Wisconsin Lib. Netwk.