DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 843 IR 055 317

AUTHOR Gamble, Lydia J.
TITLE Statistical Analysis of the Interlibrary Loan Borrowing Patrons of the Kent State University Library and Their OhioLINK Suppliers for Fiscal Year 1992-1993.
PUB DATE May 94
NOTE 36p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Libraries; *Computer Networks; Higher Education; *Interlibrary Loans; Library Statistics; Reprography; State Libraries; Statistical Analysis; *Users (Information); User Satisfaction (Information)
IDENTIFIERS Document Delivery; Kent State University OH; *OhioLINK

ABSTRACT

This study examined the interlibrary loan borrowing activity with OhioLINK libraries for Kent State University during the fiscal year 1992-1993. The study also examined the importance of automating interlibrary loan's statistical data. A total of 7,034 requests were made to participating OhioLINK libraries during this time period, and the 26 OhioLINK suppliers used during the fiscal year provided service to 51 departments. It is hoped that the descriptive analysis of these requests will enable the Interlibrary Loan department to provide better service and to provide useful information for collection development. Information acquired in the study may also prove useful in obtaining human and other resources to carry out the function of information supplier. Cross-tabulations were performed using the variables of university department, format of the material (book or photocopy), status of borrower (undergraduate, graduate student, faculty, or staff), and OhioLINK supplier. Results revealed several trends in the materials borrowed and the supplier used, as well as the department doing the requesting. Five data tables are included. (Contains 16 references.) (Author)

IR

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE INTERLIBRARY LOAN BORROWING PATRONS OF THE KENT STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY AND THEIR OHIOLINK SUPPLIERS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992/1993

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Library Science

by

Lydia J. Gamble

May 1994

ABSTRACT

This study examined the Interlibrary Loan borrowing activity with OhioLINK libraries for Kent State University during the fiscal year 1992-1993. The study also examined the importance of automating interlibrary loan's statistical data. A total of 7034 requests were made to participating OhioLINK libraries during this time period. There were twenty-six OhioLINK suppliers used during the 1992-1993 fiscal year which provided service to fifty-one departments. It is hoped that the descriptive analysis of these requests will enable the Interlibrary Loan department to provide better service and to provide useful information for collection development. Information acquired in the study may also prove useful in obtaining human and other resources to carry out the function of information supplier. Cross-tabulations were performed using the variables of university department, format of the material (book or photocopy), status (undergraduate, graduate student, faculty, or staff) and OhioLINK supplier. Results indicated several trends in the material borrowed and the supplier used, as well as the department doing the requesting. Five data tables are included.

Master's Research Paper By
Lydia J. Gamble
MA, Kent State University, 1988
M.L.S., Kent State University, 1994

Approved by

Advisor Lars Bullers Date 4-13-94

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Interlibrary Loan Department of the Kent State University Library has undergone many technological changes over the past several years. Having originally been part of the Reference Department, Interlibrary Loan began its automation with the purchase of an M300 OCLC terminal exactly ten years ago. The next step in automating was the advent of NOTIS, the library's online public access catalog and circulation system, which Interlibrary Loan started to use for its lending functions in April, 1988.

The unit understood the need for automating further to keep up with the growing requests for materials not owned by the university. In May, 1988, Interlibrary Loan began testing SAVEIT, a database management program designed by Case Western Reserve University for its Interlibrary Loan operations. Among its features are statistics reports on overall lending and borrowing activity and a collection development report. SAVEIT also permits the entering of non-OCLC mail requests. No longer having to spend laborious hours calculating by hand the numerous OCLC and mail requests for materials, this freed the staff to devote more time to giving better service to patrons.

As activity increased with the advent of online services, CD-ROMs, and other indexing tools, the unit opted to become an

independent entity and joined with the microforms center to become the Periodical and Information Access Services Department in January of 1990. The statistics kept on SAVEIT helped prove to the administration that the department was capable of being a stand-alone unit. For example, annual reports from the department from 1982 to the present show a large increase in borrowing activity.

FISCAL YEAR	BORROWING REQUESTS
1982-1983	5706
1984-1984	7794
1984-1985	8531
1985-1986	6896
1986-1987	8490
1987-1988	7809
1988-1989	8613
1989-1990	10,006
1990-1991	13,677
1991-1992	14,851
1992-1993	14,749

These figures show an increase of 43% from 1982-1990 and almost three times the amount of requests were received from 1982 compared to 1992.

According to the Office of the Registrar of Kent State University (Fifteen Day Enrollment Statistics, 1992 and 1993), the enrollment for the period of study was:

Summer 1992	
Graduate	6458
Undergraduate	8125
Academic Year 1992-1993	
Graduate	5254
Undergraduate	18,845
Summer 1993	
Graduate	2795
Undergraduate	3313
Total Fiscal Year 1992-1993	
Graduate	14,507
Undergraduate	30,283

These figures represent the possible number of patrons that could have required Interlibrary Loan services during the 1992-1993 fiscal year.

The Ohio Board of Regents began to study the increase in interlibrary loan activity as well as the growing need for space and lack of funds to purchase materials and in 1986 began to implement planning for the Ohio Access System (OLAS). This system changed its name to OLIS and then finally became the Ohio Library Information Network (OhioLINK). OhioLINK is the collaboration of

seventeen libraries and all of their respective branch libraries:

Kent State University
University of Akron
Cleveland State University
Ohio University
Ohio State University
University of Cincinnati
Miami University
University of Dayton
University of Toledo
Youngstown State University
Shawnee State University
Central State University
Wright State University
Bowling Green State University
State Library of Ohio
Northeast Ohio College of Medicine
Ohiolink central database

Sanville (1993b) states that "by the end of 1995, the OhioLINK electronic system will include forty-one institutions serving over 440,000 students, or over 325,000 full-time equivalents " (Sanville 1993b, 11). The project began in the mid-1980s and on July 1, 1993 all OhioLINK libraries were to be considered as part of the collaboration with all of its benefits, including a delivery service with Pony Express. The service plans not only to provide combined access to the 19,000,000 combined records of the seventeen universities' online catalogs, but also serve as a link to several reference databases - ABI Inform, Periodical Abstracts and Newspaper Abstracts. In 1994 they plan to institute patron-initiated requesting capabilities.

Statement of the Problem

It is evident that the newly created OhioLINK project has already impacted the Interlibrary Loan operations at Kent State University. As the faculty, students and staff of Kent State University have the opportunity to view the records of these linked libraries, they will want to retrieve more of these materials. Currently, incoming requests are searched on OhioLINK to determine if an item is owned by the system before it is ordered elsewhere. It is absolutely essential for Kent State University to review the past increases in activity and to look at other trends in borrowing activity such as high percentages of photocopies ordered versus loans, or a certain department or status requesting more of a particular item, in order to plan strategically for human and other resources in the coming year and to carry out its function as an information supplier. The use of patron statistics would enable the department to determine whether its clientele rely more on returnables (books) or non-returnables (photocopies). It would also determine whether better interviewing techniques are needed, whether some departments rely more heavily on certain institutions, which suppliers provide more of the above services, and would even show the strengths and weaknesses of each supplier.

Statistics from OCLC for the fiscal year of 1992-1993 indicate that OhioLINK libraries initiated 151,792 requests and received

301,053 requests (Sanville 1993a). Of these transactions, Kent State University was ranked as the highest borrower. These totals include all of the institutions using OCLC, although they did prove OhioLINK as a whole to be a net lender to "non-OhioLINK Ohio academic, public, corporate, medical and other libraries, as well as to out of state libraries" (Sanville 1993a, 1).

According to Sanville (1993a):

> One striking fact is the dominance of photocopying over original items in the lending of most institutions, which makes the fact that OhioLINK is checking into document delivery valid. Document delivery services are being used via OCLC and the internet and OhioLINK is negotiating with OCLC for its ArticleFirst database as well as UMI's multi-access image delivery system. (Sanville 1993a, 1)

These quick delivery methods would much improve service. According to Hawks (1992), it is expected that a large portion of the ILL needs of the institutions will be met within the system.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the borrowing patron statistics from the fiscal year 1992-1993 of Kent State University. A major objective is to determine the borrowing characteristics of those using Interlibrary Loan and to analyze the service provided to these borrowers by OhioLINK libraries. It is hoped that the knowledge of their strengths and weaknesses would ultimately provide better service for patrons and provide useful information for collection development and management.

Limitations of the Study

The study only looks at Kent State University's Interlibrary Loan borrowing records for the fiscal year of 1992-1993. The official start of the delivery system among OhioLINK libraries was not initiated until November 8, 1993. This new delivery service could show an increase in even more activity for fiscal year 1993-1994.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

A search of the current library literature reveals several exemplary articles on interlibrary loan and document delivery and the importance of automating statistics for its functions. Mary Jackson, head of Interlibrary Loan Services at the University of Pennsylvania has written several articles discussing the resource sharing needs of the 90s and beyond. Jackson (1990) describes the proliferation of electronic advances that have affected work done in interlibrary loan, and how access is becoming an alternative to ownership in many libraries. She looks at how the patron must now be offered alternative sources instead of just the typical interlibrary loan transaction and how these sources affect not only interlibrary loan, but the entire library. She also mentions how direct patron access will shape what the interlibrary loan department of the future will look like.

Jackson (1992) specifically targets the University of Pennsylvania's methods and shows how their integration into the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) consortium has created a potential increase in interlibrary loan activity and how the members reexamining this activity increase has led the organization

to reduce costs and increase speed using these network capabilities.

According to Jackson (1990), the advent of CD-ROM technology has theoretically increased the use of interlibrary loan. During the 1989-1990 fiscal year at the University of Pennsylvania, their borrowing had increased by 11% over the previous year and showed a 45% increase in the past five years.

Staff members at the University of Illinois at Urbana looked at its interlibrary loan system to determine how joining OCLC had affected its interlibrary loan usage (Potter 1986). They determined that there was a definite increase in usage of almost 300% in three years. The resource sharing demands placed on their department determined the need for better accessiblity and increased networking. Although the online circulation system at the University of Illinois at Urbana is not quite the same as that of OhioLINK, the process of interpretation of data is basically the same.

Bluh (1993) defines the term "document delivery" as a broader sharing of resources in which other means of retrieving information, including commercial document delivery services and information brokers, are used. Transactions initiated by the patron will mean a possible reduction in staff interaction with the patron, which Bluh sees as a positive change which will allow the staff to deal with the less routine matters previously associated with interlibrary loan. She sees the face of interlibrary loan as

becoming more multifaceted and fully integrated with other library departments to "meet the diverse needs of our patrons and, at the same time, use our resources wisely" (Bluh 1993, 112).

Another important factor in this study is the ratio of books borrowed versus photocopied material; the ARL study done by Thomas Waldhart (1984) is an excellent example of how important these statistics are. Waldhart discusses how the lending to borrowing ratios are distributed among the various ARL institutions and what specifically was borrowed. There was an increase in demand for both books and photocopies, but he found that smaller public libraries had tapped into the alternative sources of document delivery as well as university libraries. He also looked at the increased costs associated with the transactions.

Marsha Ra (1991) examined interlibrary loan data with a more technological view. She is the director of University Library Automation Services at the City University of New York. She feels that the librarian's role in the evolving document delivery access is to maintain order and to "serve as a bridge between the traditional and the new, serving the needs of the less educated by mediating, teaching and bring them up to a level where they can become a part of the electronic age" (Ra 1991, 25).

Nevins and Lang (1993) used statistics to show trends of borrowing within state and by state, as well as what type of libraries are doing the borrowing. The trends indicate that the

growth would only continue. They also concurred that the choice of new alternatives for document delivery would have a large impact on interlibrary loan.

Interlibrary Loan statistics can also act as a collection development tool. The use of these patron statistics can provide a good measuring device to aid in determining just what should be acquired for the library collection. Mackey (1989) points out that the idea of temporarily acquiring materials by whatever source is not a new idea to public libraries and is being accepted more and more by academic libraries with the emphasis on access, but stresses that interlibrary loan is "an adjunct to, not a substitute for collection development in individual libraries" as someone has to provide ownership (Mackey 1989, 56).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This research project involves performing an ex post facto study of the Interlibrary Loan borrowing statistics of Kent State University Library from the fiscal year July 1992 to June 1993. The proposed study focuses primarily on the information for "OhioLINK supplier," "item requested (book or photocopy)," "status," and "department." This data will provide information on whether a certain supplier provides more books or photocopies in general, whether the supplier provides to a certain department, or whether a certain department has more of a particular status doing the requesting. These statistics will enable the Interlibrary Loan department to better prepare for the interlibrary loan reference interview, which is done at the time the request is made by the patron, allowing it to provide better service where needed. In the event that more returnables are requested than non-returnables, information needed for the department to better handle their receipt, control and return to the supplier is thus determined. Using the following fields, data was entered into the university mainframe to tabulate using SPSSX:

OCLC symbol for supplier
P (Photocopy) or B (Book)
U (Undergrad), G (Graduate), F (Faculty), S (Staff)
departmental abbreviation

The twenty-six OCLC institution codes are as follows:

AKL - University of Akron Law Library
AKR - University of Akron Library
BGU - Bowling Green State University Library
CDC - Cedarville College Library
CHS - Cleveland Health Sciences Library
CIN - University of Cincinnati Library
CSU - Cleveland State University Library
CWA - Case Western Reserve Univ. Applied Sciences Libr.
CWL - Case Western Reserve Univ. Law Library
CWR - Case Western Reserve Univ. Main Library
DAY - University of Dayton Library
LMC - Cleveland State Law Library
MCL - Medical College of Ohio Library
MIA - Miami University Library
MXC - University of Cincinnati Medical Library
OAG - Ohio State University Agricultural Library
OHH - Ohio University - Zanesville Campus Library
OHI - State Library of Ohio
ONE - NE Ohio Universities College of Medicine Library
OSS - Shawnee State University Library
OSU - Ohio State University Library
OUN - Ohio University Library
TOL - University of Toledo Library
WSM - Wright State University Health Sciences Library
WSU - Wright State University Library
YNG - Youngstown State University Library

The Kent State University departmental codes used are as follows:

-GEN - Library staff
-REF - Reference Librarians
ACCT - Accounting
ACHV - Adult Counseling, Health and Vocational Educ.
ADMS - Administrative Sciences
ANTH - Anthropology
ARCH - Architecture and Design
ARTS - Art
BSCI - Biological Sciences
CHDS - Counseling and Human Development Services
CHEM - Chemistry
CICP - Center for Peaceful Change
CJST - Criminal Justice Studies
CLAX - Classical Studies
COMM - Communication Studies
ECON - Economics
EDAD - Educational Administration

EDUC - Elementary Education
ENGL - English
EPLS - Educational Psychology and Foundations
EXIS - Experimental
FACS - Family and Consumer Studies
FASH - Fashion Design and Merchandising
FINX - Finance
GEOG - Geography
GEOL - Geology
GERM - Germanic and Slavic Languages
HIST - History
INTD - Interdisciplinary Collection
JOUR - Journalism and Mass Communication
LIQD - Liquid Crystals Research
LSCI - Library Science
MATH - Mathematics
MGMT - Management
MKTG - Marketing
MUSX - Music
NURS - Nursing
PERD - Physical Education, Recreation and Dance
PHIL - Philosophy
PHYX - Physics
POLX - Political Science
RELI - Religion Studies
RLNG - Romance Languages and Literatures
SOCI - Sociology
SPED - Special Education
SPEX - Speech and Linguistics Studies
SPPA - Speech Pathology and Audiology
STAF - Non-library staff members
TDCS - Teacher Development and Curriculum Studies
TECH - Technology
THTR - Theater

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The data from the Collection Development Report was entered into the mainframe and using SPSSX the variables of OhioLINK supplier were cross-tabulated with format, department and status. The resulting tables showed that there were 7034 OhioLINK supplied items of the 14,749 items requested in 1992-1993. Of those 7034 requests, 5010 (71.2%) were photocopies and 2022 (28.8%) were loans. As for the patrons, 1887 (26.8%) were faculty, graduates totaled 3954 (56.2%), undergraduates totaled 438 (6.2%) and 362 (5.1%) staff. There were 393 instances where the status was not included on the request.

Table 1, Lender by Format, illustrates the cross-tabulation of OhioLINK supplier with the format of either books or photocopies. The highest number of loans (503 or 24.88%) were supplied by the University of Akron, as well as the highest number of photocopies (906 or 18.08%). The comparison of books to photocopies supplied by the University of Akron was almost two to one. Youngstown State University followed with the next highest amounts - 427 books (21.12%) and 525 photocopies (10.48%).

The cross-tabulation of the books and photocopies requested by

the various departments of Kent State University is shown in Table 2. The highest requester of books was the History department with 174 loans (8.61%). The least number of loans requested was by the Center for Peaceful Change. The Psychology department requested the most photocopies - 834 (16.65%). The least number of photocopies requested was asked for by the Educational Administration department.

Looking at the OhioLINK suppliers cross-tabulated with status of the borrower, the University of Akron processed the most with 719 (51%) supplied to graduate students, 95 (6.7%) supplied to undergraduate students, 401 items (28.5%) to faculty and 110 items (7.8%) to staff members. Youngstown State University followed as next highest with 507 requests (36%) supplied for graduate students, 53 (3.8%) for undergraduate students, 291 (20.7%) for faculty, and 48 (3.4%) supplied for staff members, making those two universities the most used during the 1992-1993 fiscal year. The least utilized university libraries were Central State University which supplied one faculty request and Case Western Reserve University's Social Sciences Library which supplied four graduate requests. (See Table 3).

The final cross-tabulation performed was the comparison of lender with department. These figures, demonstrated in Table 4,

are useful in showing the strengths and weaknesses of certain OhioLINK lenders. For example, twelve of the twenty six OhioLINK libraries supplied the Psychology department with its requests. The highest number of requests for the Psychology department came from NEOUCOM, followed by the amount supplied by the University of Akron. The History department had the highest amount supplied by Youngstown State University. All of the requests made by the Liquid Crystals Research department were filled by Case Western Reserve University Library. This research shows that these universities have successfully filled requests from these subject areas. In the future it may be possible to save time by requesting material on these topics from these institutions first.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

What this research has shown is that the Kent State University department that borrows the most is the Psychology department and its graduate students. It has also shown that both the University of Akron and Youngstown State Univerity are the most frequent suppliers. It also shows that more photocopies are also requested than loans. With this information it can better be determined how to do a satisfactory reference interview before the patron makes a request. Since both University of Akron and Youngstown State University are so close geographically and reciprocal lenders, it may be that the Interlibrary Loan department would want to try to always go to them with requests first, or to suggest that the patrons go to those libraries themselves. Since photocopies are requested more often than loans, the department should look into perhaps faxing articles between OhioLINK libraries if the delivery service is not sufficient. Overall, perhaps more staff should be hired to handle the increase in volume, or a second photocopier may need to be purchased. Although there is a delivery system in place, it should be evaluated to see if it fits the needs of the system. One thing that the study has succeeded in proving is that Interlibrary Loan statistics are a valuable asset and should be looked at regularly to provide new insight into factors that might be taken for granted or otherwise overlooked.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF LOANS BY
FORMAT OF MATERIAL

OHIOLINK SUPPLIER	BOOKS f	BOOKS %	PHOTOCOPIES f	PHOTOCOPIES %
AKL	3	.15	51	1.02
AKR	503	24.88	906	18.08
BGU	88	4.35	308	6.15
CDC	1	.05	0	0.00
CHS	31	1.53	470	9.38
CIN	100	4.95	113	2.26
CSU	126	6.23	390	7.78
CWA	4	.20	0	0.00
CWL	10	.49	50	1.00
CWR	205	10.14	358	7.15
DAY	22	1.09	34	.68
LMC	2	.10	41	.82
MCL	3	.15	66	1.32
MIA	85	4.20	207	4.13
MXC	8	.40	135	2.69
OAG	0	0.00	6	.12
OHH	1	.05	3	.06
OHI	13	.64	21	.42
ONE	51	2.52	401	8.00
OSS	17	.84	6	.12
OSU	102	5.04	225	4.49
OUN	97	4.80	240	4.79
TOL	90	4.45	368	7.35
WSM	2	.10	15	.30
WSU	31	1.53	71	1.41
YNG	427	21.12	525	10.48
TOTAL	2022	100.00	5010	100.00

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF LOANS
BY FORMAT AND DEPARTMENT

DEPARTMENT	BOOKS f	BOOKS %	PHOTOCOPIES f	PHOTOCOPIES %
-GEN	64	3.17	152	3.03
-REF	1	.05	2	.04
ACCT	11	.54	36	.72
ACHV	34	1.68	237	4.73
ADMS	48	2.37	145	2.89
ANTH	62	3.07	225	4.49
ARCH	9	.45	7	.14
ARTS	54	2.67	24	.48
BSCI	25	1.24	156	3.11
CHDS	4	.20	7	.14
CHEM	24	1.19	91	1.82
CICP	0	0.00	1	.02
CJST	21	1.04	148	2.95
CLAX	22	1.09	19	.38
COMM	22	1.09	64	1.28
ECON	25	1.24	32	.64
EDAD	1	.05	0	0.00
EDUC	1	.05	1	0.02
ENGL	153	7.57	165	3.29
EPLS	38	1.88	116	2.31
EXIS	1	.05	3	.06
FACS	4	.20	27	.54
FASH	4	.20	2	.04
FINX	12	.59	66	1.32
GEOG	18	.89	41	.82
GEOL	39	1.93	75	1.50
GERM	40	1.98	13	.26
HIST	174	8.61	149	2.97
INTD	0	0.00	1	.02
JOUR	9	.45	13	.26
LIQD	14	.69	136	2.71
LSCI	65	3.21	118	2.35
MATH	70	3.46	73	1.46
MGMT	0	0.00	1	.02
MKTG	11	.54	52	1.04
MUSX	49	2.42	66	1.32
NURS	41	2.03	249	4.97
PERD	17	.84	122	2.43
PHIL	36	1.78	10	.20
PHYX	23	1.14	31	.62
POLX	78	3.86	94	1.88
PSYC	150	7.42	834	16.65
RELI	27	1.34	65	1.30
RLNG	133	6.58	219	4.37
SOCI	32	1.58	79	1.58
SPED	4	.20	1	.02
SPEX	1	.05	12	.24
SPPA	15	.74	50	1.00
STAF	13	.64	34	.68
TDCS	67	3.31	265	5.29
TECH	29	1.43	29	.58
THTR	16	.80	5	.10
OMITTED	211	10.40	447	8.92
TOTAL	2022	100.00	5010	100.00

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF LOANS
BY LENDER AND BY STATUS

STATUS	OMITTED	FACULTY	GRADUATE	STAFF	UNDERGRAD.	TOTAL
AKL	1	13	39	0	1	54
AKR	84	401	719	110	95	1409
BGU	27	84	263	11	11	396
CDC	0	1	0	0	0	1
CHS	16	112	299	19	55	501
CIN	10	84	104	7	8	213
CSU	32	110	305	36	33	516
CWA	0	0	4	0	0	4
CWL	3	10	39	1	7	60
CWR	48	211	248	26	30	563
DAY	4	16	29	5	2	56
LMC	2	9	29	1	2	43
MCL	0	13	50	3	3	69
MIA	16	69	176	16	16	293
MXC	6	26	95	5	11	143
OAG	0	1	5	0	0	6
OHH	0	0	3	0	1	4
OHI	1	4	29	0	0	34
ONE	25	90	297	16	24	452
OSS	1	5	11	3	3	23
OSU	21	114	152	12	28	327
OUN	13	95	197	9	23	337
TOL	20	107	274	29	29	459
WSM	1	2	10	3	1	17
WSU	9	19	70	2	2	102
YNG	53	291	507	48	53	952
TOTL	393	1887	3954	362	438	7034
%	5.59	26.83	56.21	5.15	6.22	100.00

TABLE 4
DISTRIBUTION OF LOANS
BY FORMAT AND STATUS

	F	G	S	U	OMITTED	TOTAL	%
BOOKS	663	984	71	172	134	2022	28.80
PHOTOCOPIES	1224	2970	291	266	259	5010	71.20
TOTAL	1887	3954	362	438	393	7034	100.00
%	26.82	56.21	5.15	6.23	5.59		100.00

TABLE 5
LENDER BY DEPARTMENT

	-GEN	-REF	ACCT	ACHV	ADMS	ANTH	ARCH	ARTS	BSCI	CHDS
AKL			6	1	1					
AKR	83		6	50	38	33	4	14	34	3
BGU	11	1	1	14	4	15		4	5	
CDC										
CHS	5			41	6	70		9	23	2
CIN	5	1	2	3	6	3		4	2	
CSU	19		4	18	26	13		8	8	1
CWA				3						
CWL			5		2				1	
CWR	12	1	5	6	21	13	2	6	4	
DAY	2		1	2				1		2
LMC	1				2					
MCL	2			12		8			8	
MIA	12		1	14	13	10	1	1	8	
MXC	2			10		13			9	
OAG									1	
OHH										
OHI			2				1			
ONE	8		1	27		39	1	1	36	
OSS	1					1		1		
OSU	6		4	7	13	8		5	11	
OUN	2			9	7	12	3	6	7	
TOL	12		6	21	20	2	3	1	14	1
WSM				4		1				
WSU	1			4	5	7		1	2	1
YNG	32		3	25	29	39	1	16	8	1
TOTAL	216	3	47	271	193	287	16	78	181	11
%	3.07	.04	.67	3.85	2.74	4.08	.23	1.11	2.57	.16

LENDER BY DEPARTMENT (Cont'd)

	CHEM	CICP	CJST	CLAX	COMM	ECON	EDAD	EDUC	ENGL	EPLS
AKL			14		1					
AKR	26		28	2	18	17		1	80	41
BGU	3		14	2	5	2			17	4
CDC										
CHS	16		5						1	3
CIN	1		7	7	1				16	4
CSU	12		7	1	17	3			15	11
CWA										
CWL			12		2	3				
CWR	6		6	5	6	2			30	8
DAY			2	1					2	
LMC			6		2					
MCL			1							
MIA	2		6	1	5	3			18	9
MXC			2							5
OAG	1									
OHH			2							
OHI									1	1
ONE	8		2		1				5	8
OSS				1	2				2	
OSU	7		4	1	3	3			20	6
OUN	6	1	7	1	3	3			21	14
TOL	17		1	11	3	8	1	1	17	8
WSM										2
WSU	2		1			3			4	3
YNG	8		42	8	17	10			69	27
TOTAL	115	1	169	41	86	57	1	2	318	154
%	1.64	.01	2.40	.58	1.22	.81	.01	.03	4.52	2.20

LENDER BY DEPARTMENT (Cont'd)

	EXIS	FACS	FASH	FINX	GEOG	GEOL	GERM	HIST	INTD	JOUR
AKL								18		1
AKR	1	7	2	23	15	30	7	51		6
BGU				2	4	3	9	14		1
CDC										
CHS		7	1	1		5		1		
CIN		1		3	2	11	4	19		2
CSU	2	1	1	8	1	3	2	20		
CWA										
CWL				2				14		1
CWR		1		11	8	7	8	19		1
DAY			1					3		
LMC								11		1
MCL										
MIA				2	2	4	2	15		
MXC					1	1				
OAG										
OHH						1		9		
OHI		6			1		1			
ONE										
OSS		1		1	3	15	4	28		1
OSU				4	5	1	8	10		2
OUN		2		9	6	10	3	20		1
TOL										
WSM				2	1	8		13		
WSU	1	5	1	10	10	15	5	58	1	5
YNG										
TOTAL	4	31	6	78	59	114	53	323	1	22
%	.06	.44	.09	1.11	.84	1.62	.75	4.59	.01	31

LENDER BY DEPARTMENT (Cont'd)

	LIQD	LSCI	MATH	MGMT	MKTG	MUSX	NURS	PERD	PHIL	PHYX
AKL										
AKR	42	51	39	1	9	23	54	15	7	12
BGU	3	17	2		10	34	9		5	2
CDC										
CHS	1	3	1		1		63	38		2
CIN	2	2	4		4	10	4			
CSU	10	7	14		9	6	11	3	3	4
CWA										
CWL			1				4			
CWR	66	14	31		2	6	5	2	10	12
DAY		7	1		1		1	1	1	1
LMC							2			
MCL		1					14	4		
MIA		6	1		4		5	2	1	1
MXC	1						24	3		
OAG							1			
OHH										
OHI		10	1							
ONE		2			3		32	38		
OSS		1					3			1
OSU	4	6	5		6	5	5	4		1
OUN		8	7		2	5	10	9	3	1
TOL	8	24	12		5	6	14	4	1	8
WSM							3			
WSU		6	4				3		2	1
YNG	13	18	20		7	20	23	16	13	8
TOTAL	150	183	143	1	63	115	290	139	46	54
%	2.13	2.60	2.03	.01	.90	1.64	4.12	1.98	.65	.77

LENDER BY DEPARTMENT (Cont'd)

	POLX	PSYC	RELI	RLNG	SOCI	SPED	SPEX	SPPA	STAF	TDCS
AKL	3	5		1	2				1	
AKR	36	145	18	67	29	1	1	14	16	76
BGU	2	39	1	18	3				1	23
CDC										
CHS		122	7	5	2			16		9
CIN	4	13	4	31	2					4
CSU	9	69	8	26	13	2	1	9	5	50
CWA		1								
CWL	4	5			1					
CWR	13	48	32	33	4			1	2	15
DAY		13	1							2
LMC	2	13			3					
MCL		11		2				2		3
MIA	18	52		18	4				4	11
MXC		50		3	1		1	2	1	11
OAG										1
OHH		1								1
OHI	1	6								
ONE		163	1	4	4			6	1	13
OSS	1	3			1					
OSU	12	20	3	33	7			2	1	4
OUN	7	46	6	35	6		6	3	3	20
TOL	24	49	2	18	10	1	3	6	3	40
WSM		3			1					
WSU		11		2	4				1	4
YNG	36	96	9	56	14	1	1	4	8	45
TOTAL	172	984	92	352	111	5	13	65	47	332
%	2.45	13.99	1.31	5.00	1.58	.07	.19	.92	.67	4.72

LENDER BY DEPARTMENT (Cont'd)

	TECH	THTR	OMITTED			TOTAL	%
AKL	17	6				54	.77
AKR	3		110			1409	20.03
BGU			89			396	5.63
CDC	1		1			1	.01
CHS	2	1	34			501	7.12
CIN	1		22			213	3.03
CSU			55			516	7.34
CWA	1					4	.06
CWL	10	4	2			60	.85
CWR			65			563	8.00
DAY			10			56	.80
LMC						43	.61
MCL			1			69	.98
MIA	4	1	32			293	4.17
MXC	2		3			143	2.03
OAG						6	.09
OHH						4	.06
OHI			1			34	.48
ONE			40			452	6.43
OSS	2		3			23	.33
OSU	2	2	54			327	4.65
OUN	5	3	20			337	4.79
TOL	1		22			459	6.52
WSM			3			17	.24
WSU			6			102	1.45
YNG	7	4	87			952	13.53
TOTAL	58	21	660				
%	.83	.30	9.38			7034	100.00

REFERENCE LIST

Bluh, Pamela. 1993. Document delivery 2000: Will it change the nature of librarianship? Wilson Library Bulletin 67 (February): 49-51+.

Branin, Joseph J. 1991. Delivering on promises: The intersection of print and electronic information systems in libraries. Information Technology and Libraries 10 (December): 321-331.

Hawks, Carol Pitts. 1992. The integrated library system of the 1990s: The OhioLINK experience. Library Resources and Technical Services 36 (January): 61-78.

Intner, Sheila S. 1989. Differences between access and ownership. Technicalities 9 (September): 5-8.

Jackson, Mary. 1992. Library to library: Rethinking interlibrary loan. Wilson Library Bulletin 66 (October): 75-79.

Jackson, Mary. 1993. Resource sharing and document delivery in the 1990's. Wilson Library Bulletin 67 (February): 35-36+.

Khalil, Mounir A. 1993. Applications of an automated ILL statistical analysis as a collection development tool. Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery and Information Supply 4(1): 45-54.

LaGuardia, Cheryl M. and Connie V. Dowell. 1991. The structure of resource sharing in academic research libraries. RQ 30 (Spring): 370-376.

Mackey, Terry. 1989. Interlibrary loan: An acceptable alternative to purchase. Wilson Library Bulletin 63 (January): 54-56.

Nevins, Kate and Darryl Lang. 1993. Interlibrary loan: A cooperative effort among OCLC users. Wilson Library Bulletin 67 (February): 37-40+.

Potter, William Gray. 1986. Creative automation boosts ILL rates. American Libraries 17 (April): 244-246.

REFERENCE LIST (CONT'D)

Ra, Marsha. 1991. The future of resource sharing: Is there any? Computers in Libraries 11 (February): 25-26.

Sanville, Tom. 1993a. Memo to OhioLINK Library Advisory Council.

Sanville, Tom. 1993b. OhioLINK: What's around the corner? Ohio Libraries 6 (Fall): 11+.

Sessions, Judith and Hwa-Wei Lee, and Stacey Kimmel. 1992. OhioLINK: Technology and teamwork transforming Ohio libraries. Wilson Library Bulletin 66 (June): 43-45.

Walchart, Thomas. 1984. The growth of interlibrary loan among ARL libraries. Journal of Academic Librarianship 10 (September) 204-208.