

## A STUDY OF RURAL PUBLIC LIBRARY PATRONS BY UNOBTUSIVE OBSERVATION

Thomas P. Shilts  
Librarian  
Rogers City Public Library  
Rogers City, MI

Knowledge of patron needs and of the way patrons make use of library services is perhaps the most critical body of information for any librarian attempting to provide service to any user group. It is also likely that of all user groups, that of the public library in general and the rural public library in particular is the most difficult to define. "Planning based on erroneous assumptions about the rural patron is still being made by many library administrators" (Kirks 1989, 38). What are the information needs of rural users? What are the characteristics of these patrons? Who, exactly, are our users? Our nonusers? What can be done to bring more nonusers into the library? And finally, how do our patrons make use of the library? This is a difficult question because, "it is clear that people do not walk into a library--straight to the shelf where their desired book stands--ask a reference question on the way to the circulation desk, check out their book, and exit" (Lang 1987/88, 52). Furthermore, how do use patterns relate to user characteristics? A good deal of survey-based research has been done and is still being done on the subject of characteristics and attitudes of the public library's current and potential user group, and the resulting data are worthy of study. However, it would also be helpful together information on library use through an additional method, in this case by directly observing library-use behavior and certain characteristics of rural public library patrons wherever possible: Such a procedure might provide meaningful new information, as "much of the activity in a public library cannot be found recorded in circulation or reference statistics" (Lange 1987/88, 52). This study has two purposes; first, to add to what is already known about user characteristics, including sex and approximate age of user; and second, to explore in an organized way the uses that are really being made of rural public libraries and attempt to make generalizations about

patron use patterns as well as recommendations for further study.

### **Background Literature**

When examining research relevant to the subject of rural public library users, it is first necessary to acknowledge that rural public libraries are the rule rather than the exception when it comes to discussing public libraries. "Over 80% of the public libraries in the United States can be found in rural areas" (Vavrek 1985, 73). By this definition, "rural" means an area of 25,000 people or fewer. Even using the U.S. Census Bureau's much more strict definition (2,500 or fewer population), still 62% of all public libraries in the U.S. are rural (Vavrek 1985, 73). Parenthetically, though the focus of this study is on public libraries in rural areas, there are various libraries which serve the rural community, including such other rural libraries as school, college and special libraries, as well as state or regional libraries which provide services to the public libraries in terms of such things as interlibrary loan or reference assistance (Houlahan 1984, ). "Rural library users," then, are a large group of people with a diverse field of interests. Rural public library users are only slightly fewer and probably equally diverse. For the purposes of this study, it therefore seems fair to apply general public library research to rural public libraries, in certain cases. There are three main reasons for this. First, related to the above discussion, it seems safe to assume that rural public library users will have some things in common with public library users in general, especially in terms of basic service expectations and general user characteristics. Besides being intuitively sensible, some instances of these commonalities are supported by the present study. Second, most broad-based user studies have not specifically excluded rural library users. Third, there has been a scarcity of wide-ranging research on rural libraries and their patrons, with one exception being a state-wide study of rural information needs carried out in Pennsylvania; indeed, "no other state has seen it appropriate to conduct a survey of rural library use." (Vavrek 1990, 4). This general shortage of information on rural library patrons results in the utility of a certain amount of cautious extrapolation from more broad-based studies.

Past research concerning patrons' library use and attitudes toward the library has generally been based on such techniques as surveys distributed at the library concerning

subjects such as user satisfaction (D'Elia and Walsh 1983) and user needs and attitudes toward the library (Vavrek 1990), telephone surveys using randomly selected telephone numbers reaching both users and nonusers (Lange 1987/88; Center for the Study of Rural Librarianship 1990), and mail surveys reaching a specified or random audience. Though "user behavior both in terms of evaluation and use of the library appears to be enigmatic" (D'Elia and Walsh 1983, 132), most user studies are able to contribute to what is known about the public library patron. Moreover, certain patron characteristics are recognized in more than one study (most visibly the fact that the vast majority of public library users are women), and these findings are often also supported by the present study.

Assessing the Information Needs of Rural Pennsylvanians (Vavrek 1990) was important in developing the present project. As has been cited, this study was one of the first to concentrate on the characteristics, information needs, and opinions of rural public library users rather than public library users in general. This project came up with some interesting findings, some of which fit in well with existing research on general public library use. Though the Pennsylvania study was limited in scope to only that state, it would not be overly risky to say that the results have implications for libraries across the United States.

The most easily identified finding in public library use studies deals with the sex of public library users. According to studies, most patrons are women. Vavrek's Information Needs found that 79% of rural public library users were women (10). A 1986 paper reporting on library use in North Carolina in 1971 and again in 1986 found that "the gender distribution of library users hasn't changed since 1971; the user group is still 63% female, 37% male" (Carpenter 1987/88, 24). A Gallup survey found that "frequent library visits are made more often by women" (Wood 1985, 20). Other data (including that from the present study) exist supporting the above-mentioned generalization that a predominate number of users of the public library are women, and throughout the literature there seems to be little to dispute that conclusion. Furthermore, it seems that most public librarians know the same thing intuitively through their day-to-day dealings with patrons. In the words of one researcher, "no public librarian can deny that we serve a lot of women" (Hole 1990, 1).

Other demographic data are less conclusive. Information Needs reported that the

average age of users surveyed was 45.82, with the average female and male user 44 and 51 years of age, respectively (Vavrek 1990, 38, 2). These ages, however, are somewhat inflated due to the fact that the maximum age reported was 501 (38). To employ data from a nonrural library, a 1987 news report on a study of users and nonusers of the Enoch Pratt Free Library of Baltimore found that the median age of users was 38 ("Market Study" 1987, 18). The somewhat lower median user age reported in the Enoch Pratt study may be due to one of two factors, if not both. It is possible that the data error in the Information Needs study caused the median age reported therein to be significantly inflated. It is also possible that a difference in median age does exist between rural and nonrural library users. At the same time, it must be remembered that the Information Needs study was conducted on a statewide basis while the Enoch Pratt study surveyed users and nonusers of one library in one city.

Other studies dealing with age of users and nonusers have manipulated their age statistics differently in order to determine which age group contains the highest percentage of library users. On this basis, the Gallup survey mentioned above found that "respondents age 18-24 years (23%), likely to be still in school, use the library more often than do older respondents (17%)" (Wood 1985, 20). Another researcher found that people in their 30's were the most likely to be library users at 48% (Carpenter 1987/88, 24). In a statistic that encompasses the age groups in both of these studies, a summary report of three individual surveys indicated that "people 50 and over use libraries about half as much as the 18-34 set" (Plotnik 1978, 639). When examining statistics, especially in the above case where similar data are used to answer two different but related questions, it is always necessary to avoid comparing apples to oranges. Besides there being a wide range of survey methods and group of people surveyed (ranging from rural public library users in Pennsylvania by written survey in the Vavrek study to Wood's report on the Gallup poll, which was developed as a nationwide telephone survey of a representative sampling of adults 18 and over), the results mean different things. Though the percentage of younger people saying they use the library may be high, the actual number of such people using the library may appear small due to a smaller sampling of individuals. And conversely, though a lower percentage of older people may use the library, the number of older people using the library may appear quite high because of

a larger sampling. Thus, when computing the average age of the library user, the median age will be higher. Yet overall, if one were to attempt to draw a conclusion concerning use of the public library by age group, it would not be overly risky to conclude that age 40 or thereabouts would represent that average.

There is currently more research being done that will do much in finding out about age groups of rural library users. The results of the national telephone survey about attitudes toward rural public library use presently being conducted by the Center for the Study of Rural Librarianship will be especially helpful in investigating this question when those results are published. This study employed randomly selected telephone numbers from nonmetropolitan areas, and grouped respondents according to "user" or "nonuser" as well as gathered information about sex and age group. Thus, it will be possible to directly compare these results about rural library users to those cited above which deal with library users in general. The rural attitudes study may do much in answering the question, dealt with above, as to whether or not the rural patron is really older than his or her urban counterpart.

A third main subject of the present user study, besides the determination of sex and age of the patron, was length of the average library visit. Background literature on this subject was more scanty than that of either of the above considerations. Lange found that "younger users tended to stay longer at the library." However, "it might well be that duration is associated with use patterns rather than user characteristics" (Lange 1987/88, 63). The second of these observations makes sense, although evidence from the present study suggests that the first of these may also be accurate.

The main emphasis of the background literature search for this project was on age and sex of user as well as duration of the library visit. The reason for this is that the researcher was able to investigate these three questions using the method of unobtrusive observation, whereas it would be difficult to determine other user characteristics such as education, involvement in community organizations, and number of books read over a specified period of time through the method of unobtrusive observation. Furthermore, due to constraints of the research method, duration of visit was one of only two use patterns the researcher could accurately record. Though somewhat outside the scope of this project, it is interesting to note some of the other factors researchers believe to be

important in determining how the public library is used and who is using it. Level of education is one such factor, and in general the reports seem to indicate that there is a correlation between education and library use. The study of rural Pennsylvania public library users found that only 7% of those users had less than a high school education (Vavrek 1990, 39), while the Enoch Pratt market study indicates that 21% of users had a college degree while only 8% of nonusers had attained that same level of education ("Market study" 1987, 18). Elsewhere, physical distance from the library appears to be an important factor in patron use of library services. Lange suggests that "residential closeness to the library was related to library use and potential use" (Lange 1987/88, 61), which has much in common with Vavrek's finding that "the consequences of geographical isolation negatively affect both library clients and librarians" (Vavrek 1983, 267). Geographical distance is relative, and the drive across town for the patron in Lange's scenario may be nearly as daunting as is traversing the mountains of western Pennsylvania for the rural patron in Vavrek's model. Yet for whatever group of users the library is serving, it would appear that the library should "be located as close as possible to the home of its target population of users" (Lange 1987/88, 62). One final characteristic of library users to be discussed here appeared in several places throughout the literature, and is interesting because it seems to negate the stereotype of the library user as withdrawn, shy, and "bookish." According to Plotnik, "if one can allow that heavy public library users and heavy book readers are roughly one and the same, which they are" then it is safe to assume of both heavy readers and heavy library users that they "are not reclusive, but, on the contrary, they are the doers in life, plunging into the most activities" (Plotnik 1978, 639). To cite another paper based on the same Leo Burnett study from which Plotnik drew some of his information (along with two other broad-based user studies), it seems that activity is perhaps the most pervasive characteristic of the library user. "Library use is most highly related to activity. An individual who is active in other aspects of life, whether it be community organizations, politics, work, or sports, is also likely to be a library user" (Madden 1979, 81). Besides providing more information on the lifestyles, habits, and opinions of nonusers, moderate users, and heavy users, the Madden paper is also interesting here because it is one of the few studies which specifically excludes rural areas (as well as

inner cities) in order to tailor the information to the needs of a library in a medium-sized community. Nevertheless, other data collected exclusively from rural library users seem to support the conclusion that the generalization of the library user as an active community member can be extended from the metropolitan to the nonmetropolitan setting. In the Information Needs study, it was "discovered that 54% . . . of the respondents surveyed participated in community or social organizations" (Vavrek 1990, 17). Of course there is much other information available throughout the literature of library science on characteristics of the library user and nonuser, and a complete discussion of that topic would go beyond the purpose of this study. Since the background material on the user characteristics to be investigated here has already been briefly reviewed, it is now necessary to discuss the current study itself.

### **Methodology**

The purpose of this study was to provide some introductory data in two main areas: who is using the rural public library, and what use patterns seem to exist? The technique of unobtrusive observation was used in order to test data already gathered through user or library staff surveys and to attempt to provide additional information unavailable through other research techniques. For the purposes of this study, five rural public libraries were visited three times, with each visit lasting 55 minutes. One exception to this pattern was the library in New Bethlehem, where the last visit lasted only fifteen minutes. The reason for this makes an interesting comment on transportation in rural areas. As the researcher travelled to the New Bethlehem library, he was forced to follow a loaded log truck up and down the twisting, two-lane mountain road. This delayed the trip to New Bethlehem by at least 20 minutes, and since the library was closing for the day, the visit was curtailed. Each library studied was rural in the sense that no library served a population of over 17,000 (ALA Directory 1989). The five libraries were all located within a region consisting of two counties in northwestern Pennsylvania, and the farthest distance between any two libraries was approximately 30 miles. These were: Clarion Free Library in Clarion, Knox Public Library in Knox, Eccles-Lesher Memorial Library in Rimersburg, New Bethlehem Area Free Public Library in New Bethlehem, and

Rebecca M. Arthurs Memorial Library in Brookville. These libraries were chosen for study because of geographical proximity, and ideally one round of visits could be completed in one day. Visiting hours were arranged in an attempt to make each visit to a library at a different time of day. As will be seen by consulting the visit schedule (Appendix A), that attempt was not as successful as one would have wished, as various hours of business for the libraries as well as problems with the travel schedule prevented this. A note about data collection seems in order here. It would be a mistake to compare the data gathered from one library to that gathered from another. The use of five libraries was only to gain a more widely representative sample of rural library use and no comparison was intended. Furthermore, the shortened visit to the New Bethlehem library would prevent such a thing even if it were desirable.

As discussed above, the method of unobtrusive observation was used. For the most part, this method was successful. All of the libraries except for Clarion had only one main entrance, making it possible to monitor the comings and goings of patrons with relative ease. However, as with any methodology, this one had its drawbacks. The major problem with this type of study is the fact that the researcher cannot watch all the patrons at once. This method works well when relatively few patrons are in the library, but it begins to break down when more than about ten patrons are using the library. This is generally no problem in determining sex of the user, because that judgement has only to be made once. However, it is more complicated when attempting to judge duration of the library visit and what use the patron is making of the library. For example, this study counted a total of 168 patrons using the libraries. However, duration of visit times could only be determined for 149 of those patrons, leaving 19 users for whom there is no data about length of visit. There were other drawbacks and flaws with the design of this study, which will be brought up during later sections of this paper. Despite these problems, however, this project was successful in adding some small amount to what is known about the characteristics and user patterns of rural public library users.

## Results



One of the main purposes of this study was to test the idea that most public library users are female, or at least to further explore Vavrek's finding that 79% of the users of rural public libraries in Pennsylvania are women (Vavrek 1990, 10). This study found that of the libraries studied, 61% of the patrons were female (see Appendix A). It should be noted here that children who used the library in the company of an adult (and looked to be under the age of 13) were not grouped according to sex of user. Therefore, the statistics for this group are not figured into the total percentage of the user by sex.

A second purpose of this investigation was to look at the ages of public library patrons. Broken down by both age and sex, women of age 47 and over make up the biggest percentage of library users with 18%. The next largest percentage is for women age 27-46, with 17%. When considering age groups alone, people of over 47 make up the largest group with 29%. The second heaviest user group is people between the ages of 27-46, with 26% (see Appendix A). A most interesting statistic arises, however, if one considers all users below the age of 17 as members of the same user group. In so doing, it seems that people below the age of 17 make up 28% of the population who uses the library. The implications of this will be discussed below.

Duration of library visit was another topic covered in this research project, and data was gathered for 149 of the 168 total patrons studied. The most frequent length of visit for members of both sexes was from 10-20 minutes (30%), while the second most common visit lasted less than five minutes (29%). The third most common visit lasted from 5-10 minutes (18%) (see Appendix B). The most common visit for men was under five minutes (44%), while the most common for women lasted from 10-20 minutes (36%).

The final, and perhaps most elusive and interesting, topic studied in this project had to do with user patterns of public library patrons. User behaviors were noted and then grouped according to nine categories (see Appendix C), and within those categories according to whether that use was single (s) or multiple (m). Single use indicates that the indicated use was the only activity that patron pursued in the library. Multiple use means the patron made use of more than one library service. Thus, all indications of single use within the "Checkout & Return" category relate to

return of materials because checkout is always linked to some other library activity (with the exception of interlibrary loan materials or materials renewal, neither of which was observed). As might be predicted, "Checkout & Return" was a often used service, as was "Other" since that category takes in all other uses not listed. "Video," meaning videotape rental, was surprisingly low and perhaps indicates a flaw in the technique of this study. As for categories which received a high degree of single use, "Magazines & Newspapers" led the way, with "Browsing" and "Copy Machine and Telephone" also showing a significant degree of single use. Interestingly, there was a considerable disparity between the sexes as to single use versus multiple use. Thirty-seven percent of female patrons were single-users, while a surprising 74% of males were single-use patrons. All children of twelve and under who used the library with an adult were considered single-use patrons, mainly because it was observed that often that was the case. Furthermore, it is frequently difficult to tell whether or not a child is actually using a particular library service. Often, children seem to carry whatever activity they are doing to various parts of the library, making it difficult to judge if that constitutes a different use.

### Discussion

Since this study was conducted in a limited geographical area of northwestern Pennsylvania, it is not expected that all discussions and conclusions of this study will apply directly to all rural libraries across the United States. This was a small sampling of rural public libraries, and the best one can hope to do with such data is to suggest that some of the things which seemed to be holding true in the five libraries researched might also apply to other libraries existing in similar circumstances. However, certain findings are worth some commentary.

In terms of sex of user, this study revealed few surprises. This subject will be generally dealt within the following discussion concerning age groups of library users.

This study's findings about age groups of library users are within the range of ages other reports have indicated. Since patron age was determined observationally, it is impossible to find an average age of the rural public library user. Age determinations are not likely to be as precise as age groupings gathered by survey,

because in this study age categorization was based on an educated guess by the researcher. However, one of the strengths of this study is that it attempted to find the age of all the people who used those five particular libraries during those times. True randomness is thereby more likely than in written or telephone surveys which would probably be answered by adults.

The findings here, which indicate that the largest group of library users is composed of people over 47, is supportive of Vavrek's finding that the average female client is 44 and the average male client, 51 (Vavrek 1990, 2). This should be of little surprise, since both studies focused on Pennsylvania rural public libraries. However, another utility of this information is that there seems to be some crossover between what has been found out about rural public libraries and what exists in the literature about nonrural libraries. The Enoch Pratt Library, for instance, found that the median age of the library user was 38 ("Market Study" 1987, 18). The second most active group of users in this study, by age and sex, was females from 27-46. The library user in his, or more likely, her, early 40s or late 30s, then, would seem not to be a strictly rural phenomenon. Because of the type of study this was, it is impossible to comment on the question of whether younger people or older people are more likely to use the library. Since this was a study of library users, not the general public, the question must remain a question.

Two more age groups are of interest here and are derived from combining the statistical data for men and women into one group of users for each age category. In so doing, the following is found: people over 47 make up 29% of the users; those under 17 make up 28%; ages 27-46 account for 26%; and the ages group 17-26 makes up only 18% of the user group. Why are 17 to 26 year-olds the smallest group in the library? It could be due to the fact that this age group encompasses only nine years, while the other age categories are much broader. There is another possibility, however. This may be due to the nature of this group of potential users, not to survey techniques. It is possible that more members of this group exist but are now underserved by the library, or perhaps this lower percentage of users may really reflect the fact that, in terms of percentage, there are fewer people of this age group in rural areas. An analysis of population statistics for Pennsylvania, however,

indicates that for those 18 and those 19-44, Clarion County, in which four of these libraries are located, has above the state average in population, 3.1% compared to 1.8%, and 39% compared to 37% for the two age groups indicated (Pennsylvania Abstract 1986, 14). This would seem to indicate that, unless the population has changed substantially in four years, there may be a user group composed of adults between 17 and about age 30 who are currently underserved. Another group of users that merits special treatment here is those under 17. This will be dealt with in the discussion on user patterns.

Duration of the library visit also merits a short discussion. In general, this study seems to indicate that "younger users tended to stay longer at the library" (Lange 1987/88, 63). As a group, females of under 17 stayed at the library the longest, while men of over 47 spent the shortest time on their library visits (Appendix B). However, men in general had shorter library visits than did women in general. This information need not negate the other suggestion that Lange makes about library use duration, that "duration is associated with use patterns rather than user characteristics" (Lange 1987/88, 63). The reason for this is that men in general also made fewer uses of the library during their visits, so both the fact that the group is composed of men and the fact that men make fewer uses per visit point toward a shorter duration of visit for men.

This automatically leads to the discussion of user patterns and to the first obvious question of why it may be so that men come into the library less often, make fewer uses when they do come in, and have shorter visits than do women. Vavrek suggests seven possible reasons why women make more use of the public library than do men, and here it is appropriate to focus on two of them. First, "men may perceive the library more as a place for women" and second, "women may feel more comfortable using the library because the library staff person tends to be female" (Vavrek 1990, 14). The second of these was supported in the findings of this study, because only one time during the total of 15 visits was there a male staff person working, and even then along with female staffers. There is much evidence, both anecdotal and documentable, to suggest that perhaps libraries are often perceived of as being "women's places." In terms of written, documentable evidence, Hole says

that "we have made public libraries . . . into institutions which are hostile or useless to most males" (Hole 1990, 3). Furthermore, according to some preliminary data from the rural library attitudes study, a random sampling of 460 surveys found that 31 respondents (7%) felt that the public library was best suited to women or to women and children. No respondent felt that the library was best suited to men, although five respondents (1%) thought public library services were best suited to adults in general (Center for the Study of Rural Librarianship 1990). To focus on the anecdotal, during visits to the Rimersburg Library, it was observed that during two out of three visits the library was, besides serving as a source of information, being used as an informal meeting place for women with children. Women were observed to come into the library, and while their children played in the well-equipped children's area, these women chatted with the library staff, browsed fiction, and perhaps read newspapers. During one visit, a large study table was taken up by piles of clip-out store coupons. Women patrons would sit down and leisurely sort through these. It was obvious that this was a comfortable situation for all involved, except for the researcher who must admit to feeling slightly out of place. This is not to demean the Rimersburg Library or its staff, because male patrons also came in during these visits and the staff people seemed to be friendly and helpful; on the contrary. The Rimersburg Library was doing a booming business, and seemed to be well-funded. It appears that the Rimersburg Library has taken the advice of Heasley and Price in determining "what challenges the rural environment present [sic]" and has acted upon those challenges (Heasley and Price 1988, 24).

One more age group should be dealt with here under the discussion of user patterns, and that is the group of individuals under seventeen years of age. Literature which has suggested that there is a good deal of library use for young people seems to be supported by the findings of this survey. At the risk of oversimplification, there seems to be two main types of use within this subgroup. First, there is independent use, generally to do homework. These users are usually in their teens. Second is supervised use, and these patrons are generally younger. Exactly what these users do in the library, however, may be worth future study. Speaking of the definition of "use," for the purposes of this study it was assumed that

any person who went into the library to do anything was a user. The only exception were such individuals as postal and parcel delivery people. Returning to the subject of young library patrons, it seems that the one of the main functions of the rural public library, at least in terms of public opinion, is to provide children's services. Preliminary data from the above-cited rural library attitudes survey indicates that although a significant number of respondents feel the library is best suited to women or women and children, 93 out of 460 survey participants (20%) felt the public library was best suited to children, while another 17 (4%) thought it was best suited to women and children. This means approximately one quarter of the survey participants thought children were the group the library could best serve. One researcher feels that providing children's services to rural areas "merits more attention" because of how important these services are to children (Sheller 1983, 103). Here, however, it would seem that with public perception of the library as a children's place it would be very sensible for the library to pay more perceives the library as failing in its main mission, serving children, then that would lead to a poorer perception of the library and resulting poor funding and poor service. This and the other issues discussed above lead to the following main conclusions and observations.

### **Conclusions and Observations**

- \* The typical rural library user is female and somewhere around 40 years of age, although there is a healthy number of users under 17.
- \* Men use the library less than women but they also use the library differently; that is they use fewer library services per visit and stay for shorter periods of time. A good subject for further study would be to explore whether or not this difference is due to the "femininity" of the public library and if so, what libraries should be doing to change that.
- \* Users from around the age 17 up to about 30 are the least common user group. Since population statistics seem to indicate that this is not due to the fact that there just are not that many people that age living in rural areas, more study could be done to discover what would attract these potential users.
- \* The strong usage of the rural public library by women and children plus the

attitude that the public library is best suited to serve children and women should not be seen as a problem to solve. Certainly, more ways to attract men should be explored, but foremost should be the concern to better serve these already dedicated users. Especially in rural areas, libraries which seem to welcome women with children do a strong business. Perhaps libraries which have not yet tapped into this important user group could look at working with social service agencies to provide facilities as well as library materials for a sort of indoor "playground/library" where children could play or read while the parents used library materials or visited. By helping these patrons fight rural isolation, the library could help its users as it helped itself.

If further studies employ the method of unobtrusive observation, it is recommended that no larger libraries than those studied here be used unless the researcher has a helper or is interested in only one area of the library. At certain times it was impossible to keep track of all the activities of all the library users.

**APPENDIX A  
AGE BREAKDOWN AND VISIT SCHEDULE**

Users were broken down according to sex (f or m) and by the following age groups:

1	=	under 17, not accompanied by adult user
2	=	17 - 26
3-4	=	27 - 46
5-6	=	47 and over
CH	=	Children 12 and under who were accompanied by an adult user. This category was not divided by sex of user, and is not included in percent of user by sex.

**Clarion**

Date Time	F/1	F/2	F/3-4	F/5-6	M/1	M/2	M/3-4	M/5-6	CH
4-6-90 9:00am	7	2	4	0	4	3	5	0	0
4-23-90 2:00pm	2	3	1	2	0	1	3	1	0
4-27-90 6:50pm	3	1	2	1	0	1	1	0	3
TOTAL	12	6	7	3	4	5	9	1	3

**Knox**

Date Time	F/1	F/2	F/3-4	F/5-6	M/1	M/2	M/3-4	M/5-6	CH
4-6-90 11:00am	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
4-23-90 12:00	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2
4-27-90 2:00pm	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0
TOTAL	0	1	2	4	0	1	1	1	2



**Rimersburg**

Date Time	F/1	F/2	F/3-4	F/5-6	M/1	M/2	M/3-4	M/5-6	CH
4-6-90 1:00pm	0	2	2	0	2	0	1	1	1
4-19-90 11:00am	0	2	3	5	0	2	0	5	5
4-27-90 3:30pm	1	1	3	0	0	3	1	1	7
TOTAL	1	5	8	5	2	5	2	7	13

**New Bethlehem**

Date Time	F/1	F/2	F/3-4	F/5-6	M/1	M/2	M/3-4	M/5-6	CH
4-6-90 2:15pm	0	1	1	3	0	2	0	1	0
4-19-90 12:30pm	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	2	0
4-27-90 4:45pm	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	1	3	7	0	3	0	3	0

## Brookville

Date Time	F/1	F/2	F/3-4	F/5-6	M/1	M/2	M/3-4	M/5-6	CH
4-6-90 3:45pm	2	0	4	1	2	0	2	2	1
4-19-90 2:00pm	2	2	2	4	2	1	1	1	0
4-27-90 12:15pm	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	2	1
TOTAL	4	2	8	12	4	1	3	5	2
GRAND TOTAL	17	15	28	31	10	15	15	17	20

Total females: 91

Total males: 57

Total children: 20

Note that "children" category is not included in the following breakdown of library users by sex.

Percent female users: 61%    Percent male users: 39%

**APPENDIX B**  
**BREAKDOWN BY TIME OF VISIT**

	Under min.	55-10 min	10-20 min	20-30 min	30-40 min	40-50 min	Over min.	50
F/1	0	3	11	1	0	2	1	
F/2	2	2	6	2	0	1	0	
F/3-4	7	3	8	2	1	2	2	
F/5-6	10	10	6	1	0	1	1	
M/1	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	
M/2	6	2	2	0	1	0	0	
M/3-4	6	2	3	1	1	0	1	
M/5-6	7	4	2	0	0	3	1	
CH	2	0	3	0	0	0	9	
TOTAL	43	27	45	7	3	9	15	

Total users in this study: 168

Users for whom visit duration times were noted: 149

The visit duration times for 19 patrons were therefore not gathered for this study.

**APPENDIX C  
USE GROUPINGS**

By Age Group and Use Category  
 m = multiple use  
 s = single use

	F/1	F/2	F/3-4	F/5-6	M/1	M/2	M/3-4	M/5-6	CH	TOTL
Gen. Brows	2-s 0-m	0-s 4-m	3-s 3-m	0-s 5-m	2-s 1-m	0-s 4-m	1-s 1-m	0-s 2-m	3	11-s 19-m
Ref. Books.	0-s 0-m	0-s 1-m	0-s 2-m	1-s 5-m	0-s 0-m	1-s 0-m	1-s 0-m	0-s 1-m	0	3-s 9-m
Best Sellrs	0-s 1-m	0-s 1-m	0-s 5-m	1-s 5-m	1-s 0-m	0-s 0-m	0-s 0-m	1-s 0-m	0	3-s 14-m
Ref ?	0-s 2-m	1-s 1-m	0-s 1-m	0-s 4-m	0-s 1-m	1-s 0-m	4-s 1-m	0-s 1-m	0	6-s 11-m
Card Cat.	0-s 0-m	0-s 1-m	0-s 1-m	0-s 0-m	0-s 0-m	0-s 1-m	0-s 1-m	0-s 0-m	0	0-s 4-m
Mags & News	1-s 7-m	1-s 1-m	1-s 0-m	1-s 2-m	0-s 0-m	3-s 2-m	5-s 0-m	2-s 3-m	3	17-s 14-m
Video	0-s 0-m	0-s 0-m	1-s 1-m	0-s 0-m	0-s 0-m	1-s 0-m	0-s 0-m	0-s 0-m	0	2-s 1-m
Ckout Retrn	0-s 0-m	1-s 7-m	2-s 9-m	5-s 12-m	0-s 1-m	2-s 2-m	0-s 1-m	1-s 1-m	0	11-s 33-m
Copy & Phone	0-s 0-m	0-s 2-m	0-s 1-m	1-s 1-m	0-s 0-m	0-s 0-m	2-s 1-m	4-s 0-m	0	7-s 5-m
Other	2-s 11-m	0-s 2-m	5-s 1-m	5-s 2-m	2-s 4-m	2-s 0-m	2-s 0-m	4-s 0-m	14	36-s 19-m

Children under twelve years of age accompanied by an adult were considered to be single users only of whatever service is indicated.

Females who only used a single library service: 34  
 Males who only used a single library service: 42

Percentage of single-use females: 37%  
 Percentage of single-use males: 74%

## WORKS CITED

- American Library Directory 1989-90, 42nd edition, v. w New York: Bowker, 1989.
- Carpenter, Ray L. "Public Library Patrons and Selected Social Issues." Public Library Quarterly 8, no. 1/2, (1987/88): 21-38.
- Center for the Study of Rural Librarianship. Attitudes toward rural public library use. Unpublished telephone survey conducted March-May, 1990. Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Clarion, PA.
- D'Elia, George and Sandra Walsh. "User Satisfaction With Service--A Measure of Public Library Performance?" Library Quarterly 53, no. 2 (April 1983): 109-133.
- Heasley, Daryl K. and Deborah A. Price. "Challenges of the Rural Environment: Implications for Public Libraries." Rural Libraries 8, no. 2 (1988): 7-29.
- Hole, Carol. "Click! The Feminization of the Public Library." 1990. Unpublished paper accepted for publication in Library Journal.
- Houlahan, John. "Three Types of Libraries Serve Rural Patrons." Rural Libraries 4, no. 2 (1984): 63-77.
- Kirks, James. "How Library Systems Support Rural Library Service." Wilson Library Bulletin 63 (May 1989): 36-38.
- Lange, Janet M. "Public Library Users, Nonusers, and Type of Library Use." Public Library Quarterly 8, no. 1/2 (1987/88): 49-67.
- Madden, Michael. "Marketing Survey Spinoff: Library User/Nonuser Lifestyles." American Libraries 10 (February 1979): 78-81.
- Pennsylvania Abstract, 28th ed. 1986. Middletown, PA: The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State Data Center, 1986.
- Plotnik, Art. "Naked Came the Reader, or A Tale of Three Surveys." American Libraries 9 (December 1978): 639-640.
- "Results of Pratt Market Study Show Nonusers Not Willing to Try." Library Journal 112 (August 1987): 18.
- Sheller, Becky. "Kids are the Issue: Rural Libraries and Children's Services." Rural Libraries 3, no. 1 (1983): 95-111.

- Vavrek, Bernard. Assessing the Information Needs of Rural Pennsylvanians. Clarion, PA: College of Library Science, Clarion University of Pennsylvania, 1990.
- Vavrek, Bernard. "The Hidden Majority: Rediscovering Rural Libraries." Wilson Library Bulletin 58, no. 4 (December 1983): 266-269.
- Vavrek, Bernard. "The Importance of Being Rural." Rural Libraries 5, no. 1 (1985): 71-83.
- Wood, Leonard A. "The Gallup Survey: Library Use: An Irregular Habit." Publisher's Weekly 221, no. 21, 20-21.