

Affiliations & Community Marketing: An FDLP Forecast Study Working Paper¹



SEPTEMBER 25, 2013

The U.S. Government Printing Office's (GPO's) Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) Library and State Forecast Study Questionnaires requested responses related to the following themes: Affiliations & Community Marketing, Collection Management, Education, Future Roles & Opportunities, Library Services and Content Management Projects, and Preservation.

This series of Working Papers presents an analysis of each theme and includes major findings and conclusions from the related qualitative and quantitative data.

This report also includes analyses of responses from questions 30–33 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire and questions 17-20 of the State Forecast Questionnaire. These questions focused on future roles and opportunities for the FDLP and its libraries. A wide range of topics were included in these responses and those related to affiliations and community marketing have been analyzed and reported in this paper.

Each Working Paper includes the following sections:

- INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND
- QUESTIONS
 - Library Forecast Questionnaire
 - State Forecast Questionnaire
- SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
- DETAILED FINDINGS - LIBRARY FORECAST
 - Affiliations and Marketing-Related Comments From Other Library Questions
- DETAILED FINDINGS - STATE FORECAST
 - Affiliations and Marketing-Related Comments From Other State Questions
- GPO ACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS
 - Actions Already Taken
 - Actions in Development
- CONCLUSIONS
- APPENDICES TO SUPPORT THE WORKING PAPER
 - LIBRARY FORECAST DATA REPORTS
 - STATE FORECAST DATA REPORTS

¹ FDLP Forecast Study Working Papers have not undergone the review and editorial process generally accorded official GPO publications. These working papers are intended to make results and analysis of Forecast Study data available to others and to encourage discussion on a variety of topics.

In response to the Library and State Questionnaires, specific recommendations for each theme will be included in the FDLP Forecast Study Final Report.

PLEASE NOTE: TOTALS MAY NOT ALWAYS EQUAL 100% DUE TO ROUNDING, AND RANKINGS ARE BASED ON FREQUENCIES, NOT PERCENTAGES.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Affiliations among the FDLP community and beyond are relationships that are integral to the continued success of the FDLP and to increasing awareness of FDLP libraries across the country. No one library can fulfill all the information needs of the community being served; therefore, collaboration is necessary.

Marketing the FDLP has been and continues to be a key initiative of GPO's Library Services & Content Management (LSCM). Marketing the FDLP is also integral to the continued success and growth of the FDLP. The American public needs to be continuously informed about the FDLP and the variety of resources and services available through it in order for patronage to continue and increase.

In the FDLP Forecast Study, these two topics were combined into one category, as there is a strong relationship between them. Affiliations are an excellent and cost-effective method of marketing the FDLP and increasing awareness of the Program throughout the country.

For the purposes of this Working Paper, the terms "marketing" and "promotion" are often used interchangeably. "Marketing" is defined as "the action or business of promoting products and services." Although not always described as "community marketing" in the context of this Working Paper, marketing and promotion refer specifically to efforts within the FDLP community. The term "affiliation" is defined as "a closely connected business relationship (either formal or informal) forged to accomplish common goals."

There were six questions in the Library Forecast Questionnaire (Questions 21-26) that were categorized as "Affiliations & Community Marketing" questions. Three were based on Affiliations, two were based on Marketing, and one was a blended question that focused on both topics.

There were five questions in the State Forecast Questionnaire (Questions 9-13) that were categorized as "Affiliations & Community Marketing" questions. Three were based on Affiliations and two were based on Marketing.

QUESTIONS

Library Forecast Questionnaire:

- **Question 21:** *Does your library have formal or informal relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information?*
- **Question 22:** *Does your library market its FDLP collection and services to local non-depository libraries or in other venues where members of your community could learn of them?*
- **Question 23:** *How can GPO assist in effectively marketing the services your library provides?*
- **Question 24:** *If your library has relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information, do those libraries market your library's FDLP collection and services?*
- **Question 25:** *Is your library planning to enter into new or additional relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information?*
- **Question 26:** *Is your library planning to enter into new or additional relationships with other FDLP libraries to provide government information?*

State Forecast Questionnaire:

- **Question 9:** *Do FDLP libraries in your state have formal or informal relationships/agreements with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal Government information?*
- **Question 10:** *Do FDLP libraries in your state market their FDLP collections and services to non-depository libraries or conduct other outreach activities that target the general public?*
- **Question 11:** *How can GPO assist in effectively marketing FDLP libraries and services?*
- **Question 12:** *Within the next five years, are FDLP libraries in your state planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal Government information?*
- **Question 13:** *Are FDLP libraries in your state planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with other FDLP libraries to provide Government information?*

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Affiliations

As demonstrated by the Library Forecast data collected in affiliations questions, most libraries self-reported that they are not engaging in affiliations with either the FDLP community or with non-FDLP libraries, groups, and organizations:

- 55% of libraries reported that they do not have formal or informal relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information. (Library Q21)
- 48% of libraries reported that non-FDLP libraries with which they have relationships are not marketing FDLP resources to their patrons. An additional 39% reported that they did not know if non-FDLP libraries with which they have relationships are marketing FDLP resources to their patrons. (Library Q24)
- 88% of libraries reported that they were not planning to enter into new or additional relationships with local non-FDLP libraries. (Library Q25)
- 74% of libraries reported that they were not planning to enter into new or additional relationships with local FDLP libraries. (Library Q26)

States reported a different point of view:

- 87% of states indicated that libraries in the state have formal or informal relationships/agreements with local non-FDLP libraries. Only six states indicated no relationships/agreements. (State Q9)
- 47% of states indicated that libraries in the state were planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with non-FDLP libraries. (State Q12)
- 67% of states indicated that libraries in the state were planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with other FDLP libraries. (State Q13)

Community Marketing

As demonstrated by the Library Forecast data collected in community marketing questions, community marketing is not prevalent in FDLP libraries:

- Of 802 respondents that indicated ways that GPO can assist in effectively marketing the services that their library provides, 37% reported responses in the “Other” category, which included responses such as: no time/staff/money for marketing and marketing help is not needed. This also included 11% of the responses reporting that they were unsure of how GPO could assist them in marketing. (Library Q23)
- 59% of respondents reported that they do not market their library’s collections and services. (Library Q22)
- Of the 41% that reported they do market their library’s collections and services, many simply reported that this was being accomplished through the library’s Web site (a small component of marketing). (Library Q22)

Much like the affiliations-related responses, states showed a different point of view with regard to community marketing:

- 82% of states indicated that libraries in the state market their FDLP collections and services. Only eight states indicated that no marketing activities are undertaken. (State Q10)
- Of 45 state respondents that indicated ways that GPO can assist in effectively marketing FDLP libraries and services, a mere 1% of responses reported that they were unsure of how GPO could assist them in marketing. (State Q11)

These affiliations and community marketing results will play an important role in the development of the FDLP Strategic Plan and the FDLP National Plan.

DETAILED FINDINGS - LIBRARY FORECAST

Question 21: *Does your library have formal or informal relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information?*²

Question 21 required a standard yes/no response and provided an option for open-ended responses where respondents described the relationships.

Of 802 respondents to Question 21, 360 (45%) indicated that they had formal or informal relationships with local non-FDLP libraries, and 442 (55%) indicated that they did not.

Respondents from 360 libraries provided further elaboration via the open-ended responses. There was no limit to the number of relationships that they could provide.

Identified relationships were grouped into 36 different types, resulting in 801 observations.³

Of 36 relationship types identified in the initial review, top-ranked responses are (in ranking order):

Figure 1: Library Forecast Question 21 Most Frequent Responses

Rank	Relationship Types	Frequency	%
1	Informal Relationships	98	12%
2	Formal Relationships	97	12%
3	Access to FDLP expertise/resources/government information	74	9%
4	Interlibrary Loan	66	8%
5	Informal Referrals	55	7%
6	Referrals (undefined/general)	51	6%

The second step in analyzing responses was a process of analytical compression that grouped the 36 individual relationship types into four over-arching themes, resulting in 578 unique observations.⁴ The four over-arching compressed themes are (in ranking order):

² Parallels information requested in Question 9 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

³ The term “observations” refers to each unique “library-topic” combination. A library’s response could include numerous topics, each characterized here as “observations.”

⁴ A more detailed explanation of the analytical compression process will be provided in the FDLP Forecast Study methodology documentation.

Figure 2: Library Forecast Question 21 Compressed Themes

Rank	Compressed Theme	Frequency	%
1	Referrals and Relationships	254	44%
2	Collaborative Resources/Services	251	43%
3	Communicating/Promotion Awareness	62	11%
4	Other	11	2%
	Totals	578	100%

Question 22: *Does your library market its FDLP collection and services to local non-depository libraries or in other venues where members of your community could learn of them?*⁵

Question 22 required a standard yes/no response and provided an option for open-ended responses where respondents described the marketing methods employed.

Of 802 respondents to Question 22, 331 (41%) reported that they do market their collection and services, while 471 (59%) reported that they do not.

Respondents from 331 libraries provided further elaboration via the open-ended responses. There was no limit to the number of marketing methods that they could provide.

Identified marketing methods were grouped into 36 different types, resulting in 710 observations.

Of 36 marketing methods identified in the initial review, top-ranked responses are (in ranking order):

Figure 3: Library Forecast Question 22 Most Frequent Responses

Rank	Marketing Methods	Frequency	%
1	Web Site	123	17%
2	Collaboration with Government/local community/libraries/consortia/associations	116	16%
3	Presentations/Programs/Workshops/Classes/Webinars FDLP Resources	82	12%
4	Subject Guides	44	6%
5	Participation in Local/Regional Library Conferences and Meetings	42	6%

⁵ Parallels information requested in Question 10 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

The second step in analyzing responses was a process of analytical compression that grouped the 36 individual marketing methods into four over-arching themes, resulting in 456 unique observations. The four over-arching compressed themes are (in ranking order):

Figure 4: Library Forecast Question 22 Compressed Themes

Rank	Compressed Theme	Frequency	%
1	Direct Marketing	206	45%
2	Indirect Marketing	204	45%
3	Other	39	9%
4	Planned/Potential Marketing	7	2%
	Totals	456	101%

Question 23: *How can GPO assist in effectively marketing the services your library provides?*⁶

Question 23 did not have a yes/no (quantitative) component. Responses were entirely open-ended (qualitative). The 802 respondents to Question 23 were not limited to the number of requested marketing activities that they could provide.

Requested marketing activities were grouped into 40 different types, resulting in 1,452 observations.

Of 40 marketing activities identified in the initial review, top-ranked responses are (in ranking order):

Figure 5: Library Forecast Question 23 Most Frequent Responses

Rank	Requested Marketing Activities	Frequency	%
1	Not Sure/No Answer	162	11%
2	Satisfied with Current Offerings	103	7%
3	Free Promo Materials (unspecified)	98	7%
4	Promo Content Enhancements (focus on..., simple, by genre, by demographic)	95	7%
4	Brochures/Flyers	95	7%
6	GPO-Created Customized/Downloadable Content for Library Web Sites/Virtual Images & Tools	84	6%

⁶ Parallels information requested in Question 11 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

The second step in analyzing responses was a process of analytical compression that grouped the 40 requested marketing activities into four over-arching themes, resulting in 1,028 unique observations. The four over-arching compressed themes are (in ranking order):

Figure 6: Library Forecast Question 23 Compressed Themes

Rank	Compressed Theme	Frequency	%
1	Current/Potential Activity	484	47%
2	Other	381	37%
3	Out of FDLP Scope	129	13%
4	GPO Can Advise	34	3%
	Totals	1,028	100%

Question 24: *If your library has relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information, do those libraries market your library's FDLP collection and services?*⁷

Question 24 required a yes, no, or don't know response and provided an option for open-ended responses where respondents described the marketing relationships.

Of 802 respondents to Question 24, 102 (13%) responded "yes," 390 (48%) responded "no," while 310 (39%) responded "don't know."

Respondents from 102 libraries provided further elaboration via the open-ended responses. There was no limit to the number of individual marketing relationships that they could provide.

Identified marketing relationships were grouped into 23 different types, resulting in 157 observations.

Of 23 marketing relationship types identified in the initial review, top-ranked responses are (in ranking order):

⁷ This question did not have a parallel State Forecast Questionnaire question.

Figure 7: Library Forecast Question 24 Most Frequent Responses

Rank	Marketing Relationship Types	Frequency	%
1	Referrals from Non-FDLP Libraries	53	34%
2	Word of Mouth/Informal	23	15%
3	Promotion of FDLP Collection	13	8%
4	Web Site Links	11	7%

The second step in analyzing responses was a process of analytical compression that grouped the 23 individual marketing relationship types into four over-arching themes, resulting in 123 unique observations. The four over-arching compressed themes are (in ranking order):

Figure 8: Library Forecast Question 24 Compressed Themes

Rank	Compressed Theme	Frequency	%
1	Indirect Marketing	79	64%
2	Direct Marketing	31	25%
3	Planned/Potential Marketing	9	7%
4	Other	4	3%
	Totals	123	99%

Question 25: *Is your library planning to enter into new or additional relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information?*⁸

Question 25 required a standard yes/no response and provided an option for open-ended responses where respondents described the new or additional relationships.

Of 802 respondents to Question 25, 96 (12%) reported that they do plan to enter into new or additional relationships with local non-FDLP libraries, while 706 (88%) reported they do not.

Respondents from 96 libraries provided further elaboration via the open-ended responses. There was no limit to the number of planned relationships they could provide.

Identified new or additional relationships were grouped into 13 different types, resulting in 121 observations.

⁸ Parallels information requested in Question 12 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

Of 13 new or additional relationships identified in the initial review, top-ranked responses are (in ranking order):

Figure 9: Library Forecast Question 25 Most Frequent Responses

Rank	New or Additional Relationships with Non-FDLP Libraries	Frequency	%
1	Outreach/Collaboration	39	32%
2	Unspecified Plans	32	26%
3	More Programming, Training, Workshops, School Visits	17	14%
4	Maintain Current Efforts	9	7%
5	Send/Share Promotional Materials	8	7%

The second step in analyzing responses was a process of analytical compression that grouped the 13 individual new or additional relationships into five over-arching themes, resulting in 108 unique observations. The five over-arching compressed themes are (in ranking order):

Figure 10: Library Forecast Question 25 Compressed Themes

Rank	Compressed Theme	Frequency	%
1	Promotion-Based	45	42%
2	Ongoing/Potential Plans	40	37%
3	Outreach-Based	10	9%
4	Other	9	8%
5	No Current Plans	4	4%
	Totals	108	100%

Question 26: *Is your library planning to enter into new or additional relationships with other FDLP libraries to provide government information?*⁹

Question 26 required a standard yes/no response and provided an option for open-ended responses where respondents described the new or additional relationships.

Of 802 respondents to Question 26, 211 (26%) reported they do plan to enter into new or additional relationships with local FDLP libraries, while 591 (74%) reported they do not.

⁹ Parallels information requested in Question 13 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

Respondents from 211 libraries provided further elaboration via the open-ended responses. There was no limit to the number of relationships they could provide.

Identified new or additional relationships were grouped into 15 different types, resulting in 397 observations.

Of 15 new or additional relationships identified in the initial review, top-ranked responses are (in ranking order):

Figure 11: Library Forecast Question 26 Most Frequent Responses

Rank	New or Additional Relationships with FDLP Libraries	Frequency	%
1	Not Currently But Interested/Planning	71	18%
2	Managing Tangible Resources (Collection Management, Shared Housing, N&O, Light Archive)	54	14%
3	Maintain Current Relationships	46	12%
4	State-Wide Agreements (Plans, Structure, Discussion, Needs Regional)	45	11%
5	Establish/Maintain/Join Projects/Consortia	36	9%

The second step in analyzing responses was a process of analytical compression that grouped the 13 individual new or additional relationships into four over-arching themes, resulting in 302 unique observations. The four over-arching compressed themes are (in ranking order):

Figure 12: Library Forecast Question 26 Compressed Themes

Rank	Compressed Theme	Frequency	%
1	Shared Projects/Plans	131	43%
2	Ongoing/Potential Relationships	130	43%
3	ASERL-Related	36	12%
4	Other	5	2%
	Totals	302	100%

Affiliations and Marketing-Related Comments From Other Library Forecast Questions

Several other Library Forecast questions corresponded to the topics of affiliations and marketing or included observations that were relevant.

Question 16: *As government information is increasingly produced and distributed in digital-only formats, what barriers to access, if any, do you anticipate in the next five years?*¹⁰

While most of the examples provided in this question are access-focused, there is some mention of lack of awareness of services; this issue is typically addressed by a marketing activity.

Of the 802 respondents to Library Forecast Question 16, 419 (52%) responded “I anticipate barriers to access,” while 383 (48%) responded “I do not anticipate any barriers to access.” In the individual open-ended responses to the anticipated barriers, there were 729 observations: 44 of those were categorized as ‘promotion’, which is associated with marketing. Within the 44 observations, 30 of these mentioned workshops as a means to address the lack of awareness of FDLP resources.

Question 17D: *Please rate the following current LSCM projects areas according to how users of Federal government information in your library might benefit: Projects focused on education and online communication with FDLP members such as: FDsys training sessions; acquiring an online tool for virtual meetings; scheduling online community forums to discuss current FDLP issues; communication through social media (blogs, twitter).*¹¹

While most of the examples provided in this question are education-focused, there is mention of communication, specifically through social media, which is a marketing activity.

Of 802 respondents to Question 17d, 380 rated these LSCM projects as “extremely beneficial,” 371 rated the projects as “moderately beneficial,” and 51 rated the projects as “not beneficial.”

Question 18: *Is there another area of service that you would like LSCM to offer? (Please describe.)*¹²

Of 802 respondents to Question 18, 217 responded “yes” and chose to provide an individual open-ended response. Those responses totaled 351 observations. Of the 351 observations, a small number of comments related to affiliations (9) and marketing (8).

Of the nine affiliations-related comments, the focus was on the need for GPO to partner and collaborate with other agencies and expand partnership opportunities for depositories. This, too, is in line with the results from other questions.

Of the eight marketing comments, all were in line with those of other questions and focused on the need for GPO to create targeted and customizable promotional tools and utilize national media.

¹⁰ Parallels information requested in Question 5 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

¹¹ Parallels information requested in Question 6d of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

¹² Parallels information requested in Question 7 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

Question 30: *What leadership opportunities and roles do you foresee for your depository library in the next five years?*¹³

Of 802 respondents to Question 30, individual open-ended responses totaled 989 observations. Of the 989 observations, 108 related to a future leadership role/opportunity regarding affiliations, and 109 related to a future leadership role/opportunity regarding marketing.

Of the 108 affiliations-related observations, three main types surfaced: 1) general mention of collaborations, with no elaboration on what type specifically (43), 2) indication of future leadership in specific projects (31), and 3) indication of future leadership in or formal positions in professional groups (30). There were also 11 mentions of cooperative or consortial agreements.

Of the 109 marketing-related observations, the vast majority (76) mentioned general marketing and promotion as a future leadership role/opportunity, with no elaboration on specifically how that will be accomplished. Twenty-six (26) observations mentioned outreach-based marketing as a future leadership role/opportunity. There was a small number of specific marketing methods specified, i.e. social media, events, newsletters, and through digitization, but these numbers represented only one or two respondents each.

Question 31: *What would an ideal FDLP look like that met all of your current and anticipated needs for Federal government information?*¹⁴

Of 802 respondents to Question 31, individual open-ended responses totaled 1,699 observations. Of the 1,699 observations, 38 of those related to affiliations, and 28 of those related to marketing.

Of the 38 affiliations-related observations, two main types surfaced: 1) mention of support from GPO needed for cooperative/consortial arrangements (13) and 2) general mention of collaborations in and among the FDLP community (11). There were also a small number of mentions of support from GPO needed for ASERL-related initiatives and interlibrary loan.

Of the 28 marketing-related observations, there were 32 mentions of general promotion of the FDLP or mention of promotional materials about the FDLP in an ideal FDLP. There were a very small number of more specific mentions of marketing methods in an ideal FDLP, i.e. social media and PSAs, but these numbers represented only one or two respondents each.

¹³ Parallels information requested in Question 17 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

¹⁴ Parallels information requested in Question 18 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

Question 32: *Thinking about the next five years, what specific things would you like GPO to do to help you and your library improve public access to Federal government information?*¹⁵

Of 802 respondents to Question 32, individual open-ended responses totaled 1,308 observations. Of the 1,308 observations, 20 of those related to affiliations, and 78 of those related to marketing.

Of the 20 affiliations-related observations, there were a wide variety of requests of GPO. These included support and coordination of special projects for FDLP libraries; support for collaborative and consortial arrangements between libraries; and partnering with professional organizations and government on behalf of the FDLP.

Of the 78 marketing-related observations, there were 30 general mentions of the need for GPO to actively promote the FDLP. There were 26 mentions of the need for marketing materials from GPO. There were also smaller numbers of more specific requests of GPO, such as targeted and customizable marketing materials, social media/e-based materials, outreach to agencies and Congress, and general advocacy for the FDLP.

Question 33: *Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about the current and future vision of the FDLP?*¹⁶

Of 802 respondents to Question 33, 238 responded “yes” and chose to provide an individual open-ended response. Those responses totaled 400 observations. Of the 400 observations, 27 of those related to affiliations, and 17 of those related to marketing.

Of the 27 affiliations-related observations, the focus of all of the comments was on the need for GPO to partner with and support library and consortial cooperative initiatives and projects. There were also several mentions of the need for GPO to collaborate more with agencies and professional library organizations.

Of the 17 marketing-related observations, there was a variety of comments. These included statements emphasizing the importance of promotion; requests for GPO to improve branding of the FDLP; guide outreach; advocate for the FDLP; and develop incentives for libraries to remain in the FDLP.

¹⁵ Parallels information requested in Question 19 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

¹⁶ Parallels information requested in Question 20 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

DETAILED FINDINGS - STATE FORECAST

Question 9: *Do FDLP libraries in your state have formal or informal relationships/agreements with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal Government information?*¹⁷

Question 9 had a standard yes/no response, and the option to describe the formal or informal relationships or agreements.

Of 45 state respondents, 39 (87%) indicated that libraries in the state have formal or informal relationships/agreements with local non-FDLP libraries. Only six states indicated no relationships/agreements.

Open-ended responses were provided by 39 states, and they could provide multiple responses.

Identified relationships/agreements were grouped into 36 different topics, resulting in 162 observations.¹⁸

When comparing State Forecast Question 9 to its comparable Library Forecast counterpart (Question 21), both libraries and states reported similar relationships/agreements with non-FDLP libraries, shown below by close-ranked relationships: Interlibrary Loan, Access to FDLP Expertise/Resources/Government Information, Referrals (Undefined/General), and Informal Relationships. However, while the relationship “Reference Services” ranked 4th (7%) among states, it ranked 8th (5%) among libraries’ responses. Also, the relationship “Shared Online Catalogs” ranked 4th (7%) among states and 11th (4%) among libraries. Furthermore, library responses for “Formal Relationships” ranked high at the 2nd most popular response (12%), while for states, “Formal Relationships” ranked 9th (4%). Finally, “Informal Referrals” ranked high for libraries, 5th (7%), but for states, ranked 20th with a rounded percentage of 1%.

Of the 36 relationships/agreements identified in the initial review, the top-rated State Forecast responses, compared to the Library Forecast, are (in ranking order):

¹⁷ Parallels information requested in Question 21 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

¹⁸ The term “observations” refers to each unique “state-topic” combination. Any state’s response could include numerous topics, each characterized here as “observations.”

Figure 13: Comparison of State Forecast Question 9 and Library Forecast Question 21 Responses

State Forecast Q9 Rank	Library Forecast Q21 Rank	Relationships/Agreements	State Forecast Q9 Freq	State Forecast Q9 %	Library Forecast Q21 Freq	Library Forecast Q21 %
1	4	Interlibrary Loan	18	11%	66	8%
2	3	Access to FDLP Expertise/Resources/Government Information	16	10%	74	9%
3	6	Referrals (Undefined/General)	13	8%	51	6%
4	1	Informal Relationships	12	7%	98	12%
4	8	Reference Services	12	7%	37	5%
4	11	Shared Online Catalogs	12	7%	30	4%
9	2	Formal Relationships	7	4%	97	12%
20	5	Informal Referrals	1	1%	55	7%

Next, through analysis of the responses, the 36 relationships/agreements identified were compressed into four over-arching themes, resulting in 74 unique observations. The four over-arching compressed themes, compared to the Library Forecast, are (in ranking order):

Figure 14: Comparison of State Forecast Question 9 and Library Forecast Question 21 Compressed Themes

State Forecast Q9 Rank	Library Forecast Q21 Rank	Compressed Theme	State Forecast Q9 Freq	State Forecast Q9 %	Library Forecast Q21 Freq	Library Forecast Q21 %
1	2	Collaborative Resources/Services	35	47%	251	43%
2	1	Referrals and Relationships	25	34%	254	44%
3	3	Communicating/Promotion Awareness	13	18%	62	11%
4	4	Other	1	1%	11	2%
		Totals	74	100%	578	100%

Question 10: *Do FDLP libraries in your state market their FDLP collections and services to non-depository libraries or conduct other outreach activities that target the general public?*¹⁹

Question 10 had a standard yes/no response, and the option to describe the marketing activities undertaken.

Of 45 state respondents, 37 (82%) indicated that libraries in the state market their FDLP collections and services. Only eight states indicated that no marketing activities are undertaken.

Open-ended responses were provided by 37 states, and they could provide multiple responses.

¹⁹ Parallels information requested in Question 22 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

Identified relationships/agreements were grouped into 36 different topics, resulting in 213 observations.

When comparing State Forecast Question 10 to its comparable Library Forecast counterpart (Question 22), both libraries and states reported similar marketing activities, shown below by the almost identical top four ranked activities. However, the activity, “Articles in Newspapers/Television/Radio Interviews/PSAs,” while ranking 5th (6%) among states, ranked 11th (3%) among libraries’ responses. The 5th ranked marketing activity among libraries was “Participation in Local/Regional Library Conferences and Meetings” (6%). The same activity ranked 6th (6%) among states.

Of the 36 marketing activities identified in the initial review, the top-rated State Forecast responses, compared to the Library Forecast, are (in ranking order):

Figure 15: Comparison of State Forecast Question 10 and Library Forecast Question 22 Responses

State Forecast Q10 Rank	Library Forecast Q22 Rank	Marketing Activities	State Forecast Q10 Freq	State Forecast Q10 %	Library Forecast Q22 Freq	Library Forecast Q22 %
1	2	Collaboration with Government/Local Community/Libraries/Consortia/Associations	27	13%	116	16%
2	3	Presentations/Programs/Workshops/Classes/Webinars on FDLP Resources	24	11%	42	6%
3	1	Web Site	23	11%	123	17%
4	4	Subject Guides	15	7%	44	6%
5	11	Articles in Newspapers/Television/Radio Interviews/PSAs	13	6%	19	3%
6	5	Participation in Local/Regional Library Conferences and Meetings	12	6%	42	6%

Next, through analysis of the responses, the 36 marketing activities identified were compressed into three over-arching themes, resulting in 69 unique observations. The three over-arching compressed themes, compared to the Library Forecast’s four over-arching themes, are (in ranking order)²⁰:

²⁰ There were no State responses that indicated potential or planned marketing activities.

Figure 16: Comparison of State Forecast Question 10 and Library Forecast Question 22 Compressed Themes

State Forecast Q10 Rank	Library Forecast Q22 Rank	Compressed Theme	State Forecast Q10 Freq	State Forecast Q10 %	Library Forecast Q22 Freq	Library Forecast Q22 %
1	1	Direct Marketing	29	42%	206	45%
2	2	Indirect Marketing	33	48%	204	45%
3	3	Other	7	10%	39	9%
n/a	4	Potential/Planned Marketing	0	0%	7	2%
Totals			69	100%	456	100%

Question 11: How can GPO assist in effectively marketing FDLP libraries and services?²¹

Question 11 did not have a yes/no (quantitative) component. Responses were entirely open-ended (qualitative).

Forty-five (45) states responded to Question 11, indicating ways GPO can assist in effectively marketing FDLP libraries and services. States were not limited to the number of requested marketing activities they could specify.

Requested marketing activities were grouped into 40 different topics, resulting in 283 observations.

When comparing State Forecast Question 11 to its comparable Library Forecast counterpart (Question 23), both libraries and states reported similar requests for marketing activities from GPO. It is interesting to note, however, that the top rankings are similar when comparing state to library, but in almost reverse order for the top five. The topic, “Media Spots/TV/Internet Adv/PSAs/Newspapers/Periodicals” while ranking 3rd (6%) among states, ranked 8th (6%) among libraries’ responses. In addition, the number one ranked response from libraries, “Not Sure/No Answer” (11%) ranked much lower in state responses (1%).

Of 40 requested marketing activities identified in the initial review, the top-rated State Forecast responses, compared to the Library Forecast, are (in ranking order):

²¹ Parallels information requested in Question 23 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

Figure 17: Comparison of State Forecast Question 11 and Library Forecast Question 23 Responses

State Forecast Q11 Rank	Library Forecast Q23 Rank	Requested Marketing Activities	State Forecast Q11 Freq	State Forecast Q11 %	Library Forecast Q23 Freq	Library Forecast Q23 %
1	6	GPO-Created Customized/Downloadable Content for Library Web Sites/Virtual Images & Tools	24	8%	84	6%
2	4	Promo Content Enhancements (focus on..., simple, by genre, by demographic)	18	6%	95	7%
3	8	Media Spots/TV/Internet Adv/PSAs/Newspapers/Periodicals	17	6%	68	6%
4	4	Brochures/Flyers	16	6%	95	7%
5	3	Free Promo Materials (unspecified)	15	5%	98	7%
5	2	Satisfied with Current Offerings	15	5%	103	7%
7	7	Marketing Guidance/Best Practices/Training	14	5%	75	5%
21	1	Not Sure/No Answer	4	1%	162	11%

Next, through analysis of the responses, the 40 marketing activities identified were compressed into four over-arching themes, resulting in 98 unique observations. The four over-arching compressed themes, compared to the Library Forecast's four over-arching themes, are (in ranking order):

Figure 18: Comparison of State Forecast Question 11 and Library Forecast Question 23 Compressed Themes

State Forecast Q11 Rank	Library Forecast Q23 Rank	Compressed Theme	State Forecast Q11 Freq	State Forecast Q11 %	Library Forecast Q23 Freq	Library Forecast Q23 %
1	1	Current or Potential GPO Activity	40	41%	484	47%
2	2	Other	28	29%	381	37%
3	4	GPO Can Advise on Activity	22	22%	34	3%
4	3	Out of FDLP Scope	8	8%	129	13%
		Totals	98	100%	1,028	100%

Question 12: *Within the next five years, are FDLP libraries in your state planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal Government information?*²²

Question 12 had a standard yes/no response, and the option to describe the individual planned relationships/agreements.

²² Parallels information requested in Question 25 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

Of 45 state respondents to Question 12, 21 (47%) indicated that libraries in the state were planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with non-FDLP libraries, while 24 (53%) indicated libraries in the state were not.

Open-ended responses were provided by 21 states, and they could provide multiple responses.

Identified relationships/agreements were grouped into 13 different topics, resulting in 50 observations.

When comparing State Forecast Question 12 to its comparable Library Forecast counterpart (Question 25), both libraries and states reported similar interests in planned relationships/agreements, shown below by the identical top three rankings. However, the response, “Answer is Actually ‘No,’” while ranking 4th (12%) among states, ranked 6th (3%) among libraries’ responses. Those libraries and states that responded “Answer is Actually ‘No’” were predominately reporting that no relationships/agreements were planned, but there was interest indicated.

Of 13 relationships/agreements identified in the initial review, the top-rated State Forecast responses, compared to the Library Forecast, are (in ranking order):

Figure 19: Comparison of State Forecast Question 12 and Library Forecast Question 25 Responses

State Forecast Q12 Rank	Library Forecast Q25 Rank	New Relationships/Agreements	State Forecast Q12 Freq	State Forecast Q12 %	Library Forecast Q25 Freq	Library Forecast Q25 %
1	1	Outreach/Collaboration	11	22%	39	32%
2	2	Unspecified Plans	10	20%	32	26%
3	3	More Programming/Training/Workshops/School Visits	9	18%	17	14%
4	6	Answer is Actually “No”	6	12%	4	3%
5	4	Maintain Current Efforts	3	6%	9	7%
5	5	Send/Share Promotional Materials	3	6%	8	7%
5	8	Informal	3	6%	2	2%

Next, through analysis of the responses, the 13 relationships/agreements identified were compressed into four over-arching themes, resulting in 39 unique observations. The four over-arching compressed themes, compared to the Library Forecast’s five over-arching themes, are (in ranking order)²³:

²³ All State responses indicated current plans for relationships/agreements.

Figure 20: Comparison of State Forecast Question 12 and Library Forecast Question 25 Compressed Themes

State Forecast Q12 Rank	Library Forecast Q25 Rank	Compressed Theme	State Forecast Q12 Freq	State Forecast Q12 %	Library Forecast Q25 Freq	Library Forecast Q25 %
1	1	Outreach-Based	16	41%	45	42%
2	2	Ongoing/Potential Plans	12	31%	40	37%
3	3	Other	7	18%	10	9%
4	5	Promotion-Based	4	10%	9	8%
n/a	4	No Current Plans	0	0%	4	4%
		Totals	39	100%	108	100%

Question 13: *Are FDLP libraries in your state planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with other FDLP libraries to provide Government information?*²⁴

Question 13 had a standard yes/no response, and the option to describe the individual planned relationships/agreements.

Of 45 state respondents to Question 13, 30 (67%) indicated that libraries in the state were planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with other FDLP libraries, while 15 (33%) indicated libraries in the state were not.

Open-ended responses were provided by 30 states, and they could provide multiple responses.

Identified relationships/agreements were grouped into 15 different topics, resulting in 68 observations.

When comparing State Forecast Question 13 to its comparable Library Forecast counterpart (Question 26), both libraries and states reported similar interests in planned relationships/agreements. However, the response, “Not Currently, but Interested/Planning,” while ranking 1st (18%) among libraries, ranked 7th (7%) among states’ responses. In addition, the responses “ASERL Participation” and “ASERL Center of Excellence” ranked 4th (9%) among states, but ranked 8th (7%) and 9th (5%) among libraries. Furthermore, the response “Digitization” ranked 2nd (12%) among states and 10th (4%) among libraries.

Of 15 relationships/agreements identified in the initial review, the top-rated State Forecast responses, compared to the Library Forecast, are (in ranking order):

²⁴ Parallels information requested in Question 26 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

Figure 21: Comparison of State Forecast Question 13 and Library Forecast Question 26 Responses

State Forecast Q13 Rank	Library Forecast Q26 Rank	New Relationships/Agreements	State Forecast Q13 Freq	State Forecast Q13 %	Library Forecast Q26 Freq	Library Forecast Q26 %
1	2	Managing Tangible Resources (Collection Management, Shared Housing, N&O, Light Archive)	9	13%	54	14%
2	10	Digitization	8	12%	15	4%
3	3	Maintain Current Relationships	7	10%	46	12%
4	9	ASERL Center of Excellence	6	9%	19	5%
4	8	ASERL Participation	6	9%	26	7%
4	4	State-Wide Agreements (Plans, Structure, Discussion, Needs Regional)	6	9%	45	11%
7	1	Not Currently, but Interested/Planning	5	7%	71	18%

Next, through analysis of the responses, the 15 relationships/agreements identified were compressed into four over-arching themes, resulting in 45 unique observations. The four over-arching compressed themes, compared to the Library Forecast's four over-arching themes, are (in ranking order):

Figure 22: Comparison of State Forecast Question 13 and Library Forecast Question 26 Compressed Themes

State Forecast Q13 Rank	Library Forecast Q26 Rank	Compressed Theme	State Forecast Q13 Freq	State Forecast Q13 %	Library Forecast Q26 Freq	Library Forecast Q26 %
1	1	Shared Projects/Plans	20	44%	131	43%
2	2	Ongoing/Potential Relationships	13	29%	130	43%
3	3	ASERL-Related	8	18%	36	12%
4	4	Other	4	9%	5	2%
		Totals	45	100%	302	100%

Affiliations and Marketing-Related Comments From Other State Questions

Several other State Forecast questions corresponded to the topics of affiliations and marketing.

Question 6D: *Please rate the following current LSCM projects areas according to how users of Federal Government information in libraries within your state might benefit: Projects focused on education and online communication with FDLP members such as: FDSys training sessions; acquiring an online tool for virtual meetings; scheduling online community forums to discuss current FDLP issues; communication through social media (blogs, twitter).*²⁵

²⁵ Parallels information requested in Question 17d of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

While most of the examples provided in this question are education-focused, there is mention of communication, specifically through social media, which is a marketing activity.

Of 45 state respondents to Question 6d, 23 rated these LSCM projects as “extremely beneficial,” and 22 rated the projects as “moderately beneficial.” There were no “not beneficial” responses.

Question 7: *Is there another area of service that FDLP libraries within your state would like LSCM to offer in the next five years? (Please describe.)*²⁶

Of 45 state respondents to Question 7, 33 responded “yes” and chose to provide an individual open-ended response. Those responses totaled 117 observations. Of the 117 observations, a small number of comments related to affiliations (7) and marketing (5).

Of the seven affiliations-related comments, the focus was on the need for GPO to partner and collaborate with other agencies and encourage and support collaborative projects and consortial agreements. This, too, is in line with the results from other questions.

Of the five marketing comments, all were in line with those of other questions and focused on the need for GPO to create targeted and customizable promotional tools and conduct outreach in general.

Question 17: *What leadership opportunities and roles do FDLP libraries in your state foresee for themselves in the next five years?*²⁷

Of the 45 state respondents to Question 17, individual open-ended responses totaled 171 observations. Of the 171 observations, 24 (14%) of those related to a future leadership role/opportunity regarding affiliations, and 18 (11%) of those related to a future leadership role/opportunity regarding marketing.

Of the 24 affiliations-related observations, two main types surfaced: 1) indication of future leadership in cooperative or consortial efforts and projects (15) and 2) indication of future leadership in professional groups or formal positions held in professional groups (13). There was also mention of collaboration in general and of partnering with GPO on special projects.

Of the 18 marketing-related observations, the majority (14) mentioned general marketing and promotion as future leadership roles/opportunities, with no elaboration on specifically how that will be accomplished. Other observations mentioned outreach-based marketing, advocacy, and the promotion of specific aspects of the FDLP, such as promoting the expertise of the librarians, promoting digital access, and promoting collections.

Question 18: *What would an ideal FDLP look like that met all of your current and anticipated needs for Federal Government information?*²⁸

²⁶ Parallels information requested in Question 18 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

²⁷ Parallels information requested in Question 30 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

Of 45 state respondents to Question 18, individual open-ended responses totaled 326 observations. Of the 326 observations, 11 (3%) of those related to affiliations, and 5 (2%) of those related to marketing.

Each of the 11 affiliations-related observations was about the need for support and encouragement from GPO for cooperative/consortial arrangements, agreements, and projects between libraries in the FDLP.

The five marketing-related observations were all about general promotion as being a necessary part of an ideal FDLP.

Question 19: *Thinking about the next five years, what specific things would you like GPO to do to help FDLP libraries in your state improve public access to Federal Government information?*²⁹

Of 45 state respondents to Question 19, individual open-ended responses totaled 333 observations. Of the 333 observations, 15 (5%) related to affiliations, and 19 (6%) related to marketing.

Of the 15 affiliations-related observations, there were two main categories of requested actions of GPO: 1) support for and coordination of special projects with groups, agencies, and libraries and 2) support for collaborative and consortial arrangements between libraries.

Of the 19 marketing-related observations, there were a variety of requested actions of GPO, ranging from: general promotion of the FDLP; providing more marketing materials to libraries; promotion at the national level; and advocacy for the FDLP.

Question 20: *Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about the current and future vision of the FDLP?*³⁰

Of 45 state respondents to Question 20, 29 responded “yes” and chose to provide an individual open-ended response. Those responses totaled 90 observations. Of the 90 observations, 11 (12%) related to affiliations, and seven (8%) related to marketing.

Of the 11 affiliations-related observations, seven focused on the need for GPO to partner with and support library and consortial cooperative initiatives and projects. There were also several mentions of the need for GPO to collaborate more with agencies and professional library organizations on special projects.

The seven marketing-related observations emphasized the importance of promotion of the FDLP in general.

²⁸ Parallels information requested in Question 31 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

²⁹ Parallels information requested in Question 32 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

³⁰ Parallels information requested in Question 33 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

GPO ACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Actions Already Taken

- ***Affiliations (Library Forecast Questions 21, 24, 25, and 26 and State Forecast Questions 9, 12, and 13)***

Affiliations among the FDLP community and beyond are relationships that are integral to the continued success of the FDLP and to increasing awareness of FDLP libraries across the country. No one library can fulfill all the information needs of the community being served; therefore, collaboration is necessary. These cooperative efforts at the local, regional, state, and multi-state level may occur between GPO and Federal depository libraries. They may also be between depositories or with depository and non-depository libraries. As administrators of the FDLP, GPO strives to encourage and support affiliations at every level, both formal and informal.

- Official content and service partnerships are examples of formal collaborations with GPO.
- Cooperative repositories and consortial agreements are examples of formal relationships with other FDLP and non-FDLP libraries.
- Referrals, word of mouth promotion, and participation in library-focused email distribution lists are examples of informal relationships with other FDLP and non-FDLP libraries.

Depositories are welcomed and encouraged to consult with GPO on matters regarding cooperative efforts of any kind and to consult with fellow library colleagues to learn more about successful affiliations benefiting the FDLP.

- ***Community Marketing (Library Forecast Questions 22-24 and State Forecast Questions 10 and 11)***

Marketing the FDLP has been and continues to be a key initiative of GPO's LSCM.

In the 1980s, LSCM offered FDLP promotional materials ranging from radio Public Service Announcements (PSAs) to posters, brochures, stickers, and bookmarks. In 2001, LSCM launched the *Make the Connection at a Federal Depository Library* campaign, which included a national media contract to distribute print and audio advertisements about the FDLP. It also included, for the first time, online ordering of GPO promotional materials for libraries, posters, bookmarks, brochures, and screensavers. In 2008, LSCM launched the *Easy as FDL: Free Information, Dedicated Service, Limitless Possibilities* campaign. It included promotional videos, posters, flyers, bookmarks, pens, table tents, postcards in English and Spanish, PSAs, buttons, screensavers, and another national media contract for distributing print and audio advertisements about the FDLP. This campaign was accompanied by the FDLP Marketing Plan, which provided ideas for how depositories could use the aforementioned tools to promote themselves to both the public and to non-depositories. That plan was followed, in 2010, with Phase II of the FDLP Marketing Plan. It continued the *Easy as FDL* campaign and included new promotional tips and ideas for depositories. It also included a national media contract for distributing print and audio advertisements, this time focused on GPO's Federal Digital System (FDsys).

In FY2013, LSCM launched the *Government Information at Your Fingertips* campaign, which includes a variety of FDLP promotional materials such as posters, bookmarks, digital images, window and door decals, table tents, and PSAs. The campaign also includes FDsys pencils and sticky notes and another national media contract to distribute print and audio advertisements about the FDLP, this time focused on both the FDLP and FDsys. This campaign is accompanied by a revamped Web page on beta.fdlp.gov that includes: ideas for promoting the depository online as well as in the community; the FDLP Promotional Toolkit, which includes logos, graphics, and PSAs; access to ordering free promotional materials; and tips for celebrating depository anniversaries.

This campaign and its corresponding materials were being created at the same time the Forecast Questionnaires were being received and analyzed. This allowed LSCM to create and implement promotional strategies and materials that were direct requests of Questionnaire respondents, such as pencils, sticky notes, and digital images.

Actions in Development

- ***Community Marketing***

In FY2014, LSCM plans to continue the *Government Information at Your Fingertips* campaign. Also, additional promotional tools are being developed to expand the campaign, in direct accordance with Forecast Questionnaire responses, particularly from Library Forecast Question 23 (*How can GPO assist in effectively marketing the services your library provides?*) and State Forecast Question 11 (*How can GPO assist in effectively marketing FDLP libraries and services?*) Planned expansions include Press Release/Announcement templates for celebrating anniversaries, new services, featured collections, etc.; outreach to library schools to increase FDLP awareness; and customizable/downloadable promotional tools for Web sites and printing.

LSCM staff members are also happy to assist with the marketing needs of depositories at any time. LSCM's Lead Planning Specialist is available to consult with any depository on marketing strategies and tools and can be reached through askGPO's Ask a Question function by selecting "Federal Depository Libraries" as the category and "Marketing Strategies/Radio Spots" as the sub-category.

CONCLUSIONS

- ***Affiliations***

The responses to the affiliations-related questions in the Library and State Forecast Questionnaires also bring several conclusions to light.

1. The majority of the 802 respondents (55%) indicated that the library does not have formal or informal relationships with local non-FDLP libraries (Library Q21).
2. The vast majority of the 802 respondents (88%) reported that they do not plan to enter into new or additional relationships with non-FDLP libraries (Library Q25).

3. The vast majority of the 802 respondents (74%) reported that they do not plan to enter into new or additional relationships with other FDLP libraries (Library Q26).

These statistics indicate a gap in affiliations between the FDLP community and beyond. The FDLP benefits immensely from affiliations within the community and also from affiliations beyond the FDLP community in order to promote and increase awareness of FDLP libraries throughout the country. No one library can fulfill the information needs of any one community being served. Therefore, since the Forecast results indicate that collaboration on each of these levels is not occurring, that is an identified weakness in the FDLP network.

- **Community Marketing**

The responses to the marketing-related questions in the Library and State Forecast Questionnaires reveal several key conclusions.

1. The majority of the 802 Library respondents (59%) do not actively market their depository library or the FDLP (Question 22). Of those libraries that do actively market their FDLP collection and services, most do so through the library's Web site (17% of responses) and through collaboration with government, local community, other libraries, consortia, and associations (16% of responses).
2. When libraries were asked how GPO could assist in effectively marketing the services of FDLP libraries (Question 23), the top response was "Not Sure/No Answer" (11% of responses). The next four top responses were tied at 7% each: "Satisfied with Current Offerings (from GPO)," "Free Promo Materials (not specified any further)," "Promo Content Enhancements (to focus on certain aspects of the FDLP, target a demographic, etc.)," and "Brochures/Flyers (not specified any further)." These responses indicated that libraries would appreciate assistance from GPO in marketing, but many respondents were unsure of specific ways to accomplish this.
 - a. When responses were analytically compressed into four over-arching themes, the second-ranked theme was "Other" (37%). This is particularly telling when examining responses that were categorized into this theme. These responses indicate that marketing is not always a priority and also that library staff do not have the sufficient resources to focus on marketing or always know where to start. Examples are:
 - i. No Time/Staff/Funding for Marketing (1% of responses).
 - ii. Not Sure/No Answer (11% of responses).
 - iii. Marketing Help Not Needed (2% of responses).
 - iv. Marketing Not Needed (1% of responses).
3. In Library Question 24, libraries (48%) reported that relationships with local non-FDLP libraries do not include marketing the depository, while 39% reported they "do not know" if those non-FDLP libraries are marketing the depository, leaving only 13% of respondents that indicated "yes." Of those 13% that reported "yes," 34% indicated that marketing is being accomplished through referrals to the depository.

These statistics indicate a gap in marketing the FDLP in the libraries themselves. Marketing the FDLP is integral to its continued existence and patronage by the American public. Recognizing the

competing priorities in depositories due to funding, staffing, and resources, marketing is understandably very often one of the first functions that falls to the bottom of the priority list. This does not negate its importance in the future of the FDLP.