

The Application of Library Outreach Strategies in Archival Settings

Abstract: Librarians and archivists in the Halifax Regional Municipality were surveyed using a series of online questionnaires in order to identify library outreach strategies that could potentially be used by archives. Participants were asked for their opinions about the planning, implementation, and evaluation of outreach programmes in which they had been involved. The responses indicated that many aspects of library outreach are applicable to archival settings. In particular, the authors recommend that existing outreach programmes be expanded through a more broadly-based approach, one that promotes information literacy, connects with youth and children, partners with the community, and engages with the public in a variety of settings outside the confines of the physical archive.

About the Author(s): Creighton Barrett is currently a student in the School of Information Management at Dalhousie University and is also serving as Co-Chair of the School of Information Management Students' Association. Creighton earned a Bachelor of Music degree from Acadia University in 2007. This paper was co-researched and co-written for the Research Methods course in the School of Information Management.

Braden Cannon is a second year MLIS student at Dalhousie University's School of Information Management and is also the co-chair of Dalhousie's student branch of the Association of Canadian Archivists. He holds a Bachelor's degree in Film Studies from Carleton University and co-wrote this paper as part of the Research Methods class at the School of Information Management.

Liam O'Hare is currently completing the second year of the MLIS programme at Dalhousie University. He is also the Vice-Chair Academic of the School of Information Management Students' Association. His previous studies were at the University of Toronto, where he earned a BA (Hons.) and an MA in Medieval Studies. This paper was researched and written for a Research Methods course at the School of Information Management.

Introduction

Archives, which by their very nature are removed from daily life, suffer from a lower profile than most public libraries. Whereas public libraries are often seen as an essential component of communities, acting simultaneously as resource centres, community centres, and meeting spaces, the role of archives is less familiar to the public. Nonetheless, libraries cannot simply rely on the public to come pouring through their doors. Indeed, libraries have created a highly dynamic outreach role through strategies that educate the public about library services, deliver these services to the user in innovative ways, and attract attention to the wide variety of programmes available through local library branches.

Conversely, with their closed stacks and focus on unique, historic records, archives must work harder to draw attention and to bring more users through their doors. After all, if someone does not even know how archives function or what kind of records are held in an archive, they cannot be expected to use archival resources purely out of curiosity. Clearly, outreach is needed to raise public awareness of both libraries and archives. However, it would seem that libraries place more value on outreach than archives do. Libraries are generally better at outreach, undergo outreach campaigns more often, and as a result gain more visibility in public life.

With these factors in mind, this study has three fundamental objectives: to identify the outreach strategies that have been most successful in libraries, to offer recommendations about which ones would be most successful in archives, and to determine how these strategies could be modified and implemented in archival settings.

Statement of problem and sub-problems

In order to provide the greatest possible service to the public, archives must boost their profile in the community and reach out to potential users. What outreach strategies would be most effective in archives and how can they be implemented? To begin answering these questions, archivists may wish to consider looking to their colleagues in the public library sector, many of whom have considerable experience in developing, implementing, and evaluating successful outreach and community development programming. By examining outreach strategies developed for and implemented in public library settings, archivists will be able to identify those that have a proven record of success and that may be adaptable to the unique needs of archival settings.

This study relies on several assumptions about libraries, archives, and their use of technology. It will be helpful to clarify precisely what these assumptions are.

Libraries are better at developing outreach programming than archives

Generally speaking, this study assumes that public libraries are better prepared than archives to deliver successful outreach programmes to their users and communities. Furthermore, modes of outreach used by public libraries are generally more developed and better funded than those currently employed by archives. Evidence provided in the literature review supports this assumption.

Archives need help promoting their collections to increase use and improve access

Archives are inherently restrictive in terms of access and therefore have difficulty promoting and increasing the use of their collections. Providing online access to digital collections is helping to improve access. However, online access does not constitute outreach on its own, and digitization is costly and time-consuming. Again, evidence in the literature review supports this assumption.

With minor adjustments, successful outreach programmes in public libraries can be transferred to archival settings

This study assumes that successful public library outreach models can be used, or 'transferred' to archives to increase awareness and use of their collections and services. As such, it will be necessary to identify how public libraries plan outreach programmes and what constitutes a 'successful' programme. In general, this paper assumes that these initiatives can be adapted for use in archival settings, with minor adjustments owing to the nature of archival holdings and their users.

Literature review

To contextualize the research problems outlined above, a selection of literature on library outreach, archival outreach, and emerging technologies used in libraries and archives was reviewed.

Library outreach

In the twentieth century, libraries and library users witnessed the emergence of programming to address the various needs of users in 'underserved' populations. Changes in the social and economic landscape in the 1960s and 1970s saw the emergence of outreach services oriented towards the elderly, physically and mentally disabled, and incarcerated (Bramley, 1978).

Despite being a relatively recent phenomenon, there is a vast amount of literature that supports this user group-specific model of library outreach. The American Library Association Office for Literacy and Outreach Services has identified several 'outreach areas' for which it currently provides services, literature, training, and other information for libraries trying to serve these population groups (ALA, 2007). Hodge & Tanner (2003) identified a recent successful partnership formed in upstate New York between a special library, a public library system, and various community groups to address the information needs of rural farmers.

Academic libraries, which have traditionally relied on print collections to attract users, are reaching out to student groups and residence halls (Barnes and Peyton, 2006) and utilizing programming models from non-academic libraries that involve community groups to attract underserved users to their collections (Fabian, et al., 2003). While these libraries have also been shown to conduct community outreach based on a community's expressed need, most launch outreach programmes on their own initiative (Schneider, 2003).

In spite of some resistance, special libraries have been engaging with the K-12 community since the 1990s to provide educational programmes and access to their collections (Theunissen, 2007). Huwe (2003) has noted that, despite the vast array of technological tools now at the disposal of libraries and librarians, the fundamental aspects of outreach programming - knowing and focusing on your users, personalizing services, and understanding the research challenges facing library users of all types - have changed little in the past thirty years.

As recently as 2004 however, the American Library Association (ALA) recognized that, notwithstanding the evolution of libraries and their provision of services, the goal of providing access to information for everyone who seeks it has yet to be achieved (Orange, 2004). In her introduction to a series of essays on innovative library practices, Orange makes a case for shifting the focus from group-specific outreach programming, which is often at risk of funding cuts, to developing services for all user groups that are accessible all the time. Examples such as the Build Literacy project, a joint effort between the ALA and Verizon to promote the development of literacy coalitions between libraries, community groups, and other local agencies, support this approach by utilizing the Internet to share information about programmes being implemented across the United States (ALA, 2004). While there will always be a place for group-specific outreach programmes in libraries of all kinds, the acknowledgement that these services should be continually evaluated for their effectiveness, universality, and capacity for adaptation by other institutions is central to the objectives of this study.

Archival outreach

Archival outreach in North America received a significant boost beginning with the Task Force on Archives and Society organised by the Society of American Archivists (Dionne, 2002). Several factors contributed to this group's formation, which was mandated during David B. Gracy II's presidency of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) in the early 1980s. Gracy noted that the volume of new records and the increase in attention to education and outreach in archives are primary causes for undertaking systematic self-reflection (Dionne, 2002). Gracy also recognized the need for archivists to embrace the emerging technological capabilities of the profession in order to maintain the relevance of the field (Gracy, 1985).

Previous research has focused on surveys that asked archivists to define outreach, to explain how outreach compares to basic and reference services, and to describe what type of outreach was being done (Chute, 2002; Dearstyne, 1997). Surveys have been used to gain insights into how users of archives seek information, how this relates to outreach, and what developments users would like to see archives work towards (Duff, Craig, & Cherry, 2004).

Attention has also been focused on the archivist's role in public service and how notions of public service should be incorporated into reference service by promoting increased research use and outreach (Dearstyne, 1987). Studies have emphasized the importance of public service training in archival education (Eastwood, 1997). Archival outreach has also been considered a component of archival marketing. Weir takes this view and argues that outreach is not a luxury, but a necessity for the success of archives (2004). It has been shown that placing archival outreach in a marketing context has greatly increased the visibility of archives, archivists, and their work (Dionne, 2002; Weir, 1991).

Emerging technologies are changing the way archivists provide services to the public and opening up new potential for outreach. Case studies have shown the effectiveness of digital archives in reaching a larger audience than was possible before the advent of the Internet (Thom & Hanson, 2000; White, 2005; Altman & Nemmers, 2001). However, archivists cannot simply rely on this trend to replace other approaches to outreach. More research into how patrons use online archival resources is needed to inform adjustments to outreach strategies (Anderson, 2004).

Emerging technologies

Libraries and other institutions in the cultural-heritage sector have a long history of using computers and new technology for everything from cataloguing to digitization projects. Nevertheless, rapid developments in technology, accompanied by changes in user expectations, have caused some information professionals to feel threatened. Simultaneously, such trends have given others pause to consider the ways in which their organizations deliver

services and engage with the public (Chad & Miller, 2005; Chowdhury, Poulter & McMenemy, 2006; Curran, Murray & Christian, 2007; White, 2007).

Two related concepts that offer the potential for libraries, archives, and other institutions to address this shift are Web 2.0 and Library 2.0, models that emphasize participation over publishing and working with users' expectations over information gate-keeping (O'Reilly, 2005; Miller, 2005). When Tim O'Reilly described what he saw as the Web's new direction, he identified wikis, tagging, syndication, blogging, and websites that have a strong social or participatory quality as some of the key heralds of this change (O'Reilly, 2005). Library 2.0, an offshoot of the Web 2.0 phenomenon, is not intended to replace traditional services, but seeks to apply the spirit and sometimes the technology of Web 2.0 to the ways in which staff and the public interact, recognizing that community 'is the new nexus for information' (Chad & Miller, 2005; Curran, Murray, & Christian, 2007; Kroski, 2007, p. 2011).

Community engagement is evident in a number of Library 2.0 initiatives that have been proposed and implemented. While Chowdhury, Poulter & McMenemy see the library as 'a platform for the storage and dissemination of local community knowledge' (2005, p. 459), some institutions such as the archives at the University of Arizona Library and the Haags Gemeentearchief have already implemented programming along these lines (Morales & Rosen, 1999; Yakel, 2006). These examples also show that Library 2.0 principles are highly relevant to other institutions in the cultural-heritage sector.

Description of research methodology

This research took the form of a case study and focused on specific sites in the Halifax Regional Municipality that provide different perspectives on the central problem of applying library outreach strategies to archival settings. Rather than relying on the results of already-published studies or trying to apply the results of what had worked elsewhere to the Nova Scotian archives community, qualitative and quantitative data were collected by means of two short Web-based questionnaires. These surveys were distributed to staff members of the Halifax Public Libraries (HPL) and to archivists in the Halifax area.

Selection of sites and participants

The point of departure for this study was an inventory and assessment of outreach strategies designed in and used by the Halifax Public Libraries (HPL). Due to their involvement with the development and implementation of outreach programming, senior staff in charge of outreach, marketing, and communications were intended to be the study's main focus. The scope was ultimately broadened to include other staff such as paraprofessionals. The Halifax Public Libraries were a natural choice for this study because of the system's manageable size, the

variety of populations it serves, and the Libraries' history of involvement with more traditional programming such as book clubs, as well as innovative community development strategies such as the Working Together Project.

Concurrently, the Council of Nova Scotia Archives (CNSA) e-mail listserv was used to solicit the views of Halifax-area archivists. This listserv was selected because of both its geographic scope and restriction to members of the CNSA. The Halifax Regional Municipality was chosen as an area of focus because the area closely matches the service area of the Halifax Public Libraries and because it is home to a variety of archival institutions including municipal, provincial, and academic archives. In addition to the use of the CNSA listserv, staff at the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management (NSARM), the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections (DUASC), and the Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) Archives were asked to participate in the study directly. This was done to reach employees of those institutions who may not have been contacted via the CNSA listserv.

Data collection strategies

The primary method of collecting data for this study was a series of questionnaires distributed to staff members employed in the Halifax Public Library system and to employees at various archives in the Halifax area (please see Appendices A and B for the full text of both documents). Initially, several questions based on programming information gathered from the Halifax Public Libraries' Web site were developed with a view to learning, among other things, which groups were being targeted in local outreach programming, what programmes were considered the most successful, and what criteria were used to assess their effectiveness. Subsequently, a more extensive set of questions was created in order to elicit opinions from a sample of archivists about the applicability of public library outreach strategies to archives environments. An online format was chosen so that respondents would be able to complete the questionnaire at their own leisure. SurveyMonkey.com, the site which was chosen to host the surveys, provides helpful statistics and tracks responses and results well. The online format also offers considerable flexibility in terms of formatting questions. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected through a combination of multiple choice, rating-scale, and write-in questions.

Data analysis strategies

The results of the survey were first examined with a view to developing a broad sense of the opinions of information professionals in the library and archives fields. Subsequent analysis focussed on isolating prevalent themes or elements that seem especially noteworthy. This stage of analysis also sought out discernible patterns or leitmotifs within the responses of

individual professionals. In addition, broad trends in professional opinion about library and archival outreach programmes were identified.

Data presentation and results

Both surveys received relatively low response and completion rates, yet they yielded a good deal of valuable information. Table one illustrates the response and completion rates of the librarian and archivist surveys.

Table One: Response and completion rates of surveys

Librarian Survey			Archivist Survey		
Responses	Completed	Rate	Responses	Completed	Rate
8	5	62.5%	25	16	64%

The completion rate only refers to respondents who answered all of the questions on their survey. Some questions were skipped and others were not applicable given the institution or position of the respondent.

Respondents were given the choice to skip questions and, for the majority of questions, multiple selections were allowed. For these reasons, response rates to individual questions vary. The results can be considered broadly in terms of the demographics of the respondents and the respondents' opinions about outreach programmes.

Demographics of respondents

Responses to the library survey were received from employees at the Alderney Gate, Captain William Spry, Keshen Goodman, Tantallon, Halifax North Memorial, and Spring Garden Memorial branches. While this level of uptake leaves nine of the system's 15 branches unrepresented, survey results nevertheless represent a mix of urban and suburban environments around the Halifax Regional Municipality. Archivists from 15 different institutions responded to the survey, which helped to generate results equally representative of the urban and suburban communities in the region. While NSARM (five respondents), DUASC (three respondents), and the Shambhala Archives (two respondents) each had multiple archivists respond, archivists from a variety of museum, church, film, and other archives in the region responded as well.

Among respondents to the library survey, most identified themselves as holding management or leadership roles within their branches. These roles include Branch Manager, Community Development Manager, and Information Services Manager positions. While paraprofessionals and non-management staff are unrepresented in this list, it is reassuring to note the presence

of a Community Development Manager among the respondents, a position which has a considerable degree of relevance to this research.

Respondents to the archivist survey were given the option to select one or more departments from a list as well as the ability to write in their position or department. Responses were received from archivists in a wide range of positions (e.g. public services, reference, archival assistant, administration, etc), but a surprising 64% of archivists that responded to the survey indicated that they worked in all of the departments provided in the list. This, along with a combined 49% of respondents who work in either administration or public services, confirmed that the responses were from archival staff familiar with outreach programming at their institution.

Opinions on outreach programmes

In order to determine the respondents' opinions about developing and evaluating outreach programmes, each questionnaire contained a series of questions about the users, programmes, and evaluation criteria each respondent uses.

Primary clientele of library branches

To determine which local populations are served by library programmes and services, the library survey asked respondents to identify the primary clienteles of their respective branches. Children and adults were overwhelmingly viewed as the primary users of most library facilities. Young adults and recent immigrants were also identified as key user groups in one third of the total responses. African-Nova Scotians and Aboriginals were not identified, by any respondents, as significant users of library facilities at any of the branches from which responses were collected. Following from this information, it is perhaps unsurprising that adults were identified by 100% of respondents as being a group for which outreach programming was developed. Two thirds of survey participants indicated that children and seniors were also a significant focus of outreach programming, while one third noted that young adults, African-Nova Scotians, and Aboriginals were targeted in library outreach campaigns.

Primary focus of outreach programmes

Each survey then asked respondents to identify from a list the primary clientele or focus of their outreach programming. Respondents were allowed to select multiple user groups as well write in additional groups. While it appears that age is a primary factor for developing outreach programming at HPL branches, archives in the HRM appear more focused on the occupation and discipline of their users. Children, seniors, and adults were seen as the primary focus of outreach programmes by 60% of librarians, but only roughly a third of the archivists selected

these groups. Rather, 50% of archivists found that genealogists and/or academics were the focus of outreach programming at their institution. A quarter of respondents indicated that their programming was directed at all user groups and populations in the community. Interestingly, 37.5% of the archivists that responded indicated that they developed outreach for Aboriginal/First Nations communities while only 20% of librarians indicated this.

Involvement in outreach programmes

Survey participants were then asked to categorize the various types of outreach activities in which they were involved during the past five years, and 100% of those who volunteered to take this survey indicated that computer programming was a focus of outreach at their branches. Two thirds noted their involvement in music-, art-, and film- related strategies, while only one third cited other areas such as after-school activities, programmes for babies and toddlers, writing workshops, and so on. Archivists, on the other hand, appeared to participate in a wider variety of programmes and initiatives, but with no clearly preferred outreach strategy. One third of respondents indicated that their institution participated in the development of digital collections and other Web initiatives, while 26% were involved in lectures and workshops. Roughly 20% of respondents participated in school programmes and tours. Only 13% of archivists stated that they were involved in efforts to forge community and/or government partnerships. These responses suggest that archives in HRM are not using any cohesive strategy to promote their services and collections.

The results do not conclusively reveal any preference for one outreach strategy over another, nor do they indicate specific strategies used for the most commonly identified population groups. Rather, various institutions appear to employ a myriad of tactics to enhance their visibility, with some using strategies specific to their mandate or location (e.g. DUASC maintaining communication with Dalhousie alumni).

Success of outreach programmes

When asked to rate the success of these programmes, computer-based initiatives were judged 'very successful' by half the respondents, while the remaining half considered them to be 'successful' and 'satisfactory.' Other areas such as music, art, and film as well as activities geared towards babies, toddlers, and preschoolers were also deemed to be 'very successful' by survey respondents. These results highlight the importance of programmes that respond to a need, such as computer literacy initiatives, and those that engage members of the community through their hobbies and interests, such as art and music. Interestingly, as the responses to question eight of the library survey indicate, for programmes that librarians considered very successful, community partnerships and the availability of computer technology and Internet access were acknowledged as significant contributing factors.

Responses to the same questions on the archive survey are vaguer. One third of respondents reported that all of their outreach programmes were successful. Due to the relatively high number of population groups identified by archivists in relation to the number of respondents, it is difficult to identify trends about successful programmes, but tours and institutional Web sites were cited as successful by multiple respondents. Every archivist who engaged in outreach to government officials saw the programme as successful. However, two respondents indicated that school programmes were unsuccessful and one programme has not been requested by a school since it was developed. A lack of resources to promote and continue archival outreach programmes was cited as the cause of the failure of outreach programmes.

Criteria for evaluating success of outreach programmes

To develop a better understanding of how libraries and archives evaluate outreach programmes, those surveyed were also asked to indicate which criteria their institution used to evaluate the effectiveness of their programming. The results are shown in Table Two.

Table Two: Evaluation criteria used by libraries and archives

Libraries		Archives	
Criteria	Percentage	Criteria	Percentage
Number of participants/users	80%	Number of participants/users	57.1%
Impact on membership level	0%	Impacts on archive membership levels	28.6%
Impact on circulation levels	20%		
Impact on number of branch users	20%	Impact on number of facility users	42.9%
Feedback from participants	100%	Feedback from participants	85.7%
Feedback from programme partners	100%	Feedback from programme partners	42.9%

Responses clearly showed that feedback from participants and programming partners was the most significant factor in judging a strategy's effectiveness for libraries, but archivists did not appear to value or solicit feedback from programme partners. Continuing the emphasis on

community partnerships, library survey respondents clearly believed that programming based on this principle would be applicable to their branches. While the total number of participants was also considered somewhat important, the impact of programming on circulation, library membership, and branch users was evidently not. One third of participants also felt that interactive computer applications and displays in the community would be successful. Significantly, one respondent noted the need to avoid a 'top-down' approach to outreach by involving community members in the planning and development process. This comment resonates with responses to earlier questions that stressed the value of strategies that connect with community members.

Both library and archive staff also indicated that programming was developed independently as well as based on campaigns at other institutions. This indicates that archivists consulted other outreach programmes to develop their own, but the responses do not make clear what outreach programmes were reviewed. Archivists did not seem to be in the habit of assessing library outreach programmes for their own use, and the significant difference between librarians and archivists who cited feedback from programme partners suggests that archivists are not considering the full spectrum of outreach strategies employed by public libraries.

Successfulness in libraries and archives

To finish the archive survey, respondents were asked to identify outreach strategies they felt would be successful in libraries and in archives. Despite only half the respondents considering feedback from programme partners to evaluate the success of an outreach programme, 100% of respondents suggested that both academic partnerships and educational programming would be successful for archives and 87.5% of respondents felt this way about community partnerships. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is the cost and time associated with developing these relationships, which was cited as a hindrance in several responses to previous questions. The vast majority of archivists thought interactive Internet applications would be successful outreach strategies for both libraries and archives, and 85.7% supported the idea of bringing displays into the community. Three quarters of respondents thought children's and young adult programming would also be successful in an archive. All the archivists felt a 'book mobile' modelled outreach programme would be successful for libraries but less than half felt the same about archives. The responses to this question suggest that archivists in HRM are willing to try new outreach strategies for their institutions, with a clear preference for forging broader partnerships and increasing their presence in educational settings.

Interpretation of findings and discussion

Having reviewed the data and identified the most salient trends in the results, a number of recommendations for enabling archives to create outreach strategies adapted from and inspired by those used in library settings seem warranted. These recommendations are as follows:

Broaden the scope of outreach

The librarians who participated in the survey all identified as successful outreach efforts that focused on broad segments of their client population. Instead of focusing only on those whose activities naturally draw them to archives, such as genealogists and post-secondary students, archives should seize the opportunity to expand their client base and user levels as widely as possible.

One way libraries do this is by creating programmes that have wide public appeal and can be utilized by people from various interest groups, age brackets, and levels of education. By expanding their outreach programmes to attract non-traditional users, archives could take a first step towards creating a more public face for themselves, one that can be leveraged to build an increased interest in their important holdings and services.

Create programmes based on information literacy

In the survey results, several archivists noted that part of their outreach activities included efforts aimed at educating clients about what archives are and what archivists do. While this is a valid outreach strategy insofar as it increases public awareness about these institutions and their staff, it does not necessarily result in a greater use of archival holdings. In order for this increase in use to come about, the standard method of educational outreach should be expanded and developed into information literacy education.

Indeed, numerous participating librarians noted that some of the most successful outreach programmes developed and used in public libraries are those that are based around information literacy, most notably classes and workshops devoted to the use of computers and the Internet. This focus on information literacy gives library patrons the skills and confidence to independently search through, identify, and use library holdings. This same approach can be utilized in archives by creating workshops that teach current and potential archives patrons how to navigate through finding aids, how to request items, how to successfully identify what they need, and how to use archival resources most effectively.

The success of information literacy programmes in libraries suggests that the creation of archival information literacy programmes could result in greater use of archives by the public by demystifying many of the processes and conventions that archivists routinely use. This

strategy could be especially successful if built upon a broader programme of outreach, as mentioned above.

Focus on children

As part of the broader outreach initiatives employed by public libraries, children are often the focus of specifically-tailored programmes. These programmes serve the dual purpose of meeting the special needs of children and fostering a sense of involvement with libraries that a child may carry with him or her into adulthood. However, many of the archivists who participated in the survey identified children as a low priority for archival outreach, thus missing an opportunity to establish a relationship with a segment of the population that has the potential to grow and develop well into the future.

Although some specialist archives, such as those in academic or religious settings, may not have the opportunity to expand outreach to include children, public archives could certainly find room for this focus in their mandates. Partnerships with primary and secondary schools are one example of how archivists could take their institution out of its walls and into the lives of children. Another way of achieving this could be appearances at public heritage events where children may be in attendance. In this instance, special material could be developed which would be of particular interest to children, or a relevant selection of holdings could be brought to be shown to children. Within the walls of the archives themselves, special displays could be created to attract children to the archives where archivists can take the opportunity to educate them about what they do, the importance of archives, and how their holdings can be used.

Emphasize community partnerships

Another key finding from the library survey is that community partnerships were consistently identified as a highly successful approach to outreach. Archivists also identified these partnerships as being beneficial to archival outreach. This being the case, archives of all kinds should endeavour to create partnerships with community organizations, which could become pillars of the institution by providing support in the form of funding, records donations, and increased usage.

In creating these partnerships, it is also recommended that archives use a bottom-up approach, involving community organizations in the process of creating programmes that will appeal to both sides of the partnership and that will take advantage of the interests and specializations that community partners bring to the relationship. In other words, it is important to create programmes that have built-in appeal for community partners. This will ensure their success and increase the overall usage of archival resources.

"Bookmobile" approach

Although the "bookmobile" approach to outreach (i.e. bringing library holdings to the public via portable displays or actual vehicles that carry a selection of books) was identified by most archivists as being beneficial for libraries but relatively useless for their own institutions, our literature review suggests otherwise. As Weir (1991) demonstrates, this approach can be quite successful in bringing holdings to the public and changing perceptions of archives from staid, unengaging environments to dynamic participants in the cultural sphere. Even a simple approach, such as gathering a few noteworthy records to display at a community event, can go a long way towards increasing an archive's profile, which is a first step in reaching out to potential clients.

Conclusions

From the above, it is clear that archives could draw upon the outreach experiences gained by librarians in a manner far more widespread and varied than was first assumed by many professionals working in that field. The outreach strategies used by public librarians and the criteria used to evaluate them appear to match those employed by archivists with the notable exception of community and institutional partnerships, which archivists appear to lack. In light of the difficulties in establishing these partnerships, archives can look towards other successful programming utilized by libraries and promote their services and collections in innovative and cost-effective ways. In particular, community partnerships that connect with the information needs and interests of local residents can be a valuable step towards addressing the shortcomings of current outreach strategies. While more research needs to be done in this area to discover the best course of action for archives, it is evident from the results presented here that archives and libraries could learn a great deal from one another and work together to develop appropriate and successful outreach programming.

References

Altman, B., & Nemmers, J. (2001). The usability of on-line archival resources: The Polaris Project finding aid. *American Archivist*, 64(1), 121-131.

American Library Association. (2004). Build literacy. Retrieved from <http://www.buildliteracy.org>

American Library Association (2007). Office for Literacy and Outreach Services: outreach areas. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/Template.cfm?Section=olos>

- Anderson, I. (2004). Are you being served? Historians and the search for Primary sources. *Archivaria*, 58, 81-129.
- Bramley, G. (1978). *Outreach: library services for the institutionalized, the elderly, and the physically handicapped*. London: C. Bingley.
- Barnes, N. & Peyton, G. (2006). Reaching out to the net generation on campus: Promoting the MSU libraries in the residence halls. *Public services quarterly*, 2(4), 47-68.
- Chad, K., & Miller, P. (2005). Do libraries matter? The rise of library 2.0. Retrieved from <http://www.talis.com/applications/downloads/whitepapers/DoLibrariesMatter.pdf>
- Chowdhury, G., Poulter, A., & McMenemy, D. (2006). Public library 2.0: Towards a new mission for public libraries as a 'network of community knowledge'. *Online Information Review*, 30(4), 454-460. doi: 10.1108/14684520610686328.
- Chute, T. (2002). What's in a name? Outreach vs. basic services: A survey of college and university archivists. *Journal of Archival Organization*, 1(2), 5-40.
- Curran, K., Murray, M., & Christian, M. (2007). Taking the information to the public through library 2.0. *Library Hi Tech* 25(2), 288-297. doi: 10.1108/07378830710755036
- Davidson, K. & Peyton, G. (2007). Library outreach to the freshman football recruits and athletic academic tutors at Mississippi State University. *The Reference Librarian*, 47(97), 63-77.
- Dearstyne, B. (1987). What is the use of archives? A challenge to the profession. *American Archivist*, 50(1), 76-87.
- Dearstyne, B. (1997). Archival reference and outreach: Toward a new paradigm. *The Reference Librarian*, 56, 185-202.
- Dionne, M. (2002). Marketing the archivist: The history of the Society of American Archivists' Task Force on Archives and Society. In I. Owens (Ed.), *Strategic marketing in library and information science* (pp. 175-196). Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Duff, W., Craig, B., & Cherry, J. (2004). Finding and using archival resources: A cross-Canada survey of historians studying Canadian history. *Archivaria*, 58, 51-80.

Eastwood, T. (1997). Public services education for archivists. *The Reference Librarian*, 56, 27-38.

Fabian, C. A., et al. (2003). Multiple models for library outreach initiatives. *The Reference Librarian*, 82, 39-55.

Hodge, B. & Tanner, R. (2003). Grassroots to grassfed: Libraries partner with local organizations to address the information needs of farming communities in upstate New York. *The Reference Librarian*, 82, 107-124.

Huwe, T.K. (2006). Some best practices for personalizing outreach. *Computers in Libraries*, 26(2), 36-38.

Kroski, E. (2007). The social tools of Web 2.0: Opportunities for academic libraries. *Choice*, 44(12), 2011-2021.

Miller, P. (2005). Web 2.0: building the new library. *Ariadne*, 45. Retrieved from <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue45/miller/>

Morales, M. & Rosen, J. (1999). Accessing the old and the new: outreach via Web exhibits and archive collections at the University of Arizona Library. *The Reference Librarian*, 67-68, 57-67.

Nelson, M. (2007). Initiating engineering outreach reference services: Background and practice. *Reference Services Review*, 35(2), 265-284.

O'Reilly, T. (2005). What is Web 2.0: Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. Retrieved from <http://www.oreillynet.com/pub/a/oreilly/tim/news/2005/09/30/what-is-Web-20.html>

Osborne, R. & Hayden C.D. (Eds.). (2004). *From outreach to equity: Innovative models of library policy and practice*. Chicago: American Library Association.

Schneider, T. (2003). Outreach: Why, how and who? Academic libraries and their involvement in the community. *The Reference Librarian*, 82, 199-213.

Theunissen, Y. (2007). Developing and promoting outreach services for elementary and middle schools: case study of a rare map library at a public university. *Journal of Map Geography Libraries*, 3(2), 5-23.

Thom, J., & Hanson, B. (2000). Public service and digitized collections. *Colorado Libraries*, 26(4), 4-7.

Weir, C. (1991). Selling yourself: Outreach & promotion in the Nottinghamshire Archives Office. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 12(1), 15.

Weir, C. (2004). The Marketing context. Outreach: Luxury or necessity? *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 25(1), 71-77.

White, A. (2005). The development of digital resources by library and information professionals and historians: Two case studies from Northern Ireland. *Programme: Electronic Library and Information Systems*, 34(9), 324-336.

White, G. (2007). Broadening participation - The future of resource discovery. *Interlending & Document Supply*, 35(1), 28-30. doi: 10.1108/02641610710728168

Yakel, E. (2000). Thinking inside and outside the boxes: Archival reference services at the turn of the century. *Archivaria*, 49, 140-160.

Yakel, E. (2006). Archives and manuscripts: Inviting the user into the virtual archives. *OCLC Systems & Services*, 22(3), 159-163. doi: 10.1108/10650750610686207

Appendix A - Library Survey

1) What Halifax Public Libraries branch do you work at?

2) What position do you hold?

3) In your opinion, who is the primary clientele of your branch (check all that apply)?

a) Senior citizens

b) Young adults

c) Children

d) Adults

e) African-Nova Scotians

f) Aboriginal/First Nations

g) Recent Immigrants

h) Other

4) What specific populations (if any) has your branch developed outreach programmes for (check all that apply)?

a) Same list as above

5) What campaigns have you participated in during the last five years?

a) After-school programmes

b) Babies and toddler programmes

c) Book club

d) Books by mail

e) Computer programmes

f) e-Learning

g) Home delivery services

h) Literacy and upgrading services

i) Music, art, and film

j) Preschooler programmes

k) Saturday/Sunday programmes (youth)

l) University courses

m) Writers and writing programmes

6) In your opinion, please rate the success of the following campaigns (check all that apply):

a) Same list as above (Scale of 1-6, plus N/A option)

7) Please select the criteria you used to evaluate the effectiveness of an outreach f (check all that apply):

a) Number of participants or users of programme

b) Impact on branch membership levels

c) Impact on circulation levels

d) Impact on number of branch users

e) Feedback from participants and users of programme

f) Feedback from programme partners

g) Other

8) In your opinion, of the campaigns that you considered successful or very successful, what were the most important factors in developing and delivering the programme (check all that apply):

a) Community group partnerships

b) Computers and Internet access

c) Library facilities

d) Library staff

e) Library users

f) Library volunteers

g) School and university partnerships

h) Other

9) In your opinion, which of the following other outreach strategies do you think would work for your branch?

- a) Developing interactive Internet applications
- b) Expanding book delivery/book mobile services
- c) Building more community partnerships
- d) Hosting lectures/workshops/educational programmes
- e) Setting up library displays in the community
- f) Other

10) Has your branch developed outreach programmes independently or based on previous campaigns and campaigns at other libraries?

Appendix B - Archive Survey

1) What archive do you work in?

2) What department do you work in?

- a) Administration
- b) Public Services
- c) Reference
- d) Technical Services
- e) Archival Assistant
- f) Other

3) What specific populations (if any) has your archive developed outreach programmes for (check all that apply)?

- a) Senior citizens
 - b) Young adults
 - c) Children
 - d) Adults
 - e) African-Nova Scotians
 - f) Aboriginal/First Nations
 - g) Recent Immigrants
 - h) Genealogists/genealogical researchers
 - i) The film industry
 - j) Authors
 - k) College and university students
- 4) What outreach campaigns have you participated in during the last 5 years?
- 5) Which campaigns were successful?
- 6) Which campaigns were unsuccessful?
- 7) Please select the criteria you used to evaluate the effectiveness of an outreach programme (check all that apply):
- a) Number of participants or users of programme
 - b) Impact on branch membership levels
 - c) Impact on circulation levels
 - d) Impact on number of branch users
 - e) Feedback from participants and users of programme

f) Feedback from programme partners

g) Other

8) Has your archive developed outreach programmes independently or based on previous campaigns and campaigns at other institutions?

9) In your opinion, which of the following outreach strategies do you think would be successful in a library and an archival setting?

a) Interactive Internet applications

b) Book mobile/bringing collections to the community

c) Community partnerships

d) Academic partnerships

e) Lectures/workshops/educational programming

f) Displays in the community

g) Children's/Young Adult programming