IFLA International Leadership Programme 2012-2014
Project 5. Models for regional collaboration
for strengthening advocacy and the profession

Draft, Irina Trushina,
July, 3, 2013

Stage 1: 2012-2013, Survey results

Working Group: Atarino Helieisar (Federated States of Micronesia), Zola Maddison *coordinator* (USA), Victoria Okojie (Nigeria), Jorge Ruiz Vaca (Mexico), Rosemary Shafack (Cameroon), Irina Trushina, *facilitator* (Russia), Dina Youssef (Egypt).

Introduction

Nowadays in conditions of Information Society development the most pressing issues for librarians are to find new place and role in society, to prove social value of the profession. Information, knowledge canals of delivering have been changed, a lot of opportunities of getting information via ICT have appeared. In changing world we can't imagine any social improvement, increasing a level of life, social inclusion without digital inclusion. Does society understand that the best way for it is using already existing and already trusted platform – public libraries? Public libraries are already included in this process, and can work very effectively.

In frames of IFLA International Leaders Project 5 we decided to observe successful and failure practices of demonstrating value/impact to the community the library serves in aims of strengthening advocacy and the profession to create a toolkit for librarians using regional, national and international arena. We tried to focus on question: *Models of regional collaboration for strengthening advocacy and demonstrating value/impact to the community the library serves.*

First we determined methodical basement:

Collaboration - collaboration between libraries themselves and between libraries and authorities, social partners. Aims of working group – to analyze work of libraries aimed to make relationships, links and collaboration with authorities, social partners, private sector.

Advocacy - target work (actions) aimed to form/change social/authority's opinions about libraries on favorable context for making supporting libraries activities decisions.

In this way, strengthening the profession is our goal, collaboration is a means, and advocacy is an instrument.

In conditions of lack of significance of library role and place in Information society in social and authority's opinion *strengthening the profession* is what we wish to reach by means of advocacy using regional collaboration in this Project.

Regional collaboration for strengthening advocacy and demonstrating value/impact to the community the library serves – *regional collaboration which produced programs and services that help demonstrate the libraries value in its community.*

Subjects of advocacy
- professional unions/associations
- heads of libraries and unions of heads of libraries
- Internet social networks

Objects of advocacy
- authority bodies and policymakers who are responsible for libraries budget formation (authorities: municipal, regional, republic, federal)
- international organizations, whose positions are significant for authorities (WTO, UNESCO, WSIS, CE and so on)

- organizations and persons outside of library profession, whose opinions could influence policymakers
- mass public consciousness, which opinion is taking in mind by policymakers

Means of advocacy

- ideology providing: significance of library for universally recognized values embodiment (human rights, democracy, social modernization, innovation development and so on)
- library collaboration aimed to work with authority bodies (entry to the authorities, membership in social councils under the authorities, development of expert groups under the authorities, social hearings)
- social campaigns/actions (all-country library day, international reading day, reading festivals and so on)
- collaboration with mass media
- collaboration with Internet social networks
- training advocacy specialists

First stage of the Project: 2012-2013 included interregional survey: experts' interviews.

Aim of the survey was to identify regional collaboration for advocacy experience in different countries.

We supposed that the survey could accomplish to gather advocacy & collaboration tools that people were using that we might not be aware of. This is a good opportunity to collect these tools, so they can be pulled together in one place (the Toolkit, that our working group supposed to prepare in next year).

Analysis of results included: detection of typical experience, detection of unique experience, detection of main difficulties and barriers, detection of the presence or absence of groups, persons or organizations busy in collaboration for advocacy.

Survey results

Survey was held by working group of IFLA International Leadership Programme in March-May 2013. 7 members from working group from 7 regions (Atarino Helieisar, Federated States of Micronesia, Zola Maddison, USA, Victoria Okojie, Nigeria, Jorge Ruiz Vaca, Mexico , Rosemary Shafack, Cameroon, Irina Trushina, Russia, Dina Youssef, Egypt) organized an expert interview on regional collaboration for strengthening advocacy and the profession.

The English-language version was situated on SurveyMonkey service, the Russian-language version was situated on Russian Library Association website. The questionnaires were accessible to respondents via Internet. 275 respondents used the English-language version, 25 – used Russian-language version. Russian-language answers were translated in English and added to another part of answers.

Respondents (experts) were selected and asked to take part in survey by each member of working group through own regional networks. The summarized quantity of respondents is 290. The number of countries is 27 (*question 3 in survey*):

N	Country	Number of respondents
1.	USA	77
2.	Egypt	71
3.	Russia	25

4.	Australia	14
5.	Cameroon	11
6.	Oman	9
7.	Palestine	9
8.	Saudi Arabia	9
9.	Sudan	9
10.	Federated States of Micronesia	8
11.	Lebanon	8
12.	Jordan	6
13.	Algeria	4
14.	Kuwait	4
15.	Morocco	4
16.	UAE	4
17.	Libya	3
18.	Qatar	3
19.	Iraq	2
20.	Tunisia	2
21.	Yemen	2
22.	Bahrain	1
23.	Canada	1
24.	Syria	1
25.	Switzerland	1
26.	United Kingdom	1
27.	N/A	1
Total		289

As you can see, the most active were the representatives of the Arab countries - 150 from 289 respondents. Noteworthy is the absence of practical and Western European countries with their rich tradition of library, which, of course, reduces the value of the picture.

The survey, in principle, had been interview of experts, almost all of the respondents are experts in the field of librarianship. However, the concept of advocacy is relatively new for in the practice of librarianship, when we are not talking about the libraries of Europe and the U.S., so not all of the respondents, it is possible to assume, have sufficient awareness of the problems of advocacy. It is not so much about personal awareness, but about what kind of advocacy takes place in a number of pressing issues facing librarians around the world. The agenda of most developing countries, issues of advocacy are not a separate item, but closely intertwined with other problems. This must be taken into account because the responses illustrated the diversity of understanding of advocacy by librarians around the world. A significant percentage of respondents who declined to answer the individual questionnaire indicates, in our opinion, is not about laziness or incompetence, and the unwillingness to isolate the problem advocacy of the general circle of library issues.

Another factor that diminished the effectiveness of the survey - the lack of information about the sequence of the specific responses of the respondents to the various survey questions. Each question is given a separate set of responses. It does not, for example, to trace the effect of active participation in professional associations at the answers. In light of this the key importance is the question of the range of countries whose representatives participated in the survey.

The interview form concluded 17 questions. ***In the first question respondents were asked to mark the type of the library they are represented.*** There were 247 answers given and 43 of the respondents blinked the questions.

The international answers were divided in a certain way:

(The first number is the total number of the answers, the second one is the per cent of common number of respondents).

		Number of respondents
	Professional Union / Association	21
	Public / Community Library	92
	National Library	14
	Academic Library	93
	School Library	27
	Other	43
	Total	290

The Term "Other" was specified as:

Special library – 17, research library - 3, parliament library – 2, state library – 2, NGO library – 3, international library – 1, and: government agency – 5, teaching Library disciplines – 4. In addition, some respondents specially designated type of your institution: "public library providing service for training purposes", "a consortium of public libraries", etc. Also in the "other" answers were "University Library"(2), and "The Library Association of Samoa."

Thus, the largest group of employees were university libraries. It is easy to explain: in many countries of the "third world" university libraries are the most "advanced", often performing more functions and academic libraries, and sometimes national libraries. Accordingly, the staff of these libraries is in the forefront of the library community. In Russia on first place were public libraries.

Question 2 was: Are you a member of a library association?

This question was answered by most part of respondents - 284, declined to answer 6 people. From the 198 responses - 69.7% were positive - "yes, I am", but 86 - 30.3% negative, "No".

There was also a clarifying ***question: "If yes, what is your role in the association?".*** 130 from 198 respondents who answered positive on previous question, had replied.

How we can interpret it? It must be admitted that the answer will not be quite correct, since a significant proportion of respondents did not fully understand clarifying question, and as mean "role in the association," stated the name of the association, their place of work or occupation on the job. Such responses typed exactly 30. Among those who outlined his role in the association, many have identified it as a simple membership ("member", "simple member", etc.), such responses was 49. Those who stressed his active role in the association ("active member", "member of the committee", "participant of the round table," "president," "treasurer," etc.), including in the past ("the former Member of the Board, "etc.) had accumulated a little more - 51 responses. Finally, in a group of active members of the association we can select the category of functionaries - current and former, that is, those who held certain positions, rather than just being an active member of the association - such was almost half - 25 people.

Thus, all of the respondents to the second question can be united in four categories: the functionaries, simply active members of the association, a member of association and, finally, those who are not quite clearly conscious of his/her role in the association. This last category can be added by those respondents who were belonging to the association but declined to answer the question about his role in it. It would be very interesting to consider the dependence of the responses to the questionnaire from the other belonging to a particular category (according to our hypothesis, this is what would prove to be a key differentiating factor in the responses to the

questionnaire), but, as noted above, there is no way to trace the sequence of responses "horizontally . "

Question 4: How many people does your library serve?

		Number of answers
	0- 4 999	83
	5 000 – 24 999	81
	25 000 – 49 999	35
	50 000 - 99 999	25
	100 000+	42
	N/A	34

Question 5 was: Does your library organization have a budget for advocacy efforts?

This question was answered by 264 respondents, 26 respondents declined to answer. 81 respondents (30.7%) gave a positive answer, 183 people (69.3%) – negative. As for Russia, then in all 25 cases was answered in the negative: the library does not have a special budget for the work of advocacy. When asked, "If so, could you please inform the annual budget allocation? (approximately)" 41 respondents had answered. However, 3 from the responses straight talk about the lack of information, "I'm sorry, I do not know "), and 4 reported that there is no special section of the budget. But the main problem is that the respondents obviously understood the question in different ways: some have reported the amount allocated in the budget for advocacy, while others appear to have in mind the amount of the budget as a whole. Therefore, the findings should be taken carefully.

Question 6: What types of organizations has your library partnered with for advocacy? Please select all that apply? 125 respondents answered the question, 165 declined to answer.

	Other libraries	77
	Government agencies	50
	Commercial/businesses	33
	Non-profit organizations	61
	Local, Regional or Intl. Library Associations	68
	Other	16

Analysis of the responses that were included under the heading "Other" shows that most of them could be attributed to one of the above categories. Thus, the two answers straight talking about partnership with the library associations, two - the Centre of French culture (we can assume either NGOs or government agency), in response to a talk about civilian groups (eg NGOs). There is an answer, "the advocacy efforts directly aimed at librarians," ie, apparently, it is a partnership with other libraries. Finally, the five responses, despite the clause in the statement clarifying the issue, reported that there was no partnership in advocating their library does not. As a result, under the heading "Other" are: education (3 mentions), youth centers (1 mention), religious congregations (1 mention), Friends of Libraries (1 mention) and UN agencies (reference 1). We emphasize - we are talking about the references, not the responses, as one answer may be referred to different partners.

So, other libraries have won first place among the partners in advocacy, which once again confirms the view that the problems of libraries, librarians are best understood. This is evidenced by the second place allotted professional associations. Well, while the third place was taken by the NGO recognized source of help in cultural endeavors. The last place among the partners took the government agencies and the business community, which of course leads to sad reflection on the place of libraries in the world of power and money.

Answers from Russia found a slightly different trend: in Russia in the first place among the partners in advocacy work out government agencies.

Question 7 is determined the previous question: Of the organizations that your library organization partners with, please rank these organizations in order of who makes the best partners for your advocacy efforts, with #1 being the best partner.

The questionnaires from Russia yielded important results, although they were presented in a slightly different way than in the main array.

Thus, according to the average rating of the best partner were the mysterious "other." This could be interpreted as dissatisfaction with the usual options of partnership, but rather evidence of the incorrectness of the indicator "average." As easily seen, the respondents did not give preference to the "other." The other is much more reliable indicator - respondents who were enrolled in the category of "best partners." Here, in the first place - and by a wide margin - the "other library" - 46 votes in second place, far behind, government offices - 29 votes, then - the library associations - 24, non-profit organizations - 12, commercial - 11. The mysterious "others" were named as the best partners only 4 respondents. Thus, the answers to this question are generally consistent with the answers to the previous - Libraries in defending their interests they rely primarily on other libraries. Attractive as a partner in the business ranking took the last place. It is significant that as the worst business partner also mentioned more often than -13 votes.

Question 8 was formulated as: Please, give an example of a successful partnership and mention the advocacy programs\policies you implemented:

As can be expected, this issue has sharply raised the number of non-response: 65 respondents replied, 225- declined to answer.

The responses given many different examples of libraries in advocacy in collaboration with other institutions. Analysis allowed us to classify these examples from the point of view of what partners were mentioned in the responses. (It should be borne in mind that the answer may be referenced multiple partners).

Other libraries - were mentioned in 16 replies

NGO - 10 replies

Library associations - 9 answers

Government Institutions 6 replies

Scientific and educational institutions 3 answers

Media 3 answers

Society of Friends of the Library 2 replies

International organizations 2 replies

Business 1 reply

Other (often unable to decipher who is meant by the partner) 16 replies

Answers from Russia amounted to a separate, specific array. Of the 25 Russian respondents to this question is answered 8, but most of the answers are detailed in nature.

> *The collaboration of Centralized System of Children Libraries of Ryazan city with factory of sports equipment "Romana" was organized. Thanks to this collaboration children sport facilities accessories were got from "Romana" factory. Advertising banners were placed on the walls of library and library cards as greetings for the equipment. Collaboration with communication provider ZAO "ER Telecom holding" let us to establish Wi-fi web in the Centralized System of Children Libraries of Razan city libraries. Free of charge routers were established. Long time collaboration with book-trading organization "Livre" let us to establish large-scale library enterprises yearly. The last of our enterprise was "Children's book week", where the winner and active participants got books, stuffed toys and party games.*

The director of state Governmental National library of Karachay-Cherkessia named after X. B. Baymurakova is simultaneously the deputy of Karachay-Cherkessia Parliament. He advocates the interests of libraries, education and cultural bodies jointly with his Parliament fraction.

The Omsk State Regional Research Library named after Pushkin have a partnership with «PROMEKS-Info» and «Garant-enterprise» for free access of the users to law and society information. Those organizations gave the library free access to two law date bases ("Konsyltant Plus" and "Konsultant-Plus Regioni"). Those bases are more complete than one, being in free trail in Internet.

Thanks to The Civil Chamber of the Russian Federation and the deputies of Regional Parliament 1 million rubles was gave for the development of library book funds. Thanks to The Governor of Kostroma in 2012 100 % of regional libraries take computers. 96% of them were connected to the Internet.

We work together with authorities for creating regional library low. We work together with heads of local administrations for reservation the local libraries. We work together with legal service for consulting of librarians and library users.

We jointly with Exchequer of Kaliningrad region and business in the framework of association agreement collaborate for Incorporation of the libraries in the realization of State program "The increase of Financial awareness of the population of Kaliningrad region in 2011-2016".

The Kaliningrad library association was established jointly with other libraries, Russian Library Association and the Culture Ministry of Kaliningrad region.

Series of broadcasts "Bibliotreker" on radio "Mayak" was accomplished.

Thanks to financial support of "Russian culture (2012-2016)" program 6 projects were realized to the amount of 1,9 millions of rubles.

Cooperation with National libraries center and Federal library center allowed us to fulfill priority directions in library activity, to preserve book funds, to advance reading, to create digital copies of the documents.

Our long standing partners in "Dobrolubovka Galery" project are Archangelsk Photo club and Archangelsk regional branch of "Russian Union of Artphotographers".

For exhibitions were organized in the framework of this collaboration.

Moving exposition "20 years without USSR" was organized in library jointly with "Photocenter". New modern exhibition hall full of light and well equipped was opened in the Library. Besides assembly hall was repaired.

Cooperation with government authorities let us effectively complete tasks of the central library of Arkhangelsk Oblast and the realization of the informational policy of Russian Federation

The partnership with Press and Information agency of Arkhangelsk Oblast, the ministry of Press ands Polygraphy of Arkhangelsk Oblast, The branch of Federal Service for Supervision of Communications, Information Technology and Mass Media for Arkhangelsk Oblast. The partnership with main publishing houses let us to bring copyright deposits from producers.

In collaboration with The Election Committee of Arkhangelsk Oblast was successfully organized regular library competition "Election as a tool for democracy". The aim of this competition is to enlighten library users about legal culture.

An agreement was written with Northern (Arctic) Federal University named after M. V. Lomonosov about common working on the development of library services. Library and University will jointly collect Library funds, develop web information resources, create regional cumulative book catalogs. Those two organizations will work together under development of professional capability of library personal; to led scientific and analytical activity in library science and bibliography, to preserve rare documents of Arkhangelsk Oblast.

Long time collaboration of the library with Antonievo-Siysky Monastery for long time project "to exposit Siysk treasure" includes in the feast of 20 years of the revival of the Monastery. The regional competition "20 years of revival of Antonievo-Siysky Monastery of Holy Trinity" was organized and appreciated. 24 man and women took part in this competition.

Internal links were strengthen and library activity broads. New strategic partners were attracted for collaboration. Main partners are Presidential Library named after Boris Yeltsin and Northern (Arctic) Federal University named after M. V. Lomonosov. The collaboration with local Writers Union progressed very promptly. The main goal of one was the promotion of local writers to the public. The organization of interregional conference "Library local history is the territory for great chanses" became new phase of the collaboration with Russian Library association.

> *Staff of the library actively develop the partnership with Inter-Ethnic relations Committee, the Ministry of Education and Science of Byratia, Byrat State University, "Byrayad ynen" Publishers, The Writer's Union of Byratia, interregional civil organization VARK.*
>
> *Library has the representatives in Cultural Ministry of Republic Byratia, The Writer's Union of Byratia, Inter-Ethnic Relations Committee, Byrat State Academic Theatre named after Hoza Nasmarayev.*
> *Library actively collaborate with mass media, giving information in Russian and Byrat languages on TV and Press.*

> *During the year the active partnership was preceded with "Consultant Plus", "Garant", "Kodeks", "Referent" and "Zakonodatelstvo Rossii" systems. The presentation of DVD "Consultant Plus for Higher School" was organized jointly with "Firma Alise" company. Seminar for accountants "To create an account for 2010. We want what to know in 2011" was organized jointly with "Garant" company. The library personal was educated in usage of system for law reference "Garant Platforma F1 Expert".*
> *Partnership was established with the National radio of Chuvashia. Monthly radio shows broadcast with advertisements and exhibition's reviews.*

Question 9 was asking: During your experiences partnering on advocacy efforts, please describe any challenges you have encountered, if you were able to resolve the challenge(s), and if so how?

As in the previous question, many have chosen to avoid answering 55 responses at 235, forward. Of course, the responses revealed a number of problems faced by the library. We tried to classify them as follows (note that in one response might be called a few problems):

Financing - 11 responses
Misunderstanding of the role of libraries - 10 replies
Lack of time (One answer: "Time, time, time") - 7 replies
The lack of a meeting place - 5 replies
Bureaucracy, imperfect laws - 4
The passivity of the staff of libraries - 2
The social atmosphere - 2
"Lots of problems" - 3
"No problem" - 3
"We do not advocate" - 1
No answer - 2
Other ("It is difficult to preserve the materials in humid climates" etc.) - 7

More interesting, however, to consider the results of the answers to this question in another way: how to integrate the recognition of the problem and the recognition of its solutions? Calculation shows that in 23 cases, respondents reported solving the problem (full or partial), and only in one case - that the problem was not solved. In this case, it is clear that those respondents who have not written anything about solving the problem, and those who do not answer this question - are not so optimistic. However, this group of 23 respondents who were able to solve the problem stands out as the most active part of the surveyed audience. According to our hypothesis, it is precisely those who are actively involved in professional associations, and they also leave your contact information at the end of the questionnaire, but you can not check it, for the reasons stated above.

Question 10: Please mention important achievements or benefits you realized through you partnership. 60 respondents answered this question, 230 declined.

We can classify the responses as follows:
Support and promotion of libraries - 12 replies
Assistance in the formation of funds - 5
Expanding the range of services - 3

Purchase of machinery and computers - 3
Legislation in favor of the library - 2
Professional dialogue and cooperation - 7
The expansion of the Budget - 4
Training and methodological support - 4
Cataloging- 2
Building - 2
Widening the circle of readers - 5
Relations with other organizations and programs - 3
Work with people with disabilities and other groups - 3
Access to information resources -4
It's hard to formulate - 1

It is interesting to note that it is not the most sponsorships (financial, etc.), namely the partnership. Such items as "Supporting and promoting the work of libraries", "professional dialogue and cooperation", "Widening the circle of readers" took the top places in the list.

Question 11: please describe the work you and your advocacy partner(s) are engaged in. If you have created advocacy tools resources and materials, please, include links to the resources, or contact information for accessing there materials.

47 respondents answered the question, declined to answer 243. The answers demonstrate how a variety of experiences and divergent understanding of the topic of advocacy. It should be noted that the question concluded, in fact, two separate issues, and many respondents chose to answer one of them.

Here are some typical responses (we have tried to select exactly typical examples representing different groups of responses), describing the work done.

1. "speak about value of the library", "library advocacy through the placement of local content on the Internet," "advocacy on a personal level," "working with legislators and government officials," "we go from office to office to the rector, deans, and other administrators, urging them values of the Library "- these and similar responses - 14.

2. "The spread of culture through reading, seminars, lectures," "reading, conferences, seminars and musical meetings."

3. "Preservation of cultural materials and fundraising", "global search across all of our resources, the Interlibrary loan," "digitization, acquisition audio recordings", "indexing system MARC», etc.

It is understood, that to the advocacy can be attributed the first response only.

As for the question about the materials and techniques to help advocate, then it said 14 respondents.
We use the methodologies of library association - 3
We rely on the Internet - 2
Use the official legal database -1
By using our website, Facebook, twitter and blog - 5
We created Advocacy Toolkit in frames of the library association -1
We provide consulting assistance to libraries -2

Question 12: Do you have support within your library organization to pursue collaborative partnerships toward advocacy?

91 respondents answered, 199 declined to answer. 63 respondents answered positively (69.2%), 28 respondents had negative answers- 28 respondents (30.8%).

Question 13: How does this support (or lack of support) impact your work?

58 respondents answered, 232 – declined to answer. It is significant that the number of respondents is substantially less than the previous question, although these issues are closely related. As in previous issues, we found a difference in understanding of the topic of questioning. With some degree of conditionality responses can be divided into three groups:

Positive (in varying degrees) assessment of the situation-36 responses.

Negative (in varying degrees) rating - 11 answers.

Uncertain ("I can not say" or the answer was not on subject) - 7 answers.

Question 14: Beyond your existing partnerships, please rank which community-stakeholders you would like to partner with on advocacy efforts, with #1 being the best potential partner. (You can drag and drop the answer choices or type the ranking into the drop-down box.)

82 respondents answered the question, 208 declined to answer. Respondents ranked potential partners from 1 to 6 (1 – the best).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A	Rating
Other libraries	31	16	14	15	1	0	5	2,21
Government agencies	16	25	18	12	4	1	6	2,55
Business	12	9	23	10	17	3	8	3,27
NGO	8	14	12	30	13	0	5	3,34
Library associations	12	12	9	8	34	0	7	3,53
Others	1	3	1	1	3	65	8	5,56

As we can see, and where the average rating is not the same as the indicator of the real preferences: most libraries would like to establish partnerships with other libraries (31 respondents put them in the first place), then by a wide margin - government agencies.

By comparing the responses to the fourteenth and seventh questions, it can be argued that the structure and the real and potential partnerships in general are the same: the library would like to cooperate more closely with those with whom they are really cooperating. Noteworthy is the fact that the Library Association received a lot of negative responses - most respondents put them on too honorable fifth place in a number of potential partners. Obviously, in many countries the librarians are not well informed about the possibilities of their professional associations.

Question 15: What would you want this collaboration or partnership to accomplish?

56 responses were received, 234 respondents declined to answer.

The responses received we tried to classify were the following:

Financial support and equipment - 9 answers

friendly legislation and support of community - 5

Image and promotion the role of libraries - 11

Promotion of services and programs to attract new readers - 7

Assistance in working with disadvantaged groups - 4

vocational training librarians -3

Support from Business - 1

Cooperation with other libraries, interlibrary loan - 1

Cataloging - 1

Cooperation with Kindergarten - 1
Save the library open - 1
General considerations - 11
Today advocacy is not required - 1

Question 16: What steps, tools and/or resources would you take to pursue of a new collaboration for advocacy efforts?

Answers were the following:

Face–to-face persuasive meetings	69
Focus group discussions	42
Partnership agreement (memorandum of understanding, MOU)	47
Public statements	31
Other	13

Answers "Other" were including:

1. Workshops
2. The report of the internal commission; desirable reports prepared by the association, especially for benchmarking.
3. Strengthening cooperation and partnerships to build a prosperous Yemen.
4. training courses.
5. Presentations on our website, DVD / You Tube; PR - campaign on a national scale.
6. The strategy to improve the professionalism / business literacy library staff. Everything I do as a director of a public library in the countryside is open to debate - it's not about what we can do for the community - it's about what the community needs - yes, the public library can do this or find a partner who can ! Working together - that's what creates a community ... looking at each other, we achieve success.
7. Exchange programs and visits.
8. Surveys to determine the needs of partners.
9. Demonstration of high-quality service that speaks for itself.
10. Our organization needs first of all to set common goals.
11. Brochures, training, research and social networks.

All Russian respondents supposed the most firm form of work – MOU.

Last, the seventeenth question of the questionnaire suggested respondents to leave their contact information for further collaboration. Such information was provided by 41 respondents. We assume that this is - in general - the same respondents who answered the open-ended questions, and those who are active members of professional associations, but to test this hypothesis can not be reliably.

Conclusions:

The survey showed an interest of librarians from different countries to study the problems of library advocacy. On the other hand, there are problems became evident cognitive nature difference in understanding and advocacy related problems. It would be highly desirable to continue research using "soft" methods of sociology: interviewing, focus - groups, etc.

1. As already mentioned, the concept of "advocacy" has not yet become ubiquitous, and is generally recognized as the library community. Under the advocacy refers to all forms of social partnership involving the libraries, and just all forms of cooperation between libraries.

2. The most common group of partners in advocacy - other libraries. This coincides with a rating of potential, desirable partners. In second place, with a significant margin - government agencies. It should be noted that in the Russian picture is a little different - government agencies took first place in the list of desirable partners. Note also that the role of professional associations is essential, but - their potential value as the main organizer of the library's advocacy work is clearly not disclosed.

3. Speaking about the tasks that would solve the library through cooperation, we emphasize that the key was not to increase funding and other types of financial aid, but rather moral - psychological factors: improving the image of libraries, attract new readers, the friendly against the law libraries.