Table 24 Is your library currently using Mosio's Text a Librarian for its library text messaging services?

Table 24.1.1 Is your library currently using Mosio's Text a Librarian for its library text messaging services?

	No Answer	Yes	No
Entire sample	0.00%	11.76%	88.24%

Table 24.1.2 Is your library currently using Mosio's Text a Librarian for its library text messaging services? Broken out by type of library.

Type of Library	Yes	No
Public	14.29%	85.71%
Academic	5.00%	95.00%
Special	20.00%	80.00%

Table 24.1.3 Is your library currently using Mosio's Text a Librarian for its library text messaging services? Broken out by total number of full-time equivalent library employees.

Employees	Yes	No
Less than 5	0.00%	100.00%
5 to 19	16.67%	83.33%
20 to 49	30.00%	70.00%
50 to 149	0.00%	100.00%
150 or more	11.11%	88.89%

Table 24.1.4 Is your library currently using Mosio's Text a Librarian for its library text messaging services? Broken out by the type of virtual reference service (real time, answer later, or both).

Virtual Reference Service	Yes	No
Real time	7.14%	92.86%
Answer later	25.00%	75.00%
Both services	10.34%	89.66%

Table 24.1.5 Is your library currently using Mosio's Text a Librarian for its library text messaging services? Broken out by the year the library's virtual reference service was established.

Year Established	Yes	No
No response	33.33%	66.67%
Earlier than 2004	12.50%	87.50%
2004 to 2008	11.76%	88.24%
2009 or later	0.00%	100.00%

Explain why you chose the text messaging and virtual reference platform services that you use. Why those particular services and not others?

1. LibraryH3lp is our main platform, and through it we offer the SMS add-on product (via a 3rd party company called Twilio). LibraryH3lp is also the platform for our VR consortium, which contracts with the company Chatstaff to provide back-up and 24/7 reference service to patrons at the member libraries.

2. It was what was offered by our State Library.

3. For 24/7 webchat services.

4. Google apps are universally available including email.

5. Consortia decision.

6. Best established service at the time.

7. We tried others too and these suit us best now.

8. We were in ASERL consortium using QuestionPoint but there were concerns with staff time, costs, and software performance. Libraryh3lp was cheaper and easier.

9. Price and ease of use.

10. The consortia plans to add a text messaging service later this year. I'm not sure what platform they will be using.

11. We are not using text messaging. We chose to provide our own service (using our own librarians on commercial software) because we are familiar with the assignments and nature of our courses and the professional services are not.

12. Small library. Not much technology above a lab. Text seemed an easier way to start.

13. We use QuestionPoint because that is the platform that is used by the RHN Collaborative of which we are part. In July 2013 we started text reference through Mosio. We chose Mosio because of its capability to interact with QuestionPoint, but other factors were considered. • Mosio seemed to be the closest thing to a standard in the library world • Ease of use • The

ability to archive, send out texts to distribution lists, send out generic texts when closed.

14. Currently only use email due to budget constraints.

15. We had a thorough RFP conducted during our pilot phases.

16. We are just beginning services with Libchat. We did use Live Support.

17. Simple to use, priced right and excellent customer service.

18. Current staffing only supports email Ask Us service.

19. Fairly easy to use and support is available.

20. We started with the Illinois consortial pilot that used Question Point called AskAway, but we were unhappy with the inability for other libraries to answer our patrons since they couldn't access our resources, and we didn't feel like our small school with limited hours would be able to help other libraries. We used Mosio Text a Librarian for several years on our own and were very happy with their service. However, our service was not used enough to justify the expense, so we recently changed to the less expensive LibraryH3lp service.

21. I was not part of the original decision making process.

22. We don't use any of the above text messaging or VR platforms because the statewide initiative (and I'm sorry I don't know what software is being used) works so well for us for VR. They offer text, chat and email.

23. Several years ago Bexley Libraries participated in the initial tranche of Public Libraries in Enquire. After several years local management decision questioned the value to local taxpayers given majority of enquiries were from out of the borough (clearly, as was the whole concept of the service!) About that time neighbouring authority, (Bromley) joined the service, with whom we now work closely in a Shared Service. From memory, the decision within Bexley was initially based on the fact that it was a development of the Ask A Librarian service, which we had taken part in previously.

24. We chose Tutor because of the level of coverage it offers us. We haven't looked into other services because our current virtual reference isn't used that heavily.

25. Had LibGuides from the same vendor and looked good.

26. Because it's what the consortium uses.

27. We are part of AskColorado because we don't have enough staff to operate a virtual reference service on our own.

28. Use only email.

29. We do not use any of the above services.

30. Affordable, user friendly and accessible way to increase communication options for patrons.

31. In-house.

32. Good support and user friendly.

33. We choose QuestionPoint as a local coop with three other library systems. We wanted the best 24 hour service with the lowest cost. We have a great deal with QuestionPoint.

34. Our services consist of access to the information on our website, telephone, or email requests. We also occasionally receive requests through written mail. We are not automated, so do not offer too much in the way of virtual reference services.

Chapter 3 – Usage Statistics

Table 25 How many reference queries did your library get through virtual reference in 2012?

Table 25.1.1 How many reference queries did your library get through virtual reference in 2012?

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire sample	1,683.84	624.50	1.00	11,551.00

Table 25.1.2 How many reference queries did your library get through virtual reference in 2012? Broken out by type of library.

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Public	747.33	345.00	1.00	2,500.00
Academic	2,582.65	1,058.00	22.00	11,551.00
Special	1,859.11	394.00	8.00	8,890.00

Table 25.1.3 How many reference queries did your library get through virtual reference in 2012? Broken out by total number of full-time equivalent library employees.

Employees	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than 5	544.11	200.00	6.00	3,600.00
5 to 19	521.45	267.00	1.00	1,666.00
20 to 49	1,886.44	1,262.00	40.00	10,108.00
50 to 149	1,009.86	1,058.00	254.00	1,907.00
150 or more	4,926.13	3,871.00	850.00	11,551.00

Table 25.1.4 How many reference queries did your library get through virtual reference in 2012? Broken out by the type of virtual reference service (real time, answer later, or both).

Virtual Reference Service	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Real time	1,309.08	363.50	6.00	7,020.00
Answer later	764.00	40.00	8.00	2,400.00
Both services	2,121.28	956.00	1.00	11,551.00

Table 25.1.5 How many reference queries did your library get through virtual reference in 2012? Broken out by the year the library's virtual reference service was established.

Year Established	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
No response	1,542.00	1,281.00	6.00	3,600.00
Earlier than 2004	3,055.80	1,600.00	22.00	11,551.00
2004 to 2008	1,220.00	450.00	8.00	8,890.00
2009 or later	378.40	258.50	1.00	1,907.00