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Abstract

The terms digital divide, digital literacy, and digital inclusion have been widely used in discourse related to the Internet over the past two decades; however, these terms are rarely defined, and their meanings seem to shift with changes in technology. Yet, these concepts have driven many Internet-related policy decisions. This paper bridges the concepts and related policies with the efforts of public libraries to provide Internet education, access, and assistance. Following an examination of the meanings assigned to these terms and policy efforts based on these concepts of the digital divide, digital literacy, and digital inclusion, this paper examines the roles of public libraries related to the concepts and the ways in which these roles have been shaped by policies that impact access to information which is increasingly embedded within a range of technologies. The paper then explores the ways in which policy could better support public libraries in these roles and the ways that these roles can contribute to public library advocacy and a voice in policy-making.

I. Introduction

The explosion of personal technology in the past thirty years – cell phones, personal computers, Internet access, broadband access, and mobile devices – has created technological divisions between segments of the United States population. Various factors, including socio-economic status, education level, geography, age, disability, language, and literacy, leave large numbers of people underserved, disadvantaged, or underrepresented in terms of technology
access and usage (Jaeger, Subramaniam, Jones, & Bertot, 2011). Often, these gaps in access and usage and their ramifications are discussed using the terms “digital divide,” “digital literacy,” and “digital inclusion.” While these terms frequently arise in political, media, and academic discourse, the myriad definitions ascribed to each term creates complications in the development of solutions to the technical, social, and economic divisions already identified. Sorting out these terms and their roles in policy-making are not matters simply of semantics, however, as divisions will continue to arise as Internet and other digital technologies continue to outpace the capabilities of many Americans to access and use them. And, as significantly, information is increasingly only available through these technologies, thus creating issues of information access as well.

The progression from the discussion about the digital divide, to digital literacy, and now to digital inclusion is neither linear nor clear. Differing definitions of each term have led to a variety of methodologies and strategies to address the complications posed by the range of definitions. In a 2011 interview, S. Craig Watkins, a professor in sociology and media at the University of Texas, discussed the rapidly changing definition of the term “digital divide,” saying:

I think about 15 years ago when we used the term digital divide, we were talking largely about the question or the concern around access to technology. Fast forward about 10 or 15 years later to 2011, and now when we talk about it, I think it's less about access to technology and more about participation. (National Public Radio, 2011)

Herein lies the challenge that differing definitions can cause. Bypassing the question of access and delving directly into participation and usage, there clearly still exists the basic assumption –
even among some researchers – of ubiquity of equal access, a reality that is questionable. Access to the Internet, particularly broadband Internet, still remains an important topic for discussion, as attested by recent government efforts to build out broadband access points (Federal Communications Commission, 2010; National Council on Disability, 2009).

Historically, as technologies and accompanying infrastructure have begun to evolve more rapidly, access to and literacy in the new technologies has become an important aspect of social inclusion at an ever increasing rate (Thompson, 2008). The acceleration of the speed of adoption can be seen in public library adoption of technologies. Almost all public libraries provided public access to the Internet a few years after the launch of the World Wide Web (Bertot & McClure, 2000), but it took forty years for a majority of libraries to adopt typewriters (Dowlin, 1999). The ubiquitous nature of the Internet and accompanying services and technologies now makes equal access to and participation in the online environment a social necessity for education, employment, finance, and civic engagement (Jaeger, 2011).

But a second issue is the nature and type of Internet access that causes inclusion challenges. Increasingly, traditionally excluded populations from broadband and computing access in the home actually do have Internet access – but via smartphones (Rainie, 2010). And yet, not all content accessible via the Internet is mobile device compatible. Thus while some populations may have Internet access, significant content may not be compatible with the type of access that they have. It is important to note, however, that United States wireless carriers are changing their pricing plans to charge by data consumption, and these new pricing plans may in fact diminish access for populations that otherwise do not have access to the Internet in the home (CNN, 2011).
This unequal personal access to online information has been the topic of debate in political, social, economic, and educational forums since the mid-1900s. While the terms “digital divide” and “digital literacy” have entered into common usage, the term “digital inclusion” is still in its infancy. Digital divide implies the gap — whether based in socioeconomic status, education, geography, age, ability, language or other factors — between Americans for whom Internet access is readily available and those for whom it is not. Indeed, even those with basic, dial-up Internet access are losing ground as Internet and computer technologies continue to advance, using increasing bandwidth and demanding high-speed (“broadband”) Internet access. Digital literacy encompasses the skills and abilities necessary for access once the technology is available. Digital inclusion is, in a manner of speaking, the action plan developed to close the digital divide. It marries high-speed Internet (as dial-up access is no longer enough) access and digital literacy in ways that reach various audiences, many of whom parallel those mentioned above within the digital divide debate. To match the current policy language, “digital inclusion” will be defined here as outreach to un-served and underserved populations.

II. Definitions of Terms

The terms mentioned above – digital divide, digital literacy, and digital inclusion – each represents a different set of concepts and challenges. All of these terms are used to reflect a growing realization that technology has become an irreducible component of modern life, and its presence and use has significant impact on an individuals’ ability to fully engage in society generally and more specifically in areas such as education, employment, government, civic participation, and socialization.
The inconsistent use of terminology reflects both the newness of these issues and the varying perspectives of stakeholders. These often co-occurring concepts present significant challenges to government entities, libraries, schools, and other organizations, and addressing these issues is complicated by the lack of terminological clarity and consistency. It is a challenge to solve a problem you cannot define, and the inconsistency of definitions has affected policy-making processes that attempt to address these issues. The inconsistency also points to the evolving nature of the social, technical, and other challenges that the rapidly converging information and technology markets.

This discussion focuses on definitions and policies in the United States, but it is important to note that different nations have taken differing definitions of and approaches to digital divides, digital literacy, and inclusion (Barzilai-Nahon, 2006; Craven, 2011; Dolan & Kahn, 2011; Harle & Tarrant, 2011; Meneses & Momin, 2010; Salvador, Rojas, & Susinos, 2010; Stevenson, 2009). In the United States, policy has given priority to provision of technical means of access rather than social factors related to access and literacy (Warschauer, 2003), and this focus has been reflected in the definitions as well as the policy implementations. However, one curious constant across policy approaches to digital divides in different nations has been the failure to involve librarians in the formulation of definitions, policies, or other aspects of the policy-making process (Harle & Tarrant, 2011).

**Digital Divide**

In 1995, around the time the introduction of the Internet into popular culture, the US National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) began a series of studies charting American Internet adoption and use. The NTIA studies identified a gap between Internet
“haves” and “have-nots” that was soon termed the digital divide (NTIA, 1998, 1999). According to journalist Steve Cisler (2000), the term digital divide was originally used in a story by journalist Amy Harmon in 1996 to describe the social problem that arises when a person uses digital technology at the expense of his or her real-life interpersonal relationships. Also in 1996, The New York Times writer Gary Andrew Poole wrote about “A New Gulf in American Education, the Digital Divide,” which describes disparities in education between schools in affluent and lower income schools in Silicon Valley as providing “perhaps the most striking example anywhere in the nation of a widening gap -- between children who are being prepared for lives and careers in the information age, and those who may find themselves held back.” Whether Harmon or Poole first coined the phrase, the term was soon thereafter used by NTIA representative Larry Irving when talking about the issues related to unequal ownership of computational technology and it is through NTIA documents and public speeches that the term gained popularity when discussing Internet access disparities.

When the “digital divide” term was coined, households with Internet access and computers in the home were considerably fewer, and there were clear divides of access by race, gender, income, and educational levels (NTIA, 1998). As defined at that time, the divide focused on access to a device (personal computer) and the conduit (Internet). Over time, as computer and Internet penetration in the home increased and some of the divides closed (though full closure was never achieved), the focus shifted to broadband access, along with the need for a range of technology and information literacies. In short, inclusion, and the notion of inclusion, shifts over time, but changes in terminology have not always followed.

The term digital divide is often used to discuss circumstances where a division pertaining to digital technologies exists, be it differing levels of access to hardware, software, or digital
infrastructure, such as broadband Internet (Bertot, 2003). In an information-driven, Internet-enabled environment, access to digital resources is a critical component of social engagement. People with the means to access these digital technologies become the haves, who are able to use these technologies for a wide range of purposes. Those without a means to access these technologies become the have nots, and are often at significant disadvantage. Their access to critical information, including employment, educational, and government resources, is restricted. “The problem of exclusion is exacerbated in social terms even as it statistically diminishes” (Feather, 2011, p. 67). The problem created by the digital divide is primarily one of access. As services and resources become increasingly available only online, the ability to access these resources becomes paramount. It is important to note that many of the people most affected by the digital divide are traditionally underserved populations, such as people with low income levels, minorities, older Americans, and those living in rural areas who may have most need of specialized services (FCC, 2010).

**Digital Literacy**

Digital literacy builds upon the concept of digital divide to indicate the ability not just to access digital infrastructure, but also to utilize it. The term digital literacy also gained popularity in the mid-1990s, as it became clear that simple access to information and communication technologies was not enough to obtain needed information or services; one needed knowledge, skills, and abilities as well (Gilster, 1997). Digital literacy generally is used to refer to an individuals’ ability to locate, evaluate and use digital information, encompassing both technologies, such as computers, and services, such as e-mail. It can also include their ability to deal with and make sense of the amount of information they receive (Goulding, 2001). The kinds
of technologies and level of access available have a significant impact on digital literacy (Meneses & Momino, 2010). One specific component of digital literacy includes what is known as information literacy, which is the ability to recognize when information is needed, find and evaluate the information, and use it effectively (American Library Association, 1989). People with access to digital technologies but who are not digitally literate face unique challenges. While those accessing digital resources in a public library may receive assistance from library staff, as two-thirds of those using library computers do (Becker et al, 2010); such assistance is not available for private or in-home Internet use. In addition to the standard definition of digital literacy, some argue that the ability to create as well as absorb content is a component of digital literacy (Hobbs, 2010).

Digital Inclusion

The final NTIA (2000) report during the Clinton/Gore administration was entitled “Falling through the Net: Toward Digital Inclusion.” Rather than continue to focus on the gaps in technology access between the haves and the have-nots, the term digital inclusion changed the focus of the study to a socio-political approach, emphasizing the foreseeable role of digital technology as a means to engage American society. Digital inclusion encompasses approaches to narrowing the digital divide and increasing digital literacy. One recent study identified the underlying components necessary for digital inclusion as adequate funding for technology, sufficient physical and technological infrastructure to support the technology, adequate bandwidth, and sufficient training in using the technology (Becker et al, 2010). If the digital divide and digital illiteracy are the problem, digital inclusion is the proposed solution, representing the ability of individuals and groups to access and use information and
communication technologies (IMLS, 2011). While digital inclusion is still not clearly defined, the first step to creating a substantive dialogue and definition might well be the Obama Administration’s quickly-enacted *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (commonly referred to as the Stimulus Bill) and the $7.2 billion in funding “aimed at expanding broadband access to help bridge the technological divide and create jobs building out Internet infrastructure” (White House, 2009).

Digital inclusion can reference any strategies to provide training, services, or opportunities designed to address the challenges of the digitally disadvantaged. Components of digital inclusion include economic and workforce development and training (IMLS, 2011). For individuals without access, digital inclusion is a means of gaining access to digital resources. Initiatives such as President Barak Obama’s National Wireless Initiative, intended to provide high-speed wireless services to most Americans, remove barriers to access by lowering the infrastructure requirements with wireless access; Americans need only mobile devices and not costlier computers to gain Internet access (NTIA, 2011).\(^1\) While not all Internet-enabled tasks can be completed on a mobile device, this initiative is an example of digital inclusion as policy. For individuals who cannot make best use of digital resources, digital inclusion is training or other opportunities to develop digital skills and comprehension.

III. Government Approaches to Infrastructure

The legislative roots of digital inclusion can be traced to the *Communications Act of 1934* in which Congress established the precedent of unifying telecommunications and broadcasting standards to promote widely available nationwide wire and radio communication services in an

---

\(^1\) According to 2011 Pew Internet and American Life reports, 83% of American adults own mobile phones and 42% of these owning a smartphone (or 35% of total Adult population) (Smith, 2011).
affordable and nondiscriminatory manner. The *Telecommunications Act of 1996* was a comprehensive update and expansion of telecommunications laws, including promoting universal service to people in low income, rural, insular, high cost, and other disadvantaged areas to make telecommunications more affordable. The *Telecommunications Act of 1996* could not foresee the advent of broadband as a defining communication medium; the language of the law, however, anticipated that there would continue to be advancements in this area and included non-specific text to allow for promotion of access to future technologies (Gilroy & Kruger, 2002). As telecommunications companies increasingly focused on developing and marketing broadband Internet services, the disparities between Americans who could access the infrastructure and those who could not became more pronounced, leading to what is now one aspect of the digital divide.

No major legislation surrounding the development of broadband access was enacted until the Stimulus Bill. The Bill, provided $7.2 billion in funding for loans and grants to be offered and administered by the NTIA and the United States Department of Agriculture’s Rural Utilities Service (RUS). The majority of the funding ($4.7 billion) was to be used to build broadband infrastructure in underserved and un-served areas, with $2.5 billion specifically for rural areas (White House, 2009).

NTIA created the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP) as its grants funding arm. In its first round of funding, BTOP provided $293 million to 56 grantees, one each from the 50 states, 5 territories, and the District of Columbia for a variety of state-level programs intended to increase the level of broadband access and therefore encourage digital inclusion (http://www.broadbandusa.gov). Additionally, BTOP committed funds for states to gather data “twice a year on the availability, speed, and location of broadband services, as well as the
broadband services that community institutions, such as schools, libraries and hospitals, use.” In collaboration with the FCC, the data collected was used to develop the National Broadband Map, which launched in 2011 at http://broadbandmap.gov/. RUS, operating its own funding program, primarily through loans, as the Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP), provided funding for 285 last-mile projects (providing access to customers), 12 middle-mile awards (transmissions lines for large areas), four satellite awards, and 19 technical assistance awards in 45 states and one territory (USDA, 2011).

In February 2010, the FCC released its National Broadband Plan, consisting of recommendations to “guide the path forward through the rulemaking process at the FCC, in Congress and across the Executive Branch”. The FCC’s Plan attempts an umbrella approach to the issue of broadband availability and addresses development, economic market forces, policy reform, and policy creation, amongst other subjects. With regard to digital inclusion, the FCC emphasizes creating incentives to promote digital inclusion, which the report views as the combination of sufficient broadband service, affordable broadband service, and the availability of opportunities to develop digital literacy needed to use broadband. Perhaps recognizing the broad scope of the abovementioned inclusion efforts, the FCC couches its recommendations in terms of “should,” not “must” — a less effective but infallible strategic move should none of the methods suggested come to fruition.

In the plan, several new programs are suggested. Of relevant interest are the Connect America Fund and the proposed method of financially supporting it (FCC, 2010). The FCC recommends transferring at least a decade’s worth of monies invested in the Universal Service Fund (USF) to expand broadband access. Created by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, the USF is a mechanism by which schools and libraries
receive financial assistance (under the E-Rate program) to ensure that Internet connectivity is available to those institutions. Over time, the E-rate program has been enormously important in the development of Internet infrastructure and connectivity in schools and libraries, providing billions of dollars over the course of a decade and a half (Jaeger, Bertot, McClure, & Rodriguez, 2007; Jaeger, McClure, & Bertot, 2005).

Currently, virtually all public schools and about half of public libraries benefit directly from E-rate funds (Jaeger & Yan, 2009).

When considering acting upon the ideas of digital inclusion and thereby bridging the digital divide, divesting the E-Rate program presents a paradoxical approach. Schools and libraries offer Internet services to communities and constituencies who are likely to fall within the Stimulus Bill’s mandate of making broadband accessible to un-served and underserved populations. In about two-thirds of communities, public libraries are the only source of free public Internet access, particularly in rural and economically disadvantaged areas (Bertot, McClure, & Jaeger, 2008). Defunding the program obviously will lead to a loss of Internet access in the physical structures where it has been most readily available to the largest number of people who need access. Defunding the E-Rate program also presents another challenge, including loss of access to those who have no wish for Internet in their homes but still wish to perform Internet-only functions, such as filing taxes.

In 2010, 60% of American adults use broadband connections at home (Rainie, 2010). Nearly 125 million Americans do not use broadband at home, although this could mean in some cases that Internet access exists in the home but people are using slower access technologies, such as dial-up service (Census Bureau, 2010). In a recent survey by the NTIA, however, a
staggeringly large number — 30% of all persons in the United States — do not use the Internet anywhere (NTIA, 2010). For certain populations, such as persons with disabilities, the percentage of non-users of the Internet is even higher (NCD, 2009). In the case of persons with disabilities, the non-usage is directly linked to the laws related to infrastructure and digital inclusion providing explicit permission for providers of access and content to not include persons with disabilities in their services (Jaeger, 2011; Lazar & Jaeger, 2011).

With respect to digital inclusion and broadband capabilities, the NTIA survey emphasized four major reasons for the even higher number (40%) of those not using broadband at home (NTIA, 2010):

- People did not feel they needed broadband;
- People felt broadband was too expensive;
- Lack of or insufficient end-point equipment (i.e., computers); and/or
- Lack of service availability, particularly in rural areas.

The NTIA study ironically demonstrates that the goals of the Stimulus Bill to ensure access to broadband capabilities for all is not the only obstacle to fostering digital inclusion and creating a digital nation — and might not even be the main complication.

IV. Government Approaches to Education and Literacy

Along with a muddled policy approach to the digital divide and infrastructure, the policy approach to digital literacy and inclusion is contradictory and problematic. In an attempt to address the issues of the digital divide and create a more digitally inclusive infrastructure, several government agencies collaborated to create DigitalLiteracy.gov as an instructional website to “serve as a valuable resource to practitioners who are delivering digital literacy training and
services in their communities” (DigitalLiteracy.gov, n.d.). In accordance with this statement, one of the main menu categories is entitled “Find Educator Tools.” However, the lack of a clear audience creates some inconsistencies in the website’s approach. While providing educational tools, materials, and guides for individuals and entities, such as libraries, that are attempting to bridge the digital divide, the site also attempts to speak directly to the have-nots of the digital world. An in-depth review of the site shows that the majority of the website appears to speak directly to those very people who do not have Internet or prefer not to go online. Within the Digital Literacy Initiative Fact Sheet, the push-pull complications of digital inclusion are perfectly represented by two sequenced bullet points:

- There are notable disparities between demographic groups: people with low incomes, disabilities, seniors, minorities, the less-educated, non-family households, and the non-employed tend to lag behind other groups in home broadband use.
- While there is no single solution to closing the broadband adoption gap, increasing digital literacy skills among non-users is key to bringing them online and opening doors to opportunity. (DigitalLiteracy.gov, 2011)

Identifying underrepresented groups is absolutely necessary in order to target those in the most need of education, attention, and access. But not offering solutions, approaches, best practices, or other means to resolve the disparities (as seemingly evinced by the second bullet point) is problematic.

Additionally, devoting resources to an entire “Learn the Basics” section assumes that the people needing to gain digital literacy will somehow intuitively find the site if they manage to find Internet access. As a lack of government literacy is frequently tied to a lack of digital literacy, there are several flaws in approach to the site (Jaeger & Thompson, 2003, 2004). A
more fruitful approach would perhaps be to design the site’s content with and for those community institutions (e.g., libraries and schools) that are best positioned to help meet the challenges of digital exclusion within their communities.

Also, the “In the Community” section discusses online training and digital literacy resources for people with disabilities, yet the website suffers from a clear lack of accessibility for users with different disabilities. Adding to the missing facets of digital inclusion not addressed by DigitalLiteracy.gov is that it exists only in one language. These oversights are especially problematic, as persons with disabilities and non-English speakers are two of the groups facing the greatest barriers to digital inclusion (Jaeger, 2011; Livingston, 2010).

Another institution attempting to define, address, and implement a viable plan for digital inclusion is the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). As requested in the National Broadband Plan, IMLS created a Proposed Framework for Digitally Inclusive Communities (IMLS, 2011). IMLS defines the goals of digital literacy as falling within the following categories:

- All members understand the benefits of advanced information and communication technologies;
- All members have equitable and affordable access to high-speed Internet-connected devices and online content; and
- All members can take advantage of the educational, economic, and social opportunities available through these technologies.

The IMLS framework identifies a total of 11 principles “for focusing efforts in the areas most important for making the entire community digitally inclusive now, for planning for the future, and for identifying areas where special effort will be required.” Five of these principles are
defined as “foundational principles” with the other six defined as “targeted principles.” By initiating the five foundational principles, the remaining six targeted principles ostensibly will be achieved. While the framework is a more coherent approach to digital literacy and inclusion than that of DigitalLiteracy.gov, and mostly in line with the current administration’s goals, it is not a plan that is mandated, enforceable, or funded.

V. The Role of Libraries

With 16,672 public library buildings in the United States (IMLS, 2011), public libraries are in nearly every community (see Figure 1). Public libraries provide important public access computing and Internet access in their communities (Bertot, et al., 2011):

- 99.3% of public libraries offer public Internet access;
- 64.5% of libraries report that they are the only provider of free public computer and Internet access in their communities;
- 85.7% of public library branches offer wireless (Wi-fi) Internet access; and
- Overall, public library branches report an average of 16.0 public access computers. Rural libraries reported an average of 9.6 public access computers, suburban libraries reported an average of 19.6 public access computers, and urban libraries reported an average of 28.0 public access computers.

And though communities may have cafés, coffee shops, or other establishments that provide free Wi-fi, they do not by and large provide public access computers in conjunction with the wireless access.

[insert Figure 1 about here]
In addition to access to public access technologies, public libraries offer a range of information technology instruction. Only 13% of libraries surveyed offered no technology training, with 38.0% of libraries offering formal training classes, 28.1% offering one-on-one trainings, 78.8% offering point-of-use assistance, and 29.5% offering online training material (Bertot, et al., 2011). Of those libraries offering formal information technology instruction, 92.9% offer general computer skill classes, 93.5% offer general Internet use classes, 81.9% offer general online/Web searching classes, 79.5% offer general software use (e.g., wordprocessing, spreadsheets, presentation) classes, and 54.5% offer online database classes. Thus, as compared to a café or other Wi-fi venue, public libraries are often the only community-based access point to the Internet, public access computing, expertise, and information (iPAC, 2010).

**Challenges in Public Access**

In spite of the importance of these public access technology and Internet-enabled services, public libraries face a number of challenges in their efforts to provide access to and instruction in digital resources. Libraries report across the board increases in the use of their public access technologies, Wi-fi, training classes, and online resources, thus representing an increase in demand on library resources and staff. These increases have occurred concurrent to dramatic decreases in library budgets, as policy-makers apparently experience a disconnect between the significance of digital literacy and inclusion for the next generation economy while diminishing support for the primary Internet access and training point for those affected by the digital divide.

As reported by libraries (Bertot et al, 2011):
• 76.2% reported having insufficient public access Internet workstations to meet patrons’ needs during at least some part of a typical day.

• 44.9% reported that their Internet connection speed is insufficient to accommodate patron demand some or all of the time.

• 77.2% reported that space limitations prevent additional workstations, while 54.4% state that the lack of electrical outlets or sufficient cabling are significant barriers to adding workstations or laptops.

With increased usage, these added pressures on the network and infrastructure are occurring as library funding is being cut at local, state, and federal levels around the nation (Bertot & Jaeger, in press; Sigler et al, in press). These overwhelming demands refute assertions that public libraries have benefitted from the focus on digital divides, digital literacy, and digital inclusion simply because they have received funding for technology from private sources like the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (e.g., Stevenson, 2009).

And, a simple lack of access is not the only driver of this usage. The U.S. IMPACT study reported that of the 45% of public library visitors who used the Internet in 2010, and 75% of that group had access to the Internet at home, work, or elsewhere (Becker et al, 2010). It is likely the presence of a helpful, skilled librarian, who can assist those who lack the necessary information literacy skills required to fill out online forms or search for vital information that draws these individuals to the public library to go online (Jaeger, 2008; Jaeger & Bertot, 2009; Jaeger, Bertot, Shuler, & McGilvray, in press).

Libraries continue to lead the way with digitally inclusive programs, such as the New York State’s Education Department initiative – highlighted on the DigitalLiteracy.gov site - to “[teach] digital literacy courses at computer learning centers in 13 libraries across upstate New
York.” News organizations such as the Washington Post (Roso, 2011) have also highlighted how libraries continue to be the go-to resource for people intent not just on accessing the Internet, but also expanding their job skills and therefore their hireability for future employers. Many other libraries have created partnerships with local community organizations to ensure that community needs – from access to food to mental health services to employment services - are available to community members through creative uses of the Internet (Bertot & Jaeger, in press; Sigler et al, in press).

However, these efforts to increase digital literacy and digital inclusion have not been rewarded through policy decisions and point to the discrepancy in the public library funding model – whereby public libraries are increasingly envisioned as part of the national infrastructure to promote connected and digitally inclusive communities (FCC, 2010), but the funding sources for public libraries are almost entirely local. The defunding of public libraries at both the state and local levels while they are increasingly important to ensuring Internet access and training is a significant issue. But policy discrepancies exist at the federal level as well, with the FCC proposal to defund the E-rate, while simultaneously featuring libraries prominently in the National Broadband Plan. And it is unclear at this time the extent to which libraries benefitted from the Stimulus Bill broadband funds, as many successful non-library or non-state library agency lead applicants may or may not have included libraries in their deployment of broadband.

VI. Conclusion: Reconciling Policy and Practice

As the NTIA BTOP, RUS BIP, and other Stimulus Bill-funded programs are currently underway, a complete picture of the success (or failure) of this large undertaking cannot yet be
judged. The fact remains, however, that the United States, for all its technological achievements, has lagged behind many other industrialized nations in the establishment of comprehensive and competitive information access programs. The argument may be made that, regardless of whether certain segments of the population will continue to opt out of the use of broadband technology in the home even if it is made available and affordable, it is important that future generations currently living in un-served, disadvantaged, or underserved populations will have the choice to opt-in.

For these populations, the public library currently stands as the primary resource through which Internet access, education, and resources are available. As a result, public libraries are relied upon more than any other cultural institution to overcome the digital divide, teach digital literacy, and foster digital inclusion. As detailed above, the federal policies in this area acknowledge this reality, relying specifically on public libraries in a number of ways to promote digital literacy and digital inclusion. Yet, public libraries are predominantly excluded from the funding made available for digital literacy and digital inclusion, as well as being excluded from the decision-making processes related to policy in this area.

Further exacerbating this disjunction between federal policy and public library practice in terms of digital literacy and digital inclusion, public library budgets have been heavily reduced during the economic downturn of the last several years, even though the use of libraries has skyrocketed (Sigler et al, in press). While governments at all levels are relying on public libraries to ensure digital inclusion, the same governments are reducing the funding of the libraries that are being relied upon. This situation places public libraries in an untenable of greater service demands, greater service expectations, and fewer resources by which to meet these demands and expectations.
If this situation is to be addressed, the solution can only be found in reconciling the incompatibility between funding cuts at the state and local level, as well as limited support at the national level, with the increased view at the federal level that libraries are part of the solution to large-scale technological problems. As with many other current areas of information policy, this situation evidences a clear lack of harmonization between major policy goals (Shuler, Jaeger, & Bertot, 2010). Simply put, public libraries cannot be simultaneously promoted as the solution to digital divide issues by the FCC, IMLS, DigitalLiteracy.gov, and other government agencies and facing the significant reduction of the small amount of federal funding they receive by taking the funding away from the E-rate program to meet other policy goals.

There are no other cultural institutions prepared to serve the public in the digital literacy and digital inclusion capacities that public libraries do, for a lack of sufficient public access technology and for a lack of the ability to provide education and training related to the Internet. As such, the change has to be in policy rather than practice, unless the federal government opts to abandon policy focus on promoting digital literacy and digital inclusion.

There are three core changes that could help to harmonize the policy and the practice of digital literacy and digital inclusion. The first is extremely straightforward – when demanding more of libraries to fulfill these digital literacy and digital inclusion functions, do not reduce library funding. The plan to take any E-rate funds, while state and local governments are drastically cutting library budgets, will not serve to increase digital literacy and digital inclusion. Libraries have been placed in the social role of ensuring digital literacy and digital inclusion and their support from all levels of government needs to increase to a level that such services, training, and resources can be adequately provided.
Second, policy-making related to the digital divide, digital literacy, and digital inclusion needs to bring public libraries into the discussions, designs, and decisions. A place in the policy-making process for libraries would have quickly illuminated the problems with relying on libraries while cutting their funding. Additionally, the input from the social instructions that work to foster digital literacy and digital inclusion into the development of DigitalLiteracy.gov would likely have resulted in a website far better equipped to promote digital literacy and digital inclusion.

In addition, though there are attempts to create and/or foster partnerships between libraries and government agencies that could benefit communities greatly, they may not come with the funding, governance, or other structures necessary to ensure success. One example is the partnership between the IMLS and the United States Department of Labor (IMLS, n.d.). Though announced in June 2010 with the intent of bringing together Labor’s employment services and one-stop career centers and libraries as community-based institutions, there is little evidence of a broad national collaboration. For example, the resources provided on the IMLS website are more than a year old, and when one heads to the CareerOneStop site (http://www.careeronestop.org/) one cannot find materials directed at libraries that want to partner and/or engage the Labor’s resources. Indeed, the resources are directed at the public seeking employment and/or training and do not seemingly consider that those in need of assistance may not have access to, or be facile with, Internet-enabled technologies to take advantage of the provided resources and information.

And finally, libraries need to take more initiative in terms of advocacy. Libraries have accepted – and in most cases embraced – these responsibilities without the needed support from governments. Public libraries must make a stronger, more public case for the support they need.
Without changes in policy in this area, public library roles in promoting digital literacy and digital inclusion will not be sustainable. For each member of a population that is disadvantaged in terms of digital literacy and digital inclusion, and for society as a whole, such an outcome would have dismal consequences. Without the public library as capable intermediary, the gaps between the digital haves and the digital have nots will quickly escalate as digital inclusion becomes more and more central to participation in education, employment, government, and many other areas.
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