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Abstract

Library date due slips can potentially contain personal information (e.g., names) that compromises patron privacy. A survey was conducted of fifty-five Canadian English-language public library systems to determine what information is being printed on date due slips. While it was discovered that personal information was sometimes included, it was most often in the form of the borrower’s library card number, an almost anonymous identifier. The most commonly included information related to library services, such as the name of the library, the titles of items borrowed, and the due date. Respondents cited patron privacy as the main reason for not including personal patron information. It appears that Canadian public libraries are aware of the importance of maintaining confidentiality in regard to library user records, at least in terms of the content of date due slips.
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Introduction

The authors have both, upon opening a public library book (either one we have borrowed or one we have pulled from the shelf) found inside a date due slip from a previous borrower. This was not surprising: library users (including ourselves) often use date due slips as bookmarks or tuck them away in the book so as not to lose the vital information (the due date) they contain. What was surprising was that some date due slips included a lot of information in addition to the due date – including the patron’s name and library card number, and the list of titles.
borrowed that day. As librarians interested in use patterns, the authors have both looked carefully at this information to inform our collection development and reader’s advisory practices. But we also both realized that, as helpful as this information is to the patron, it also revealed much about the borrower her/himself, likely more than they might be comfortable with others knowing. Public libraries have worked hard to protect patron privacy and patron records, and it was surprising to encounter this information on the date due slips. We set out to determine how common this practice was.

**Literature Review**

While little writing exists on the practices of producing date due slips, there is a relatively large body of literature on patron privacy in libraries. The literature search therefore examined relevant works about legislation affecting libraries, ways of handling the legislation, patron privacy, tensions between patron privacy and patron service, the effect of social networks and integrated library systems, and examples of integrated library systems that produce date due slips.

The effects of legislation, in particular the USA PATRIOT Act and the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), on patron privacy have received considerable attention. Several authors have provided historical perspectives on the creation of these Acts and suggested potential solutions for libraries that address the problems this legislation has created, such as updating privacy policies and shortening records retention (Bowers; Coolidge; Matz; Phillips). These Acts, although American, have also concerned authors writing about Canadian libraries. Caidi and Ross have advised Canadian libraries to promote awareness and revise policies to protect themselves from the effects of the USA PATRIOT Act (90). Burkell and Carey have expressed concern about access to Canadian patron information by American third-party vendors (4). Provincial legislation concerning freedom of information and privacy protection, such as Ontario’s Municipal Freedom of Information and Privacy Protection Act (MFIPPA), have been examined in terms of their abilities to protect patron privacy (Tomp 272-274; Burkell and Carey). Within the broader context of government information policy, Trosow has written about privacy in libraries (46-48). Dryden has analyzed Canadian MLIS programs to see how they provided education about user privacy (184-197).

Some authors have suggested turning to the American Library Association (ALA) as a resource for libraries with patron privacy issues. ALA’s Code of Conduct, their public statements supporting patron privacy, and the ALA Privacy Toolkit have been identified as valuable tools (Fouty 290; Gerhardt 4; "Rep. Sanders’s Remarks" 176-186; Stevens, Bravender, and Witteveen-Lane 33). Others have argued that, while these sources are helpful, the strategies suggested are not enforceable and, therefore, have limited value (Burek-Pierce 30-31; Seaman 3).

It has been noted that there is a tension between assuring patron privacy and providing good library service. Trina Magi found that “service-oriented library directors find themselves caught between two principles here – the desire to
make the patron’s experience efficient, friendly, and convenient on one hand, and the desire to ensure that the library serves patrons as a sanctuary for confidential inquiry on the other” (752-753). Both ALA and practicing professionals have recommended shorter retention times for patron records as an important strategy to ensure privacy (“As Libraries Go Digital” 33; Bernstein 54; Bowers 381-382; Coombs 495; Coyle 55; Engstrom, Hartley and Kezele 4; Lamdan 134). There are those, however, who lament the associated loss of statistical information that could be used to improve service, circulation, and collection development (Estabrook 48-49; Nicholson 36-37).

Several authors, focusing on the role of libraries and librarians in protecting user privacy, have noted that these concerns often have excluded children and young adults (Adams, “The Age of the Patron and Privacy”, “Principal and Confidentiality”, and “Protecting the Privacy of Student Patrons”; Chmara; Yates). While several articles have suggested that users have an expectation of privacy, one noted that patrons “honestly don’t care a smidgen if there is a privacy law, they just want convenience” (Stevens, Bravender, and Witeveen-Lane 39).

The emergence of social networks has also impacted patron privacy. Internet usage in libraries, for example, has created concerns that patron information is being collected through e-book and internet usage (Caldwell-Stone 60-61; Chmara 64-65; Coombs 495; Huff 87; Schneider 98). Integrated library systems (ILS) are also of concern. Breeding believes that libraries are not a target of hackers, but he also asserts that libraries can and should take steps to protect information from them (30-32).

The implementation of ILS software has allowed for new features for libraries and their users, but these features can also be seen as problematic. For example, ILS software allows libraries to print self-adhesive hold labels with patrons’ names, which can be affixed to the spines of books to facilitate user retrieval from hold shelves in public areas. As anyone can ascertain the identities of patrons and the type of material they are borrowing simply by browsing the hold shelves, this has been seen as a threat to privacy (Bowers 54; Stevens, Bravender, and Witeveen-Lane 34). Self-checkout systems are often regarded as a possible way for library users to protect their privacy when checking out sensitive materials; however, in a study designed specifically to explore this, Matheson and Hancks were unable to verify the supposition (29, 34).

Before the emergence of computer technology, due date slips were pasted in the back of the book and stamped for circulation. These types of slips were used as a tool for analyzing materials circulation (Fenske 265-270; Gillie and Teper 939-956). Computerization has allowed due date slips to be customized, printed, and given to the patron, and this has been seen as a convenience which has increased library productivity (Harris 15; Samuelson 19; Spidel 5).

We reviewed the web sites of the two most frequently used ILS systems, Evergreen and SirsiDynix, in order to gain some insight into the production of
date due slips and the possible types of information that can be provided on them. We discovered that both systems have the capability to allow patron information, such as Name, User Account Number, and User Email, to be printed on date due slips; however, both systems also offer options to omit this information ("Frequently asked questions about Evergreen"; "Receipt fields for circulation records"). Although "the ideal slips should respect people’s privacy" (Schmidt 19), there are instances where this has not been observed. For example, in one of the very few papers to specifically address date due slips, Hogan describes the types of things that can be inferred about a person from the information on the slips:

I learned a great deal of information about people from those tiny slips. I discovered the person's full name and the date and time of day they had checked out their books. If they had any fines to pay, how much they paid. I learned what material they took home, and how many items they checked out…. I learned of the woman who is interested in cooking with chocolate, and one who is all thumbs when it comes to plumbing. I know the man who likes to draw and play the guitar, and the one who is interested in fly fishing…. I know those who are looking for work, or are searching for a better position, or trying to keep the one they have. I know the name of the person who wants to understand about fatal friendships and the one who wants to be a tough-minded optimist. (15)

Hogan’s article provides an excellent illustration of how date due slips can affect patron privacy when slips are found and examined by strangers. There is, however, little research or literature about the frequency or types of personal information included on computer-generated date due slips. To address this gap, we conducted a study to investigate the following research question: What types of patron information are included on public library date due slips?

**Method**

We used a structured survey that included some open-ended questions to gather information about date due slips. The survey was a combination of checklists and open questions. In addition to completing the questionnaire, participants were asked to provide copies of printed date due slips from both their self-serve and staffed service counter terminals. Surveys were distributed by email. Participants had the option of either mailing or emailing their completed surveys. Sample date due slips could be mailed or scanned and emailed.

To make the study feasible in terms of the time and resources available to complete it, and because the authors practice and teach librarianship in Canada, we decided to limit the study to Canadian public libraries.

The questionnaire was designed to capture information about the library’s province of origin (with an option not to identify), the name of the ILS program...
being used, and the types of information that are present on date due slips produced by self-serve terminals and staffed service counters. A checklist was designed to capture the slip information; the options on the checklist were developed after examining information about Evergreen (“Frequently asked questions about Evergreen”) and SirsiDynix (“Receipt fields for circulation records”) software. The survey is included; see the Appendix.

Using online and print directories, an alphabetized list of Canadian public library systems that offered English language service was compiled. From this list, all the library systems were included as survey recipients except for Ontario, which has a very large number of libraries. For Ontario, every third library system was randomly selected. This resulted in a partially stratified sample of 266 libraries. After the study received approval from the Research Ethics Board of Western University, requests to complete the survey and the survey itself were sent via email along with a letter of information. There were twelve automated responses indicating errors in email transmission, reducing the sample size to 254. A total of fifty-five responses were received, resulting in a response rate of 21.7%. It should be noted that some provinces/territories had few library systems (some had only one), and if a respondent from one of these provinces/territories participated, there was a possibility of identification. In order to ensure the privacy of study participants, a statement cautioning the possibility of identification due to geographical information was included in the letter of information, along with the provision of an option for the respondent to select “No province” as a response to the provincial location question. In addition to the fifty-five responses, we received notes from four libraries that were still using date due slips pasted in the back of books and manually stamped. These libraries therefore were unable to participate.

Responses to the closed survey questions were tabulated and reported as frequencies. Chi-square analyses were completed to look for relationships between variables. Responses to the open-ended questions were analyzed through close reading to identify relevant themes.
Results

The number of respondents varied across provinces and territories (see Table 1).

Table 1
Response by province and territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/territory</th>
<th>Number of libraries approached</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of return</th>
<th>Percentage of total respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Territories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunavut</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon Territory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No province</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Twelve emails, from libraries in Quebec, Manitoba, Alberta, Ontario, British Columbia, and Nunavut, returned error messages. They are not included in the study statistics.

The highest number of responses was received from British Columbia (n=21, 38% of the total sample) and Ontario (n=18, 33%). Alberta, Manitoba, Nova Scotia and Quebec each had three respondents (5%). Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan, and one unnamed province had one respondent (2%) each. No responses were received from the northern Territories. The results of a chi-square test conducted to check for a relationship between geographic area and the presence of personal information were not significant, indicating no relationship between these variables.

In order to determine whether there was a relationship between the ILS software used by the libraries and the information provided on date due slips, libraries were asked to identify their ILS provider. The top three programs reported were SirsiDynix (which included Horizon, Symphony, Unicorn, and Workflows) with a count of twenty-two, Evergreen/Evergreen Sitka (n=14), and Millenium/Sierra...
In all, eleven different providers were identified. The small number of elements in some cells did not allow for a chi-square analysis. However, no relationship was readily apparent between particular ILS systems and the type of information included on date due slips.

Information printed on date due slips varied between libraries and also, in small ways, between slips issued at staffed service counters and those printed at self-service counters (see Table 2). Fifty-three of the fifty-five responding libraries use a dedicated date due slip printer; one uses a regular desktop printer, and one indicated that it does not print date due slips but rather hand-stamps a slip affixed to the item being borrowed. Fifty-four of the responding libraries indicated that they check materials out at a staffed service desk; the library that hand-stamps its slips did not answer this survey question. Twenty of the libraries reported using self-service checkout counters. We compared the information included on the date due slips to see if there were any differences between those printed at the staffed service counters and those printed at self-service counters. Only minor differences were found, suggesting that the type of information included did not vary between staffed and self-service checkout.

Table 2
Information printed on date due slips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Staffed service counters (n=54 libraries)</th>
<th>Self-checkout counters (n=20 libraries)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information about the borrower:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron surname</td>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron first name</td>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron phone number</td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron email</td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron ID number</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information about billing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount billed</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount paid</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information about items borrowed:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>n=51</td>
<td>n=19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call number</td>
<td>n=17</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID number of item</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcode of item</td>
<td>n=44</td>
<td>n=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of copies</td>
<td>n=8</td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date checked out</td>
<td>n=36</td>
<td>n=17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current time</td>
<td>n=35</td>
<td>n=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date due</td>
<td>n=54</td>
<td>n=19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three most commonly reported items on date due slips printed at staffed service counters were: Date Due (n=54, 100%), Title of Item Borrowed (n=51, 94.4%), and Library Name (n=46, 85.2%). This is not surprising, as the due date and perhaps also the library’s name are essential to the purpose of these slips. The title of the item borrowed could be seen as an element which would serve users well.

Categories of user information which could be regarded as personal included: Patron First Name, Patron Last Name, User (Patron) ID Number, Amount Billed, Amount Paid, Patron Email, and Patron Phone Number. The most frequently reported personal information item printed on date due slips at staffed service desks was the Patron ID Number (n=23, 42.6%). Very few libraries included either Patron First Name or Patron Last Name (both n=7, 13%). Even fewer printed Amount Billed (n=3, 5.6%), Amount Paid (n=2, 3.7%), Patron Email (n=1, 1.9%), or Patron Phone Number (n=1, 1.9%) on date due slips. It is interesting to note that few libraries included information which actually identified users, and when a library did include personal information it was most often a relatively anonymous Patron ID Number.

Information about items borrowed was provided by some libraries, with fifty-one (94.4%) listing the Title, forty-four (81.5%) the Barcode Number, and seventeen (31.5%) the Call Number. Only a few included the Author (n=6, 11.1%).

Information about the library also appeared on date due slips, with Library Name appearing on most (n=46, 85.2%) and Library Logo and Library Slogan on a few (both n=4, 7.4%). Some libraries promoted their services on date due slips (n=18, 33.3%) and some included messages about things like fines owing, holds, or renewals (n=18, 33.3%). One (1.9%) included a Community Message. None of the date due slips received had any paid advertising printed on them. When asked if any other information was included on the date due slips, one library noted that the number of the checkout terminal was printed; another library included the expiry date of the user’s library card, and two libraries printed the name of the person who provided service during the transaction.
The last open-ended question on the survey asked the libraries to list the reasons for the inclusion or exclusion of specific types of information. From libraries that included personal information, the answers varied. Seven respondents stated the inclusion/exclusion of information was tied to the template associated with their ILS software. Thirteen respondents indicated they chose to use only the patron’s ID number because of concerns about privacy, indicating this resulted in better identity protection when compared to a slip with a user’s first and last name. It should also be noted that, of the twenty-three respondents that had Patron ID numbers on their slips, four indicated the Patron ID number was purposefully truncated to ensure even further protection. One respondent stated:

Patron names and identifiers were removed from the date due slip for privacy. It is easy to misplace these small receipts, or leave them in a book upon return. After finding so many receipts with name and patron barcode, as well as the titles of the books that they had checked out, we made this change. There were never any complaints either way, but the name and patron barcode also gave others potentially easier access to that patron’s online account.

**Discussion**

It appears that the most frequent types of information on date due slips are Date Due, Title of Item Borrowed, and Library Name. Patron names did appear on some of the date due slips, but the User (Patron) ID number was more prevalent than patron names. The prevalence of the ID number over patron name was due to the belief that the ID number (especially when truncated) provided greater privacy protection than names. Only one of the fifty-five respondents provided both these items (patron name and the full User [Patron] ID number) on their date due slips. This suggests that the majority of public libraries surveyed made efforts to limit the appearance of patron information on date due slips, with the purpose of protecting patron privacy.

An interesting insight was provided by one of the four libraries that did not complete the survey. As previously noted, these libraries did not provide computer-generated date due slips for their patrons – they stamped dates on date due slips pasted in the book. One of these recipients explained that their library had no intentions of providing printed date due slips to their patrons. This decision was driven by service, not by privacy concerns:

Our library is not a big city library, but it is a busy, vibrant library. We service a community of under [one thousand] people, and so we do date dues the old fashioned way. We use a pocket date due – we stamp the pocket of the book with the date the book is due back and then we write the number of the patron beside the stamp so they (and us) will know that they have read this book. While this is all going on we visit with the patron, maybe remind them that they have already read the book and it is all part of the very hands on, friendly service that our patrons expect and
love of our library. We will NEVER have a self check kiosk, because that would kill our customer service plan.

This comment illustrates how some libraries see the use of technology such as computer-generated date due slips and self-serve counters as an impediment to service. It also points to the tension inherent between the need to protect privacy and the desire to provide service (see the earlier discussion of Magi’s research). We argue that it is exactly this desire to serve that may have prompted some libraries to include, in the very small space afforded by a date due slip, the titles and other information about items borrowed which gives the borrower a potentially useful list to help her/him keep track of loans.

**Conclusion and ideas for future research**

While the results of this survey were interesting and useful, they also suggested some ways that would move this inquiry forward. With over 70% of our data from two provinces (British Columbia and Ontario), further study could explore regional trends. It would be useful to study this phenomenon in other library contexts such as academic, research, and special libraries. Conducting interviews with library staff would be helpful to get at the reasons behind the choices for what information to include on library date due slips. Interviews with library users could capture their perspectives. ILS vendors could be queried about their date due templates.

As the innate curiosity of reading the date due slips of others might never disappear, the omission of patron information from date due slips will help protect patron privacy. While the relatively small response rate (21.7%) and the lack of data from any of the northern Territories somewhat limit the generalization of these results to all Canadian public libraries, it appears that, for the most part, they are doing a good job when it comes to protecting the privacy of their users.
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Appendix – Survey

STUDY: Giving the slip: Types of information on library date due slips

There are two parts to this study:

Part A – Copy of Date Due Slips: Print a date due slip using an account not attached to an actual library user, such as a test account, an account associated with a particular function or department such as repairs or circulation, or a dummy account - DO NOT SEND a slip from an actual patron!

Please provide 2 slips: 1) one produced from a desk check out terminal 2) one produced from a self check kiosk

The sample date due slips can be sent using one of two ways:
1) Scan a PDF, JPG, or GIF copy and email to: jhung42@uwo.ca
OR
2) Mail a copy to the following address:
   J. Hung – Survey
   Street
   City, Province   Postal Code [Anonymized]

PART B – Survey: Please complete the survey below.

1. Please identify if you are a branch, or the main branch for a library system (Mark the check box)

   Branch outlet

   Main Branch

2. In which province or territory is your library located (Mark the check box or highlight the province that applies)

   British Columbia
   Alberta
   Saskatchewan
   Manitoba
   Ontario
   Quebec
   Newfoundland
   Nova Scotia
   New Brunswick
   Prince Edward Island
3. What is the name of the software program used to produce date due slips (i.e. Evergreen, SirsiDynix Harmony, Millennium Sierra) Please fill in the blank: ___________________

4. How many date due printers do you use to serve patrons at the checkout counter (Please write or type number) ________

5. How many self-serve date due printers do you have for public use (Please write or type number) ________

6. The following is a list of the types of information that could be on due date slips.
   - Please check all the types of information that appear on the front and back of the date due slip from your library.
   - There is one section for slips produced at the service/checkout counter by staff, and another for slips produced at self-serve kiosks by patrons.
   (Please mark the check box or highlight all the boxes that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Service or checkout counter</th>
<th>Self-serve kiosks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Charged/checked out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID number of Item being borrowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcode of Item being borrowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron First Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron Last Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Copies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of item borrowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User (Patron) ID number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Billed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount Paid
Patron Email
Patron Phone Number
Paid Advertising from sponsors
Library Name
Library Logo
Library Slogan
Library event/service/product marketing
Library related messages (i.e. fines, renewals)
Community Messages

Please go to the next page for more questions

7. Is there any other information that is on the date due slip that does not fall in any of the categories above? Please specify:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

8. Were there any reasons why the specific types of information were included or not included on your library date due slips? Please explain:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing the survey! Please return this survey either by mail or email:

Mail: Jean Hung – Survey
Street
City, Province
Postal code

Email: jhung42@uwo.ca