

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION
FOR THE DEGREE DOCTOR IN PHILOSOPHY IN THE
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Melissa Cast-Brede

Presented on:

Title: Academic librarians' role in gatekeeping: The influence of vendor labeling on academic library collections

Abstract approved: _____
Dr. Mirah Dow

The purpose of this study is to determine the influence of one corporate book vendor on collection holdings in seven Carnegie Class L academic libraries in the areas of practice of education and educational administration. The study uses the communicative rationality theory of Habermas (1989), the habitus work of Bourdieu (1988; 1993), and the gatekeeping theory of Lewin (1947) as theoretical frameworks for explaining how book vendors serve as a connection between organizations and individuals and the librarian's gatekeeping role in collection development. Analysis of variance was used to measure overall congruence. Library employee size, vendor-supplied categories, and vendor-supplied labels were examined utilizing chi square test of analysis. While statistically significant difference was found in an overall analysis of the book holdings, no significant difference was found in examinations of the vendor-supplied categories nor vendor-supplied labels indicating congruence and the influence of the book vendor on book collections. Findings were mixed in the analyses involving number of library employees. Smaller academic libraries of 69 or fewer employees had significantly different collections than the two larger groups of libraries. Academic

libraries with 70 to 95 employees and academic libraries with 96 or more employees did not have statistically different book collections indicating congruence. Book vendors were found to work at the routine level of analysis and to act as intermediaries who create legitimizing structures that influenced book selection.

Keywords: Academic Libraries, Gatekeeping, Approval Plans, Book Vendors, Collection Development, Selection, Communicative Rationality, Habitus

ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS' ROLE IN GATEKEEPING: THE INFLUENCE OF
VENDOR LABELING ON ACADEMIC LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

by

Melissa A. Cast-Brede

Emporia, KS

November 2013

A Dissertation

Presented to

EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

The School of Library and Information Management

Partially funded by a grant from the

College and University Section of the Nebraska Library Association

Dr. Gwen Alexander, Dean of the School of
Library And Information Management

Dr. Mirah Dow (Chair)

Dr. Gwen Alexander

Dr. John Hill, University of Nebraska at Omaha

Dr. Kathy Ermler, Dean of the Graduate
School and Distance Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere gratitude goes to my dissertation chair, Dr. Mirah Dow, for all her help, support, and genuine interest. Her patience and wisdom guided me well throughout the doctoral program. I also thank the other members of my committee. Dr. Gwen Alexander was firm when needed and flexible when necessary. Dr. John Hill acted as my white knight and helped me to stay in the program when I thought I would have to give up on the doctoral process. All three committee members were generous in their support, encouragement, and dedication to the process.

I am very thankful for the support and patience of my husband, Kent, who made me laugh even when I didn't feel like it, and my parents who knew when to ask questions, when to give encouragement, and when to supply cake.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
<u>CHAPTER</u>	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Librarians and Libraries Identify with Books	2
Identity	2
Library Purpose.....	3
National Collection	3
Library Values	4
Librarian Expertise.....	5
Danton.....	6
Edelman	6
Atkinson.....	7
Advent of Outsourcing, Book Vendors, and Approval Plans	7
Significance.....	10
Considerations for the Patron.....	11
Considerations for Collection Development Librarians	11
Considerations for Academic Libraries	12
Considerations for Universities.....	13
Considerations for Scholarly Communication.....	15

	Summary of Concerns.....	16
2	BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE	
	Critical Theory	17
	Communicative rationality.....	18
	Habitus	20
	Gatekeeping Theory.....	22
	Levels of Analysis.....	23
	Individual	23
	Routine.....	24
	Organizational.....	25
	Extramedia	26
	Routine Level In-Depth	27
	Book Vendors and Approval Plans.....	29
	History.....	30
	Effectiveness and return on investment	31
	Financial Benefits	32
	Adequacy of approval plans.....	32
	Effects of book vendors	33
	Missed Works	34
	Overlap.....	35
3	METHOD	
	Purpose of the Study	37
	Variables	37

	Independent Variable Descriptions.....	37
	Dependent Variable Descriptions	37
	Research Questions, Sub-Questions, and Data Analysis	38
	Limitations of the Study.....	43
	Definitions of Terms	43
	Procedures.....	45
	Demonstration.....	46
4	RESULTS	
	Purpose of the Study	49
	Independent Variable Description	49
	Dependent Variable Description.....	49
	Research Question #1 Results.....	50
	Research Question #2 Results.....	51
	Research Question #3 Results.....	52
	Research Question #4 Results.....	53
	Research Question #5 Results.....	54
	Research Question #6 Results.....	55
	Research Question #7 Results.....	56
	Research Question #8 Results.....	57
5	CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION	59
	Conclusions.....	60
	Research Question #1 Conclusion	60
	Research Question #2 Conclusion	61

Research Question #3 Conclusion	62
Research Question #4 Conclusion	63
Research Question #5 Conclusion	63
Research Question #6 Conclusion	64
Research Question #7 Conclusion	65
Research Question #8 Conclusion	65
Discussion	66
Findings Related to the Literature.....	66
Implications for Practice	69
Implications for Future Research.....	70
Conclusion	71
REFERENCES	73
TABLES	94
FIGURES	106
PERMISSION TO COPY.....	109

List of Tables

Participating Libraries by University Name, Library Name, and Library Director Name	94
Post-test Seven-Group Comparative Survey Design by Library Location, Study Constraints, Independent Variables, and Dependent Variables.....	95
Analysis of Variance Comparison of Seven Medium-Sized Peer University Libraries for Frequency of Practice of Education Holdings	96
University Libraries with Significantly Greater Mean Frequency of Practice of Education Holdings.....	97
Analysis of Variance Comparison of Seven Medium-Sized Peer University Libraries for Frequency of Education Administration Holdings	98
University Libraries with Significantly Greater Mean Frequency of Educational Administration Holdings.....	99
Observed Frequencies for the Number of Library Employees at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Titles Available Compared To Averaged Practice of Education Holdings	100
Observed Frequencies for the Number of Library Employees at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Titles Available Compared To Averaged Educational Administration Holdings	101
Observed Frequencies Book Vendor Labeled Content Areas General-Academic (GEN-AC), Advanced-Academic (ADV-AC), Professional (PROF), and Popular (POP) at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Available Titles Compared to Averaged Practice of Education Holdings	102
Observed Frequencies Book Vendor Labeled Content Areas General-Academic (GEN-AC), Advanced-Academic (ADV-AC), Professional (PROF), and Popular (POP) at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Available Titles Compared to Averaged Educational Administration Holdings	103
Observed Frequencies Book Vendor Labeled Basic-Recommended, Research-Recommended, Research-Essential, Specialized, Supplementary, and Books without a Label at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Available Titles Compared to Averaged Practice of Education Holdings	104

Observed Frequencies Book Vendor Labeled Basic-Recommended, Research-Recommended, Specialized, Supplementary, and Books without a Label at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Available Titles Compared to Averaged Educational Administration Holdings105

List of Figures

Example of Book Vendor Notification Records106

YBP/L&H Select Profiling Definitions107

YBP/L&H Select Profiling Definitions, Page 2108

Chapter 1

In a society composed of many corporate chains, customers usually expect to encounter a high level of homogeneity in products. Customers know exactly what a hamburger from McDonald's will look and taste like no matter where in the world it is ordered. Is this homogeneity in products right for libraries and library collections? Many library leaders express concern that librarians are moving away from traditional in-house, user-centered collection development practices to outsourced collection services by book vendors that result in high levels of homogeneity, or stated another way, cookie cutter library collections. The perceived problem is that academic libraries across America with book vendor-driven collections may have a critical loss of librarian expertise and as a result have become too homogenized and unable to reflect local needs.

Library outsourced services by vendors include the purchasing of book records from the library cooperative OCLC Online Computer Library Center, formerly known as the Ohio College Library Center, and the acquisition of books through intermediary book vendors. A particular concern with the acquisition of books through intermediary book vendors is in academic library collection development and the practice of establishing profiles with third-party book vendors for the automatic ordering of books based on specific criteria. Many professional librarians fear that collection development, the creation and maintenance of a set of resources for a particular community (Bullis & Smith, 2011; Edelman, 1979; Haines, 1950; Johnson, 2009; McColvin, 1925; Oder, 1997), has become operationalized and eliminated decision-making by professional librarians who have historically served as gatekeepers for the facilitation of public discourse. This perceived shift from librarian expertise to operationalized acquisitions

leads to the need to investigate the influence of book vendors on library holdings, particularly in academic libraries. This introductory chapter explains the problem by highlighting the importance of books, the role of books in libraries, the expertise of the librarian as illustrated in seminal collection development models, the history of library use of book vendors, and the place of librarians as information gatekeepers to provide context for this investigation of the influence of book vendors on library holdings.

Librarians and Libraries Identify with Books

Many professionals in library and information science (LIS) see themselves as gatekeepers facilitating the flow of quality knowledge on its way to society (Chamberlain, 1991; Lu, 2007; Metroyer-Duran, 1993; Oder, 1997). The LIS field is an interdisciplinary field focused on information from creation to use with the purpose of access to information and the goal of resolution of human problems (Rubin, 2004). Even in a digital world, the book remains a highly used medium for the dissemination of knowledge. Consequently, books today continue to be fundamentally entwined with library identity, purpose, and values.

Identity. A recent study by OCLC of patron perceptions indicated that the identity of libraries was very closely tied to books despite the significant increase in online offerings such as electronic journals, streaming media, and chat reference services (DeRose, Cantrell, Carlson, Gallagher, Hawk & Sturtz, 2011). When people define libraries, they think of books (Osburn, 2006). This perception is shared by many librarians. As Merle Jacob stated, “Libraries have one product and that is their collection” (Oder, 1997, p. 29). Indeed, the connection between books and libraries goes back over a hundred years when Melvil Dewey first uttered the phrase that would become

the motto of the American Library Association (ALA): “The best reading, for the largest number, at the least cost” (Berry, 2004, p. 8). Even though the motto and its association with books has been challenged multiple times, it remains.

Library purpose. The connection between books and libraries has often fueled what many librarians believe to be the purpose of libraries. In the 1850s, George Ticknor encouraged the city of Boston to ensure that the Boston Public Library be accessible to all citizens and a place of education for the common person (Harris, 1975). While Ticknor was primarily concerned with assimilating the recent influx of illiterate immigrants into American culture, his stance was the beginning of the concept of the library as a place of “egalitarianism and democracy” (Harris, 1975, p. 4). Dewey (1906) clearly echoed the sentiment when he wrote that libraries should cooperate “to supply books for common use” (p. 55). Today, many professional librarians align their professional standards with democratic ideals (Alstad & Curry, 2003; Andersen, 2005; Harris & Sordt, 1981; Leckie & Buschman, 2007; McCabe, 2001; Wiegand, 1999). In assisting community members to become an informed citizenry through access to quality resources and public venues for rational discourse, librarians often view their professional practice as crucial to the equal access and dissemination of information to all of their constituents.

National collection. Another concept relevant to librarians’ core values, including access to all (American Library Association, 2004), is the conceptualization of a national collection wherein all libraries of the United States combine to form one collection. There is no national collection in the United States (U.S.) in the sense that one entity works to collect everything published. Rather, libraries in the U.S. informally

collaborate to form a dispersed national collection to ensure a copy of each book is held somewhere and is publicly available (Lee, 2000). Edelman (2006) referred to this as the “Great Library theory: Give the money to the largest libraries, let them decide what is best, and all will be taken care of” (p. 238). The beginning of this concept may have its roots in the work of John Langdon Sibley of Harvard University. In the 19th century, Sibley began collecting everything ever published because he believed that future advances could easily be based on contemporary works (Mexal, 2011). This concern for preserving the national collective knowledge base has remained strong for academic libraries where recently libraries have relied on the major members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) to collectively and comprehensively acquire the majority of books published (Budd & Harloe, 1997). However, increases in publishing output and journal costs have jeopardized this effort. As Kyrillidou and Young (2005) reported for ARL, serial expenditures have increased over 300% since 1986 “to the detriment of other budget lines” (p. 10).

Library values. Foremost in the tradition of libraries is the role of skilled librarians in selecting materials with the local community as the focus. (Curley, Broderick, & Bonk, 1985; Oder, 1997). As Curley, Broderick and Bonk proclaimed, “only a dedicated librarian can build a collection” (p. 10). For them and others, selection is where community and library purpose align (Bullis & Smith, 2011; Drury, 1930; Haines, 1950; McColvin, 1925; Ranganathan, 1964). Books historically have been selected based on various criteria of quality and appropriateness for the local community. For decades, library leaders such as Lionel McColvin, Helen Haines, and Shiyali Ramamrita Ranganathan passionately conveyed the librarian’s role in bringing quality

resources to library communities based on local needs. In Haines' (1950) words, libraries should "enrich" (p. 16) patrons' lives. For his part, the influential Ranganathan (1964) highlighted the need to connect local patrons to books in his oft-quoted *Five Laws of Library Science* and his belief in "Every reader his or her book" (p. 280). According to these library leaders, libraries are essential in a growing cultural society. McColvin (1925) summed up the belief most eloquently,

We consider the library throughout the discussion, not as a separate or separable institution existing apart from or independent of the life of the community, but as an integral part of human activity. We regard the library as an organ in the social body, functioning only in relation to the rest of the organism. (p. 16)

In their review of recent collection development literature, Bullis and Smith (2011) noted the continued emphasis on supporting the needs of the local community.

Librarian Expertise

A century ago, books were selected individually in academic libraries by either the library director or faculty members (Mosher, 1983). As publishing and academe expanded into new knowledge areas such as interdisciplinary studies, the academic library director began to delegate the work to specialized staff members or faculty members (Edelman, 2006; Harris, 1986b, Mosher, 1983). New departments were developed and devoted to collection development, requiring librarians to develop subject expertise and knowledge of the publishing industry. For example, in 1960 the State University of New York at Albany (SUNY/Albany) library had one librarian to select the

books (Bonk & LaCroix, 1980). By 1966, six subject specialist librarians were selecting books. Fourteen years later, 12 subject specialist librarians were selecting books. The writings of Danton (1935), Edelman (1979), and Atkinson (1984), who are considered influential collection development researchers, emphasized the importance of librarians' expertise in selection of materials.

Danton. In an effort to identify necessary parameters for quality collections, Danton (1935) investigated the organizational characteristics of libraries with recognized quality collections. He identified a correlation between the level of responsibility librarians have in selection, the credentials of the librarians, staff size, availability of selection tools, and the amount of time spent on selection with the quality of academic library collections. Based on this research, Danton emphasized the importance of skilled librarians being allowed the time to focus on the collection. In the decades since, many professional librarians have confirmed Danton's findings (Atkinson, 1984; Edelman, 1979; Evans, 2000; Kanazawa, 1991). For instance, Kanazawa (1991) determined that organizational size was a great influence on the type of model implemented and found that institutions larger than 50 staff members should utilize a separate department model.

Edelman. Edelman's 1979 description of collection practice has been heavily cited as a foundation for research regarding collection development. Edelman identified three levels of collection development activity. The first level involves categorization of audience needs and recognition of the fiscal reality. In the second level activity, the focus is on selection of materials with the establishment of criteria and methods. In level three, the selections from level two are purchased. Although Edelman's seminal work appears to strongly lean toward operationalized procedures, the three levels in his model

also involve individual practices and behaviors such as knowledge of individual faculty research interests. It is particularly noteworthy that Edelman warned against using his work as the basis for automating the decision-making process, highlighting the importance of individual selectors concerned with their constituents to provide the “couleur locale” (1979, p. 38) that is so central to library values.

Atkinson. Atkinson (1984) agreed with Edelman in the concept of selection as part of a whole although still a solitary act. According to Atkinson, while the context of a book’s citation, such as the reputation of the publisher or a positive book review, greatly influences decision-making, the individual selector’s subjective judgment is the final arbitrator. As he stated, “that the suitability of the cited document is finally determined on the basis of a context that can only be privately assembled and applied” (Atkinson, 1984, p. 114). Atkinson asserted that if there were any overarching organizational factors guiding decisions, they were only derivatives of micro decisions made previously by the selector. For him, selection is an art form rather than a practice conducted by a laborer.

Advent of Outsourcing, Book Vendors, and Approval Plans

With the advent of U.S. library directors and advisory boards choosing to move collection development decisions from within the library to outsourcing collection management to book vendors, libraries began to move away from what was considered primary tools of selection. Book reviews, publisher catalogs, core lists, and bibliographies were once the collection development librarian’s primary tools of selection (Bonk, Magrill, & Carter, 1979; Evans & Saponaro, 2005; Futas, 1995; Gorman & Howes, 1989; Tucker & Torrence, 2004). The librarian’s role in contributing to community discourse through collection development began to change with the continued

growth of the publishing industry and the pricing crises of the 1970s and 1980s when book prices increased at a significantly higher rate than the Consumer Price Index (Selsky, 1989). Book production in the arts and humanities grew over 62%. Books in the social sciences increased by over 90% and book production in science grew 173% (Perrault, 1995). At the same time, book prices increased by 41%. These pressures on libraries continued as library budgets stagnated or declined straining staffing levels (Bullis & Smith, 2011; Demas & Miller, 2012; Reilly, 2013). In an attempt to deal with these pressures and resulting challenges, libraries began outsourcing some aspects of book selection to book vendors through the use of pre-approval purchase plan profiles. One of the main motivations in the adoption of approval plans has been the desire for cost savings (Eldredge, 1996; Horava, 2006). As Eldridge (1996) noted in her contemplation of approval plans, often the only way a library can increase its funding for resources is to save funds elsewhere. It is this tightening of budgets and declining staffing levels that leads to growing concerns about the use of approval plans.

For the first time, libraries could set up a profile based on their needs with a vendor who would pre-select titles and ship them to the library for "approval." The pre-approval purchase plan profiles, also known as approval-plan profiles, are outlined by the library in terms of subjects, reading levels, and other characteristics. Books vendors use these outlines to match books to the library's purchase plan and send them to the library for approval. This approval process is typically based on surface level descriptions of the book in contrast to the traditional user-centered collection development practices of the past based on patron needs. There is little interchange between the book vendor and a collection development librarian relevant to factors traditionally considered best practices

in collection development such as the consideration of what Eldeman (1979) called audience-need characterization. By 1996, 93% of ARL members reported using approval plans (Flood, 1997). The approval plan model has also expanded to ebook profiles (Buckley & Tritt, 2011).

As approval plan profiles are based on a set of characteristics such as content level and geographic designations, books are described by the same characteristics, such as content and geographic designations, in addition to the traditional bibliographic information. To make collection development librarians aware of books that were not gathered from the approval plan profiles, book vendors often use notification slips as illustrated in Figure 1. Originally, notification slips were cards with the bibliographic information for a particular book so collection development librarians could identify books that were missed by the approval plan. Currently, most book vendors and librarians use an online version that enables search results to be sorted by groupings such as call number range, subject headings or keywords for particular time periods, formats, publishers, etc. The same characteristics utilized in the approval plan are available in the notification systems. Typical content-level descriptions are juvenile, popular, professional, and academic (general or advanced). Some book vendors add additional descriptors such as whether or not a text is an essential title on the subject, a recommended title, or a supplemental title.

Many library leaders are concerned that the book vendor ordering process has reduced or eliminated the user-centered focus that professional librarians have contributed to making library collections meet the needs of the communities they serve (Chamberlain, 1991; Evans & Saponaro, 2005; Okerson, 2005; Serebnick, 1984,

Tonkery, 2001). They believe that the outcome of outsourcing selection will create academic libraries with the same book collections, regardless of the academic programs, students, and faculty they serve. Many library critics question whether librarians are really active gatekeepers in public discourse. Evans and Saponaro (2005) voiced their concern in stating, "Given today's staffing situation in most libraries, there is a real danger that the plan will shift from approval to blanket order, simply because the staff has to attend to more pressing duties" (p. 236). As a result, many critics have begun to question whether librarians are really the active gatekeepers of democracy they claim to be.

Significance

Many librarians are concerned that the increased reliance on approval plans has led to homogeneity in library book holdings as mergers in the book industry centralized many activities in publishing (Okerson, 2005; Serebnick, 1984, Tonkery, 2001). Despite documented benefits of efficiencies in labor costs and discounted book pricing (Bostic, 1991; Eldredge, 1996; Johnson, 2009; Plodinec & Schmidt, 2002), there are strong voices of concern. As Chamberlain (1991) asked and answered in her speech on librarians as gatekeepers, "What happens when a few vast companies control the publishing and other forms of access to information? More and more resources go to supporting them until they are the only game in town" (p. 268). Okerson (2005) echoed Chamberlain's (1991) concerns in her reflection on changes in acquisition processes and as libraries moved from ownership of physical items to licensing access to electronic resources. She expressed concern that as increasing amounts of selection occur through the licensing of bulk collections of ebooks and journal subscriptions, the identification of resources of

particular concern to a local community decreases and as a result the collections in the United States become more and more similar. According to Okerson (2005), half of all the books available were published after 1977. Of those, only 24% are held in more than ten libraries and only 5% are held in more than 100 libraries. This perceived reliance on book vendors to decide what is supplemental and what is essential has possible implications for library patrons, collection development librarians, academic libraries, and the universities they serve, as well as the larger scholarly community.

Considerations for the patron. In a patron-centered academic library, student and faculty needs must be considered first. They need access to a variety of alternative concepts not always represented in the mainstream press to understand and contribute to academic discussions of social, cultural, and political issues (Berman, 1976; Dilevko, 2008). However as budgets become tighter, selectors have become more focused on collecting only core titles to the extent that secondary titles are neglected (Dilevko, 2008; Shipman, 1993, Willett, 1998). Unfortunately, book vendors are often reluctant to cover many small press and professional association titles because they provide little financial gain as opposed to larger publishing houses with larger print runs that offer significant discounts to bulk orders (Anderson, 2004; Eldredge, 1996, Miller, 1992). To serve the diverse needs of undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty, subject specialists need to move beyond approval plans in order to acquire specialized sources from small presses, professional organizations and international publishers (Brantley, 2010; Dali & Dilveko, 2005).

Considerations for collection development librarians. Many collection development librarians perceive the operationalization of the book selection process as

diminishing their influence (Cohen & Galbraith, 1999; Nardini, Getchell & Cheever, 1996; Womack, Adams, Johnson, & Walter, 1988). Yet even book vendors highlight the importance of librarian expertise. As Yankee Book Peddler (YBP) executive Nardini wrote, “Despite a vendor’s best work, no library will have a fully effective approval plan without having staff able to forge and maintain consensus on priorities and procedures” (1993, p. 418). Several studies have found significant amounts of literature not selected by approval plans (Hulbert & Curry, 1978; Lavoie & Schonfeld, 2006; Okerson, 2005; Perrault, 1994; Schwartz, 1992a; Schwartz, 1992b; Schwartz, 1994). As Hulbert and Curry (1978) observed, approval plans cannot replace librarian expertise.

Considerations for academic libraries. Academic libraries must serve their constituents who have varying needs by representing these information requirements in their collections. As Shipman (1993) explained, “the university library exists within an institution which is specifically defined by the principle of the communication of ideas” (p. 18). The university and its various units exist within numerous larger societies that often raise questions of those ideas. Numerous disciplines have grown and evolved to include new sub-categories. As a result, librarians question academic libraries’ abilities to support the new multidisciplinary and academic sub-categories with current practices (Brantley, 2010; Greco, Jones, Wharton, & Estelami, 2007; Wilson & Edelman, 1996). Additionally, academic libraries are being called upon to serve non-curricular, administrative initiatives, such as language learning software to support campus globalization efforts and to attract international students (Bullis & Smith, 2011; Downey, 2013). It would be an unfortunate irony that as academic libraries become more and more homogenized, their patrons become more and more diverse.

Several other studies have documented literature loss (Lavoie & Schonfeld, 2006; Perrault, 1994; Schwartz, 1992a; Schwartz, 1992b; Schwartz, 1994). In anthropology, Schwartz (1992a) found that 40% percent of the anthropology book output for a nine year period was not held in any of the ARL libraries. In her award-winning study of the national collection, Perrault (1994) investigated the effects of the declining purchasing ability of academic libraries on the holdings of works held nationwide by examining the acquisitions patterns of ARL member libraries. Her study found that coverage of works in the humanities declined by over 31%. Not far behind, social sciences coverage declined by over 28%. The sciences fared the best with only a 15% decline. Perrault concluded with the concern that "... collections of academic libraries in the United States would decrease in diversity and evolve toward a collection resources base made up of core materials—has indeed come to pass" (p. 304). More recently, Lavoie and Schonfeld (2006) documented that over 9,000,000 titles are held by only one library in the Worldcat database, which is the largest inventory of academic and public library holdings in the world (OCLC, 2012). From their study of book production and library holdings, they estimate that only two-thirds of all books published each year are collected. Such figures led Lavoie and Schonfeld (2006) to question how much of our cultural knowledge base has been lost.

Considerations for universities. In addition to the social implications of knowledge creation and development, there are financial considerations in terms of the return of investment (ROI) universities receive when they support diverse library collections. ROI research in academic libraries is just beginning but initial studies into reader purchase cost versus library costs indicate that for every dollar spent on library

resources, the university gets three dollars back in usage costs in terms of faculty time and grants received (King, Aerni, Brody, Herbison, & Knapp, 2004; Tenopir & King, 2007). Noting the increasing importance of grants to university funding, recent research has investigated correlations between library funding and grant funding. Tenopir, Love, Park, Wu, Baer, and Mays (2010) recently published the findings of their regression analysis of 10 years of data from six research universities. Finding a correlation between increases in library funding and increases in grant funding, they included in the study an investigation of the use of library resources in grant applications and found that successful grant applicants cited more books and articles in their applications. The study also found that for every book or article cited, successful grant applicants read at least 18 other books or articles. Simply put, successful grant applicants read more and therefore require access to diverse collections.

The concern of many is that the isomorphic behavior of academic libraries has limited their abilities to serve their local constituents and the resulting decline of diverse collections has endangered scholarly communication. As purchasing power began to decline, concerns for preserving the human knowledge base began to appear. For instance, budgetary concerns have impacted university presses greatly. Budd and Urton (2003) documented the link between academic library purchasing power and university press output. Where academic libraries once had direct relationships with university presses, more and more were relying on book vendors instead. They cautioned that the university goal of knowledge development and creation is at risk in that “facing an absence of choice, some work is not being communicated in any medium” (p. 12).

Considerations for scholarly communication. Online developments have also created new models of patron-driven acquisition (PDA) where the records for ebooks are loaded onto library catalogs prior to acquisition and are only purchased when users click to access the books. At an ALA Midwinter panel presentation on the future of PDA, Anderson, Bosch, Gibbs, and Sinha (2011), of the University of Utah, University of Arizona, and Duke University, respectively, indicated that a large portion of their monograph budget was directed toward PDA purchases. Such PDA models often rely on the book records from the same book vendors involved in approval plans. In studying how these book vendors influence current library holdings, we will gain insight into the future influence of these book vendors in PDA book selection.

Many attendees at the aforementioned panel presentation expressed concern for the loss of literature not acquired. In response to questions regarding the LIS profession's responsibility to preserve the cultural record and avoid homogenization, Anderson (American Library Association Midwinter Meeting panel discussion, January 9, 2011), stated that libraries should rely on a media resource perceived by many to be a monopoly: Google Books. It remains to be seen what new collection development models PDA and Google Books will bring. In 2009, Darnton, of Harvard University's library system, proclaimed that, "Google can make the Enlightenment dream come true" (para. 35), yet in the same editorial piece he reminded his audience of concerns regarding monopolistic control and how it can inhibit knowledge distribution. Others have sought to remind us that Google Books is the result of Google's collaboration with 30 contributing libraries (Lewis et al., 2010). Pointing out that 75% of the content of Google Books is from libraries, Lewis et al. (2010) observed that it was the collection

development work of skilled academic librarians that made Google Books possible. If academic librarians no longer acquire books with perpetuity in mind, what will such projects as Google Books be able to provide for public discourse?

Summary of Concerns

Over the years, book vendors have merged together to the extent that only a few vendors are serving many libraries. As a result, LIS leaders have vocalized warnings about collections becoming too homogenized and unable to reflect local need. Critics wonder if libraries have wrongly accepted corporate book vendors and the appeal of efficiencies in labor costs and discounted book pricing, and if librarians have abdicated their roles as gatekeepers knowledgeable about books and the diverse communities they serve. Are library collections becoming all the same? Statistical examination into the development and construction of library book collections is needed to determine the extent to which library collections are the same or different. This study is key to learning about the impact of corporate book vendors on collection development practices in academic libraries and the present and future role of libraries. This study presents an investigation of the influence of book vendors as gatekeepers through an examination of the congruence of education monograph holdings of academic libraries in peer institutions.

Chapter 2

Background and Review of the Relevant Literature

Libraries play a gatekeeping role in public discourse (Alstad & Curry, 2003; Harris, 1986b; McCabe, 2001). However, many in the library and information science (LIS) profession are concerned that years of using third-party book vendors have created homogeneous book collections, which raises questions regarding the influence of book vendors and who the actual gatekeepers are in library book collections. This chapter places the study within existing literature in the field. It begins with a discussion of critical theory as a perspective for investigating this phenomenon. The literature surrounding gatekeeping theory is reviewed, including a focused discussion of the routine level of analysis and filtering found in gatekeeping theory, and examined. Past research in the area of approval plans and collection development places this study within LIS research. As Kurt Lewin (1947) stated in his groundbreaking research on gatekeeping theory, the “first diagnostic task in such cases is that of finding the actual gatekeepers” (p. 145). This study seeks to find actual gatekeepers by investigating the effect of book vendors in the gatekeeping process and on the congruence of academic library book collections.

Critical Theory

Several theorists within LIS have encouraged the profession to consider critical theory as a framework for questions of influence within the discipline (Budd, 2003; Harris, 1986a; Hussey, 2010; Leckie & Buschman, 2010). In the context of this study, critical theory’s queries into how dominant groups use media to homogenize information sources as a mechanism of social control is useful. Early critical theorists proclaimed

that cultural production was controlled by consumer capitalism, which in turn was controlled by the dominant social system (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972; Pyati, 2010). As Horkheimer and Adorno (1972) so eloquently stated, “The flood of detailed information and candy-floss entertainment simultaneously instructs and stultifies mankind” (p. xv). In this way, critical theory provides context to explain how Lewin’s gatekeeping process lends itself to the homogenization of information.

Such a worldview makes sense to LIS professionals concerned with a perceived homogenization of library collections. Their wariness of corporate mergers in the publishing and book industry (Okerson, 2005; Serebnick, 1984) echoes Horkheimer and Adorno’s (1972) warnings about the dominant control of culture by the few, “Under monopoly all mass culture is identical” (p. 121). The dominant system provides structure and organization to increase the efficiencies of society that it in turn homogenizes. As Harris (1986a) reminded the LIS field, the questions of how producers of culture are organized, and how those networks and relationships influence cultural production within library activities, are still very present within the profession and require attention. Two recent critical theorists, Habermas and Bourdieu, provide additional perspective relevant to questions of homogenization and the influence of information sources.

Communicative rationality. Habermas (1989) investigated the use of reason in what he called the public sphere, where people come together publicly to, “debate over the general rules governing relations in the basically privatized but publicly relevant sphere of commodity exchange and social labor” (p. 27). In the public sphere, individuals create shared understanding and consensus regarding truth and what is normatively right in society. Such an atmosphere is much like the one many libraries

purport to create through programming and balanced collections (Alstad & Curry, 2003; Berman, 1976; Dilevko, 2008; McCabe, 2001). Academic libraries typically view themselves as participants in the public sphere by means of providing access to the literature spurring debates (Sargent, 1993).

According to Habermas (1984), two types of rationality compete for control: instrumental reason and communicative reason. Instrumental reason manipulates and controls society by objectifying systems. It is the rationality of rules and procedures, and it dominates knowledge. Habermas argued that communicative reason could prevail over instrumental reason with the rational critique of ideas through open, public discourse. Rational critique leads to communication action, which allows empowerment and emancipation from the dominating systems' controls.

Through his labeling of instrumental reason, Habermas (1989) acknowledged the controlling nature of rationalism and the media's role in that domination. He believed that the public sphere began to lose its influence when publishing became more directed to the masses and based on advertising. Rational discourse turned to consumerism in a society that was becoming re-feudalized where people became "passive consumers of infotainment and that their only role is to acclaim the ruling elites' decisions" (Thomassen, 2010, p. 36). In a re-feudal environment, people are separated from knowledge producers by middle agents who, as Habermas (1989) put it, "administer the conversation" (p. 164). These middle agents work in such social institutions as radio stations and publishing houses. Some LIS researchers would include libraries and book vendors in the list of middle agents (Harris, 1986b; Sargent, 1993).

In his work examining the connection between Habermas' (1984; 1989) work and the gatekeeping activities of collection development, Sargent (1993) argued that it is the "ethical responsibility" (p. 8) of librarians to represent a multitude of voices and truths in library collections in order to support the open discourse of patrons. Additionally, librarians must recognize that collections are not entirely objective but are shaped by society and social relationships, and that determinations of truth may vary across communities (Berman, 1976; Dilevko, 2008). As Shipman (1993) acknowledged, the declining purchasing power of libraries has led to collections shaped mainly by core titles. Alternative considerations of different truths have become secondary additions, thus limiting library patrons' access and ability to engage in critical discussions.

Habitus. Partially influenced by Lewin (1947), Bourdieu's (1988) work heavily relies on field theory (Martin, 2003; Özbilgin & Tatli, 2005) to explain how "a feel for the game," or habitus, influences the creation and distribution of intellectual works (p. 782). Cultural practice occurs within a field where the creation of culture is affected by external factors such as rules and conventions that allow particular discourses and actions. It is a "structured structure" (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002, p. 158) where cultural works are created within a group then distributed by intermediaries and later they are filtered by another group. All the while, the cultural work is being shaped by the field as it also shapes how society perceives the world. As Budd (2003) noted, libraries could be seen as social institutions that create cultural products in Bourdieu's view.

To succeed in society, actors must acquire capital such as social capital, cultural capital, or economic capital (Bourdieu, 1993; Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002). They must rely on patronage such as grants or community arts support. For distribution, the

cultural producer needs a variety of institutions or structures in the form of agents, publishers, gallery owners, etc. A work cannot be considered legitimate until it has been recognized by established groups. In their explanatory text regarding the work of Bourdieu, Webb, Schirato, and Danaher (2002) used the term “gatekeepers” (p. 167) in referring to those serving the role of granting legitimacy. It is this role that speaks to many librarians when they describe their societal purpose (Chamberlain, 1991; Lu 2007, Metoyer-Duran, 1993; Oder, 1997) and worries others as libraries begin to rely on outside organizations more and more (Okerson, 2005).

Understanding the rules and processes is important in Bourdieu’s (1993) work as it explains how participants can situate themselves in positions that enable them to take advantage of possibilities by engaging in “possible winning strategies” (p. 184). Indeed, Bourdieu (1993) believed this to be the purpose of theory in that it “provides the means for knowing what one is doing and for freeing oneself” (p. 184) which is the essence of critical theory.

Edelman (1979) and Edgar (2003) conceptualized the process of how the values of the public sphere and the effects of cultural capital translate into selection and how the interaction of organizations and individuals predict gatekeeping through communications. Approval plans are similar interactions in that they serve as a connection between organizations and individuals. As such, book vendors attempt to structure their databases and approval plans utilizing categories that reflect the valued characteristics of resources in academic libraries. For academic librarians to maintain their position in academe, it is important for them to identify how the structures of book vendors’ systems influence library collections.

Gatekeeping Theory

Many librarians believe the responsibility of selection places them as gatekeepers to information as they filter and link resources for their patrons (Lu, 2007, Metoyer-Duran, 1993). The activities of filtering and linking are key components of social psychologist Lewin's (1947) gatekeeping theory. Lewin's concept of gatekeeping developed primarily from his study of food purchasing habits in American households. In tracking how food progresses into the home, he noted the importance of position within the field and the people who were in "key positions" (p. 143) in moving food. Food progresses through channels in various steps such as purchasing, transportation, and cooking. As Lewin pointed out, "[f]ood does not move by itself" (p. 144). Someone in a key position helped to move it at each stage. This person is operating a gate where his/her decision to move or not move the food is subject to various forces or co-existing facts such as likes, dislikes, costs, convenience, etc. An early library leader, Bostwick (1910), conceived a similar description of the librarian's role when he wrote of a librarian as a "distributor" (p. 3) who is subject to the same conditions as other distributors who must meet the needs of clientele. A further connection of Bostwick's (1910) work to Lewin (1947) includes an eerie precursor to Lewin's description of items flowing through channels as he wrote of libraries as a system of distribution much like hydraulics guide fluid through pipes. According to Bostwick (1910), "the laws of distribution of a collection of objects to a group of persons hold, whether those objects be books or cakes of soap" (p. 4). By using the structure of gatekeeping theory, this study seeks to investigate the extent to which book vendors and librarians act as gatekeepers.

Lewin (1947) developed his gatekeeping theory through his work in field theory. Field theory in the social sciences has its origins in the physical sciences where it is used to examine the flow of a transmitted force within a spatial area such as gravity (Martin, 2003). A crucial aspect of field theory in terms of methodology is that the force within the field is not visible and cannot be measured directly. Therefore, the effects of the forces are measured. As Martin (2003) explained in his discussion of field theory, “While we cannot see magnetic fields, we can quickly come to accept that they are there, and we can understand how to navigate and manipulate them” (p. 14). Gatekeeping has grown significantly since Lewin’s (1947) original study identifying individual gatekeepers to investigations into how routine, organizational, and extramedia forces also act as gatekeepers in the transmission of information.

Levels of analysis. Similar to Lewin’s (1947) original study on gatekeeping, this study seeks to identify who the gatekeepers are in the construction of academic library collections. Unfortunately, Lewin was not able to develop his theory beyond his initial investigation due to his untimely death prior to the publication of his study. However, numerous researchers (Shoemaker, 1991; Shoemaker & Vos, 2009) recognized the significance of gatekeeping theory and extensively furthered Lewin’s research. Over time, these researchers have identified four levels of analysis or forces influencing public discourse: individual, routine, organizational, and extramedia.

Individual. The individual level considers the influence actors have on the gatekeeping process. As such, research at the individual level looks to models of thinking and personal characteristics of gatekeepers. Much of the research on the individual level of gatekeeping has occurred in journalism while investigating how

editors select which news items to cover in their publications (Weaver & Wilhoit, 1996; White, 1950). Similarly in library science, the aforementioned collection development models of Edelman (1979) and Atkinson (1984) focused on the cognitive processes of collection development librarians in selection, as have several subsequent researchers (Kovacs, 1990; Rutledge & Swindler, 1987; Williams, 1991). However, Quinn (2007) noted the lack of LIS research on the affective aspect of selection that the communication studies literature emphasized. As such, the cognitive models in LIS that collection development processes primarily focused on became routinized (Edelman, 1979, Evans, 2000).

Schwartz (1989) referred to the tacit knowledge of collection development librarians in his model of selection that uses bounded rationality and the garbage can model. Frustrated with “persnickety” (Schwartz, 1989, p. 329) quantitative methods, he explained how selectors use tacit knowledge in decision-making. According to Schwartz, collection development librarians have a continual set of problems or needs to address that fill a garbage can. As publishers produce more and more books, selectors consider how each book helps the selector address the problems/needs in the garbage can. The decisions are not strictly rational as selectors are limited in their abilities to process all the books published yearly but also by such factors as time and budget. Bounded by these limitations, selectors cannot always find the best resource but often end up settling for what is good enough.

Routine. At the routine level of analysis, the commonality of routines across many organizations is examined (Shoemaker, 1991; Shoemaker & Vos, 2009). These repeated routines are gatekeepers’ regular or recurring processes used in the performance

of their jobs. They operate in the boundary between the individual level and the organizational level, which indicates how organizational operations interact with the individual actor's decision making. In gatekeeping theory, routines provide short cuts for decision making whereby operational rules dictate whether something passes through the channel without the gatekeeper's intervention. Such investigations have been prevalent in communication studies in examinations into the influence of routines on the content of local news media (Shoemaker, Eichholz, Kim, & Wrigley, 2001), particularly the effect of newswire services (Brown, 1979; Gieber, 1956; Gold & Simmons, 1965; Whitney & Becker, 1982), and between online and print news sources (Cassidy, 2006). The concern for homogenization in the news led Gieber (1956) to state that the news wire editors were passive gatekeepers and "[t]he press association has become the recommender of news to the wire editor and thus the real *selector* of telegraph news" (p. 432).

As was stated in the previous section on the individual level of analysis, many of the cognitive aspects of book selection have become routinized. In response, several collection development models involve formulaic equations and matrices of inputs weighted toward specific criteria such as the requestor's position, the publication of a review, and the reputation of the publisher and author (DePew, 1975; Losee, 1987; Losee, 1991; Rutledge & Swindler, 1987). The criteria became routines that filter books before they come to the collection development librarian. These routines are also included within approval plan profiles as indicated in the previous chapter's discussion of book vendor content labels and descriptions.

Organizational. At the organizational level of analysis, research examines how routines vary between organizations and filter information before moving it along the

gatekeeping process (Shoemaker, 1991; Shoemaker & Vos, 2009). Again, the communication studies literature dominates the research of gatekeeping at the organizational level with investigations into how organizational policy influences which news items are given preference (Attaway-Fink, 2004; Breed, 1955; Reisner, 1992). Following Danton's (1935) aforementioned influential study, several LIS researchers have examined the influence of organizational structure and policies on collection development (Edgar, 2003; Feng, 1979; Snow, 1996; Stoffle, Fore, & Allen, 1999).

Additionally, there is the growing reliance of organizations on market data. Attaway-Fink (2004) found that market research exercised great influence over content as gatekeepers became driven by demographics. As she noted, "[J]ournalists are charged with the responsibility of adapting their views on newsgathering to include the production of stories that meet target markets" (p. 153). Attaway-Fink acknowledged a tension between wants and social responsibility that is readily apparent in the literature on collection development (Bob, 1982; Gable, 2007; Isaacson, 2006; Rawlinson, 1981). The debate between the social responsibility of collecting only "good books" and giving their patrons what they want even if it is of low quality appears again and again in the history of LIS.

Extramedia. The extramedia level of research recognizes that gatekeepers are in organizations that operate within a field next to other organizations, such as libraries and information technology service companies, in such a way that influences the gatekeeper (Hirsch, 1977; Shoemaker, 1991; Shoemaker & Vos, 2009). Economic and politics forces are obvious examples of such influences (Burch & Harry, 2004; Donohue, Gans, 1979a, Gans, 1979b; Olien & Tichenor, 1989) as are the pressures of technology (Arant

& Anderson, 2001; Boeder, 2005; Cassidy, 2008; Prisuta, 1979). In LIS, researchers have investigated the immediate pressures from libraries' constituents and the concern for how libraries meet community information needs (Anderson, Bosch, & Gibbs, 2011; Carrigan, 1995; Ferguson, 1986).

For example, Ferguson (1986) took a structural-functional systems approach in developing his model of collection development with the assumption that all collection development departments, regardless of organization, were trying to "sustain their existence" (p. 3). His model describes how the larger environment, as a set of cultural beliefs on how things should be done, influences the conversion of inputs into selection decisions. In this process, interests are expressed, aggregated, and presented to the decision makers who make the decisions that are implemented. Additionally, the LIS literature has begun to examine how new technological forces may broaden selection capabilities by enabling academic libraries to assume publishing roles through institutional repositories that make locally created research openly available (Jantz & Wilson, 2008; Lynch & Lippincott, 2005; Mercer, Koenig, McGeachin & Tucker, 2011; Stoffle, Fore & Allen, 1999; Webb, 2001)

Routine level in-depth. In considering the discussions of gatekeeping and critical theory, it is apparent that the use of book vendors occurs at the routine level where the structures of book vendors filter the communication between the collection development librarian and the publisher. This structure can filter and shape information as it flows (McCombs & Shaw, 1976; Shoemaker & Reese, 1991). One of the research questions within this study is to what extent do the book vendor categories of content level and Yankee Book Peddler YBP-select labels influence library book holdings.

Often it is categories that provide structure, thereby filtering information items before directing some through the gatekeeping process (Brown, 1979; Gieber, 1956; Gold & Simmons, 1965; Hirsch, 1973; Whitney & Becker, 1982). In several journalism studies, the structure of the newswire services was echoed by the newspapers. For instance, if the newswire content for a given day was 25% hard news, 30% entertainment news, 15% political news and 30% economic news then the newspapers had the same percentage breakdowns in their coverage (Brown, 1979; Gieber, 1956; Gold & Simmons, 1965; Hirsch, 1973; Whitney & Becker, 1982). Hirsch (1973) documented a similar effect of categories within the music industry. In the filtering phase of music selection, he noted the importance of genre labels or categories placed by the promoters on a song's likelihood of receiving airtime and concern for Top 40 stations to reflect a similar balance of different genres as other Top 40 stations.

An obvious argument against these findings is that it is the shared values of the actors involved that shapes the category makeup. While a couple of studies have identified the influence of shared values (Weaver & Wilhoit, 1996; White, 1950), many others have noted the dominance of the categories or filters (Brown, 1979; Hirsch, 1973; Shoemaker, Eichholz, Kim, & Wrigley, 2001, Whitney & Becker, 1982). In their counterbalanced field study, Whitney and Becker (1982) found little support for the hypothesis that shared values influenced the news wire selections. They found strong support for the hypothesis that news wires' proportions influenced news selection through filtering of the news in categories. Gatekeepers provide filtering activities such as categories to help their constituents deal with an overwhelming amount of information (Lu, 2007; Metoyer-Duran, 1993). Such is the case for the aforementioned wire editors

and radio stations. In many ways, book vendors structure the unseen environment of scholarly monographs for libraries in the selection process.

The routines between the collection development librarian and the library formed the basis of Edgar's (2003) model. He illustrated the multiple layers of organizational factors influencing phenomena in concentric circles. Book selection lays in the innermost circle with a two-way arrow pointing to the concept of collection development, indicating the exchange between the two activities. Surrounding the two central concepts are the various forces that influence collection development, such as user value, content, and professional activities. However, these factors only directly connect to collection development and not the act of individual selection. Selection is mostly isolated from the forces except for its connection to collection development. Thus the organizational forces influence selection only as they are routinized through the collection development process.

The gatekeeping levels of analysis can provide a structure to illustrate the variety of forces at work in collection development. Gatekeeping theory also demonstrates how the content of a book collection is shaped by each level. While gatekeeping theory clearly documents the process of decision-making, it does not provide a perspective for understanding the effect. Critical theory can provide this needed framework.

Book Vendors and Approval Plans

In many ways, book vendors match Habermas' (1989) description of middle agents and Bourdieu's (1988) "structured structure" (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002, p. 158). Additionally, book vendors act in the boundary between libraries and publishers as functional links in the book acquisition process, which is an attribute of the routine

level of analysis in gatekeeping theory (Adams, 1980). As such, book vendors are clearly gatekeepers in the publishing industry using approval plans as a mechanism for their participation in discourse.

This section reviews the library science literature in order to explore the role of approval plans in library collection development. Adopted as a means of helping academic libraries address the challenges of increased publishing at a time of stagnating budgets, approval plans have been the subject of many studies. Much of the literature has focused on procedural investigations into setting up and administering approval plans (Bullis & Smith, 2011; DeVilbiss, 1995; Dobbyn, 1972; Nardini, 1993; Nardini, 1994; O'Neill, 1992; Reidelbach & Shirk, 1984; Schatz, 1997). This focus on “how-to” reflects a traditional view in the LIS profession of theory as a set of procedures developed through practice instead of earnest examination (Smiraglia, 2002). In her meta-analysis of collection development research, O'Neill (1992) noted that most articles discussed what to evaluate but few actually did any evaluation. Yankee Book Peddler (YBP) executive Nardini (1993) made a similar observation in that many questions regarding the use of approval plans remained. This continues to be the case twenty years later; however, some studies (Alan, Chrzatowski, German, & Wiley 2010; Carrigan, 1995; Evans, 1970; Evans & Argyres, 1974; Kingsley, 1996; St. Clair & Treadwell, 1989; Tucker, 2009) have addressed less administrative issues to investigate the effectiveness and effects of approval plans. The following section provides a brief history of approval plans and concludes with an overview of the research on approval plans.

History of approval plans. The concept of approval plans was developed by Richard Abel (Abel, 2008) during his time as manager of the Reed College Bookstore in

Portland, OR. In 1954, Abel began buying large amounts of books from publishers in order to sell them to academic libraries at discounted prices. Within a few years, he purchased the company from the college and developed what would be called the approval plan out of a meeting with librarians at Washington State University (Abel, 2008). As stated in the previous chapter, libraries could set up a profile based on their needs with a vendor who would pre-select titles, and ship them to the library for "approval." The concept was a success and the Richard Abel Company grew from having \$26,000 in sales in 1954 to \$35,000,000 in 1974. However, Abel had stretched the company thin and by 1975 the company was forced into bankruptcy (O'Neill, 1993). By that time, the concept of approval plan usage in academic libraries had caught on and other vendors had entered the market (O'Neill, 1993). By 1996, 93% of Association of Research Libraries members reported using approval plans (Flood, 1997) with the practice now expanding to ebook approval plans (Buckley & Tritt, 2011).

Effectiveness and return on investment. As evidenced by the motto of the ALA, a number of LIS professionals view effectiveness as a combination of meeting local needs while maintaining cost efficiencies. However, evaluation of book collection adequacy has proven difficult (Bonk & LaCroix, 1980; Clapp & Jordan, 1989; Nardini, 1993). Part of the financial situation requires that libraries see a return of their investment. Carrigan (1995) noted that libraries benefit two groups: direct users of libraries and non-users who benefit from others' use, such as cities gaining an educated labor force. Therefore, he argued collection development models should be based on a benefits perspective where the return on investment is considered through the use of standards both internal and external. As usage is often a proxy measure for benefits

(Carrigan, 1995), many researchers investigated whether or not approval plan-selected books actually circulated. As a result, much of the library science research on book vendors has centered on concepts of cost savings and usage.

Financial benefits. Most of the benefits noted by approval plan proponents are financial. Many tout the labor savings accrued with approval plans by enabling libraries to reclassify staff members into other areas (Bostic, 1991; Eldredge, 1996; Johnson, 2009; Plodinec & Schmidt, 2002). While some studies found that relying on the approval plan reduced duplication of tasks and reduced staff time (Connell, 2008; Fowler & Arcand, 2003; Kaatrude, 1989), other studies reported the opposite (Blecic, Hollander, & Lanier, 1999; Bazirjian, 1996; Cohen & Galbraith, 1999). Challenging proponents of approval plans, Barker (1989) studied the acquisition patterns of libraries. Contrary to conventional wisdom, he found that staff reductions were the result of decreased buying power and not approval plans. Additionally, approval plans have begun to develop a reputation for being costly. In two separate studies, Jacoby (2008) and Blecic et al. (1999) found that a number of librarians perceived approval plans as too expensive.

Adequacy of approval plans. If meeting local needs is of primary importance, then the adequacy of approval plan created book collections must be considered. In their attempt to develop a quantitative formula for determining the adequacy of academic library collection, Clapp and Jordan (1989) noted that most guides to selection found that a collection can only be assessed locally. Repeatedly noting that titles should be “carefully chosen,” they note that evaluating adequacy can be labor intensive. YBP executive Nardini (1993) also noted the challenges of assessing the effectiveness of approval plans and referred to the lack of performance standards. Perhaps that is why the

most common method of measuring the effectiveness of approval plans has been to examine their circulation statistics in comparison to nonapproval plan-selected monographs despite the limitations of failing to encompass in-library use and the extent of use such as being a foundational text for a research paper (Danielson, 2012; Littman & Connaway, 2004). The results of such studies have been mixed. In the earliest of these, Evans (1970) found that librarian-selected titles had higher usage than faculty-selected and vendor-selected titles. Additionally, the study included a summary of a subsequent report with a fifth library that confirmed Evans' original findings. In a follow-up, Evans and Argyres (1974) investigated the circulation statistics of nine libraries and found that titles selected by approval plans had the lowest circulation rates. Later, Alan, Chrzatowski, German, and Wiley (2010) found that 30% of books acquired through approval plans at two research libraries never circulated. Alan, Chrzatowski, German, and Wiley (2010) did not report on the circulation rates of librarian selected books.

Other research has reported different findings. St. Clair and Treadwell (1989), Kingsley (1996), and Brush (2006) found books selected through approval plans circulated at a higher rate than librarian-selected materials. However, Tucker (2009) expressed concern for skewed data. While his study found circulation of works acquired through an approval plan almost equal in usage to items not acquired through an approval plan, a closer look revealed the opposite. Tucker (2009) noticed that it took just a couple of colleges to skew the results. In seven out of nine colleges, the monographs acquired outside of the approval plan had higher circulation rates.

Effects of book vendors. Only a few studies have investigated the effects of book vendors on the content of library collections. As demonstrated in the first chapter,

many library leaders have voiced strong concern regarding the diversity within library collections, as well as the loss of significant literature to future library users. To develop a full picture of the relationship between book vendors and library collections, content of library collections must be considered alongside costs and circulation.

Missed works. One of the largest areas of concern in relying on approval plans is that of missing significant titles (Hulbert & Curry; Lavoie & Schonfeld, 2006; Okerson, 2005; Perrault, 1994; Schwartz, 1992a; Schwartz, 1992b; Schwartz, 1994). Early in the literature on approval plans, Hulbert and Curry (1978) documented a significant number of books not selected within an approval plan even though the publisher was covered by the book vendor. Almost 30 years later, researchers continued to identify titles missed by approval plans (Connell, 2008; Gammon & Zeoli, 2003; Miller, 2006). In an attempt to increase the diversity of materials, the OhioLink system of 80 academic and special libraries began the Not-Bought-In-Ohio Report (NBIO) (Gammon & Zeoli, 2003). Begun in response to a discovery that the number of unfilled interlibrary loan requests and the number of duplicate titles was increasing, NBIO took a retrospective look to see what the approval plans missed and then added them. The study found that 34% of professional titles were not acquired by any of the 80 member libraries. In an effort to build on the work of the NBIO Report and increase diversity in the OhioLink system, John Carroll University began limiting purchases of titles already owned by eight other consortia members (Connell, 2008). A kindred not-bought project was conducted in Colorado in an attempt to address a similar concern of overlap and missed literature (Miller, 2006). All three of the aforementioned articles are a result of expressed concern for the homogenizing use of book vendors.

Overlap. There are a couple of studies that challenge the perception of overlap. Authors Nardini and Cheever (1996) from Yankee Book Peddler partnered with Getchell of Quinnipiac College to compare the collections of four libraries with the same approval plan vendor for overlap. Two of the libraries were large with similar budgets and collections. The two other libraries were smaller in size with similar budgets and collections. In the comparison, Nardini, Cheever, and Getchell (1996) looked at the type of publisher such as scholarly publishers, trade publishers, sci/tech publishers, and university presses. They found an overlap of 67% of university press titles with the two larger libraries and a 44% overlap of university press titles with the two smaller libraries. The authors declined to state whether the overlap found was appropriate or not, noting that the judgment may be in the eye of the beholder and stating,

The answer will likely depend less upon what is observed than upon who is doing the observing. It is easy to imagine two librarians, side-by-side each week at the same approval plan review shelf, one delighted that the approval plan is delivering a core group of titles, the other discouraged to look on as a faraway cookie cutter shapes their collection. It is hard to say how these two librarians would interpret this study's findings. (Nardini, Cheever, & Getchell, 1996, p. 93)

In another examination of overlap, Nardini partnered with Armstrong (2000) to investigate the collections of three libraries within the same consortia with similar results to his previous study with Cheever and Getchell (1996). In both studies, only percentages were considered and as a result analysis of the statistical significance of overlap could not be determined. As before, the question of whether the overlap is really

an area for concern or if it “reflect[s] a collective wisdom about what to collect and what not to collect” (Armstrong & Nardini, 2001, p. 103) went unanswered. More recently, Alan, Chrzatowski, German, and Wiley (2010) found extremely similar results. Interestingly, they also discovered that half of the titles acquired by the two libraries in the study were from the same ten publishers. These findings suggest that book vendors do indeed influence a substantial portion on library book collections.

Chapter Three

Method

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not academic library collections are becoming homogeneous in terms of what is available in library book collections from one institution to another. The ultimate question is do academic libraries using book-vendor driven collection development practices have collections that are similar or different in the two subject content areas of *practice of education* and *educational administration*? It begins with the hypothesis that if academic libraries outsource collection services to book vendors then collections will become more similar than different in terms of new book purchases.

The study addressed this hypothesis through a series of analyses using IBM SPSS Statistics software to calculate analysis of variance and chi-square test of significance outlined in question format.

Variables

Independent variable descriptions. The independent variables include the Yankee Book Peddler (YBP), vendor-labeled content levels, vendor-labeled YBP-select labels, and the number of library employees of the participant libraries. The libraries are all within Carnegie Class L universities and were identified as peer institutions by the Board of Regents of the Group 1 institution and the bargaining unit agents of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

Dependent variable descriptions. Dependent variables are the book holdings in the areas of *practice of education* and *educational administration* under the Library of

Congress classification call number of LB. The following specific ranges were randomly selected: a) LB1555-LB1602 and b) LB1705-LB2286.

As most institutions are under a fiscal calendar running from July 1 to June 30, the book title sets include monographs appearing in the approval plan set from July 1 to June 30, 2006.

The seven universities were chosen through purposive sampling to control for potential influence of curriculum and type of academic institution. The seven institutions were selected from an identified list of ten peer institutions of the investigator's home institution ($N = 7$) by the Board of Regents of the Group 1 institution and the bargaining unit agents of the AAUP, and were found to offer graduate degrees in the areas of teacher education and educational administration. All of the designated peer institutions are Carnegie Class L except for one, which was not included in the study. The seven selected universities are all clients of the same book vendor.

Research Questions

The statistical analysis in question format follows:

Overarching book vendor practice of education research question #1. Do medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor have different or congruent *practice of education* holdings?

Sub-question 1a. Is there a significant main effect between the seven medium-sized peer university libraries for frequency of *practice of education* holdings?

Research sub-question #1a was analyzed utilizing a single classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine the main effect between *practice of education* holdings. An F ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null

hypothesis. Independent t tests were utilized for contrast analysis when a significant F ratio was observed. Because multiple statistical t tests were conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type I errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed in tables.

Overarching book vendor educational administration research question #2.

Do medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor have different or congruent *educational administration* holdings?

Sub-question 2a. Is there a significant main effect between the seven medium-sized peer university libraries for frequency of *educational administration* holdings?

Research sub-question #2a was analyzed utilizing a single classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine the main effect between *educational administration* holdings. An F ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis. Independent t tests were utilized for contrast analysis when a significant F ratio was observed. Because multiple statistical t tests were conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type I errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed in tables.

Overarching number of librarians and number of library staff practice of education research question #3. Does the number of library employees in medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor have different or congruent *practice of education* holdings?

Sub-question 3a. Are observed frequencies for the number of library employees in medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor the same or different for *practice of education* holdings?

Research sub-question #3a utilized a chi-square test of significance to compare observed versus expected impact of librarian and library staff frequencies on *practice of education* holdings. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type I errors. Frequencies and percents are displayed in tables.

Overarching number of library employees educational administration research question #4. Does the number of library employees in medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor have different or congruent *educational administration* holdings?

Sub-question 4a. Are observed frequencies for the number of librarians and number of library staff in medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor the same or different for *educational administration* holdings?

Research sub-question #4a utilized a chi-square test of significance to compare observed versus expected impact of librarian and library staff frequencies on *educational administration* holdings. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type I errors. Frequencies and percents are displayed in tables.

Overarching vending content level label practice of education research question #5. Do the books labeled by the book vendor as ADV-AC, GEN-AC, and PROF in medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor have different or congruent *practice of education* holdings?

Sub-question 5a. Are observed frequencies for books labeled by the book vendor as ADV-AC, GEN-AC, and PROF in medium-sized peer universities with the same book

vendor the same or different for *practice of education* holdings?

Research sub-question #5a utilized a chi-square test of significance to compare observed versus expected impact of book expenditure frequencies on *practice of education* holdings for books labeled by the book vendor as ADV-AC, GEN-AC, POP and PROF. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type I errors. Frequencies and percents are displayed in tables.

Overarching vending content level label educational administration research question #6. Do the books labeled by the book vendor as ADV-AC, GEN-AC, POP, and PROF in medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor have different or congruent *educational administration* holdings?

Sub-question 6a. Are observed frequencies for books labeled by the book vendor as ADV-AC, GEN-AC, POP, and PROF in medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor the same or different for *educational administration* holdings?

Research sub-question #6a utilized a chi-square test of significance to compare observed versus expected impact of books labeled by the book vendor as ADV-AC, GEN-AC, POP, and PROF on *educational administration* holdings. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type I errors. Frequencies and percents are displayed in tables.

Overarching vending select label practice of education research question #7. Do the books labeled by the book vendor in the YBP-select category as research-essential, basic-recommended, research-recommended, specialized, and supplementary in

medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor have different or congruent *practice of education* holdings?

Sub-question 7a. Are observed frequencies for books labeled by the book vendor in the YBP-select category as research-essential, basic-recommended, research-recommended, specialized, and supplementary in medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor the same or different for *practice of education* holdings?

Research sub-question #7a utilized a chi-square test of significance to compare observed versus expected frequencies for books labeled by the book vendor in the YBP-select category as research-essential, basic-recommended, research-recommended, specialized, and supplementary. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type I errors. Frequencies and percents are displayed in tables.

Overarching vending select label educational administration research question #8. Do the books labeled by the book vendor in the YBP-select category as research-essential, basic-recommended, research-recommended, specialized, and supplementary in medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor have different or congruent *educational administration* holdings?

Sub-question 8a. Are observed frequencies for books labeled by the book vendor in the YBP-select category as research-essential, basic-recommended, research-recommended, specialized, and supplementary in medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor the same or different for *educational administration* holdings?

Research sub-question #8a utilized a chi-square test of significance to compare observed versus expected frequencies for books labeled by the book vendor in the YBP-

select category as research-essential, basic-recommended, research-recommended, specialized, and supplementary in medium-sized peer universities with the same book vendor the same or different for *educational administration* holdings. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type I errors. Frequencies and percents are displayed in tables.

Limitations of the Study

The study is delimited to the seven Carnegie Class L universities as listed in Table 1 identified as peer institutions by the Board of Regents of the Group 1 institution, and the bargaining unit agents of the American Association of University Professors, and the book listings of Yankee Book Peddler (YBP) from 2005-2006 and 2007-2008. All of the institutions are customers of YBP (A. Bailey, personal communication, March, 2, 2009). All of the institutions have graduate programs in the areas of teacher education and educational administration.

This study was confined to the publicly available holdings of the seven Carnegie Class L peer universities and the book holdings of YBP. This study recognizes that a library's holding of a title may not directly be the result of it appearing in the approval plan or the notification slips. Given the quantitative nature of the design, it does not take into account the perceptions of academic librarians at the selected universities or those of the YBP book vendors.

Definition of Terms

Approval plans. Profiles development in cooperation with a book vendor and a library to identify library needs in particular subject areas, often classified by the Library of Congress classification number for each subject. As books are identified as matching

the library's profile, they are sent to the library to be reviewed for approval. The books may be returned to the book vendor if the library decides the books do not fit its collection unless the books were ordered preprocessed.

Book vendor. Book distribution company that purchases large quantities of titles from publishers to resell to other organizations, such as libraries. Often book vendors offer approval plans to assist libraries in acquiring monographs.

Carnegie class L universities. As defined by the Carnegie Foundation (2010), class L includes larger universities with at least 50 master's degrees and less than 20 doctoral degrees.

Collection development. Process including the selection, acquisition, processing, and organizing of library resources.

Congruence. Term referring to the conforming effect of one variable on another resulting in significantly similar holdings.

Holdings. The titles and resources that make up a library's collection.

Literature. The publishing that occurs within a field or discipline that represents its ideas, issues, and theories. Literature refers to all formats within scholarly communication.

Monographs. Term representing books listed on a book vendor's listings.

Overlap. Term referring to commonly held titles amongst libraries.

Selectors. Collection development librarians who are responsible for selecting resources for their respective library.

Procedures

Book records for the books available from the book vendor, Yankee Book Peddler (YBP) during the years of the study, July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006 and July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008, were downloaded from the YBP database for this study's subject areas along with the content level and YBP-select descriptions for each title. As the content is the same, print books and ebooks are counted as holdings. The areas considered were *practice of education* and *educational administration* under the Library of Congress classification call number LB, which serve the shared graduate programs in teacher education and educational administration of the study's seven university libraries. The specific ranges randomly selected were a) LB1555-LB1602 and b) LB1705-LB2286. As most institutions are under a fiscal calendar running from July to June, the title sets include books available from YBP from July 1 to June 30 for the years 2006 and 2008. These years were selected as library staffing numbers are available from the National Center for Education Statistics biennially on even numbered years. Additionally, the book listing information was readily available for those years and the seven institutions shared the same Carnegie classification during this time period. Later years were not added as one of the institutions had a change in Carnegie classification. As there are no human subjects in this study and the data is publicly available, steps to obtain informed consent were not required.

Data were collected with the assistance of a library science graduate student paid by a research grant from the College and University Section of the Nebraska Library Association. The graduate student used the publicly available WorldCat database to determine library holdings for each book in the aforementioned call numbers ranges for

the indicated years and the participating institutions. As the Cleveland State University Michael Schwartz Library is part of the OHIOlink consortium, its holdings are not listed individually in Worldcat. Therefore, the Cleveland State University library's online catalog was separately searched.

The procedure in this study reflect the procedures used in previous studies. Holdings data from bibliographic applications such as Worldcat and library catalogs have been utilized several times over the years to examine the influence of a gatekeeping source on library holdings and are publicly available data (Perrault, 1999). For example, Budd and Wyatt (2002) investigated the influence of the review publication *Publishers' Weekly* by comparing library holdings data. Calhoun (1998) looked for a correlation between reviews in *Choice Reviews* and library holdings. Nardini, Getchell, and Cheever (1996) and Armstrong and Nardini (2000) used holdings data in their examinations of approval plans and overlap. In these studies, percentages were analyzed. As noted in chapter two, the Nardini, Getchell and Cheever (1996) study involved two large libraries and two small libraries and looked at publisher type such as scholarly publishers, trade publishers, sci/tech publishers, and university presses. Armstrong and Nardini (2000) examined the library holdings of three libraries in the areas of history, economics, literature, and chemistry.

Demonstration

This study utilized a seven-group, post-test-only comparative survey design. To analyze the main effect between the seven medium-sized peer university libraries for frequency of *practice of education* holdings and *educational administration* holdings, a single classification ANOVA was utilized. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level

of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis. Independent t tests were utilized for contrast analysis when a significant F ratio was observed. Because multiple statistical t tests were conducted, a two-tailed .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type I errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed in tables.

The seven institutions have varying staff sizes within the different libraries, ranging from 40 employees to well over 100 employees. A chi-square test of independence was utilized to compare observed versus expected impact of library staff frequencies on *practice of education* and *educational administration* holdings. As multiple statistical tests were conducted, a .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type I errors. Frequencies and percents are displayed in tables along with the statistical analysis.

YBP uses different content level labels and YBP-select recommendation labels as descriptive information within the book record. The book category labels are of two types: content level and YBP-select (see Figures 2 and 3 for descriptions). Content level labels indicate the perceived readership level of a book (California Digital Library, 2005). These categories as labeled by YBP are general-academic (GEN-AC), advanced-academic (ADV-AC), professional (PROF), popular (POP), and juvenile (JUV) (McConnell Library, n.d.; YBP, n.d.). The juvenile category was not examined as part of this study. The YBP-select categories are similar to content labels in that they describe the accessibility of the book to different readers but they also add a qualitative perspective to the description (McConnell Library, n.d.; Yankee Book Peddler, n.d.). These categories are basic-essential, research-essential, basic-recommended, research-

recommended, specialized, and supplementary. Basic essential was not examined as none of the titles were labeled as such.

A chi-square test of independence was used for each of these categorical forms of data to compare observed versus expected impact of the content level label frequencies and YBP-select label frequencies on *practice of education* and *educational administration* holdings. As multiple statistical tests were conducted, a .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type I errors. Frequencies and percentages are displayed in tables along with the statistical analysis.

ANOVA is a measurement of observed variance in a particular variable when partitioned into components attributable to different sources of variation. It provides a statistical test of whether the means of several groups are equal and can be used to determine similarities in groups of two or more. The ANOVA statistical analysis was used to answer a series of questions about identified university library collections. An independent *t* test was not used as there are seven groups that were be treated separately. Chi-square test of independence helps determine how dependent two factors are to each other. It was used to infer the relationship between library staff size, vendor-labeled content levels, and vendor-labeled descriptions and library book collections. The post-test seven-group comparative survey is displayed in Table 2.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not academic library collections are becoming homogeneous in terms of what is available in library book collections from one institution to another. It begins with the hypothesis that if academic libraries outsource collection services to book vendors, then collections will become more similar than different in terms of new book purchases. The ultimate question is do academic libraries using book-vendor driven collection development practices have collections that are similar or different in the two subject content areas of *practice of education* and *educational administration*?

Independent variable descriptions. The independent variables include the Yankee Book Peddler (YBP), vendor-labeled content levels, vendor-labeled YBP-select labels, and the number of library employees of the participant libraries. The libraries are all within Carnegie Class L universities and were identified as peer institutions by the Board of Regents of the Group 1 institution and the bargaining unit agents of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

Dependent variable descriptions. Dependent variables are the book holdings in the areas of *practice of education* and *educational administration* under the Library of Congress classification call number of LB. The following specific ranges were randomly selected: a) LB1555-LB1602 and b) LB1705-LB2286. As most institutions are under a fiscal calendar running from July to June, the book title sets will include monographs appearing in the approval plan set from July 1 to June 30, 2006. The seven universities

were chosen from an identified list of ten peer institutions of the investigator's home institution ($N = 7$). All of the included designated peer institutions are Carnegie Class L. The seven selected universities are all clients of the same book vendor.

Research Question #1 Results

Table 3 displays results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for post-test Research Question #1: Is there a significant main effect between the seven medium-sized peer university libraries for frequency of *practice of education* holdings? As seen in Table 3 the null hypothesis for the ANOVA comparison of seven medium-sized peer university libraries for frequency of *practice of education* holdings was rejected where *practice of education* holdings was: University of Nebraska at Omaha, $M = 0.31$, $SD = .46$; University of Missouri-St. Louis, $M = 0.26$, $SD = .44$; University of Northern Iowa, $M = 0.57$, $SD = .49$; Cleveland State University, $M = 0.28$, $SD = .46$; University of Texas at San Antonio, $M = 0.41$, $SD = .49$; University of Colorado Denver, $M = 0.42$, $SD = .49$; Northern Illinois University, $M = 0.52$, $SD = .24$, and $F(6, 4752) = 43.39$, $p < .0001$. Because a statistically significant main effect F -ratio was observed *post hoc* contrast analyses, also displayed in Table 3, were conducted.

As found in Table 4, 14 of the 21 possible statistical comparisons were statistically different and seven of the comparisons were not significantly different. In this visual inspection of the tabled significant and not significant comparison university library *practice of education* holdings, the University of Northern Iowa library was found to have holdings significantly greater than five of the six (83%) comparison libraries. Three university libraries the University of Texas at San Antonio, the University of Colorado Denver, and Northern Illinois University were found to have holdings

statistically greater than three of their six (50%) comparison libraries while three university libraries the University of Nebraska at Omaha, the University of Missouri-St. Louis, and Cleveland State University were found to not have any holdings statistically greater than any of their six (0%) comparison libraries.

Research Question #2 Results

Table 5 displays results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for post-test Research Question #2: Is there a significant main effect between the seven medium-sized peer university libraries for frequency of *educational administration* holdings? As seen in Table 5, the null hypothesis for the ANOVA comparison of seven medium-sized peer university libraries for frequency of *education administration* holdings was rejected where *education administration* holdings was: University of Nebraska at Omaha, $M = 0.45$, $SD = .50$; University of Missouri-St. Louis, $M = 0.23$, $SD = .43$; University of Northern Iowa, $M = 0.51$, $SD = .50$; Cleveland State University, $M = 0.22$, $SD = .42$; University of Texas at San Antonio, $M = 0.38$, $SD = .49$; University of Colorado at Denver, $M = 0.38$, $SD = .49$; Northern Illinois University, $M = 0.49$, $SD = .50$, and $F(6, 2807) = 24.21$, $p < .0001$. Because a statistically significant main effect F -ratio was observed *post hoc* contrast analyses were conducted.

As found in Table 6, 15 of the 21 possible statistical comparisons were statistically different and six of the comparisons were not significantly different. In this visual inspection of the tabled significant and not significant comparison university library *practice of education* holdings, the University of Northern Iowa library and Northern Illinois University library were found to have holdings significantly greater than four of the six (66%) comparison libraries. The University of Nebraska at Omaha was

found to have holdings statistically greater than three of six (50%) comparison libraries. Two university libraries, the University of Texas at San Antonio and the University of Colorado Denver, were found to have holdings statistically greater than two of their six (33%) comparison libraries while two university libraries, the University of Missouri-St. Louis and Cleveland State University, were found to not have any holdings statistically greater than any of their six (0%) comparison libraries.

Research Question #3 Results

Table 7 displays observed frequencies for the number of library employees, (A) 69 or fewer, at the University of Nebraska at Omaha and the University of Missouri-St. Louis, (B) 70 to 95, at Cleveland State University, the University of Colorado Denver, and the University of Northern Iowa, and (C) more than 96 at, Northern Illinois University, and the University of Texas San Antonio in seven medium-sized peer universities with the post-test same book vendor titles available compared to averaged *practice of education* holdings. The third hypothesis was tested using chi-square (X^2) analysis for an A x B x C contingency table with further analyses representing the 2-way interactions for A x B, A x C, and B x C, respectively for post-test same book vendor titles available compared to averaged *practice of education* holdings frequencies. Prior to chi-square analysis observed *practice of education* holdings were averaged by dividing the actual observed number of holdings by the number of libraries within each of the employee frequencies cells. The actual observed number of holdings for libraries with 69 or fewer employees was 390 divided by two for averaged observed holdings of 195. The actual observed number of holdings for libraries with 70 to 95 employees was 877 divided by three for averaged observed holdings of 292. The actual observed number of

holdings for libraries with 96 or more employees was 637 divided by two for averaged observed holdings of 318. Averaged observed holdings were utilized for analysis of this research question. As found in Table 7, the null hypothesis was rejected for the A x B x C contingency analysis where $X^2(2, N = 2845) = 23.30, p < .0001$. Further analysis to explain the overall significance determined that the A x B number of library employees, (A) 69 or fewer, (B) 70 to 95 post-test same book vendor titles available compared to averaged *practice of education* holdings frequencies null hypothesis was rejected for the A x B contingency analysis where $X^2(1, N = 1847) = 14.30, p < .0001$. The A x C number of library employees, (A) 69 or fewer, (C) more than 96 post-test same book vendor titles available compared to averaged *practice of education* holdings frequencies null hypothesis was also rejected for the A x C contingency analysis where $X^2(1, N = 1873) = 21.50, p < .0001$. Finally, the B x C number of library employees, (B) 70 to 95, (C) more than 96 post-test same book vendor titles available compared to averaged *practice of education* holdings frequencies null hypothesis was not rejected for the B x C contingency analysis where $X^2(1, N = 1970) = 0.76, p = .382$.

Research Question #4 Results

Table 8 displays observed frequencies for the number of library employees, (A) 69 or fewer, at the University of Nebraska at Omaha and the University of Missouri-St. Louis, (B) 70 to 95, at Cleveland State University, the University of Colorado Denver, and the University of Northern Iowa, and (C) more than 96 at, Northern Illinois University, and the University of Texas San Antonio in seven medium-sized peer universities with the post-test same book vendor titles available compared to averaged *educational administration* holdings. The fourth hypothesis was tested using chi-square

(X^2) analysis for an A x B x C contingency table for post-test same book vendor titles available compared to averaged *educational administration* holdings frequencies. Prior to chi-square analysis, observed *educational administration* holdings were averaged, by dividing the actual observed number of holdings by the number of libraries within each of the employee frequencies cells. The actual observed number of holdings for libraries with 69 or fewer employees was 279 divided by two for averaged observed holdings of 139. The actual observed number of holdings for libraries with 70 to 95 employees was 455 divided by three for averaged observed holdings of 151. The actual observed number of holdings for libraries with 96 or more employees was 353 divided by two for averaged observed holdings of 176. Averaged observed holdings were utilized for analysis of this research question. The fourth hypothesis was tested using chi-square (X^2) analysis for an A x B x C contingency table. As found in Table 8 the null hypothesis was not rejected for the A x B x C contingency analysis where $X^2(2, N = 1672) = 3.28, p = .194$. Because the observed chi-square result was not found to be statistically different no *post hoc* analyses were conducted.

Research Question #5 Results

Table 9 displays observed frequencies for the book vendor labeled content areas general-academic (GEN-AC), advanced-academic (ADV-AC), professional (PROF), and popular (POP) at seven medium-sized peer universities with the post-test same book vendor available titles compared to averaged *practice of education* holdings.

Prior to chi-square analysis, observed *practice of education* holdings were averaged, by dividing the actual observed number of holdings by the number of libraries. The actual observed number of holdings for ADV-AC was 757 divided by seven for averaged

observed holdings of 108. The actual observed number of holdings for GEN-AC was 59 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of eight. The actual observed number of holdings for POP was 11 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of two. The actual observed number of holdings for PROF was 1074 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of 153. Averaged observed holdings were utilized for analysis of this research question. The fifth hypothesis was tested using chi-square (X^2) analysis for an A x B x C x D contingency table. As found in Table 9, the null hypothesis was not rejected for the A x B x C x D contingency analysis where $X^2(2, N = 951) = 2.13$, $p = .545$. Because the observed chi-square result was not found to be statistically different, no *post hoc* analyses were conducted.

Research Question #6 Results

Table 10 displays observed frequencies for the book vendor labeled content areas general-academic (GEN-AC), advanced-academic (ADV-AC), professional (PROF), and popular (POP) at seven medium-sized peer universities with the post-test same book vendor available titles compared to normalized *educational administration* holdings. Prior to chi-square analysis, observed *educational administration* holdings were averaged, by dividing the actual observed number of holdings by the number of libraries. The actual observed number of holdings for ADV-AC was 655 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of 94. The actual observed number of holdings for GEN-AC was 87 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of 12. The actual observed number of holdings for POP was 87 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of four. The actual observed number of holdings for PROF was 309 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of 44. Averaged observed holdings were utilized for

analysis of this research question. The fifth hypothesis was tested using chi-square (X^2) analysis for an A x B x C x D contingency table. As found in Table 10 the null hypothesis was not rejected for the A x B x C x D contingency analysis where $X^2(2, N = 554) = 0.86, p = .835$. Because the observed chi-square result was not found to be statistically different, no *post hoc* analyses were conducted.

Research Question #7 Results

Table 11 displays observed frequencies for the book vendor labeled YBP-select categories, research-essential, basic-recommended, research-recommended, specialized, supplementary, and books without a label, at seven medium-sized peer universities with the post-test same book vendor available titles compared to normalized *practice of education* holdings. The seventh hypothesis was tested using chi-square (X^2) analysis for an A x B x C x D x E x F contingency table. Prior to chi-square analysis, observed *practice of education* holdings were averaged, by dividing the actual observed number of holdings by the number of libraries. The actual observed number of holdings for basic-recommended was 13 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of two. The actual observed number of holdings for research-essential was seven divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of one. The actual observed number of holdings for research-recommended was 321 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of 45. The actual observed number of holdings for specialized was 15 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of two. The actual observed number of holdings for supplementary was 725 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of 104. The actual observed number of holdings for books without a label was 820 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of 117. Averaged observed holdings were utilized for

analysis of this research question. As found in Table 11 the null hypothesis was not rejected for the A x B x C x D x E x F contingency analysis where $X^2(2, N = 951) = 3.79$, $p = .581$. Because the observed chi-square result was not found to be statistically different, no *post hoc* analyses were conducted.

Research Question #8 Results

Table 12 displays observed frequencies for the book vendor labeled YBP-select categories, basic-recommended, research-recommended, specialized, supplementary, and books without a label, at seven medium-sized peer universities with the post-test same book vendor available titles compared to normalized *educational administration* holdings. The research-essential category had no titles and was not included in the analysis. The eighth hypothesis was tested using chi-square (X^2) analysis for an A x B x C x D x E contingency table. Prior to chi-square analysis, observed *educational administration* holdings were averaged, by dividing the actual observed number of holdings by the number of libraries. The actual observed number of holdings for basic-recommended was 17 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of two. The actual observed number of holdings for research-recommended was 242 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of 35. The actual observed number of holdings for specialized was 11 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of two. The actual number of holdings for supplementary was 291 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of 42. The actual observed number of holdings for books without a label was 522 divided by seven for averaged observed holdings of 75. Averaged observed holdings were utilized for analysis of this research question. As found in Table 12 the null hypothesis was not rejected for the A x B x C x D x E contingency analysis where $X^2(2,$

$N = 558$) = 1.04, $p = .904$. Because the observed chi-square result was not found to be statistically different, no *post hoc* analyses were conducted.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion and Discussion

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not academic library collections using the same book vendor are becoming congruent. The independent variables include the Yankee Book Peddler (YBP), vendor-labeled content levels, vendor-labeled YBP-select labels, and the number of library employees of the participant libraries. Dependent variables are the book holdings in the areas of *practice of education* and *educational administration* under the Library of Congress classification call number of LB. All holdings data were retrospective, archival, and publicly available. The library directors were contacted to inform them of the study. The statistical analysis of the first two research questions tested the overall congruence of *practice of education* and *educational administration* holdings using ANOVA. The remaining six research questions utilized chi-square tests of significance to test the association between the independent variables and the *practice of education* and *educational administration* holdings.

The formative works of Habermas (1989), Bourdieu (1988, 1993) and Lewin (1947) were used by this researcher to theorize that the influence of an intermediary between the librarian and book publishers will lead to the homogenization of library book collections. Initial examinations of library holdings using ANOVA indicate diversity in the *practice of education* and *educational administration* book holdings, however; closer analyses between library pairs indicate that conditions of congruence within the study collections do exist within the participating libraries' current holdings.

Initial overall examinations of collection holdings data using ANOVA found significant indications of differences among collections. However, post hoc analyses and the research questions involving the independent variables of library employee size, content level categories, and YBP-select categories indicated aspects of congruence across library collections and characteristics of book vendor gatekeeping at the routine level of analysis.

Conclusions

The following conclusions may be drawn from the study for each of the eight research questions.

Research Question #1 Conclusion

The first hypothesis compared the overall *practice of education* holdings of the seven libraries using ANOVA. Overall, the results indicated that the *practice of education* holdings of the seven medium-sized libraries have significant difference between the collections. However, these findings do not necessarily mean there is significant difference when comparing the collections in pairs. As Tucker (2009) found in his examination of the approval plans for nine colleges at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, as two collections could skew the data. Pair-wise, post hoc analyses conducted between all library collections found that the variance was greatest between four of the seven libraries: University of Northern Iowa, University of Texas San Antonio, Northern Illinois University, and University of Colorado Denver where the null hypothesis was rejected in the direction of greater *practice of education* holdings for these four universities in all post hoc analyses. However, equipoise was found between three of the seven libraries where the null hypothesis was not rejected in equivalent

practice of education holdings in all post hoc analyses: University of Nebraska Omaha, University of Missouri—St. Louis, and Cleveland State University. The lack of statistical difference between these three libraries is an initial indication of the influence of the book vendor. Although the findings of variance between four of the libraries indicate independence from book vendor influence, the equipoise found among the remaining three libraries suggests that book vendor influence may be a concern in some libraries suggesting the need for librarian vigilance and review of this issue.

Research Question #2 Conclusion

The second hypothesis used ANOVA to compare the overall *educational administration* holdings of the seven libraries. Overall, the results indicated significant difference with the *educational administration* holdings of the seven medium-sized libraries. These findings do not necessarily mean there is significant difference between the individual library collections as a couple of collections could potentially skew the data. Pair-wise, post hoc analyses conducted between all library collections found that the variance was greatest between five of the seven libraries: University of Northern Iowa, University of Texas San Antonio, Northern Illinois University, University of Colorado Denver, and University of Nebraska Omaha as the null hypothesis was rejected in the direction of greater *educational administration* holdings for these five universities in all post hoc analyses. However, equipoise was found between two of the seven libraries where the null hypothesis was not rejected in equivalent *educational administration* holdings in all post hoc analyses: University of Missouri—St. Louis and Cleveland State University. Even though the findings of variance between five of the libraries indicate independence from book vendor influence, the equipoise found among

the remaining two libraries suggests that book vendor intervention may be a concern in some libraries. Due to the specialization of the *educational administration* discipline, such as in its focus on management issues, academic libraries may be more selective in collecting practices for this area.

Research Question #3 Conclusion

Much of the literature regarding the benefits of working with book vendors is hoped-for labor savings (Bostic, 1991; Eldredge, 1996; Johnson, 2009; Plodinec & Schmidt, 2002). Therefore, the third hypothesis tested the effect of the number of library employees on the *practice of education* holdings in the seven medium sized libraries using chi-square analysis. The null hypothesis for the *practice of education* holdings for libraries with 69 or fewer library employees, 70 to 95 library employees, and 96 or more employees was rejected as significant difference was found between the collections.

However, the pair-wise comparisons between libraries with different staff sizes of 69 or fewer library employees, 70 to 95 library employees, and 96 or more employees present a different picture. Comparisons between the libraries with 69 or fewer employees, and the two larger groupings, 70 to 95 library employees and 96 or more employees, showed statistically significant differences in the direction of smaller holdings. Yet, the comparison between the 70 to 95 employees grouping and the 96 or more employees found no significant difference. This finding is contrary to literature suggesting that smaller libraries perhaps rely more on book vendors than larger libraries (Bostic, 1991; Eldredge, 1996; Johnson, 2009; Plodinec & Schmidt, 2002). Theoretically, it may be that smaller libraries recognize their limitations and are more selective in developing collections than larger libraries. It is interesting to note that of the averaged holdings no

library, regardless of employee size, consistently purchased more than half of the titles from the vendor list of available works.

Research Question #4 Conclusion

The fourth hypothesis tested the effect of the number of library employees on *educational administration* holdings in the seven medium sized libraries using chi-square analysis. No statistical significance was found between the different library size groupings of 69 or fewer library employees, 70 to 95 library employees, and 96 or more employees, indicating congruence between collections. This finding is consistent with the literature stating that use of a book vendor leads to congruent collections (Chamberlain, 1991; Okerson, 2005; Serebnick, 1984; Tonkery, 2001). It is interesting to note that of the averaged holdings no library, regardless of employee size, consistently purchased more than half of the titles, which is reflected in the lack of difference as the libraries were collecting the same few titles. This helps substantiate the concerns of several library leaders regarding missed works and the number of titles not collected by libraries (Connell, 2008; Gammon & Zeoli, 2003; Hulbert & Curry, 1978; Lavoie & Schonfeld, 2006; Miller, 2006; Okerson, 2005; Perrault, 1994; Schwartz, 1992a; Schwartz, 1992b; Schwartz, 1994).

Research Question #5 Conclusion

While the results of the first four research questions indicated aspects of congruence, results from the fifth research question more clearly demonstrate the influence of the book vendor. The fifth hypothesis tested the observed frequencies for the book vendor labeled content levels of general-academic, advanced-academic, professional, and popular in *practice of education* holdings. No statistical significant

difference was found between the averaged holdings of the seven participating libraries. The participating libraries followed the same distribution of the content levels available, which corresponded with YBP's distribution. The congruence of the distribution suggests the possibility of gatekeeping theory's routine level of analysis idea at work where a cross-organizational routine influences the shape of information, thus generating congruence (Shoemaker, 1991; Shoemaker & Vos, 2009). This is similar to the patterns identified in gatekeeping literature regarding newspapers using the same newswire service and the similarity of news coverage (Brown, 1979; Cassidy, 2006; Gieber, 1956; Gold & Simmons, 1965; Shoemaker, Eichholz, Kim, & Wrigley, 2001; Whitney & Becker, 1982).

Research Question #6 Conclusion

The clear indication of the book vendor influence is also seen in the sixth research question. The sixth hypothesis tested the observed frequencies for the vendor-labeled content levels of general-academic, advanced-academic, professional, and popular, in *educational administration* holdings. No statistical significant difference was found between the averaged holdings of the seven participating libraries. Again, the participating libraries followed the same distribution of the content levels available corresponding to YBP's distribution. The cross-organizational influence of the book vendor is a possible explanation for the congruence found between the collections. The congruence of this distribution also suggests the possibility of gatekeeping theory's routine level of analysis idea at work as noted in the research question #5 conclusion where a cross-organizational routine influences the shape of information, thus generating congruence (Shoemaker, 1991, Shoemaker & Vos, 2009). This is also similar to the

patterns identified in gatekeeping literature regarding newspapers using the same newswire service and the similarity of news coverage (Brown, 1979; Cassidy, 2006; Gieber, 1956; Gold & Simmons, 1965; Shoemaker, Eichholz, Kim, & Wrigley, 2001; Whitney & Becker, 1982).

Research Question #7 Conclusion

The influence of book vendors is demonstrated in the seventh research question. The seventh hypothesis tests the observed frequencies of the vendor-labeled YBP-select categories of research essential, basic recommended, research-recommended, specialized, supplementary, and books without a YBP-select label, in the *practice of education* holdings of the seven participating libraries. No significant difference was found between the participating libraries. This suggests the influence of the book vendor is present in the congruent distribution of the books selected and corresponds with YBP's distribution, demonstrating how a cross-organizational intermediary can shape information. The congruence of the distribution once again suggests gatekeeping theory's routine level of analysis idea at work where a cross-organizational routine influences the shape of information, thus generating congruence (Shoemaker, 1991; Shoemaker & Vos, 2009). As in the conclusions for research questions #5 and #6, this is similar to the patterns identified in gatekeeping literature.

Research Question #8 Conclusion

The results of the final research question supports the theory of the role of a cross-organizational book vendor influencing library holdings. The eighth hypothesis tests the observed frequencies of the vendor-labeled YBP-select categories of research essential, basic recommended, research-recommended, specialized, supplementary, and books

without a YBP-select label, in the *educational administration* holdings of the seven participating libraries. No significant difference was found between the participating libraries. This suggests possible influence of book vendors' labels on libraries' holdings across the seven peer institutions of this research study.

Discussion

Findings related to the literature. This study examined the *practice of education* and *educational administration* library holdings of seven peer institutions using the same book vendor to investigate the influence of book vendors on book collections. Many of the results support the theories of Habermas (1989), Bourdieu (1988; 1993), and Lewin (1947), as well as the concerns of several library leaders (Chamberlain, 1991; Evans & Saponaro, 2005; Okerson, 2005; Serebnick, 1984; Tonkery, 2001; Willett, 1998) in the homogenization of information. While overall comparisons found in this study indicate a level of diversity in the studied collections, and explain differences such as size of holdings, there are also data suggesting the possible influence of book vendors in chi-square analyses of independent variables where content level categories and YBP-select label characterizations were examined.

The influence of the number of library employees was first identified by Danton in his influential 1935 study. He found that library size shaped the organizational structure surrounding book selection. Libraries with more employees would often have separate collection development departments, suggesting that the specialists in these departments could focus on developing comprehensive and diverse collections because time was available for such a concentrated effort. However, the results of research questions in this study supplied little significant data in support for Danton's findings,

suggesting that library size and more employees may not shape the organizational structure surrounding book selection. Research question three examined the relationship between *practice of education* holdings and number of library employees, and found significant difference overall between the monograph collections; however, the difference was mainly between the groups of smaller-sized libraries and the two larger groups. The two larger groups of libraries did not have significantly different collections as would be expected from Danton's (1935) benchmark work. Research question four examined the relationship between *educational administration* holdings and number of library employees and found no difference. These findings suggest that factors other than number of employees are involved, such as smaller libraries facing more severe fiscal restraints, requiring collection development librarians to be more selective in order to best expend their available budgets. Future changes, such as in the ebook market and its pricing models, may lead to additional pressures on libraries and the selection process.

Habermas (1989) discussed the influence of intermediaries in information production. When applied to matters of collection development, his theory suggests that by increasing the distance between knowledge creators and knowledge consumers, intermediaries such as publishers, book vendors, and libraries narrow the type of information available to the public, thus theoretically influencing the shape of knowledge. Such influence may be a possible explanation for the results of research questions five through eight where no significant difference was found between the library holdings in both subject areas when the independent variables of content level categories and YBP-select labels utilized by the book vendor were considered. The make-up of the seven libraries' book holdings consistently reflected the proportion of the

titles in the content level and recommendation categories presented to them. For example, Table 9 indicates that most of the titles available were labeled PROF, followed by ADV-AC, GEN-AC, and POP. The libraries' holdings totals were in the same order with the libraries selecting PROF the most, followed by ADV-AC, GEN-AC, and POP. In Table 10, the titles available were mostly ADV-AC, followed by PROF, GEN-AC, and POP. Again, the libraries' holdings totals were in the same order with the libraries selecting ADV-AC most often, followed by PROF, GEN-AC, and POP. This pattern repeats with Tables 11 and 12. In both tables, most of the titles available were not assigned an YBP-select label. As shown by the libraries' holdings totals, most of the titles selected were not assigned YBP-select labels. The second most common YBP-select label on the titles available was supplementary. The libraries' holdings totals indicate that the second most acquired group of books was supplementary. The pattern continues with Research-Recommended as the third most common label and the third most commonly acquired type of book. Interestingly, it is not the meaning of the label itself but the proportion of the available titles that seem to matter. This suggests that collection development librarians are following and recreating the information structures presented to them.

Bourdieu (1988, 1993) discussed how gatekeeping intermediaries theoretically create the rules and conventions for granting legitimacy in information production. Such rules and conventions create a structure of structures whereby individuals and ideas move within a cultural field. The content level categories and YBP-select labels could easily be seen as tools for granting such legitimacy that construct a system for recognition. Again, the possible influence of the book vendor's categories and labels is indicated as the

results of research questions five through eight indicate no significant difference between the book vendor categories and labels, and the categories and labels held by the libraries. Thus, the libraries' holdings mirrored the proportional patterns of book vendor categories, suggesting that the librarians relied on the structures of the book vendor to guide them in building collections rather than their knowledge of the community.

Lewin's (1947) gatekeeping theory is also very clearly supported by the study's results. Additionally, the results of this study parallel other gatekeeping research utilizing the routine level of analysis where cross-organizational practices, such as using the same book vendor, were examined. The current study's results particularly reiterate the historical findings of Brown (1979), Gieber (1956), Gold and Simmons (1965), and Whitney and Becker (1982) who assert that the structure of the intermediary affects (newswires) the structures of the information organization (local newspapers). As in the aforementioned studies where the structure and filtering of newswires led to congruence among different local newspapers, the content level categories and labels provided by YBP seem to be shaping the structure of collections in the areas of *practice of education* and *educational administration*. The lack of statistical differences between the categories and labels as shown by the results of research questions five through eight discussed, and illustrated by Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12 indicate the similarities in category and labeling patterns between the titles available and averaged holdings.

Implications for practice

The collection development literature often emphasizes the importance of using a core list to maintain an identified set of core titles (Evans & Saponaro, 2005; Johnson, 2009). It appears from the study results that core titles are being maintained with the

help of the book vendor something surmised by Nardini, Cheever, and Getchell (1996) in their review of overlap in library collections between book vendor customers. Given the library and information science (LIS) profession's purported belief in supporting the unique information needs of their communities, perhaps academic libraries could direct more energy towards collecting the non-core literature as promoted by Dilevko (2008) and seek out the works from the non-mainstream press (Berman, 1976; Brantley, 2010; Dali & Dilevko, 2005).

Building diverse collections beyond the core can only enrich the informal national collection constructed from the combined efforts of libraries across the country. It is clear from this study that core titles are sufficiently held in the seven studied university libraries. If this is the case in other university libraries, any missed core titles can be easily obtained through interlibrary loan. Therefore, collection development specialists do not need to spend large amounts of time on core titles but can give more attention to identifying hard to find, yet significant, works. After all, book vendors were originally seen by many as a means to increase diversity in library collections by freeing up collection development librarians' time to locate specialized works (Eldredge, 1996). Therefore, monographs of limited distribution should be purchased and become more readily available within the national network of libraries. As Mexal (2011) stated, "today's unread detritus might spark tomorrow's breakthrough" (para. 5).

Implications for future research

The focus of this study was limited to topics within the education field that reside within the behavioral sciences. Other disciplines, particularly those outside of the behavioral sciences, such as the sciences and humanities, are structured very differently.

Education is also a professionally driven discipline. It will be important to verify whether the phenomenon of congruence within the content level categories and YBP-select labels occurs in disciplines with different structures and without the professional career focus, such as literature, history or chemistry, as it did within education.

Additionally, this study was built upon the tradition of librarian selection of books. It will be important to determine if the gatekeeping effects, that of gaining legitimacy, of the book vendor structure are still at work in the future public driven acquisition (PDA) environment. As discussed briefly in the first chapter, a new concept of book selection, PDA, has arisen as a result of ebook technology. While library patrons have always been able to request that specific books be ordered, PDA enables patrons to immediately select and download a book of their choice. An intermediary book vendor is still required to provide the platform, and hence structure, to facilitate the patron's access, and many of the libraries working with PDA are pre-selecting the books to be loaded onto their catalogs (Anderson, Bosch, & Gibbs, 2011). Additionally, two of the largest academic library ebook vendors, ebrary and Ebook Library, recently merged (ProQuest, 2013), reducing competition.

Conclusion

It is clear that a level of congruence is occurring in the collections of the participating libraries and that book vendors act as gatekeepers in the book selection process. At the routine level, book vendors act as middle agents providing legitimizing structures, including categories and labels that contribute to the perception of a monograph's social capital. Additionally, the findings of this study indicate a tension between the values of the library science profession that professes a dedication to

meeting the unique needs of local communities through collecting diversified holdings and the book vendor's professed benefit of economy of scale. It is important for library leaders to recognize the influence of book vendors and vendor approval plans as they are in all probability not expected to disappear. PDA selection is also expected to grow introducing patron selectors and another intermediary, the ebook provider, to the environment. By understanding the influences and tensions of the multiple actors in book selection, librarians can better develop Bourdieu's "a feel for the game," (1988, p. 782) thereby serving their local constituents better.

References

- Abel, R. (2008, September). Papa Abel remembers--The tale of a band of booksellers, fascicle 7: Life after Reed College. *Against the Grain*, 20, 84-85.
- Adams, J. S. (1980). Interorganizational processes and organization boundary activities. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 2, 321-355.
- Alan, R., Chrzastowski, T. E., German, L., & Wiley, L. (2010). Approval plan profile assessment in two large ARL libraries. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 54(2), 64-76.
- Alstad, C., & Curry, A. (2003). Public Space, Public Discourse, and Public Libraries {computer file}. *Libres*, 13(1). Retrieved from http://libres.curtin.edu.au/libres13n1/pub_space.htm
- American Library Association. (2004). *Core values of librarianship*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/offices/oif/statementspols/corevaluesstatement/corevalues>
- American Library Association. (2012). *Mission & Priorities*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/aboutala/missionhistory/mission>
- Andersen, J. (2005). Information criticism: Where is it? *Progressive Librarian*, 25, 12-22.
- Anderson, R. (2004). *Buying and contracting for resources and services: A how-to-do-it manual for librarians*. New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers.

- Anderson, R., Bosch, S., & Gibbs, N. (2011, January). Is selection dead? The rise of collection management and the twilight of selection. *American Library Association Midwinter Meeting*. Association for Library Collections and Technical Services panel presented at the American Library Association Midwinter Meeting, San Diego, CA.
- Arant, M. D., & Anderson, J.Q. (2001). Newspaper online editors support traditional standards. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 22(4), 57-69.
- Armstrong, K., & Nardini, B. (2000). Making the common uncommon? Examining consortial approval plan cooperation. *Collection Management*, 24(1/2), 45-55.
- Atkinson, R. (1984). The citation as intertext: Toward a theory of the selection process. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 28(2), 109-119.
- Attaway-Fink, B. (2004). Market-driven journalism: Creating special sections to meet reader interests. *Journal of Communication Management*, 9(2), 145-154.
- Barker, J. W. (1989). Vendor studies redux: Evaluating the approval plan option from within. *Library Acquisitions*, 13(2), 133-141.
- Bazirjian, R. (1996). The impact of approval plans on acquisitions operations and work flow. *Acquisitions Librarian*, 16, 29-36.
- Berman, S. (1976). Let it all hang out: A think piece for Luddite librarians. In P.G. Schuman (Ed.). *Social responsibilities and libraries: A Library Journal/School Library Journal selection* (pp. 341-349). New York: R.R. Bowker.
- Berry, J. N. (2004). Editorial: Dewey's ALA motto still works fine. *Library Journal*, 129(3), 8.

- Blecic, D. D., Hollander, S. and Lanier, D. (1999). Collection development and outsourcing in academic health sciences libraries: A survey of current practices. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, 87(2), 178-186.
- Bob, M. C. (1982). The case for quality book selection. *Library Journal*, 107(16), 1707-1710.
- Boeder, P. (2005). Habermas' heritage: The future of the public sphere in the network society. *First Monday*, 10(9). Retrieved from <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/1280/1200>
- Bonk, S., & LaCroix, M.B. (1980). Approval plans in a developing university library 1970-1979: A case study. In P. Spyers-Duran & T. Mann. (Eds.), *Shaping library collections for the 1980s* (pp. 32-42). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Bonk, W. J., Magrill, R. M., & Carter, M. D. (1979). *Building library collections*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Bostic, M. J. (1991). Approval acquisitions and vendor relations: An overview. In B. Katz (Ed.). *Vendors and Library Acquisitions* (pp. 129-145). New York: Haworth.
- Bostwick, A. E. (1910). *The American Public Library*. New York & London: Appleton. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books/about/The_American_public_library.html?id=HL_Lr9wXy6YC
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). Vive la crise! For heterology in social science. *Theory and Society*, 17(5), 773-787.

- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brantley, J. S. (2010). Approval plans, discipline change, and the importance of human mediated book selection. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 34(1), 11-24. doi:10.1016/j.lcats.2009.12.001
- Breed, W. (1955). Social control in the newsroom: A functional analysis. *Social Forces*, 33(4), 326-335.
- Brown, R. (1979). The gatekeeper reassessed: A return to Lewin. *Journalism Quarterly*, (56(9), 595-601.
- Buckley, M., & Tritt, D. (2011). Ebook approval plans. *Computers in Libraries*, 31(3), 15-18.
- Budd, J. M. (2003). The library, praxis, and symbolic power. *The Library Quarterly*, 73(1), 19-32.
- Budd, J. M., & Harloe, B.M. (1997). Collection development and scholarly communication in the 21st century: From collection management to content management. In G.E. Gorman & R.H. Miller (Eds.). *Collection management for the twenty-first century* (pp. 3-25). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Budd, J. M., & Urton, E. R. (2003). University press publishing and academic library holdings. *Publishing Research Quarterly*, 19(2), 5-13.
- Budd, J., & Wyatt, C. (2002). "Do you have any books on—" an examination of public library holdings. *Public Libraries*, 41(2), 107-112.

- Bullis, D. R., & Smith, L. (2011). Looking back, moving forward in the digital age: A review of the collection management and development literature, 2004-8. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 55(4), 205-220.
- Burch, E. A., & Harry, J. C. (2004). Counter hegemony and environmental justice in California newspapers: Source use patterns in stories about pesticides and farm workers. *Journalism & Mass Media Quarterly*, 81(3), 559-577.
- Calhoun, J. C. (1998). Gauging the reception of Choice reviews through online union catalog holdings. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 42(1), 21-43.
- California Digital Library. (2005). YBP approval plan profile and memorandum of agreement. Retrieved from <http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/sharedprint/docs/Moa567111.pdf>
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2010). *Classification description*. Retrieved from <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/basic.php>
- Carrigan, D. P. (1995). Toward a theory of collection development. *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory*, 19(1), 97-106.
- Cassidy, W. P. (2006). Gatekeeping similar for online, print journalists. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 27(2), 6-23.
- Cassidy, W. P. (2008). Outside influences: Extramedia forces and the newsworthiness conceptions of online newspaper journalists. *First Monday*, 13(1). Retrieved from <http://www.uic.edu/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2051/1922>

- Chamberlain, C. (1991). The gatekeeper and information. *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory*, 15, 265-269.
- Clapp, V., & Jordan, R. (1989). Quantitative criteria for adequacy of academic library collections. *College & Research Libraries*, 50(1), 154-163.
- Cohen, M., & Galbraith, J. (1999). The five blind men and the elephant: Differing perceptions of the institution of an approval plan. *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services*, 23(1). 31-38.
- Connell, R. (2008). Eight may be too many: Getting a toe-hold on cooperative collection building. *Collection Management*, 33(1/2), 17-28.
- Curley, A., Broderick, D. M., & Bonk, W. J. (1985). *Building library collections*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Dali, K., & Dilevko, J. (2005). Beyond approval plans: Methods of selection and acquisition of books in Slavic and East European languages in North American libraries. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*, 29, 238-269.
- Danielson, R. (2012). A dual approach to assessing collection development and acquisitions for academic libraries. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 36(3/4), 84-96
- Danton, J. P. (1935). The selection of books for college libraries: An examination of certain factors which affect excellence of selection. *The Library Quarterly*, 5(4), 419-456.

- Darnton, R. (2009, February 12). Google & the future of books. *New York Review of Books*, 56(2). Retrieved from <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2009/feb/12/google-the-future-of-books/>
- DePew, J. N. (1975). An acquisitions decision model for academic libraries. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 26(4), 237-246.
- DeRose, C., Cantrell, J., Carlson, M., Gallagher, M., Hawk, J., & Sturtz, C. (2011). *Perceptions of libraries, 2010: Context and community: a report to the OCLC membership*. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC. Retrieved from <http://www.oclc.org/reports/2010perceptions.htm>
- Devilbiss, M. (1975). The approval-built collection in the medium-sized academic library. *College & Research Libraries*, 36(6), 487-492.
- Dewey, M. (1906). Origins of the ALA motto. *Public Libraries*, 11, 55.
- Dilevko, J. (2008). An alternative vision of librarianship: James Danky and the sociocultural politics of collection development. *Library Trends*, 56(3), 678-704.
- Dobbyn, M. (1972). Approval plan purchasing in perspective. *College & Research Libraries*, 33(6), 479-484.
- Donohue, G. A., Olien, C. N., & Tichenor, P. J. (1989). Structure and constraints on community newspaper gatekeepers. *Journalism Quarterly*, 66(4), 807-845.
- Drury, F. K. W. (1930). *Book selection*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Edelman, H. (2006). Intelligent design and the evolution of American research library collections: A personal reflection. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 50(4), 234-238.

- Edelman, H. (1979). Selection methodology in academic libraries. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 23(1), 33-38.
- Edgar, W. (2003). Toward a theory of collection development: An activities and attributes approach. *Library collections, acquisitions & technical services*, 27(4), 393-425.
- Eldredge, M. (1996). Major issues in approval plans: The case for active management. *Acquisitions Librarian*, 16, 51-59.
- Evans, G. E. (1970). Book selection and book collection usage in academic settings. *Library Quarterly*, 40(3), 297-308.
- Evans, G. E. (2000). *Developing library and information center collections*. Greenwood, Colo: Libraries Unlimited.
- Evans, G. E., & Argyres, C. W. (1974). Approval plans and collection development in academic libraries. *Library Resources and Technical Services*, 18(1), 35-50.
- Evans, G. E., & Saponaro, M. Z. (2005). *Developing library and information center collections*. Westport, Conn: Libraries Unlimited.
- Feng, Y. (1979). The necessity for a collection development policy statement. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 23(1), 39-44.
- Ferguson, A. W. (1986). University library collection development and management using a structural-functional systems model. *Collection Management*, 8(1), 1-14.
- Flood, S. C. (1997). *Evolution & status of approval plans: A SPEC kit*. SPEC kit, 221. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Services.

- Fowler, D. C., & Arcand, J. (2003). Monographs acquisitions time and cost studies: The next generation. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 47(3), 109-124.
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Futas, E. (1995). *Collection development policies and procedures*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Gable, C. (2007). The freedom to select. *American Libraries*, 38(3), 38.
- Gammon, J. A., & Zeoli, M. (2003). Practical cooperative collection for consortia: Books-not-bought-in-Ohio. In E. Shreeves (Ed.) *The new dynamics and economics of cooperative collection development: papers presented at a conference hosted by the Center for Research Libraries* (pp. 77-105). Binghamton, NY: Haworth Information Press.
- Gans, H. J. (1979a). *Deciding what's news: A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, Newsweek, and Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gans, H. J. (1979b). The messages behind the news. *Columbia Journalism Review*, 17(5), 40-45.
- Gieber, W. (1956). Across the desk: A study of 16 telegraph editors. *Journalism Quarterly*, 33(4), 423-432.
- Gold, D., & Simmons, J. L. (1965). News selection patterns among Iowa dailies. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 29(3), 425-430.
- Gorman, G. E., & Howes, B. R. (1989). *Collection development for libraries*. London: Bowker-Saur.

- Gorman, G. E., & Miller, R. H. (1997). *Collection management for the 21st century: A handbook for librarians*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.
- Greco, A. N., Jones, R. F., Wharton, R. M. & Estelami, H. (2007). The changing college and university library market for university press books and journals: 1997-2004. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 39(1), 1-32.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Haines, H. E. (1950). *Living with books: The art of book selection*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Harris, M. H. (1975). The role of the public library in American Life: A speculative essay. *Occasional Papers: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science*. 117. Retrieved from <https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/3863/gslisoccasionalpv00000i00117.pdf?sequence=1>
- Harris, M. H., & Sodt, J. (1981). Libraries, users, and librarians: Continuing efforts to define the nature and extent of public library use. *Advances in Librarianship*, 11, 109-133.
- Harris, M. H. (1986a). The dialectic of defeat: Atimonies in research in library and information science. *Library Trends*, 34, 515-531.
- Harris, M. H. (1986b). State, class and cultural reproduction: Toward a theory of library service in the United States. *Advances in Librarianship*, 14, 211-52.

- Hirsch, P. M. (1973). *The structure of the popular music industry: The filtering process by which records are preselected for public consumption*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
- Hirsch, P. M. (1977). Occupational, organizational and institutional models in mass media research: Toward an integrated framework. In P.M. Hirsch, P.V. Miller and F.G. Kline (Eds.). *Strategies for Communication Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1972). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Horava, T. (2006). A concurrent pilot project approach to approval plans. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 30, 69-76.
- Hulbert, L. A., & Curry, D. S. (1978). Evaluation of an approval plan. *College & Research Libraries*, 39(6), 485-491.
- Hussey, L. (2010). Social capital, symbolic violence, and fields of cultural production: Pierre Bourdieu and library and information science. In G.J. Leckie, L.M. Given & J.E. Buschman (Eds.). *Critical theory for library and information science: Exploring the social from across the disciplines* (pp. 41-51). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Isaacson, D. (2006). Don't Just Read - Read Good Books. *American Libraries*, 37(11), 43.
- Jacoby, B. E. (2008). Status of approval plans in college libraries. *College & Research Libraries*, 69(3), 227-240.

- Jantz, R. C., & Wilson, M. C. (2008). Institutional repositories: Faculty deposits, marketing, and the reform of scholarly communication. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(3), 186-195. Retrieved from <http://0-www.sciencedirect.com/www.whitelib.emporia.edu/science/article/pii/S0099133308000323>
- Johnson, P. (2009). *Fundamentals of collection development and management*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Kaatrude, P. B. (1989). Approval plan versus conventional selection determining the overlap. *Collection Management*, 11(1-2), 145-150.
- Kanazawa, M. (1991). Organization theory and collection management in libraries. *Collection management*, 14(1/2), 43-57.
- King, D.W., Aerni, S., Brody, F., Herbison, M., & Knapp, A. (2004). *The use and outcomes of university library print and electronic collections*. The Sara Fine Institute for Interpersonal Behavior and Technology. Retrieved from http://web.utk.edu/~tenopir/research/pitts/Pitt_Use_Final.pdf
- Kingsley, M. (1996). Circulation statistics for measuring approval plan effectiveness. *Against the Grain*, 8(4), 1-17.
- Kovacs, B. (1990). *The decision-making process for library collections: Case studies in four types of libraries*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Kyrillidou, M., & Young, M. (2005). *ARL statistics, 2004-05: A compilation of statistics from the one hundred and twenty-five members of the Association of Research Libraries*. Retrieved from the Association of Research Libraries website: <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/arlstat05.pdf>

- Lavoie, B. F., & Schonfeld, R. C. (2006). Books without boundaries: A brief tour of the system-wide print book collection. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 9(2). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0009.208>
- Leckie, G. J., & Buschman, J. E. (2007). Space, place, and libraries: An introduction. In G. J. Leckie & J. E. Buschman (Eds.). *The library as place: History, community, culture* (pp. 3-25). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Leckie, G. J., & Buschman, J. E. (2010). Introduction: The necessity for theoretically informed critique in library and information science (LIS). In G. J. Leckie, L. M. Given & J. E. Buschman (Ed.). *Critical theory for library and information science: Exploring the social from across the disciplines*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Lee, H. (2000). What is a collection? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51(12), 1106-1113.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: II. Channels of group life; social planning and action research. *Human Relations*, 1, 143-153.
- Lewis, A., Courant, P. N., Farley, L., Kaufman, P., King, J. L., Schottlaender, B., Walters, C., Wheeler, B., & Wilkin, J. (2010, January 14). Google & the future of books: An exchange. *New York Review of Books*, 57(1). Retrieved from <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2010/jan/14/google-the-future-of-books-an-exchange/>

- Littman, J., & Connaway, L. (2004). A circulation analysis of print books and e-books in an academic research library. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 48(4), 256-262.
- Losee, R. (1987). A decision theoretic model of materials selection for acquisition. *Library Quarterly*, 57(3), 269-283.
- Losee, R. M. (1991). Optimality and the best collection: The goals and rules of selectors and collection managers. *Collection Management*, 14(3/4), 21-30.
- Lu, Y. (2007). The human in human information acquisition: Understanding gatekeeping and proposing new directions in scholarship. *Library and Information Science Research*, 299(1), 103-123.
- Lynch, C. A., & Lippincott, J. K. (2005). Institutional repository deployment in the United States as of early 2005. *D-Lib*, 11(9). Retrieved from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september05/lynch/09lynch.html>
- Martin, J. L. (2003). What is field theory? *American Journal of Sociology*, 109(1), 1-49.
- McCabe, R. B. (2001). *Civic librarianship: Renewing the social mission of the public library*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- McColvin, L. R. (1925). *The theory of book selection for public libraries*. London: Grafton.
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1976). Setting the political agenda: Structuring the “unseen environment.” *Journal of Communication*, 26(2), 18-22.
- McConnell Library, Radford University. (n.d.). *Approval book selection*. Retrieved from http://library.radford.edu/colldev/approval_selection.html

- Mercer, H., Koenig, J., McGeachin, R. B., & Tucker, S. L. (2011). Structure, features, and faculty content in ARL member repositories. *Journal Of Academic Librarianship*, 37(4), 333-342. Retrieved from <http://0-www.sciencedirect.com/www.whitelib.emporia.edu/science/article/pii/S0099133311000760>
- Metoyer-Duran, C. (1993). Information gatekeepers. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, 28, 111-150.
- Mexal, S. J. (2011, May 22). The quality of quantity in academic research. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Quality-of-Quantity-in/127572/>
- Miller, H. (2006). Cooperative monographic collection development, pt. 2. The Colorado not-bought project: Cooperative collection development without a shared approval plan. *Against the Grain*, 18(1), 57.
- Miller, H. S. (1992). *Managing acquisitions and vendor relations: A how-to-do-it manual*. New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers.
- Mosher, P. (1983). Collection development to collection management: Toward stewardship of library resources. *Collection management*, 4(4), 41-48.
- Nardini, R. F. (1993). Approval plans: Politics and performance. *College & Research Libraries*, 54, 417-425.
- Nardini, R. (1994). The approval plan profiling session. *Library Acquisitions*, 18(3), 289-295.
- Nardini, R., Getchell, C. M., & Cheever, T. (1996). Approval plan overlap: A study of four libraries. *Acquisitions Librarian*, (16), 75-97.

- OCLC. (2012). What is Worldcat. Retrieved from
<http://www.worldcat.org/whatis/default.jsp>
- Oder, N. (1997). Outsourcing model—or mistake? The collection development controversy in Hawaii. *Library Journal*, 122, 28-31.
- Okerson, A. (2005). Reflections about collections: With the help of Peter Cook and Dudley Moore. *Charleston Advisor*, 7(1). Retrieved from
<http://www.library.yale.edu/~okerson/fiesole.html>
- O'Neill, A. L. (1992). Evaluating the success of acquisitions departments: A literature review. *Library Acquisitions*, 16, 209-219.
- O'Neill, A. L. (1993). How the Richard Abel Co., Inc. changed the way we work. *Library Acquisitions*, 17, 41-46.
- Osburn, C. B. (2006). Collection management in the *Library Quarterly*, 1931-2005. *Library Quarterly*, 76(1), 36-57.
- Özbilgin, M., & Tatli, A. (2005). Understanding Bourdieu's contribution to organization and management studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(4), 855-877.
- Perrault, A. H. (1994). The shrinking national collection: A study of the effects of the diversion of funds from monographs to serials on the monograph collections of research libraries. *Library Acquisitions*, 18(1), 3-22.
- Perrault, A. H. (1995). The changing print resource base of academic libraries in the United States. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 36(4) 295-308.
- Perrault, A. H. (1999). National collecting trends: Collection analysis methods and findings. *Library & Information Science Research*, 21(1), 47-67.

- Plodinec, L., & Schmidt, J.B. (2002). Which worked better for Mississippi State: Standing orders or an approval plan?. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 26(4), 439-448.
- Prisuta, R. H. (1979). Local television news as an oligopolistic industry: A pilot study. *Journal of broadcasting and electronic media*. 23(1), 61-68.
- ProQuest. (2013, May 14). ProQuest completes acquisition of EBL. Retrieved from <http://www.proquest.com/en-US/aboutus/pressroom/13/20130514.shtml>
- Pyati, A. (2010). Herbert Marcuse: Liberation, utopia, and revolution. In G. J. Leckie, L. M. Given & J. E. Buschman (Ed.). *Critical theory for library and information science: Exploring the social from across the disciplines*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Quinn, B. (2007). Cognitive and affective processes in collection management. *Library Resources and Technical Services*, 51(1), 5-15.
- Ranganathan, S. R. (1964). *The five laws of library science*. New York: Asia Publishing House.
- Rawlinson, N. (1981). Give 'em what they want! *Library Journal*, 106(20), 2188-2190.
- Reidelbach, J. H., & Shirk, G. (1984). Selecting an approval plan vendor II: Comparative vendor data. *Library Acquisitions*, 8(3), 157-202.
- Reisner, A. (1992). The news conference: How daily newspaper editors construct the front page. *Journalism Quarterly*, 69(4), 971-986.
- Rubin, R. (2004). *Foundations of library and information science*. New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers.

- Rutledge, J., & Swindler, L. (1987). The selection decision: Defining criteria and establishing priorities. *College and Research Libraries*, 48(2), 21-30.
- St. Clair, G., & Treadwell, J. B. (1989). Science and technology approval plans compared. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 33, 382-392.
- Sargent, S. (1993). Jurgen Habermas and the ethics of gatekeeping. *Cataloging & Classification*, 16(3), 7-15.
- Schatz, B. (1997). The pregnant pause: The time between profiling an approval plan and receiving books. *Library Acquisitions*, 21(2), 115-120.
- Schwartz, C. A. (1989). Book selection, collection development and bounded rationality. *College and Research Libraries*, 50(3), 428-443.
- Schwartz, C. A. (1994). Empirical analysis of literature loss. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 38, 133-138.
- Schwartz, C. A. (1992a). Literature loss in anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, 33(3), 315-317.
- Schwartz, C.A. (1992b). Literature loss in international relations. *Political Science and Politics*, 25(4), 720-723.
- Selsky, D. (1989). Libraries face continued price increases of books and periodicals. *Library Journal*, 114, 28.
- Serebnick, J. (1984). An analysis of publishers of books reviewed in key library journals. *Library and Information Science Research*, 6, 289-303.
- Shipman, J. S. (1993). Jurgen Habermas and collection development. *Cataloging & Classification*, 6(3), 17-24.
- Shoemaker, P. J. (1991). *Gatekeeping*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Shoemaker, P. J., Eichholz, M., Kim, E., & Wrigley, B. (2001). Individual and routine forces in gatekeeping. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(2), 233-246.
- Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (1991). *Mediating the message: Theories of influences on mass media content*. New York: Longman.
- Shoemaker, P. J., & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Smiraglia, R. P. (2002). The progress of theory in knowledge organization. *Library Trends*, 50(3), 330- 349.
- Snow, R. (1996). Wasted words: The written collection development policy and the academic library. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 22(3), 191-194.
- Stoffle, C. J., Fore, J., & Allen, B. (1999). Developing new models for collection development. *Journal of Library Administration*, 28(4), 3-15.
- Tenopir, C., & King, D.W. (2007). Perceptions of value and value beyond perceptions: Measuring the quality and value of journal article readings. *Serials*, 20, 199-2007.
- Tenopir, C., Love, A., Park, J., Wu, L., Baer, A., & Mays, R. (2010). *University investment in the library, phase II: An international study of the library's value to the grants process*. San Diego, CA: Elsevier. Retrieved from http://libraryconnect.elsevier.com/sites/default/files/2010-06-whitepaper-roi2_0.pdf
- Thomassen, L. (2010). *Habermas: A guide for the perplexed*. London: Continuum.
- Webb, J., Schirato, T., & Danaher, G. (2002). *Understanding Bourdieu*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Tonkery, D. (2001). Mergers and acquisitions in the library marketplace: Opportunity or threat? *Serials Review*, 27(1), 45. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.leo.lib.unomaha.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=4356822&site=ehost-live>
- Tucker, J. (2009). Collection Assessment of Monograph Purchases at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Libraries. *Collection Management*, 34(3), 157-181.
- Tucker, J. C. & Torrence, M. (2004). Collection development for new librarians: Advice from the trenches. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 28, 397-409.
- Weaver, D. H., & Wilhoit, G. C. (1996). *The American journalist in the 1990s: U.S. news people at the end of an era*. Mahwah, N.J: Erlbaum.
- Webb, J. (2001). Collections and systems: A new organizational paradigm for collection development. *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services*, 25, 461-468.
- Webb, J., Schirato, T., & Danaher, G. (2002). *Understanding Bourdieu*. London: Sage Publications.
- White, D. (1950). The "Gate Keeper": A case study in the selection of news. *Journalism Quarterly*, 27, 383-390.
- Whitney, D. C., & Becker, L. B. (1982). 'Keeping the gates' for gatekeepers: The effects of wire news. *Journalism Quarterly*, 59(1), 60-65.
- Willett, C. (1998). Consider the source: A case against outsourcing materials selection in academic libraries. *Collection Building*, 17(2), 91-95.

- Williams, L. (1991). Subject knowledge for subject specialists: What the novice bibliographer needs to know. *Collection Management*, 14(3-4), 31-47.
- Wilson, M. C., & Edelman, H. (1996). Collection development in an interdisciplinary context. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 22(3), 195-200.
- Wiegand, W. (1999). Tunnel vision and blind spots: What the past tells us about the present; reflections on the twentieth-century history of American librarianship. *The Library Quarterly*, 69(1), 1-32.
- Womack, K., Adams, A., Johnson, J. & Walter, K. L. (1988). An approval plan vendor review: The organization and process. *Library Acquisitions*, 12(3-4), 363-378.
- Yankee Book Peddler Library Services. (n.d.). *YBP/L&H Select Profiling Definitions*. Retrieved from http://www.ybp.com/pdf/profiling_definitions.pdf

Table 1.

Participating Libraries by University Name, Library Name, and Library Director Name.

University	Library	Library Director
Cleveland State University	Michael Schwartz Library	Glenda Thornton, Director
Northern Illinois University	University Libraries	Patrick Dawson, Dean
University of Colorado at Denver	Auraria Library	Mary M. Somerville, University Librarian
University of Missouri at St. Louis	University Libraries	Christopher R. Dames, Dean
University of Nebraska at Omaha	Criss Library	Steve Shorb, Dean
University of Northern Iowa	Rod Library	Katherine Martin, Acting Dean
University of Texas at San Antonio	UTSA Libraries	Dr. Krisellen Maloney

Table 2.

Post-test Seven-Group Comparative Survey Design by Library Location, Study Constraints, Independent Variables, and Dependent Variables.

Library Locations	Study Constants	Independent Variables	Dependent Measures
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. University of Nebraska at Omaha 2. Cleveland State University 3. Northern Illinois University 4. University of Colorado at Denver 5. University of Missouri at St. Louis 6. University of Northern Iowa 7. University of Texas at San Antonio 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The libraries were all customers of Yankee Book Peddler during 2005-2006 and 2007-2008 2. The seven universities were all Carnegie Class L universities for the years being examined, were identified as peer institutions by the Board of Regents of the Group 1 institution and the bargaining unit agents of the AAUP, and offer graduate degrees in the areas of teacher education and educational administration. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of library employees 2. Vendor-labeled content levels 3. Vendor-label YBP select descriptions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Practice of education book holdings of the seven university libraries 2. Educational administration book holdings of the seven university libraries

Table 3

Analysis of Variance Comparison of Seven Medium-Sized Peer University Libraries for Frequency of Practice of Education Holdings

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	59.43	9.90	6	43.39	.000****
Within Groups	1084.80	0.22	4752		**** <i>p</i> < .0001.

Tukey Honestly Significant Difference *Post Hoc* Test

University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. University of Missouri-St. Louis: *ns*.
 University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. **University of Northern Iowa**: *p* < .01.
 University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. Cleveland State University: *ns*.
 University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. **University of Texas at San Antonio**: *p* < .01.
 University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. **University of Colorado Denver**: *p* < .01.
 University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. **Northern Illinois University**: *p* < .01.

University of Missouri-St. Louis vs. **University of Northern Iowa**: *p* < .01.
 University of Missouri-St. Louis vs. Cleveland State University: *ns*.
 University of Missouri-St. Louis vs. **University of Texas at San Antonio**: *p* < .01.
 University of Missouri-St. Louis vs. **University of Colorado Denver**: *p* < .01.
 University of Missouri-St. Louis vs. Northern Illinois University: *ns*.

University of Northern Iowa vs. Cleveland State University: *p* < .01.
University of Northern Iowa vs. University of Texas at San Antonio: *p* < .01.
University of Northern Iowa vs. University of Colorado Denver: *p* < .01.
 University of Northern Iowa vs. Northern Illinois University: *ns*.

Cleveland State University vs. **University of Texas at San Antonio**: *p* < .01.
 Cleveland State University vs. **University of Colorado Denver**: *p* < .01.
 Cleveland State University vs. **Northern Illinois University**: *p* < .01.

University of Texas at San Antonio vs. University of Colorado at Denver: *ns*.
 University of Texas at San Antonio vs. **Northern Illinois University**: *p* < .01.

University of Colorado Denver vs. Northern Illinois University: *ns*.

Note. **Bold** = University Libraries with Statistically Significantly Greater Mean Frequency of Practice of Education Holdings.

Table 4

University Libraries with Significantly Greater Mean Frequency of Practice of Education Holdings

	UNO ¹	UMSL	UNI	CSU	UTSA	CUD	NIU
UNO		<i>ns</i>	UNI	<i>ns</i>	UTSA	CUD	NIU
UMSL			UNI	<i>ns</i>	UTSA	CUD	<i>ns</i>
UNI				UNI	UNI	UNI	<i>ns</i>
CSU					UTSA	CUD	NIU
UTSA						<i>ns</i>	NIU
CUD							<i>ns</i>
NIU							

Note. **Bold** = University Libraries with Significantly Greater Mean Frequency of Practice of Education Holdings. *Italicize ns* = University Libraries with Not Significantly Greater Mean Frequency of Practice of Education Holdings.

¹UNO = University of Nebraska at Omaha; UMSL = University of Missouri-St. Louis; UNI = University of Northern Iowa; CSU = Cleveland State University; UTSA = University of Texas at San Antonio; CUD = Colorado University Denver; NIU = Northern Illinois University.

Table 5

Analysis of Variance Comparison of Seven Medium-Sized Peer University Libraries for Frequency of Education Administration Holdings

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	32.83	5.47	6	24.21	.000****
Within Groups	634.27	0.22	2807		**** <i>p</i> < .0001

Tukey Honestly Significant Difference *Post Hoc* Test

University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. University of Missouri-St. Louis: *p* < .01.

University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. University of Northern Iowa: *ns*.

University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. Cleveland State University: *p* < .01.

University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. University of Texas at San Antonio: *ns*.

University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. University of Colorado at Denver: *p* < .01.

University of Nebraska at Omaha vs. Northern Illinois University: *ns*.

University of Missouri-St. Louis vs. **University of Northern Iowa**: *p* < .01.

University of Missouri-St. Louis vs. Cleveland State University: *ns*.

University of Missouri-St. Louis vs. **University of Texas at San Antonio**: *p* < .01.

University of Missouri-St. Louis vs. **University of Colorado at Denver**: *p* < .01.

University of Missouri-St. Louis vs. **Northern Illinois University**: *p* < .01.

University of Northern Iowa vs. Cleveland State University: *p* < .01.

University of Northern Iowa vs. University of Texas at San Antonio: *p* < .01.

University of Northern Iowa vs. University of Colorado at Denver: *p* < .01.

University of Northern Iowa vs. Northern Illinois University: *ns*.

Cleveland State University vs. **University of Texas at San Antonio**: *p* < .01.

Cleveland State University vs. **University of Colorado at Denver**: *p* < .01.

Cleveland State University vs. **Northern Illinois University**: *p* < .01.

University of Texas at San Antonio vs. University of Colorado at Denver: *ns*.

University of Texas at San Antonio vs. **Northern Illinois University**: *p* < .01.

University of Colorado at Denver vs. **Northern Illinois University**: *p* < .01.

Table 6

University Libraries with Significantly Greater Mean Frequency of Educational Administration Holdings

	UNO ¹	UMSL	UNI	CSU	UTSA	CUD	NIU
UNO	UNO	<i>ns</i>	UNO	<i>ns</i>	UNO	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>
UMSL			UNI	<i>ns</i>	UTSA	CUD	NIU
UNI				UNI	UNI	UNI	<i>ns</i>
CSU					UTSA	CUD	NIU
UTSA						<i>ns</i>	NIU
CUD							NIU
NIU							

Note. **Bold** = University Libraries with Significantly Greater Mean Frequency of Educational Administration Holdings. *Italicize ns* = University Libraries with Not Significantly Greater Mean Frequency of Educational Administration Holdings.

¹UNO = University of Nebraska at Omaha; UMSL = University of Missouri-St. Louis; UNI = University of Northern Iowa; CSU = Cleveland State University; UTSA = University of Texas at San Antonio; CUD = Colorado University Denver; NIU = Northern Illinois University.

Table 7

Observed Frequencies for the Number of Library Employees at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Titles Available Compared To Averaged Practice of Education Holdings

Source	Number of Library Employees			X^2	p
	69 or Fewer	70 to 95	96 or more		
	A	B	C		
	N	N	N		
Titles available	680	680	680		
Averaged Holdings	195	292	318		
Totals	875	972	998	23.30	$p < .0001^{abcd}$

^aObserved versus expected cell frequencies used for calculation with $df = 2$ and a tabled value = 9.210 required to obtain an alpha level of .01, the threshold for statistical significance for this research question.

Note. Libraries with: 69 or Fewer Employees UNO and UMSL; 70 to 95 Employees CSU, UNI, and CUD; and 96 or More Employees NIL and UTSA.

Post Hoc Analyses

^bA x B: The number of library employees, (A) 69 or fewer, (B) 70 to 95 post-test same book vendor titles available compared to practice of education averaged holdings frequencies null hypothesis was rejected for the A x B contingency analysis where $X^2(1, N = 1847) = 14.30, p < .0001$.

^cA x C: The number of library employees, (A) 69 or fewer, (C) more than 96 post-test same book vendor titles available compared to practice of education averaged holdings frequencies null hypothesis was also rejected for the A x C contingency analysis where $X^2(1, N = 1873) = 21.50, p < .0001$.

^dB x C: The number of library employees, (B) 70 to 95, (C) more than 96 post-test same book vendor titles available compared to practice of education averaged holdings frequencies null hypothesis was also rejected for the B x C contingency analysis where $X^2(1, N = 1970) = 0.76, p = .382$.

Table 8

Observed Frequencies for the Number of Library Employees at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Titles Available Compared To Averaged Educational Administration Holdings

Source	Number of Library Employees			X^2	p
	69 or Fewer	70 to 95	96 or more		
	A	B	C		
	N	N	N		
Titles available	402	402	402		
Averaged Holdings	139	151	176		
Totals	541	553	578	3.28	$p = .194 ns^a$

^aObserved versus expected cell frequencies used for calculation with $df = 2$ and a tabled value = 9.210 required to obtain an alpha level of .01, the threshold for statistical significance for this research question.

Note. Libraries with: 69 or Fewer Employees UNO and UMSL; 70 to 95 Employees CSU, UNI, and CUD; and 96 or More Employees NIL and UTSA.

Table 9

Observed Frequencies Book Vendor Labeled Content Areas General-Academic (GEN-AC), Advanced-Academic (ADV-AC), Professional (PROF), and Popular (POP) at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Available Titles Compared To Averaged Practice of Education Holdings

	Book Vendor Labeled Content Areas				X^2	p
	ADV-AC	GEN-AC	POP	PROF		
	A	B	C	D		
Source	N	N	N	N		
Titles available	245	21	11	403		
Averaged Holdings	108	8	2	153		
Totals	353	29	13	556	3.28	$p = .194 ns^a$

^aObserved versus expected cell frequencies used for calculation with $df = 3$ and a tabled value = 11.345 required to obtain an alpha level of .01, the threshold for statistical significance for this research question.

Table 10

Observed Frequencies Book Vendor Labeled Content Areas General-Academic (GEN-AC), Advanced-Academic (ADV-AC), Professional (PROF), and Popular (POP) at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Available Titles Compared To Averaged Educational Administration Holdings

	Book Vendor Labeled Content Areas				X^2	p
	ADV-AC	GEN-AC	POP	PROF		
	A	B	C	D		
Source	N	N	N	N		
Titles available	235	28	8	129		
Averaged Holdings	94	12	4	44		
Totals	329	40	12	173	0.86	$p = .835 ns^a$

^aObserved versus expected cell frequencies used for calculation with $df = 3$ and a tabled value = 11.345 required to obtain an alpha level of .01, the threshold for statistical significance for this research question.

Table 11

Observed Frequencies Book Vendor Labeled Basic-Recommended, Research-Recommended, Research-Essential, Specialized, Supplementary, and Books without a Label at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Available Titles Compared To Averaged Practice of Education Holdings

	Book Vendor Labeled YBP-select Categories						X^2	p
	A	B	C	D	E	F		
Source	N	N	N	N	N	N		
Titles Available	6	84	1	4	285	300		
Averaged Holdings	2	45	1	2	104	117		
Totals	8	129	2	6	389	417	0.86	$p = .581 ns^a$

Note. Book Vendor Labeled YBP-select Categories: A = Basic-Recommended, B = Research-Recommended, C = Research-Essential, D = Specialized, E = Supplementary, and F = Books without a Label.

^aObserved versus expected cell frequencies used for calculation with $df = 5$ and a tabled value = 15.086 required to obtain an alpha level of .01, the threshold for statistical significance for this research question.

Table 12

Observed Frequencies Book Vendor Labeled Basic-Recommended, Research-Recommended, Specialized, Supplementary, and Books without a Label at Seven Medium-Sized Peer Universities with the Post-test Same Book Vendor Available Titles Compared To Averaged Educational Administration Holdings

		Book Vendor Labeled YBP-select Categories						
		A	B	C	D	E		
Source		<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	X^2	<i>p</i>
Titles Available		5	87	3	123	184		
Averaged Holdings		2	35	2	42	75		
Totals		7	122	5	165	259	1.04	$p = .904 ns^a$

Note. Book Vendor Labeled YBP-select Categories: A = Basic-Recommended, B = Research-Recommended, C = Specialized, D = Supplementary, and E = Books without a Label.

^aObserved versus expected cell frequencies used for calculation with $df = 4$ and a tabled value = 13.277 required to obtain an alpha level of .01, the threshold for statistical significance for this research question.

Figure 1.

Examples of Book Vendor Notification Records.

Title:CRITICAL ISSUES IN EARLY CHILDHOOD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		ISBN:1557668256
Editor:MARTHA ZASLOW		
Publisher:BROOKES PUBLISHING CO	Pub Year:2006	Binding:Paper
LC Class:LB1775.6.C745 2006	Content Level:ADV-AC	YBP Select:Research-Recommended
Language:English		
US List:38.95 USD	US Status:Out of print. Sourced to an out-of-print supplier	
Also Available From: YBP MARKETPLACE	NON-RETURN/NON-CANCEL YBP-US	
UK List:32.95 GBP	UK Status:Import Only	
Library Note:Add...		

Title:CURRICULUM OF DIFFICULTY: NARRATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION AND THE PRACTICE OF TEACHING.		ISBN:0820481505
Author:FOWLER, LEAH C		
Publisher:PETER LANG	Pub Year:2006	Binding:Paper
LC Class:LB1775.F67	Content Level:ADV-AC	YBP Select:Supplementary
Series Title:COMPLICATED CONVERSATION.	Series Volume:17	
Language:English		
US List:29.95 USD	US Status:Orders accepted	
Also Available From: YBP MARKETPLACE		

Figure 2.

YBP/L&H Select Profiling Definitions.

YBP/L&H Select Profiling Definitions

1. **Basic-Essential.** An important book, and one accessible to all readers on a college or university campus. A work of scholarship that will receive widespread attention within its field and may be read in other fields too. Non-scholarly works such as journalism, memoir, travel, or essays may be categorized here when written by leading authors or are otherwise of exceptional quality and likely to receive prominent notice in review media such as the *New York Times Book Review* or the *Times Literary Supplement*. Works of literature by well-known authors will also fall within this category. Standard or significant new reference works would fall here as well. Works of any kind by significant authors, whose books libraries will need to buy on name alone, will often fall here. A necessary purchase for any library collecting the subject, whether supporting undergraduate, graduate, or professional programs.
2. **Research-Essential.** An important scholarly, technical, or professional book, accessible to many upper-level undergraduates and to most graduate students. Subsequent works of science or scholarship in the field will need to refer to these books. High-quality reference or practical works in narrowly defined, but not esoteric, subject areas may also categorize here. A necessary purchase for any library supporting intensive undergraduate research, or graduate or professional degrees in the subject.
3. **Basic-Recommended.** A scholarly or non-scholarly work accessible to all academic readers and useful to any library collecting in the subject, but not likely to receive the wide notice of an “essential” book. The book’s subject may be one where a great many other books are available, or may be about a subject not heavily studied on most campuses. The book might be written by an author without established reputation, or might be brought out by a secondary publisher. Most literary works will categorize here. Most reference works will categorize here. A desirable purchase for any library collecting the subject, whether supporting undergraduate, graduate, or professional programs.
4. **Research-Recommended.** A scholarly, technical, or professional book accessible to most graduate students and to some undergraduates. Useful to any graduate or professional program, but not likely to receive the scholarly attention of an “essential” book. The book’s subject may be one where a great many other books are available, or may be about a subject not heavily studied on most campuses. The book might be written by an author without established reputation, or might be brought out by a secondary publisher. Books derived from dissertations or conferences, and collections of scholarly articles, will often categorize here. A desirable purchase for any library collecting the subject, whether supporting intensive undergraduate research, or graduate or professional programs.

Figure 2: YBP/L&H Select Profiling Definitions, Page 1. Reprinted from

YBP/L&H Select Profiling Definitions, by Yankee Book Peddler Library

Fig Services, n.d. Retrieved from http://www.ybp.com/pdf/profiling_definitions.pdf

YBP/L&H Select Profiling Definitions, Page 2.

5. **Specialized** A scholarly, technical, or professional book accessible or useful *only* to experts in the field, due to difficult or highly esoteric subject matter. A desirable purchase only for libraries supporting advanced research or large professional programs. A necessary purchase only for libraries attempting to approach a comprehensive subject collection.
6. **Supplementary**. Two types of books which most libraries will buy selectively. 1) A book of high quality or note, but written for a lay (non-academic) readership. Examples would be some fiction written by well-known genre authors, non-scholarly books with outstanding illustrations, or guidebooks, textbooks, cookbooks, or travel books of extremely wide appeal or of high quality. Also, highly topical popular books may categorize here. An optional purchase for any library supporting leisure reading or supplementing an academic collection with lay material. 2) An academic book with limited potential readership due to narrow scope or to modest authority.
7. **Not a Select Title**. A marginal purchase for most academic libraries. The subject may be ephemeral, the approach non-academic, or the quality relatively low. Many textbooks, "Popular" level books, guidebooks, and other books intended for a lay readership will categorize here. These books will be of interest primarily to libraries supporting recreational reading, introductory coursework, or special collections; or to libraries wanting to document popular culture. Most academic libraries can be highly selective.

Figure 3: YBP/L&H Select Profiling Definitions, Page 2. Reprinted from

YBP/L&H Select Profiling Definitions, by Yankee Book Peddler Library

Services, n.d. Retrieved from http://www.ybp.com/pdf/profiling_definitions.pdf

I, Melissa A. Cast-Brede , hereby submit this dissertation to Emporia State University as partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree. I agree that the

Library of the University may make it available for use in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I further agree that quoting, photocopying, or other reproduction of this document is allowed for private study, scholarship (including teaching) and research purposes of a nonprofit nature. No copying which involves potential financial gain will be allowed without written permission of the author. I also agree to permit the Graduate School at Emporia State University to digitize and place this dissertation in the ESU institutional repository.

Signature of the Author

November 25, 2013

Date

Academic librarians' role in gatekeeping:
The influence of vendor labeling on
academic library collections

Title of Dissertation

November 25, 2013

Date Received