The purpose of this evaluation of the children's book review centers was to determine the answers to two major questions: Would the children's book review centers (CBRC) receive enough use to justify their continued funding and existence? and would the CBRCs improve the librarians' selections of children's books? Data for the study were collected through the use of (1) a monthly report containing lists of the number of books received that month and the number of persons signing the visitor's register, and a photocopy of the register; (2) a questionnaire sent to the school and public librarians who had signed the register one or more times and to public librarians responsible for children's book selection who had not signed the register; and (3) a questionnaire and a site visit to the 53 school and public librarians involved in the study. The conclusion based on the data was that the children's book review centers cannot be viewed as successful. The children's librarians who first requested the CBRCs showed the least benefit. The selection of recommended books by school librarians and heads of public libraries improved, but more books not recommended were also selected. (WR)
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INTRODUCTION

In 1972 sixteen Children's Book Review Centers were established in Illinois. Their purpose was to make children's books available for librarians to examine before purchase. It was assumed that public and school librarians would be the major users of the centers with occasional use by other interested persons: teachers, parents, day care center personnel, etc.

The purpose of the evaluation of the Children's Book Review Centers was to determine the answers to two major questions:

1. Would the Children's Book Review Centers (hereafter referred to as "the Centers") receive enough use to justify their Continued funding and existence?
2. Would the Centers improve the librarians' selection of children's books?

The preliminary report of the evaluation, issued in January, 1974, described the data gathered on the use and administration of the centers for the twelve month period from October, 1972 to September, 1973. For the most part, the present report will not repeat that information. The major conclusions of the preliminary report were:

1. The Centers were not receiving enough use to justify their continued existence as presently constituted.
2. The administrative pattern of the Centers did not appear to be very efficient or effective.

This final report is concerned directly with the two major questions listed above. Data from the preliminary report is updated and analyzed in relation to the evidence gathered since that report.

The data for the study were collected in the following ways:

1. Each Center submitted a monthly report listing the number of books received during the month, the number of persons who signed the Register of Visitors, and a photocopy of the Register.

2. A questionnaire was sent to the school and public librarians who had signed the Register one or more times, and to public librarians responsible for children's book selection who had not signed the Registers. (See Appendix A for the questionnaire.)

3. A questionnaire (see Appendix B) and a site visit to the 53 school and public librarians involved in the study of the Centers' effectiveness.

USE OF THE CENTERS

Over a twenty month period from October 1972 to June 1974 the sixteen Children's Book Review Centers had 2,064 signatures on their combined Registers of Visitors. During this period, each Center had a mean of 129 visits or six visits per month. However, as Table 1 shows, the figures vary widely from Center...
to Center. Some of the Centers received very little use, while others receive a fair amount of use. This suggests that, as stated in the preliminary report, the Centers must be considered individually with regard to use.

The data from the Register of Visitors should be considered with caution. In the course of the evaluation, persons who had signed the Registers were asked how many times they had visited a Children's Book Review Center. Fifty-three librarians who took part in the study of effectiveness of the Centers had signed the Registers an average of 2.49 times. They reported, however, that they had visited a Center an average of 6.03 times. The 154 public librarians who had signed the Register one time reported that they had visited a Center an average of 2.93 times. The 94 school librarians who had signed the register one time reported an average of 2.54 visits to the Centers. The size of the discrepancy suggests that the registers are not a reliable guide to the amount of use the Centers received, and that Center use has been greater than was believed.

Another aspect of the use of the Centers which should be considered is the variation in use by month of the year. As Graph 1 shows, the months with the highest use: March, April, October, and November, coincide with the months the Centers received the most books. Table 2 presents the details of the number of titles received by each Center.

Two other tables add pertinent information. Table 3 shows the number of Center users by type. Surprisingly, twenty-five
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>'72</th>
<th>'73</th>
<th>'74</th>
<th>System Total</th>
<th>System Average per Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total  | 77   | 146  | 57   | 60    | 65     | 126   | 138   | 91    | 62    | 75    | 59    | 116   | 161   | 300   | 58    | 122   | 89    | 110   | 82    | 70    | 2,064 |
| Average| 6.0  | 11.0 | 4.5  | 5.0   | 10.0   | 10.0  | 6.0   | 4.5   | 4.0   | 7.0   | 10.9  | 4.0   | 8.0   | 6.7   | 5.5   | 5.5   |

A blank square indicates that a Register was not kept for that month.
*Closed during renovation.
percent of the use was by non-librarians. This category included several college classes, some children brought for selection purposes, interested parents, and others. Table 4, however, shows that the pattern of use changes when the repeat users are examined. In the twelve-month period from June, 1973 to May, 1974 ninety-two users signed the Register more than one time. Sixty per cent of these repeat users were public librarians, which is a significant change from the thirty-six per cent of the total users. The fact that only 92 of the 1,093 visits were repeat visits is also indicative of the type of use the Centers

GRAPH 1

AVERAGE NUMBER OF VISITORS PER CENTER
AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF TITLES RECEIVED
PER CENTER, BY MONTH
### Table 2

MONTHLY NUMBER OF TITLES RECEIVED BY EACH CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>'72 Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>'73 Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>System Total</th>
<th>System Average per Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>194*</td>
<td>1,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total per Month | **1833** | **1592** | **1259** | **2008** | **1253** | **2078** | **2110** | **1672** | **957** | **1197** | **1435** | **2643** | **2046** | **1640** | **1961** | **1238** | **1478** | **1743** | **1489** | **2495** | **33,827** |
| Average per Month | **141** | **122** | **97** | **134** | **84** | **139** | **132** | **105** | **59** | **75** | **90** | **165** | **128** | **103** | **123** | **77** | **92** | **109** | **93** | **156** |**         |

*Information unavailable
**Incomplete total
TABLE 3

TYPE AND NUMBER OF VISITORS PER CENTER
FROM JUNE, 1973 - MAY, 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*System</th>
<th>Public Librarians</th>
<th>School Librarians</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of All Users

|                        | 36 | 39 | 25 |

*Information not available for System Number 3
| Number of Visitors By Each | Total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Visits</th>
<th>Public Libraries</th>
<th>School Librarians</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of All Repeat Users: 60

Number of Visits: 92
Although, the possibility exists that many repeat users felt that they did not need to sign the Register on subsequent visits.

During the twenty months of the study, the Centers received a total of 33,827 books. In that same period of time only 2,064 visitors signed the Registers. The average cost per book was $1.11. If one excludes all the other costs of operating the Centers, the cost per user is still $18.00. If the Center use was twice the amount shown by the Registers, as other data indicates, the cost per user would be $9.00. Again, this is based solely on the cost of the books for the Centers and does not include any administrative costs!

The data concerning use of the Centers, as discussed above, leads to the conclusion that the Centers, as presently constituted, are not being used enough to justify their existence.

COMPARISON OF USERS AND NON-USERS OF THE CENTERS

In the spring of 1974 a questionnaire was sent to three groups of librarians: public librarians who had signed the Register of Visitors at least one time, school librarians who signed the register at least one time, public librarians responsible for selecting children's books who had not signed the register. The purpose of this questionnaire (see Appendix A) was two fold:

1. To compare the patterns of use and reaction to the Centers of one-time visitors to the Centers and of the fifty-three librarians who used the Centers more than one time.
2. To discover the reasons for non-use of the Centers by persons to whom they would be most beneficial.

A total of 559 questionnaires were sent and 385 were returned, for a return rate of 69%. Sixty-four per cent of the questionnaires were sent to public librarians and 66% of those returned were from public librarians. There was no follow-up, as the return rate was sufficient and representative of the two types of librarians queried.

Forty-six of the returns were not analyzed: Forty-one of these because the person was not responsible for selection, three were returned unopened, one was from a pre-school teacher, and one unknown. The remaining returns were divided into four groups as shown in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Librarians</th>
<th>School Librarians</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visited Center</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Visit Center</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>225</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>339</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several interesting facts emerged. Of the public librarians who visited the Centers, 54 were children's librarians and 94 were heads of libraries. Of the 71 public librarians who did not visit the Centers, only 8 were children's librarians, while
were heads of libraries. Not unexpectedly, children's librarians are more likely to visit the Centers than are heads of libraries.

Of the 154 public librarians who visited the Centers, only 80 said that they used the Centers to select children's books, when they were asked to check which of several means of selecting books they used (Appendix A, question number 5). Of the 94 school librarians, 67 said they used the Centers to select. However, when asked this question in a slightly different manner (Appendix A, question number 9), 87 public librarians and 70 school librarians said they use the Center for selecting children's books. All but six of these Center visitors said they used reviews to select children's books.

The two groups who used the Center varied in their use of the reviewing media. BOOKLIST was used by more public librarians than other reviewing media, while this was true for LIBRARY JOURNAL among the school librarians. See Table 6 for more information on use of the reviewing media. The last three media listed in Table 6 were included in the "other" category by the respondents and are included because at least ten persons in one group listed them.

Distance was the factor singled out by both groups as hampering their use of the Centers.

The librarians were not in agreement as to how the books in the Center should be arranged. Forty per cent of the public librarians prefer the books to be arranged by age of the reader, 35% by author, and 34% by subject. The school librarians' preferences varied only slightly: 48% by subject, 45% by age of reader,
TABLE 6

NUMBER OF CENTER-VISITING LIBRARIANS WHO USED THE REVIEWING MEDIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewing Medium</th>
<th>Public Librarians</th>
<th>School Librarians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Journal</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers Weekly</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn Book</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkus</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklist</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*New Books for Children</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top of the News</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Tribune (Book World)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Times</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and 30% by author. The percentages add up to more than 100% because the librarians checked more than one choice, suggesting an arrangement which would combine several of their preferences.

Question number fifteen (Appendix A) probed for solutions to the problems of the Centers by asking for preferences among alternatives. Among the public librarians the mobile unit was the most popular suggestion (58%), while 44% preferred a closer location, and 33% would appreciate time off from work to visit the Centers. The school librarians were most in favor of time off (65%), longer Center hours (42%), and only then for a closer Center location or mobile unit (37% each). These percentages are for the Center Visitors. Those who had not visited the
Centers indicated similar choices.

The last question asked how the person had learned of the Center. The public library systems were overwhelmingly given the credit.

A comparison of the answers to this questionnaire with the responses from the 53 librarians who participated in the study of the Centers' effectiveness shows some differences. However, many of the questions were not worded identically for the two groups, so the results are not conclusive, but only indicative. (See Appendix B for the questionnaire used in the study of effectiveness).

The question asking which factors affected frequency of use of the Centers elicited different answers from the three groups, although the highest percentage of each group indicated distance from the Center was a factor. Only 64% of the librarians in the effectiveness study checked this factor, while 80% of the public librarians and 76% of the school librarians who signed the registers once, felt distance was important. Fifty-three percent of the school librarians indicated the Center hours were a factor, compared to 38% of the public librarians and only 13% from the effectiveness study. None of the latter group indicated that space in the Center or the Center's furnishings influenced their frequency of use, while thirty to forty percent of the one-time signers indicated that these two factors affected their repeat use of the Centers. Sixty-two percent of the school librarians said that the arrangement of the books affected frequency of use,
negatively, judging from comments made to the investigator. Thirty-eight percent of the public librarians, but only 13% of the librarians participating in the effectiveness study indicated that this was a factor in their non-use of a Center.

A similar question also elicited differing responses from the three groups. When asked which of several alternatives would encourage greater use of the Centers, the librarians in the effectiveness study preferred a mobile unit (38%) and time off from work to visit the Center (36%). Even more public librarians preferred a mobile unit (58%), but 44% also checked a closer location for the Center. The school librarians, however, indicated time off (65%) as their first preference, and then longer Center hours (42%).

Contrasts were also apparent in the answers to questions concerning methods of selection. By definition 100% of the effectiveness study group used the Centers for selection, with 81% indicating that they also used reviews and 57% publishers' catalogs. Ninety-seven percent of the public librarians used reviews and 61% publishers' catalogs, but only 52% used the Centers. Ninety-eight percent of the school librarians used reviews, 71% the Centers and 56% publishers' catalogs.

Finally, the reviewing media used by the three groups were compared. Seventy-four percent of the effectiveness study group used LIBRARY JOURNAL and 60% used BOOKLIST. Fifty-eight percent of the public librarians used LIBRARY JOURNAL and 81% BOOKLIST. Ninety-five percent of the school librarians used LIBRARY JOURNAL.
and 65% BOOKLIST. As previously stated, few school librarians used PUBLISHERS WEEKLY or KIRKUS. The effectiveness study group were more likely to use them (13% and 30% respectively), and of the three groups the public librarians used them most (34% and 43%).

The differences in the answers of the three groups reflect their differing circumstances. The librarians participating in the effectiveness study who use the Centers more frequently than the other groups, were less critical of the Centers, as shown by the answers concerning the use of the Centers. The school librarians were the least mobile of the three groups, and hence indicated that such factors as distance, time off, and hours were more important to them. The group which probably has had the least library education in children's work, the public librarians, used the Centers less and used the less revered reviewing media (PUBLISHERS WEEKLY and KIRKUS) more. They were also more likely to use salesmen, which is generally considered a rather dubious method for library book selection.

However, aside from these easily explainable differences, the Centers themselves do not seem to have provoked very different reactions from the three different groups, which permits greater reliance to be placed on the presumed representativeness of the 53 subjects used in the study of effectiveness.
EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CENTERS

The major assumption behind the establishment of the Centers was that physical examination of children's books results in better book selection than other methods used by librarians. The study was developed to test this assumption. Fifty-three librarians were identified which satisfied the following requirements:

1. Each had selected the children's books for the same library in both 1971 and 1973,

2. Each had used a Children's Book Review Center for selection of 1973 children's books.

Arrangements were made to visit each of the fifty-three librarians during the spring of 1974. Prior to the investigator's arrival, a questionnaire was sent to the librarians, to be discussed during the visit. (See Appendix B for the questionnaire). The questionnaire asked for information in four categories: the Children's Book Review Center, the library, methods of selection, and the selector. These questions were intended to provide information on the use of the Children's Book Review Centers and on any circumstances peculiar to the library or librarian which might affect the results of the study.

The major purpose of the visit was to check a list of books previously compiled by the researcher against the card catalog and the on-order file of the library. The list represents the most highly recommended books and the least recommended books in the children's book reviewing media. It was compiled by checking the reviews in seven reviewing media for children's books pub-
lished in 1971 and 1973. The list is composed of 420 books which fall into four categories:

1971 Recommended titles
1971 Not Recommended titles
1973 Recommended titles
1973 Not Recommended titles

The year 1971 was chosen as the last full year before the Centers were established, and 1973 was chosen as the first full year of Center operation. (See Appendices 3 and 4 for a description of how the list was compiled and for the list of titles).

The study hypothesized that librarians who used the Centers in the book selection process would purchase more recommended titles than non-recommended titles because physical examination of the book improves book selection. Therefore:

1. The librarian would purchase more of the 1973 recommended books than of the 1971 recommended books on the list.
2. The librarian would purchase fewer of the 1973 not recommended books than the 1971 not recommended books on the list.

Provision was also made to determine whether physical examination improved the selection of one type of book more than another. The books were divided into two categories for this purpose: picture books and other books. Finally, in order to test the importance of having the children's books of all the publishers in the Center, books were included on the checklist whether or not their publisher was participating in the Centers.
In order to prevent the size of the library from skewing the results, a selection score was computed as follows: the percentage of books on the list which are held by the library is divided by the total number of books purchased by the library that year.

In order to investigate the interrelationships and effects of all the factors, a selection score was computed for each library for each of the following categories:

1. Recommended 1971 picture books not in the Center
2. " " " " in the Center
3. " " " other " not in the Center
4. " " " " in the Center
5. " 1973 picture " not in the Center
6. " " " " in the Center
7. " " " other " not in the Center
8. " " " " in the Center
9. Not Recommended 1971 picture books not in the Center
10. " " " " " in the Center
11. " " " " other " not in the Center
12. " " " " " in the Center
13. " " 1973 picture " not in the Center
14. " " " " " in the Center
15. " " " " other " not in the Center
16. " " " " " in the Center

Please note that the 1971 categories "not in" and "in" are theoretical, as there were no Centers in 1971. Books by
those publishers who had books in the Centers in 1973 were considered "in" books for 1971. This theoretical distinction provides a means of ascertaining that no factor other than whether or not the book was by a participating publisher differentiated the books.

The analysis of variance statistic was used to determine whether or not any of the factors: year, type of book, and availability of the book in the Center was responsible for a significant difference in the libraries' scores. Recommended and Not Recommended scores were analyzed separately. For example, the analysis of variance answered the question of whether or not the libraries' scores for 1971 selection vary significantly from 1973 selection scores. If they did, one would conclude that physical examination does affect the selection of children's books. If the scores are greater in 1973 than in 1971 one would conclude that physical examination improves children's book selection. Other analyses of variance were computed to determine if factors which varied among the libraries were responsible for any significant differences among the scores.

A warning must be stated here. The size of the sample: 53 libraries, is too small to permit the proper statistics to be used freely and conclusively. The results can only be used as a guide to indicate trends and possible influences, rather than to provide conclusive judgments.

For both Recommended and Not Recommended titles, analysis of variance showed that the year, availability, and type of book
were significant factors. However, when the mean scores were studied, several problems appeared. While the scores showed that the 1971 Not In and In scores were very similar and the 1973 Not In scores were lower than the 1973 In score, the 1973 scores were significantly lower than the 1971 scores. The similar scores for 1971 were expected, since the division was theoretical and the books in the two groups were selected using the same method. The 1973 scores show that the books in the Center available for physical examination were selected more frequently than the books which were not available for examination.

The lower 1973 scores would cause one to conclude that the Centers caused a general lowering of the quality of selection. However, several extraneous factors could account for this finding. The data were collected in the spring of 1974, which may have been too soon for the collection of information on the selection of 1973 books. Thus, the libraries may have lower 1973 scores overall simply because they have not finished purchasing their 1973 books. If one takes this factor into account and compares the differences between In and Not In scores for the two years, the statistics are dramatic evidence in favor of the theory that physical examination improves book selection. That is, there is little difference between the In and Not In scores for 1971, which is expected because books in both categories were selected by the same method, but there is a large difference between the 1973 In and Not In scores. Books in these latter two categories were selected by different methods,
and the higher scores are for the books which were available for physical examination.

The second unexpected result is that the above description of the scores: higher for In than Not In, etc. is true of the Not Recommended as well as the Recommended scores. This was not predicted. Better book selection of Not Recommended books would have been shown by lower In than Not In scores. This was clearly not the case. Thus, a second conclusion is drawn. Physical examination improves the selection of recommended books, but simultaneously causes an increase in the number of Not Recommended books selected.

ANALYSIS BY TYPE OF BOOK

The scores for the two types of books were compared. The analysis of variance showed that they were significantly different and, as expected, the picture book scores were much higher from 1973 Not In to 1973 In. The scores for the Other Books were lower than those for the Picture Books, and the increase from 1973 Not In to In was small. This suggests that physical examination is most effective in the selection of books which have a large amount of pictorial content. However, as with the other factors, the Not Recommended scores increased (Picture more than Other) instead of decreasing as expected, reinforcing the conclusion that physical examination increases the likelihood of Not Recommended books being selected, and suggesting the high impact of pictorial content in the physical examination process.
ANALYSIS BY CATEGORY OF INDIVIDUAL SELECTING CHILDREN'S BOOKS

Another factor which was analyzed was the position of the selector. There were three categories: head of public library, public children's librarian, and school librarian. It was expected that the public children's librarians would have the best scores and that the heads of public libraries would have the worst scores. This was in general true, although several interesting facts emerged: while the public children's librarians had the highest Recommended scores of the three groups, they showed the least change from 1973 Not In to 1973 In. They also showed the least change in Not Recommended scores from 1973 Not In to 1973 In: almost no change at all. In fact, the analysis of variance indicated that the differences in the Not Recommended scores based on position could occur too often on a chance basis to be considered significant.

One other factor showed significance, but only for the Not Recommended scores. This was the factor of the books in the Center having or not having reviews in them. Five of the Centers did not place reviews in the books, while the other eleven did. The analysis of variance indicated that there was a significant difference in the scores for Not Recommended books depending on this factor. However, a scrutiny of the means shows that the higher scores were for the books having reviews in them, particularly picture books. It was predicted that reviews in the book would have lowered the incidence of the selection of not recommended books. The fact that
the picture books had the higher scores suggests that the visual impact of the book offsets bad reviews of the books. It is also possible that the reviews were not read by the librarians. This is reinforced by the fact that several of the librarians mentioned to the investigator that they simply did not have time to read reviews during their visits to the Center.

The following other factors were tested using the analysis of variance, but no significance was found for any of them.

1. Relative amount of use of the Center for selection of 1973 books. (Most used method, second-most used, or infrequently used.)

2. Relative amount of use of reviews for selection of 1971 books. (Same categories as number 1.)

3. Statement of the selector that she did or did not select differently one the Center was available.

4. Age of selector.

5. Number of years the selector had been selecting children's books.

6. Whether or not the selector had the assistance of others in selecting books.

7. Number of years the selector had worked in libraries.

8. Whether or not the selector's library received books on long-term loan from the public library system.

9. Statement of the selector as to whether or not the reputation of the publisher initially influenced her
judgment of a book.

10. Policy of the library with regard to Nancy Drew and the Hardy Boys books. (a. Purchased by library within last five years. b. In the library but not purchased by library. c. Not in the library.)

11. Whether the selector had had none or at least one of the following courses: children's materials, young adult materials, book selection, or any other course pertinent to selecting children's books.

From the evidence provided by the analyses of variance the following statements can be made. Physical examination of children's books results in the selection of more recommended books that does selection by other methods, particularly when the selector is the head of a public library or a school librarian. Children's librarians are the least affected by the change in method. However, physical examination also results in the selection of more not recommended books by school librarians and heads of public libraries. Children's librarians showed no significant change from method to method on not recommended books. Also, the selection of picture books was affected much more than the selection of other books.

From these statements certain conclusions can be drawn. The children's librarians, who originally requested the Children's Book Review Centers, did not select better books with the use of the Centers than they did without the Centers. School librarians and heads of public libraries were greatly influenced by physical
examination of the books, but do not seem to have the necessary background to separate the recommended titles from the not recommended titles.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In terms of use and effectiveness the Children's Book Review Centers cannot be viewed as successful. The children's librarians who first requested them showed the least benefit. The other two groups, school librarians and heads of public libraries, were affected, but with equivocal results: their selection of recommended books improved, but they also selected more not recommended books. Use of the Centers has not reached expectations and several recent developments may further hinder an increase in use: tighter budgets, which result in smaller book budgets, smaller and fewer salaries for children's librarians, less money for traveling expenses, and less time for traveling as the libraries become more short-handed.

Several alternatives to the sixteen Children's Book Review Centers can be suggested. The negative approach would be to discontinue the Centers. A more positive approach would be to continue the Centers on a modified basis. Those Centers not receiving much use from system members or support from the system should be eliminated. The remaining Centers should expand their responsibilities to provide service to librarians from wider areas. The Centers would be used for two workshops per year for librarians who select children's books and to provide a source for titles
which children's book selectors would like to examine before purchase. The workshops would acquaint children's book selectors with the children's books published in the preceding six months. A portion of the workshop would highlight outstanding and special titles and might also discuss some titles which were not recommended. The remainder of the workshop would provide an opportunity for examination of the books and informal exchange of opinions and ideas. The purposes of the workshops would be to:

1. focus attention on the importance of children's book selection,
2. provide an opportunity for exposure to new children's books,
3. provide an opportunity for exchange of ideas about children's books,
4. provide an incentive, in the form of time off from work to attend, travel expenses, and an explanation and demonstration of the benefits of good children's book selection,
5. provide adequate time for an examination of some of the best new children's books, and
6. result in better children's books to be selected for the public and school libraries of Illinois.

A children's library consultant should be available at each of the remaining Centers to work with librarians and other individuals selecting books for children.

One Center, preferably the one situated at the State Library,
would serve as headquarters for the Centers. Its purposes would be:

1. to receive the books from the participating publishers for all the Centers,
2. to order books from non-participating publishers which would be useful to the Centers,
3. to prepare the books and deliver them to the Centers,
4. to collect payments from the Centers and pay the publishers,
5. to serve as a repository for books no longer needed at the Centers, with discretion to dispose of them in whatever manner deemed appropriate, and
6. to serve as the coordinator of the workshops.

While workshops in each of the Centers should use local personnel for local arrangements, the central theme, most of the publicity, and any other factors common to all of the Centers would be handled by the Coordinating Center.
Appendix A

Questionnaire to One and No-Time Users.

1. Are you responsible for selecting children's books? Yes ___ No ___
   IF NO, PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IMMEDIATELY WITHOUT ANSWERING THE REST
   OF THE QUESTIONS. THANK YOU.

2. Do you select children's books for:
   ___a. public library
   ___b. school library
   ___c. nursery school, kindergarten, or day care center.
   ___d. gifts to children
   ___e. other (please describe) __________________________________________

3. What is your position (in your library or school)? _________________

4. What was your children's book budget for 1973? __________

5. How do you select children's books?
   ___a. reviews
   ___b. publishers' catalogs
   ___c. salesmen
   ___d. bookstores
   ___e. Children's Book Review Center
   ___f. other (please list:) _____________________________________________

6. If you use reviews, which reviews do you use:
   ___c. Horn Book ___d. Kirkus Reviews
   ___e. Booklist ___f. New Books for Children
   ___g. Top of the News ___h. Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books
   ___i. other (please list): _____________________________________________
7. Have you ever visited a Children's Book Review Center?  Yes ___ No ___
   IF NO, SKIP THE NEXT QUESTIONS AND GO TO QUESTION 15.
   IF YES, ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.
8. How many visits have you made to the Center? ________________
9. Do you use the Center to select children's books?  Yes ___ No ___
10. Do you use the Children's Book Review Center for:
   ___ a. All of your selection
   ___ b. Most of your selection
   ___ c. Half of your selection
   ___ d. Some of your selection
   ___ e. None of your selection
11. Are there card files and/or lists of the books in the Center?  Yes ___ No ___
   a. If Yes, are they useful?  Yes ___ No ___
   b. If No, would they be useful?  Yes ___ No ___
12. Which of the following factors make the Center more difficult or easier for you to use. (Place check in appropriate column those factor which make a difference for you.)
   
   Easier More Difficult
   ___ ___ a. distance to the Center
   ___ ___ b. hours Center is open
   ___ ___ c. amount of space in the Center
   ___ ___ d. furniture in the Center
   ___ ___ e. arrangement of books in the Center
   ___ ___ f. other (Please list): ____________________________________________
13. How would you prefer to have the books arranged in the Center?
   _a. author
   _b. title
   _c. publisher
   _d. age of reader
   _e. subject
   _f. other (please list): ________________________________

14. Are there reviews in the books in the Center? _Yes ___ No ___.
   a. If Yes, are the reviews helpful? _Yes ___ No ___.
   b. If No, would reviews be helpful? _Yes ___ No ___.

15. Please check following items which would encourage you to use a Children’s Book Review Center more than you do.
   _a. evening and weekend hours at the Center.
   _b. Center at a closer location.
   _c. a mobile unit containing the Center materials which would come regularly to your public library.
   _d. small deposit collections from the Center in your local public library.
   _e. mail service from the Center of specific title, author, or subject requests.
   _f. payment of travel expenses to and from the Center.
   _g. time off from work to go to the Center.
   _h. other (Please describe:) ________________________________

Appendix B

THE STUDY OF EFFECTIVENESS

This questionnaire was designed to answer one of the main questions asked by the evaluation: Do the Centers improve the selection of children's books? This report contains only a brief description of the study and leaves many details unexplained and many questions unanswered. This was done for two reasons: to shorten this final report to a readable and meaningful length, and to prevent redundancy. The details, the reasoning behind the study, and its multitudinous results will be presented later in the form of a Ph.D. dissertation prepared at the Graduate School of Library Science, University of Illinois. Questions about the study of effectiveness can be directed to:

Anne Billeter
21205 Roscoe Blvd., Apt. 49
Canoga Park, California 91304
Questionnaire to 53 Repeat Users

Directions: Please circle the number to the right of the answer you wish to give

Children's Book Review Center

1. How many times since January 1, 1973 have you visited the Children's Book Review Center? 12-13/1

2. Which one of the following most accurately describes how you use the Children's Book Review Center:
   a. Read reviews before you go to the Center...1
   b. Read reviews at the Center......................2
   c. Read reviews after returning from the Center...3
   d. Do not read reviews..............................4

3. Which one of the following most accurately describes how you use the Children's Book Review Center:
   a. Look for specific titles you have previously heard of or read........1
   b. Look for titles on a specific subject..................2
   c. Browse.............................................3
   d. Look for titles for a specific age group................4

4. Are there card files and/or lists of the books in the Center?..................Yes......1
   No........2
   a. If Yes, are they useful?.........................Yes......1
      No........2
   b. If No, would they be useful?....................Yes......1
      No........2

5. Which of the following factors are important in determining how frequently you use the Center?
   a. Distance to the Center..........................a.....1
   b. Hours the Center is open.........................b.....1
   c. Amount of space in the Center...................c.....1
   d. The type of furniture in the Center............d.....1
   e. The arrangement of the books in the Center...e.....1
   f. Other (Please list) ........................................f.....1
6. How would you prefer to have the books arranged in the Center?
   a. author..................a....1
   b. title..................b....1
   c. publisher..............c....1
   d. age of reader...........d....1
   e. subject..................e....1
   f. date received............f....1
   g. other (Please list:)........g....1

7. Are there reviews in the books in the Center...Yes....1
   No....2
   a. If Yes, are the reviews helpful?.........Yes....1
      No....2
   b. If No, would reviews be helpful?.........Yes....1
      No....2

8. Please check the following items which would encourage you to use a Children's Book Review Center more than you do.
   a. Evening and weekend hours at the Center...a....1
   b. Center at a closer location...............b....1
   c. A mobile unit containing the Center materials which would come regularly to your local public library.............c....1
   d. Small deposit collections from the Center in your local public library.............d....1
   e. Mail service from the Center of specific title, author, or subject requests for examination before selection.............e....1
   f. Payment of travel expenses to and from the Center.........................f....1
   g. Time off from work to go to the Center.........................g....1
   h. Other (Please describe) .................h....1

The Library

9. Does your library receive any books directly from publishers on approval? Yes....1
   No....2
   a. If Yes, please list the publishers: ......

10. Does your library receive any books directly from publishers on standing order? Yes....1
    No....2
    a. If Yes, please list the Publishers: ......
11. Were there any unusual occurrences in your library in either 1971 or 1973 which would affect selection of children's books. (For example, an unusually large or small budget, a decision to concentrate on buying a certain type of book, etc.)

   Yes......1
   No......2

   a. If Yes, please describe the occurrence, specifying the year. ________________

12. Does your library have agreements with other local institutions (which serve children) to divide the responsibility for buying books in certain subject areas or of a certain type?

   Yes......1
   No......2

   a. If Yes, please explain the agreement, including what institutions and type of books are involved. ________________

13. Does anyone assist you in selecting titles? Yes......1

   If Yes, please answer the following questions:
   No......2

   a. Please list their title(s) or position(s)

   ________________________________

   b. Do you review their selections or suggestions?

   Yes......1
   No......2

   c. Do you generally accept their selections or suggestions?

   Yes......1
   No......2

14. Do you have final responsibility for the individual titles you select?

   Yes......1
   No......2

   a. If No, who does, and what is her/his position? ________________________________

15. When did you last weed the children's collection?

   ________________________________

16. Have you weeded from the children's collection any 1971 books on the basis of content? Yes......1

   If Yes, how many? ________________________________
17. Have any 1971 children's books been discarded due to wear, and not been replaced?  
   Yes.....1  
   No.....2

   a. If Yes, how many ____________________________

18. Do you receive children's books on long-term loan from the public library system?  
   Yes.....1  
   No.....2

   a. If Yes, approximately how many per year? ________
   b. If Yes, do you choose these books? Yes.....1
   No.....2

19. Does the public library system give you any children's books to be housed permanently in your collection without charge?  
   Yes.....1  
   No.....2

   a. If Yes, how many per year? ________
   b. If Yes, do you choose these books? Yes.....1
   No.....2

20. If the library receives any children's books as gifts from members of the public are these books:  
   a. all added to the collection........a.....1  
   b. reviewed for appropriateness to the collection.................b.....2

21. Does the library buy books which children request, whether or not the books are of good quality?  
   Yes.....1  
   No.....2

22. Are there either Nancy Drew or the Hardy Boys books in your library?  
   Yes.....1  
   No.....2

   a. If Yes, were any of them purchased by the library in the last 5 years? Yes.....1
   No.....2

23. Does the library buy only good quality books for its children's collection?  
   Yes.....1  
   No.....2

24. What was the children's book budget for calendar year 1971? __________________________

25. What was the children's book budget for calendar year 1973? ______________________________
26. If the library receives gifts of money from members of the public which are used to purchase children's books, about how much is given in any one year? 

27. How many books were purchased in 1971? 

28. How many books were purchased in 1973? 

Method of Selection

29. Do you select books differently now that you can use the Children's Book Review Center Yes....1 No....2 

30. How did you select books in 1971? (Please place a one (1) by the method most frequently used; a two (2) by the method next most frequently used, and a three (3) by any other methods which were used.)
   a. reviews 27/2
   b. publishers' catalogs 28/2
   c. salesmen 29/2
   d. bookstores 30/2
   e. Children's Book Review Center 31/2
   f. exhibits 32/2
   g. other libraries 33/2
   h. other (please list) 34/2

31. How did you select books in 1973? (Please use the previous question's answering system.)
   a. reviews 36/2
   b. publishers' catalogs 37/2
   c. salesmen 38/2
   d. bookstores 39/2
   e. Children's Book Review Center 40/2
   f. exhibits 41/2
   g. other libraries 42/2
   h. other (please list) 43/2
32. If you use reviews, which reviews do you use?
   a. School Library Journal
   b. Publishers' Weekly
   c. Horn Book
   d. Kirkus Reviews
   e. Booklist
   f. New Books for Children
   g. Top of the News
   h. Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books
   i. other (Please list):

33. Does the reputation of the publisher initially influence your judgment of a book?
   Yes...1
   No...2

34. Are there any publishers whose books you automatically select?
   Yes...1
   No...2
   a. If Yes, please list

The Selector

36. Your Position
   a. head of library (with responsibility for adult and children's services)
   b. school or children's librarian (with responsibility for children's and/or young adult services, but not adult services)
   c. assistant with some duties in children's services (but with other duties also)
   d. other (Please describe):

37. Your age:
   20-29...1
   30-39...2
   40-49...3
   50-59...4
   60...5
38. Please place a check before each item which pertains to you.
   __a. high school diploma
   __b. Associate degree (2 years of college)
   __c. Bachelor's degree with at least a minor in Library Science.
   __d. Bachelor's degree with less than 18 hours of Library Science.
   __e. 5th year Bachelor's degree in Library Science
   __f. Master's degree in Library Science
   __g. other Master's degree
   __h. Certificate of Advance Study or other 6th year degree in Library Science.
   __i. Doctoral degree in Library Science
   __j. other education for credit (please list):

39. Please list any workshops or other continuing education experiences you have had which have been helpful to you in your selection of children's books:

40. Please place a check before the courses you have had which specifically relate to selection and/or children's books:
   __a. Children's Literature (or Materials)
   __b. Young Adult Literature (or Materials)
   __c. Selection of Library Materials
   __d. other (please list): ______________

41. How many years have you worked in library? _____

42. How many years have you been selecting books? _____

43. How many years have you been selecting children's books? ______________
Appendix C

COMPILATION OF THE LIST

Reviews were read in seven reviewing media for all children's books copyrighted 1971 or 1973. "Children's books" is defined for this purpose as books written for children and young people through grade 12. Books were excluded from this category if they were intended for adults but were of interest to young people. The reviewing media are: BOOKLIST, BULLETIN OF THE CENTER FOR CHILDREN'S BOOKS, HORN BOOK, KIRKUS, LIBRARY JOURNAL, PUBLISHERS WEEKLY, and TOP OF THE NEWS. The reviews were rated on the following scale:

1 = Highly Recommended
2 = Good
3 = Additional: Recommended when additional titles of this type are needed.
5 = Mediocre: has some good and some poor qualities.
7 = Poor: of poor quality but has some redeeming factor.
9 = Not Recommended.

The ratings were applied in as objective and consistent a manner as possible.

"1" was assigned to:
- all reviews in HORN BOOK
- all reviews in TOP OF THE NEWS
- "R" reviews in BULLETIN OF THE CENTER FOR CHILDREN'S BOOKS

* reviews in KIRKUS
* reviews in LIBRARY JOURNAL
"2" was assigned to:

- all reviews in BOOKLIST
- favorable reviews in KIRKUS
- favorable reviews in LIBRARY JOURNAL

"3" was assigned to:

- "Ad" reviews in BULLETIN OF THE CENTER FOR CHILDREN'S BOOKS
- "additional" reviews in KIRKUS
- "additional" reviews in LIBRARY JOURNAL

"5" was assigned to:

- "mediocre" reviews in KIRKUS
- "mediocre" reviews in LIBRARY JOURNAL
- "mediocre" reviews in PUBLISHERS WEEKLY

"7" was assigned to:

- "M" for "Marginal" reviews in BULLETIN OF THE CENTER FOR CHILDREN'S BOOKS
- "poor" reviews in KIRKUS
- "poor" reviews in LIBRARY JOURNAL
- "poor" reviews in PUBLISHERS WEEKLY

"9" was assigned to:

- "NR" in BULLETIN OF THE CENTER FOR CHILDREN'S BOOKS
- "not recommended" reviews in KIRKUS
- "not recommended" reviews in LIBRARY JOURNAL
- "not recommended" reviews in PUBLISHERS WEEKLY
Titles were eligible for inclusion on the list if they:

1. had no reviews contradicting the prevailing judgment
2. had two or more "1's" and five or more "1's", "2's", and "3's" OR had one or more "9's" and two or more "7's" and "9's".

The final list contained 420 titles, composed of:

99 - 1971 Recommended titles
136 - 1971 Not Recommended titles
105 - 1973 Recommended titles
80 - 1973 Not Recommended titles
APPENDIX D

THE LIST OF TITLES USED IN THE
STUDY OF EFFECTIVENESS


Alexander, Martha. NO DUCKS IN OUR BATHTUB. Dial, 1973.


Braider, Donald. GEORGE BELLOWS AND THE ASHCAN SCHOOL OF


Cannon, Calvin. WHAT I LIKE TO DO. Coward, 1971.


Chalon, Jon. THE VOYAGE OF THE FLOATING BEDSTEAD.

Charlton-Perrin, Geoffrey. LITTLE LORD BLINK AND HIS ICE CREAM
CASTLE. McCall, 1971.

Childress, Alice.  A HERO AIN'T NOTHING BUT A SANDWICH.

Christian Science Monitor.  WHAT YOU CAN DO: PRACTICAL
. SUGGESTIONS FOR ACTION ON SOME MAJOR PROBLEMS OF THE
SEVENTIES.  McKay, 1971.


Christopher, Matthew.  LOOK WHO'S PLAYING FIRST BASE.  Little,
1971.


Clewes, Dorothy.  THE END OF SUMMER.  Coward, 1971.

Clifton, Lucille.  THE BOY WHO DIDN'T BELIEVE IN SPRING.

Clymer, Eleanor.  THE SPIDER, THE CAVE AND THE POTTERY BOWL.

Cohen, Daniel.  MAGICIANS, WIZARDS, AND SORCERERS.  Lippincott,


Cortesi, Lawrence.  JIM BECKWOURTH: EXPLORER-PATRIOT OF THE
ROCKIES.  Criterion, 1971.


Daniels, Leo Francis. INTERNATIONAL VISUAL DICTIONARY. Clute International Institute, 1973.

De Gerez, Toni. 2-RABBIT, 7-WIND: POEMS FROM ANCIENT MEXICO. Viking, 1971.


Dunne, Mary Collins.  REACH OUT, RICARDO.  Abelard, 1971.


Fleischman, Sid.  MCBROOM'S GHOST.  Grosset, 1971.


Fox, Sonia.  CHICAGO BURNS.  Putnam, 1971.


Galbraith, Clare. VICTOR. Little, 1971.


Goodall, John S. SHREW'BETTINA'S BIRTHDAY. Harcourt, 1971.


Kalnay, Francis. IT HAPPENED IN CHICHIPICA. Harcourt, 1971.


Kingsley, Emily. THE SESAME STREET 1,2,3 STORY BOOK. Random, 1973.


Kraus, Robert. SHAGGY FUR FACE. Windmill, 1971.


Lively, Penelope. THE GHOST OF THOMAS KEMPE. Dutton, 1973.


McKone, Jim. TO WIN IN NOVEMBER. Vanguard, 1971.


Martin, Patricia Miles. NAVAJO PET. Putnam, 1971.


Matheu, Martha. WHALES, SAILS AND SCRIMSHAW. Young Scott, 1973.


Miller, Helen Markley. JEDEDIAH SMITH ON THE FAR FRONTIER. Putnam, 1971.


Morgan, Julie. DRAG RACING. Lippincott, 1971.
Offit, Sidney. NOT ALL GIRLS HAVE MILLION DOLLAR SMILES, AND OTHER TALES FROM SAM ORLINSKI'S SCENE. Coward, 1971.


Polland, Madeleine. TO KILL A KING. Holt, 1971.


Rowe, Anne. THE LITTLE KNIGHT. Lothrop, 1971.


Sutton, Margaret. WE LOVE YOU BEATLES. Doubleday, 1971.


Tashjian, Virginia. THREE APPLES FELL FROM HEAVEN: ARMENIAN TALES. Little, 1971.


Thompson, Vivian. HAWAIIAN TALES OF HEROES AND CHAMPIONS. Holiday, 1971.


