

1984

An Analysis of Six Months of Juvenile Book Reviewing by Four Major Reviewing Sources

Marilyn Weber
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1984 Marilyn Weber

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>

Recommended Citation

Weber, Marilyn, "An Analysis of Six Months of Juvenile Book Reviewing by Four Major Reviewing Sources" (1984). *Graduate Research Papers*. 4082.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/4082>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

An Analysis of Six Months of Juvenile Book Reviewing by Four Major Reviewing Sources

Find Additional Related Research in UNI ScholarWorks

To find related research in UNI ScholarWorks, go to the collection of [School Library Studies Graduate Research Papers](#) written by students in the [Division of School Library Studies](#), Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, at the University of Northern Iowa.

Abstract

This study was based on Zena Sutherland's 1965 research of review coverage of juvenile books by School Library Journal, Book list, Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books, and Horn Book. Sutherland's research analyzed twelve months of reviewing by the selected sources for the purpose of determining the number of titles reviewed by all four of the reviewing sources, by three of the four reviewing sources, by two of the four reviewing sources, and by only one of the four reviewing sources. The representation of nonfiction and fiction titles was also analyzed by Sutherland. This research study adopted the same objectives for analysis but analyzed only six months of reviewing. Because of the difference in time periods analyzed, comparisons were based on percentages.

Overall results of this study were:

Titles reviewed by 4 sources 27

Titles reviewed by 3 sources 132

Titles reviewed by 2 sources 455

Titles reviewed by 1 source 978

An Analysis of Six Months of Juvenile Book
Reviewing by Four Major Reviewing Sources

A Research Paper
Presented to the
Faculty of the Library Science Department

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Marilyn Weber
June 15, 1984

Read and approved by
Leah Hiland

W. Duane Johnson

Accepted by Department
Elizabeth Martin

Date *July 3, 1984*

Abstract

An Analysis of Six Months of Juvenile Book Reviewing by Four Major Reviewing Sources Marilyn Weber

This study was based on Zena Sutherland's 1965 research of review coverage of juvenile books by School Library Journal, Booklist, Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books, and Horn Book. Sutherland's research analyzed twelve months of reviewing by the selected sources for the purpose of determining the number of titles reviewed by all four of the reviewing sources, by three of the four reviewing sources, by two of the four reviewing sources, and by only one of the four reviewing sources. The representation of nonfiction and fiction titles was also analyzed by Sutherland. This research study adopted the same objectives for analysis but analyzed only six months of reviewing. Because of the difference in time periods analyzed, comparisons were based on percentages.

Overall results of this study were:

Titles reviewed by 4 sources	27
Titles reviewed by 3 sources	132
Titles reviewed by 2 sources	455
Titles reviewed by 1 source	978

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables.....	ii
Chapter	
1. The Problem.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Problem Statements.....	3
Hypotheses.....	4
Importance of the Study.....	5
Assumptions.....	6
Limitations.....	7
Definitions.....	7
2. Review of Related Literature.....	9
3. Methodology.....	21
4. Analysis of Data.....	25
5. Conclusions, Recommendations and Summary.....	32
Conclusions.....	32
Recommendations.....	36
Summary.....	39
Bibliography.....	42
Appendices.....	44

Tables

Table	Page
1. Number and Percent of Reviews by Reviewing Source.....	26
2. Promptness of Reviews of the Four Reviewing Sources.....	31
3. A Comparison of 1965 and 1983 Reviewing by Four Major Reviewing Sources.....	32

CHAPTER ONE

The Problem

Introduction

Each year the publishing industry inundates the public with thousands of new titles. Most, if not all, of these newly published materials must be evaluated in some way for inclusion into library media center collections. The sifting and evaluation of these new titles is a monumental task and one that must be approached in stages by a variety of professionals. Library media specialists usually make the final decisions about whether a title will be incorporated into a particular collection. Those decisions are most often based upon book reviews.

"The use of reviews is an essential part of the selection process."¹ Library media specialists and others responsible for collection development have long depended upon the book review for selection of books for particular collections. That dependency continues in the current status of book selection and thus the need for good and thorough book reviewing continues.

Reviewers and reviewing journals play a crucial role in the selection process. Because library media specialists and

¹ Rosemary Weber, "The Reviewing of Children's and Young Adult Books," Top of the News, 35 (Winter 1979), 131-137.

others who purchase books cannot possibly read or examine all that is published, they must depend upon reviewers.² Virginia Woolf, in a pamphlet entitled Reviewing, describes the function of the reviewer as "partly to sort current literature; partly to advertise the author; partly to inform the public."³ Since the reviewer has access to far more newly published materials than the selector, the role of the reviewer becomes essential in terms of making the public aware of these new materials.

In 1982, Publisher's Weekly reported a total title output for juvenile books at 2,677.⁴ More than 80 percent of these juvenile books published are sold to schools and libraries.⁵ Few, if any, library media specialists have access to that output of juvenile titles for personal evaluation. "Most librarians must depend upon the various selection aids for their information about new titles. It is important, therefore, to consider whether there are any weaknesses in this

² Bernice E. Cullinan, Literature and the Child (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1981), 517.

³ Virginia Woolf, Reviewing (London: Hogarth Press, 1939), 10.

⁴ Chandler B. Grannis, "U.S. Title Output, Average Prices: Final Figures for 1982," Publisher's Weekly, 224 (September 1983), 29.

⁵ Sylvia E. Kamerman, ed., Book Reviewing (Boston: The Writer, Inc., 1974), 54.

system for aiding librarians in their choice of titles."⁶

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the coverage of the four major reviewing media used by school library media specialists. Because library media specialists cannot personally inspect every new title, they must depend upon the reviewing media to help make decisions about selection. A reviewing source which is dependable and as complete as possible in its coverage of new titles is desirable. Zena Sutherland stated that in 1965, School Library Journal, Booklist, The Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books, and Horn Book were the children's review sources most used by librarians.⁷ This study attempted to make some determination of coverage of reviewing among those four journals.

Problem Statements

1. What percentage of juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources were reviewed in all four sources?

⁶ Mary Duncan Carter, Building Library Collections (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1969), 113.

⁷ Zena Sutherland, "Book Reviews: Before & After," School Library Journal, 21 (February 1975), 22-23.

2. What percentage of juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources were reviewed in three of the four sources?

3. What percentage of juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources were reviewed in two of the four sources?

4. What percentage of juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources were reviewed in only one of the four sources?

5. What percentage of juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources and reviewed by all four sources are fiction and nonfiction?

6. How many juvenile book publishers are represented by the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, by all four of the selected reviewing sources?

Hypotheses

1. Five percent or more of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources will be reviewed by all four sources.

2. Ten percent or more of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources will be reviewed by three of the four sources.

3. Twenty percent or more of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources will be reviewed by two of the four sources.

4. Sixty-five percent or more of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources will be reviewed by only one of the four sources.

5. Of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, by all four of the selected reviewing sources, 25 percent or more will be nonfiction and 60 percent or more will be fiction.

6. Of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, by all four of the selected reviewing sources, sixteen or more publishers will be represented.

Importance of the Study

The importance of this study is aptly conveyed in this statement by Mary Duncan Carter in her book Building Library Collections:

It is certainly true that many books are never reviewed, and the librarian depending upon the general reviewing media would never become aware of their existence. Furthermore, if the conscientious librarian wants to read a number of reviews, in order to form a more sound judgment of a book, he may well be disappointed. Except for the very popular titles--particularly in nonfiction--only a bare minimum of reviews are likely to appear, and some titles may not be reviewed at all.⁸

Library media specialists need to know which reviewing sources will give them the most comprehensive coverage of

⁸ Carter, p. 113.

published titles on which to base selection choices. Most library media specialists do not have the time or the resources to ferret out information on all titles that might be published in a year. Sources which can be depended upon to give complete and reliable information to the library media specialist are crucial. Thus the identification of sources which most nearly fulfill that criteria becomes crucial to the selector.

Assumptions

The deluge of newly published materials each year necessitates that library media specialists have access to current information about these materials. This information is essential to wise selection decisions, thus, timely and reliable selection tools become essential. In the past, reviewing periodicals have filled this need. An assumption of this research was that reviewing journals continue to fill that need and are heavily relied upon by library media specialists.

Another assumption was that School Library Journal, Horn Book, Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books and Booklist are the most used reviewing sources for juvenile books. Researchers cited in this paper have all chosen these four journals for inclusion in their studies, the consensus being that these reviewing journals enjoy popularity among library media specialists.

Limitations

This study was limited to six months of reviewing from July to December, 1983, in four major reviewing sources which cover a wide range of subjects of juvenile books. The four reviewing sources were School Library Journal, Booklist, Horn Book, and Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books. Information included for compilation was the title, the publisher, and the name of the reviewing source. Fiction and nonfiction books were designated from Booklist only. Reviewing of nonprint materials was not investigated.

Definitions

The term "juvenile" is a frequently used term in the literary profession, however, it is not a term which is frequently defined. The definition seems to be somewhat elusive and applied differently in various situations. In an attempt to arrive at a definitive definition of "juvenile," this researcher corresponded with Chandler Grannis, Contributing Editor for Publisher's Weekly, which is published by the Bowker Company. Although Mr. Grannis was also unable to supply a precise definition, he indicated that the staff of Library Journal considers a children's (juvenile) book to be "one that is for persons through the age of 14."⁹ For the

⁹ Letter received from Chandler B. Grannis, Contributing Editor, Publisher's Weekly, 8 November 1983.

purposes of this research, that definition was adopted when referring to a juvenile book.

The four major reviewing sources were defined as School Library Journal, Booklist, Horn Book, and Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

The literature selected for inclusion in this study is centered around the concept of book reviewing as it relates to the selection of books for library media centers. Particular attention was given to literature which dealt with the selection of books for juveniles and prominent juvenile reviewing media.

Charles Busha dealt with a broad perspective of the reviewing/selection process in a study of the reviewing media and public libraries. He pointed out that the "information explosion" in terms of "an ever increasing mass of publications flowing from the trade, government, and private presses of the nation" creates a problem of book selection. He further stressed that "the problem of developing and maintaining book collections is one which now must be attacked in a thorough, almost scientific manner" and that "there is a pressing need for prompt and systematic evaluation of newly published books."¹⁰

The problem of dealing with the annual wealth of new publications was also addressed by Bernice Cullinan in her book

¹⁰ Charles Busha, "Book Selection in Public Libraries: An Evaluation of Four Commonly-Used Review Media," Southeastern Librarian, 18 (Summer 1968), 92-100.

Literature and the Child:

Reviewers can play a pivotal gate-keeping role in determining whether a book gets to library or bookstore shelves. Because librarians and others who purchase them cannot possibly read all of the 2,000 books, on the average, published for children each year, they often depend upon the recommendations of reviewers.¹¹

Rachael DeAngelo, in an article which examined the major juvenile reviewing sources concurred with the above statements by Busha and Cullinan but introduced the additional concept of the selector's reading background:

Few adults have the depth and breadth of reading background to choose the best of the old; fewer still have access to the deluge of new books and the time for reading to apply the criteria of quality necessary to choose the best of the new.¹²

She also pointed out that:

As those responsible for book selection continue to lack both time and opportunity to see and examine new books while they are still new, it becomes obvious that book selection must be increasingly dependent on the current reviews.¹³

Library media specialists should become familiar with reviewing sources. As book selectors, they need to judge reviewing media according to the purpose, the philosophy and the audience for which the reviews are intended.¹⁴ They also need to be aware of the basic characteristics of reviewing

¹¹ Cullinan, p. 517.

¹² Rachael W. DeAngelo, "Media for Disseminating Critiques," Evaluating Books for Children and Young People, ed. Helen Huus (Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1968), 110-125.

¹³ Ibid., p. 111.

¹⁴ Ibid.

media.¹⁵ DeAngelo identified and described a number of prominent reviewing sources for juvenile books. Among them are "The Big Four" reviewing journals for children's and young adults' books. "The Big Four" include Booklist, Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books, The Horn Book Magazine, and the School Library Journal and were given that name at a book reviewers' conference in 1963.¹⁶ According to DeAngelo, "these four remain the best known, the most widely consulted, and the most generally useful in book selection for children and young people in both school and public libraries."¹⁷ Their basic characteristics are:

Booklist

published semi-monthly
 reviews only titles recommended for purchase
 arranges juvenile titles alphabetically by author in
 two sections: "Children's Books" and "Books for
 Young Adults"
 reviews are written by staff
 indicates titles that are particularly good in the
 genre

Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books

published monthly for eleven months of the year
 reviews arranged alphabetically by author
 reviews only children's and young adult books
 indicates quality of books with a coding system
 reviews are written by staff with the assistance of
 an advisory committee

¹⁵ Busha, p. 98.

¹⁶ DeAngelo, p. 112.

¹⁷ Zena Sutherland, "Current Reviewing of Children's Books," Library Quarterly, 37 (January 1967), 110-118.

Horn Book

published bi-monthly
 reviews are arranged by a combination of age and
 genre
 reviews only "most" recommended titles
 reviews written by staff and guest reviewers

School Library Journal

published monthly from August to May
 reviews are arranged alphabetically by author within
 three age categories
 reviews recommended and not recommended titles
 indicates titles excellent in relation to others of
 its kind
 reviews are written by staff, librarians, and others
 in the field¹⁸
 attempts to review virtually all of the annual
 production of children's books¹⁹

While it is generally agreed that book selectors must depend to a great extent upon reviewing media, the question is often raised as to the completeness of coverage represented by them. Zena Sutherland addressed this concern in relation to juvenile books in a study which she conducted in 1965. Her study was reported in an article entitled "Current Reviewing of Children's Books" and centered around the question "What is the character and the measure of my access to current publication of children's literature via the sources of critical evaluation?" Included in this article were reports of two other studies of current reviewing; one by Evelyn Anderson and the other by Louise Galloway. Similar methods were used by

¹⁸ Virginia Witucke, "The Performance of Juvenile Book Review Media," Serials Review, 8 (Spring 1982), 49-54.

¹⁹ Trevelyn E. Jones, "Annual Policy Statement '83," School Library Journal, 30 (September 1983), 99.

both. "Each analyzed one year of reviewing, giving some attention to policies and practices of their chosen media and scrutinizing, in particular, those reviews that all of their media had published in common."²⁰

Anderson analyzed Booklist, Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books, Horn Book, and School Library Journal using fifteen criteria. She also analyzed the four journals for frequency of reviews. Anderson found that out of 1,450 juvenile titles announced by Publisher's Weekly in 1955, 166 were reviewed by all four journals and that 428 titles, or one-fourth of those published, were not reviewed by any of the four journals. She concluded from her study that Booklist and the Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books are basic selection tools while Horn Book and School Library Journal are supplemental.²¹

Galloway analyzed juvenile titles announced by Publisher's Weekly in 1959. She examined the four reviewing journals investigated by Anderson but added four additional journals: New York Herald Tribune, New York Times, Elementary English, and Saturday Review. Galloway applied a list of nineteen criteria to reviews of fourteen books. Conclusions of her study were that 73 percent of 1959 titles were reviewed by one or more of the reviewing sources. Galloway also found that

²⁰ Sutherland, "Current Reviewing," p. 110.

²¹ Ibid., pp. 110-111.

Booklist and School Library Journal reviewed more than 50 percent of the juvenile books in 1959. A general conclusion was that "reviewing--for school library purposes--is inadequate both in quality and in quantity."²²

Zena Sutherland took a slightly different approach in her research. She felt that the analyses conducted by Anderson and Galloway were valuable for content but that they did not give a broad picture of reviewing. For this reason, Sutherland chose to examine 1965 reviewing rather than 1965 titles. Sutherland recognized the overlap of 1964 titles in 1965 reviewing and 1965 titles into 1966 reviewing but decided that "since the pattern of time lag repeats each year, there seemed no reason to pursue the 1965 titles."²³

Journals examined for Sutherland's study were "The Big Four," Booklist, Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books, Horn Book Magazine, and School Library Journal.²⁴

In 1965, there were 2,299 juvenile titles reviewed by one or more of the four reviewing media. Of those 2,299 reviews, 1,501 were reviewed in only one publication. The following is the breakdown of titles in this category:

<u>School Library Journal</u>	927
<u>Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books</u>	350
<u>Booklist</u>	139
<u>Horn Book</u>	85

²² Ibid., pp. 111-112.

²³ Ibid., p. 114.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 115.

Books reviewed by two of the four reviewing sources totaled 466. Totals for this category are listed below:

<u>School Library Journal</u>	405
<u>Booklist</u>	203
<u>Horn Book</u>	175
<u>Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books</u>	149

Books reviewed by three of the four reviewing media totaled 238 and are as follows:

<u>School Library Journal</u>	211
<u>Booklist</u>	198
<u>Horn Book</u>	176
<u>Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books</u>	129

Out of the 2,473 titles published and the 2,299 reviews in 1965, only ninety-four titles were reviewed by all four reviewing media. The total 1965 reviewing output for each of the four media follows:

<u>School Library Journal</u>	1619
<u>Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books</u>	748
<u>Booklist</u>	608
<u>Horn Book</u>	530 ²⁵

Because of the increasing number of science books, Sutherland analyzed her review data in relation to coverage of science books. She found science books reviewed by all four media to be a low percentage, only 4 percent. Reviews of science books in the other categories--those reviewed in three sources, two sources and only one source--ran 12 to 13 percent of the total review output.²⁶

Sutherland further analyzed the four selected reviewing

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

media for fiction versus nonfiction titles. She found that of the books reviewed by only one source, 721 out of 1,501 titles were nonfiction; of the titles reviewed by two media, 244 out of 466 were nonfiction; of the titles reviewed by three media, 105 out of 238 were nonfiction; and of the titles reviewed by all four media, 28 out of 94 were nonfiction.²⁷

Further investigation revealed that of the 94 books reviewed by all four selected media, 32 publishers were represented. One publisher was represented by twelve titles and eleven had only a single title.²⁸

Several more recent studies have been done dealing with similar concepts as the Sutherland study, but with some variations. Rosemary Weber conducted a study which focused on 1977 reviewing of books for children and young adults in seven periodicals often used as selection aids by children's, young adult, and school librarians. The seven periodicals examined were Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books, Booklist, Horn Book, New York Times Book Review, Publisher's Weekly, School Library Journal, and Kirkus.²⁹

Weber found 3,915 different children's and young adult books reviewed in a total of 7,611 reviews. School Library

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 116.

²⁹ Weber, pp. 131-132.

Journal reviewed the most titles with 2,290 reviews or 30 percent. Booklist followed with 2,024 reviews or 27 percent and Kirkus was third with 1,187 reviews or 15 percent.³⁰

Less than 1 percent of the titles were reviewed by all seven periodicals during 1977. Fifty-five percent were reviewed by only one of the seven journals, and 76 percent were reviewed by only one or two of the seven journals.³¹

School Library Journal and Booklist were found to be responsible for the greatest percentage of coverage among the seven journals. Only 10 percent of the titles with two reviews were not reviewed by either Booklist or School Library Journal. Of the total reviewing, Booklist covered 40 percent and School Library Journal covered 38 percent.³²

Virginia Witucke conducted two studies; one in 1980 and one in 1982 which asked the question, "How well served by the major review sources are those libraries for which children's books are purchased?" The 1982 study was an update of the 1980 study. Review periodicals examined were Booklist, Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books, Horn Book, New York Times Book Review, and School Library Journal.³³

³⁰ Ibid., p. 133.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid., p. 134.

³³ Virginia Witucke, "A Comparative Analysis of Juvenile Book Review Media," School Media Quarterly, 8 (Spring 1980), 153-160.

Witucke's methodology was adapted from a study previously mentioned by Charles Busha, "Book Selection in Public Libraries: An Evaluation of Four Commonly Used Review Media." A random sample of thirty titles was chosen from the entire pool of Notable Children's Books of 1972, 1973, and 1974. Notable Children's Books were chosen because they are books which selectors want to know about and which are likely to be considered for purchase.³⁴ The sampling method was modified in the 1982 study to include a random sample of ten titles from each year, 1972, 1973, and 1974.³⁵

Witucke reported the results of her study in two segments: handling of reviews which dealt with coverage and promptness; and characteristics of reviews which dealt with length, authorship, critical themes, and consistency.³⁶ For the purposes of this paper, reporting of results will focus on the coverage of reviews.

Witucke found in 1980 that among the five sources, there was about 83 percent coverage of the sample titles. The 1982 sample title coverage was 77 percent. Momentarily setting aside the sample group, Witucke compared the total juvenile title output for the three years and the number of reviews

³⁴ Witucke, "The Performance of Juvenile Book Review Media," p. 49.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Witucke, "A Comparative Analysis of Juvenile Book Review Media," p. 153.

published in the tools examined. Her 1980 findings were that School Library Journal reviewed 97 percent of the total output, but in 1982 that percentage dropped to 88 percent. In 1980, Booklist reviewed 40 percent of the total output and 42 percent in 1982. The percentage of coverage represented by the remaining three journals was considerably less than either School Library Journal or Booklist.³⁷

Several common themes have emerged throughout the studies reported on here. Sutherland, Weber, and Witucke all agreed that no single reviewing journal offers complete coverage and that good book selection necessitates use of more than one reviewing tool. Their concluding comments support this statement.

No journal gives complete coverage and no one of the four so intensively scrutinized is without some flaws.³⁸

None of the seven journals discussed reviews of all the books reviewed during a year....If the user wants to read more than half of the reviews published or reviews for more than half of the books reviewed, more than one journal must be consulted.³⁹

The need for increased coverage of juvenile publication and the need for more critical handling of individual titles are criticisms long leveled at the reviewing apparatus and supported by this study.⁴⁰

³⁷ Virginia Witucke, "A Comparative Analysis of Juvenile Book Review Media," p. 154; Witucke, "The Performance of Juvenile Book Review Media," p. 49.

³⁸ Sutherland, "Current Reviewing," p. 116.

³⁹ Weber, p. 136.

⁴⁰ Witucke, "A Comparative Analysis of Juvenile Book Review Media," p. 159.

Again, there was no sense that one could single out any one of these reviewing tools as being adequate and sufficient.⁴¹

These researchers also caution the book selector to know the basic characteristics, consistencies and variances among the reviewing sources and to match them to the purposes of particular library media centers.

Zena Sutherland, in a speaking engagement, reported in an article, "Book Reviews: Before and After" referred to her study and proposed a kind of solution:

I turned up a statistic that interested me then and does still. Of the close to 3000 new children's books that had been published during the previous year, only 94 titles had been reviewed by all these review publications. It's a statistic better described as appalling rather than interesting. Although I can see all the problems attached to it even as I suggest it, I say that we need some sort of cooperative distribution of reviewing among the review sources. It really seems a shame that so many books get so little coverage.⁴²

⁴¹ Witucke, "The Performance of Juvenile Book Review Media," p. 54.

⁴² Sutherland, "Book Reviews: Before & After," p. 23.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

The methodology which was used in this research study was modified from a similar study done by Zena Sutherland and reported in "Current Reviewing of Children's Books." That study has been previously discussed in this paper in the review of related literature. Sutherland analyzed four major juvenile reviewing sources (Booklist, School Library Journal, Horn Book, and Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books) over a one year period of time. Her analysis was based on the 1965 review coverage of published titles and the frequency of reviews among the four selected sources.⁴³ As in the Sutherland study, this researcher analyzed the four major reviewing sources for juvenile books covering a designated period of time. Juvenile titles reviewed in those sources were entered into a computer data base program for the purpose of finding the number of reviews per title, publishers represented and whether titles are categorized as fiction or nonfiction.

Reviews examined for this research were those appearing in the selected reviewing sources in the six months from July through December, 1983. This time period was chosen for several reasons. First, the analysis of six months of reviewing as opposed to one year of reviewing was more

⁴³ Sutherland, "Current Reviewing," pp. 114-115.

manageable in terms of time and resources available to this researcher. Second, since the summer months represent a less active period for the publishing and reviewing industries, a six month time period representing slack periods as well as peak periods in publishing, was predicted to bring about more valid and comparable results than a shorter period of time. Third, the examination of 1983 reviewing made this study as timely as possible.

Review sources selected for this research were the same sources as those used by Zena Sutherland:

School Library Journal (SLJ) published by R. R. Bowker Co.

Booklist (BL) published by the American Library
Association

Horn Book (HB) published by Horn Book, Inc.

Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books (BCCB)
published by the University of Chicago⁴⁴

Juvenile titles were the focus of this study, therefore the upper limit of the recommended age or grade level of titles entered were those considered to be suitable for age 14 or eighth grade. Categories of reviews from each selected source which were analyzed are:

⁴⁴ From this point, each of the four reviewing sources will be identified by the abbreviations enclosed in parenthesis.

SLJ-Preschool & Primary Grades

-Grades 3-6

-Junior High Up (except titles recommended as beginning at 9th grade)

BL-Children's Books

-Books for Young Adults (included titles also reviewed as "Children's Books" but not titles also reviewed as "Adult Books")

HB-Picture Books

-Stories for Younger Readers (age 6-8)

-Stories for Intermediate Readers (age 9-12)

-Stories for Older Readers (age 12 through Young Adult)

-Poetry ("Intermediate", but not "Older")

-Nonfiction

BCCB-New Titles for Children and Young People

The pieces of information gathered for each review in each selected source included title, publisher, the name and date of the reviewing journal and whether the title was published in paperback form. For BL only, fiction and nonfiction designations were included for each title. When the titles were determined for books reviewed by all four selected reviewing sources, numbers of fiction and nonfiction were ascertainable for titles which were reviewed by all four sources.

A microcomputer data base program was utilized to record and compile the information from each selected reviewing source. The data base program, Visifile, published by Creative

Computer Applications permitted the establishment of a record for each title and possessed record search and sort capabilities. Record fields were established for each type of information entered in the record. The field names were: title, publisher, journal/date, nonfiction, and paperback. Although the indication of whether a book was initially published in paperback form was not addressed in the hypotheses, it was included as a matter of personal curiosity. Because SLJ has the greatest number of reviews, one or two issues were scanned to establish a mean number of characters required for each field. The articles a, an, and the were not entered when they appeared as the first word in a title. Publisher names were shortened.

Reviews in SLJ were entered first, followed by reviews in BL, HB, and BCCB. Because all of the reviews would not fit on one floppy disc, a sort was done after all issues of one journal were entered. A printout of this sort was then used to determine whether a title had been entered and the record was updated to include the journal and date. For titles not previously entered, a new record was created. After the fourth journal was entered and sorted, this researcher compiled the information with the use of the printout.

CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis of Data

Data for analysis for this research were compiled according to the number of titles reviewed by all four selected reviewing sources, by three of the selected reviewing sources, by two of the selected reviewing sources, and by only one of the selected reviewing sources. A compilation was also made of the fiction and nonfiction books and the number of publishers represented by those titles which were reviewed by all four selected reviewing sources.

Information compiled was analyzed for purposes of comparison to Zena Sutherland's study of 1965 reviewing of juvenile titles. The research study presented here analyzed six months of reviewing as opposed to the twelve months of reviewing analyzed by Sutherland. Statistical results of both studies were converted to percentages so that the difference in time span would not be a factor in comparing results of the two studies.

This researcher found a total of 1,592 different titles in 2,384 reviews among the four selected reviewing sources from July to December, 1983. Table 1 presents an analysis by reviewing source of the number and percentage of titles reviewed in one or more sources. Percentages displayed are based on the number of titles each source reviewed when divided by the total number of titles in each category.

Table 1
Number and Percent of Reviews by Reviewing Source

Reviewing Source	Titles Reviewed in 4 Sources		Titles Reviewed in 3 Sources		Titles Reviewed in 2 Sources		Titles Reviewed in 1 Source	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<u>SLJ</u>	27	100.0	128	97.0	392	86.2	648	66.3
<u>BL</u>	27	100.0	108	81.8	337	74.1	226	23.1
<u>HB</u>	27	100.0	44	33.3	33	7.3	28	2.9
<u>BCCB</u>	27	100.0	116	87.9	140	30.8	76	7.8

Of the total number of titles reviewed, SLJ reviewed the most with 1195, followed by BL with 698, HB with 132, and BCCB with 359. SLJ's attempt to review all children's publishing is evident here in that it reviewed more titles than the other three sources combined. BL, even with its selective reviewing policy had a substantial number of reviews especially when compared with BCCB and HB.

The number and percentage of the 1,592 titles reviewed in one or more of the four sources were as follows:

Titles reviewed by 4 sources	27	1.7%
Titles reviewed by 3 sources	132	8.3%
Titles reviewed by 2 sources	455	29.0%
Titles reviewed by 1 source	978	61.0%

The first hypothesis, "five percent or more of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the

selected reviewing sources will be reviewed by all four sources," was rejected. Titles reviewed by all four of the selected reviewing sources were found to be 27 or 1.7 percent of the total titles reviewed. The first four hypotheses of this study were based on the Sutherland study with the assumption being that reviewing coverage would have increased somewhat, if not dramatically, in the intervening years since 1965. Sutherland's study revealed 4 percent of the total titles reviewed were reviewed by all four of the reviewing sources.⁴⁵ The percent (1.7) of titles found in this research which were reviewed by all four reviewing sources falls far below the predicted 5 percent and far below the 4 percent found in the Sutherland study.

Hypothesis two, "ten percent or more of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources will be reviewed by three of the four sources," was rejected. Sutherland found that 10 percent of the total titles reviewed fell into this category.⁴⁶ This researcher found that only 8.3 percent of the total titles reviewed were reviewed by three of the four reviewing sources. As shown in Table 1, SLJ reviewed the most titles in this category with 128, however, BCCB with 116 titles and BL with 108 titles were close behind.

⁴⁵ Sutherland, "Current reviewing," p. 115.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

HB was last with only 44 titles reviewed in this category. In fact, HB was last in the number of titles reviewed in all categories except those reviewed by all four sources.

The third hypothesis, "twenty percent or more of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources will be reviewed by two of the four sources," was accepted. This researcher found that 29 percent of the total number of titles reviewed were reviewed by two of the four reviewing sources. Sutherland found 20 percent coverage of titles in this category.⁴⁷ SLJ reviewed the most titles in this category with 392 titles. BL was second with 337 titles reviewed, BCCB was third with 140 titles reviewed, and HB was last with 33 titles reviewed in this category. Of the 455 titles reviewed by two of the four reviewing sources, SLJ and BL together reviewed 288 titles or 63.3 percent.

The fourth hypothesis, "sixty-five percent or more of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, in the selected reviewing sources will be reviewed by only one of the four sources," was rejected. This research revealed that 61 percent of the total titles reviewed were reviewed in only one source. The Sutherland study found 65 percent in this category. Again, SLJ reviewed the most titles in this category with 658. BL was second with 226. BCCB was third with 76,

⁴⁷ Ibid.

and HB was last with 28. Eighty-nine percent of the 978 titles reviewed by only one source were reviewed by either SLJ or BL.

Hypothesis five, "of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, by all four of the selected reviewing sources, 25 percent or more will be nonfiction and 60 percent or more will be fiction," was accepted. The percentages of nonfiction and fiction titles found in this research were 29.6 percent and 70.4 percent respectively. Zena Sutherland's percentages were extremely close to these. Percentages of nonfiction and fiction books produced by her research were 29.7 percent and 70.2 percent respectively.⁴⁸

Hypothesis six, "of the juvenile books reviewed from July to December, 1983, by all four of the selected reviewing sources, sixteen or more publishers will be represented," was accepted. Of the approximately 200 publishers of juvenile books,⁴⁹ seventeen were represented by the 27 titles which were reviewed by all four reviewing sources. This hypothesis was based on the fact that Zena Sutherland found 32 publishers represented by 94 titles which were reviewed by all four sources over a twelve month period.⁵⁰ Since this

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Literary Market Place, 1984 (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1983), pp. 150-51.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 116.

research was based on a six month period of time, Sutherland's results were halved in the formulation of hypothesis six for this research.

As a matter of personal curiosity, a compilation was made of the number of titles which were published in paperback form. Of the 1,592 titles reviewed, 315 titles or 19.8 percent were published in paperback. SLJ reviewed the largest number of titles in paperback with 255 titles. BL was second with 97 titles, BCCB was third with 22 titles, and HB was last with 8 titles published in paperback.

Also as a matter of curiosity, this researcher compared the promptness of reviewing among the four reviewing sources. Table 2 displays the data for the four reviewing sources with the number of reviews each had published first, second, third, and fourth. Of the 27 titles reviewed by all four reviewing sources, BL was the most prompt with 22 first reviews. SLJ was second with 8 first reviews, HB and BCCB tied for third each with 5 first reviews. The total of first reviews is greater than the number of titles reviewed by all four reviewing sources because if two sources tied for the first review, both were given credit for it. That method was also applied to compilations of second, third, and fourth reviewing positions. Although BCCB had the same number of first reviews as HB, the fact that it had more reviews in fourth place, makes it the least prompt of the four reviewing sources.

Table 2
Promptness of Reviews of the Four Reviewing Sources

Reviewing Source	First Review	Second Review	Third Review	Fourth Review
<u>SLJ</u>	8	8	7	4
<u>BL</u>	22	4	1	0
<u>HB</u>	5	11	5	6
<u>BCCB</u>	5	9	2	11

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions, Recommendations and Summary

Conclusions

The purpose of this research study was to determine the coverage of the four major reviewing media used by school library media specialists and to analyze changes in patterns for reviewing juvenile books by the "Big Four" reviewing sources since Zena Sutherland's research in 1965. Table 3 presents a comparison of the results of the two studies.

Table 3

A Comparison of 1965 and 1983 Reviewing
by Four Major Reviewing Sources

Reviewing Sources		Reviews in 3 Sources		Reviews in 2 Sources		Reviews in 1 Source	
		*1965	**1983	1965	1983	1965	1983
<u>SLJ</u>	#	211	128	405	392	927	648
	%	88.7	97.0	86.9	86.2	61.8	66.3
<u>BL</u>	#	198	108	203	337	139	226
	%	83.2	81.8	43.6	74.1	9.3	23.1
<u>HB</u>	#	176	44	175	33	85	28
	%	73.9	33.3	37.6	7.3	5.7	2.9
<u>BCCB</u>	#	129	116	149	140	350	76
	%	54.2	87.9	32.0	30.8	23.3	7.8

*Represents twelve months of reviewing.

**Represents six months of reviewing.

First analysis of the data seems to indicate that reviewing coverage of newly published titles had decreased in comparison to Zena Sutherland's 1965 study. The number of titles reviewed by all four reviewing sources was much smaller than expected. One factor that might explain this phenomenon is that SLJ and BL are reviewing more titles than in the past. Numbers presented in Table 3 indicate that SLJ and BL reviewed more titles in 1983 than in 1965 in every category. The reader should be reminded that the 1983 statistics represent six months of reviewing while the 1965 statistics represent twelve months of reviewing. BCCB also tended to review more titles in 1983 than in 1965, however, its reviewing pattern is erratic and inconclusive.

HB, on the other hand, appears to have significantly decreased its reviewing coverage of newly published titles. As indicated in Table 3, HB's percentage of reviews in 1983 as compared to 1965 is down by at least 50 percent in all three categories. This fact could help explain why the percentage of titles reviewed by all four reviewing sources is lower than in Sutherland's study. No reason for HB's decline in the number of titles reviewed could be determined without further study. A drop in the number of reviews in one source could have a dramatic effect on this category of analysis. HB's lower reviewing output combined with SLJ's and BL's increase in reviewing output had an effect on the percentages exhibited in each category.

The effect of varying time lags among the appearance of reviews for titles among the four reviewing sources is a difficult factor to assess. The time lag causes one to question the claim by SLJ to review virtually all children's books published. SLJ generally was not as prompt in its reviewing of titles as BL. (See Table 2) Differences in the reviewing process of the two sources could account for the difference in promptness of reviewing. SLJ enlists persons in the field for reviewing while BL employs a staff of reviewers. BL's method of reviewing probably is more prompt than SLJ's method of reviewing. That time lag might be distorting the results of this research. However, since the Sutherland study would have experienced the same phenomenon, this fact does not distort the comparability of the two studies.

The results of the research seem to indicate that the broad scope of children's reviewing has not changed significantly since the Sutherland study of 1965. In fact, some results were strikingly similar to the results of the Sutherland study, as in the case of the fiction and nonfiction books and the number of publishers represented by titles reviewed by all four reviewing sources. The category of titles reviewed by three of the four reviewing sources and the category of titles reviewed by only one of the four reviewing sources were within five percentage points of those same categories in the 1965 study. The category of titles reviewed by all of the four reviewing sources was less than half of the

same category in the 1965 study, a disappointing statistic for the media specialist trying to glean as much support as possible for selection choices. The only category of comparison to the 1965 study which had a significant increase was the category of titles reviewed by three of the four reviewing sources. This fact gives further credence to the effect that HB's diminished reviewing output might have had on the category of titles reviewed by all four reviewing sources.

Sutherland's conclusion was that "no journal gives complete coverage, and no one of the four so intensively scrutinized is without some flaws."⁵¹ This 1983 research tends to support that statement; however, complete coverage may be an impossibility in view of the 2500 to 3000 children's books published annually.⁵² SLJ certainly seems to approach reviewing everything published in light of the 1195 children's reviews credited to it over the six month period scrutinized in the 1983 research. Apparent to this researcher is the fact that SLJ and BL make a strong combination for media specialists seeking more than one review for a selection choice. Together, the two sources represented 79 percent of the reviewing, thus

⁵¹ Sutherland, "Current Reviewing," p. 116.

⁵² Joanne O'Hare and Betty Sun, eds., The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information (New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1982), p. 385.

the validity of their wide use among media specialists is supported by this research.

Media specialists need to be familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of each reviewing source. While SLJ gives more complete reviewing coverage than the other three selected reviewing sources, it is not the most prompt. BL tends to be the most prompt of the selected reviewing sources but by policy it does not attempt to review everything that is published. BCCB tends to be the least prompt of the four selected reviewing sources, and as exhibited in this research, HB's reviewing coverage of all that is published is very low.

The conclusion of this researcher is that although the broad picture of juvenile reviewing does not seem to have changed significantly since 1965, certain aspects of it have changed. Media specialists need to be alert to these changes and to the characteristics of the selection tools used by them.

Recommendations

Speaking about her research findings in a keynote speech in 1974, Sutherland proposed the need for some cooperative method of distribution of reviewing among the reviewing sources.⁵³ This proposition was prompted by Sutherland's findings that review coverage was lacking and that there was a need for a more complete and cooperative effort among the four

⁵³ Sutherland, "Book Reviews: Before and After," p. 23.

selected reviewing sources than was being carried out at that time. In view of the current research results, this researcher would have to concur with that statement. In a time of tighter budgets and more demands on education, media specialists can ill afford to make uneducated purchases of materials which will be incorporated into a media center. Although the two reviewing journals most used by media specialists, SLJ and BL, were found to be a strong pair in review coverage of newly published titles, the coverage was far from complete. The results of this research support the use of SLJ and BL by media specialists but also signals to them that other sources, perhaps many other sources, may need to be consulted in the selection process.

Cooperative distribution of reviews by the reviewing sources seems an unrealistic solution to the problem of review coverage. The likelihood that competitive entities such as reviewing sources will ever come together in a cooperative effort at providing complete review coverage seems remote. Not so unrealistic, however, is the possibility of using data bases to provide reviewing information to media specialists via microcomputers. The major hinderances to the use of multiple review sources by media specialists are time and money. A data base in which reviews are entered by the various reviewing sources might be a cost effective way for media specialists to make selection decisions. This method certainly would be a time saver. With ever increasing availability of

microcomputers in media centers, this possibility of review accessibility seems to be a realistic one for the future.

This research study was fairly straightforward in its approach to date gathering. Once the areas from which data were to be gathered were defined, the process had few ambiguous areas. One difficulty was the determination of age levels which are considered by publishers to fall into the "juvenile" category. This researcher was unable to produce a definitive definition of the term "juvenile" in the literature nor from Zena Sutherland herself. Lacking that information, arbitrary age ranges were imposed based on evidence found in the literature and on editorial practice by reviewing sources.

Perhaps an appropriate piece of related research might have to do with time lags in reviewing of new titles among the four sources which were scrutinized in this study. Results of the current research were affected by time differentials in the reviewing process. Although this research attempted to determine which sources were most prompt in reviewing new titles, an in-depth study of this process might shed more light on the results of this study. Choosing a selected list of titles reviewed in one source and checking the other three sources for reviews over a period of time--perhaps a year--might yield some interesting results relating to the coverage of reviewing among the four sources. This researcher believes coverage to be more complete than actually revealed by this study and differing time lags could be a major contributor

to the outcome of the current research. The use of Sutherland's methodology prohibited such an approach for the current research because the comparability of the two studies would have been destroyed.

Another related research study might be conducted to determine whether the "Big Four" is still intact. The four selected reviewing sources for this study have been considered to be the most used sources by school library media specialists. The statistics discovered by this research concerning HB's review coverage might cause its status in the "Big Four" to be questioned. Other more recent publications may have taken over this distinction.

Paperback book publishing was investigated briefly by this research but offers the possibility for more in-depth investigation. Of particular interest might be the number of titles now originally published in paperback as opposed to those paperbacks which are reissues of previously published titles.

Summary

This research study was based on the 1965 research conducted by Zena Sutherland concerning the review coverage of newly published titles by School Library Journal, Booklist, Horn Book, and Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books. Sutherland's 1965 research analyzed the four selected reviewing sources to determine the number of titles which were reviewed

by all four selected reviewing sources, by three of the four selected reviewing sources, by two of the four selected reviewing sources, and by only one of the four selected reviewing sources. She also analyzed the publishers and the number of fiction and nonfiction titles which were represented by titles reviewed by all four reviewing sources. Sutherland's research revealed that out of 2,299 titles reviewed, 94 were reviewed by all four of the selected reviewing sources, 238 were reviewed by three of the four selected reviewing sources, 466 were reviewed by two of the four selected reviewing sources, and 1,501 were reviewed by only one of the four reviewing sources. Of the 94 titles reviewed by all four selected reviewing sources, twenty-eight of the titles were nonfiction and thirty-two publishers were represented.

For this research, six months of reviewing was analyzed covering the time period from July to December, 1983. A microcomputer data base program was used for entering and compiling data from the four selected reviewing sources. Data entered were title, publisher, the journal name and date, whether the title was fiction or nonfiction, and whether the title was published in paperback. A printout was used for compiling the research data.

Results of this research revealed that out of a total 1,592 titles reviewed, 27 were reviewed by all four of the selected reviewing sources, 132 titles were reviewed by three of the four selected reviewing sources, 455 titles were reviewed by

two of the four selected reviewing sources, and 978 titles were reviewed by only one of the four selected reviewing sources. Of the 27 titles which were reviewed by all four of the selected reviewing sources, 8 titles were nonfiction. Of these 27 titles, 17 publishers were represented. Data concerning the promptness of reviewing among the four selected reviewing sources revealed that BL was the most prompt while BCCB was the least prompt. This research also found 315 or 19.8 percent of the 1,592 titles were published in paperback.

Conclusions were that review coverage by the four selected reviewing sources has not changed significantly since the Sutherland study. SLJ and BL exhibited the most comprehensive review coverage of the four selected reviewing sources and together these two sources reviewed a high percentage of newly published titles. Media specialists need to be aware of the characteristics of the review media being used. This research could be of use to media specialists in choosing selection tools among the reviewing sources.

Bibliography

Periodicals

- Busha, Charles. "Book Selection in Public Libraries: An Evaluation of Four Commonly-Used Review Media." Southeastern Librarian, 18 (Summer 1968), 92-100.
- Grannis, Chandler B. "U.S. Title Output, Average Prices: Final Figures for 1982." Publisher's Weekly, 224 (September 1983), 29.
- Jones, Trevelyn E. "Annual Policy Statement '83." School Library Journal, 30 (September 1983), 99.
- Silver, Linda R. "Criticism, Reviewing, and the Library Review Media." Top of the News, 35 (Winter 1979), 123-130.
- Sutherland, Zena Bailey. "Book Reviews: Before & After." School Library Journal, 21 (February 1975), 22-23.
- , "Current Reviewing of Children's Books." Library Quarterly, 37 (January 1967), 110-118.
- Tunis, John R. "What Is a Juvenile Book?" Horn Book, 44 (June 1968), 307-310.
- Weber, Rosemary. "The Reviewing of Children's and Young Adult Books in 1977." Top of the News, 35 (Winter 1979), 131-137.
- Witucke, Virginia. "A Comparative Analysis of Juvenile Book Review Media." School Media Quarterly, 8 (Spring 1980), 153-160.
- , "The Performance of Juvenile Book Review Media." Serials Review, 8 (Spring 1982), 49-54.

Books

- Carter, Mary Duncan. Building Library Collections. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1969.
- Cullinan, Bernice E. Literature and the Child. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1981.
- Darling, Richard L. The Rise of Children's Book Reviewing. New York: Bowker, 1968.
- Huus, Helen, ed. Evaluating Books for Children and Young People. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1968.
- Kamerman, Sylvia E., ed. Book Reviewing. Boston: The Writer, Inc., 1974.
- Literary Market Place, 1984. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1983.
- O'Hare Joanne, and Betty Sun, comp. and ed. The Bowker Annual of Library & Book Trade Information. New York: Bowker, 1982.
- Woolf, Virginia. Reviewing. London: Hogarth Press, 1939.

Letter

- Grannis, Chandler B. Letter to author. 8 November 1983.

Reviewing Journals

- Booklist. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Horn Book. Boston: Horn Book Incorporated.
- School Library Journal. New York: R. R. Bowker Co.

APPENDIX A

FIELDS ESTABLISHED FOR VISIFILE DATABASE

FILE=RESEARCH			
FIELD NAME	TYPE	START	LENGTH
-----	-----	-----	-----
TITLE.....	A.....	6.....	30
PUBLISHER.....	A.....	36.....	8
JOURNAL/DATE.....	A.....	44.....	8
NONFICTION.....	A.....	52.....	1
PAPERBACK.....	A.....	53.....	1

APPENDIX B

CODES USED FOR ENTERING DATA

JOURNAL/DATE FIELD

- A School Library Journal
- B Booklist
- C Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books
- D Horn Book

- 0 July
- 1 August
- 2 September
- 3 September 15
- 4 October
- 5 October 15
- 6 November
- 7 November 15
- 8 December
- 9 December 15

NONFICTION/FICTION FIELD

- N Nonfiction
- F Fiction

PAPERBACK FIELD

- P Paperback

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE OF TITLE ENTRIES

REC#	TITLE	PUBLISHE	JOURNAL/	N	P
1	CARSICK ZEBRA AND OTHER ANIMAL	HOLIDAY	A1D1		
2	WORD DETECTIVE:WORDS AND SENTE	USBORNE	A1		
3	MOONCAKE	PREN-HAL	A1C4D2		
4	COLLECTION OF FAVORITE NURSERY	GROSSET	A1		
5	PEAR BY ITSELF, A	CHILDREN	A1		
6	PLEASE, WIND?	CHILDREN	A1		
7	RAIN! RAIN!	CHILDREN	A1		
8	SNOW JOE	CHILDREN	A1		
9	ONE WHOLE DOUGHNUT, ONE DOUGHN	CHILDREN	A1		
10	PETER PAN	RANDOM	A1		
11	BUTTERFLIES AND RAINBOWS	BANDE HO	A1		
12	FOUR VALENTINES IN A RAINSTORM	CROWELL	A1		
13	MARY BETTY LIZZIE MCNUTT'S BIR	CROWELL	A1		
14	ARTHUR'S APRIL FOOL	ATL:LITT	A1		P
15	ALFRED, THE DRAGON WHO LOST HI	THREE TR	A1		
16	TRAVELING MEN OF BALLYCOO, THE	HBJ	A1		
17	HOUSES	CHILDREN	A1		
18	STRANGERS	CHILDREN	A1		
19	I HATE MY BROTHER HARRY	HARPER	A1		
20	LET'S EAT/ALLONS MANGER!	KIDS CAN	A1		P
21	FARM HOUSE	LITTLE S	A1		
22	FIREHOUSE	LITTLE S	A1		
23	MOTHER GOOSE HOUSE	LITTLE S	A1		
24	MOUSE HOUSE	LITTLE S	A1		
25	CHICKEN STEW	PELHAM/M	A1		
26	ANIMAL HEDGE, THE	DUTTON	A1		
27	KILLER SNAKES	HOLIDAY	A1		
28	BINKY GETS A CAR	CLARION	A1D1		
29	MR. WINK AND HIS SHADOWN, NED	HARPER	A1		
30	CULLY CULLY AND THE BEAR	GREENWIL	A1D2		
31	GIT ALONG, OLD SCUDDER	LOTHROP	A1D1		
32	STAR BOY	BRADBURY	A1C1		
33	ROUND FISH, FLATFISH AND OTHER	CROWN	A1D1		
34	SLUGS	LITTLE	A1		P
35	NORTHERN ALPHABET, A	TUNDRA	A1		
36	PIRATE WHO TRIED TO CAPTURE TH	HARPER	A1		
37	IT'S A SHAME ABOUT THE RAIN:TH	HUMAN SC	A1D2		
38	BOOK OF OPPOSITES	DOUBLEDA	A1		
39	BOOK OF TOYS	DOUBLEDA	A1		
40	COUNTING AND COLORS BOOK	DOUBLEDA	A1		