

VOLUME 45

ISSUE 6


NOVEMBER 2019

THE
Journal OF
Academic
Librarianship



website : <http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jacalib/>

EESM
BOOKSTORE
Telefax (02)905-2351 / 930-9728
CP# 09052849354



THE
JOURNAL OF
ACADEMIC
LIBRARIANSHIP

Vol. 45, Iss. 6, November 2019



ELSEVIER

Amsterdam • Boston • London • New York • Oxford • Paris • Philadelphia • San Diego • St. Louis

THE
Journal OF
Academic
Librarianship

November 2019

REGULAR ARTICLES

- Beg, borrow, and steal: Formal and informal access to the scholarly literature at U.S. master's universities**
William H. Walters 102059
- Examining differences and similarities between graduate and undergraduate students' user satisfaction with digital libraries**
Fang Xu and Jia Tina Du 102072
- Evaluating journal quality by integrating department journal lists in a developing country: Are they representative?**
Jing Li, Xiaoli Lu, Jianping Li and Dengsheng Wu 102067
- Language style matching as a measure of librarian/patron engagement in email reference transactions**
Ann Agee 102069

- Predatory and exploitative behaviour in academic publishing: An assessment**
Jaime A. Teixeira da Silva, Judit Dobránszki, Panagiotis Tsigaris and Aceil Al-Khatib 102071
- An examination of formal mentoring relationships in librarianship**
Alyse Jordan 102068

COLUMNS

- The Academic Library and the Common Read: A Multitude of Possibilities for Collaboration With Campus Programs and Departments**
Katelyn Angell 102019





Beg, borrow, and steal: Formal and informal access to the scholarly literature at U.S. master's universities

William H. Walters

Mary Alice & Tom O'Malley Library, Manhattan College, 4513 Manhattan College Parkway, Riverdale, NY 10471, USA



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Access
Articles
Books
Faculty
Retrieval
Scholarly communication

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the methods by which faculty obtain scholarly articles, books, and chapters. It focuses on full-text retrieval rather than discovery, drawing on a survey of 529 full-time faculty at U.S. colleges and universities in the Carnegie *master's—large* and *master's—medium* categories. When seeking articles, faculty rely mainly on their home-institution library collections, freely accessible online resources, and interlibrary loan. The situation is different for books, however; faculty most often purchase the books they need. Despite the continuing importance of formal access mechanisms (home-institution library collections and interlibrary loan), faculty rely on other sources of full text—informal access mechanisms—for 50% of the articles and 66% of the books they use. Nearly 25% get more articles from the open web than from any other source, and substantial minorities report heavy reliance on other sources. In particular, faculty sometimes use other libraries, often relying on current or past affiliations (e.g., part-time teaching) or on the user accounts of family, friends, and colleagues. Many are critical of their university library collections, but most are satisfied with freely accessible online resources and interlibrary loan.

Introduction

Most studies of scholars' information-seeking strategies focus on the methods by which they discover or identify potentially relevant documents. The methods they use to actually retrieve, obtain, or access full-text books and articles are generally not discussed. (See, for example, Davis, 2004; Flaxbart, 2001; Gil, 2016; Robbins, Engel, & Kulp, 2011; and Rupp-Serrano & Robbins, 2013.) Although the retrieval of full-text documents is often integrated into the search process—through link resolvers, for instance—the methods used to retrieve documents do not necessarily coincide with the mechanisms used to identify them. For example, an article identified through EconLit may be obtained through a full-text database/collection, an Open Access (OA) archive, the library's print collection, interlibrary loan, the collection of a nearby research library, a personal subscription, the author's web site, or a request sent to a colleague.

This study focuses on retrieval rather than discovery, examining the methods faculty use to obtain (i.e., access or retrieve) scholarly articles, books, and chapters. Using data from a survey of 529 full-time faculty at colleges and universities in the Carnegie *master's—large* and *master's—medium* categories, the analysis addresses four research questions:

1. To what extent do faculty rely on sources of full text other than

library collections and interlibrary loan (ILL)—in particular, on freely accessible web resources, personal subscriptions/purchases, departmental subscriptions, and documents received from authors and colleagues? To what extent do they rely on library collections other than those of their home institutions?

2. Are there distinct groups of faculty who rely heavily on particular sources of full text? Are those faculty notable in terms of discipline, academic rank, or gender?
3. What access mechanisms allow faculty to use libraries other than those of their home institutions? Is access granted due to a current affiliation (e.g., part-time teaching, consulting, or enrollment), a previous affiliation, the affiliation of a friend or colleague, the payment of membership or use fees, or other mechanisms?
4. Are respondents' written comments consistent with their other survey responses? Do their comments provide additional insight into their use of libraries, freely accessible online resources, and other sources of articles and books?

For our purposes, the library collections and ILL services of the respondent's home institution are regarded as *formal* access mechanisms. Librarians, patrons, and vendors have traditionally regarded these formal mechanisms as the primary means by which scholarly books and articles are obtained. In contrast, *informal* access mechanisms are those

E-mail address: william.walters@manhattan.edu.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacalib.2019.102059>

Received 8 July 2019; Received in revised form 14 August 2019; Accepted 15 August 2019

Available online 27 August 2019

0099-1333/ © 2019 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.



ELSEVIER

The Journal of Academic Librarianship

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jacalib

Examining differences and similarities between graduate and undergraduate students' user satisfaction with digital libraries

Fang Xu^a, Jia Tina Du^{b,*}^a No.199, Renai Road, Suzhou Dushu Lake Higher Education District, School of Social Science, Soochow University, Suzhou, Jiangsu 215123, China^b School of Information Technology and Mathematical Sciences, University of South Australia, GPO BOX 2471, Adelaide, SA 5001, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Digital libraries
 Information system success theory
 TAM
 Affinity theory
 User satisfaction
 Comparative study

ABSTRACT

Informed by the theories of Information System Success, Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Affinity, this study aims to explore the differences and similarities between graduate and undergraduate students' satisfaction with digital libraries (DLs). Descriptive statistics and One-way ANOVA were employed to analyse 426 valid responses collected from a survey. The results indicated that compared with undergraduate students, graduate students were more satisfied with digital libraries' system quality, information quality, and service quality, affinity, perceived ease of use, and perceived usefulness. Individual differences of users, such as age, frequency of use and use experience, had a significant impact on undergraduate and graduate students' satisfaction with digital libraries. University librarians and service providers should notice the similarities and differences between undergraduate and graduate students' satisfaction with digital libraries, and improve the system, information and service quality of digital libraries to increase the perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness, and digital libraries' affinity, thus to enhance user satisfactions.

Introduction

As a logical extension of a physical library in the digital information society, digital libraries can be regarded as a collection of digital information resources, including various types of electronic databases and serials, and networked information resources, which can provide users with relevant services through information and communication technologies (ICTs) (Heradio, Fernandez-Amoros, Cabrerizo, & Herrera-Viezmá, 2012). Therefore, the development of digital libraries and the information behaviour of digital library users will inevitably be affected by information technologies. In recent years, some new technologies such as big data (Li, Jiao, Zhang, & Xu, 2019), cloud computing, mobile Internet, and artificial intelligence (Wang, 2017) have emerged, which have pushed digital libraries to make great progress. At the same time, the use of digital libraries has increased significantly (Kennedy & Dunn, 2018; Thong, Hong, & Tam, 2002).

In China, digital libraries have developed rapidly since the release of the China Academic Library and Information System (CALIS) program in 1998. Nowadays, almost all Chinese universities have digital library websites. In recent years, due to the popularity of tablet computers, smart phones and other mobile reading devices, increasingly digital libraries are adopting existing mobile technologies to provide mobile services to meet the diverse needs of users for mobile reading (Zha,

Zhang, Li, & Yang, 2016). However, a growing number of studies have found that college students prefer to use search engines like Google and Baidu (the most popular search engine in China) rather than digital library websites to obtain information resources, because the former is more convenient and easier to use, and has the function of search term suggestion and search result ranking (Du & Evans, 2011; Joo & Choi, 2015; Kim & Sin, 2011). Although students perceive online digital library information resources and associated services to be more reliable, they still prefer to use search engines to quickly find information needed for completing their school assignments, course papers, and theses or dissertations (Connaway, Dickey, & Radford, 2011).

Many college students including undergraduate and graduate students are digital natives who have been born and raised in digital environments, are familiar with using digital devices and are satisfied with creating and sharing new information within a virtual space (Joo, Park, & Shin, 2017). The way they find, obtain and use information is fundamentally different from that of previous generations (Prensky, 2001).

Another important fact that should be noticed is that nowadays university students, regardless of educational level like undergraduate or graduate, are provided with a uniform interface and the same services in digital libraries. This may not meet the diversified needs and behaviour preferences of students with different educational and

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: tina.du@unisa.edu.au (J.T. Du).



Evaluating journal quality by integrating department journal lists in a developing country: Are they representative?

Jing Li^a, Xiaoli Lu^b, Jianping Li^{c,d}, Dengsheng Wu^{c,*}

^a School of Information Management, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, PR China

^b National Geological Library of China, Beijing 100083, PR China

^c Institutes of Science and Development, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, PR China

^d University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, PR China



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Journal evaluation
Journal ranking
Weighted average percentile
Department journal list
Research evaluation

ABSTRACT

The appraisal of research output is of particular interest to scholars and academic administrators, and the career success of academicians is partially dependent on the journals in which their manuscripts are published. Department journal lists (DJLs) which are reflective of the priorities of the schools that created them, are a frequently used criterion for promotion and tenure (P&T) decision in academic departments. Although previous studies have employed DJLs in the assessment of faculty publications, the sample population has been restricted to developed countries rather than developing countries. This study empirically investigated the characteristics (e.g., journal scope, ranking schemes) of the DJLs currently used by Chinese business and management (B&M) schools. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work that shows how do Chinese academia recognize the quality of English-language journals, as well as the difference between the Chinese and Western academicians regarding the recognition of journal quality. Our findings indicated that a major difference exists not only across Chinese B&M schools but also between China and the developed countries, i.e. the top-level journals were likely underrated by Chinese B&M community, and those journals at the medium-level journals were likely overrated by Chinese B&M community. Some suggestions will inform librarians on practices associated with the process of DJL compiled and research evaluation.

Introduction

Journal evaluation is an important research policy in an academic institution and often used by multiple parties for tenure decisions, grant funding, annual evaluation et al. (Bales, Hubbard, Sare, & Olivarez, 2019; Meredith, Steward, & Lewis, 2011; Mingers & Yang, 2017; Schmied, Byland, & Lienhard, 2018). In recent years the number of scholarly outlets has largely increased which is a burden of academic assessment. Accordingly, it is possible to improve the speed and efficiency of assessment processes, school administrators, i.e., deans, are motivated to construct departmental journal lists (DJLs) as a guide for evaluating faculty research (Beets, Lewis, & Brower, 2016; Reinstein & Calderon, 2006; Walker, Fleischman, & Stephenson, 2010). In developed countries, DJLs are used in some colleges and universities, but also depending on the subject. According to a survey, Business schools seems to prefer internal journal lists (Bales et al., 2019). In 2008, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) encouraged business schools to develop internal journal lists, because

such lists provide the benefit of clear and effective enumeration of the journals in which school administrators encourage faculty publication (Beets et al., 2016; Walker et al., 2010). It is similar in the developing country, e.g. China. According to our survey, almost all of 137 universities with government funding have created their internal journal lists as indicators of institutional standards for faculty performance. Unfortunately, there is little research on the sample of Chinese academic institutions. In recent years, China has been attracting increasing attention globally because of its economic growth and scientific achievements. Therefore, the population sample in China may be a good representative of developing countries to research on the practical assessment of journal quality.

DJLs provide a clear journal list and each Journal in the DJLs are given specific tiers, e.g. "A+, A, A-, B+" to indicate high, moderate, low, or unacceptable in quality (Adams & Johnson, 2008). From an applied perspective, DJLs are reflective of the practical assessment of journal quality used in actual academic environments (Van Fleet, McWilliams, & Siegel, 2000). Nonetheless, the construction of such

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: wds@casipm.ac.cn (D. Wu).



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

The Journal of Academic Librarianship

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jacalib

Predatory and exploitative behaviour in academic publishing: An assessment



Jaime A. Teixeira da Silva^{a,*}, Judit Dobránszki^{b,*}, Panagiotis Tsigaris^{c,*}, Aceil Al-Khatib^{d,*}

^a P. O. Box 7, Miki-cho Post Office, Ikenobe 3011-2, Kagawa-ken 761-0799, Japan

^b Research Institute of Nyíregyháza, IAREF, University of Debrecen, P.O. Box 12, Nyíregyháza H-4400, Hungary

^c 805 TRU Way, Department of Economics, Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops, British Columbia V2C 0C8, Canada

^d Faculty of Dentistry, Jordan University of Science and Technology, P. O. Box 3030, Irbid 22110, Jordan

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Beall
Blacklists
Deontological ethics
Exploitation
Predatory behaviour
Whitelists

ABSTRACT

The issue of “predatory” publishing continues to affect many scholars around the world who publish. When one reads the fairly vast literature surrounding “predatory” publishing, there is an erroneous tendency to continue pivoting around Jeffrey Beall’s blacklists of “predatory” open access (OA) journals and publishers. However, to be “predatory” involves much more than defining a handful of select behaviours, and it is becoming increasingly important to start defining, or curtailing, the lexicon to avoid referring to any journal or publisher that might display one of the following qualities (exploitative, deceptive, excessive, unscrupulous, abusive, advantageous, manipulative, profit-seeking, or others) as synonymously meaning “predatory”. This paper focuses mainly on the oft-interchangeable terms “predatory” and “exploitation”, and explores the morality of predatory and exploitative actions by applying a deontological ethics approach which implies that certain actions are wrong even if they achieve good consequences, with the understanding that because a predatory entity aims to exploit others, these actions would be considered morally wrong from a deontologist’s perspective. In articulating our argument, we attempt to expand the conversation around this important topic, with the hope that it might bring additional clarity to the issue of what might constitute a “predatory” journal or publisher.

“Predatory” publishers still exist, but without an exact definition of what they are

The debate surrounding “predatory” journals, publishers or publishing, especially within the context of open access (OA), rages on. This issue becomes increasingly important as the publishing industry swivels towards a state of fully OA, especially in the EU, by 2020,¹ and as competition increases for an annual €8 billion market for scientific publications.² Plan S, most likely the largest visionary plan for OA publishing globally, fails to mention or recognize the existence, potential threats and risks of “predatory” OA journals and publishers,³ weakening the implementation of the plan. As Green (2018) states, “Plan S will not deliver OA or solve the serials crisis”, even less if it fails to consider the issue of “predatory” publishing. Depending on the source of discussion about this topic, the definition might change, and there is a wide range between those that negate the existence of a

problem, offering misguided advice believing that the issue of “predatory” publishing deserves less attention and not more (Wager, 2017), others who feel that it is not a real phenomenon with clearly defined parameters or entities (Anderson, 2015; Berger, 2017; Eriksson & Helgesson, 2017; Reynolds, 2016), while staunch defenders and/or critics may be obsessed with the phenomenon to such an extent that they are no longer able to appreciate with clarity what it is they are dealing with, or describing (Strielkowski, 2017). Amaral (2018) referred to all publishing entities as being “predatory” – a radical viewpoint that does not represent the overwhelmingly positive aspects of academic publishing – while others have suggested that the term “predatory journals” be retired altogether (Anderson, 2015; Eriksson & Helgesson, 2018). Eriksson and Helgesson (2018) referred to such entities as “deceptive” while Anderson (2015) indicated that such entities operate in “bad faith”. In an extreme case, Umlauf and Mochizuki (2018) called for “predatory publishing” to be considered a cybercrime

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: jaimetex@yahoo.com (J.A. Teixeira da Silva), dobranszki@freemail.hu (J. Dobránszki), ptsigaris@tru.ca (P. Tsigaris), aceil@hotmail.com (A. Al-Khatib).

¹ <https://eua.eu/resources/publications/417:towards-full-open-access-in-2020.html> (June 29, 2017).

² <https://www.mpg.de/12138624/quality-control-in-science> (July 20, 2018).

³ <https://www.coalition-s.org/principles-and-implementation/> (no date; last accessed: August 18, 2019).



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

The Journal of Academic Librarianship

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jacalib

An examination of formal mentoring relationships in librarianship

Alyse Jordan

Arizona State University Library, 300 Orange Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85281-1006, United States of America



Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative study was to provide a description on formal mentoring relationships in the Library Leadership and Management Association (LLAMA) mentoring program. The LLAMA mentoring program is designed to assist mentees in exchanging knowledge and technical skills and to retain novice librarians, provide networking opportunities, and reinforce diversity. There is limited empirical research that addresses formal mentoring relationships in librarianship research (Boers, 1997; Kuyper-Rushing, 2001; Wojewodzki, Stein, & Richardson, 1998; Zhang, Deyoe, & Matveyeva, 2007). The significance of this study was twofold: (a) to explore relationships of LLAMA's former mentoring participants and (b) to investigate the careers of mentees after participating in a formal mentoring program. The results discuss the dynamics of the reported mentor-mentee relationships, contribute to formal mentoring literature, and specifically highlight formal mentorship relationships in librarianship.

Formal mentoring programs in workplaces or professional organizations may provide training, career development, emotional support, and diversity; however, available research in librarianship mentoring focuses heavily on informal mentorship. (Allen, 2007; Allen, Finkelstein, & Poteet, 2009). Consequently, empirical research addressing formal mentorship is examined in nursing, health care, business, and psychology literature more frequently than librarianship literature (Birch, Asiri, & de Gara, 2007; Finley, Ivanitskaya, & Kennedy, 2007; Harvey, McIntyre, Heames, & Moeller, 2009; Haynes & Ghosh, 2008; Hinkle & Kopp, 2006; Matuszek, Denni, & Schraeder, 2008; Sawatzky & Enns, 2009). Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, and Dubois (2008) stated, "The study of mentoring has generally been conducted within disciplinary silos with a specific type of mentoring relationship as a focus" (p. 254).

Eby et al. (2008) examined interpersonal relationships, motivation, and career mentoring outcomes. The authors formed six hypotheses in their examination of approximately 15,000 articles and reports addressing youth, academic, and workplace mentoring. The outcomes in mentoring from the six categories of mentoring were as follows: (a) behavioral, (b) attitudinal, (c) health related, (d) relational, (e) motivational, and (f) career. Furthermore, Eby et al. conducted interdisciplinary database searches in psychology, business, education, health, and medicine, and they concluded that mentoring does influence "workplace mentoring and career attitudes, work attitudes, and

some career outcomes" (p. 263). Their research does not clearly state which industry found a correlation between mentoring influencing career and work attitudes, and career outcomes. The present study sought to examine mentor-mentee relationships in a professional organization's formal mentoring program from 2010 to 2015.

Research problem

Librarians are retiring at a rapid rate. This investigation examined how to prepare entry-level and mid-career librarians for leadership positions in libraries and professional organizations. This study examined the formal mentoring program of mentor-mentee relationships of the LLAMA from 2010 to 2015. The rapid changes in librarianship personnel are the result of baby boomers retiring in large numbers (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016). The result is an increased need for leaders to fill vacant administrative positions. The U.S. Department for Professional Employees (2010) reported, "The current population of librarians is aging; 58% of librarians in the U.S. are projected to reach the retirement age of 65 between 2005 and 2019, while 40% of library directors plan to retire between 2007 and 2016" (p. 6). The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012) projected a 7% growth in numbers of librarians from 2012 to 2022 with an increased demand for librarians' skillset to include accessing electronic information. There is an increasing concern regarding retention of mid-career librarians. Subsequently, recruiting new librarians is critical to professional sustainability and growth.

Green (2008) stressed that, as baby boomers leave the workforce, a more diverse group of leaders will replace them in the 21st century. As long-term librarians leave, institutional memory and professional skills disappear. Savickas (2007) forecasted that organizations will continue to downsize, outsource, and retain a flat organizational structure; therefore, workers will need to be flexible and mobile in the 21st century to develop their careers. The purpose of the current study was to evaluate the relationships of mentees with their mentors and explore factors that contribute to mentees' career outcomes. The traditional model of mentoring originates from Greek mythology. A classic example is Homer's *Odyssey* (Barr, 1998; Eby, Rhodes, & Allen, 2007; Kram, 1985), in which an experienced individual guides a younger less experienced person. Mentoring examples vary historically from Homer's *Odyssey* to current librarians, pop icons, athletes, politicians, musicians, corporate executives, and educators (Eby et al., 2007). There are

E-mail address: alysjordan2013@gmail.com.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacalib.2019.102068>

Received 2 July 2019; Accepted 3 September 2019

Available online 22 October 2019

0099-1333/ © 2019 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.



Case studies

The Academic Library and the Common Read: A Multitude of Possibilities for Collaboration With Campus Programs and Departments



Katelyn Angell

Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus (LIU Brooklyn), United States of America

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Common read
Student engagement
Library outreach
First year students
Information literacy

ABSTRACT

The continued popularity of the common read within the first year curriculum invites critical campus partnerships between the academic library and a wide variety of campus departments. These can include Honors, Student Success, Academic Affairs, and Community Engagement. This paper describes the efforts of one First Year Success Librarian to collaboratively expand campus programming related to the common read. Specifics include planning events related to the book and its themes, creating learning objects for first year students and pedagogical tools for instructors, and holding a position of leadership in the common read committee. Additional examples from existing library and information scholarship and future ideas are shared as well, with the goal of assisting a diversity of campus stakeholders on how to best support common read initiatives.

LIU Brooklyn, a medium-sized urban university in Brooklyn, New York is one of hundreds of higher education institutions in the United States with a common read, or common reader, program. Penguin Random House (Diaz, 2018) documented over 500 common read programs at colleges and universities during the 2018–2019 school year. The widespread popularity of this important first-year program necessitates greater documentation within library and information science (LIS) literature of partnerships and programs academic libraries can initiate to become more involved in the campus common read.

Foreshadowing the expansion of common read programs, Ferguson (2006) explained their overarching appeal in 2006: “reading the same book brings people closer together as a community by creating ground for discussion” (n.p.). Through a common read students can engage both with each other and myriad academic and student affairs professionals. Ferguson goes on to illustrate one role the campus library can play in improving the common read experience for students: teaching them to research the book and its themes. While providing research instruction in this manner is an essential skill to teach new library users, it is just one of many steps that librarians can take to foster excitement and learning related to the common read.

In addition to teaching students critical information literacy skills using the common read as a jumping off point, librarians can also collaborate with a wide variety of campus departments to better incorporate a common read into the fabric of university life. This column will offer both a review of successful partnerships between a campus library and outside departments documented within LIS literature and ideas gleaned from the author's own professional practice as LIU

Brooklyn's First Year Success Librarian.

Colleges and universities differ regarding the targeted readership of a common read. Most administrations reserve a common read for the first-year population, while others opt for a university-wide program. Interestingly, there is also evidence of common reads for students planning to major in a specific discipline. Edington, Holmes Jr., and Reinke (2015) detail creative common read programs for first year engineering students at both the University of Michigan and University of Virginia. The common read program at the author's institution is for first-year students, and is embedded within a mandatory one-credit course titled First Year Seminar (FYS).

Academic librarians can and do play significant roles in selecting, promoting, and further supporting the common read. Librarians can have a key role in choosing a common read, typically by serving on a steering committee comprised of diverse campus stakeholders tasked with this activity. The author initially served as a member on the campus common read committee, which was co-chaired by the two coordinators of the Honors College. The other members on the committee are a mix of administrators and faculty in a wide range of disciplines. However, following the departure of one of the coordinators, the author was approved to replace her as co-chair. This type of assignment ensures that the library can play an important role in determining the common read, a duty well-suited to information professionals skilled in collection development and reader's advisory.

If a common read doesn't already exist, there is documentation of librarians taking the initiative to request the support of administration to begin a program themselves, as was the case at Greenfield

E-mail address: Katelyn.Angell@liu.edu.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacalib.2019.03.007>

Received 18 March 2019; Accepted 19 March 2019

Available online 28 March 2019

0099-1333/ © 2019 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.