
Thirty-two peer reviewed library science papers were read and analyzed for current thinking and best practice concerning six sub-topics within the greater context of attracting and keeping young adults in libraries: the physical library space, staff-patron interactions, young adult programming, collection development, technology, and service promotion. Also included is a word analysis of the papers graphing the frequency of specific keywords related to the topics. The word analysis shows that contemporary peer-reviewed literature has been most concerned with collections and collection development. Suggestions for best practice, flaws, and suggestions for future research into this area are included.
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Introduction

The role of a librarian is to support and guide patrons in her domain. However, how should one define a patron? Depending on the type and placement of the library facility, patrons can range from retirees to infants, businessmen to school children, and each patron set has their own specific needs and desires. One of the most notoriously fickle and mysterious patron groups is that of the adolescent or young adult range. According to the American Library Association (APA), a young adult or teen is a person aged approximately 12 to 18 years. The American Association of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP) defines adolescents as spanning roughly from middle to high school age, which in America spans the ages of 12 to 19. Finally, Merriam-Webster defines adolescents as those still developing but not yet having accomplished maturity. These definitions combine to paint a very distinct picture. An adolescent or young adult is a patron who is no longer a child but not yet an adult. The typical age range is from 12-19 under what psychology would call “normal” or “typical” development, but librarians should remember that it also includes older individuals still seeking an adult identity.

This information then begs the question: How should librarians regard young adults, and why are they so difficult to predict? Psychologically, young adults (YAs) are still developing. They are at a stage in life where they wish to test boundaries, experiment with novel stimuli, struggle with a sense of self-identity, and continue to think primarily of the present (AACAP 2001). Furthermore, the YA brain is not yet finished developing. Like a toddler developing motor control, a teenager does not have the full capability to
grasp certain situations in the same way a mature adult would. The frontal cortex, responsible for executive planning and decision-making, does not fully develop until well into adulthood, meaning that YAs on the whole struggle more with decisions and impulse control (AACAP 2008). However, according to the AACAP, this does not allow for excuses of behavior or the inability to limit their impulses, simply that adults should take into account the additional struggle that this continuing development represents. Teens can make rational decisions and be responsible for their actions if given the opportunity and motivation. YAs as a group desire to be seen as individuals capable of making rational decisions and having their own unique types of interaction and culture (Hill 2008, Mori 2008, Saunders 2003). Unfortunately, the continuing perception of some in the library science field and for many adult patrons in the library is very negative, describing them as “troublemakers, rebels … delinquents, hoodlums, and headaches” (Mori 2008, p.29) and expressing trepidation or even fear of interacting with this patron group (Hill 2008).

With such an overwhelming negative perception to fight against and an awareness of this discrimination among teens themselves (Hill 2008), it should not be a surprise that the YA group is among the most notoriously difficult to attract and keep in the library. However, this group is still extremely important to the continued funding and existence of the library structure, as the YA group will soon mature into the adult patronage. Already the adult patronage of libraries is decreasing, from an estimated 62% of cardholders in 2010 to only 58% in 2011 (ALA 2011) although adult user satisfaction remains steadily above average. Although adult satisfaction is important enough to be polled on a national level, there are few nationwide polls rating teen satisfaction, perhaps
because teens are not yet seen as an ‘important’ demographic due to their lack of influence on governmental decisions and public funding. In fact, although an estimated 78% of teens own a library card, the average number of visits per year is only 14.5 (ALA 2011). Judging from these statistics, although it can be difficult to get teens in the door, it appears that it is even harder to create a returning base of patrons that will grow to love and support the public library.

What measures, then, should libraries take in order to attract and keep teens? This paper analyzed research published since 2000—associated with the internet boom—in order to answer just this question. More than 30 peer-reviewed articles and publically available theses relating strictly to the attraction and maintenance of a YA population were analyzed for progress and current best practice theories. The major factors appearing to attract and maintain YA patronage were divided into categories related to the treatment of space, collection development, the use of technology, program creation, promotional methods, and librarian/patron interaction. For each category the results of the analysis is discussed, as well as recommendations for current best practice. Weaknesses in the current research, and ideas for further research are also discussed.

Methodology

Acquisition of Papers

Wilson Library Database, ERIC, and the UNC Masters Thesis Online Archives were primarily used in order to find articles relevant to the search parameters. An initial review of papers found using the search terms “attraction/attracting,” “young adults,” “teens,” “adolescents,” “library,” “keeping,” and “maintenance” resulted in the decision to focus the search on six categories—space, collection development, the use of
technology, program creation, promotional methods, and librarian/patron interaction—since the papers retrieved seemed to show a tendency to treat these factors. Further searching continued with these categories, limiting searches to peer reviewed papers published since 2000. Several database hits were discarded due to lack of relevance in the body of the paper or because the age range described did not meet this paper’s requirements for a YA group, defined as 12 to 18 years of age. Several more were book reviews or lists that were discarded because they did not discuss the topics directly. A total of 32 papers were retrieved for use in analysis.

Word Analysis

In order to obtain a rough idea of the popularity of the treatment of topics, a computer search was completed for numbers of topic-related words in each document. This allows for a more objective view of the prominent concerns of current research and help shape the evaluation. This analysis was pursued to compliment, not limit, the research, so no removal criteria were included in study selection. Appendix A contains a list of the words used divided by relevant category.

Evaluation

The study papers were read and marked manually for relevance per each of the six topics. Relevance included bulleted lists categorizing topics, comments, feedback, statistics, and further problems found in studies concerning one or more targeted topics. Key words were helpful in evaluation but were not the primary criteria. Instead, the presence of discussion, recommendation, and evaluation of a topic was desired. The treatment of each topic was compiled and evaluated for current thinking and best practice.
Results

Word Analysis

The results of the word analysis conducted to identify current concerns in the youth services field is shown in Appendix. The Collection category appeared most frequently, appearing 1,115 times. This is nearly double the amount as the second closest high frequency category, Technology. As previously mentioned, Technology keywords appeared the second most frequently, 703 times in the 32 documents, followed closely by Programming with a frequency of 654. The category appearing the least often was Promotion at 183 appearances, and the second least was Interaction, at 242.

Evaluation

Space.

Of the articles examined for this paper, eleven discussed the library as “a space;” that is, the physical commodity of the library itself, from the floors to the furniture, regardless of any services provided. It appears that Young adults in particular seek places in which they can gather and socialize, and the public library is often viewed as an appealing choice based on location and perceived safety (Agosto 2007, Farrelly 2006, Pierce 2005). This use of the library as a gathering place was coined by Farrelly (2006) as a “third space.”

*The first space being home, the second… school… and the third is somewhere outside the strictures of the first two where teens can socialize and relax.* (p. 41)

One of the most popular requests made by young adults when they are polled about beneficial additions to the library is to allow a section of the building to be
specified for talking and socializing with friends (Agosto 2007, Pierce 2005). When asked to design their own spaces without any other hints or input, Pierce (2005) found that 52.6% of responding North Carolina high school students requested “special seating areas to work or talk in groups” and 15.8% wanted to be able to watch television or movies in-house. Agosto (2007) discovered that 9.2% of responding teens in two public libraries, one in Pennsylvania and one in New Jersey, viewed the library as a “beneficial physical environment” (p. 60), thus suggesting that the library was viewed by these teens as a place to simply exist without seeking entertainment, services, or information. Some respondents specifically noted that they sought refuge in the library from outside stimuli ranging from dangerous homes or neighborhoods to simple noise interference. It is important to note here that though this particular response was low statistically, it may be given larger weight proportionally by professionals in the field seeking to provide exactly such a refuge to “at-risk” and underserved YAs, particularly in urban environments or in communities with large numbers of homeless teenagers.

Furniture was very high on the list of priorities for both library professionals and target YAs as an aspect of the library to change in order to attract and keep teens in the library space. Pierce (2005) inferred that her responding population of teens found library furniture uncomfortable “given that 78.9% of respondents asked for comfortable seating or couches” (p. 35). Saunders (2003) experienced a similar revelation when the teen-cooperative rebuilding of a youth library in Kentucky resulted in only one unanimous design element: a “George Nelson Marshmallow Sofa” (p. 115). Another library in Oakland, California attempted to fuse teen desire for comfortable furniture with ergonomics by using the body-conscious design theory (Cranz & Cha 2006) which
highlights the differences in posture and increased kinesthetic need in YAs and provides support for those differences. Although not every design element worked as planned, the overwhelming response from the YA population about the furniture was positive, with particular attention paid to shared sitting places, novel furniture, and furniture featuring height-adjustability. A chart reporting frequency of use of the new furniture indicated that the less traditional pieces attracted the most attention from young adults, the floor and adjustable height stools garnering the most attention, and the traditional bench seating garnering the least.

Novelty as a design element was also noted to be important to YAs, who desired novelty in everything from colors to the shape of the room itself. Pierce (2005) requested drawings of an ‘ideal’ space from her surveyed YAs, who responded with a variety of possibilities. Although the majority of the designs were traditional rectangular shapes, 30.3% of responses instead chose atypical or even completely novel space shape ideas. These atypical shapes included complete circles, interconnected squares, odd-angled rooms, and even one in the shape of a boom box. Preferred color schemes from the same pool of respondents were overwhelmingly blue or green and the polled YAs expressed negative feelings for white, off-white, grey, and brown, which are popular in traditional interior design because they are considered part of a neutral color palette (Bailey, Bailey, & Treloar 2009).

Cranz and Cha (2006) also experienced the power of novel design in teen spaces through the discovery of use of a “round thing” (p. 50) included in the Cesar Chavez Library. The “round thing” was constructed of “a large, cylindrical disk, also carpeted on its top and sides,” (p. 50) and at first provided much puzzlement for all patrons. However,
once YAs were certain they would not be chastised for using this piece of furniture, it quickly became a popular gathering spot for groups of friends who piled onto the platform or sat back to back on top of it. From interviews conducted with some of the teen patrons, the “round thing” was viewed both as a piece of furniture and a social activity, allowing for social interaction or workspace equally.

In terms of overall design, Saunders (2003) noticed that her Louisville, Kentucky teens preferred a sleek, modern look as opposed to any of several themes being considered, which the teens viewed as childish. Although this by no means speaks to the design preferences of YAs in general, it is important to note that the teens themselves made this decision and that it was contrary to the initial design thoughts and emerged only with the continued input of the YAs themselves.

Although the preference for a relaxed, social atmosphere was repeatedly expressed, YAs also continued to express the desire to choose between a lively atmosphere and one more quiet and study-oriented. A common trend in many of the papers (Agosto 2007, Bishop and Bauer 2002, Pierce 2005, Saunders 2003, Shay 2011) was the request of teens for two separate spaces—a study space and a socialization space. High school students in particular wanted a place for quiet research or study (Bishop and Bauer 2002, Pierce 2005, Saunders 2003, Shay 2011), possibly driven by the increased need for such activities in preparation for SATs or graduation. However, even these quiet areas demonstrated the differences in YA preferences, as “quiet study areas” typically included “large desks for group work” (p. 36) in addition to smaller independent study areas (Pierce 2005), insinuating that even studying can be viewed as a social activity.
Perhaps because of the rivalry of businesses such as Barnes and Noble and Borders, research has also focused on the addition of food to YA spaces. Bishop and Bauer (2002) experienced success in food-oriented activities such as chocolate tasting and a “Java Jam” while Cook, Parker, & Pettijohn (2005) found that 80.6% of polled teens “like to eat out with [their] friends” and 59.5% “like the snack areas at Barnes and Noble” (p. 159). Over 18% % of YAs surveyed by Pierce (2005) expressed a desire for food to be available without any prompting, 15.8% of which specifically mentioned coffee. Shay (2011) and Hannan (2011), located in Australia and New Zealand respectively also indicate that the allowance or provision of food were large motivators for the attendance of teens in their libraries, indicating that the YA desire for the freedom to eat can cross entire continents.

**Programming.**

Libraries are often adept at providing children’s and adult programming but struggle to find teen programs that can consistently draw a significant audience. According to the fifteen relevant articles found in this study, key programming aspects include time, content, personal investment, and novelty.

Because the YA’s life is typically dominated by school and school-related activities, timing programs around the busy YA’s schedule is imperative. In discussions of peak YA times in the library, a consistent hour arose from the literature—‘after school’ (Bishop & Bauer 2002, Brown 2007, Frew & Haver 2008, Hill 2008, Shay 2011). Brown (2007) in particular noted that her peak YA times were from 3PM to 8PM and Bishop & Bauer (2002) described the after school hours as “crucial” (p. 36). A number of the papers discussed the types of programs designed for after typical library hours.
Suggestions ranged from dinner events to simply teen-only evenings, but all suggested that programs allowing YAs after-hours access were successful (Bishop & Bauer 2002, Ehlers 2008, Fratena 2010, Frew and Haver (2008), Hannan 2011, Macchion & Savic 2011).

Shay (2011), and Fratena (2010) further emphasize the importance of gross timing of events in the larger context of the YAs’ lives. They cautioned to carefully track community events and to collaborate with competing extracurricular interests such as community youth centers and school-sponsored activities so that library programming can avoid these busy times. In Australia, Shay (2011) noted that school holidays usually resulted in fewer YAs in the library in general, and discovered that programming conducted at this time had few to no participants.

The content of the programs offered to young adults is crucial to gaining their interest. The literature suggested a wide range of possible activities and success stories. Fratena (2010) suggested a “bold step” for programming by having programs happen after the library is officially closed, even outlining what a lock-in event might look like. She stressed being prepared to entertain and change plans quickly in order to keep YAs’ interest throughout the evening. Bishop & Bauer (2002), Hannan (2011), and Macchion & Savie (2011) all reported the popularity of after hours lock-ins or extended programs which included an exclusive teen-only aspect and a roster of activities and socialization opportunities from computer and board games to volunteer DJs. Ehlers (2008) additionally promoted the creative talents of her local teens by organizing open mic and short film festivals featuring her local population.
However, YAs are not all leisure-centric. Pierce (2005) discovered that her population of surveyed YAs not only requested book-related programming activities, but also seminars and/or tutorials on a variety of subjects ranging from how to conduct library research to SAT and college preparations. Bishop & Bauer (2002) noted that teens ranked career help programs as a service of higher importance than librarians while Hannan (2011) noted among successful programs college and job seminars and college promotions.

Personal investment in the planned programs has been shown to predict higher rates of participation in YAs. Hannan (2011) recommended requiring teens to pre-register for events and programs in order to increase attendance while Frew & Haver (2008) suggested a signup sheet. Several sources advocated the use of focus groups or the aptly named ‘Youth (or Teen) Advisory Board’ in order to gain a core population that would interested and invested in events (Bishop & Bauer 2002, Ehlers 2008, Hannan 2011, Jones 2002, Macchion & Savic 2011, Shay 2011). One unique method of personal investment mentioned by Hannan (2011) was to offer rewards to teens who brought friends to events, and also to hold team events that would allow regular patrons to compete with friends. In fact, she also discovered that the ‘team leaders’ of such cooperative events were typically regular patrons (97% library card holders) who brought in friends who might not otherwise regularly visit the library (79% library card holders).

Although regular programming such as monthly book discussion groups or summer reading events can bring in a steady attendance rate, studies show that adding a certain degree of novelty can increase these rates and help to build a larger base population of YAs. Gayton (2010) experienced difficulty in keeping her summer reading
program in Manaku, New Zealand populated. Although the summer reading program was held yearly and offered prizes, she discovered that it attracted few teens and that many of them dropped out partway through the program. In order to remedy this, she experimented with the hierarchy and structure of the program, providing novelty to her population and the populations of related library branches by offering social incentives in the form of rankings, a variation on the old reward system, and an end of program celebration. Continuing modifications and feedback allowed her to determine that public rankings were unsuccessful but that her population preferred a smaller prize raffle hierarchy for intra and inter-system drawings, and an expanded point system that allowed them to read and review more than just books. She also discovered that many YA patrons were enthusiastic about a fine exchange program addition in which reviews of books and websites could be turned in for a set amount of fine forgiveness. This related well to an observation by Hannan (2011) that “events should be about teens and what they want, not about what we want them to know, do, or find out” (p. 36). Manaku branch teens were interested in websites and paying off library fines, so when the summer reading program included these, their numbers increased and the drop out rate lowered (Gayton 2010). Shay (2011) noted that “ongoing programs may not work” and that events should be kept “fresh” (p. 45) in order to keep YAs coming back, a sentiment echoed by Macchion & Savic (2011) who said that teens “are looking for a variety of entertainment” (p. 21).

Although not traditionally considered programming, allowing and organizing teen volunteers has been similarly examined within the literature. Macchion & Savic (2011) noted the organization of teen volunteers, known as VolunTeens during an exchange program with Columbus Metropolitan Library (CML). CML treated their VolunTeens
identically to adult volunteers, including giving job training, a handbook, and hosting welcome and thank you events for volunteers. In addition, CML offered multiple levels of volunteer commitment, allowing a ‘short-term’ summer VolunTeen program separately from volunteer opportunities during the school year. Bishop & Bauer (2002), when interviewing YAs on what would make the library more attractive, discovered that YAs had an interest in volunteering. Participants were described as “extremely enthusiastic about serving on teen advisory boards” and excited about “the opportunity to volunteer at the library” (p. 41). One interviewee voiced the idea that more library jobs could be given to teens instead of to older adults, and that volunteering “gave me a new feeling of responsibility” (p. 41).

Interaction.

The interaction between YAs and library staff appears to be crucial to both parties’ library experience and has been shown to impact the number and behavior of teens in the library in general. As a result, twenty-two articles were found to speak in some significant way of librarian-teen patron interaction.

Libraries fortunate enough to have a dedicated YA librarian have benefited through the relationship the librarian has built with her local teens, such as in the case of Demi Johnson (Ehlers 2008). Miss Johnson made it a point to seek her prospective patrons outside of her library walls, attending major events such as sports games and theatre performances, going to movie and book release parties, and making herself otherwise available for any teen looking for a sympathetic ear. Ehlers (2008) was able to report that as a result, her YA circulation saw a 65% increase. Miss Johnson may have gone above and beyond the call of duty, but several other sources also advocated building
a positive relationship with YAs through the simple method of listening (Bishop & Bauer 2002, Hannan 2011, Joseph 2010). Joseph (2010) actually mentioned listening under the label of respect, noting that although one did not have to agree with what a YA said, it was better to listen and allow them to have their say. Similarly, Hannan (2011) cautioned readers to “honor [YAs’] opinions” (p. 36) and make communication between the librarian and the patron a rewarding experience.

Although the basic tenet of listening to your patrons seems rudimentary, there may be a reason it must be mentioned in the literature. Several papers suggested that library staff at large have historically had a very negative view of YA patrons and that the YAs, in turn, also knew about the staffs’ perceptions. Sentiments such as “can’t live with ’em, can’t shoot ’em,” “we just don’t know what to do with them” (Hill 2008, p. 24-25), having staff “rove throughout the library in thirty minute shifts, asking teens to be quiet” (Brown 2007, p. 23), and believing that with YAs “the guiding principle is two steps forward, one step back…” (Leonard 2008, p. 28) delineate the stubbornly negative thinking that even YA specialists can harbor. Other papers quoted teens saying that others saw them as “criminals” (Hill 2008, p. 25) or that “adults think that teenagers are all alike” (Saunders 2003, p. 114). Agosto (2007) surveyed YAs and unearthed many of the same complaints from participants, including experience with “unpleasant library staff” (p. 56) To add to the YA’s burden of perception, Booth (2005) found that teens were “accustomed to being given unsolicited advice on every aspect of their lives, including reading choices” (p. 33) and Leonard (2008) intimated that teens need to be taught general manners while in the library setting.
Despite the prevailing negative perceptions, current literature offers some hope for improving librarian/YA interactions. Aside from the aforementioned listening and making oneself available, Mori (2008), Bishop & Bauer (2002), and Joseph (2010) recommended making the effort to learn and use YAs’ names. Mori (2008) expressed that learning an individual’s name could help dispel the idea that you as a professional would assign a negative label to the YA and conveyed that she valued the person. Joseph (2010) proposed learning not only the YA’s name but also some detail about them, such as a favorite genre or media. Bishop & Bauer (2002) collected interviews from library professionals about what would help attract YAs to the library. Two of the interviewed shared that they felt talking with their patrons was the most crucial key to gaining their loyalty. Aside from remembering names, Hannan (2011) made a point to keep her teens updated about how their input affected library programs and services, the success of programs, and even sent thank you notes via text or e-mail. Farrelly (2006) suggested “easing up on restrictive rules enforcement” and “allowing teenagers to hang out even if they don’t have anything to read or homework to finish” (p. 41). Booth (2005) offered this advice for setting up YA interaction:

“*Smiles, welcoming body language, and greetings can assure teens that they are welcome in the area... Greeting [teens] with eye contact and a genuine smile can do a lot for future interactions.*” (p. 34)

Booth further asserted that YAs should be treated similarly to an adult patron in terms of being accepted and welcomed.

Collection.
A total of seven papers dealt with the collection or development of the collection for YAs, two of each paper falling into one of three ideations: the collection as a source of information, integration of YAs’ direct input should influence collection development, and the use of lists derived from the collection to guide YA readers’ leisure reading. While Agosto (2007) and Shay (2011) did not exclude the need for YAs’ leisure reading, they highlighted the importance of reference material for a YA-specific collection. Agosto (2007) further added that YAs have a need for information of all types and not only for school or work. According to her, YAs look for information “related to unspecified needs, for information related to personal needs” besides looking for school-related information (Agosto 2007). When Shay (2011) rethought her library’s YA section, she specifically included a teen-only reference area for study work, but located it in close proximity to leisure materials. This dovetailed well with a suggestion made to Bishop & Bauer (2002) by an interviewed YA who proposed collection modification should include what professionals would call non-fiction books on topics such as famous person biographies and books on fashion, which she indicated would be more popular among the general YA population. Another participant simply advocated acquiring “more interesting books” (p. 41). Loertscher (2008) advocated shaping your collection based on the “habits of the users” (p. 42) and mentioned adding digital print media to the collection in order to provide YAs with continuous access to materials.

Related to collection development, Macchion & Savic (2011) and Gayton (2010) suggested that book lists were popular reading tools for teens and that such lists greatly influenced teen reading trends on a local level. Gayton (2010) discovered that a summer reading book list, although not mandatory, resulted in YAs reading more of the listed
books and even commuting to less convenient library locations in order to acquire the
listed materials. Macchion & Savic (2011) covered a book club that met with a success
comprised of students who read books from a state library list and convened to discuss
the book.

**Technology.**

Of increasing concern in the ‘digital age’ is the need to stay current with new
technological trends and incorporate these tools into the library professional’s arsenal.
Certainly the eighteen pieces of literature addressing technology implied that YAs were
always on the cutting edge of technological trends, and being familiar with these trends
marked success or failure in several related cases.

Foremost in the technological concerns of library professionals was the use of the
internet and web 2.0, with eleven papers concerned with these technologies in some form.
Of those regarding YAs’ wants and needs when designing a library, Pierce (2005)
discovered that YA-specific computers with internet access was the second most popular
request, with 76.3% of respondents listing this, 42.1% of whom placed “internet” or
“computers” first on the list. Bishop & Bauer (2002), when interviewing YA librarians,
received the comment that “computers are a huge drawing card for the teens” (p. 41) and
interviewed teens saying that they went to the library to use the internet. Cook et al.
(2005) found that the majority of their respondents used “the Internet on a daily basis,
like to surf the Web, and like to get email,” adding that “early teens are very involved
with technology” (p. 159).

Since teens were determined or assumed to be constantly on the internet, Hannan
(2011), Goodman (2007), Norris (2009), and Gayton (2010) used and/or recommended
online methods for communication with one’s YA population. All of these authors agreed that email, while prevalent in the lives of adults, was considered “slow and passé” (Norris 2009, p.1) by teens. They suggested that email could be used but should not be relied upon. Gayton’s (2010) Australian YA population proved to be “irregular checkers of email” (p. 113) and Hannan (2011) noted that email was “generally not used as a communication tool until [teens] are much older or in the mainstream workforce” (p. 34). Instead of email, text messaging or SMS via cell phone was mentioned specifically by Hannan (2011), Norris (2009), and Gayton (2010), although these authors also voiced concerns over the practicality of cost in using this medium. In addition to text messaging, social media of various types, most involving the collaborative and interactive features of web 2.0 technologies, were discussed. Although the types of social media found popular by local YAs varied, Facebook or MySpace, various web log or ‘blog’ sites, and applications for iPhone and available through Google garnered frequent mention throughout the literature (Berger 2010, Bishop & Bauer 2002, Gayton 2010, Goodman 2010, Hannan 2011, Lesesne 2006, McMorland, Tolnay, & Vick 2010, and Norris 2009). Hannan (2010) learned that in order to remain up to date with your local YA population, you must “keep up to date with social media trends and be ready to jump off them… when you need to” (p. 36)

In a school media center, the addition of new hardware in the form of the smart board created a bridge between the teenaged students and the faculty (Ramsey 2010). Students were able to adapt to and use the smart boards more quickly than adults, and a program was created to pair students as technological mentors with struggling faculty
members, resulting in a cooperative and collaborative partnership between media center, students, and teachers.

Another aspect of technology that has proven to be a consistent draw across continents was video games. Although in Osborne’s (2008) experience, the video game Runescape was the source of many YA behavioral problems, she also noted that working with the problematic YAs and asking them to create their own rules for library gaming etiquette solved the problem quickly. Other papers discussing video games focused primarily on consoles such as the Xbox, Wii, and Playstations. Most library professionals’, patrons’, and parents’ responses to the addition of consoles to the YA section were positive (Ehlers 2008, Hill 2008, Macchion & Savic 2011, Shay 2010). Naturally, the addition of consoles also implies the purchasing cost of the games themselves, but most libraries chose interactive and group games that were popular with their teens such as Dance Dance Revolution, Wii Fit, and Guitar Hero. In the case of Humboldt Public Library (Ehlers 2008), the YAs were enthusiastic about the possible acquisition of a Playstation 3 and games and organized fundraisers to help raise the needed money. Acquisition of these consoles and games has shown to increase library patronage and circulation (Macchion & Savic 2011) and was thought to allow librarians more opportunities to promote library programs and services (Ehlers 2008, Macchion & Savic 2011).

**Promotion.**

Promotion of programs, special events, or even the existence of a YA library space using both traditional and e-formats, were met with success according to the six studies addressed. According to findings by Cook et al. (2005), “young teens indicated a
positive attitude about receiving mail” (p. 161) followed by a suggestion to send postcards addressed to the teens to advertise events and services. The suggestion of postcards was echoed by McMorland et al. (2010) and Gayton (2010), who used promotional postcards in the mail to a positive effect. Flyers and newspaper ads, other traditional advertising venues, were advocated by Frew & Haver (2008), Shay (2010), and McMorland et al. (2010). Hannan (2011) emphasized that the most important step in promotion was to “get your advertising outside of your library’s four walls” (p. 35) and enacted this by having librarians go to local schools to talk with YAs and promote their services. Similarly, Frew & Haver (2008) suggested going to local schools during the beginning of the academic year and Shay (2010) promoted asking interested teachers to promote the library in the classroom. Shay (2010) was also fortunate enough to have contact with a local school principal who arranged a meeting between the librarians and the school class representatives. Thinking even more unconventionally, Gayton (2010) in New Zealand utilized a local dance troupe to visit high schools and promote the library throughout the region. Cook et al. (2005) stressed that according to their findings, invitation by friends and promotion by teen opinion leaders could potentially be very strong promotional sources.

Utilizing technological advances has also proven valuable for library promotions. Cook et al. (2010) suggested using specifically YA-tailored web sites to draw YAs’ attention. Morland et al. (2010) used what they dubbed “guerilla tactics” (p. 72) by signing up for frequented YA-oriented sites and posting promotions for events there. However, Hannan (2011) stressed caution when posting program and event promotions on other sites, stressing that one should “consider the implications if your [teen] event
ends up listed in the same category as a playgroup event for toddlers” (p. 35). Frew & Haver (2008), Shay (2010), and Cook et al. (2005) suggested using email to contact teens already on the library’s mailing list to engage their interest or simply remind them of an upcoming event.

Discussion

Word Analysis

Assuming that word frequency is correlated with topics of particular interest, the results of the word analysis indicate that literature in the 21st century written regarding how to attract and maintain young adult populations in libraries, especially public libraries, are primarily concerned with the library’s collection. The next highest concern of contemporary literature is technology as indicated by frequency. Of the least concern is promotion of library programs, followed closely by patron-staff interactions.

These trends were found to be both concerning and surprising. Given the rapid change of technological hardware and software since the 1990s, it was thought that this topic would be a large concern. However, it is also entirely possible that some of the keywords used in the collection topic may have, in reality, also been concerned with the collection of technology or collection mediums such as e-books or e-readers, thus blurring the line between the two topics. If this is the case, it would reflect the new blurring of lines between a physical and digital collections and the importance of supporting access to both in the 21st century.

Of large concern was the low frequency, thus implying low concentration of publication efforts, surrounding the topic of library promotion. Promotion and advocacy
are emphasized in academic classes, yet the professional literature reflects a lack of new thinking and innovation in the field concerning this topic. Similarly, interaction between YA patrons and library staff are underemphasized despite the obvious need for successful interactions in order to encourage future visitation by patrons. When examining the literature regarding interaction, many papers reflect a lack of knowledge on the part of the staff on how to conduct a successful interaction. This may reflect a need for more training in the field or more updates within the professional literature as more strategies are developed for interacting with teens. Promotion, discussed more in depth below, should also be more emphasized particularly, as promotional methods change with technology. Successful promotion can draw in previously un- or under-served populations and help to emphasize the importance of the library to the youth today.

Although word analysis can reveal trends in focus over a certain period, this method of analysis can also be flawed. It is entirely possible that too many, too few, too broad, or inaccurate keywords were used in the analysis, which would result in an inaccurate reflection of the topics. Furthermore, there was no statistical power provided by this analysis. The purpose of these numbers was to provide a frame of reference of literature written since 2000 within a certain scope in order to aid in identifying popular literature trends in future, or for comparison with trends in the 1900s.

**Evaluation—Recommendations and Suggestions for Future Study**

**Space.**

The literature shows that young adults desire a multiple-use public space. The ideal public library should not only serve as a hub of information for recreational and academic purposes, but should offer entertainment, socialization opportunities, and a
sense of security. In order to provide this, it may be necessary to section or divide the YA space into ‘quiet’ and ‘loud’ zones, and librarians should be prepared to sacrifice a certain amount of silence in the YA section in exchange for teens feeling ownership of the space.

In terms of furniture, teens in general tend to seek innovation and comfort of design. This, however, does not mean that teens do not want some degree of familiarity. Pierce (2005) discovered that teens still wanted items such as desks and study tables, and the “round thing” observed by Cranz & Cha (2006) suffered initial unpopularity due to its extreme novelty while rotating stools were consistently in use. Cranz & Cha (2006) suggest keeping in mind the unique ergonomics of the YA, who can be in varying growth stages and often fare better when able to be in continuous movement. Furniture that rocks, rotates, and allows for frequent position changes may, under this philosophy, be seen as more desirable. Although there may be concerns about the expense and upkeep of large pieces of furniture such as sofas or armchairs, variants of these types of furniture should also be considered for YA use for both study and social space.

Space design as a whole can vary greatly with successful results. The literature shows no proof or disproof for general space designs. Instead, the implementation of the dual-space, quiet and loud, with a way of designating the barrier between the two, is of more importance. Although teens have expressed interest in innovative room design (Pierce 2005), there is no clear preference for a ‘traditional’ room layout versus a ‘nontraditional’ one.

In order to compete with popular gathering locations such as Starbucks or Barnes and Noble, it may be wise to consider the addition of food to the YA space. Whether the
food is provided, sold, or allowed to be brought in by the YAs, there has been a trend of preference for spaces that allow the consumption of food (Cook et al. 2005, Pierce 2005). The reasons behind this rationale were not discussed in the literature.

Future studies concerning library space and design for YAs might venture further into the reasons YAs are strongly attracted to food-oriented spaces, and whether it is the food alone or some connotation associated with the allowance or presence of food that is considered attractive. This would not only provide further insight into YAs, but also allow library administrators to make informed decisions of rules regarding food within the YA spaces. Further research could be done into the types of furniture preferred by young adults and what discriminates a comfortable piece of furniture from one that is not. This would aid in making purchasing decisions for the space, as it is possible that what is considered comfortable by the YA audience differs greatly from the adult audience. Cranz & Cha (2005) began research into this area with the specific body-conscious design philosophy, but took the stance of retrospection as opposed to introspection.

**Programming.**

According to the literature, part of the success of a YA program will depend on the timing of said program. Because the YA’s schedule is often limited by academics and extracurricular activities, keeping up to date with the local school and community extracurricular schedules is imperative. The proactive librarian will take care to schedule her programs around such important events as dances, sports games, theatrical productions, midterms, and the like. Although it may be unrealistic to keep up with every extracurricular opportunity schedule in the community, it would be wise to canvas the YA population and track the most popular activities in order to attract the largest number
of participants. Depending on the YA population, there may also be calendar times when the YAs need more or less support or when they are more or less available, such as school holidays when students travel, or midterms when they may need extra study materials. Librarians should take the time to mark these times for future participation predictions.

Setting the time of any event, including regular programming, to well after school hours will also aid in attracting more event participants. The hours between 3 PM and library close have been described as crucial in providing teens with safe after school alternatives (Bishop & Bauer 2002). The literature has expressed great success with after or late hour programs (Bishop & Bauer 2002, Ehlers 2008, Fratena 2010, Hannan 2011, Macchion & Savic 2011), so coordinators should consider extending YA library hours in the evenings or holding after-hour events that allow busy YAs to attend.

Programming content can vary widely with equal success. In general, innovative programs, relevance to pop culture, relevance to current events in the YA’s life, large special interest group panels, and hands-on activities have been reported in the literature as having large success (Bishop & Bauer 2002, Hannan 2011, Macchion & Savie 2011). The literature has also illustrated the need for not only entertainment events, but academic, career, or learning-oriented programming, particularly for older YAs (Bishop & Bauer 2002, Hannan 2011, Pierce 2005). Pierce (2005) in particular received a large amount of YA requests for such study-oriented programs as SAT and college prep, and Hannan (2011) also received career-oriented program requests.

Personal investment on the part of the YA population can aid in boosting programming interest and numbers. In general, the more connected the YA feels to the
program, whether through planning, brainstorming, or promoting, the more likely he or
she is to attend (Bishop & Bauer 2002, Ehlers 2008, Hannan 2011, Jones 2002, Macchion
& Savic 2011, Shay 2011). This phenomenon can also extend to the simple expedient of
asking the YA to pre-register, even when there is no fee (Frew & Haver 2008), or
providing incentives to bring friends (Hannan 2011).

Establishing a system for YAs to volunteer in the library can also draw large
numbers and has been expressed as desirable by YAs (Bishop & Bauer 2002, Macchion
& Savic 2011). YA volunteers could help not only in the YA section, but in many of the
sections adult volunteers also work, such as general shelving and organization. They can
also help prepare children’s programs by setting up and taking down components, and be
aids in summer reading programs or other events.

It is important to note that programming popularity will also depend heavily on
current trends, pop culture, and the specific YA population. While this study has
inspected common elements to successful programs, the literature studied has been
diverse and the specific programs mentioned had very few content-based commonalities.
Librarians must conduct their own investigations and be constantly up to date with the
trends and needs of their local YA populations to keep programming relevant.

Much of the current research focuses largely on specific programs and events, but
future studies might track trends in programming popularity. Specifically, it might be
possible to correlate literature trends with programming popularity and attendance, or the
time of year with academic or career-oriented program popularity. This would aid in
program planning and selection and help ensure that programming for YAs happens
when it is most needed or wanted.
Interaction.

The basic tenets of achieving positive interactions with YAs are being proactive with greetings, getting to know library regulars personally, refraining from offering unasked-for advice, having positive body language, approaching YAs with an open mind and treating them as the unique population that they are. Making oneself available and visible by leaving the desk can increase interactions with YAs (Booth 2005), as can visiting schools or other popular teen hangouts so that YAs become comfortable with approaching and asking questions (Ehlers 2008).

An important component to avoiding conflict and promoting positive interactions between library staff and YA patrons is the understanding of the growth and development of the average teen from psychological, physical, and social aspects. Young adults are in a very metamorphic stage of life in all aspects. In situations wherein the staff are intimidating or hostile towards the YA population, there are seminars and workshops available to instruct library staff in the developmental and behavioral expectations of teens as well as coaching on how to best handle this population.

Listed repeatedly throughout the literature was the need to listen nonjudgmentally to YA patrons. Bishop & Bauer (2002), Hannan (2011), and Joseph (2010) highlighted successful interactions when librarians listened carefully to their YA populations. Listening makes teens feel respected and valued as individuals, which is an interaction they may not receive frequently anywhere else.

A surprising amount of literature continues to focus on what one might consider basic interactions with people in general, namely treating the patron with respect and approaching him or her with positive body language. Amazingly, such interactions as
smiling at the patron or using his or her name must be explicitly mentioned in YA literature. Future publications may be interested in why such interactions must be spelled out repeatedly, or if perhaps the same kind of customer service training given in retail stores might also benefit YA librarians or libraries with underserved YA populations. Perhaps the positive interactions on the retail level have led YA populations to bookstores and malls, and adding this atmosphere and interaction to the public library would aid in attracting more teens. More research should also focus on interaction from the point of view of the teen, as the majority of literature found for this study focused primarily or entirely on the patron-librarian interaction from the view of the librarian.

**Collection.**

Within this paper’s scope of YA appeal, there were three distinct philosophies relating to collection development: YAs require their own information sources; YAs should be involved in collection decisions; YAs enjoy book lists. Based on these, a YA collection would ideally include its own nonfiction section as well as databases and computer access so that this population would not need to browse through the general nonfiction sections. YA input, whether in suggestions, requests, surveys, or hands-on selection through an advisory, should also be considered when adding to or building a new YA collection. YA interest may vary by locale, so only the library’s native population could give an accurate account of desirable collection items. Particularly when trying to boost interest in items or a certain theme, book lists have been well-attended by teens. Periodically creating new lists to highlight certain times of year, new selections, certain themes or genres, or other ideas should be considered for those YAs who rely on this means of readers advisory.
Collection development can be a very comprehensive topic. This study did not address cultural, developmental, or psycho-social needs of YAs, all of which are extremely important when building a collection. This study certainly does not dismiss the need to consider these factors, as well as the idea of literary quality, but the purpose of this study is to provide an overview of literature primarily concerned with attracting and keeping YAs, which many collection development documents treat as more of a secondary characteristic.

Future research might study changes in literature trends and ideal times of the year to weed a YA collection based on YA and publisher schedules. There might also be more quantitative studies of the popularity of nonfiction versus fiction versus serializations regarding YA interests. This could help shape YA collection focus, particularly if YAs prefer serials to monographic texts, or if there is a change in preferred media.

**Technology.**

YAs are stereotypically adopting new technologies almost as quickly as they are developed. Although adopting every new hardware and software change is unreasonable, being able to make quick decisions and adaptations can help YA librarians communicate more effectively with their populations, particularly in cyberspace. Some technologies, such as computers, e-readers, and the internet, have become very widespread in recent years. If the library has these resources available to adults, it may be wise to invest in hardware for exclusive YA use. Use of social communication tools such as text messaging, SMS, IM, blogs, and Twitter can shift rapidly in popularity among local populations. However, while a tool remains popular, it is often the best way to alert
potential patrons of the YA library and its services. Librarians may wish to implement a
decision making system that would reduce downtime between trends in order to remain
flexible and track popular cyberspace hangouts. Library websites should also remain up-
to-date with layout and application trends, utilizing interactive web 2.0 technology in
order to better engage YA interest. Simply having a website will not attract teens, but
constant interaction and updates may keep technology-focused teens tuning in.
Implementing new tools to extend access to resources should also be considered. Many
YAs have become accustomed to twenty-four access via the internet, and libraries
wishing to compete with Google Scholar and Wikipedia may want to consider remote
patron access to databases or e-books.

The rise of the console video gaming system provides libraries with another way
in which to attract and keep YAs. Popular systems such as the Playstation 3, Xbox 360,
and Wii may be expensive, but providing access to these systems also allows teens
without these systems at home an opportunity to experiences that may have once been out
of their reach. The library can also host video game tournaments or ‘parties’ that draw
large crowds of YAs, many of which may not yet be patrons. The noise aspect of video
gaming must be considered in YA spaces attached to libraries with no sound barriers, but
librarians should keep in mind that a probationary period with a patron-generated rules
list may help to prevent this situation. Once YAs are inside the library, they can be shown
other library resources and services, introduced to the staff and regular patrons, and may
even sign up for future programming. Video game tournaments can also provide new
social interactions for teens, which are important during this stage of development.
Because of the constant change in technology development and trends, the advice given in this study regarding technology may be outdated in as few as two to five years. Librarians should constantly track technology trends, particularly local ones, as opposed to relying entirely on peer-reviewed works, which can be months or years out of date at the time of publication.

Future literature would do well to focus less on specific current trends or sites and more on creating and utilizing strategies to best cope with the rapid YA shift in technology interests. Having an effective strategy would help less technology-savvy librarians to keep up with their populations.

**Promotion.**

Promotion can do a great deal to impact the success of the YA section in general at a library, and can take a large number of forms. Notably, promotional materials should be expressed outside of the library’s walls as much as possible (Hannan 2011) and put in places accessible to YAs who are not already familiar with the library’s offerings. Schools, newspapers, local hangouts such as stores and cafes, and other community centers were the most mentioned venues for promotional advertisements and fliers. However, promotion does not need to be restricted simply to paper. Creative solutions such as websites, spokespeople, representative groups, and promotional shows have also been utilized in the literature to positive effect. Caution should be used when promoting in venues parallel to other community events, particularly if there is a chance the program could be associated with a younger or older age group.

In order to contact YAs who have participated before, studies suggest a variety of options. Although many adults rely heavily on email for communication, it has been
suggested that the YA population does not turn as quickly to this communication medium. Instead, text messaging or SMS may be more popular among this group. However, this trend of popularity may change, and the YA librarian is best served by asking for the preferred means of contact when giving updates, promotions, or reminders to current YA patrons. Although not as quick to respond to email, YAs generally appreciate the gesture of receiving mail of all types. Changing promotional tactics with postcards sent to the patron’s residence may also have a positive impact.

Unfortunately, none of the literature pertaining to the topic of promotion provided statistical figures to reinforce the idea of which combination or single promotional type would yield the best results. The general approach, instead, seemed to be to use any and all promotional practices possible. This practice would eventually take its toll on library funding and time, and might begin to desensitize the YA population to library promotional tactics. Therefore, future research would do well to determine which types or combinations of promotional practices are best suited to the YA audience, when and if YAs become desensitized to promotional tactics, and how to overcome possible desensitization. This information would greatly aid libraries with small budgets and/or time constraints, and help to maximize impact on the YA community.

**Conclusion**

This study intended to discover the trends and best practice recommendations of literature written since the turn of the century in order to provide an overview of the development of young adult librarian practice. Findings in the trends and recommendations for best practice were a mixture of “hopefully innovative” and “scrambling to simply keep up”. Particularly astounding were the artifacts found in
literature which suggested that current thinking of how to treat young adult populations continues to be apathetic, hostile, or even afraid. The professional community would be best served to leave this type of thinking behind and focus on the need to better understand the importance and potential of the YA population. However, some professionals such as Demi Johnson (Ehlers 2008) and Hannan (2011) continue to provide forward direction and progress for all. With regards to positive trends, new movements and developments in technology have been well-accepted by the library community at large, and much of the literature speaks towards how to best use one’s budget to cover various new technology needs, and how to best stay abreast of technology’s rapid changes.

The trends in word analysis indicated more interest in collections and technology—rather than in interaction and promotion to the individual teen. Given that young adults have been slowly gaining recognition as their own cultural and distinct age group, it will be interesting to see how literature examining their services changes in focus throughout the rest of the century. As the YA population grows, it is this author’s hope that library professionals will become more proficient in attracting and keeping them in libraries, thus providing much needed avenues of support and safe entertainment in the teen life.
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Appendix A

This table displays the words used in the word analysis search and the category to which the word belongs. Words ending with a * indicate that the search was performed for the base word and variations thereof. For example, “attract*” indicates a search for not only the word “attract,” but also “attraction,” “attracting,” and “attracted.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Spac*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furni*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decor*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stool*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sofa*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desk*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poster*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wall*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Color*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Program*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunte*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Promot*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertis*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remind*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postcard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flyer*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Interact*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treat*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborat*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listen*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opinion*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Collect*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magazine*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Playstation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xbox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

The following is a table of the frequency of keywords by category and paper. Total frequencies of keyword categories are included at the end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Programming</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop &amp; Bauer 2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayton 2010</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fratena 2010</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranz &amp; Cha 2006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehlers 2008</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesesne 2006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan 2001</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamberson 2002</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook et al. 2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loertscher 2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morland et al. 2010</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown 2007</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard 2008 &amp; Mori 2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannan 2011</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph 2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill 2008</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth 2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborne 2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrelly 2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Programming</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelly &amp; Joseph 2010</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman 2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones 2002</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agosto 2007</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frew &amp; Haver 2008</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce 2005</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey 2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macchion et al. 2011</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunders 2003</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shay 2011</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustafoff &amp; Tetteau 2008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>654</strong></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
<td><strong>1115</strong></td>
<td><strong>341</strong></td>
<td><strong>703</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>