DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 572   IR 003 656

AUTHOR   Beach, Allyne
TITLE   Library Book Theft: A Case Study.
PUB DATE   Mar 76
NOTE   123p.; Undergraduate Honor's Thesis, Ohio State
                University

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Book Thefts; Library Research; Questionnaires;
                *University Libraries

ABSTRACT
        As part of an investigation of library theft at Ohio
State University, relevant literature was explored, causal hypotheses
were formulated, a questionnaire was distributed to a representative
sample of 350 students, data were analyzed, and conclusions drawn.
Opinions of 19 self-identified book thieves and 231 nonthieves were
used to identify the motives for theft, the methods used, and
possible preventative measures. The text summarizes the literature
search, describes the research methodology, and states the findings,
including tabular summaries of questionnaire data. (EMH)

LIBRARY BOOK THEFT: A CASE STUDY

By

Allyne Beach

Undergraduate Honor's Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree, Bachelor of Arts
with Distinction in Sociology

The Ohio State University

March, 1976

2

Acknowledgments

I extend my warmest appreciation and praise

to my advisor, Dr. Joseph E. Scott,
for his challenging questions and for his patience

my gratitude

to Kaye Gapan, Robert Allen Daughtery, and The Ohio
State University staff for their co-operation

to the faculty and staff of the Sociology Department
for their assistance

and my indebtedness

to my friends and tolerant roommates

to Sue for her encouragement

and to Roberto for all his faith and love

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iii

Chapter

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

This research is an investigation of library book theft at The Ohio State University. Specifically, the study attempts to answer such questions as: who steals library books, what are their motivations, and what methods do they use. In addition, opinions of book thieves* and non-thieves are examined with regards to what techniques they feel would best deter and prevent book theft.

The focus of this research will be on book theft only. It will not address the question of journal mutilation, periodical theft, fire or any of the sundry phases of library material loss. The people who are book thieves will be determined by self-reporting techniques. A questionnaire distributed to 466 students will be the principal research tool. The major theoretical perspective will be that used to study white collar crime.

History

Library book theft is not a new problem. Librarians have been aware of this problem for ages. Since the twelfth

---

* Although the term book "thieves" may in some analyses connotate a professional criminal the term thief and stealer will be used interchangeably. In this regard these terms refer to a person who takes a book from the library in an unauthorized manner.

1

century, libraries have been plagued by book theft. At
that time, the librarians' solution was to chain books to
the library walls (Sutuchi, 1973). But as the times have
changed, the demand has increased for more ready access
to books and other library materials. In addition,
librarians have become more sensitive and more responsive
to the growing needs of patrons (Gapan, 1975). Conse-
quently, in the present era when the trend is to augment
the flow of information and the availability of resource
material for numerous people, limitations on library use
would inhibit rather than facilitate the goals of contem-
porary librarians.

The increased volume of library use today is not
unexpectedly associated with an accelerated rate of book
loss (Reneker, 1970). The concern over this loss has
grown. In 1940, fourteen articles about actual cases of
book theft or methods to deter it appeared in the Library
Literature. The number of such articles gradually
increased, perhaps reflecting a greater concern for this
phenomenon. In 1969, there were forty-three articles
on book theft in the Library Literature. Yet another
indicator of the librarians' heightened concern with this
problem is documented in a study of two hundred libraries
done by the Burns Security Institute in 1973. Seven out
of ten libraries reported theft as their most important
problem (Burns Security Institute, 1973).

Scope

The national interest in the library book theft
problem stems in part from financial pressure. On the
basis of inventories of current books received, librarians
estimate that 4 to 6 per cent of their total collection
is missing* (Daughtery, 1975). The total dollar loss due
to missing books in 140 libraries which responded to a
survey conducted by the Burns Security Institute was
$437,400 per year or an average annual dollar loss of
$3,120 per library, equivalent to about eighty-five books**-
(Burns Security Institute, 1973). A sample inventory done
by Irene Braden in 1967, determined that the per cent of
books missing from libraries at The Ohio State University
ranged from 1 to 15 per cent*** (Braden, 1968). Librar-
ians at The Ohio State University estimated that the
dollar loss due to book theft was approximately $64,000
in 1972. Based on estimations of loss made by The Ohio
State University Library statistician the loss would be
$140,000 in 1972.# The discrepancy in the figures is due

---

* Current and popular books have a higher loss rate
than other types of library books (Gapan, 1975).
** Most libraries surveyed were small public libraries.
*** Academic libraries generally have a higher loss rate
than public ones (Gapan, 1975).
Although some estimations have been made, actual dol-
lar loss is difficult for librarians to determine.
Complete inventories are seldom if ever done due to
the tremendous amount of money and time such an under-
taking would require. Moreover, the task of deter-
mining a book's status (lost vs. stolen) is compli-
cated by the fact that missing books reappear often at
the end of a quarter or the school year.

to the fact that the librarians' estimate is based on the
average rate of book loss times the amount of money the
library spent on replacing books in 1972; the statistician's
rate was based on an estimation of the books missing times
the average worth of a book in 1972.

Despite such financial losses, a recent study by
Maxine Renecker (1940) showed that librarians feel the major
consequence of library book theft is the inconvenience the
patron must suffer. It is possible that the librarians
responded to Renecker's survey this way because of their
conception of proper professional response rather than
their actual inclinations. Still, these librarians and
those the researcher has talked with, have noticed the
frustration the patron and they themselves have undoubtedly
experienced spending unrewarded hours searching the stacks
or checking in other libraries for desired materials that
have been stolen. Consequently, library users are subse-
quently often forced to write term papers or project
reports with incomplete or inadequate resources. Further,
the library is often unable to replace all stolen material
thus compounding the frustration of missing resources for
future users and for librarians who must deal with these
patrons.

Librarians have tried publicity campaigns, student
security guards, limiting exits, and electronic devices to
deter library book theft (Green, 1964). For the most part,

as the review of the library literature will reveal, these
techniques have been unsuccessful. At The Ohio State
University, the concern of librarians has been partially
concentrated on means to deter book theft. The director
of The Ohio State University Library thinks formality makes
students feel alienated and thus more likely to steal
books (Atkinson, 1975). Thus, one step the library has
taken in response to the directors opinion is to keep
formality low. This is accomplished by not requiring a
special library card, by employing student personnel, by
making access to books relatively easy, and by gently
reminding patrons of overdue books with post card notices
sent to the patron's residences. These procedures, while
perhaps necessary to create a warm, welcome atmosphere,
allow greater opportunity to would-be book thieves to steal
library materials. A number of counter measures have been
implemented to modify such opportunities and hopefully
deter book theft. First, a review of The Ohio State's
University's newspaper the Lantern, since 1970 indicates the
librarians' attempt to curtail book loss by amnesty days
(April 1970, 71, 72), librarians' consideration of black
listing students who owe over fifty dollars in fines and/or
books to the library and revocation of privileges of
faculty who will not return books (1973, 75). Second, the
Lantern has published several articles and editorials
discussing the library book loss problem. In addition, this

news paper has had articles on the effectiveness of student security guards and electronic security systems, Check Point and Tattle_Tape, installed in the Education, Main, and Commerce Libraries. Third, along with such security devices installed in a number of libraries, librarians have limited the number of exits and entrances to one central point. Fourth, librarians here have also distributed questionnaires in the Commerce and Biological Science Libraries to gather information about book theft and what can be done about it. Last, and perhaps the most decisive action librarians have taken has been against book multilators. Since the summer of 1975 the Commerce Library has been enforcing section 2909.10 (12488) of the Ohio Criminal Code which states:

> 2909.10 (12488). Destroying books or paintings.
>
> No person shall intentionally deface, obliterate, tear, or destroy, in whole or in part, or cut or remove an article or advertisement or any page-or part of any scientific material, newspaper, book, magazine, or periodical belonging to another person, association, corporation, or public library, or intentionally deface, obliterate, or destroy, in whole or in part, any picture, painting, sculpture, statue, monument, or any work of art or reproduction of work of art, belonging to another person, association, corporation, museum, or public library.
> Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than five hundred dollars or imprisoned not more than thirty days, or both.

In this way the librarians are employing the power of the state as well as that of the university.

Library book theft is costly not only financially but also psychologically. One librarian, Oscar Trelles (1973), estimates the loss due to book theft nationwide at five million dollars. No one has calculated the man hours lost searching for lost books. Like other types of deviant behavior, theft prevents the system from working as smoothly as it might by forcing libraries to spend money on replacing books rather than on expanding their collection. Moreover, at best, library book theft means the patron is deprived of his or her time, and, at worst, the person is deprived of needed information.

Despite the extent of the library book theft problem, only scanty research has been done. Most of the research which has been done deals with deterrence systems. Still, as will be seen from the review of the literature most of the articles concern speculation and opinion of librarians rather than empirical studies of library patrons and book thieves. Thus a study which examines the attitudes of the student community, particularly those of book thieves is essential.

Not only should this study increase the knowledge of how and why library book theft is accomplished but also this knowledge may help librarians determine effective methods for deterrence.

A review of the literature dealing with book theft and white collar crime in general will be given in Chapter II.

Chapter III will discuss this particular study including the sample, questionnaire construction and administration as well as other methods employed in analyzing the data. The findings themselves and the interpretation of the data will be presented in Chapter IV. Finally, Chapter V will summarize the study and discuss its implications.

REFERENCES

Chapter I

Atkinson, Hugh
　1975　　　　interview held at The Ohio State University
　　　　　　　Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Braden, Irene A.
　1968　　　　"A Pilot Inventory of Library Holdings."
　　　　　　　American Library Association Bulletin.
　　　　　　　62:1129-31.

Burns Security Institute
　1973　　　　National Survey on Library Security
　　　　　　　Bethesda, Md.:ERIC Document Reproduction
　　　　　　　Service ED080131.

Daughtery, Robert Allen
　1975　　　　interview held at The Ohio State University
　　　　　　　Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Gapen, Kaye
　1975　　　　interview held at The Ohio State University
　　　　　　　Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Green, H.
　1964　　　　"Analysis of Literature Dealing With Vanda-
　　　　　　　lism as Indexed in Library Literature 1953-
　　　　　　　63." Master's thesis, Atlanta University.

Reneker, Maxine
　1970　　　　"Book Theft in Academic Libraries."
　　　　　　　Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1970.

Sutuci, Sano
　1975　　　　"Protection: Open Access form Chained
　　　　　　　Libraries." Tosh-Kai. 25:27-30.

Trelles, Oscar M.
　1973　　　　"Protection of Libraries." Law Library
　　　　　　　Journal 66:241-258.

CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will review the literature on library book theft and develop hypotheses applicable to this particular study. The discussion will consider literature in many diverse areas. Not only is this done for the sake of completeness, but also it is done to give this project more continuity with other research.* The literature will be presented in this manner: First the literature dealing with a specific aspect of library book theft will be examined, second, a discussion about the literature will ensue, third, a list of hypotheses or possible areas of investigation will be given. The literature review involves a survey of material from diverse disciplines.

Library Factors

While the conceptual framework associated with white collar crime is the reference point for this research, other hypotheses based on knowledge of librarians, security systems analysts, university educators and administrators, and social scientists will be taken into account. The

---

* For a discussion of constructing hypotheses in a new area of research see Frank Westie, "Toward Closer Relations Between Theory and Research: A Procedure and An Example," American Sociological Review, Vol. 22, 2 (April, 1957), pp. 150-154.

10

first area of the research to be discussed is library
factors. Most of the articles in library periodicals
addressing the topic of book theft deal with techniques
which constitute an environmental design in libraries to
minimize book theft. These include the utilization of
electronic devices, the allowance of only one exit, the
rearrangement of furniture, the placement of shelves for
better viewing, extension of library hours and the assign-
ment of fines to book thieves (Savage, 1959; Reneker, 1970;
Quick; 1964; Feret, 1972; Berry, 1965; Morrison, 1966;
Clark and Haydee, 1969). The factors discussed most
frequently in the literature were included in this study's
survey. Students were asked to evaluate the efficacy of
the addition of electronic devices, the assignment of
fines to book thieves, the provision of more library hours,
and the instigation of publicity campaigns in curbing book
theft. The hypotheses drawn from the literature were that
such environmental changes will reduce book theft.*

Bureaucratic Factors

A second area of the literature to be considered
was derived from a study by Oliner and Manuel (1975). In
this study, they tested assumptions that theft is in

---

* Humphries (1974) thinks that students used the theories
  presented in this discussion as rationales.. However, he
  believes that the only way to deter crime is by changing
  the environment.

response to material deprivation, for kicks, and for status pressure (the idea that the act itself makes a person appear more like an adult). They also explored the ideas that stealers have a significant other, a member of the person's family, peer group etc., that stole and that people who steal books do so as a political protest. From this examination, they found that both stealers and non-stealers perceive material deprivation as a powerful motivation to steal and that more stealers than non-stealers believe role models encourage people to steal. In addition, Oliner and Manuel found that stealers increasingly rationalize their behavior by saying that they steal in protest against the university. Stealers feel that big business and the university are related; as a result of this relation they feel that their university has lost touch with their values.

An intriguing study by Erwin Smigel (1972) concerning attitudes toward stealing in relation to the victim organization has some of the same political protest overtones as the Oliner and Manuel study (1975). Smigel found that while the 212 Indiana residents interviewed generally disapprove of stealing, if forced they would prefer to steal from large business, first, from government, second and finally, from small business. The principles involved seemed to Smigel to be "least evil" (they think

that big business has excess profit, that big business
.cheats the general public) and "least risk." Although
these two were the main factors, Smigel urges other
variables like anonymity, bureaucracy, power, and imper-
sonality may play a part in the respondents' decision.

A study by Stern (1966) on the effects college
environments have on students may indicate why these
findings are particularly relevant to book theft in a large
university setting. Stern found that schools with over
12,000 students such as The Ohio State University, tend to
have "low student dignity." "Low student dignity" is
defined as. students having little voice in the affairs of
the university.*

Stern's findings in light of Smigel's and Oliner's
and Manuel's studies suggest that students might feel more
comfortable taking books from a larger university than a
smaller one or even from a larger library as opposed to a

---

* A study by Pace (1964) in which techniques similar and in
some cases identical to Stern's were used, found the
values of the larger university and these of the students
of the larger university are the same. Furthermore, if,
in some case, university values conflict with the stu-
dent's values, the student will yield his values and the
values of his peers in favor of the university. Neverthe-
less, this apparent discrepancy between Stern's and
Pace's findings may be explained by the fact that,
although there is wide variation between colleges and
departments, students belong to a more dominant culture
which is practical and status oriented. Perhaps this
dominant culture encourages the students to at least
accept or perhaps adapt their values to that of the
university itself, if they conflict.

smaller library or department library with which a student
may identify. If students feel the school itself does not
fulfill their·values and the university is more concerned
with administrative efficiency rather than with the values
of the student and/or the student feels there is less chance
of being caught stealing from a larger library, the student
may be more likely to steal books from a larger university
or library. Using this analysis, three hypotheses will be
derived. These are: people steal books in protest against
the university which they think is like "big business;"
students feel there is less "risk" stealing from a large
library than a small library; students feel less guilty
stealing from a large library than a small or department
library.

University Setting Factors

A third area of the literature concerning theft in
the university setting will be presented. Six out of seven
shoplifters interviewed by Walter Lunden (1966) in his
study of college shoplifters revealed that they shoplifted
because it presented a challenge or because it was an
acceptable way to obtain items for themselves or others.
Lunden summarized his study by saying shoplifters stole
books for "kicks." Only a small per cent of students in
the Oliner and Manuel study and a small per cent of the non-
stealers in Lunden's study felt "kicks" was a rationale for

stealers (Oliner and Manuel; 1975, Lunden, 1966). Still, the hypothesis that students steal library books for kicks will be examined in this research.

A second description of college theft is derived from a study by Poland. In his research of college students at Purdue University, Poland (1971) explored the hypothesis that theft among college students is a gang type behavior.* He found class background and attitude toward the law of male stealers to be the same as male non-stealers. Aside from class rank, the only difference which appeared between stealers and non-stealers was that stealers participated more in premarital sex, marijuana smoking and liquor buying for minors. Consequently, Poland's hypothesis was unsupported by his research. Similarly, Waldo and Hall (1970) found that attitudes among junior high students towards the criminal justice system did not differ significantly between those who had and those who had not violated the law. Yet, when E.W. Vaz (1969) studied the attitudes of public and private high school students, he found private school boys had a less rigid interpretation of the law. He also found that private school boys had a greater propensity to speed in their automobile, drink alcohol,

---

* Poland based his study on Sutherland's and Cressey's notion of differential association. Poland interpreted this concept by saying stealers learn methods and attitudes from their friends.

etc. This research suggests that one of the components of library book theft might be one's peer or family view of book theft as well as the view the stealer and the general community hold on the degree of "rightness" or "wrongness" of stealing a book.

White Collar Crime Factors

The hypotheses identified thus far deal with the effectiveness of changing the environment, that book theft is affected by bureaucracy and may be a result of people viewing the university as a "big business," that books are stolen for kicks, and that book theft is a result of gang behavior. The major thrust of the study, however, is to examine library book theft as a form of white collar crime. In this regard, discussion of library book theft will entail a description of the types of pressures which may lead to book theft, a comparison of library book theft with shop-lifting, and a discussion of the white collar crime perspective may be appropriate to analyze library book theft in an academic setting.

From the literature review and from selected inter-views by the researcher, it appears that library book theft is a response to pressure. Curtis, a security expert, argues that this pressure is a kind of social psychological pressure; for example, a way to compensate for a highly neurotic need (Nunes, 1972). Other librarians, however,

feel that academic pressure is the major motivation of
book thieves.* Lee Zimmerman (1960) in his article,
"Pilfering and Mutilating Books," and Maxine Renecker on
the basis of her nationwide survey both feel academic
pressure is the primary explanation to account for library
book theft. Norman Vines (1969) who investigated book
theft in two high school libraries, one in a higher and
one in a lower economic area, also feels academic pressure
is important. Finally, the opinion that book theft is
due to academic pressure is echoed by Rita Schefrin in her
introduction to her synopsis of library security systems
(Schefrin, 1971).

Response to this pressure by the academic book
thief is parallel to that of the shoplifter. Shoplifting,
according to Cameron (1969) involves a drive for economic
gain and no legitimate means of obtaining it. Shoplifting
entails a sort of material deprivation, a group to instruct,
and group support. Material deprivation has been mentioned
several times in the literature. Material deprivation used
in this context has a special connotation. Material
deprivation, for book theft, and perhaps for shoplifting as
well, is a material deprivation of needs artifically

---

* Although this research is not dealing directly with muti-
  lation, it is interesting to note the ideas of those who
  have studied it. Mutilators responding to interview by
  Clyde Hendrick and Marjorie Murfin (1974), revealed that
  they mutilated books because of pressure of assignments.

created by the system and not necessarily required by the individual to survive. The deprivation may be related to a perceived need by the individual to maintain his or her role in a system or culture. The model of library book thieves being comparable to shoplifters has also been suggested by Kaye Gapan (forthcoming) in her analysis of book theft. In sum, it appears that like the shoplifter and the white collar criminal as described by Sutherland, Cressey, Geis, and many others, the patron who removes books in an unauthorized manner in the course of his or her work, his or her role as a student, does so as a result of the pressures of his or her status rather than for a source of income.

The researcher has taken a electic approach because no research has necessarily made any of the hypotheses less tenable with regards to library book theft. However the researcher has emphasized the white collar crime framework because this perspective seems to encompass the aspects of crime, types of behavior, group attitudes, unclear definition of the act, and motivations for the act, the most completely and concisely. This perspective seems applicable because library patrons, particularly at a university, are generally from a middle-class background. Finally, this perspective is supported by the opinions of librarians who have studied this problem although only one librarian, Gapan, has placed it in such a framework. Therefore, this

perspective seems to be the most appropriate for the library book theft phenomenon.

Library book theft appears to be a type of avocational crime, that is a crime by a person who does not think of himself as a criminal. (Avocational crime is a term coined by Geis, 1974.) His or her major source of income or status comes from a source other than the crime

the person commits. As suggested by Kaye Gapan (1975), library book theft may also be deterable by publically labeling it as a crime. The act of library book theft will be defined for this research as the intentional removing of books from the library in an unauthorized manner (Green, 1964).

This chapter has summarized the literature dealing with library book theft. The perspectives that will guide the analysis of the data are: library environmental design, bureaucratic factors, library book theft as motivated by kicks, library book theft as a result of gang behavior, and white collar crime factors. The following list of hypotheses will be tested.

   A. Library Factors

       1. Electronic devices will curb book theft.

       2. More xeroxing machines will curb book theft.

       3. Fining book thieves will curb book theft.

       4. Conducting publicity campaigns will curb book theft.

5. Library book thieves do not have enough time to use the library.

6. The expense of xeroxing motivates people to steal.

7. Student security guards will curb book theft.

B. Bureaucratic Factors

1. People steal books in protest against the university which they think resembles "big business."

2. Books are more likely to be stolen from larger than a smaller library.

3. Purpose of library (e.g. department, reference) affects place where books are stolen.*

C. University Setting Factors

1. Book thieves steal books for kicks.

2. Book thieves learn their methods for stealing rather than develop methods themselves.

3. Perception of "rightness" or "wrongness" of book theft is shared by book thieves and their friends. Book thieves will define the act as the book thieves' friends do.

D. White Collar Crime Factors

1. People are unsure if library book theft is right or wrong.

---

* Direction of relationship is not hypothesized.

2. People steal books because of academic pressure.

   a. Students deal with stiff competition by stealing books to keep them from their peers.

   b. Students steal books because they cannot afford to buy books.

   c. Students steal books to get better grades.

   d. Students steal books to have the books for their personal collection.

   e. Grade point, class rank, and college may influence academic pressure.*

3. Stealer's friends perceive book theft as legitimate.

4. Stealers are of middle class background.

5. Sanctions against book theft are not often enforced. When they are, the sanctions do not affect the stealer's "life chances."

Each of these hypotheses will be individually examined and commented upon in Chapter IV.

---

* Direction of relationship is not hypothesized.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER II

Berry, John N.
    1965   "To Catch a Thief," Library Journal 90:1617-
                    1621.

Cameron, Mary Owen
    1964   Booster and the Snitch. London: Free Press
                    of Glenco, Collier and Macmillan Limited.

Clark, Robert F. and G. Haydee
    1966   "Your Charging System: Is It Theft Proof?"
                    Library Journal 91:642-643.

Feret, Barbara L.
    1972 .   "Point of Sale," Wilson Library Bulletin.
                    47:46-47.

Gapan, Kaye
    1971.   "The Book Thief." Master's thesis,
                    University of Washington

Geis, Gilbert
    1974   "Avocational Crime," Handbook of Criminology,
                    Daniel Glaser, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally
                    College Publishing Company, 272-273.

Green, H.
    1964   "Analysis of Literature Dealing With Vandalism
                    as Indexed in Library Literature 1953-63,"
                    Master's thesis, Atlanta University.

Hendrick, Clyde and Marjorie E. Murfin
    1974   "Project Library Ripoff: A Study of Periodi-
                    cal Mutilation in a University Library,"
                    College and Research Libraries 35:402-411.

Humphries, Russell
    1974   "Why Do They Steal," The College Store
                    Journal, 104-105.

22

Lunden, Walter A.
    1966   Shoplifting Among College Students. Ames,
                Iowa: Iowa State University Science and
                Technology.

Morrison, Perry D.
    1966   "Lost Book Campaign in Sacramento," Wilson
                Library Bulletin 40:526-529.

Nunes, John
    1972   "The Electronic Librarian," College Management
                7:26-27.

Oliner, S.P. and Maurice, Manuel
    1975   "Student Theft: Crime or Protest," Humboldt
                Journal of Social Relations.

Pace, C. Robert
    1964   The Influence of Academic and Student Sub-
                cultures in College and University Environ-
                ments. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document
                Reproduction Services DE 003037.

Poland, Stephen G.
    1971   "Characteristics, Behavior, and Attitudes of
                Male College Students Who Have Committed
                Theft." Ph.D. Dissertation, Purdue University.

Quick, Mary
    1964   "A Proposed Program for Reducing Book Losses,"
                Master's thesis, West Michigan University.

Reneker, Maxine
    1970   "Book Theft in Academic Libraries." Master's
                thesis, University of Chicago.

Savage, Ernest A.
    1959   "Buy, Borrow, or Steal: Thieves' Methods,"
                Library Journal 84:141-145.

Schefrin, Rita A.
    1971   "The Barriers to and Barriers of Library
                Security," Wilson Library Journal 45:870-878.

Smigel, Erwin
    1970   "Attitudes Towards Stealing Related to Size
                of Victim Organization" in Crime Against
                Bureaucracy, Erwin Smigel and H. Lawrence
                Ross eds. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold
                Company, 15-27.

Stern, George G.
    1966   Studies of College Environments. Bethesda,
                Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Services
                ED 010647.

Vaz, E.W.
    1969   "Delinquency and Youth Culture: Upper and
                Middle Class Boys," Journal of Criminal Law,
                Criminology, and Police Science 60:33-46.

Vinnes, Norman
    1969   "A Search for Meaning in Book Theft," Scho-
                lastic Librarian 18:25-27.

Waldo, Gordon P. and Mason E. Hall
    1970   "Delinquency Potential and Attitudes Toward
                the Criminal Justice System," Social Forces
                49:291-298.

Zimmerman, Lee
    1960   "Pilfering and Mutilating Books," Bookmark
                13:5-9.

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

The case study method will be used in this research. This method was chosen because the study is exploratory in nature, the results of this research will determine if more research is warranted. The library system at The Ohio State University is a good choice for study because its library system has a wide variety of library materials and security systems. Also a representative sample of The Ohio State University student population provides as much heterogeneity in respondents as possible.

A discussion of why and how this particular sample was chosen, how the questionnaire was developed and administered, and what techniques of measurement were employed will be presented in the following sections.

Sample

The sample was drawn from college students* enrolled

---

* Undoubtedly a major factor in the library loss rate is employee theft. In fact, Mary Cameron (1964) in her works on shoplifting estimates the loss rate due to employee theft at 67 per cent. Moreover, instances of library employees stealing books have been cited in the library literature (ALA Asks Victimized Libraries to Contact Librarians Guilty of Stealing Pertaining to Special Committee, 1964; Librarians Guilty of Stealing Purloining

25

in various classes at The Ohio State University in the fall
of 1975. The classes were chosen because the researcher was
interested in surveying a heterogeneous sample with regards
to experience with library materials and deterrent systems
and with regards to class rank and field of study.*
Classes were chosen by examining the enrollment of all the
classes in the fall quarter of 1974 in each college on the
basis of class rank and college. If the enrollment books
were unavailable, deans or administrative assistants or in
one case the counselor of the college listed courses that
would have students of intercollege diversity** and a
majority of juniors and seniors. The researcher concen-
trated on juniors and seniors because a poll by The Ohio
State University's PULSE (1974) indicated that juniors,

Converting Federal Property on Loan to Library. 1964)
Some of these concern employees abusing their check-out
privileges; others deal with stealing from rare collections.
William Bond (1973) in his article on book store security
suggests, in addition, that rapid turnover leads to theft.
At The Ohio State University the turnover rate for both
student part-time employees and civil service equivalents
(clerks, library assistants, for example) is 25 per cent
per year (The Ohio State University, 1975). However,
because of time and monetary limitations and because the
researcher suspects the self report rate would not be as
valid among library employees, this study will be limited
to an examination of students.

* The librarians at The Ohio State University conducted a
study similar to this one in 1973-74 using only library
patrons for a sample. Sampling a group of students more
varied in type and frequency of library use, will serve as
a check on their findings.

** An example of a class with intercollege diversity would be
Accounting 212 with business administration, finance,
marketing, and accounting and perhaps students in other
colleges taking accounting in preparation for law school.

and seniors were the principal users of the library system.

Classes were selected from this list by practical considerations.*   These classes were: Microbiology, 509, French 101, Statistics 125, Accounting 212, Sociology 430, Classics 120, Astronomy 150, English 290, English 205, and Sociology 790. Although choosing classes on a practical consideration may have introduced systematic error into the sample, midway through the survey answers to the questions concerning demographic variables were reviewed and the sample characteristics were found to be representative of the students at The Ohio State University.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire method was deemed the most appropriate way to tap the opinions of many students in a variety of fields and all class ranks. In addition, the questionnaire, particularly a self-administered one such as this, facilitated obtaining a large sample quickly. The questionnaire was administered by the researcher in nine classes and by the researcher's colleague in one class,

---

* Practical considerations include if the researcher was free when the class was offered, etc. If the researcher knew the instructor she contacted the instructor beforehand to arrange an appropriate day to survey. If the researcher did not know the instructor, she arrived ten minutes before the class was there, explained her research, and asked the instructor for permission to survey the class. Although no instructor refused, the instructor of Accounting 212 asked the researcher to return later on in the week because the class was reviewing for an examination.

Sociology 790. Of the 446 questionnaires administered, 14 per cent or 66 questionnaires were unuseable because they were answered in a haphazard manner or were incomplete.*

The questionnaire was developed from the review of the literature. It was pretested twice; each time to twenty people as they entered or exited from the Main Library.** The original questionnaire was revised after the first pretest based on the comments of the researcher's peers and professors as well as those of the respondents original. A second pretest questionnaire was composed primarily of closed-ended responses which would allow easy coding and easy replication of the study. A copy of this questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

Although slight alterations and modifications were made to accommodate the idiosyncracies of each classroom setting, an effort was made to keep a consistent procedure

---

* These questionnaires were however analyzed apart from the "good" data. The answers, except for the responses concerning motivation, were similar to the general sample. Those who answered the questionnaire in a haphazard manner more frequently chose outsmarting the library and stiff competition as motivations for book theft. Although more than one half of these respondents left these questions blank, the demographic variables that were available indicate that these people parallel the other students in the study in background, except for field of study. Business administration students most frequently completed the questionnaire haphazardly. No nurses or allied medical students completed the questionnaire in an inconsistent manner.

** The self-report rate from these questionnaires was 5 per cent.

from class to class.* Questionnaires were given to students already seated and to others as they entered the classroom. No questionnaires were given to students who entered the classroom five minutes after the hour unless they insisted on filling one out after hearing the topic of the question-naire.** Before and while the researcher distributed the remaining questionnaires to latecomers, she introduced her-self by name and explained that the questionnaire was being done in co-operation with the Department of Sociology and the library. At this point and several times while the students were completing the questionnaire it was emphasized that the responses were anonymous. Other than those printed on the questionnaire, these were the only instructions given.*** The questionnaire took between seven and thirteen minutes to complete. After the questionnaires were

---

* While the researcher was surveying she was concerned about the varying amounts of interest and co-operation that the classes seemed to have in this study. However, when the results obtained from each class were compared these differences did not appear significant except in the case of business administration. The researcher surveyed a class with business administration students on a day students were discussing their test results.

** This time boundary was set to maintain a degree of time consistency from class to class as well as to prevent the questionnaire from taking too much time away from the instructor's planned lecture.

*** Yet as the researcher became aware that people were not taking the questionnaire as seriously as they might, she stressed the importance of the straight answers to the questionnaire honestly so the results would be effective in upgrading the library's ability to serve them.

returned to the researcher, she debriefed the students.*

After each surveying session, the researcher assigned a three digit code to each questionnaire with the first number being the same for each questionnaire completed in one class. This was done to aid comparative analysis of each class. In addition, the researcher logged comments, events, and the procedure implemented in the preceding session.

Questionnaires were then coded and key-punched.** The few numerical answers were coded as given. Other open ended questions such as those dealing with demographic variables were collapsed and assigned a numeric code. If a person wrote an answer in, an answer code was developed to include it too.*** Finally, if the person made comments about the questionnaire, a question or questions about library book theft or about the library itself a special note in the form of a code was made on the questionnaire's respective computer card.

Measurement

There is no official record kept by law enforcement

---

* Only one questionnaire was not coded. That was one where
  the researcher observed two people collaborating. They
  gave answers like president of the United States as
  father's occupation.
** This occured with four questions and only in one case
  did the written-in responses exceed 2 per cent of the
  total. With that question written in response repre-
  sented 4 per cent of the total answers.

agencies or courts of the amount of library book theft, so it is a hidden crime. There are two ways of ascertaining data on hidden crime, victimization studies and self-report studies. Although libraries, the victims of library book theft, have computed rough estimates, the number of stolen books can only be guessed at. Since the victimization rate is difficult to determine, self reporting is the remaining technique. Most of the research reviewed in Chapter II utilized the self-report technique to determine the number and characteristics of participants in theft. In addition, this technique has been used with populations similar to college students. In this study, the researcher also relied on the self-reporting technique to distinguish book thieves from non-book thieves.*

This technique was perfected in 1957 by Nye and Short (1957). It has been used extensively since then, for example to compare self-report data with such traits as social-economic class (Clark and Wenniger, 1962) self concept (Tangri and Schwartz, 1967) and official records (Gould, 1969). Others have tried to validate the results of self-report data by accompanying it with a polygraph test (Clark and Tift, 1966) or with the co-operation of self-reporter's friends (Hood and Sparks, 1970).

---

* While many sources were used for this discussion, the framework for this discussion is based on Hood and Spark's discussion, pages 46 to 70.

There are two methods of administering the self-report technique, interviewing and self-completion. The self-completion technique was employed in this study. Although the self-completion technique has been criticized because it encounters such difficulties as general comprehension and poor motivation both Dentler and K. Elmhorn found the per cent of questionnaires discarded due to this reaction to be 3 to 4 per cent and .0.5 per cent respectively (Hood and Sparks, 1970). Furthermore studies using this technique have not found exaggeration to be much of a problem. What may compound this problem of exaggeration however, is a person's interpretation of a question (Hood and Sparks 1970).* Hopefully some of these misconceptions were eliminated by the pretest and by the fact that the researcher and the persons in this study both attend The Ohio State University. Since the researcher shares the same middle-class background as the majority of the students and the same university education the researcher should be able to use a vocabulary comprehensible to both. Since the researcher and the subjects have similar vocabularies this study should not encounter many of the problems of other studies using the self-report technique where the researcher

_____

* Martin Gold found in his study that more upper or middle-class white boys tended to confess accidental or trival acts of property destruction as a violation that did poorer white boys (Hood and Sparks, 1970). This should not be important in this study.

is older and may be of a different culture or class than
his subjects. Another method to eliminate this problem was
to ask the respondent to specify the use of the book after
it is taken, for example: did you keep it, sell it, or
return the book eventually. Finally, the self-completion
technique promotes anonymity.

Occupational and educational levels were grouped
according to the Hollingshead scale (Hollingshead, 1964).
The income was categorized by Bureau of the Census listings
(Bureau of Census, 1972).

Crosstabulations and frequency distributions were
chosen to analyze this data because most of the data was
nominal. The mode and index of dispersion were used to
describe the central tendency and variability of the data.
Chi-square was used to test for independence among the
components of the various perspectives: library factors,
bureaucratic factors, university setting factors, and white
collar crime factors outlined in Chapter II. Chi-square
was also used to test the relationship the demographic
variables have with the components of the hypotheses as
well. Chi-square was employed as a test for significance
between those who reported either that they themselves or
that their best friend stole books and those who did not.
The significance level was set at 0.05. Phi, or where
appropriate, Cramer's V was used to measure the degree of
association.

In this chapter the sampling, questionnaire con-
struction, and techniques for measurement were discussed.
The case study method was used in this research. The mass
administration of the questionnaire eliminated a degree of
self-selection in the sample. Although it is not neces-
sarily representative of the general population, the sample
is heterogeneous and fairly representative of the students
attending The Ohio State University in the fall of 1975.
Because of the nature of the crime, self-reporting was used
To find those who steal books. The statistics appropriate
to nominal data will be employed for analysis.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER III

1965   "ALA Asks Victimised Libraries to Contact
          Special Committee," Library Journal 89:1574.

Bond, William
  1973   Eleven Steps Can Lead You to Curtailing Inven-
          tory Losses and Crime in the Campus Bookstore.
          College and University Business 54:3:53.

Bureau of the Census
  1972   Social and Economic Statistics of United
          States, Department of Commerce, Washington,
          D.C.

Cameron, Mary Owen
  1964   Booster and the Snitch. London: Free Press of
          Glenco, Collier, and Macmillan limited.

Clark, John P. and Eugene P. Wenninger
  1962   "Socio-Economic Class and Areas Correlates of
          Illegal Behavior Among Juveniles." American
          Sociological Review 24:826-834.

Clark, John P. and Larry L. Tift
  1966   "Polygraph and Interview Validation of Self-
          Reported Deviant Behavior," American Sociological
          Review 31:516-523.

Gould, Leroy C.
  1969   "Who Defines Delinquency: A Comparison of
          Self-Reported and Officially Reported Indices
          of Delinquency for 3 Racial Groups," Social
          Problems 16:325-326.

Hollingshead, August B.
  1965   Two Factor Index of Social Position. Yale
          Station, New Haven, Connecticut.

Hood and Sparks
  1970   Key Issues in Criminology: New York: World
          University Library 46-70.

35

1969   "Librarians Guilty of Stealing, Purloining
and Converting Federal Property on Loan to
Library," Library Journal, 94:24000.

Nye, F. Ivan and James F. Short
1957   "Scaling Delinquent Behavior." American
Sociological Review 22:326-331.

1975   Personal Office of the Ohio State Library
Interview held in Ohio State University Main
Library Room 208, June 1957.

The Ohio State University
1974   An Ohio State University Poll Report on
Student Library Usage. The Ohio State
University, Columbus, Ohio.

Trangri, Savera and Michael Schwartz
1967   "Delinquency Research and Self Concept Variable,"
Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police
Science 58:182-190.

CHAPTER IV.   FINDINGS

This chapter will report the opinions and demographic variables of students who completed the questionnaire, with a separate examination of those who admitted to book theft.   First, students' opinions of the seriousness of library book theft will be examined.   Second, students' opinions about people's motivations to take books, about what factors affect the procedure involved in taking books, and about what methods they feel would be effective in curbing book theft will be discussed.   The second part of this chapter will contrast the backgrounds and opinions of those who admitted to stealing books and those who did not. The third and fourth sections will deal with how the findings supported the hypotheses outlined in Chapter II and the implications of these findings.

Students Opinion

As Tables 1 through 9 incidate, the student sample was heterogeneous on all variables.   The distribution of this sample is similar to The Ohio State University Poll's distribution, given in Appendix B.   This sample contains a greater proportion of juniors and seniors than in The

37

Ohio State University population. Otherwise, however, the sample is fairly representative of The Ohio State University population for the Fall of 1975 as well.*

The student sample was diverse with regards to fields of study. Over 20 per cent of the sample are in a professional field of study. Approximately 15 per cent of the student respondents are in agriculture, home economics or natural resources. Those who studied social and behavioral sciences composed 14 per cent of the sample (Table 1).

The sample is almost equally divided between males and females (See Table 3). The class standing of students was skewed toward more advanced students (see Table 2). Seniors composed 20 per cent of the sample and juniors, 20 per cent of the sample, while freshmen comprised 15 per cent of the sample. The greater proportion of juniors and seniors were included in the sample because a 1974 poll by The Ohio State University's poll found that juniors and seniors use the library more frequently than underclassmen.

The social-economic background of the sample is also skewed towards the middle class (see Tables 4 through 7). Medium professionals-administrative personnel, lesser professionals, proprietors of medium business ($35,000 to

---

* The researcher examined the statistics given by The Ohio State University Statistics.

TABLE 1

Respondent's Field of Study**

	Per Cent	Number
Professional and pre-professional*	22.0***	(81)
Agriculture, home economics, and natural resources	14.7	(54)
Social and behavioral sciences	14.1	(52)
Arts and humanities	13.5	(50)
Biological and physical sciences	6.8	(25)
Business administration	10.1	(37)
College of education	7.9	(29)
University college or general studies	10.6	(30)
Missing		(12)
Total	100.0	(380)

* Occupational and educational levels were grouped according to Hollingshead scale (1965). They were further collapsed into groups containing 30 or more cases. The income was categorized according to the Bureau of the Census (1972) listings. Major or department was grouped by colleges and later on the basis of Stern's (1966) and Pace's (1964) research on major field and corresponding attitudes: engineers, architects, allied medical people, nurses and pre-professional; arts and humanities students, natural resources, home economics and agriculture students; education; and miscellaneous including general studies, university college, and undecided. Other questions such as stealing a book were categorized as yes or no.
** Questions concerning demographic characteristics had the most missing answers. A few people wrote that they felt these questions were none of the researcher's business or not applicable.
*** The per cents given in this and subsequent tables have been adjusted for missing data.

TABLE 2

Respondent's Class Rank

	Per Cent	Number
Graduate, professional, or continuing education	7.5	(28)
Seniors	19.6	(74)
Juniors	31.8	(120)
Sophomores	26.0	(98)
Freshmen	15.1	(57)
Missing		(3)
Total	100.0	(380)

TABLE 3

Respondent's Sex

	Per Cent	Number
Male	51.6	(195)
Female	48.4	(182)
Missing		(4)
Total	100.0	(380)

TABLE 4

The Occupation of the Principal Wage Earner
in Respondent's Family

	Per Cent	Number
Major Professional	22.9	(76)
Medium professional	33.2	(110)
Semi-professional and farmers	11.1	(27)
Technical and clerical	23.7	(90)
Unemployed, receiving some sort of government benefits	8.4	(28)
Missing		(38)
Total	100.0	(380)

TABLE 5

Combined Family Income of Respondents

	Per Cent	Number
Greater than $25,000	26.4	(93)
$15,000 - $24,999	34.4	(121)
$10,000 - $14,999	27.3	(96)
$ 5,000 - $ 9,999	9.4	(33)
less than $4,999	2.6	(9)
Missing		(28)
Total	100.0	(380)

TABLE 6

Education of Principal Wage Earner in Respondent's Family

	Per Cent	Number
Graduate or Professional training	17.8	(62)
College education	25.8	(90)
Vocational or up to three years of college	18.6	(65)
High school or less	37.7	(152)
Missing		(31)
Total	100.0	(380)

TABLE 7

Percentage of Respondent's Current Educational Expenses Paid for by His or Her Family

	Per Cent	Number
Zero per cent	34.6	(129)
Twenty-five per cent	15.3	(57)
Fifty per cent	11.3	(42)
Seventy-five per cent	17.7	(66)
One hundred per cent	21.2	(79)
Missing		(4)
Total	100.0	(380)

$100,000) made up 33 per cent; technical and clerical
workers, 27 per cent of the sample. Those who were
unemployed or receiving some type of government benefits
comprised 8 per cent of the sample. Educational level of
the family was measured by asking the respondent to give
the highest level of education of the person who was the
principal wage earner of the family. Thirty-eight per
cent of the respondents reported that this person in their
family had a high school education or less, 26 per cent
reported that the principal wage earner in their family had
a college education, 18 per cent reported that this person
had graduate or professional training, and 19 per cent said
this person had either vocational training or between one
and three years of college. Sixty per cent of the sample
had a combined family income of $15,000 a year or more.
Twenty-seven per cent had income levels between $10,000 and
$14,999 a year. This distribution indicates that most
students in this study have a middle-class background.
Finally, 25 per cent of the sample were not dependent on
their parents for current educational expenses. Twenty-one
per cent of the sample were totally dependent on their family
to meet current educational expenses.

Study and reference research were the principal ways
that the sample used the library. (See Table 8). Fifty-three
per cent of the sample used the library between one and

three times a week; 33 per cent of the sample did not use the library at all (See Table 9).*

Students' conception of the library book theft phenomenon was measured by questions concerning students' perception of whether library book theft was right or wrong and students perception of consequences of library book theft, particularly students' estimates of the financial loss due to library book theft. Forty-seven per cent of the sample viewed book theft as illegal and indi- cated they felt people apprehended should be punished. However, when given hypothetical vignettes (see Appendix A) of students stealing library books for a variety of reasons the punishments they selected were not severe.** Furthermore,

---

* People seemed to interpret this question as referring to habitual use of the library. In other words, students who say they used the library zero times a week did not seem to be saying that they never used the library; the answers to other questions concerning library use indicate that these people did not consistently use the library.

** Seventy-eight per cent of those answering the library study questionnaire in 1974 defined library book theft as illegal. While 44 per cent of the people in the 73 study felt the individual stealing did not think this behavior was wrong, only 29 per cent of the respondents in the 74 study felt this way (Ohio State Librarians: forthcoming).

    The responses to this question may be biased by the fact that the wording on pages previous to the one in which this question appear gave the impression that the researcher thought library book theft was wrong. This could have suggested to the respondent that library book theft is wrong.

    Definition of book theft is affected by library use. Those who used the library primarily for reference work were not as severe in the degree of badness they assigned to library book theft.

TABLE 8

Respondent's Reasons for Using the Library

	Per Cent	Number
Study	63.0	(241)
Reference	65.0	(246)
Study only during midterms and finals	16.0	(63)
Leisure reading	21.0	(79)
Missing		(19)
Total		380

TABLE 9

Frequency of Respondent's Library Use Per Week

	Per Cent	Number
Zero times	33.2	(126)
One to three times	53.2	(202)
Four to five times	8.4	(34)
More than six times	4.2	(16)
Missing		(2)
Total	100.0	380

TABLE 10

Respondent's Perception of Best Friend's Opinion
of Library Book Theft

	Per Cent	Number
Strongly approve	0.0	(0)
Approve	2.1	(8)
Uncertain	33.1	(125)
Disapprove	42.3	(160)
Strongly disapprove	22.5	(85)
Missing		(2)
Total	100.0	380

TABLE 11

Respondent's Perception of Parent's Opinion
to Library Book Theft

	Per Cent	Number
Strongly approve	1.1	(4)
Approve	0.5	(2)
Uncertain	6.4	(24)
Disapprove	36.2	(136)
Strongly disapprove	55.0	(210)
Missing		(4)
Total	100.0	380

students believe their best friend was more uncertain about approving or disapproving library book theft than their parents. Only 22 per cent of the sample percieved their "best friend" as strongly disapproving of book theft, while 56 per cent of the sample perceived their parents as strongly disapproving of the act. Seventy-four per cent of the students cited depriving other patrons of the book as the worst consequence of library book theft. This is similar to the results found by Reneker (1970) in her study of librarians and almost identical to The Ohio State University librarian study. Finally, the average of the students' estimate of the dollar loss due to book theft at The Ohio State University in 1975 was $55,880.* This is close to the $64,000 estimate made by librarians at The Ohio State University made in 1972.

In summary, students perceived library book theft as a problem and, at least financially, a rather serious one. Students felt library book theft deserves punishment, but the majority of these students chose a punishment which would hinder specifically the academic pursuits rather than the entire life of the book thief. The choice of punishment by the student combined with the fact that students perceive

---

* Although some people interpreted the question to deal with average value of the book the person stole, and others the average value of a book, the average response was $4.80. The average value of a book is $14.00 (Gapan, 1975).

harm done by book theft as deprivation of the academic
community of its resources indicates that students view
book theft as an academic crime only.

The data for Table 12 was ascertained by asking
students what motivations they perceived people had when
they stole books. As Table 12 indicates, no one motivation
to steal books clearly dominates the others. The most
strongly supported motivations are those dealing with
material deprivation. The high cost of xeroxing and
inadequate funds to purchase books were thought by respon-
dents to be frequent motivations for book theft. The
perceived high cost of xeroxing is affected by library use.
People who use the library to study and for reference
materials more often felt that the high cost of xeroxing
is important. Twenty per cent of the students felt people
frequently steal books in protest against The Ohio State
University. Seventeen per cent felt challenge was a fre-
quent motivation of stealing books. A small portion of the
total sample felt that pressure to receive good grades or
stiff competition among peers was a possible motivation for
those who steal books. This finding   reflects the rather
unlikely attitude that students are not conscious of compe-
tition or the more likely attitude that students do not
think having extra library resources is an aid in managing
the competition peers present.

TABLE 12

Reasons Given By Respondents As to Why Students Steal
Library Books

		Per Cent	Number
Xeroxing is too expensive**#	Often	30.3	(115)
	Sometimes	43.4	(165)
	Rarely	26.3	(100)
Cannot afford to buy book for a course or project	Often	27.4	(104)
	Sometimes	51.5	(195)
	Rarely	21.1	(80)
Not enough time to use book in the library	Often	26.2	(99)
	Sometimes	47.6	(180)
	Rarely	26.2	(99)
As protest against OSU because OSU is like a "big business"***	Often	20.1	(76)
	Sometimes	35.1	(133)
	Rarely	44.9	(171)
As a challenge	Often	16.6	(63)
	Sometimes	38.2	(145)
	Rarely	45.3	(172)
Extra text will help to relieve pressure of getting good grades	Often	14.2	(54)
	Sometimes	45.4	(172)
	Rarely	40.4	(163)
Stiff competition	Often	4.5	(36)
	Sometimes	35.4	(134)
	Rarely	55.1	(209)
Total (of each category)		*	(380)

* The rate of missing answers ranged from 0 to 1. The index of
dispersion ranged from 84 to 98 per cent. Because the
difference between each category is small the data was
presented in this manner. This procedure will be followed
in the subsequent tables of this nature.
** The pressure to get good grades was rated by 30 per cent
of those people completing the library study in 1974 as
a possible motivation to get good grades. Eight per cent
in 1973 and 26 per cent in 1974 of the respective library
studies said that photocopying played a part in library
book theft. In the library's study they found that 19 per

cent in 1973 and 5 per cent in 1974 thought a person
took books in ordertobe part of a group or to gain status
they found 25 per cent in 1973 and 17 per cent in 1974
thought people take books because of the challenge.
(Ohio State University Librarians).

*** Although the relationship between field of study and
pressure is not significant, arts and humanities
students felt less pressured; social science majors, the
most. Juniors were the most pressured among class
ranks.-

Although the relationship is not significant,
majors in the college of education seemed to feel stiff
competition the last; professional, social science and
business the same. Juniors felt stiff competition the
most among class ranks.

These categories are similarly worded to those on the
questionnaire.

Given the distribution in Table 13, students felt carrying out a book in a purse or satchel was the most common technique for stealing a book. Twenty-one per cent of the sample felt the most common technique of stealing books was hiding in clothing. The distribution of other answers dealing with factors affecting the procedure involved book theft are more skewed. Students felt that stealers develop their own methods to steal books for the most part (see Table 14). This belief is consistent with belief held by 81 per cent of the students that book theft is a spontaneous act (See Table 15). People perceive less risk in stealing from large libraries (See Table 16). Seventy-nine per cent of the students did not perceive the type of library affecting the amount of guilt a person felt when he or she stole a book. However, of those who did perceive the type of library as affecting the amount of guilt a person felt, (15 per cent) said that they would feel less guilty stealing from the main library (See Table 17).

Table 18 lists how students rated each method for curbing book theft. Fifty-one per cent felt electronic devices were effective. Thirty-three per cent of the sample felt fines were an effective method for curbing book theft. Those who viewed fines as effective were more punitive in responses to the vignettes. Still, when students were asked to choose an appropriate punishment they chose to take library privileges away for a year (See

TABLE 13

Respondent's Opinion of How Books Are Stolen

	Per Cent	Number
Writing in False Date	8.1	(28)
Hiding in clothing	21.4	(74)
Carrying in purse or satchel	57.5	(199)
Other: hide in another book, throw out the window, etc.	13.0	(45)
Missing		(4)
Total	100.0	380

Mode = carrying in purse or satchel
Index of Dispersion = 80%

TABLE 14

Respondent's Opinion of Methods Learned From Friends

	Per Cent	Number
Learned from friends	24.6	(89)
Develop by themselves	70.4	(255)
Both	5.0	(18)
Missing		(18)
Total	100.0	380

Mode = develop own method
Index of Dispersion = 66%

TABLE 15

Respondent's Opinion on Planning Theft

	Per Cent	Number
Spontaneous	80.6	(295)
Planned	18.6	(68)
Both	0.8	(3)
Missing		(14)
Total	100.0	(380)

Mode = spontaneous
Index of Dispersion = 47%

TABLE 16

Respondent's Perception of Risk at Large vs Small Library

	Per Cent	Number
Large library	72.3	(256)
Small library	27.4	(97)
Missing		(26)
Total	100.0	380

Mode = Large Library
Index of Dispersion = 80%

TABLE 17

Respondent's Perception of Guilt Stealing from
Different Types of Libraries

	Per Cent	Number
Department Library	4.2	(15)
Main Library	14.6	(52)
Reference	2.0	(7)
All equally	43.4	(155)
None of them	35.9	(128)
Missing		(23)
Total	100.0	380

TABLE 18

Respondent's Opinion on Ways to Curb Book Theft

		Per Cent	Number
Electronic devices**	Effective	51.4	(190)
	Somewhat Effective	43.2	(160)
	Ineffective	5.4	(20)
Heavily fine	Effective	32.6	(123)
	Somewhat Effective	43.2	(163)
	Ineffective	24.1	(91)
Have more xeroxing machines	Effective	22.4	(84)
	Somewhat Effective	42.1	(158)
	Ineffective	35.5	(133)
Student security guard	Effective	18.6	(70)
	Somewhat Effective	45.7	(172)
	Ineffective	35.6	(134)
Publicity campaign	Effective	7.2	(27)
	Somewhat Effective	40.6	(153)
	Ineffective	52.3	(197)
*Total (of each category)		100.0	380

* The missing rate ranged from 1 to 3 people; the index of dispersion ranged from 82 to 97 per cent.
** Exit guards were rated as 30 per cent in 1973 and 18 per cent effective in 1974; publicity campaigns- 21 per cent in 1973 and 11 per cent in 1974 in the study by the librarians at Ohio State University. They also found that 56 per cent in 1973 and 98 per cent in 1974 thought electronic devices to be effective in curbing book theft. It seems that this opinion varies with whether an electronic device has been installed in the respective library. While 98 per cent of the students in Commerce Library thought an electronic device would be effective, only 36 per cent of those in the Bio-Science Library thought it was important. Commerce Library obtained Check Point in that year, while Bio-Sciences was without such a device.

Tables 19 and 20). Although the cost of xeroxing was reported as being a frequent motivation for book theft, having more xeroxing machines was viewed by only 22 per cent of the total sample as effective. This suggests that the availability of xeroxing machines is not as important as the cost of the xeroxing. Last, publicity campaigns and student security guards are considered ineffective.

Book Thieves Opinion

Five per cent of the sample reported stealing books. On the average stealers said they stole three books.*,** Although estimates of book loss are rough, the estimates of The Ohio State University librarians and the estimations made from the data of this study coincide to some degree. Given that the actual average worth of a book is $14.00, the loss due to book theft may range from $35,000 to $105,000 per year.*** Although the larger estimate is larger than the librarians' estimate of $64,000 it is less

---

* No time boundaries were given for this question. Consequently, students could have meant they stole a certain amount of books in one year or in their entire experience at The Ohio State University.

** Respondents interpreted the question dealing with what a person does with a stolen book in many ways. Still of the minority who selected an alternative, 18 per cent said they would return the book eventually, 5 per cent said they would keep it for a collection, 0.4 per cent said they would sell it. 5 per cent said they would forget about the book and with time keep it. Fourteen of the 19 stealers said they returned the book eventually.

*** The estimations in this study were made by multiplying 5 per cent of The Ohio State University population times $14.00 times one times three books to get range.

TABLE 19

Respondent's Choice of Punishment for a Book Thief
who was a Pre-med Student and whose Motivation
was to Prevent Others from Using the Book

	Per Cent.	Number
No penalty*	1.1	(4)
Told to return the book and lectured by the librarian	15.3	(56)
Take away library privileges for a year	62.0	(227)
Five days in jail and $50 fine	16.9	(62)
Six months in jail and $1,000 fine	4.6	(17)
Missing		(1)
Total	100.0	380

Mode = Take away library privileges for a year
Index of Dispersion = 70%

* Six people mentioned that they could not find the appropriate answer among these categories.

TABLE 20

Respondent's Choice of Punishment for a Book Thief
Whose Motivation was to Fulfill a Material Need

	Per Cent	Number
No penalty	2.7	(10)
Told to return the book and lectured by the librarian	32.9	(120)
Take away library privileges for a year	50.4	(184)
Five days in jail and $50 fine	9.9	(36)
Six months in jail and $1,000 fine	4.1	(15)
Missing		(15)
Total	100.0	380

Mode = take away library privileges for a year
Index of Dispersion = 78%

TABLE 21

Stealer's Field of Study

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Professional and preprofessional	16.7	(3)*	22.0	(81)
Agriculture, home economics and natural resources	5.6	(1)	14.7	(54)
Social and behavioral sciences	11.1	(2)	14.1	(52)
Arts and humanities	38.9	(7)	13.5	(50)
Biological and physical sciences	0	(0)	6.8	(25)
Business Administration	16.7	(3)	10.1	(37)
College of education	5.6	(1)	7.9	(29)
University College or general studies	5.6	(1)	10.6	(30)
Missing		(1)		(12)
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 10.75819$
$df = 6$
sign = 0.0961
Cramer's V = 0.17215

64

59

TABLE 22 (continued)

* When less than five cases were in one cell the x^2 was
  corrected using Fisher's exact test. Subsequent tables
  with less than five cases in one cell will be corrected
  by Fisher's exact test.

TABLE 22

Stealer's Class Rank

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Graduate, professional or continuing education	5.0	(1)	7.5	(28)
Seniors	31.0	(6)	19.6	(74)
Juniors	26.0	(5)	31.8	(120)
Sophomores	15.7	(3)	26.0	(98)
Freshmen	21.0	(4)	15.1	(57)
Missing		0		3
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 9.64461$
df = 8
sign = 0.2909
Cramer's V = 0.16080

66

TABLE 23

Stealer's Sex

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Male	52.6	(10)	51.6	(195)
Female	47.4	(9)	48.4	(182)
Missing		0		4
Total	100.0	19.	100.0	380

$x^2 = 0.01488$
$df = 1$
$sign = 0.9042$
$phi = 0.00598$

than the $140,000 estimation made based on The Ohio State University Library statistician's figures. Both of the librarians' figures were calculated using 1972 data.*

For the most part the demographic characteristics and opinions of those who admitted to book theft did not differ markedly from those who did not report book theft.** Because the sample of book thieves is small, their opinions and characteristics will be presented in full. Special note will be made of the significant differences between the total sample and the book thieves.

While occupation and education are significantly related to each other, only the relationship between occupation and those who steal books was significant (See Tables 24 and 25). In general, more of the principal wage earners in the families of those who admitted to book theft were unskilled, unemployed, or receiving some type of

---

* Students were asked if their best friend stole books; the researcher's intention was to compare this rate to the self-report rate. However, although the relationship between the two is significant at the 0.0001 level, the responses of the self reporters are seldom parallel to responses of those who admitted their best friend stole books. The discrepancy may be a result of a small sample in both cases. Consequently the analysis of questions and how those who reported their best friend stealing books will not be presented. The researcher, perplexed by this problem, interviewed 15 library patrons concerning the question to determine how they would answer the question of their best friend stolen books as they would if the question concerned their own behavior. Most of the respondents said they would. Of the 5 who admitted their best friend stole books, 4 reported they answered the question as themselves.

** Although no study has been made, a review of Director's Annual Report 73-74 and 74-75 indicates that the book loss rate has stabilized around this figure.

TABLE 24

Occupation of the Principal Wage Earner in Stealer's Family

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Major Professional	13.3	(2)	22.9	(76)
Medium professional	33.3	(5)	33.2	(110)
Semi-professional and farmers	0	(0)	11.1	(27)
Technical and clerical	26.7	(5)	23.7	(90)
Unemployed receiving some sort of government benefits	20.0	(3)	8.4	(28)
Missing		4		35
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380.

$x^2 = 25.30614$
df = 6
sign = 6.0003
Cramer's V = 0.3

TABLE 25

Stealer's Family Combined Income

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Greater than $25,000	5.8	(1)	26.4	(193)
$15,000 – 24,999	35.3	(6)	34.4	(121)
$10,000 – 14,999	41.1	(7)	27.3	(96)
$ 5,000 – 9,999	11.8	(2)	9.4	(33)
less than $4,999	5.8	(1)	2.6	(9)
Missing		2		28
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 4.93149$
$Df = 4$
sign = 0.2944
Cramer's V = 0.11870

government benefit and fewer were major professionals.
Accordingly, the income of these families was lower but
not significantly lower than that of the total sample.
Forty-two per cent of the stealers' families as compared to
27 per cent of the non stealers' families earned between
$10,000 and $14,999 annually; 6 per cent of the stealers
as compared to 26 per cent of the non-stealers' families
earned $25,000 a year or more (See Table 26). Other
relationships are of interest. First, a greater per cent
of stealers did not receive help to meet their current
educational expenses from their parents. Second, the most
frequent book theives were arts and humanities' students
(See Table 27). Third, stealers did not seem to come from
a particular class rank. Fourth, a greater proportion of
stealers used the library for leisure reading and study
during midterms and finals, while frequency of library use
did not seem to differ between the two groups (See Tables
28 and 29). Finally, although Poland (1971) hypothesized
that men steal more frequently than women, 53 per cent of
the men and 47 per cent of the women reported book
theft in this study (See Table 23).

Like the total sample, the overwhelming majority
of book thieves felt book theft was wrong. However, most
stealers did not feel the act was as worthy of punishment
as the total sample did. Like the total sample, the
stealers felt the most appropriate punishment in the

71

TABLE 26

Education of Principal Wage Earner in Stealer's Family

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Graduate or professional training	12.5	(2)	17.8	(62)
College education	18.8	(3)	25.8	(90)
Vocational or up to three years of college	31.3	(5)	18.6	(65)
High school or less	37.6	(6)	37.7	(132)
Missing		3		31
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 2.70010
df = 6
sign = 0.8454
Cramer's V = 0.08821

TABLE 27

Percentage of Stealer's Current Educational Expenses Paid for by His or Her Family.

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Zero per cent	44.4	(8)	34.6	(129)
Twenty-five per cent	11.1	(2)	15.3	(57)
Fifty per cent	22.2	(4)	11.3	(42)
Seventy-five per cent	11.1	(2)	17.7	(66)
One hundred per cent	11.1	(1)	21.2	(79)
Missing		2		4
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 4.19189$
$df = 4$
sign = 0.3807
Cramer's V = 0.10644

TABLE 28

Type of Stealer's Library Use

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Study	47.0	(9)	63.0	(251)
Reference	74.0	(14)	65.0	(246)
Study only during midterms and finals	37.0	(7)	16.0	(63)
Leisure reading	47.0	(9)	21.0	(79)
Missing	*			19
Total	*	19	100.0	389

$x^2 = 61.49042$
df = 20
sign = 0.0001
Cramer's V = 0.4

*. Same format as Table 8.

69

74

TABLE 29

Stealer's Frequency of Library Use

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Few times	94.4	(17)	86.4	(328)
Many times	5.6	(1)	13.1	(50)
Missing		1		2
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 0.42413
df = 1
sign = 0.5149
phi = 0.05213

hypothetical vignettes was taking away library privileges for a year (See Tables 39 and 40). Sixty-seven per cent of the stealers felt depriving other patrons of the book was the worst consequence of library book theft. The mean of the stealers' estimate of dollar loss due to library book theft per year was $17,700.

Stealers' perception of how their "best friend" and how their parents felt about book theft was significantly different from the general sample (See Tables 30 and 31). Although the stealers perceived their "best friends" and parents as not necessarily approving of book theft, they certainly thought they were less disapproving than the total sample did. A greater number of stealers were uncertain of how their "best friend" would perceive library book theft than the total sample. This suggests that Cameron's hypothesis that stealers have some group support is applicable to book theft.

In summary, like the general sample stealers viewed library book theft as an academic crime. They differed in that they did not feel the crime is as "bad."

As the data in Table 32 shows, stealers cited not being able to afford a book as a frequent motivation for stealing more often than the total sample did. Thirty-two per cent of the stealers felt not having enough time for book use in the library was a frequent cause of book theft. Twenty-six per cent of the stealers and 22 per

TABLE 30

Stealer's Perception of "Best Friends'" Opinion of Book Theft

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Strongly Approve	0	(0)	0	(0)
Approve	0	(0)	2.1	(8)
Uncertain	61.0	(11)	33.1	(125)
Disapprove	16.7	(3)	42.3	(160)
Strongly disapprove	22.2	(4)	22.5	(85)
Missing		1		2
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 8.16823
df = 3
sign = 0.0427
Cramer's V = 0.14818

TABLE 31

Stealer's Perception of Parent's Opinion of Book Theft

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Strongly approve	0	0	1.1	(4)
Approve	5.6	1	0.5	(2)
Uncertain	22.2	4	6.4	(24)
Disapprove	50.0	9	36.2	(136)
Strongly disapprove	22.2	4	44.0	(210)
Missing		1		4
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 21.73642$
$df = 4$
sign = 0.0002
Cramer's $V = 0.24237$

TABLE 32

Stealer's Opinions on Motivation's For Book Theft

		Stealers		Total Sample	
		Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Xeroxing is too expensive	Often	15.8	(3)	30.3	(115)
	Sometimes	47.4	(9)	43.4	(165)
	Rarely	36.8	(7)	26.3	(100)
Cannot afford to buy a book for course or project	Often*	42.1	(8)	27.4	(104)
	Rarely	57.9	(11)	72.6	(275)
Not enough time to use book in library	Often	31.6	(6)	26.2	(99)
	Sometimes	47.4	(9)	47.6	(180)
	Rarely	21.1	(4)	26.2	(99)
As a protest against OSU because OSU is like a "big business"	Often	15.6	(3)	20.1	(76)
	Rarely	84.2	(16)	80.0	(304)
As a challenge	Often	21.1	(4)	16.6	(63)
	Sometimes	31.6	(6)	38.2	(145)
	Rarely	47.4	(9)	45.3	(172)
Extra text will help to relieve pressure of getting good grades	Often	26.3	(5)	14.2	(54)
	Rarely	73.7	(14)	85.8	(325)
Stiff competition	Often	22.2	(4)	9.5	(36)
	Rarely	74.8	(14)	90.5	(343)
Total (of each category)		100.0	19	100.0	380

TABLE 32 (continued)

* Some responses were reclassified in a way that most
  accurately reflected the initial answer. For example,
  since most people answered question 18 as morally wrong
  the question was recoded in 2 categories: those who said
  it was ok and those who said it was not. If this more
  simplified comparison yielded a significant relationship
  more detailed analysis could be done. This process of
  reclassifying was done here and in subsequent tables.

cent of the stealers respectively said an extra text would relieve the pressure of getting good grades and keeping a text would reduce stiff competition. Sixteen per cent of the stealers cited protest against The Ohio State University as a frequent motivation for book theft.

Like the total sample, 56 per cent of the stealers felt carrying a book in a purse or satchel was the method for stealing books (See Table 33). Sixty-seven per cent felt book theft was a spontaneous act (See Table 35). Seventy-two per cent of the stealers said they develop methods to steal books by themselves. However the stealers did not perceive the factors of "least risk" and "least evil" as Smigel (1972) hypothesized. Unlike the general sample, little difference in risk from stealing from a large or small library was perceived by the stealers. Stealers and non-stealers differed significantly in their conception of guilt as resulting from stealing different types of libraries. Although non-stealers would feel less guilty stealing from the main library, stealers would feel less guilty stealing from a department library. Also, not one book thief chose to steal from the reference room (See Tables 36 and 37).

Students in the total sample and students who admitted to book theft viewed curbs to booktheft in similar ways (See Table 38). Sixty-eight per cent of the stealers answering felt electronic devices were an

TABLE 33

Stealer's Opinion of How Books Are Stolen

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Writing in false date	11.1	(2)	8.1	(28)
Hiding in clothing	16.7	(3)	21.4	(74)
Carrying in purse or satchel	56.5	(10)	57.5	(199)
Other	16.7	(3)	13.0	(45)
Missing		1		
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 0.53613
df = 3
sign = 0.9109
Cramer's V = 0.03971

TABLE 34

Stealers' Opinion If Methods Are Learned From Friends

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Learn from friend	27.8	(5)	24.6	(89)
Develop methods by themselves	72.2	(13)	70.4	(255)
Both	0	(0)	5.0	(18)
Missing		1		18
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 1.03045$
df = 2
sign = 0.5976
Cramer's = 0.05373

TABLE 35

Stealer's Opinion on Planning Book Theft

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Spontaneous	66.7	(12)	80.6	(295)
Planned	33.3	(6)	18.6	(68)
Both	0	0	0.8	(14)
Missing		1		
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 2.68804$
$df = 2$
$sign = 0.0208$
Cramer's $V = 0.08691$

TABLE 36

Stealer's Perception of Risk at Large vs Small Library

	Stealers		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Larger Library	52.7	(10)	72.3	(256)
Small Library	47.3	(9)	27.4	(97)
Missing				26
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 21.73119.
df = 3
sign = 0.0001
Cramer's V = 0.25

TABLE 37

Stealer's Perception of Guilt From Different Libraries

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Department Library	26.3	(5)	4.2	(15)
Main Library	5.3	(1)	14.6	(52)
Reference	0	(0)	2.0	(7)
All equally	42.1	(8)	43.4	(155)
None of them	26.3	(5)	35.9	(128)
Missing				23
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

$x^2 = 24.92303$
$df = 7$
sign = 0.0001
Cramer's V = 0.26

TABLE 38

Stealer's Opinion on Ways to Curb Theft

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
Electronic devices				
Effective	58.4	(13)	51.4	(190)
Somewhat effective	21.1	(4)	43.2	(160)
Ineffective	10.5	(2)	5.4	(20)
Heavily fine				
Effective	36.8	(7)	32.6	(123)
Ineffective	63.2	(12)	67.3	(254)
Have more xeroxing machines				
Effective	21.1	(4)	22.4	(84)
Somewhat effective	26.3	(5)	42.1	(158)
Ineffective	52.6	(10)	35.5	(133)
Student security guard				
Effective	15.8	(3)	18.6	(70)
Somewhat effective	26.3	(5)	45.7	(172)
Ineffective	57.9	(11)	35.6	(134)
Publicity campaign				
Effective	15.8	(3)	7.2	(27)
Somewhat effective	47.4	(9)	40.6	(153)
Ineffective	36.8	(7)	52.3	(197)
Total (of each category)	*	19	100.0	380

82

TABLE 38 (continued)

* Table 38 is presented in the same manner as Table 18.

effective means of curbing book theft. In addition,
although the stealers were not as stringent in their view
of "badness" as the total sample, stealers and non-stealers
chose almost equal punishments given the hypothetical
vignettes (See Tables 39 and 40). Thirty-seven per cent
of the stealers felt heavy fines would be effective. Like
the general sample, stealers did not feel a student
security guard or conducting a publicity campaign were
effective means to limit book theft.

In sum the differences between the stealers and
non-stealers were: occupational level was significantly
lower than that represented in the total sample, stealers
did not define the "badness" of library book theft as
rigidly as did the total sample, stealers' perception of
how their "best friends" and parents viewed the act was not
as negative as was the perception of the total sample's
"best friends" and parents and finally, stealers did not
feel there was less risk in stealing from a large library
as the majority of the total sample did nor did they feel
less guilty stealing from a larger library as the majority
of the total sample did.

Hypotheses and Frameworks

The third section of this chapter will discuss the
extent to which the research supported the hypotheses

TABLE 39

Stealer's Choice of Punishment for Book Thief who was a Pre-Med Student and Whose Motivation was to Prevent Others Using the Book

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
No Penalty	5.3	(1)	1.1	(4)
Told to return the book and lectured by the librarian	15.8	(3)	15.3	(56)
Take away library privileges for a year	68.4	(13)	62.0	(227)
Five days in jail and $50 fine	10.5	(2)	16.9	(62)
Six months in jail and $1,000 fine	0	(0)	4.6	(17)
Missing		1		1
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 4.7335
df = 4
sign = 0.3158
Cramer's V = 0.11467

TABLE 40

Stealer's Choice of Punishment of Book Thief Whose Motivation was to Fulfill a Material Need

	Stealer's		Total Sample	
	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number
No penalty	5.6	(1)	2.7	(10)
Told to return book and lectured by Librarian	27.8	(5)	32.9	(120)
Take away library privileges for a year	50.0	(9)	50.4	(184)
Five days in jail and $50 fine	16.7	(3)	9.9	(36)
Six months in jail and $1,000 fine	0	(0)	4.1	(12)
Missing		1		15
Total	100.0	19	100.0	380

x^2 = 2.26407
df = 7
sign = 0.6864
Cramer's V = -0.07950

86

outlined in Chapter II.* The four division of hypotheses
that will be discussed are: library book theft as a pro-
test against bureaucracy, library book theft as a form of
kicks, library book theft as gang behavior, and library
book theft as white collar crime.

The Ohio State University was viewed by most
students as bureaucratic.** However the only measure
dealing with bureaucratic factors which was significantly
related with all other tested components of the hypothesis
that stealing is in protest against "big business" was
whether students think they have a say in university
policy. This measure is similar to Stern's measure of
"low student dignity" (Stern, 1966). Furthermore, while
Smigel's hypothesis about "least risk" was supported by
the opinions of the total sample, stealers were equally
divided on the issue. Only 21 per cent of the total
respondents felt stealing from the main library compared

---

* Specific components of the library book theft phenomenon
will be considered in the discussion of the literature
from which they were derived. In addition, these factors
will be compared to various components of each hypothe-
sis to see if they are significantly related. As des-
cribed in Chapter III, chi-square was used to determine
if the components were significantly related at the 0.05
level.

** Although 74 per cent liked The Ohio State University
educational system and 46 per cent felt that the univer-
sity administration seemed to care about the rights and
privileges of the students, only 10 per cent felt there
was little red tape at The Ohio State University and
only 12 per cent felt they had a say in university policy.
Book thieves liked The Ohio State University educational
system less than did non-book thieves. Three-fourths of

to a department library made a difference in guilt.
Thirty-one per cent of the stealers felt there was a
difference in guilt. Students did not think protest
against The Ohio State University because it is like "big
business" was strong motivation for book theft. Although
people perceive The Ohio State University as bureaucratic,
this does not appear to stimulate library book theft.

Although the hypotheses of Poland and Lunden were
not explored fully, the findings of this study indicate
that their hypotheses do not apply to library book theft.
Few of the total sample and even fewer of the stealers
felt kicks was a motivation for library book theft.
Similarly, Poland's (1971) hypothesis that book theft is
a gang type of behavior was unsupported in this research
as it was in his own study. Despite the fact that
stealers and non-stealers view book theft as wrong; 'a
greater portion of non stealers felt the act was illegal
and should be punished. Furthermore, stealers were
uncertain about how their friends viewed book theft. It
seems that it the act was a result of gang behavior, the
participants would be certain of the opinions of their
friends and that they would approve of the act. The

---

them felt the university did not care about students
rights and privileges. The direction of the stealers
in this study is the same direction of the opinions of
stealers in Oliner's and Manuel's study (1975).

strongest indication that Poland's hypothesis is inappro-
priate is that only 25 per cent of the stealers said
methods for stealing books were learned from their friends.

Like the other factors, not all the hypotheses
derived from using the white collar crime perspective were
supported by this study.*

People who admitted they stole books came from
slightly lower middle-class background compared to the
middle-class background of the total sample. This
relationship is logical, using the white collar perspective,
given that the principal pressure motivating people to
steal books was material deprivation.** Both stealers and
non-stealers felt library book theft was wrong. But fewer
stealers felt the act was illegal and deserved punish-
ment.*** Perception of crime was significantly related
with the perceived opinion of family and friends. A
significantly greater proportion of the stealers were
uncertain about the opinions of their friends and felt
their parents' opinion was not as negative as the total

---

* When typed, the question asking the respondent's grade
   point was omitted. This error was not discovered until
   the researcher began to analyze the data.
** A significant relationship existed between those who
   perceived material deprivation as a reason to steal
   books and those who were less severe in punishing the
   person represented in the hypothetical vignettes in
   which material deprivation was the reason.
*** Occupation of parent was significantly related to how
   a person perceived the severity of book theft. Medium
   and small professionals seemed less severe.

sample perceived the opinion of their "best friend" and
parents. In particular, the fact that the attitude of the
"best friend" is uncertain and that the book thief
develops methods on his own to steal makes the comparison
between theft and shoplifting not as strong. Cameron
(1964) has indicated that in-group instruction and group
support are essentials of shoplifting.

Implications of Findings

In sum, this research has clarified motivations
leading to, methods of and ways to curb library book theft.
It has pinpointed that the total sample perceived library
book theft as wrong. In fact, almost one-half of the
sample felt the act was illegal and should be punished.
As expected stealers did not define act of book theft as
negatively as the non-stealers. Even though fewer stealers
than non-stealers felt library book theft was illegal and
even fewer stealers than non-stealers felt library book
theft was both illegal and that it should be punished,
practically all of the stealers felt that book theft was
wrong.

Just as there was a discrepancy in the degree of
wrongness perceived by the stealers and non-stealers so is
there a discrepancy between their estimates of dollar loss
to the university due to library book theft, and between the
stealers and non-stealers. The average estimate made by

the total sample was $56,000. The average of the
estimates made by stealers was $18,000. Still, to both
stealers and non-stealers, book theft is wrong principally
because it hinders the academic achievement of their
fellow students. Consequently, the most appropriate
punishment in the eyes of book thieves and non-book
thieves is taking away library privileges for a year.

Furthermore this study indicates that material
deprivation is the major motivation for stealing books.
Neither stealers nor non-stealers were very supportive of
the motivation derived from Oliner's and Manuel's hypothe-
sis that book theft is done in protest against the
university's bureaucracy and resemblance to "big business"
nor of Lunden's hypothesis that book theft is done for
kicks. Poland's hypothesis that theft among college
students resembles gang behavior seems inappropriate with
regards to book theft principally because book theft is a
spontaneous act, using a method the thief develops himself.

Bureaucratic factors did not influence book
theft. The total sample felt there was less risk in
stealing from a large library than a small one, but
stealers were equally divided about the issue. Further-
more, perception of guilt did not seem to play a major
role in choice of location for library book theft. When a
difference in guilt was perceived by the respondents,
the stealers, unlike those in the total sample, perceived

less guilt from stealing from department libraries than
the main library.

Occupation of parent and use of library were the
demographic variables which yielded a significant
difference between stealers and non-stealers. Stealers were
in the lower portion of middle-class categories than the
the non-stealers which tends to explain material depriva-
tion or relative deprivation which this research evidences
as a major motivation for book theft. A greater portion
of stealers were in the field of arts and humanities, and
were dependent on themselves to meet current educational
expenses. Demographic variables - class rank or field
of study did not significantly affect the amount of
academic pressure. However, a greater number of juniors
said that the pressure of good grades and that stiff
competition was a motivation for book theft. A greater
number of social and behavioral science, professional and
business administration students felt stiff competition
was a motivation for book theft. Social and behavioral
science students felt the pressure of good grades more
than other fields.

Fifty-one per cent of the total sample and 68 per
cent of the stealers felt electronic devices are effective
means of curbing book theft. The effectiveness of
electronic devices was supported not only by the opinion

of the sample but by actual fact.* Publicity campaigns
were not thought to be effective for the most part by
the students. Publicity campaigns have been shown only to
be effective during the period in which they are being
conducted (Gapan, 1976). Although both stealers and non-
stealers thought books are taken by hiding them in
clothing or putting them in a satchel or purse, student
security guards were not thought to be an effective means
of limiting book theft by the sample.

Given the factors affecting book-theft, the
researcher feels that the white collar crime perspective
yields the best tool for analysis of this phenomenon. The
fact that the stealers perceive their "best friends" as
uncertain rather than approving of book theft makes the
analogy with shoplifting not as strong. But the social
class of the stealers and the motivation of material
deprivation suggest that the white
collar crime perspective is appropriate. In the sketch of
white collar crime, it was hypothesized that patrons who
steal books do so in response to academic pressure. If
some of the pressures spurring library book theft come
directly from the pressures as a student, this research did
not clarify these pressures. Perhaps this is a possible
research topic for educators.

---

* The Commerce Library has reported a drop in loss rate
from 6 to 0.4 per cent (Smiley, 1975) since the installa-
tion of electronic devices.

For the most part, the opinions and demographic
variables of stealers did not differ markedly from the
non-stealers. When significant differences do occur, it
is difficult to be sure if these differences are due to
actual variation in the opinions of the stealers or if
they are due to the small number of stealers in the sample*

Suggestions For Further Research

Given the limitation and findings of this study
the following suggested research projects may clarify the
components of the library book theft phenomenon:

1. Examine the effect in attitude change produced by
   the introduction of electronic devices and ques-
   tionnaires concerning book theft.

2. Study other library settings to find out if the
   problem and its consequences are perceived as in
   this research.

3. Interview book thieves to explore other motiva-
   tions, methods of book theft, and the degree and
   nature of group support.

4. Examine book theft at small universities to recheck
   the idea that theft may be affected by size. This
   may also be a way of testing how bureaucracy
   affects book theft.

5. Examine the attitudes towards book theft in other
   large universities either where the students are
   more politically inclined or where the university
   is not as well organized as The Ohio State
   University.

---

* As noted in the section discussing book thieves' opinions,
  although the number of book thieves was small, it seems
  to be somewhat reasonable considering the estimates of
  book loss.

6. Obtain a larger sample of book thieves, perhaps by
   sampling in libraries, to see if the perceived
   attitudes and participation in library book theft
   are similar to those who admitted book theft as
   originally hypothesized in this research.

7. Explore grade point as an intervening variable in
   academic pressure.

8. Examine type of books stolen in greater detail.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER IV

Bureau of the Census
    1972   Social and Economic Statistics United States
                    Department of Commerce. Washington, D.C.

Cameron, Mary
    1964   Booster and the Snitch. London.: Free Press
                    of Glenco, Collier and Macmilliam Limited.

Gapan, Kaye
    1975   interview held at The Ohio State University
                    Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Gapan, Kaye
    1976   interview held at The Ohio State University
                    Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Hollingshead, August B.
    1965   Two-Factor Index of Social Positon. Yale
                    Station, New Haven, Connecticut.

Ohio State Librarians
                    Unpublished study.

The Ohio State University Poll
    1974   Report on Student Usage. The Ohio State
                    University, Columbus, Ohio.

Oliner, S.P. and Maurice, Manuel
    1975   "Student Theft: Crime or Protest. Humboldt
                    Journal of Social Relations.

Poland, Stephen
    1971   "Characteristics Behavior, Attitudes of Male
                    College Students Who Have Committed Theft."
                    Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University.

Reneker,   Maxine
    1970   "Book Theft in Academic Libraries." Master's
                    thesis, University of Chicago, 1970.

96

Smigel, Erwin
    1972   "Attitudes Towards Stealing Related to Size
                   of Victim Organization." Crime Against
                   Bureaucracy. ed. Erwin Smigel and L.T.
                   Lawrence Ross, New York: Van Reinhold Co.
                   pp. 15-27.

Smiley, Jackie
    1975   interview held at The Ohio State University
                   Columbus, Ohio.

Stern, George
    1966   Studies of College Environments. Bethesda,
                   Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Ser-
                   vices ED 010647

CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study has been to explore the
motivations behind, the methods of, and the ways to curb
library book theft at The Ohio State University. Four
areas of the literature were drawn upon to guide the
research. These areas dealt with library factors, bureau-
cratic factors, university setting factors, and white
collar crime factors. Some hypotheses drawn from these
include: electronic devices will curb book theft, people
steal books in political protest against the university,
size and purpose of library affects where book theft
occurs, book thieves steal for kicks, book theft is a form
of gang behavior, people steal books because of academic
pressure and people are ambiguous in their definition of
book theft.

The case study method was used because this study
was exploratory in nature. A questionnaire distributed in
mass to nine classes at The Ohio State University served
as the principal research tool. Three hundred and eighty
questionnaires were analyzed. Nineteen of these were

98

completed by book thieves. Book thieves were ascertained by self-reporting techniques. Chi-square was used to determine the significant differences between stealers and non-stealers. It was also used to determine independence between the components of the sets of hypotheses.

The sample was fairly representative of The Ohio State University student population of the fall of 1975. A proportionately greater number of juniors and seniors were included in the sample because they have been shown to use the library more frequently than underclassmen. The occupation of the stealers' parent and the type of library use were the only demographic variables on which stealers and non-stealers differ significantly. A greater proportion of the stealers in this study were arts and humanities students and were dependent on themselves to meet their current educational expenses. Motivations concerning material deprivation were most often thought by the sample to be frequent motivations for book theft. A greater portion of the stealers felt that stiff competition and pressure for getting "good" grades were frequent motivations for book theft than did the total sample. As described by the opinions of the sample, book theft appears to be a spontaneous act and the book thief develops his own methods for stealing books. The most common method appears to be carrying out the book in a purse or satchel. Stealers and non-stealers alike think electronic devices

are an effective means for curbing book theft. Finally, this research does not support one set of hypotheses in its entirety. Although the sample viewed The Ohio State University as bureaucratic, students did not think that stealing books was done in protest against the university. Further, while the total sample perceived less risk stealing books from a large library, the stealers did not perceive a difference in risk between a large and a small library. Similarly, those in the total sample who perceived difference in guilt in stealing from different kinds of libraries said they would feel less guilty stealing from the main library. Conversely, the stealers said they would feel less guilty stealing from a department library. These findings contradict Smigel's (1970) hypotheses that people are more likely to steal from larger organizations.

In the same manner, the opinions of the stealers and non-stealers indicate that the motivation of kicks and book theft as a gang behavior are not applicable to the library book theft phenomenon. Lastly, this research suggests that book theft is a form of white collar crime. While material deprivation is considered a frequent motivation, the research did not identify the pressures that affect the person in his role as a student. Although the attitudes of the stealer, the stealers' "best friends" and parents appear to be significantly different from

those of the total sample the attitudes are not supportive
of book theft. For these people book theft is less
"wrong" than for the total sample.

Finally, although the sample of stealers is small,
it seems reasonable considering the estimations made by
the librarians at The Ohio State University. If one
combines the data librarians gathered in their 1973-75 study
and the data of this research it appears the loss rate
hovers around 10 per cent of students or approximately
$70,000 worth of missing books.

In conclusion, this research has described the
methods involved in, the considerations of, and the moti-
vations behind library book theft on the basis of the
opinions of stealers and non-stealers. The findings served
to clarify some factors apparently not involved in book
theft, namely kicks as a motivation and gang behavior as
a form. Further, this research has suggested library
book theft as a form of white collar crime. This research
however, has contributed a description by participants in
library book theft and by the students. In this way, this
research has begun to fill the gap present in the litera-
ture on library book theft and has pointed the way for
further research. Finally, this research may be used by
librarians when they evaluate means to deter book theft.
It may also aid librarians in determining the financial and
circulation goals the library wants to meet. Although this
study focused only on academic libraries, and it is not

known if patrons of academic libraries are similar to
library patrons outside the academic setting, the following
discussion might also be useful to librarians outside the
academic community.

The opinions of stealers and non-stealers alike,
indicate that financial loss is not the most important
consequence of library book theft. To these people,
depriving other patrons of the library book is the worst
consequence of this theft. It indeed may be that in an abso-
lute sense stealing library books is as wrong as stealing
any other item. Yet given the fact that students feel the
most appropriate punishment is taking away library
privileges for a year, it is questionable if publicly
labeling library book theft as a crime would be acceptable
by the academic community. While the threat of prosecu-
tion may deter the crime, employing the proper structure
necessary to apprehend and prosecute students may be
difficult.* For example, how would the university community
feel about having police officers around the library and
arresting book thieves? This research indicates that most
students feel fines of $50.00 or more and jail sentences
are inappropriate punishments. Further, it is doubtful
police would give this crime high priority unless the
university community strongly demanded it, if then.

---

* Not enough time has passed to evaluate the recent action
  of the library to use the Ohio Code.

Since this and other studies indicate that theft is a result of need perhaps the best solution to the book theft problem is to supply more books. The librarians and the community believe that a wide circulation is the most important function of the library. Perhaps then librarians should spend money that would go for security guards, turnstiles or electronic devices on extra copies of popular and current books. The researcher is not suggesting that eliminating protection devices would stop book theft. What the researcher is suggesting is that money spent on these devices might be better spent on buying multiple copies of frequently used books. While the cost may be the same, the potential for meeting the goal of wide circulation is greater. Further by concentrating on what books are most frequently used and wanted the librarians will be more concerned with fulfilling the needs of their patrons and the university community rather than limiting the opportunities for fulfilling those needs. Is that not what librarians should be concerned with in the first place?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES

LIBRARY BOOK THEFT

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine some of the factors concerning library book loss at Ohio State. Please do NOT put your name on this questionnaire. Several steps are being taken to guarantee your anonymity. Since many of the questions concern attitudes, there are no necessarily right or wrong answers. Please answer each question as completely and honestly as possible.

These questions deal with your opinion and experience with book loss at the OSU libraries in the last year.

1. How often have you been able to find a book you wanted at OSU libraries within the last school year?

   a. ___ 0 times
   b. ___ 1-3 times
   c. ___ 4-6 times
   d. ___ more than 7 times

2. Do you think the principle reason could not find the book was...

   a. ___ because you did not understand how to use the library system
   b. ___ because the book was not listed in the card catalog
   c. ___ because the book was mis-shelved
   d. ___ because the book was stolen

3. What, in your opinion is the worst consequence of book theft?

   a. ___ financial cost to the university
   b. ___ inconvenience to the patron because the person wastes time
   c. ___ it makes the person frustrated
   d. ___ it deprives other patrons of the use of the book

105

4. What do you estimate is the dollar loss to Ohio State University each year because ob book theft?

_____

How effective or ineffective would each of the following techniques be in curbing book theft?

5. To install electronic devices like Check Point in the Commerce Library
   a. ___ effective
   b. ___ somewhat effective
   c. ___ ineffective

6. To have a student security guard at the exit.
   a. ___ effective
   b. ___ somewhat effective
   c. ___ ineffective

7. To heavily fine ($15.00 or more) anyone apprehended for stealing a book
   a. ___ effective
   b. ___ somewhat effective
   c. ___ ineffective

8. To have more xeroxing machines
   a. ___ effective
   b. ___ somewhat effective
   c. ___ ineffective

9. To have a publicity campaign explaining the bad consequences of book theft
   a. ___ effective
   b. ___ somewhat effective
   c. ___ ineffective

NEXT, These questions are designed to tap your opinion on why people steal books.

People steal books because ...

10. They feel they don't have enough time to use the books in the library
    a. ___ often
    b. ___ sometimes
    c. ___ rarely

11. They cannot afford to buy a book for a course or project
    a. ___ often
    b. ___ sometimes
    c. ___ rarely

12. They feel pressured to get good grades and feel an extra reference or text will get them a better grade
    a. ___ often
    b. ___ sometimes
    c. ___ rarely

13. Xeroxing is too expensive
    a. ___ often
    b. ___ sometimes
    c. ___ rarely

14. It serves as a protest   a. ___ often
against OSU. They think   b. ___ sometimes
OSU is like "big   c. ___ rarely
business"

15. To see whether they can   a. ___ often
outsmart the library   b. ___ sometimes
personnel   c. ___ rarely

16. Competition is stiff and   a. ___ often
they want to make sure   b. ___ sometimes
no one else uses the   c. ___ rarely
book

17. How many books has your
best friend taken? _____

18. Library book theft, is...   a. ___ ok because books are
part of the learning
resources of the univer-
sity and belong to the
student
          b. ___ morally wrong
          c. ___ illegal
          d. ___ illegal and should be
punished

19. How many times a week do   a. ___ 0 times
you use the OSU library   b. ___ 1-3 times
system?   c. ___ 4-5 times
          d. ___ more than 6 times

20. (Check as many as apply)   a. ___ to study
I use the library...   b. ___ to use reference books
and research materials
          c. ___ to study only during
midterms and finals
          d. ___ for leisure reading

Please select the one best response for people in each of
the following situations

21. The book thief is a pre-   a. ___ no penalty
med student whose motive   b. ___ told to return the book
is to keep a chemistry   and then lectured by a
text so none of the per-   librarian on the evils
son's fellow students   of book theft
could use it   c. ___ take away the person's
library privileges for
a year
          d. ___ 5 days in jail and
$50 fine.

e. ___ 6 months in jail and $1,000 fine

22. The book thief is a person whose father earns less than $10,000 a year The thief steals a text and reference books to study for a history test.

a. ___ no penalty
b. ___ told to return the book and then lectured by a librarian on the evils of book theft
c. ___ take away the person's library privileges for a year
d. ___ 5 days in jail and $50 fine
e. ___ 6 months in jail and $1,000 fine

23. How would your best friend react to someone who stole a book from the library?

a. ___ strongly approve
b. ___ approve
c. ___ uncertain
d. ___ disapprove
e. ___ strongly disapprove

How would your family?

a. ___ strongly approve
b. ___ approve
c. ___ uncertain
d. ___ disapprove
e. ___ strongly disapprove

24. If you were to steal a book which method would you use?

a. ___ writing in a false date
b. ___ hiding in clothing
c. ___ carrying in purse or satchel
d. ___ other; please specify

25. Do you think people generally...

a. ___ spontaneously decide to take a book
b. ___ plan to take a book before they use the library that day or night

26. Do you think people...

a. ___ learn from their friends how to take books
OR
b. ___ develop methods to take books by themselves

NOW, These questions deal with characteristics of people filling out this questionnaire

27. What is your sex?   a. ___ male
                          b. ___ female

28. What is the occupation of your parents who contributes the most to your family's income? Please list the exact title, his or her responsibilities.

_____

What is his or her highest level of education?

_____

Your family's combined income is

a. ___ less than $5,000 a year
b. ___ $ 5,000 - $ 9,999 a year
c. ___ $10,000 - $14,999 a year
d. ___ $15,000 - $24,999 a year
e. ___ $25,000 or more a year

How much of your living   a. ___ 0%
and school expenses does   b. ___ 25%
your family pay for?   c. ___ 50%
                           d. ___ 75%
                           e. ___ 100%

29. What is your major (department)? _____

30. What is your class rank?
    a. ___ first quarter freshman
    b. ___ freshman
    c. ___ sophomore
    d. ___ junior
    e. ___ senior
    f. ___ graduate (Master's level)
    g. ___ graduate (Ph.D. level)
    h. ___ professional, please specify
    i. ___ other, please specify

31. How many books have you ever stolen (borrowed without letting the library know) from the OSU libraries?

_____

Please estimate the average value of each book

_____

32. If you stole a book (bor-   a. ___ return it eventually
rowed without letting the b. ___ keep it for a collec-
library know) what did   tion
you do with it?   c. ___ sell it
                        d. ___ forget about the book
                            and with time keep it
                        e. ___ didn't steal the book

33. Do you think there is   a. ___ large library at OSU
less risk stealing a   b. ___ small library at OSU
book from a ...

34. Would you feel less   a. ___ your department's
guilty stealing a book   library
from ...   b. ___ the main library
                        c. ___ the reference room
                        d. ___ all equally
                        e. ___ none of them

35. Would you recommend to a. ___ yes
your best friend to   b. ___ no
attend OSU?

    If yes, would it be
    because...

36. You like the type of   a. ___ yes
educational system   b. ___ no

37. The university admin-   a. ___ yes
istration seems to care b. ___ no
about the rights and
privileges of the
students

38. There is little "red   a. ___ yes
tape" at OSU   b. ___ no

39. Students have a say in   a. ___ yes
the way professors   b. ___ no
teach, how money is
spent in the policies in
general

Please write any comments and suggestions you have about
the questionnaire on the back of the LAST page of the question-
naire. Then return the questionnaire to the lady distri-
buting them today.

                 THANK YOU

APPENDIX B

The Ohio State University Poll's Distribution of Fall 1976
Students, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

TABLE 41

Field of Study

	Per Cent	Number
Agriculture	7	(24)
Social and behavioral	10	(31)
Arts and humanities	8	(26)
Physical and biological science	10	(29)
Professional	18	(54)
Business administration	12	(37)
Education	17	(54)
Engineering	7	(21)
Other	10	(29)
Total	100	305

TABLE 42

Class Rank

	Per Cent	Number
Graduate	15	(26)
Seniors	37	(114)
Juniors	19	(59)
Sophomores	19	(57)
Freshmen	15	(47)
Total	100	305

TABLE 43

Parent's Occupation

	Per Cent	Number
Businessmen	39	(121)
White collar	21	(66)
Blue collar	21	(66)
Farmers	2	(7)
Unemployed	16	(16)
Don't know or not applicable	10	(29)
Total	100	305

TABLE 44

Parent's Income

	Per Cent	Number
Greater than $40,000	8	(26)
$30,000 - $39,999	6	(19)
$24,000 - $29,999	7	(20)
$18,000 - $23,999	13	(39)
$14,000 - $17,999	11	(35)
$11,000 - $13,999	10	(29)
$ 8,000 - $10,999	7	(22)
Less than $9,999	6	(18)
Don't know or not applicable	32	(97)
Total	100	305

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1965   "ALA asks Victimized Libraries to Contact
              Special Committee," Library Journal 89:1574.

Atkinson, Hugh
    1975   interview held at The Ohio State University
              Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Berry, John N.
    1965   "To Catch a Thief," Library Journal 90:1617-
              1621.

Bond, William
    1973   "Eleven steps can lead you to curtailing
              inventory losses and crime in the campus
              bookstore: College and University Business
              54:3:53.

Braden, Irene A.
    1968   "A Pilot Inventory of Library Holdings."
              American Library Association Bulletin.
              62:1129-31.

Bureau of the Census
    1972   Social and Economic Statistics of United
              States Department of Commerce, Washington,
              D.C.

Burnes Security Institute
    1973   National Survey on Library Security
              Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduc-
              tion Service ED 080131.

Cameron, Mary Owen
    1964   Booster and the Snitch. London: Free Press
              of Glenco, Collier and Macmillan Limited.

Clark, John P. and Eugene P. Wenninger
    1962   "Socio-Economic Class and Areas Correlates
              of Illegal Behavior Among Juveniles." Ameri-
              can Sociological Review 24:826-834.

113

Clark, John P. and Larry L. Tift
1966   "Polygraph and Interview Validation of Self-
            Reported Deviant Behavior," American Sociologi-
            cal Review 31:516-523.

Daughtery, Robert Allen
1975   Interview held at The Ohio State University
            Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Gapan, Kaye
1971   "The Book Thief," Master's thesis, University
            of Washington.

1975   Interview held at The Ohio State University
            Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

1976   Interview held at The Ohio State University
            Main Library, Columbus, Ohio.

Geis, Gilbert
1974   "Avocational Crime," Handbook of Criminology,
            Daniel Glaser, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally
            College Publishing Company, 272-273.

Gould, Leroy C.
1969   "Who Defines Delenquency: A Comparison of
            self-reported and officially reported indices
            of delinquency for 3 racial groups," Social
            Problems 16:325-326.

Green, H.
1964   "Analysis of Literature Dealing With Vanda-
            lism as Indexed in Library Literature 1953-
            63." Master's thesis, Atlanta University.

Hendrick, Clyde and Marjorie E. Murfin
1974   "Project Library Ripoff: A Study of
            Periodical Multilation in a University
            Library," College and Research Libraries
            35:402-411.

Hollingshead, August B.
1965   Two Factor Index of Social Position. Yale
            Station, New Haven, Connecticut.

Hood and Sparks
1970   Key Issues in Crime in Toronto: New York:
            World University Library 46-70.

Humphries, Russell
1974   "Why Do They Steal," The College Store
            Journal 104-105.

1969   "Librarians Guilty of Stealing, Purloining
        and Converting Federal Property on Loan to
        Library," Library Journal 94:24000

Lunden, Walter A.
    1966   Shoplifting Among College Students. Ames
            Iowa: Iowa State University Science and
            Technology.

Morrison, Perry D.
    1966   "Lost Book Campaign as Sacramento," Wilson
            Library Bulletin 40:526-529.

Nunes, John
    1972   "The Electronic Librarian," College Manage-
            ment 7:26-27.

Nye, F. Ivan and James F. Short
    1957   "Scaling Delinquent Behavior." American Sociolog-
            ical Review 22:325-331.

Oliner, S.P. and Maurice, Manuel
    1975   "Student Theft: Crime or Protest. Humboldt
            Journal of Social Relations.

Ohio State Librarians
            Unpublished study.

The Ohio State University
    1974   An Ohio State University Poll Report on
            Student Library Usage. The Ohio State
            University, Columbus, Ohio.

Pace, C. Robert
    1964   The Influence of Academic and Student Sub-
            cultures in College and University Environ-
            ments. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document
            Reproduction Services DE 003037.

Personnel Office
    1975   Interview held in Ohio State University Main
            Library Room 208, June 1957.

Poland, Stephen
    1971   "Characteristics Behavior, Attitudes of Male
            College Students Who Have Committed Theft."
            Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University.

Quick, Mary
    1964   "A Proposed Program for Reducing Book Losses,"
            Master's thesis, West Michigan University.

Reneker, Maxine
1970   "Book Theft in Academic Libraries." Master's
            thesis. University of Chicago.

Savage, Ernest A.
1959   "Buy, Borrow, or Steal: Thieves' Methods,"
            Library Journal 84:141-145.

Schefrin, Rita A.
1971   "The Barriers to and Barriers of Library
            Security," Wilson Library Journal 45:870-
            878.

Smigel, Erwin
1970   "Attitudes Towards Stealing Related to Size
            of Victim Organization" in Crime Against
            Bureaucracy, Erwin Smigel and H. Lawrence
            Ross eds. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold
            Company, 15-27.

Smiley, Jackie
1975   Interview held at The Ohio State University
            Columbus, Ohio.

Stern, George
1966   Studies of College Environments. Bethesda,
            Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Ser-
            vices ED 010647.

Sutuci, Sano
1975   "Protection: Open Access from Chained
            Libraries." Tosh-Kai. 25:27-30.

Trangri, Savera and Michael Schwartz
1967   "Delinquency research and self concept
            Variable" Journal of Criminal Law,
            Crimology, and Police Science 58:182-190.

Trelles, Oscar M.
1973   "Protection of Libraries." Law Library
            Journal 66:241-258.

Vaz, E.W.
1969   "Delinquency and Youth Culture: Upper and
            Middle Class Boys," Journal of Criminal Law,
            Criminology, and Police Science 60:33-46.

Vinnes, Norman
1969   "A Search for Meaning in Book Theft,"
            Scholastic Librarian 18:25-27.

Waldo, Gordon P. and Mason E. Hall
1970   "Delinquency Potential and Attitudes Toward
            the Criminal Justice System," Social Forces
            49:291-298.

Zimmerman, Lee
1960   "Pilfering and Mutilating Books," Bookmark
            13:5-9.