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Abstract—Reporting on the results of a survey conducted in spring 2017, the author offers insight into the contemporary trends and challenges of collecting US, Canadian, and European print and digital art exhibition catalogs by academic art librarians in the United States and Canada. Findings demonstrate that for academic institutions with programs in art history, fine arts, or design, exhibition catalogs are a collection priority. Due to the variety of publishers of art exhibition catalogs, specialized knowledge to identify and acquire these resources is required.

Introduction
Selecting and acquiring art exhibition catalogs has always been a collection development challenge for art librarians. Learning about a catalog and then obtaining a copy in a timely manner can be an obstacle since print runs are often limited, and distribution channels are not always well-established. Art exhibition catalogs provide pertinent information for art scholars and have expanded from a printed list of artworks to publications that include scholarly essays, detailed explanations of objects, bibliographies, and illustrations. Sources for catalogs have also evolved. Museums, galleries, commercial publishers, private curators for exhibitions, and major academic presses may all be involved in distribution. The formats of art exhibition catalogs have also expanded to include digital publications.

The author conducted a survey in spring 2017 to explore current practices in the selection and acquisition of art exhibition catalogs at US and Canadian academic institut-
tions. These geographic areas have similar collecting practices, academic programs, and populations. This study defines academic institutions as art and design schools, two-year colleges, four-year colleges with no PhD programs, and four-year colleges with PhD programs.

Art exhibition catalogs are permanent records of temporary events published irregularly by a great number and many types of institutions. The content of art exhibition catalogs varies widely, so survey participants were provided with a definition up front. For the purposes of the survey, art exhibition catalogs include two types as defined by Lois Swan Jones in *Art Research Methods and Resources*: a summary catalog and a scholarly catalog.

1. A **summary exhibition catalog** contains only a minimal entry—artist’s name, title, medium, dimensions, probable date created, and a present location—for each work of art, which may or may not be illustrated.

2. A **scholarly exhibition catalog** is a more comprehensive document, providing the data recorded in a summary catalog, plus additional information such as exhibition records; provenance, or list of all known owners and sales in which the work figured after leaving the artist’s studio; literature referring to the piece; information on any related works; and if possible, information concerning the subject. Moreover, many of the works of art are illustrated in color. Scholarly catalogs, which usually include pertinent essays concerning the artist, the style, and/or the historical period, are frequently the best and most recent investigation and interpretation of an artist’s work or of a specific subject. Depending upon the topic, an exhibition catalog can remain the most significant research on a subject for years.

In this article and for the survey, a digital exhibition catalog is defined as either a digitized book or born-digital publication. Digitized books are copies of print monographs, and born-digital publications exist only in digital format. Most academic institutions included in this study focus on collecting materials concerning Western art. The questions in the survey regarding print art exhibition catalogs were designed to compare collection practices of titles produced in the United States and Canada to non-English European titles. Further research comparing the collection of English-language European titles to non-English European titles is warranted but beyond the scope of this investigation.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Little of the scholarly record directly addresses the selection and acquisition of art exhibition catalogs. The majority of the literature covers collection development in gen-
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eral. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, a number of monographs provided specific collection guidance to art librarians. These authors covered a range of topics such as the management of art libraries, developing a collection, and providing information services.

Anthony Burton’s chapter “Exhibition Catalogues,” which appeared in the Art Library Manual, opens by emphasizing the importance of catalogs as being first and foremost a record of the existence of works of art. Burton discussed the history of the exhibition catalog, acquisition resources, cataloging practices, accommodation of odd formats, and security considerations of catalogs.

In the book chapter “Understanding Art Museum Catalogues,” Lois Swan Jones underscored the variety of information included in exhibition catalogs and their importance for those researching the arts, since they disseminate the most current scholarship on the subject. She also explored the varying times during an exhibition that catalogs are published, emphasizing that not all are produced before the opening of a show.

Swan Jones later coauthored Art Libraries and Information Services with Sarah Scott Gibson, in which exhibition catalogs were again presented as specialized reference works. The text provided guidance on selecting, acquiring, organizing, and retrieving exhibition catalogs. The authors emphasized that, due to the number of catalogs produced locally, nationally, and internationally, librarians need to develop systematic plans for acquiring them or risk their going out of stock before a librarian even knows of their existence. The authors also stressed the difficulties of learning about newly published catalogs and provided a list of options for acquisitions such as museum exchange programs, standing orders, and specialized dealers.

Writing from a dealer’s perspective in 1980, Brian Gold of Worldwide Books published a column in the ARLIS/NA Newsletter about the economics of publishing exhibition catalogs. Gold made the argument that art librarians should use the service of specialized dealers to help contend with the limited print runs of many museums publishing exhibition catalogs. He also indicated that, although catalogs would continue to increase in price, they would still provide valuable information central to library collections.

Writing again in 1983, Gold’s article covered the advantages and disadvantages of common methods used to acquire exhibition catalogs including title-by-title ordering, standing orders, and exchanges. Gold discussed the necessity of staying informed
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about recently published catalogs. He also noted that, unlike trade art books, the majority of exhibition catalogs are not always highly publicized despite their importance. To ensure that libraries obtain the materials they need, Gold emphasized the value of a dealer list and the advantage of using a combination of methods for acquiring catalogs.

In her 1983 article, Wanda Dole analyzed collection development trends of the 1980s specific to art libraries. She highlighted an increase in the acquisition of titles from smaller presses and galleries. Dole also noted an increase in the use of artists’ books and exhibition catalogs, while expressing concern that there was an overall decline in the total percentage of library budgets dedicated to buying art monographs even though their unit cost was increasing.

There was a dearth of literature covering art exhibition catalogs in the 1990s. As part of a 2003 survey on current practices in art libraries, Susan Craig concluded that approval plans and individual firm orders were used extensively to acquire mainstream publications and exhibition catalogs. Craig also determined that e-books were not yet a significant format for art and architecture topics.

In 2014, D. Vanessa Kam wrote a two-part article about the current state of the art book and collection development in art libraries. The first part of her article was based on interviews with library professionals in academic and museum libraries in the United States and Canada. These professionals noted the dominant role that print publications still had in library collections based on the great number still being published and their indisputable importance in the research process of art scholars. Kam also highlighted the difficulty in acquiring varied formats of print publications, particularly from smaller presses that had not been picked up by approval plan vendors. In the article’s second part, Kam interviewed publishers from Europe and the United States, highlighting the limited number of art e-book publications available as compared to the case in other disciplines. Kam concluded from her interviews that art librarians would continue to collect printed books for the foreseeable future because publishers would continue to produce them.

That same year, Jennifer Yao explored the availability of art, architecture, and design e-books to academic libraries. She determined that art monographs as e-books
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are rare, and that only about 2 percent of e-books offered by EBSCO, JSTOR, and ProQuest were in these disciplines, with most titles issued by scholarly presses. Based on her research, Yao concluded it was not possible to create a balanced and comprehensive collection using only e-books.

Paula Gabbard’s recent article on museum e-book publishing discussed the scope and scale of e-book creation in North American museums.\(^{19}\) She determined that a significant number of institutions made large quantities of their publications available electronically through open access. However, the selection and acquisition of museum-published e-books for libraries was problematic since many large academic institutions acquire e-books only through university-approved vendors, which often do not offer museum e-books.\(^{20}\)

**METHODOLOGY**

The author created a twenty-four-question survey using Qualtrics, an online data collection and analysis tool. The survey included skip logic so that, based on a participant’s responses, certain questions did not appear. For example, if participants answered that they did not acquire digital art exhibition catalogs, additional questions about collection practices related to this format did not appear. Additionally, some questions allowed for multiple answers, resulting in responses that exceeded 100 percent.\(^{21}\)

The survey was emailed to a select list of 2,442 academic librarians in the United States and Canada, based on the Art Libraries Society of North America directory. Because many large academic institutions employ more than one individual who may participate in the selection of art resources, the author chose one person per institution to receive the survey. Due to similarities in programs and populations, academic institutions were the sole focus of the survey.

**PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR INSTITUTIONS**

Seventy-three participants, or 30 percent of those who received the email, completed the survey. The results represent a range of academic institutions. The greatest number of responses were from four-year colleges with PhD programs (60.27 percent), followed by four-year colleges with no PhD programs (20.55 percent), art and design schools (17.81 percent), and two-year colleges (1.37 percent). All four-year colleges had student populations ranging from 0 to 40,000, with an average of over 10,000. Art and design schools and two-year colleges responding had student populations under 2,000. Only two art and design schools had student populations ranging between 2,000 and 10,000.

Respondents were asked if the art and design collection was located in a separate library and about the size of collections related to these disciplines. Initially, the author expected the data collected from these questions to reveal trends related to the collect-
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tion practices of art exhibition catalogs among the various types of academic institutions, but no correlation was apparent.

All seventy-three respondents work at academic institutions that have a program in at least two of the following: design, fine or visual arts, and art history (Table 1). Sixty-three responded that they have liaison librarians. Only one respondent indicated the liaison did not have collection development responsibilities.

**COLLECTING AND ACQUiring**

The bulk of the survey questions gathered data about academic art librarians’ collecting practices and acquisition of art exhibition catalogs. Seventy percent of respondents stated that art exhibition catalogs were explicitly a part of the collection development policy at their institutions.

Across the various institution types, there was no apparent trend over the past five years in terms of overall budget changes relating to acquiring print or digital materials. Participants indicated that budgets for acquiring digital materials had increased (26 percent) or stayed the same (56 percent) (Figure 1). For 50 percent of the participants, the average budget for acquiring print materials did not change. Thirty-two percent of participants noted a decrease in print materials budgets, and 16 percent noted an increase (Figure 2). Print budgets in comparison to digital were more likely to decrease.

**AWARENESS OF AVAILABLE CATALOGS**

Art librarians rely on a variety of sources to learn about new print and digital art exhibition catalogs. Participants could choose from a multiple answer list, with a write-in option, to indicate what sources they consulted to learn of available catalogs. Data particular to each format revealed an overlap among the sources consulted.

Faculty recommendations and dealer emails or catalogs were reported as the most frequent way to stay apprised of available print art exhibition catalogs (Table 2). Vendor slips and approval plans received the same number of responses and tied for third. The reliance on listservs came in closely after the use of vendor slips and approval plans. Thirteen respondents commented on other ways they learned about available art exhibition catalogs. Among these write-in responses were museum visits, published exhibition reviews (both print and electronic), and published art exhibition announcements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic programs at participants’ institutions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine or Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Librarians learn about available digital art exhibition catalogs from listservs (thirty responses), dealer emails/catalogs (thirty responses), and faculty recommendations (twenty-five responses) (Table 3). Eleven respondents noted other ways that they learned about available digital catalogs with the majority stating the use of vendor slips. Twenty-four respondents indicated that they did not acquire digital art exhibition catalogs. Of the respondents that acquired digital art exhibition catalogs, only 38 percent indicated there was a system in place at their institutions to allow for public discovery of freely

**Figure 1.** Budget allocations for acquiring digital art and design materials over the past five years.

**Figure 2.** Budget allocations for acquiring print art and design materials over the past five years.
available digital catalogs. Discovery was more likely to be provided at four-year institutions and through catalog records (54 percent) or LibGuides (34 percent).

**ACQUIRING PRINT**

Given the continued production and reliance by art scholars on print publications, a series of questions relating specifically to how art exhibition catalogs are acquired was included in the survey. Participants were provided a set of answers with the same choices for US/Canadian and non-English European titles. Individual firm orders,

Table 2. How respondents learn about available print exhibition catalogs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty recommendation</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer e-mail or catalog</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor slips</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come in on approval</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listserv</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher standing order</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. How respondents learn about available digital exhibition catalogs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listserv</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer e-mail or catalog</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty recommendation</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not acquire</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription service</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
approval plans, and gifts were the top three responses indicated for both geographic locations (Tables 4 and 5).

Along with the options for how participants acquired art exhibition catalogs, an additional option was listed for the non-English European titles: do not acquire. Only 8 percent of participants indicated they did not acquire non-English European titles, with no dominance of a particular type of academic institution. Forty-seven percent of respondents indicated the number of non-English European print catalogs acquired in the past five years had stayed the same, 26 percent indicated a decrease, 7 percent an increase, and the remaining respondents were unsure. Seventy percent of respondents had not seen inadvertent duplication of print exhibition catalogs in multiple languages.

Results indicated that overall, the use of print exhibition catalogs in the past five years had not declined for participants, with 45 percent unsure about overall use and 42 per-

Table 4. How respondents acquire US and Canadian print exhibition catalogs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual firm order</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval plan</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On exchange</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher standing order</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. How respondents acquire non-English European print exhibition catalogs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual firm order</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval plan</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not acquire</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher standing order</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On exchange</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cent indicating usage had stayed the same. No obvious trends across the types of academic institutions related to overall print usage were indicated by the results.

Considering other ways that academic institutions acquire art exhibition catalogs, a series of questions related to museum or library exchange programs was included in the survey. Only twelve respondents indicated they participated in this type of program, of which nine were four-year academic institutions that awarded doctorates. Participants in exchange programs also indicated that receipts had stayed the same, followed closely by respondents being unsure or seeing a decrease.

Related to the availability of purchasing recently published art exhibition catalogs within the past year, 66 percent of respondents indicated that at times they could not acquire titles because they were out of print. Twenty-six percent indicated that they had never had trouble acquiring a recently published catalog, with 8 percent indicating that it “happened frequently.”

**Discussion**
The author was surprised to find that there were no direct correlations between budget allocations, student populations, and collection size among the various types of academic institutions that responded. The data collected from this survey did reveal that all participants support programs in at least two of the following: design, fine or visual arts, and art history. Further, 86 percent of respondents worked at institutions with a liaison librarian that had collection development responsibilities. These findings demonstrate the commitment and relevance of academic libraries to supporting academic programming, and that specialized knowledge is regarded as a necessity in the collecting practices of art materials.

While some respondents indicated that they collected digital exhibition catalogs, the affirmative response rate was low. Given the lack of available digital publications about art, architecture, and design as revealed in the literature, the low response rate is not surprising. If digital catalogs exist, they are often scholarly press titles available through established vendors. In contrast, while more museums are creating freely available digital exhibition catalogs, the data collected about providing discovery for these resources was limited, and discovery is most often provided by four-year academic institutions. It is possible that four-year academic institutions are more likely to have the tools and staff in place to provide discovery. Future consideration should be given to the role of art librarians in providing access and discovery to freely available art exhibition catalogs.

Survey data related to the acquisition of print art exhibition catalogs shows that art librarians rely on a variety of methods, with the most popular being individual firm orders, approval plans, and gifts. Previous literature revealed the prevalence of these same methods and emphasized the necessity for using a combination of them to successfully acquire art exhibition catalogs.22

The data collected specific to the acquisitions of non-English European catalogs was an attempt to see how many academic institutions still actively collected these titles.
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Many respondents provided comments addressing the complexities of collecting non-English European titles, including the necessity of working with in-country vendors and an overall decline in the number of institutions purchasing foreign language titles. The former comment may shed light on the latter, in that many institutions may not have the budget for an established relationship with an in-country vendor. There may be other trends at play, such as overall decline in use of non-English titles. One respondent made the statement that foreign language materials were not collected unless English was included within the same publication.

Respondents’ comments highlighted trends related to the complexities of collecting art exhibition catalogs. One such issue is the difficulty in acquiring and learning about the availability of small press and gallery art exhibition catalogs. Participants also commented on the difficulty of knowing when catalogs were published during an exhibition. Depending on established vendor relationships, acquisition systems, and available staff time, the difficulty of acquiring art exhibition catalogs can vary among academic institutions. These findings support themes in the literature from the past thirty years.23

A few participants stated that exhibition catalogs were not treated any differently than other art monographs. This may be due to the fact that many catalogs accompanying major exhibitions are jointly published with university presses. Because numerous academic institutions rely on established vendors for their acquisitions, this adds to the complexities of acquiring smaller publications. Further assessment of the specific programs and research strengths of each academic institution could provide more insight on the selection and acquisition of art exhibition catalogs.

One fact apparent from the survey results and literature is that large numbers of print art exhibition catalogs are still published, and they remain relevant to academic programs. Art librarians are not opposed to collecting digital publications; it is instead the lack of availability and systems to provide access and discovery that create a barrier. To support academic art scholarship, libraries must collect print. Art exhibition catalogs often provide the most current information on an artist. Many of the respondents provided comments addressing the importance of collecting catalogs for information on contemporary artists, particularly in supporting studio art programs.

While the survey did include a question related to the usage of print art exhibition catalogs, future assessment about the overall use of print collections in art libraries would be worth pursuing to provide quantitative data for the ongoing dialogue concerning the value of print in arts research. In addition, survey data revealed that budget allocations to acquire print were more likely to decrease compared to allocations for digital materials. Moving forward, collecting specific data from art libraries over a period of time is needed to track any trends in the shift of budget allocations among publication formats.24


CONCLUSION
Lois Swan Jones’s 1978 definition of art exhibition catalogs was used to preface the survey for participants, but it also highlights how these sources can remain the most significant research on a subject for years.25 Art exhibition catalogs serve as the permanent record of a temporary event, providing continued access. Still true today, exhibition catalogs are a collection priority for any academic library at an institution with programs and scholars in the arts.

This survey was conducted to achieve a better understanding of the collecting practices surrounding art exhibition catalogs. It is the author’s hope that the data collected from this survey can add to the conversation about how academic library collections support the research and teaching needs of art scholars, while also highlighting the specialized knowledge needed to acquire art library resources.

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY INSTRUMENT: EXHIBITION CATALOG COLLECTING PRACTICES

ENVIRONMENT
Q1 Select the option that best describes your institution.
   ○ Art & Design School
   ○ 2-year College
   ○ 4-year College with PhD
   ○ 4-year College no PhD
Q2 About how large is the total student population at your institution?
   ○ 0 to 2,000
   ○ 2,000 to 10,000
   ○ 10,000 to 20,000
   ○ 20,000 to 30,000
   ○ 30,000 to 40,000
   ○ over 40,000
Q3 Does your institution have programs in the following? Select all that apply.
   ○ Design
   ○ Fine or Visual arts
   ○ Art History
   ○ None of the above
Q4 Do you have a dedicated liaison librarian for Design, Fine/Visual Arts, or Art History?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
Q5 Does the liaison librarian have collection development responsibilities?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

Q6 Does your institution have a separate library that houses your art and design collection?
○ Yes
○ No

Q7 Indicate the approximate number of print art and design volumes in your collection.
○ 0 to 20,000
○ 20,000 to 50,000
○ 50,000 to 100,000
○ 100,000 to 200,000
○ 200,000 to 500,000
○ Over 500,000
○ Not sure

ACQUISITIONS AND COLLECTING

Q8 Are exhibition catalogs explicitly a part of your collection policy?
○ Yes
○ No

Q9 In the past 5 years, has the budget related to acquiring print art and design materials:
○ Increased
○ Stayed about the same
○ Decreased
○ Not sure

Q10 In the past 5 years, has the budget related to acquiring digital art and design materials:
○ Increased
○ Stayed about the same
○ Decreased
○ Not sure

Q11 How do you learn about available print exhibition catalogs? Select all that apply.
○ Listserv
○ Faculty recommendation
○ Vendor slips
○ Dealer e-mail or catalog
○ Blog
○ Come in on approval
○ Publisher standing order
○ Social media
○ Other (please specify)

Q12 How do you learn about available digital exhibition catalogs? Select all that apply.
○ Listserv
○ Faculty recommendation
○ Dealer e-mail or catalog
○ Blog
○ Subscription service
○ Social media
○ Other (please specify)
○ Do not acquire

Q13 If you use a subscription service for digital exhibition catalogs, which vendor(s) do you use?

Q14 Do you provide discovery to freely available digital exhibition catalogs?
○ Yes
○ No

Q15 How do you make freely available digital exhibition catalogs accessible? Select all that apply.
○ Library catalog record
○ LibGuides
○ Other (please specify)

Q16 How are most of your US and Canadian print exhibition catalogs acquired? Select all that apply.
○ Approval plan
○ Publisher standing order
○ On exchange
○ Individual firm order
○ Gifts
○ Other (please specify)

Q17 How are most of your European language (non-English) print exhibition catalogs acquired? Select all that apply.
○ Approval plan
○ Publisher standing order
○ On exchange
○ Individual firm order
○ Gifts
○ Other (please specify)
○ Do not acquire

Q18 In the past 5 years, has the number of European language (non-English) print exhibition catalogs you have acquired:
○ Increased
○ Stayed about the same
○ Decreased
○ Not sure

Q19 In the past year, how often have you attempted to purchase a recently published exhibition catalog that was out of print?
○ Frequently
○ Sometimes
○ Never
Q20 Does your library participate in a museum or library exchange program for exhibition catalogs?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

Q21 Are the number of exchange receipts:
   ○ Increasing
   ○ Staying about the same
   ○ Decreasing
   ○ Not sure

ASSESSMENT
Q22 In the past 5 years, has the usage of print exhibition catalogs in your collection:
   ○ Increased
   ○ Stayed about the same
   ○ Decreased
   ○ Not sure

Q23 In the past 5 years, have you noticed inadvertent duplication of print exhibition catalogs in multiple languages in your collection?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Not sure

FINAL THOUGHTS
Q24 If you have any final thoughts on the acquisitions or selection of exhibition catalogs, please share.