A comparative study of collection development practices in English Literature across a sample of UK academic libraries

Arleen McCombie

Abstract

The development of academic library collections and the guarantee of their quality and coherence have for decades depended on the knowledge of the subject specialist. Yet with the advent of information technology the importance of subject domain knowledge and disciplinary structures within the library has been challenged.

The research issue investigated here has been stimulated by the paucity of studies on collection development as applied to a single academic discipline, English Literature. This study seeks to explore how collection decisions are made and what contextual factors influence the thinking of academic librarians. Therefore rather than simply gathering facts the focus of this study is on individual perspectives. Furthermore, it takes a deliberately holistic approach by examining collection development in the round instead of looking at a particular component.

The key findings of this study are that traditional collection development continues to be a critical responsibility of academic liaison librarians, but that a more collaborative approach to collection development is being instituted in practice. In particular, the knowledge of the academic librarian is being partly diluted through new organisational structures and purchasing methods. At least for the near future, however, academic librarians continue to be confident about their own relevance and contribution to the collection development process.

Keywords

Academic libraries, collection development, English literature, academic librarians, stock selection, organisation practices.

Introduction

> We are in a time of enormous change. A typical academic library collection in 1999 was in many ways more similar to a collection from twenty or even one hundred years earlier than it was to today's collection. (Levine-Clark, 2019: 87)

Collection development is central to the mission of all academic libraries. It serves research and teaching, and contributes to the academic ranking of universities. It is an ongoing process but at its most fundamental level it requires librarians to select, acquire and evaluate materials according to the needs of a community of users and the boundaries set by policies and financial resources. Wider contextual factors also shaping collection development include changing user needs and the rise of new scholarly practices, such as open access publishing, in higher education.

Until the early 1990s the dominant model practised by most research libraries was one of stewardship, with the focus on building a local collection to function as autonomous and comprehensive for that particular institution. This model saw the library collection as institutional capital and was suited to the learning and research environment of the time, which was predicated on the information universe of print and the principle of ownership. In this model collections were local in scale and valued for their size and scope, reflecting the professional judgement of librarians. However, with the rise of new technology from the mid-1990s a ‘network logic’ (Dempsey, Malpas and Lavoie, 2014) came to the fore.

This network logic has ushered in a new paradigm. It revolves around the servicing of user needs, chief of which is the principle of immediate access. In the new millennium the information universe is global in scale and academic libraries have adapted by modelling their practice on the idea of the ‘facilitated collection’ (Dempsey, 2016). As well as directing users to externally available resources academic libraries no longer invest so much of their money and time in predicting user needs; rather, they respond to patron-driven demands and increasingly devote their energies to managing shared resources (print and electronic). A new variety of ‘stewardship arrangements’ have come into existence and with the shift to electronic formats library workflows and processes have changed. Issues such as licensing arrangements, choice of platform and compatibility with library management systems means that academic librarians have to work in a much more joined-up way with various units across the library organization. Electronic resources such as journals are typically sold by commercial publishers in big package deals for which consortia purchasing arrangements have become the norm. As these packages represent such a big investment their acquisition is typically overseen by a collection development manager, who has oversight of collection development across the whole organization of the university. The practice of subscribing to electronic packages means savings in time for the traditional activity of selection: with one subscription decision the library has access to thousands of books. Nevertheless, critics of the ‘big deal’ process point out that access does not necessarily mean *perpetual* access. Scholarship of the future is potentially being sacrificed because collections nowadays are often leased rather than owned.

1.1 Background and context

At the service level libraries have also undergone a period of ‘rebranding’ to reflect the way the higher education market has become increasingly competitive. High on the agenda of every university nowadays is the need to offer an excellent student experience. The millennial generation increasingly view education as another consumer good and their evaluations of their undergraduate experiences are recorded in the National Student Survey (NSS), which is an annual exercise taken very seriously by all UK universities. Question sixteen of the survey specifically focuses on library resources and services and asks whether they meet the expectations of final year undergraduates. University libraries thus increasingly find themselves being rated for things like opening hours, PC access, and the variety of study space available. The expectation that libraries will be open 24/7 brings with it associated costs at a time when library budgets are either static or only slowly increasing. Meanwhile library stakeholders from an older generation have different, more traditional, expectations. A survey of UK academic staff carried out by Ithaka, Jisc and RLUK found that almost all respondents continued to view the library’s principal role as being a purchaser of information resources (Housewright, Schonfeld & Wulfson, 2013). Balancing the needs of these different constituencies is important but difficult to achieve in practice.

The shift in user expectations towards a more service-focused library model has also had brought with it a change in the use of space. With the increasing use of electronic resources the footprint of the physical collection is being actively downsized as libraries move away from a storage (collections) function, and reconceive their space as being for social learning and new facilities such as 3-D printing rather than shelving. Freeing up space previously occupied by under-used books and journals is seen as a positive development by many institutions and one which is increasingly being adopted. Statistics from a 2013 survey of the Society of College, National and University Libraries (SCONUL) demonstrated an overall increase in the use of high density offsite book storage facilities across the UK sector (Annual Library Statistics, 2014: 36). What remains to be investigated is the impact of this practice on library user behaviour, particularly on humanities researchers. Getting rid of open stacks decreases the ability to browse, which in turn effects the chances of researchers making serendipitous discoveries. However, many library directors would make the case that the trend for investing in storage facilities is an operational efficiency which still underlines the continuing importance of the low-use physical collection (sometimes also called the 'legacy' collection).

Developments of collection infrastructure at the collective level also have to be considered in this context: the purpose of the British Library-instituted UK Research Reserve, (established in 2007) was to pioneer a large-scale collaborative print management project for the HE sector. Specifically, the role of the UKRR has been to co-ordinate the activities of university libraries regarding the preservation of back runs of print-only journals. The project has been touted as a successful example of HE sector collaboration and currently there are scoping exercises taking place to broaden the UKRR's remit into other areas of older library stock, such as low-use print monographs. (Banks & Hoskins, 2019). Advocates of this process say that collective collection management is not just about rationalisation, but also about foregrounding the value of print by drawing attention to the scarcity of some titles which should be retained for the good of scholarship.

These are the broad trends but what are their implications? According to higher education critics the move away from localized and autonomous collection-building towards more co-operative working has resulted in collections becoming increasingly homogenized, with library budgets tied up in 'big deals' with the biggest publishers. The move to hive off legacy print collections and manage them separately from other library resources gives impetus to the idea of the 'core' collection but as information theorists and commentators point out, the idea of the 'core' is often problematic (Nisonger, 2007). Reimagining the mission of collection-building has also meant the organizational staffing model has changed in some institutions, with the specialist expertise of the subject librarian being diluted and an increasing focus on 'liaison' roles which involve more generic outreach skills. Meanwhile, by consigning print resources to off-site storage on the grounds of taking up valuable space, disciplines which are dependent on print books (principally the humanities) find themselves edged out of the library. These are all areas which merit further investigation.

1.2 Focus of Research

Surprisingly, while there has been much professional LIS debate about collection development at the macro-level there have been very few studies which have examined university collection development over the past 20 years in the context of a single discipline, at least within the humanities. A search of the LIS journal literature reveals that most articles focussing specifically on English literature collections were published in the 1980s (Heinzkill, 1980; Stern, 1983; Cullars, 1985; Budd, 1986). These articles are written from a North American perspective and it is interesting to note that the Association of College & Research Libraries in America has dedicated a section of its work to supporting librarians who specialize in 'Literatures in English.' Their website (www.ala.org) shows how this specialist library community stays connected. In the UK context the nearest equivalent is the CILIP Academic & Research Libraries Group but this body does not organize its work into subject specialisms.

This article aims to address this gap by looking at English Literature within the UK context as a university specialism closely tied to the academic library, but one which increasingly has had to defend its relevance in the 21st learning environment. The researcher studied English Literature as an undergraduate and postgraduate more than 15 years ago, and is interested in revisiting the discipline in the light of the changes academic libraries have undergone since then.

Since the millennium there has been a concerted effort by UK governments to promote STEM disciplines in higher education, with an implicit undermining of the value of humanities teaching and research. The consequences of this can be seen in resource provision across UK university libraries in terms of budget allocations. In the scientific disciplines academic e-journals form the main source of scholarly material and inflationary pressures have resulted in a situation where they consume most of the materials budget (Research Information Network Report, 2010). Disciplines in the arts & humanities do not have the same kind of leverage and are at real risk of not receiving a proportionate share of resources.

Beyond this there are a few reasons why English as an academic discipline is distinctive and provides an interesting case-study for understanding changes in collection development. Most obviously, as a non-vocational subject there is no unified or prescribed programme of study which UK universities have to offer for an English degree. Across universities the courses offered are very much influenced by individual staff in the particular English department. This means that the material chosen by faculty which ends up in the library very much reflects the research and teaching interests of that particular institution. In this respect English is the antithesis of a textbook-dominated domain such as law or pharmacy. Related to this is the fact that literature is not a knowledge domain which offers 'information' in the same way that other disciplines do i.e. it does not develop in a linear, progressive fashion. Literature collections 'age' differently from other collections, because old literary works are constantly being re-interpreted (or re-discovered) for contemporary audiences. Even older works of literary criticism can still be 'current' e.g. a study found that 44% of the critical works cited by Milton scholars were dated before 1900 (Stern: 202).

The reception of literary texts are also very much bound up with their format and transmission. There is usually a need to collect a sequence of texts, from the first edition onwards, and canonical authority is very much bound up with print. Indeed, despite new developments (such as the rise of digital humanities), English Literature is still one of the more 'traditional' scholarly domains in which research output is measured by the printed monograph. Again, this points to a difference with the scientific disciplines where the journal article is the gold-standard of scholarly output. A study which analysed citations and sampled publications in English literature found that 69% of scholarly citations were to books and only 31% were to journal articles (Kelsey & Knievel, 2012: 11).

Literary inquiry continues to be text-based and therefore literary research is typically presented in the form of an extended argument. For students of literature this means engaging in 'deep-reading' rather than scanning or skimming for information, as is common with other subject disciplines. Achieving the right balance between electronic and print material is thus a critical matter for the librarian in charge of English literature collection development.

Finally, in higher education different subject disciplines have different degrees of coherence in terms of how they are structured, epistemologically and institutionally. The idea of *scatter* advanced by J.B. Motes (1962) and adopted by Marcia J. Bates (1996) is useful for thinking of the framework within which disciplines operate. A low-scatter discipline such as pharmacy is one in which the body of authoritative literature as well as fundamental principles and modes of inquiry is well-organized. Core journals are easily identified and specialized areas are well-delineated. However, a high-scatter discipline is one in which the boundaries are fuzzy and the information resources on which it draws are disparate, extending across subject domains. A study of 34 literary journals, using citation data from Web of Science, looked at the 'intellectual base' of Literature as a field of scholarly inquiry and determined that it had become more 'interdisciplinary' since the 1990s, frequently citing texts from sociology, history, politics and art (Hammerfest, 2011). The rise of gender studies and cultural studies is also evidence of a trend towards inter-disciplinarity.

However, for evaluative purposes the higher education landscape is still very much structured according to disciplines. As one critic points out, "the demands of research assessment exercises [such as the REF] and quality reviews of teaching help reinforce disciplinary boundaries…" (Moran, 2010: 174). Although the idea of a core body of high cultural literary texts, the so-called 'canon', has been challenged students still apply for courses in 'English' when they submit UCAS applications, and academics still have their work peer-reviewed by other scholars in the discipline of 'English'.

1.3 Research Aims and Objectives

The aim of this research were to explore the impact of new practices in collection development as they affect the study and research of English Literature in a sample of academic libraries. The approach will be comparative and the objectives are as follows:

1. To compare and contrast methods, tools and models for collection evaluation and selection/de-selection.
2. To gain a broader understanding of the challenges posed by the new academic landscape for collection development. What has changed for the better and what is not as good as it used to be?
3. To understand how librarians try to meet the needs of different stakeholders and stay on top of scholarly trends.

Although undoubtedly important to literary research this study will not address special collections i.e. archives and manuscripts. This domain is increasing its profile through the work of bodies such as Research Libraries UK (RLUK) and warrants separate study. Perhaps in the future the boundaries between general collections and special collections may be redrawn but for now an operative distinction remains.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The 'collection' as a concept

There is a limited body of literature which provides a conceptual framework for understanding collection development within the information eco-system of higher education. For example, Lee (2000) claims that librarians view their collections responsibilities within a graded framework of control (ownership, license, interlibrary loan) while users in academia perceive information resources within a more flattened framework of access. Later she interviewed academic staff and devised a model from their perspective of four concentric circles or 'information spaces' (2003) which put digital resources (personal and institutional) at the centre of the user experience and relegated the library's physical holdings to the intermediate circle. An alternative collections grid for universities was proposed by Dempsey (2003) which divided resources into four different categories according to their *uniqueness* and *stewardship*. The principal usefulness of this model was how it demonstrated the digital environment now encompassed not only published content but also managing open web content and institutionally produced content disseminated through repositories.

2.2 Subject Specialists

The kind of generic activities librarians associate with collection development include evaluating resources in different formats, negotiating with vendors, working with faculty to maximise the budget, deselecting materials, and promoting awareness of resources to students. These activities remain important but much 21st century debate around collection development has centred on the changing role of the subject librarian. Part of this change is cultural, reflecting the growing importance of digital resources and the standardized way they are packaged and mediated. A consequence of this has been consortia arrangements and less potential for individual subject specialists to directly shape and manage collections (Cove & Craig in, 2004). However, the change has also been organizational: with the advent of electronic resources acquired through 'big deals' the structural organization of collection development for the past decade has reflected the increasingly centralised nature of responsibility in higher education. Many key decisions about selection are now made by collection development managers and a principal tool for acquisition is the approval plan. The latter does away with the title-by-title selection that was traditionally practised by subject librarians with expertise in their field. However, what exactly constitutes 'expertise' is a moot point. In the case of a law library the value of the librarian having some kind of legal training is obvious but in the humanities things are more problematic. Two studies in the U.S. have explored the perceived usefulness of advanced degrees (masters or doctorate) to the work of subject librarians by conducting surveys. In a 2011 study of subject librarians with PhDs, "credibility with faculty" and "understanding of the research process" were both cited as advantages conferred by advanced degrees (Gilman & Lindquist, 2011: 402-403). Another survey carried out in the U.S. in 2016 compared the beliefs and attitudes of subject librarians without advanced degrees to those with advanced degrees in their area and found that the picture was mixed (Day & Zurek, 2018). Respondents who had a PhD said that it had enhanced their abilities to liaise (78%), benefitted their teaching (74%) and contributed to their understanding of collection development (64%). According to the same study 30% of respondents without an advanced degree believed that holding one would help them with collection development because they would have a better appreciation of research trends (Day & Zurek: 46). However, it is significant that 70% of those surveyed without advanced degrees in their subject area did not feel it affected their professional efficacy one way or another.

Within the literature itself the title 'subject librarian' has been increasingly superseded by the less discipline-specific one of 'academic liaison', which registers the fact that the role "has evolved from subject-based collection development into subject-based user support." (Gaston, 2001: 21). Enumerating the new responsibilities of subject librarians, including project work and more involvement in teaching and scholarly communications, one commentator wryly summed up the new role as "the old job plus." (Penfield, 2001: 34). The old job devoted a significant amount of time to selection because in the print era the dominant acquisition philosophy was 'just in case'. Trying to acquire as comprehensive a collection as possible made sense at a time when scholarly monographs could go out of print quickly. Now that technology means books do not go out of print this philosophy no longer applies but the extent to which librarians have ceded control of responsibility for selection is still a matter of concern for some. Brantley (2010), for example, focuses on the area of monograph selection to argue for the importance of the specialist librarian's mediating role given that approval plans often overlook small presses and areas of interdisciplinary scholarship. While acknowledging the limitations of 'macro-selection', the article is generally pessimistic and concludes that the reality is that the depth of subject specialist knowledge in the 21st century university library has been downgraded.

The degree to which change was affecting the UK academic library sector a decade ago can be gauged by the decision to devote a special issue of the SCONUL newsletter to the role of subject librarians (SCONUL Focus no. 45, 2009). Although there are 40 articles in this special issue from various contributors it is interesting to note that not a single article specifically addresses collection development. The majority of articles instead focus on innovative practices in areas such as outreach initiatives and research support.

That this might not be reflective of the situation on the ground, amongst practitioners, was borne out by two separate studies. The first, based on a survey of UK subject librarians (Simmons & Corrall, 2010) looked at their key responsibilities and found that 86% rated liaising with academic departments as very important, followed by collection management (68%) and managing budgets (49%). Soon after this study another journal article was published which looked at how subject librarian job descriptions mapped to new and developing areas of library services (Brewerton, 2012). Along with noting that collection development continued to be 'core' and ranked third in terms of job duties, behind information literacy but far above data collection, Brewerton carried out a questionnaire across 22 HEI's in the UK and noted that the respondents (69% of whom were subject librarians) were 'reluctant' to embrace some newer areas of liaison work, such as research partnership with academics (Brewerton: 109). This suggested that the majority of subject librarians were behind the curve professionally. However, it is interesting to counterpoint Brewerton's article with a 2011 study by Cooke et al. which found that:

> the knowledge, skills and services that appear to be most highly valued by users [of academic libraries] may not reflect those on which greatest emphasis is placed by those who are managing library services…this study found that subject knowledge and keeping up-to-date in one's subject field are seen by academic staff as critically important attributes of an Academic Liaison Librarian. (Cooke et al. 2011: 24)

This suggestion of a divide between library management and library stakeholders about the perceived value of the different competencies of subject librarians is an important one to keep in mind.

2.3 Organizational Models

Another angle to understanding how structural change in the organization has affected collection development is to consider the rise of functional models and their associated impact on subject librarians. Functions work across disciplines; for example, 'Research support' is an example of a function which aligns itself with an interdisciplinary service model and raises issues such as data management, open access and copyright, not all of which a traditional subject librarian might be conversant with. More generally, the functional model "can enhance the development of a coherent collection and make working on shared projects, such as serials cancellation or collection analysis easier." (Johnson, 2014:61). An American case study by Morris and Currie (2014) reiterates these points and argues that a move away from a library model based on traditional subject disciplines to a more functional and 'holistic' model can actually be good for collection development because it results in a more integrated service and cross-disciplinary packages area easier to acquire. Yet an important counter-argument invoked by critics is that functional organization can often create distance from users. Strong lines of communication with departments/faculties is one of the principal reasons given for retaining the subject-based model by a recent interview sample of UK senior library managers (Hoodless & Pinfield, 2018). Relationships with stakeholders and the importance of the subject librarian as intermediary thus remains a key aspect of collection development.

2.4 Who decides?—Professional vs. patron dilemma

An emerging area of collection development in the U.S. and the U.K. over the last 15 years has been patron-driven demand (PDA), also known as demand-driven acquisition (DDA). Rather than relying on the librarian's predictive powers and professional judgement, stock is selected at the point of need by users and students (both undergraduates and graduates) have more say in the selection process. Request mechanisms have long been in place in university libraries but PDA as a practice is seen as qualitatively different and has accrued a lot of controversy in the literature. Implementation of DDA is possible with print materials but it has been associated in the literature mostly with e-books and a wider need to engage with the digital age. While there are different models the process generally involves vendor records for titles being loaded into the library OPAC catalogue: without knowing if a title is owned by the library or not, the user clicks on a record and triggers the loan/purchase of the item.

'Disruptive technology' is a term that has been applied in the business realm to processes that allow the customer to 'do it themselves" (Christenson, Aaron and Clark, 2001: 32) and many academic librarians seem to view PDA as a disruptive technology, allowing patrons to develop collections for themselves. Economically the justification for adopting PDA is that it foregrounds the issue of cost per use, particularly in relation to monographs. Provocative claims that, for example, 20% of a library collection typically accounts for 90% of its use (Peters, 'The Long Tail', 2006) have meant DDA being viewed as a better way of matching demand with supply. Especially at a time of fiscal constraint and in a market where students are increasingly seen as 'customers' PDA is viewed by some in academia as the best way of mediating commodity selection. The utilitarian nature of the pro-PDA argument is best exemplified by the Spitzform (2014) in 'Patron-Driven Acquisitions: Collecting as if Money and Space Mean Something'.

Other studies have tried to assess the effectiveness of PDA by exploring how much the choices of patrons and librarians differ when it comes to selection. For example, in a 2011 case study at a state university in Texas it was discovered that only 30 % of the students' selections would have been chosen by subject librarians across the five disciplines examined (Shen et al. 2011). However, a limitation of this study is that it does not specify if the students were undergraduates and graduates. And the picture is further complicated by the fact that although the titles selected by the students differed from librarians they were not outside the scope of the library's collection policy.
Another U.S. case study looking specifically at graduate students presents a more positive picture. Purdue University was a pioneer of the PDA process and in 2010 staff examined titles selected through PDA. Significantly, the results showed that liberal arts students (including English majors) were the heaviest users of the service (Anderson et al. 2010). The conclusion was that the selections were appropriate and that graduate possibly could help librarians tap into research trends better than faculty.

By allowing users more say in selection PDA has democratic overtones but there are problems associated with it. For instance, Walters (2012) points out that collection development has traditionally been carried out by subject librarians precisely to ensure a focus on the long-term needs of the institution. Through their professional training they are able to think holistically about the collection, ensuring that it is balanced and oriented towards future research needs. Students cannot be expected to have this overview and are likely to prefer vendor-supplied material which is more mainstream and likely to come from trade publishers rather than scholarly presses. The 2010 study at Purdue University by Anderson et al. found that collection quality through PDA remained high but other commentators have worried about the 'Amazonification' of the library catalogue, even to the extent of accusing PDA-advocates of fetishizing "the unfettered collection process because it leads to instant statistical gratification."(Sens and Fonesca, 2013: 368).

An American proponent of PDA, Rick Anderson, has argued that while it remains the professional duty of librarians to evaluate material for quality this is not the same as librarians being able to predict which materials will be 'relevant' for research in the future (Anderson and Magier, 2011). He argues in a blog that this kind of future-thinking is a hangover of the 'just-in-case' philosophy of the age of print, and that the digital age requires engagement with actual user behaviour in the here-and-now. (Anderson, "What Patron-Driven Acquisition", 2011).

A large portion of the literature in this field is based on opinion as much as evidence and seems to ignore the possibility that in actual practice PDA will more often be used in conjunction with traditional acquisition methods, rather than as a substitute. Results tend to be from studies carried out in the U.S. and these have been mixed, but it seems likely that as students become increasingly like customers in a 'marketised' higher education landscape, the idea of student-led collection development will continue to grow.

2.5 Materials format—e-book or print?

Over the past decade there have been many comparative studies looking at the issue of electronic versus print resources in the academic library. Particularly in relation to journals, most institutions have now adopted a policy of purchasing print only as a last resort. However, the situation is more complex in relation to the adoption of e-monographs. Several studies have focussed on the issue of whether there are format preferences are specific to disciplines (Chrzastowski and Wiley, 2015; Cummings, Larrivee and Vega, 2015; Ramirez and Tabacaru, 2015). The results of these studies have been inconclusive; for example, Ramirez and Tabacaru found that when identical titles in the humanities were available in both formats there was no usage data at their institution to indicate a clear user preference for ebooks.

Other studies with a more qualitative approach have examined attitudes towards ebooks within disciplines through surveys, being careful to distinguish user groups and the purposes of use. Two studies have concentrated on the attitudes of faculty in the humanities and reached interesting conclusions (Kacahaluba, Brady and Critten, 2014; Murray, 2018). The first study by Kacahaluba et al. discovered that literary scholars were under the assumption that print was more cost-effective and therefore allowed the library to build bigger collections. Participants also cited the fact that it was easier to navigate the scholarly apparatus of footnotes, endnotes and references in print than it was on screen. Murray's study found that more than half the faculty surveyed had real concerns about the possibility of ebooks supplanting print. However, both studies found that humanities scholars were open to embracing ebooks if it meant increasing the size and scope of the monographic collection.

2.6 Data and decision-making

Collection development is an art, not a science, but academic librarians are now working in an increasingly technological and data-driven environment in which different methods of evaluation are applied to resources in order to provide accountability for decisions. Particularly at a time of flat or declining budgets there is a perceived need to take the 'guesswork' out of collection development (Shirkey 2011). Nevertheless, collection assessment raises a variety of issues. Circulation statistics have been used for decades in academic libraries as one of the most reliable measures of a collection's 'use' value but sometimes the numbers do not tell the whole story. Indeed, the faulty use of data in this area has been highlighted by Amy Fry in a 2015 article for *Library Philosophy and Practice*. In this article she critically examines the way a particular study at Pittsburgh University in 1979 is still being used to promote outdated and unsupported thinking about monograph collections in 21st century peer-reviewed LIS literature. The 1979 study that is frequently cited found that about 40% of the books acquired in a given year had not circulated after six years; it also concluded that most use of a monograph should be expected to occur in the years immediately following acquisition (Kent, 1979). By drawing on a wide range of recent circulation statistics from a diverse array of higher education institutions Fry's article demonstrates that the claim that books which don't circulate after a couple of years will never be used is unfounded and that collections indeed 'grow' in use as they age (Fry:19).

Training is often needed to work with data and therefore subject librarians most often deal with statistics at one remove, getting system-generated reports rather than gathering the data themselves. Other times they may have to familiarise themselves with differences in usage data supplied by vendors. They may also adopt a user-centred approach and solicit feedback about the collections through surveys, focus groups and social media analytics. Although collection assessment is supposed to underpin decision-making, the literature strongly suggests that it is more often done on an as-needed basis rather than routinely (Nabe, 2011) because it is very time-consuming, and many staff find it overwhelming. Indeed, one study found that subject librarians were fundamentally sceptical about the pertinence of data for collection development, only conceding its relevance for weeding and serials cancellation (Brown and Stowers, 2013).

As usual there are case-studies of research libraries who have adopted innovative tools to aid collection development. For example, Harvard University has developed a bespoke analytical tool for data visualisation (Showers, 2015: 29). Not only does visualisation benefit Harvard library staff but it also allows patrons to stay informed by offering a visual 'window' onto collections. In the UK the nearest equivalent project has been the Copac Collection and Content Management (CCM) tool. This

Jisc-initiated project was set up in 2011 to provide contributing institutions with stock-weeding data at a collective level. It has developed into a service where comparative analytics are deployed by means of maps and graphs that allow libraries to "benchmark specific collections within the wider national landscape, and identify areas of commonality or difference." (Showers: 35). The CCM tool also allows universities to 'profile' individual subject areas in order to gauge strengths and weaknesses and show what percentage of the collection is unique (Showers: 39). The COPAC CCM tool has been used at Manchester University where one advocate has hailed it as potentially game-changing, stating "the aim is to get beyond bald usage statistics and 'cost per use calculations' and grapple with questions of what constitutes good usage.' (Kirkwood, 2016: 283).

2.7 Budgets

After staffing the materials budget represents the biggest area of expenditure for every academic library and developing collections is core within that. Different resource distribution models (RDM) exist within the UK academic landscape which ease pose advantages and drawbacks. A 2008 study that sampled ten UK university libraries found the majority had a formula-based RDM which balanced an element of central library management with devolved areas of control to academic schools/departments (Detraz, 2009). There are variations within this model but typically a 'top slice' of the library collections budget is managed at the macro-level (for generic databases and other subscription-based materials) and the remainder of the budget is split between the academic schools representing different disciplines. However, this formula model does not take into account the different types of resources used by different disciplines, the extent of required reading on reading lists, the research activeness of different schools, and other variables therefore some universities have favoured a more flexible 'weighted' model (Banks: 27). The weighted model factors in allocations to disciplines according to the student profile, average cost of book price, research output and the strategic needs of the collection. Finally, there is an income-based model where the library budget is divided amongst disciplines according to a ratio of which functions generate most income, teaching or research (Banks: 28).

In relation to the university library's responsibility to the different academic disciplines it should be noted that there is the potentially thorny issue of equity surrounding budget allocation. Disciplines whose materials are disproportionately more expensive (e.g. STEM subjects) may feel that overall they are getting 'a smaller bite of the cherry.' However, departments whose students and faculty use the library more (e.g. English) may feel that they deserve more.

2.8 Written Policies

An instrumental tool for collection development is an agreed policy stating how this activity will be organized which is usually published online. Essentially a collection development policy establishes priorities and provides a framework for librarians for making decisions as well as being a vehicle to communicate to stakeholders. However the comprehensiveness of the document is often balanced against the degree of detail it offers and its actual value has therefore been contested in the literature. An often-deployed argument is that collection development policies are generic and uninformative (Snow, 1996); a counter-argument is that by aiming for comprehensiveness rather than detail this allows greater flexibility to librarians to actually make decisions whereas more detailed policies require frequent revision or risk ending up out-of-date. (Douglas, 2011).

Subject-specific collection development policies in academia have not been widely studied (McGuigan and White, 2003) and a search online does not suggest they are very common. Much more common are university subject webpages, also known as 'Libguides': these are aimed at undergraduates and describe the library's suite of resources for a particular subject. Since their focus is usually also on library instruction (e.g. referencing) these cannot be mistaken for subject collection development policies. They lack key evaluative statements to qualify as collection development policies such as statements on 1) acquisition criteria; 2) policy of retention depending on currency of materials; 3) depth of collection; 4) reference to the academic programmes supported.

Retention policies in particular are important to the subject of English Literature. As one commentator has noted, such policies need to “directly address often unique long-term research needs” and “identify materials that need to be kept over the long-term” (Belanger, 2016). The issue of legacy print collections and remote storage is a very live one for researchers of English Literature and detailed guidelines in these areas also need to be part of any policy.

2.9 De-Selection

Arguably weeding is the most contentious area of collection development, even more so than selection. Reports of opposition to weeding projects feature regularly in higher education news publications both in the U.K. and the U.S. (e.g. *Inside Higher Ed* and *The Chronicle of Higher Education*). The journal literature published in this area is dominated by institutional case studies, most of which are focused on downsizing print collections and which go on to describe various methodological approaches without reference to specific subject areas. However, one recent study takes a more discipline-differentiated approach and argues that while quantitative criteria are applicable for stock-weeding in the sciences more qualitative and finer-tuned criteria need to be deployed in the arts & humanities (McAllister and Scherlen, 2017). The authors recognise that material in the humanities often continues to be relevant to research despite being older and low-use and conclude by saying that more formal assessment models need to be developed for evaluating humanities monographs, otherwise valuable material will be lost through disposal.

In 2016 the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) in America published ‘Guidelines for Deselecting Literatures in English’ a four page document that considered the kind of ‘special considerations’ librarians need to pay when weeding literary material. As well as recognising currency as being irrelevant for literary criticism the guidelines identify the need to pay close attention to specific editions of literary texts and the need to consider preserving the work of independent publishers and authors. Interestingly, in the ACRL guidelines there is no mention of digital literature despite the fact that hypertext fiction/poetry pose special preservation issues, a matter which has received some attention in librarian studies (Warwick, 2000; Green & Fleming-May, 2015).

3. Methodology

3.1 Introduction

All research is situated within a theoretical framework depending on the particular theory of knowledge which underpins it, and the philosophical stance that underpins the research presented here is interpretivism. An interpretivist stance views knowledge creation as an inherently subjective process rather than an encounter with objective ‘facts.’ It is a theory most often identified with the sociologist Max Weber (1864-1920) whose idea of ‘verstehen’ meant “understanding something in its context” (Holloway, 1997). In the case of the research presented here that context is the U.K. academic library sector in relation to the arts and humanities.

Although they form part of the same information sector academic libraries are very heterogeneous institutions, their differences being manifested in their missions, organisational structures and different research strengths as detailed later in this report. Also, English Literature itself is a constructed subject of enquiry because there are multiple interpretations of what constitutes English as a discipline depending on different ideologies. This research will be centrally concerned with the ideas, attitudes, and opinions of librarians in the field and therefore can be considered a qualitative study. In addition to that, however, it will also be a comparative study, seeking different perspectives on the same phenomenon and looking for diverging practices as much as commonalities. In qualitative studies the importance is placed on depth rather than breadth because, unlike quantitative studies, the aim is not to generalise from the collected data. Instead qualitative studies derive meaning from data by looking for patterns and themes which are discernible even in small population samples (Creswell, 2008).

3.2 Research Methods and Data Collection

Deciding on the size of the research population provides focus for any study and the purposive sampling method has been adopted here. From the start the intention has been to sample the views of liaison/subject librarians from 6 to 8 academic libraries to gain a diversity of perspectives. Although these libraries are not necessarily representative they provide a good cross-section of the higher education community because they include ancient, modern and London-based institutions. All operate within the context of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) but some prioritise teaching while others prioritise research. Opting for institutional variation can make it potentially harder to make legitimate comparisons across the phenomenon being studied and this is something the researcher has duly taken on board.

The six Scottish universities were chosen on the basis that the subject librarians indicated a wish to participate (one Scottish university was contacted but did not reply). All the participating Scottish universities are members of SCURL (Scottish Confederation of University and Research Libraries) and, as such, are signatories to the Scottish Collections Policy on print retention. Four of the universities are members of RLUK (Research Libraries UK) and four are not; some of the participating libraries have also been members of UK Research Reserve (UKRR). The two universities in England were selected on the basis that they have representatives who actively participate in the JISC mail listserv LIS-LIT. This is a small online community of literature librarians in higher education who seek to share views on best practice.

Although it would have been feasible to limit this study exclusively to Scottish universities (a sample size of six) it was felt that expanding it to include English universities gave a better picture of the higher education landscape. Also, none of the librarians based at the Scottish universities participated in the Jisc listserv LIS-LIT but it was felt that reaching out to members of this community was important as they were likely to be both enthusiastic and knowledgeable about library practice.
In addition to the listserv for literature librarians there is also a JISC mail listserv specifically for collection management. Some consideration was given to whether participation in this study should also be sought from contributors to this mailing list but ultimately it was decided against seeking their inclusion. Most are collection managers who operate at a macro-level within their institution and it was felt that because of their wider remit the issues that would seem pertinent to them would not necessarily coincide with the subject-specific focus of this study.

3.3 Population and sample

The ‘ideal’ interviewee was someone with extensive experience as an academic subject librarian (i.e. someone who has been working in this area for at least 5 years). Individual backgrounds will inevitably differ but the interviewee sample needed to be as balanced as possible if their opinions were to carry equal weight. After deciding which universities to approach I identified the name of the literature librarian on the institution’s web page and searched for their LinkedIn profiles. This background check revealed the career paths of the individuals and how long they had been working in their field. Four of the selected interviewees had worked for over 20 years as subject librarians at their university; the other three had all worked for 10 years or more in their current role (one did not have a LinkedIn profile). Six of the subject librarians were female and two were male. One of the interviewees had a PhD in English literature and one was in the process of completing a PhD in literature. Of the remaining librarians, one had a graduate degree in English and the rest had graduate degrees in arts-related disciplines.

3.4 Interviews as a research method

The research was conducted using semi-structured interviews (SSI) via telephone or Skype (participant's preference). Audio-recordings were made and the mode of interviewing was based on pragmatic considerations. Although remote interviews are sometimes not perceived as being as useful as face-to-face interviews recent studies have shown that they can elicit equally rich data if approached in a prepared manner (Novick, 2008). E-mail interviewing was considered on the basis there would be no need to make a recording or a transcription and this would mean a major saving in time. However, e-mails are an asynchronous form of exchange that can potentially result in having to chase up participants to get them to reply to messages. It was decided that, on balance, Skype or telephone were better mediums to make the most effective use of the participant's time.

Semi-structured interviewing was chosen because it allows for flexibility while at the same time allowing cross-interview comparisons to be made (Bryman, 2012). It tends to be used when there is sufficient objective knowledge about a phenomenon but subjective knowledge is lacking (Richards & Morse, 2007). When carried out properly the method of SSI achieves a balance between breadth and depth, thus providing a comprehensive view of the phenomenon under examination.

An interview schedule was devised (see Appendix) based on the prior findings of the literature review. The format was structured to ensure that questions had a systematic order but that there was latitude to probe the interviewee's individual response. From an epistemological viewpoint it has to be acknowledged that the interview format is not unproblematic and can throw up several issues. For instance, as well as the actual responses obtained an interviewer also has to be mindful of the phenomenon of implicit data collection i.e. that questions motivate responses by giving an impression of the interviewer, particularly his/her state of knowledge (McIntosh & Morse, 2015). The interviewee may curtail their response if they do not think they will be understood.

Another problem with interviews is that the raw data they are composed of is language and language is subject to shifting and contested meanings. Even with a schedule prepared an interview is not like a scientific experiment, which can be repeated under exactly the same conditions. Comparability is inevitably reduced if sequencing and wording differs in each interview, but it is often the case that an interview becomes most interesting precisely when it veers off script and more closely resembles conversation. The more unstructured an interview becomes the more time-intensive it is to analyse, however (Denscombe, 2014).

An additional consideration to be made was whether or not to show the interviewees the schedule in advance. Given that the interviewees were acting as de facto representatives of their institutions there was a certain responsibility on them to validate their comments with facts, rather than just speaking from the cuff. Some of the questions were also closed and asked for statistics. All participants were e-mailed the schedule 10 days before the interview took place.

In the case of this research the interviewer was also a novice, therefore a final point for consideration was pilot testing the interviews. Pilot testing allows follow-up questions to be critically explored. Follow-up questions are key to semi-structured interviews, and the comparative nature of this research means that there needs to be some consistency in the follow-up questions. However, although pilot testing seems like a good idea it is not always feasible. The reality is that most academic librarians are busy people and simply do not have the time to take part in such a process. A compromise approach was to allow the actual participants to see the schedule in advance and encourage them to offer suggestions which could then be incorporated into the schedule. The interviews all lasted about 35-45 minutes. They were recorded and the interviewer kept post-interview notes to complement the interview data.

3.5 Research techniques not selected

Finally, it should be noted here that the researcher also considered examining organizational documentation (in the form of university library committee reports) to provide a documentary perspective to the interviews. However, only two of the universities published the reports of their library faculty committees online, and even the reports that were published online and available were at least 3 years out of date. Reluctantly therefore, it was decided not to pursue this approach.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

For the purpose of this study all interviewees were requested to consent to being recorded and were also made aware that they could withdraw from the study at any time. They were provided with a copy of the Interview Consent Form to retain for their own records (see Appendix) and were given the opportunity to review the transcript of their own interview in order to edit any information that they did not wish to be included. Since this research focused on potentially sensitive work-related areas like librarian-faculty relationships, inter-institutional relationships, and budgetary matters the issue of whether or not to identify participants needed to be addressed. Describing the context and different institutional settings is important for understanding the nature of the data, however contributors are anonymous, referring to them simply as University A, University B etc.

3.7 Data Analysis

The data from the interviews was transcribed and then analysed thematically. Braun and Clarke (2006) describe the process for initial coding of data then sorting it into themes/patterns. During transcription it is particularly important to keep referring back to the original research questions in order to identify what is relevant. For this study I was interested in the interviewees' own experiences and points of view. A thematic analysis can be theoretical (predetermined by the research questions) or inductive (driven by the data itself). This study represents an attempt to combine both aspects.

One way of identifying a theme is to note the frequency with which certain ideas/expressions occur. Semantic themes operate "…within the explicit or surface meanings of the data and the analyst is not looking for anything beyond what a participant has said." (Braun & Clarke: 84). However, qualitative analysis also requires engaging with the data at a deeper level, sometimes described as moving from the semantic to the 'latent' level of analysis. Latent analysis involves going beyond explicit meanings to consider the underlying assumptions behind certain discourses. As described by Braun and Clarke, latent analysis "…starts to identify or examine the underlying ideas, assumptions, conceptualisations and ideologies". (2006:84). In the case of academic librarianship one assumption would be that the librarian tries to serve all the stakeholders of the library impartially. However actually providing a 'balanced' collection that meets the needs of different stakeholders, both in the short and long-term, is a contentious process which involves many difficult decisions based on certain values.
To summarise the data analysis process consisted of the following stages:

Step 1. Printing out and reading the transcribed interviews as an entire corpus.
Step 2. Removing the pieces of data with no relevance to the research.
Step 3. Identifying emerging themes/sub-themes as they relate to quotes from the transcript.
Step 4. Grouping recurring themes and developing more precise categories.
An example of moving from step3 to step 4 is given below:

Stakeholders
Academics
Expertise
Selection
Collaboration

Table 1: Institutional Profiles

University A	Leading London research HEI with centre of excellence for advanced study of English. Member of RLUK. • New subject-specific collection development policies to be implemented in 2020.
University B	Ancient Scottish HEI. Ranked in QS world top 200 for study of English Literature. Member of RLUK. • Collection policy 2 years old. Reviewed every 3 years.
University C	Modern Scottish HEI. Ranked in UK National Student Survey top 20 for satisfaction with English Studies. • Collection policy 3 years old. Reviewed every 3 years.
University D	Ancient Scottish HEI. Ranked in QS world top 40 for English Literature. Member of RLUK. • Collection policy 6 years old (2013).
University E	Ancient Scottish HEI. Ranked in QS world top 40 for English Literature. Member of RLUK. • Collection policy 5 years old (2014).
University F	Modern English HEI. Doctoral Creative writing programme and postgraduate Masters level courses in English. • Collection policy 1 year old. Reviewed every 3 years.
University G	Modern Scottish HEI. Ranked in top 5 in UK National Student Survey for English Studies. • Collection policy 2 years old. Reviewed every 2 years.
University H	Modern Scottish HEI. Ranked in top 100 of Guardian University Guide for English & Creative Writing. • Collection policy 2 years old. Reviewed every 2 years.

Table 2 Interviewee Profiles

	Job Title/Role	**Identifier**	**No. of subjects (including English)**
Interview 1	Research Librarian	A	1
Interview 2	Information Consultant	B	6
Interview 3	Learning & Teaching Librarian/ Research resources Librarian	CI (LTT) & CR (RRL)	Not applicable
Interview 4	Academic Support Librarian	D	8
Interview 5	Liaison Librarian	E	5
Interview 6	Subject Librarian	F	1
Interview 7	Faculty Librarian	G	16
Interview 8	Faculty Librarian	H	10

4 Findings & Analysis

4.1 Selection

Selection is the first area considered in the interview schedule and for the academic librarian it involves consultation and collaboration with various stakeholders. As described in the literature the typical model for the liaison process is one where the university department/school has a faculty representative (Library Rep) who collaborates with the subject librarian on how resources are going to be spent.

This traditional model applies for six of the interviewees in this study but not for two of them. Interviewee A works with academics on an individual rather than a departmental basis; Interviewee C works in a functional system. The other six respondents work in universities where the liaison staff are organized by faculty/college rather than subject. This move away from subject specialization was regretted by interviewee E, who had over 20 years' experience. She now felt she was spreading her collection development efforts too thinly. Interviewee G claimed that although officially librarians are organized along faculty groupings rather than individual disciplines the reality is that in key processes (like selection) a subject-aligned liaison approach continued. Interviewee H stated that being responsible for a whole faculty actually enhanced her selection abilities because English literary criticism is incredibly cross-disciplinary anyway.

The organisation by functional specialism was unique to interviewees C1 and C2. At that university's library collection development is split: the Liaison/Learning & Teaching team is responsible for strategic engagement and relationship management, linking up the different Academics Schools with the Library & Learning Centre. Feedback from academic staff and students about collections is channelled through this team and the staff deal with these issues holistically, rather than by individual disciplines. Previously feedback and resource requests had to be filtered through subject liaisons but now this information is accessed in one place by one team. The Research & Resources Division functions alongside the Liaison and Learning team and is responsible for resource acquisition and budgeting.

Significantly, fifteen years ago interviewee C2 worked in the same academic library but as a traditional liaison librarian with a collection development focus on English Literature and American Studies. She said her university's move to a functional organization for library staff has meant sharing knowledge and expertise in a team. In particular, she said that instead of the liaison focus on partnerships with academic disciplines there is more of a focus on how the library can contribute to the overall strategic goals of the university.

4.2 Budget arrangements

The actual process of selection involves balancing needs/wants of stakeholders within the fiscal constraints of the budget. All of the study participants described a process whereby the 'top slice' of the library budget was given over to big purchasing commitments i.e. cross-disciplinary and recurrent expenditure. It is important to note that many of the journals supporting literary studies come from a wide range of multidisciplinary publisher and aggregator packages.

That aside, five of the interviewees responded that as faculty/subject/resources librarians they controlled the day-to-day purchasing budget for firm orders and made the decisions (A, C, E, G and H). Both interviewees B and D work in a system where budgetary control is devolved to academics, however interviewee D commented that there is a strong consultative element at his university which has committees at the School/College/University level. In contrast, interviewee B said that most of the committees for budget allocation at his library had been scrapped and that with the exception of one big committee the departmental library rep was the sole conduit of communication. Interviewee F stated that at her university the Library Services Manager decided how the budget would be allocated (to the book fund or serials fund) but that within that she had some discretionary spending power. Similarly, interviewee C said that the budget was based on types of resources, not subject areas: there was a budget for Ebook packages, another for print book purchase, and another for individual book purchases and reading lists.

Only one of the participants (interviewee A) described a budget structure which was coded to allow for tracking expenditure at the level of discipline/subject area. For the other participants Interviewee D's comment is representative:

> Our budget reports are now produced at a College level…ten years ago I spent more time on the detail of what my individual subject areas spent, and I used to produce monthly reports. There was far more granularity but the current state of affairs is that budget reports are all managed via the College Committees once or twice a semester. This just reflects the nature of purchasing now, where so much more is purchased as large multidisciplinary digital bundles.

4.3 Collaboration with Faculty

A 2003 study comparing circulation of print books in the humanities selected by academics with print books selected by librarians found that those selected by librarians circulated more frequently (Dinkins: 6). Although quite old now, this study provides an interesting contextual window for exploring librarian-faculty liaison work. All participants described a situation where the requests made by academics were prioritised but selections by liaison librarians were critical to help shape the overall collections. Keeping up to date with their subject domain was therefore seen as vital by everyone and involved attending departmental meetings and events such as seminars where they could be apprised of the latest postgraduate research, and not just the work of faculty. In particular, interviewee E said that for the purposes of purchasing-decisions she liked to 'canvass' postgraduates because they were the ones often doing the cutting-edge research. She also observed that it was a good thing that older academics usually did not want to as act library reps, giving the job to their more junior colleagues to do. From her experience younger academics showed more enthusiasm for ordering books, but also for engaging with decisions over e-resources. Interviewee G made the different point that it was important to guard against being unduly influenced by the 'big hitters' with a high profile in the English department. Her own university has several Gothic specialists but she was very conscious of not developing an 'imbalance' in the collection by prioritising their requests. She also made the point that 'things come and go out of fashion' in literary studies: teaching is often influenced by individual research interests and the collection development profile of the English department can therefore change quite radically with any changes in staff.

4.4 Reading Lists

One area very germane to resource selection in terms of determining a 'core collection' for teaching purposes is academic reading lists. Four of the librarians (C, F G and H) mentioned this as forming the primary basis of selection and purchasing decisions. However, as a mechanism it can be problematic because the level of engagement of academics with electronic reading lists is highly varied. Interviewee F stated she was very aware that 'pockets' of the English literature collection were weak because the academics in these areas often did not bother updating their lists. Interviewee G, by contrast, noted that reading lists for arts & humanities courses were far longer than those from other faculties. She said that reading lists had the potential to reduce stock selection to a very mechanistic process, based purely on the ratios of students and the categorisation of materials. However her own experience was that she had a lot of communication with the English faculty about reading lists and felt that her observations about the student usage of the recommended materials were appreciated. At the other end of the spectrum, interviewee A drew attention to the fact that reading lists did not play any role in her library. Her contact with faculty was based on their role as individual researchers rather than as lecturers. In terms of selection responsibilities she described herself as being given lots of time and autonomy for making title-by-title decisions, hence 'very free.' While not describing herself as an expert in her domain she felt well-informed because she was able to meet with publishers' representatives and attend book fairs, which gave her current knowledge beyond just standard publisher alert services or mailing lists:

> I have freedom to buy from any source I want really, and with our collection we like to buy outside of the canon quite heavily. So I would go to a book fair and source the small independent presses publishing there, I do what I like really.

4.5 Communication

Establishing a close relationship with faculty was seen as imperative by all participants, but the main method of consultation was by e-mail. Only two (interviewees D and F) said they had set up a blog specifically as a form of outreach to their subject specialists. Both said they used their blogs to post current journals contents and relay scholarly publishing news to the Literature school/department. Interviewee D stated that he (very occasionally) also posted reviews of recent book acquisitions but tended to do this when these related to the period of literature he himself had studied at PhD level. Both acknowledged that only a few academics from their department seemed to engage with the service but nevertheless it was good to know they were going some way to meeting current awareness needs. Interviewee F mentioned that she used Twitter to follow research news from academics not only at her own university but also those from different universities with similar collecting areas: that way she could find recommendations for books that she might never have considered.

Despite frequent reference to the 'divide' between academics and subject librarians in the literature it was notable that none of the participants mentioned any problems collaborating with academics over resource selection. A possible explanation is that all the interviewees were experienced in their role and felt they had acquired sufficient authority to make decisions because academics trusted them. The only slight suggestion of conflict was provided by interviewee H talking about how, in the event of a budget surplus, she made the decision how to allocate it:

> The academics who get are those that bother to respond…I am more likely to get new things for people who do that, even though I know there are some resources that would probably be very well used in other literary areas. Viewed objectively, I should really get those things. But if I've had no feedback from faculty on that, well, I don't.

4.6 Patron-Driven Acquisition

Every participant except for interviewee E said PDA was implemented at their library. Interviewee E said that her library had trialled PDA but had experienced reservations about its effectiveness. She cited quality control issues (the possibility of collections being heavily split between introductory works and narrow research work) and also digital rights management issues. Interviewee H believed that PDA was a useful selection tool, but one which needed to 'complement' rather than replace librarian-driven selection. She did not feel its current implementation detracted from exercising her professional judgement in her own role. Interviewee G was also broadly in favour and pointed out that PDA selection could still be mediated by the librarian so that certain categories of book e.g. titles outside the scope of the collection policy, would not be included for selection. Interviewee C cited the fact that because titles could be accessed by users (without a purchase being triggered) savings could be made whereas under the 'traditional' method those rental titles might have been purchased outright.

The strongest warning notes about PDA were invoked by interviewees A and B. The latter said PDA was possibly 'vulnerable' to being abused by over-users, and would mean extra work because it would need to be closely monitored. Also, he considered that there was a real potential for collections becoming unbalanced unless subject librarians were involved in heavily curating the collections on offer. Interviewee A said that her library had yet to do a full subject breakdown analysis of PDA, therefore she was still agnostic about its merits for the English Literature collection. Her library was an unusual adopter of PDA because it was not implementing the model to meet 'just-in-time' needs to support specific courses or assignments.

4.7. Format Preferences

Understanding how different formats (print and electronic) are used in the context of research, teaching and learning is key to any collection development strategy and particularly salient for book-reliant subjects such as English. The expenditure in favour of digital may seem like an unstoppable force but it is also important to consider the wider context. The SCONUL annual statistical returns offer a reliable snapshot of trends in the UK higher education sector. The latest returns for 2016-2017 record a 13% decrease in average print stock per FTE user over a 3 year period since 2013; in comparison, there has been a 21% increase in the average number of e-books purchased per FTE user. On average, for SCONUL members, one third of total book stock is presently accounted for by ebooks ('The continuing evolution of UK academic libraries', 2018:2).

For all participants in this study the data on the relative adoption of print versus electronic format was available at the macro-level rather than at the level of subjects/disciplines. Interviewee C was the only participant to state that the majority of the book collection at her institution was electronic rather than print (51% to 49%). For the other participants, the percentage of ebooks in the collection ranged from 35% to 50%.

Table 3: Split between print and electronic

Institution Identifier	Percentage split between print & electronic
A	50/50
B	60/40
C	49/51
D	56/44
E	61/39
F	51/49
G	65/35
H	50/50

*Percentages above apply to general library collections and are not specific to English.

Digging deeper into the figures, it is interesting to compare the views and perceptions of the interviewees on what format best fits user needs. Interviewee F pointed out that at her institution links to reading lists were embedded in VLEs, meaning that users could just click through to get immediate access to content rather than having to make a trip to the library for the print version. Despite this accessibility, however, annual surveys at her institution of undergraduates studying literature found that they regularly ended up buying the print versions of core texts because they preferred that format for deep, immersive reading of primary works (i.e. novels, plays, poetry). Similarly, interviewee H made the point that print books are cheap for fiction and that older titles which remain relevant for literary studies are often not represented in e-book packages. The issue of availability and the marketplace was also raised by interviewee D: despite an e-preference policy at his university he said many works relating to literary studies (both primary and secondary) were not available electronically. Indeed, he pointed out that literature and works relating to literature had a lower rate of availability in digital format than titles in philosophy and history (two other disciplines traditionally associated with print).

A more fundamental issue of ownership was raised by interviewee B, who said that ebook subscription packages were generally not popular with academics because every six months or so there was usually a turnaround of stock meaning some titles ended up being deleted. For academics in the humanities, this was added justification for sticking with print as a more reliable resource. A possible solution would be to purchase e-books outright. However, Interviewee B also stated that in the context of a flat budget it made more economic sense to acquire ebooks through large purchase packages because that would mean drawing on a central fund rather than dipping into the department's own monograph budget.

Two of the study participants reported moves in the opposite direction at their respective institutions. Interviewee A observed that at her library e-book purchasing had historically been low and it had been left up to the librarian to choose the preferred format for the subject area. This year (2019), however, management concern about use of library space means there is a new purchasing policy of introducing a 50/50 format split. This policy, she acknowledged, will have significant implications for users. The ability to browse the stacks is very important for literature researchers and unless the library promotes greater awareness of e-books much of this new material will remain 'invisible'. The library is therefore trying to think of ways to better integrate the print and digital collections. Several strategies have been mooted such as creating more displays of print books and placing LibGuide lists of e-books alongside these, or placing markers with QR codes in strategic sections of the physical stacks so that patrons can link to a relevant e-book. Whatever marketing strategy is adopted, it will have to be monitored for effectiveness.

Interviewee E stated that over the past 5 years there had been a 500% increase in e-books in the arts and humanities faculty at her institution. In the absence of an e-preference policy to enforce such a change she attributed the drivers behind this statistic to a combination of factors, including the declining cost differential between ebooks and hardbacks and increased willingness to adopt ebooks by academics. Somewhat surprisingly, however, she admitted that apart from annual surveys there had been no library-directed research to examine the reasons for the massive hike in e-reading or to identify which particular subjects/disciplines were behind the increase.

Despite the balance at the institutional level between print and electronic collections shifting and expenditures on print books in certain cases decreasing (interviewee B) there was a consensus among interviewees that there was no perceived 'crisis' for print. All eight believe that for the foreseeable future (i.e. the next five years) e-books will remain supplementary to print books in English studies. The majority of the participants offered the argument that print was a format that was congenial for sustained reading, and that informal user feedback (from both students and faculty) registered a clear preference for print. The idea of the 'hybrid collection' in English Literature was strongly supported even by interviewee D whose library had an e-preference policy.

4.8 Collection Assessment

The two main methods of collection assessment described in the literature are quantitative (materials-centred) and qualitative (user-centred). The responses of all 8 interviewees revealed dissatisfaction with quantitative methods, by voicing the limitations of this approach for a subject like English Literature where system-generated statistics require complex interpretation.

In terms of e-resources the need for a subject-based approach to usage that was nuanced was made by interviewee B. He said that his university's electronics resources manager had joked about "cancelling all the subscriptions to humanities journals" because of low usage statistics (in comparison to STEM subjects). However, this joke underlined a serious point: in terms of cost per use (CPU) a £40 humanities journal used 8 times could be justified as an expenditure in relative terms with a £1500 science journal used 800 times. Similarly, interviewee D said that annual collection assessment at his institution was focused on electronic journal and database subscriptions but that utilitarian "raw cost per use data" was not always helpful with an arts subject like English. Even if a particular database or journal might only be used by a handful of academics in these areas if it was of vital importance to their research/teaching then it should not be cancelled. Interviewee H reported "an aversion to usage data" by faculty in the arts & humanities and said that she had experienced problematic conversations on this subject. She seemed generally less sympathetic to the idea that an under-used electronic resource should continue to be subscribed to by the library. However, she also stressed that it was important for the librarian not just to accept usage statistics at face value but always to delve deeper; for example, a decrease in the use of an electronic resource could reflect a change in the focus of the curriculum:

> Or maybe we need to do a big social media promotion of database A or perhaps as faculty librarian I can do a promotional talk at a lecture. So analytical tools allow you to explore collection issues which might be related to marketing; for example, use has dropped off, why is that?

This issue of resource- awareness potentially impacting usage was also mentioned by interviewees B and D who both said that student satisfaction surveys were important for gauging how informed various user populations were of the electronic resources available to them.

Another electronic resource whose usage can be difficult to evaluate are e-books. Five of the interviewees (A, B, D, G and H) pointed out that comparative analysis of electronic and print monographs can be tricky because usage of ebooks is not directly comparable to print circulation. Critically, ebooks allow casual use to be recorded, something which is not the case for print books. Usage statistics of the different formats therefore do not inform the librarian about an important indicator, the actual intensity of use. On the same subject interviewee F argued that the availability of the different formats also skewed usage statistics; print books can be checked out of the library for a longer period (sometimes up to a year), which meant they were out of circulation (unless recalled), whereas ebooks could be simultaneously accessed.

Data on inter-library loan (ILL) requests were also monitored by all interviewees for collection development purposes. Often seen primarily as a way of measuring unmet needs or deficits in a collection, these statistics also have to be interpreted with caution. Interviewee G said that the highest users of the service at her institution were faculty, and that a significant percentage of ILL requests reflected narrow research interests for material that was beyond the scope of collection policies. Interviewee F, by contrast, said that her institution was actively trying to improve its scores in the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and therefore the interlibrary loan system had been changed to encourage use.

Interviewee A had some atypical observations to make about the value of interlibrary loan data. Firstly, she said it was common for English Literature academics at her institution to rely on a personal contacts network for borrowing, rather than using ILL. While this was frustrating for her she could partially recover these 'missing' ILL statistics by doing citation analysis of academics' output and identifying materials cited in bibliographies that were not owned by the library. However, this was time-intensive and not the most efficient way to monitor collection gaps.

The reverse side of this was that ILL requests from external users also allowed her to assess collection strengths, and it was important (for internal reports) to be aware of data trends in this area as well. Her library's recent format policy shift (to acquire half of future titles as ebooks) could mean that in future her library struggles to meet ILL requests. Interviewee A was also one of two participants in this study to mention the need to measure in-house use of print materials rather than relying solely on checkout figures.

> It's important to know not just what's being borrowed but also what's being consulted. At research level they come in and spend hours in the library, so we try and capture that. We have visiting scholars, most of them have borrowing privileges, but some don't so we need to monitor that.

The other participant to mention browsing and in-house usage of print materials was interviewee D. His institution had looked into the viability of measuring this area to understand the totality of print circulation but had decided against it mostly on practical grounds (books could be hidden, missing, or patrons may re-shelve the items themselves, thus defeating the purpose of an in-house exercise). He personally regretted not having data in this area because he felt it was relevant for his subject (English

Literature) but said that his library required all academic support librarians to put their main effort into monitoring electronic resource usage, as it represented the biggest investment.

None of the participants reported making use of the COPAC collection management tools to 'profile' their subject collections. However, with only one exception (University H) all of the institutions are contributors to the National Bibliographic Knowledgebase. This service, launched by JISC in 2019, is designed to offer an aggregation of metadata from the UK's academic and specialist libraries. A new collection management tool, Library Hub Compare, is part of the new NBK facilities and is available to all contributors to help them benchmark their collections using comparative analytics and data visualisation. Interviewee G mentioned that her collection manager is very persuaded about the value of this service for collection purchasing decisions although the library has yet to integrate the service into its workflow.

4.9 Data Analysis and De-Selection

Increasingly nowadays academic libraries gather statistics on monograph usage to inform their policy on print retention. The idea of 'currency' and its relation to the information needs of a discipline like English Literature was raised by all the participants in this study. Although they could only offer estimates rather than exact figures five participants said that 50-75% of their English Literature print collection was published pre-2000 (i.e. more than 20 years old). Of those, the interviewees who represented the older institutions (A, B, D and E) said that a small but significant portion of their stock was pre-1990 (i.e. more than 30 years old). The continued value of older publications for literary studies has received some scholarly attention. A 2002 study examining citations in the field of nineteenth century American and British literature found that the median age for book citations was 14 years but that literary scholars also cited books that were over 100 years old (Thompson: 132). A 2012 study by Amy Fry similarly found that print books in the humanities continued to 'grow' their circulation and were perceived as 'relevant' long after print books in other disciplines were considered obsolete. Also important to consider is that scholarly editions of primary works in literature have a very long shelf life and can continue to be authoritative for decades (despite the advent of electronic editions).

The implications of this for de-selection practices in English Literature are that it is very difficult to calibrate a 'threshold' figure for weeding purposes. Indeed the absence of guidelines is seen in the fact that none of the libraries studied here have discipline-specific statements on deselection in their collection development policies. Interviewees C and F said that their libraries applied a general 10 year last circulation rule to print stock (including literature) while interviewees E and G said that their library had a 15 year last circulation rule. Both, however, said this rule was not consistently applied for English literature-related stock and that consultation with English academics was more intense than with other faculty. The fact that a lot of valuable literary material has not been digitized and that future research needs are very hard to predict was made most strongly by interviewee A:

> We could have easily got rid of a lot of our novels from the early 20th century which are not part of the canon but I'm really glad no one did get rid of them, because people are now re-discovering inter-war women writers and that is becoming a new research field. Some of these writers, you know, have never been back in print so the only way to read them is in the first editions and a lot of academic libraries did not keep so-called non-canonical writers.

Overall, the perspectives of the different interviewees seem to converge on the idea that use of quantitative data for English Literature collection development must be nuanced. In particular, no set of usage statistics should be interpreted in isolation: print circulation needs to be analysed alongside interlibrary loan and e-book usage. For humanities, a further consideration is that patron use of monographs needs to be assessed over several years (a decade or more) in order to gain a reliable appreciation of scholarly value. Even more than in the case of selection, deselection requires intensive consultation with faculty in a subject like English.

5. Study Limitations

It is important to acknowledge several limitations to this research. Firstly, the reliance on qualitative data, without any supplementary data such as institutional documentation (library committee/annual reports, collection reviews etc) means that the views of the study participants offer only a snapshot of collection development. In reality collection development is a highly political activity which entails close working relationships with many colleagues (e.g. collection managers, electronic resource librarians, acquisitions). This study, by treating the interviewees as individual decision-makers, lacks a group dimension to round out their impressions of their roles. Institutional cases studies might have explored this socio-political perspective more.
Secondly, the interviewees were assured of anonymity and confidentiality but there may still have been some hesitancy about offering critical reflections regarding collection development at their institutions. This was particularly seen in the participants' responses to the question about areas for improvement (see Appendix for interview schedule). My impression was that all the participants were very circumspect in their responses and little substantive information was gained. It was also hard to probe about relations with academics in any depth meaning that the idea of 'collaboration' was not as explored in as much detail as it could have been.

5.1. Future Research Recommendations

Collection development is an ecosystem with many layers and this study had to narrow its thematic focus. Cooperative collection development was not explored, although it is a burgeoning area in the library literature. Not only is consortia purchasing important, but there are also attempts in the UK to institute collaborative monograph management at the national level. Recent key developments in scholarly communication such as the growth of the Open Access are also not addressed in this study. The implications of OA for the humanities and monograph publishing are of considerable interest to subject librarians but it is an area which merits a separate study.

Increasingly in the future it has been predicted that academic libraries will be more focussed on the idea of the 'inside-out' collection: instead of arranging access to external scholarly products the library's focus will be on curating and disseminating the scholarly output of the university in the form of research data published in institutional repositories (Day and Novak, 2019). There could also be growing emphasis on "unique and distinctive collections" (RLUK) and more convergence between the work of archivists and librarians with regard to management of printed material.

6. Conclusion

This comparative study has examined the concept of collection development through the lens of a specific university subject discipline. Both concepts ('the collection' and 'the academic discipline') have been subject to revision over the years. For example, the argument has been deployed that interdisciplinary information-seeking has exposed the artificial parameters of many academic library collections (Hurd, 1992). Even more fundamentally, the infrastructure and the boundaries of the library collection have been destabilised through electronic networks, giving rise to the 'facilitated collection' (Dempsey, 2016).

The traditional print-based model of the library implied a high level of professional control through the collection development process of planning and selection. However, the technology of the 21st century has ushered in an information environment characterised by instant access and the 'blurring of boundaries and diminishing of control.' (Bodi and O'Shea, 2005:42). Concurrently, the idea of the collection as a fixed physical resource has been superseded by the idea of the collection as a dynamic

service to be customised according to the individual user. Contemporary LIS literature also registers a shift away from the idea of the subject librarian as domain specialist towards a more fluid identity as content facilitator and resource co-ordinator. More and more resources are purchased as bundles of aggregated content with the result that the selection input of the subject librarian is minimised.
The organisational structure of academic libraries also affects the identity of subject librarians. Many UK higher education institutions are blurring subject divisions by consolidating disciplines into schools and colleges at the faculty level. As the participants in this study have illustrated, liaisons are having to spread their expertise wider and for some this has contributed to the impression that they have become more of a generalist. Collectively, however, the liaison librarians in this study have many decades of knowledge between them which has left them still with a strong sense of their own importance in collection development.

All of the participants examined here have worked for a number of years not only in the same role but also at the same institution. A different sampling of interview subjects with more diverse career profiles might have yielded more contrasting insights, particularly as regards faculty relations. It tends to be the case that the longer people have worked within an organisation, the harder it is to be critically reflective about its practices. This was demonstrated in the inability or reluctance of the study participants to suggest improvements that could be made to the collection development process at their university library. As experienced practitioners they undoubtedly deploy large reserves of tacit knowledge in carrying out their roles. Experience may also have factored into their generally sceptical attitudes towards more data-driven collection assessment and the greater weight they placed on subjective factors such as faculty consultation, when making deselection decisions.

At the level of individual participants it was naturally the case that some were more forthcoming than others. Interviewee A, a member of the literature listserv, was very enthusiastic and gave detailed responses to questions. However, although she was very quotable I was conscious that her London-based specialist library was an ‘outlier’ institution and therefore I had to guard against giving disproportionate emphasis to her responses. At the other end of the spectrum, institution F was also something of an outlier because although a modern teaching-focused university it is currently undergoing an institutional agenda to boost its research credentials. Interviewee F was also atypical in that she was the only participant with the official designation ‘subject librarian’ and the only participant who was solely responsible for English Studies (the interview with participant F is included in the appendix).

Arguably the most important ingredient of a collection development strategy is balance, in which the quality and quantity of resources are proportionately aligned. A subject librarian needs to know when it makes sense to invest in high-use materials to satisfy current demand and when to buy and maintain low-use materials that add to the long-term value of the collection. The study participants all agreed that getting the mix right is more an art than a science, particularly against a background of flat (or decreasing) budgets and a higher premium on library space. All the participants used a combination of purchasing models spanning print firm orders, e-book packages, approval plans and PDA. However, the weighting of these different elements is specific to individual institutions and the way they prioritise collection development goals. Format considerations are also critical: the age of holdings and circulation statistics cannot be the only measure of scholarly value for a subject like English Literature.

Consistent with the faculty-level organisation of most of the university libraries there was a lack of granularity in the availability of information about resource usage at a subject level. For example, it was simply not possible for participants to give detailed information about the composition of print and electronic books in their English Literature collections or offer statistical data to back up their feelings regarding the impact of e-book availability on the use of print. Across the institutions it was also not possible to give a weighting of PDA against firm orders in English Literature. Although this was somewhat frustrating to the researcher, none of the participants felt this lack of granularity had a material and damaging effect on their collection development decisions. This was an example of how the LIS literature about trends towards more data-driven decision making conflicted with practice on the ground.

Collection development is a service which, to a large extent, still revolves around disciplinarity, and the participants in this study felt that it was core to their duties as liaison librarians. Although new practices and philosophies such as PDA and 'just-in-time' collecting have implications for the role of the liaison librarian these developments are not currently perceived as 'challenges' but as innovations to be adopted while being customised to the individual institution. In the future the research needs of different disciplines may diverge to the extent that the model of the 'collection' will be unique to that particular discipline and the idea of the general collection will be a thing of the past. For the moment, just as there is no typical library, there is no typical formula for developing a discipline-based collection.

References

Reports

JUBB, M. 2010. Challenges for academic libraries in difficult economic times. *Research Information Network Report.* Available at www.rin.ac.uk/challenges-for-libraries-FINAL-March 2010

HOUSEWRIGHT, R., SCHONFELD, R.C., WULFSON, K. 2013. Ithaka S + R/Jisc/RLUK UK Survey of Academics 2012. Available at https://www.rluk.ac.uk>RLUK

IMHOF, R., VAN VUREN. M., SOULES, A., LUDWIG V., PEPPER, E., MCGUIGAN, N. 2016. Guidelines for Deselecting Literatures in English Collections in Academic Libraries. *Association of College and Research Libraries* at www.ala.org/content/directoryofleadership/sections/les.

PINFIELD, S., COX, A.M., RUTTER, S. (2017). Mapping the Future of Academic Libraries. *Society of Colleges, National and University Libraries Report*. Available at https://www.sconul.ac.uk

WHITE, S., MALONE, E., STUBBINGS, R. (2018). The continuing evolution of UK academic libraries. *Commentary on the SCONUL Annual Statistical Return 2016-2017* At https://www.sconul.ac.uk/documents/The_continuing_evolution_of UK academic libraries/.

Articles, Conference Papers, and Monographs

ANDERSON, K.J., Freeman R.S., Herubel J-P., Mykytiuk, L.J., Nixon, J.M., Ward S.M. (2010). Liberal arts books on demand: a decade of patron-driven collection development. *Collection Management* 35 (3/4), pp.125-141.

ANDERSON, R., (2011). What Patron-Driven Acquisition Does and Does Not Mean. *The Scholarly Kitchen* at https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2011/05/31

ANDERSON, R., MAGIER D. (2015). Hyde Park Debate: Wherever Possible, Library Collections should be shaped by Patrons, instead of Librarians. Paper available at http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/charleston
Banks, C., Hoskins, J., (2019). UKRR-Partnerships & Collaboration-Celebrating the Achievements of UKRR 2007-2019. Conference Presentation available at http://bl.ac.uk/news/2019/April/the-next-chapter-for-the-UK-research-reserve.

BANKS, P. (2014). Resource allocation for libraries in higher education. *SCONUL Focus* 60 pp. 26-29.

BATES, M., (1996). Learning about the Information Seeking of Interdisciplinary Scholars and Students. *Library Trends*, 45 (2), pp. 155-164.

BELANGER, A., (2016). Implementing Collection Life Cycle Management. *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference* at http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284316245.

BODI, S., O'SHEA, K.M. (2005). The Library of Babel: Making Sense of Collection Management in a Postmodern World. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 31 (2), pp.143-150.

BREWERTON, A. (2012). Re-skilling for Research: Investigating the needs of researchers and how library staff can best support them. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 18 (1), pp.96-110.

BROWN, J.M., STOWERS, E.D. (2013). Use of data in collections work: an exploratory survey. *Collection Management*, 38 (2), pp. 143-162.

BRYMAN, A. (2004). *Social Research Methods* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

BOYATZIS, R., (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic Analysis & code development* (Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE).

BRANTLEY, J.S. (2010). Approval Plans, Discipline Change & the Importance of Human-Mediated Book Selection. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services* 34.1, pp.11-24.

BRAUN, V., AND CLARKE, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, pp. 77-101

CHRZASTOWSKI, T.E. (2005). E-book use and value in the humanities: scholars practices and expectations at scholarcommons.scu.edu

COOKE, L., NORRIS, M., BUSBY, N. (2011). Evaluating the impact of academic liaison librarians on their user community: A review and case study. *New Review of Academic Librarianship* 17 (1), pp.5-30
Cove, L.M., Craig in, M.H. (2004). Reconfiguring control in collection development: A Conceptual framework for assessing the shift towards electronic collections. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 55 (4), pp.312-325.

CRESSWELL, J.W. (2002), Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods, 2nd ed. (London: SAGE Publications).

CULLARS, J.M. (1985). Characteristics of the Monographic Literature of British and American Literary Studies. *College and Research Libraries,* 46 pp.511-522.

CUMMINGS, L.A., LARRIVEE A., VEGA, L. (2015). Comparing electronic vs. print book preferences between students in the social sciences, the arts and STEM. *Library Hi-Tech News*, 32 (4), pp.1-4

DAY, A., NOVAK, J., (2019). The Subject Specialist is dead! Long live the subject specialist. *Collection Management,* 44 (2-4), pp. 117-130.

DAY, L., ZUREK, J. (2018). Beyond the MLIS: Reflections on the role of professional and continued education for academic library liaisons. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 25 (2), pp.131-149.

DEMPSEY, L. (2016). The Facilitated Collection, *Lorcan Dempsey's Weblog,* http://orweblog.oclc.org/towards-the-facilitiatedcollection (accessed on 3/4/2019).

DEMPSEY, L. (2003). The Recombinant Library: portals and people. *Journal of Library Administration* 39 (4), pp.103-136.

DEMPSEY, L., MALPAS, C., LAVOIE, B. (2014). Collection Directions: The Evolution of Library Collections and Collecting. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 14 (3), pp.393-423.

DENSCOMBE, M. (2014). *The Good Research Guide: For Small-Scale Research* (London: Open University Press).

DETRAZ, M-P., (2009). Comparative Study of information resource allocation models & strategies. Edinburgh University commissioned consultancy report at http://www.docs.is.ed.ac.uk/docs/lib%2Darchive/libcom/PapersFeb09/

DINKINS, D. (2003). Who chooses wisely? Ebook PDA purchases: Librarian and teaching faculty selections. *Against the Grain*, 24 (6). Article 8.

DOUGLAS, C.S. (2011). Revising a Collection Development Policy in a rapidly changing environment. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*, 8 (1), pp.15-21.

FRY, A., (2015). Conventional Wisdom or Faulty Logic? The Recent Literature on Monograph Use and E-Book Acquisition. *Library Philosophy and Practice* Paper 1307 at http://digitialcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article

GASTON, R. (2001). The changing role of the subject librarian with a particular focus on UK developments, examined through a review of the literature. *New Review of Academic Librarianship,* 7 (1), pp.19-36.

GILMAN, T., LINDQUIST, T., (2010). Academic Research Librarians with Subject Doctorates: Experiences and Perceptions 1956-2006. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy,* 10 (4), pp.399-412.

GREEN, H.E., AND FLEMING-MAY, R.A. (2015). Humanities Librarians & Virtual Verse. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41 (4), pp.457-465.

HAMMERFEST, B. (2011). Interdisciplinarity and the intellectual base of literature studies: citation analysis of highly cited monographs. *Scientometrics*, 86 (3), pp.705-725.

JENSEN, K. (2009). Engaging Faculty through collection development utilizing online survey tools. *Collection Building*, 28 (3), pp.117-121.

JOHNSON, P. (2014). *Fundamentals of Collection Development and Management*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: American Library Association).

KACHALUBA, S.B., BRADY, J.E., CRITTEN, J. (2014). Developing humanities collections in the digital age: exploring Humanities faculty engagement with electronic and print resources. *College & Research Libraries*, 75 (1), pp.91-108.

KELSEY. C., KNIEVEL, J. (2012). Overlap between humanities faculty citation and library monograph collections, 2004-2009. *College & Research Libraries*, 73 (6), pp. 569-583.

KENT, A. (1979). *Use of Library Materials: the University of Pittsburgh Study*. (New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.).

KIRKWOOD, R. (2016). Collection development or data-driven content curation? An exploratory project in Manchester. *Library Management*, 37 (4/5), pp.275-284.

LEE, H.L. (2000). What is a collection? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology* 51 (12), pp.106-113.

LEE, H.L. (2003). Information Spaces and Collections: Implications for Organization. *Library & Information Science Research* 25 (4), pp.419-436.

LEVINE-CLARK, M. (2019). Imagining the Future Academic Library Collection. *Collection* Management, 44 (2-4), pp.87-94.

LINK, F.E., TOSAKA, T., AND WENG, C. (2015). Mining and Analyzing Circulation and ILL for Informed Collection Development. *College & Research Libraries* 76 (6), pp.740-754.

MCALLISTER, A.D., SCHERLEN, A. (2017). Weeding with Wisdom: Tuning De-Selection of Print Monographs in Book-Reliant Disciplines. *Collection Management*, 42 (2). pp. 76-91.

MCGUIGAN, G.S., WHITE, G. (2003). Subject-specific policy statements. *The Acquisitions Librarian*, 15 (30), pp.15-32.

MCINTOSH, M., MORSE J.M. (2015). Situating & Constructing Diversity in Semi-Structured Interviews. *Global Qualitative Nursing Research* volume 2.

MORAN, J., (2010), *Interdisciplinarity.* New Critical Idiom Series. (London: Routledge).

MORRIS, S.E., CURRIE, L. (2014). Remember Me? Content development in a User-Centred Services Library. *Collection Management*, 39 (2/3), pp.96-109.

MUNRO, B., PHILPS, P. (2008). A Collection of Importance: The Role of Selection in Academic Libraries. *Australian Academic & Research* Libraries, 39(3), pp.149-170.

MURRAY, D.C. (2018). Humanities E-Books: An Affective Faculty Survey. *Collection Management* 43, pp.3-27.

NABE, J. (2011). Changing the organization of collection development. *Collection Management*, 36, pp.3-16.

NISONGER, T.E. (2007). Journals in the Core Collection: Definition, Identification and Applications. *The Serials Librarian*, 51 (3-4), pp.51-73.

NOVICK, G. (2008). Is there a Bias against Telephone Interviews in Qualitative Research? *Research in Nursing & Health*, 31 (4), pp.391-398.

OLIVA, V.T. (2016). De-Selection of Print Monographs in the humanities & social sciences in the digital age. *Collection Building,* 35 (2), pp.37-47.

PETERS, T. (2006). The Long Tail Wags the Dog. *American Library Association Tech Source* blog at http://www.techsource.ala.org/blog/2006/07/the-long-tail-wags-the-dog.

PINFIELD, S. (2001). The changing role of subject librarians in the academic library. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 33 (1), pp.32-38.

RAMIREZ, D., TABACARU, S. (2015) Evidence-based collection management: A discipline-specific usage analysis of PsychBOOKS. *Collection Management*, 46 (3), pp.163-184.

SENS, J.M., FONESCA, A.J. (2013). A skeptic's view of Patron-Driven Acquistions; is it time to ask the tough questions? *Technical Services Quarterly* 30 (4), pp.359-371.

SHEN, L., CASSIDY, E.D., ELMORE, E., GRIFFIN, G., MANOLOVITZ, T., MARTINEZ, M. & TURNEY, L.M. (2011). Head first into the patron-driven acquisitions pool: A comparison of librarian selection versus patron purchases. *Journal of Electronic Resources* Librarianship, 23 (3), pp.203-218.

SHIRKEY, C. (2011). Taking the Guesswork out of Collection Development: Using Syllabi for a User-Centred Collection Development Method. *Collection Management*, 36 (3), pp.154-164.

SHOWERS, B., (ed.) (2015) *Library Analytics and Metrics: Using Data to Drive Decisions and Services* (London: Facet Publishing).

SIMMONS, M., CORRALL, S. (2011). The changing educational needs of subject librarians: a survey of UK practitioner opinions and course content. *Education for Information*, 28 (1), pp.21-44.

SNOW, R. (1996) Wasted words: The written collection development policy and the academic library. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 22 (3), pp.191-194.

STERN, M (1983). Characteristics of the Literature of Literary Scholarship. *College and Research* Libraries, 44, pp.199-209.

THOMPSON, J.W. (2002) The Death of the Scholarly Monograph in the Humanities? Citation Patterns in Literary Scholarship. Libri, 52 (3), pp.121-135.

TUCKER, J.C., TORRENCE. M. (2004). Collection Development for new librarians: Advice from the trenches. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*, 28 (4), pp.397-409.

WALTERS, W.H. (2012). Patron-Driven Acquisition and the education mission of the academic library. *Library Resources & Technical Services* 56 (3), pp.199-213.

WARWICK, C. (2000). The lowest canonical-denominator: electronic literary texts & the information professional. *Information Research*, 5 (2) at www.informationr.net/ir/5-2/paper71.html (accessed on 26/2/2019)

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Rita Marcella, for her guidance and support and constructive criticism throughout this process. Thanks are also due to the academic librarians who kindly gave up their time to contribute to this study. Their insights and patience with my queries and novice interviewing skills were much appreciated. Finally, I must thank my fellow students on the course for their encouragement, along with my family.