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This chapter describes the empirical quantitative and qualitative research and case studies pertaining to collection management practice in academic libraries published between 1990 and 2007. The topics covered include collection size and growth, material cost, library expenditures, budgets and budgeting, collection development policies, collection composition, organization and staffing for collection management, selection, and the evaluation of the collection development process and the collection itself. The chapter identifies the most influential and useful studies and the most active areas of research. The collection management research literature was limited in the methodologies employed (surveys and case studies), statistical analyses applied (basic and descriptive), and the scope of the problems addressed (inputs and processes). More studies that focus on effectiveness, outcomes, and impact are needed.

Introduction

This chapter continues the review of academic library collection management research conducted and published in 1990 by Osburn. Like Osburn, the author consulted annual and multiyear reviews of the collection management literature published between 1990 and 2007. These proved to be very useful both for identifying reports of research and for the analyses of findings. Beyond these, the author conducted literature searches, followed citations, and browsed the tables of contents of prominent collection management journals. The majority of the works cited in this chapter were published in the profession's monographs, journals, and conference proceedings. All were published in English, and most document academic library practice in the United States. In order to make manageable the voluminous literature, some limitations were placed on the breadth of collection management-related subjects included. For this reason, with a few exceptions, the literatures of selection for storage, preservation, weeding, scholarly communication, resource sharing, and acquisitions have been excluded.

The focus of this chapter, like that of the book as a whole, is on research. One of the problems that emerged almost as soon as the author began to consider this writing project was the question of how to define research. The editors did not offer a definition, wisely allowing authors wide latitude in the selection of literature to be included. This author's goal was to examine the way those in the library profession have employed research methods to investigate the questions, issues, and problems relative to the academic library collection. Therefore, in addition to the empirical quantitative and qualitative research projects identified and discussed here, she has included selected local studies. Although they vary greatly in sophistication and quality, these serve as case studies and are important because they reflect the types of recent challenges those in the trenches faced and the strategies they used to address them.

Technological and economic factors have transformed academic library collection development from a largely solitary effort conducted within the library to one that, with growing frequency, requires collaboration with a wide range of library and campus units, as well as with other libraries. Likewise, the collection itself has been redefined by the placelessness and volatility of electronic resources, the changing landscape of scholarly communication, and user expectations of any time/any place access. Collection management research, with its successes and limitations, was both the product of, and a contributor to, this transformation.

Size and Growth of Collections

Rightly or wrongly, collection size has long been considered an indicator of collection quality. By the early 1980s, collection managers generally understood that the goal of a "comprehensive" collection was unrealistic. But during the 1990s and early 21st century, it was the concept of a shrinking national collection and local collection loss that provided the context in which collection management was practiced and research on it conducted.

University Libraries and Scholarly Communication, or "The Mellon Report," set the framework for its discussion of the principles of scholarly communication and the role of research libraries by identifying historical trends in collections, expenditures, and publishing. The analysis it offered of the 1912–1991 collection expenditure data of 24 members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) documented the volatility of collection growth, the declining percentage of library expenditures vis-à-vis university budgets, and a growing crisis in serial pricing.

Other ARL
publications provided further evidence of the shrinking aggregate print research library collection. “Research Libraries in a Global Context: An Exploratory Paper” described an increase in worldwide book publication, increases in serials prices, a weakening U.S. dollar, and a resulting decline in the percentage of published foreign resources purchased by research libraries annually. Reed-Scott’s background paper on foreign acquisitions characterized the coverage of foreign materials in U.S. research libraries as “deteriorating.” The authors of both papers observed and expressed concern about the trend toward collection homogeneity. Changing Global Book Collection Patterns in ARL Libraries provided a profile of the holdings of all ARL libraries, based on a snapshot of the WorldCat database, by publication date and world regions. The average number of ARL library holdings decreased for nine of the most widely held countries between 1980 and 2004, suggesting that libraries were acquiring fewer books from these countries than they had in the early 1980s. This study raised questions about the meaning of this downward trajectory and provided a baseline for future studies. In addition, ARL tracked trends in research library acquisitions and collection growth in its annual compilations of data on member libraries.

Other studies furthered the concern about the national collection’s size and diversity. Using 1967–1987 data on volumes held by the Bowdoin List (of 40 liberal arts colleges) and ARL libraries, Werking found that, contrary to Fremont Rider’s widely accepted thesis on collection growth, three quarters of the college libraries and one half of ARL libraries had not doubled in size every 16 years. Perrault analyzed the growth of nonserial imprints based on data from 72 ARL libraries. She found an overall decline in monographic acquisitions among these libraries, as well as significant declines in the numbers of nonserial imprints by broad subject groups and decreases in the percent of total imprints acquired. Perrault also documented a shift toward the acquisition of science and English language nonserial materials. Her data on the mean number of libraries owning titles supported the conclusion that the aggregate collection was becoming less diverse in subject coverage and language.

National trends in serials collections were explored by Chrzastowski and Schmidt by studying ARL library serial holdings records for 1992–1994. This research built on their previous studies of cancellations by five ARL libraries, in which they found that the overlap of serials titles cancelled had grown from 4.3% to 7.2%. Recognizing the need to look at serials collections collectively, the researchers created an aggregate library based on serials records from 10 ARL libraries, which they then used to analyze collection and cancellation rates and characteristics. Their findings included an accelerating rate of cancellation; a 63% overlap in domestic serials, with 37% of titles unique to only one library; and a cancellation overlap rate of 8.3%.

Chrzastowski’s closer look at the science serials in the aggregated collection documented similar patterns of collection shrinkage, with higher subscription overlap and serial cancellations as measured in dollars among the science serials than had been found in the aggregate collection.

A number of studies that were smaller in scope provided additional evidence of shrinking serials collections. For example, Rowley documented the erosion of the Iowa academic libraries’ aggregated serials collection, and Burnam found that the collections of scientific literature were not growing at the majority of the private liberal arts college libraries that participated in his study. Most recently, in a study of print science serials in 75 Illinois academic libraries, Chrzastowski, Naun, Norman, and Schmidt found 59% of these titles to be unique in that they were held by only one library, with another 14% owned by only two of the libraries included in the study.

Researchers have only recently begun to focus on the size and growth of the national digital collection. In 2007, Lavoie, Connaway, and O’Neill examined the aggregate digital collection as reflected in the combined digital holdings in WorldCat. Their analysis revealed that this aggregate collection is small but growing rapidly and at a much faster pace than the WorldCat database as a whole. They identified the widely held items as government documents and netLibrary e-books and analyzed these digital resources by holdings patterns and material types.

Cost of Information Resources
Rising prices of materials were one of the chief reasons for the shrinking national collection. Periodical price surveys based on data from EBSCO Subscription Services continued to be published each spring in Library Journal. These annual analyses typically included average cost per title by subject area and country of origin, as well as price projections for the coming year. Annual price analyses for periodicals and serials based
on data provided by Faxon, and more recently Swets, included average prices by subject area and cumulative price increases over multiples years. The periodical price increases were also presented by LC Classification categories. The Bowker Annual included data on prices paid by academic libraries, including average prices and price indices for U. S. and foreign publications, books, periodicals, and other material types.

Collection managers also had access to a number of longitudinal studies and analyses of serial prices by subject. Price increases for journals for academic veterinary medical libraries were published from 1990 to 2000. Analyses included annual price increases and comparisons with 1983 and 1997 prices. Marks, Neilsen, and Petersen published a longitudinal price study focused on scientific journals. The data for this study were the 1967–1987 prices for 370 titles. In addition to measuring price increases, this study also analyzed titles by price per page and publisher nationality. The authors found that prices from foreign commercial publishers were higher and had risen faster than domestic titles. Sapp conducted an analysis of mathematics journal prices with similar findings. Schmidle and Via analyzed the pricing trends for library and information science (LIS) journals from 1997 to 2002. They identified variations between commercial and professional and academic presses and documented price increases related to commercial publisher acquisitions of established journals. These authors also calculated cost per citation for selected LIS journals as a measure of return on investment of acquisitions dollars.

Library Expenditures
In addition to data on the prices of information resources, collection managers needed reliable data on what other academic libraries and, in particular, what their peer institution libraries were spending. As previously noted, The Mellon Report provided a historical look at expenditures, as did the Werking study. In addition, Prabha and Ogden analyzed expenditures by ARL and ACRL libraries between 1982 and 1992 and found increases in overall expenditures and growth in the proportion of expenditures that were being used for serials. Petrick’s study of expenditures by SUNY libraries indicated that between 1994 and 2000 expenditures for electronic resources increased, although the increases were not consistent in that period. He found that the funding to support these increased expenditures did not come from funding for print and audiovisual materials and concluded that e-resources were “augmenting rather than replacing” traditional formats. Like Werking, Petrick noted difficulties encountered in comparing expenditure data. Annual expenditure data, in the aggregate and institution-specific, were made available by ARL and ACRL. The Bowker Annual reported the academic library acquisitions expenditures by state and material type. In 1998, Library Journal surveyed 1,000 academic libraries and analyzed their expenditures by size and type of institution. The survey was repeated in 2001, and the researchers identified changes in the percent of spending on types of materials and in subject areas.

Acquisitions Budgets
Academic libraries have faced ever-increasing materials costs and acquisitions budgets that were not growing as fast as those of their parent institutions. Despite this, very little research was conducted on how, or how successfully, collection managers advocated for additional or inflation funding. Jenkins published a case study that described the University of Dayton Library’s experience using benchmarking to advocate for acquisitions fund increases. A 1994 survey of 230 academic libraries conducted by Allen showed that, as a group, libraries relied on university entitlements for their acquisitions budgets and generated very few independent funds. Allen also found that libraries at private institutions were more successful at fundraising for acquisitions than those at public institutions.

New information resource formats and services, as well as the need for hardware and software, put additional pressure on already stretched acquisitions budgets. In 1990, 99% of the ARL libraries responding to a SPEC Kit survey reported that they used their materials budgets to acquire, not only books and serials, but other formats such as microforms, videos, and sound recording. Eighty-seven percent reported acquiring bibliographic files, and 15% computer hardware. Seventy percent of the respondents in Allen’s study agreed that certain technology costs should be charged to the library materials budget. Almost 84% agreed that funding such costs in this manner continued a long-standing trend.

The research on methods used by library collection managers to allocate the funds available to them focused on identifying defendable criteria for making these allocations. In his 1990 review of the literature of allocation formulas, Budd commented that while academic libraries use allocation as a means of distributing acquisitions funds, the use of
allocation formulas "appears not to be as pervasive as it was a relatively short time ago." Indeed, the research literature suggests that the majority of academic libraries did not use allocation formulas. In 1990, only 14% of the libraries completing a SPEC Kit survey reported that they used a numerical formula to allocate and there was "little consistency among the formula elements." A survey published by ACRI four years later indicated that about 40% of small college and university libraries used allocation formulas. The variables most frequently included in these formulas were book prices and number of faculty and students per department; course level was the most frequent weighting factor.

From 1990 to 2007, a handful of methodological studies—i.e., studies designed and conducted for the purpose of testing an allocation method, formula, or formula variable(s)—were published. Brownson tried to quantify the library's selection policy and use it, along with shelf counts and circulation data, to construct a model that explained variation in expenditure by subject. Based on deviations from the 80/20 Rule, which states that 80% of collection use will be from only 20% of the materials in that collection, Britten quantified "relative levels of use" in selected LC subject classes and discussed the use of this measure as a basis for allocating book acquisitions funds.

Crotts explored the relationships among expenditures, enrollment, and circulation, determined that circulation was the best indicator of relative demand for books, and developed an allocation model based on his findings. Young applied seven allocation formulas to the same data and compared the results. For four science departments he then compared allocations calculated from these formulas with the average expenditures of 60 libraries. He found that the formula allocations were fairly consistent for the broad subject areas of humanities, social sciences, and sciences but varied when applied to more specific science subject areas. The mean allocations from the formulas and the survey libraries were also very similar. Wise and Perushek tested an allocation methodology using lexicographic linear goal programming and determined that it successfully allocated funding within the context of multiple, incommensurable, and conflicting collection development goals. Canepi conducted a meta-analysis of 75 fund allocation formulas, identified the variables used and their frequency of use, and employed factor analysis to identify related variables and variables found within the same formula.

Case studies consisted of descriptions of local efforts to develop formulas for effectively allocating funds. Bandelin and Payne described the process of developing an allocation formula in a collaborative, rather than faculty-driven, collection development program. German and Schmidt developed a formula to allocate new money and then described the process by which the Library Allocation Steering Committee addressed the issue of how well the collections budget supported campus priorities and how responsive it was to change. Arora and Klajian described their efforts to develop a formula that would maximize journal usage over library units and branch libraries. Sorgenfrei presented a failure analysis of the development and use of an allocation formula at the Colorado School of Mines Library. Lowry described the development of a matrix formula for budget allocation that was the product of cooperation among three academic libraries and that allowed individual libraries to select variables appropriate to their situations. Lafferty, Warning, and Vlies reported on their efforts at the University of Technology in Sydney to incorporate literature dependence into their formula. Kalyan, Weston, and Evans described the development of budget allocation formulas at Seton Hall, Portland State, and Monash University libraries. Bailey, Lessels, and Best used data from Georgia's University Borrowing Program to allocate monograph funds at Auburn University Library.

Collection Development Policies

The literature pertaining to collection development policies included calls to rethink the need for, and purpose and content of, the collection development policy. At the same time, numerous manuals, articles, and texts offering assistance with writing traditional collection development policies appeared. The body of published research on collection development policies is relatively modest in both the number of studies published and the variety of research methods employed. Those who conducted research on this topic relied heavily on the survey approach, the methodology that characterized this literature in the 1980s.

The survey conducted by Futas for the third edition of Collection Development Policies and Procedures asked whether libraries had collection development policies, where they were written, by whom, and how often they were reviewed. Vignau and Maneses surveyed academic libraries in Cuba regarding the status of, and need for, collection development
Collection Composition

As previously described, the research on collection growth documented the decrease in collection subject and language diversity as changes in collection composition. Other research focused on the extent to which library collections included specific subject matter and material types. More recent research related to collection composition was dominated by concerns about electronic resources.

In 1993, Brancolini and Provine conducted a SPEC Kit survey that focused on video and multimedia (CD-ROMs) collection policies and procedures. In 1997, Brancolini presented the results of that survey along with the findings of one conducted in 1995 that covered all facets of selecting, budgeting, and managing these types of materials.

Crawford and Harris studied ownership of 110 fiction and 120 nonfiction best sellers published from 1940 to 1990 and concluded that future scholars may not have access to these popular culture materials. They also surveyed ownership of religious texts and found that, while texts in English were widely held, those in their original languages were not. Krieger’s survey of popular Catholic periodicals indicated that they are not widely collected, and Schwartz reported on the gap between book publication output and holdings in 71 ARL libraries in the area of Judaic studies.

Stoddart and Kiser conducted an informal survey of 20 libraries that collected self-published magazines or “zines” and provided some information about how they were collected, cataloged, accessed, and preserved. Marinko and Gerhard studied holdings of alternative press titles by ARL libraries and called for the expansion of national holdings of these materials. Mulcahy found that library holdings of award-winning science fiction novels varied widely in ARL libraries, with few collecting science fiction comprehensively.

A survey of ARL libraries by Pellack revealed that as of 2003, about half of the respondents acquired and maintained a collection of historic industry standard, and 60% reported that they acquired standards on demand. The 2005 SPEC Kit survey, Spatial Data Collections and Services, revealed that 89% of the responding ARL libraries collected digital data sets.

Many of the large research libraries began investigating and defining their roles regarding e-journals early in the 1990s, and these reports were collected in Electronic Journals in ARL Libraries. A survey conducted for that 1994 SPEC Kit identified the challenges libraries faced and the trends in making e-journals available. Another SPEC Kit survey conducted in 1994 revealed that a significant numbers of ARL members were at the stage of either investigating or offering local and remote access to e-journals and that they were following traditional methods for selecting, acquiring, processing, and cataloging them. In 1999, Ashcroft and Langdon found that all but one of the research libraries they surveyed included e-journals in their collections.

Ninety-six percent of the UK and North American academic libraries surveyed by Ashcroft in 2002 made e-journals available to their users. ARL surveys reported by Case indicated that 75% of a small sample of ARL libraries reported that they were selectively cancelling print journals in favor of electronic versions. An information survey conducted by DeVoe in 2005 revealed that 85% of the respondents had canceled print and kept the electronic versions of journals. Robbins, McCain, and Scrivener found evidence that ARL libraries were gradually shifting from print reference materials to their electronic counterparts. The research...
on the access to free scholarly e-journals conducted by Fosmire and Young suggested that, as of 2000, libraries were not "collecting" these types of resources. Almost half of the 213 e-journals in their sample had no holding symbols attached to their OCLC bibliographic record.\(^9\) However, seven years later a SPEC Kit survey on open access resources revealed that 97% of the respondents provided links to open access journals, and Lavoie, Connaway, and O'Neill found that the number of digital materials in WorldCat was growing faster than the database as a whole.\(^{10}\)

**Organization and Staffing for Collection Management**

The research literature on organization and staffing illustrated the many variations on the ways in which academic libraries translated collection management into practice.

**Organization and Administration**

The *Guide to Collection Development and Management Administration, Organization, and Staffing* provided an overview of the organizational models used in all types of libraries.\(^8\) *Organization of Collection Development*, a SPEC Kit published in 1995, described the organizational models employed at ARL libraries and found only subtle changes in the formal organization of collection development since the 1987 SPEC Kit survey. These changes included an increase in the number of part-time professional staff involved in collection management and some organizational changes in response to the increase in information resources in electronic format.\(^8\) Kenselaar conducted interviews about collection development administration with librarians at selected research libraries. Topics covered included the use of advisory committees, manner and frequency of communication with selectors, use of full-time bibliographers, collection development policies, budget allocation, assessment, and preservation.\(^8\) Bryant compared the interview data she collected on collection development organizational structures in 1989–1990 with responses to an inquiry about changes in 1995 and found that collection development officers were losing their separate identity within the library organization and that collection development librarians' responsibilities were broadening in terms of the range of material formats they selected and the types of activities assigned to them. She also found that these changes were occurring in a wide variety of organizational structures.\(^8\) Fisher conducted a survey of multitype libraries, of which the overwhelming majority of respondents were from academic libraries, and did not find consensus about collection development and acquisitions organizational structures. More than half of his respondents indicated that their organizational structures had not changed over the previous six years.\(^{11}\)

Although the research indicated that change was not widespread in this period, some academic libraries did experiment with major organizational change in collection management and these experiences were reported in the literature as case studies. Webb reported on combining the collections and systems functions at Washington State University Libraries.\(^{12}\) The team management approach to collection management was taken at the University of Nevada Las Vegas Library and documented by Biery.\(^{13}\) Eckwright and Bolin described the organizational benefits at the University of Idaho resulting from the creation of a hybrid position that included both collection management and cataloging responsibilities.\(^{14}\)

**Collection Management Responsibilities and Requirements**

A number of important theoretical, personal opinion, and prescriptive articles on the changing responsibilities of those involved in collection management were published since 1990.\(^{15}\) Earlier, the research that examined collection management responsibilities and requirements consisted of analyses of position announcements. In more recent years, researchers used surveys to identify and document changing roles and responsibilities.

Robinson reviewed 433 collection management position announcements that appeared in *College and Research Libraries News* between 1980 and 1991 and found that the majority of these advertised positions had combined responsibilities, generally with reference, and required a strong subject background but not an advanced degree. Forty-six percent of the positions required or preferred foreign language competence, but few required supervisory or budget experience or knowledge of automation. Robinson also found little change in the responsibilities and qualifications included in announcements during the decade studied.\(^{16}\) Haar examined the 35 advertisements for bibliographer positions that appeared in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* between March and October 1990 and found that liaison and reference duties, bibliographic instruction, and online searching were the most frequently listed responsibilities. He also found
that the LIS master's degree, advanced subject degree, foreign language ability, and collection management experience were the qualifications most often required and preferred, and that few advertisements required reference or budget skills or experience. In his study of position announcements for academic subject specialists in business, social sciences, and science from 1990 to 1998, White found that the majority included collection development, reference, and bibliographic instruction responsibilities, and he identified a trend toward including technology-related responsibilities.

In 1999 and 2000, Intner used surveys and interviews to investigate how the Internet had affected the work of collection development librarians. Her findings included an extensive list of activities for which these librarians used the Internet, and her data indicated that their responsibilities included collecting Internet resources. She also interviewed library administrators from six academic libraries, who confirmed that the importance of Internet resources was growing and that these resources were causing changes in the types of materials they bought, how they made the materials available, and the patrons they served. McAbee and Graham surveyed 138 librarians in medium-sized academic libraries to determine subject specialist responsibilities, how much time they spent on their tasks, whether they had enough time, and the value to their position of the tasks they performed. Wilson and Edelman focused on the effect of increasing interdisciplinarity on the selector/bibliographer. Their analysis of the intellectual endeavors of the faculty of one library science graduate program illustrated the difficulties a selector would have in establishing selection parameters.

Hardy and Corrall surveyed 32 English, law, and chemistry subject liaison librarians at universities in the United Kingdom and found that they carried out a wide range of similar responsibilities and required similar competencies.

The most ambitious study of the changing roles of collection managers was published by Dorner in 2004. Using data from four focus groups, he developed a Web-based survey to which he received responses from collection managers at academic and special libraries in five major English-speaking countries. The study found that over the previous five years, collection managers had increased responsibilities that were primarily related to digital resources, including on activities related to physical access and technology issues, and on attending education and training sessions. Collection managers involved in consortial work reported increases in time spent liaising about such activities.

Education and Training for Collection Management

A number of collection management texts were published between 1990 and 2007, while the research on education for collection management included surveys of practitioners and reviews of LIS graduate programs. Haar reviewed twelve 1990–1991 program bulletins and found that only half of these programs offered collection development courses. Budd and Brill surveyed LIS educators and practitioners in 1994 regarding specific aspects of course instruction. Although both groups agreed on what needed to be taught, practitioners indicated that their formal instruction in collection management had not been adequate. Practitioners also ranked the value of on-the-job training higher than did the educators. Metz conducted an informal review of 10 LIS program catalogs and found that most did not require a course on collection development. He also compared the content of the courses with an earlier study of fundamental elements of a basic course in collection development and found that topics such as organization and arrangement, history of publishing, and distribution infrastructure had been replaced by resource sharing and fund allocation. Based on this review, he called for such curricular additions as access vs. ownership, electronic and digital resources, and organizational structure for collection development.

In their review and discussion of the status of and challenges facing collection management education, Blake and Surprenant cited Blake's finding that 87.4% of the ALA-accredited schools had at least one faculty member with an interest in collection management. In his review of catalog descriptions of collection management courses, Blake found fewer programs in which collection management courses were required than did Metz, but his review of topics covered in those courses yielded a similar list. Liu and Allen addressed the need for subject-specific training/education for business information specialists. Their interviews of 147 academic business librarians indicated that the majority did not have the level of business and economics expertise that they would have if they had academic degrees in those disciplines. The researchers also surveyed
instructors of business information resources courses in ALA-accredited LIS programs and determined that their courses covered major business topics, including management, marketing, and finance. Given that collection management was not necessarily required for those enrolled in LIS master's programs and that bibliographer responsibilities were changing, it is not surprising that many guides and handbooks for collection practitioners were published. However, research on training and professional development was scant. Casserly and Hegg surveyed 246 academic libraries in four-year educational institutions to determine how those who participated in collection development were trained and evaluated. They found that more than half of the respondents were given training and that the most common type was the orientation program. The researchers developed a profile of the libraries most likely to have training programs. Forte and others offered a case study of the development of a collection manager training program and manual at the UC–Santa Barbara Library. The training sessions consisted of a series of panel discussions on topics included in the ALA Guide for Training Collection Development Librarians. It had an evaluation component and was found to benefit both new and seasoned collection managers. Lyons compared the relevancy of two professional development opportunities, the annual conference of the ALA and that of the American Political Science Association (APSA), from the point of view of librarians with collection development responsibilities and found strong evidence of the importance of academic conferences. Using case studies and a survey of experts, Dilevko and others provided evidence that by carefully reading and analyzing scholarly book reviews, academic librarians can derive significant knowledge about the intellectual and historical context of a subject area in which they may not have formal training, but for which they may have reference, instruction, or collection development responsibilities.

**Evaluation of Collection Management Librarians**

Evaluation of those involved in the collection management process is an important, yet infrequently addressed, topic. Casserly and Hegg found that librarians responsible for collection development in academic libraries tended to be involved in the evaluation of their bibliographers/subject specialists as a colleague during the peer review process and, outside that process, only when these individuals were evaluated for promotion or tenure. The survey that served as the basis for a 1992 SPEC Kit found that supervisors of those involved in collection management conducted annual performance reviews and that peer review was used by only 32% of the respondents. The survey identified the types of documentation bibliographers/selectors provided as part of their peer review process and indicated that some libraries required selectors and bibliographers to submit monthly reports and obtain input from faculty in their assigned academic departments as part of that evaluation process. Kenselaar's interview subjects described their approaches to meeting with, but not necessarily evaluating, selectors.

A methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of selectors was developed by Dennison, who compared library monographic and journal holdings with subject-specific, tiered checklists and applied a goodness of fit statistical test to the results. Based on a very small number of interviews, Gonzalez-Kirby identified attributes of bibliographers associated with effective collection development, including specialized subject knowledge, research, and support for and contact with faculty.

**The Selection Process**

The research that examined selection focused on partnerships with faculty, the identification of selection criteria, and the tools and data that informed the process.

**Working with Faculty Partners**

The question of who should select reflected an awareness that collection managers and faculty need to work together to build collections and that collection managers need to know more than they typically do about how their faculty partners select materials. Jenkins found that faculty at the College of Mount St. Joseph ranked selection fifth out of a list of seven secondary activities, which included serving on campus committees, advising students, and miscellaneous duties assigned by their department chair. In a later study at the same institution, he found that faculty used reviews to select materials less frequently than did librarians.

At Kean University, Kuo found that faculty most often used publisher catalogs and journal book reviews to inform their selection, that those with one to five years of ordering experience were the most active selectors,
and that faculty most often ordered books for undergraduates, employing the criteria of "good for students" and "good for teaching." Kushkowskii surveyed business faculty at three Iowa universities and found that faculty perceived their own areas as more important to their institution's business curriculum than other business subjects. Chu's study focused on the lateral relationship between academic faculty and librarians who share responsibilities for collection development and underscored these groups' differing understandings of collaboration, constraints, and possibilities. Neville, Williams, and Hunt described the College of Charleston's liaison program and offered case studies of how it worked in departments at opposite ends of the spectrum of faculty involvement in the collection development process. The researchers also conducted a survey of their faculty liaisons and identified issues concerning selection of these liaisons, training, and recognition of effort. White's case study of the development and evolution of the selection and assessment process for electronic resources to support the College of Business Administration at Pennsylvania State University revealed that a strong partnership in collection building carried over into enhanced support for faculty research and instruction. University of Manitoba researchers found that most librarians believed that their interactions with faculty substantially impacted the collection, improved communications with faculty, and helped the librarians become aware of new resources and identify areas in which the collections were inadequate. Walther used a Web-based survey to explore the librarian-faculty relationship at one urban academic institution from the perspective of journal cancellations. He found that the factors used by librarians and faculty for identifying journals to be cancelled were similar and that librarians used input from faculty rather than acting arbitrarily.

Lee conducted a historical case study of collection development for women's studies, using analyses of historical documents and archival records as well as personal interviews. She found that the personal ideologies of those involved in collection development influenced their determination of information needs and the means by which to address those needs and that collection development had been influenced by institutional bureaucracy and politics, especially with respect to operating structures, the politics of interdisciplinarity, personnel deployment, and aspiration for prestige.

Criteria Used for Selection
In studying the strategies used by academic libraries to mitigate the impact of price discrimination, Haley and Talaga found that libraries selected and deselected journals based on factors other than price alone and therefore were vulnerable to price discrimination. Spencer and Millson-Martula identified the factors considered important by college and small university libraries when cancelling print serials. The top five factors considered were indexing, cost, evaluation, availability in print locally or in electronic format, and use. Metz and Stemmer surveyed heads of collection management at ARL and Oberlin Group libraries and found strong positive correlations among their familiarity with publishers, opinions about a publisher's academic relevance, and their perceptions of a publisher's intellectual and editorial quality. The researchers also found that selectors used publisher reputation as an evaluation criterion, especially when other information, such as a review, was not available. Lewis asked 56 members of the ACRL Law and Political Science Section with responsibilities for selecting political science materials to evaluate the quality of political science books published by 62 publishers and compared their responses with the results of a similar survey of faculty who were members of the APSA. She found that university press titles were more highly ranked by librarians and that textbook publishers were more highly ranked by APSA members. Sweetland and Christensen surveyed 33 Wisconsin academic libraries about their languages and literatures collection practices and compared their holdings with the Choice list of outstanding academic books. They found that selection in most libraries was based on faculty suggestions and curriculum-related needs, while criteria that addressed future needs or availability at other libraries were not considered.

More recently, concerns about burgeoning electronic resources resulted in research on criteria for selecting these types of materials. In 2001, the Digital Library Federation (DLF) published Jewell's study of library practices related to the selection and presentation of commercially available electronic resources. Based on interviews and discussions with academic librarians involved with electronic resources, reviews of Web sites, and quantitative data, Jewell identified best practices. That same year, the DLF also issued a report by Pitschmann on free Web resources. Pitschmann used data gathered from interviews, Web sites, and subject
gateways to identify practices to help libraries develop and sustain collections of free third-party Web resources.\textsuperscript{130}

**Collection-Building Tools and Data**

The tools that facilitate and the data that inform collection development range from approval plans to publisher-generated use statistics for electronic resources. This review indicated ongoing interest in the traditional tools and a growing interest in usage data.

**Mechanical Selection**

Loup and Snoke conducted a survey of 28 ARL libraries to determine how they supplemented their approval plans in the areas of philosophy and political science. They found that the responding libraries used standing orders and, to a lesser extent, retrospective purchasing. The researchers also collected data on approval plan expenditures.\textsuperscript{111} In 1996, 93\% of the respondents to an ARL SPEC Kit survey indicated that they used approval plans and that they spent at least $100,000 on these plans. The survey also indicated that use of such plans to acquire foreign or specialized materials had not decreased since a similar survey was conducted in the 1980s. Respondents identified advantages and disadvantages of such plans and described how their plans were administered.\textsuperscript{112} Calhoun, Bracken, and Firestein developed a method to determine the publishers that should be included in a core collection for large- and medium-sized research libraries based on the 80/20 rule and estimated the costs of approval plans that would supply core materials.\textsuperscript{113} Dali and Dilevko surveyed Slavic collection development specialists to determine the extent to which academic libraries in North American acquired books in Slavic and other Eastern European languages through approval plans and to identify the extent to which they used other collection strategies, including bookstores, gifts, exchanges, independent book agents, and book fairs.\textsuperscript{114}

Several case studies illustrated the range of approaches that were taken to evaluate and improve blanket order and approval plans. Pulikuthiel conducted an evaluation of the approval plan used by the Centre for Development Studies in terms of faculty participation, subject and publisher distribution of books received, expenditures, and imprints.\textsuperscript{115} Galbraith’s case study was motivated by an engineering library’s need to reduce its approval plan return rate. She compared the effectiveness of selection using Blackwell’s Collection Manager database with the approval plan and, based on the results, discontinued the plan.\textsuperscript{126} Sennyey assessed the performance of two blanket-order vendors that supplied French and Spanish books to the University of Illinois Library based on both the number of materials they supplied and the quality of those materials. Sennyey proposed this methodology as a way of evaluating blanket-order suppliers on an ongoing basis.\textsuperscript{137} Calhoun analyzed a core collection for the libraries in the California State University system in terms of reviews, holdings, and publishers and presses to develop strategies to improve approval plan effectiveness.\textsuperscript{138} Brush compared the circulation rate of engineering approval plan books with that of books in the engineering section of the collection—i.e. the books classified in the Ts—and found that the approval books were much more heavily used.\textsuperscript{139}

**Reviews**

Much of the research into reviews and reviewing focused on small or alternative press titles and *Choice* as the providers. Serebnick’s study of reviewing patterns of small press titles indicated that the percentage of small press books reviewed had decreased since 1980 and that a small number of journals published the majority of reviews.\textsuperscript{140} Dilevko and Dali also addressed the availability of reviews of alternative or small press titles and found that titles featured in *Counterpoise* were frequently reviewed in other sources. The researchers also analyzed favorable reviews and characterized the books featured only in *Counterpoise*.\textsuperscript{141}

Carlo and Natowitz used content analysis to study a sample of *Choice* reviews of titles in American history, geography, and area studies and found that the majority received favorable ratings and were recommended for purchase. They also found that reviewers most frequently applied criteria of quality or originality of analysis, completeness of research, and readability or quality of narrative.\textsuperscript{142} Jordy, McGrath, and Rutledge used *Book Review Digest* to assess the quality of publishers’ output and developed a profile of *Choice* as a source of book reviews. They found that *Choice* opinions were similar to those from other sources in their sample, that *Choice* and other reviewers were equally likely to judge a book to be outstanding, but that *Choice* reviewers were significantly more likely to judge a book to be “very good.”\textsuperscript{143} Sweetland compared criteria for evaluating Web sites developed by the Southern California Online Users Group, the University
of Georgia, and Rettig and Laguardia with *Choice* reviews and found that *Choice* did not generally include information on authority, reliability, and other traditional measures of quality. Williams and Best determined that *Choice* could not be used to predict circulation for political science, public administration, and law books at Auburn University.

**Integrated Library System (ILS) Data**

Chief collection development officers at 108 ARL libraries were surveyed by Carrigan regarding the availability and usefulness of data from their ILSs. His research indicated that less than half of the libraries regularly used the data produced by their systems to inform collection development decisions. Carrigan then analyzed how the data were used and why they were not used. Casserly and Ciliberti surveyed collection management librarians at small- and medium-sized institutions using DRA and Innovative Interfaces Inc. ILSs about the availability and usefulness of 18 types of collection management data. They found that the data were less useful than available. Kraemer and Markwith reported on the integration of subscription agent and ILS data to inform collection-building decisions at the Medical College of Wisconsin.

**E-Journal and Database Publisher Data**

By the beginning of the present decade, collection managers were all too aware of the shortcomings of vendor-supplied use data and of the incompatibility of use measures across information resources. In a white paper sponsored by the Council on Library and Information Resources, Luther identified library and publisher issues surrounding e-journal usage statistics. In 1999, Dawson compared the variety of use statistics from the BUBL Journals service and developed a search-to-browse ratio as a means of comparing use of individual titles. Two years later, Blecic, Fiscella, and Wiberley compared the use data supplied by 51 vendors with the International Coalition of Library Consortia’s categories of data, identified additional useful measures, and made recommendations to vendors and libraries about generating, analyzing, and interpreting use data. Shim and McClure reported and made recommendations based on efforts to standardize vendor usage statistics as part of the ARL’s E-Metrics Project. E-Metrics Project studies included surveys of libraries about problems associated with usage reports and field tests of vendor statistics. Hahn and Faulkner derived three metrics to evaluate the value and performance of e-journals based on use statistics provided by High Wire Press and used these to develop benchmarks for evaluating potential purchases. After applying these benchmarks to two test titles, the researcher concluded that they were reliable.

**Evaluating the Collection Development Process**

Only a few researchers chose to tackle the problem of assessing the collection development program, or as Carrigan characterized it “to determine how effectively collection developers allocate the resources at their disposal.”

Bias was investigated by Harmeyer, who evaluated one aspect of the collection development process in California academic and public libraries. His survey of library holdings of eight prochoice and prolife books indicated that non-religiously affiliated academic and public libraries were three times as likely to hold prochoice than prolife books. Ochola and Jones reported the results of their survey of teaching faculty and librarian assessments of the Baylor University’s library liaison program. The data were used to develop recommendations to help invigorate the program. Mozenter, Sanders, and Welch described the restructuring of the liaison program at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and their survey of teaching faculty to assess the effectiveness of their assigned subject librarians. The researchers identified program planning, responsibility, training, evaluation, and communication characteristics that were associated with an effective liaison program. Yang also approached the evaluation of the library liaison program by surveying the faculty. Faculty at Texas A&M University identified updates about the services available, consulting on supporting instructional needs, and ordering books or serials as the primary services they needed. These services were compared with those offered by the library, and library services were found to be fairly consistent with faculty expectations. However, faculty were unaware of some of the services the library provided. Dinkins evaluated library and faculty selection at Stetson University by comparing the percent of selections that circulated at least once during the period of the study. As part of an evaluation of George Washington University Libraries’ monograph acquisitions program, Stebelman compared the titles acquired by the library with those reviewed by *Choice* and analyzed the findings by subject and publisher type.
Cooperative Collection Development

Much as been written about cooperative collection development both pre- and post-1990. In recent years, electronic resources and the resulting increased importance of consortia have provided a wealth of opportunities for cooperation and collaboration. A number of authors provided the historical, theoretical, and organizational contexts in which to consider cooperative collection development efforts. The research literature included efforts to quantify cooperative efforts and characterize and measure their success. Case studies reflected the range of these efforts.

The majority of respondents to the 1998 ARL survey on cooperative collection management programs had at least one collaborative relationship and one consortium membership. The most common reason for collaboration was to expand services and collections, and the acquisition of materials—usually electronic—was the most common form of collaboration. The researchers noted that cooperative efforts for print resources occurred most frequently in area studies. A working group formed by the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) surveyed libraries in order to “map” cooperative collection development activities and also found that cooperative projects for print materials frequently focused on area studies. The working group identified 89 projects, most of which began after 1990, and the majority of survey respondents reported that at least one of their cooperative activities was the shared purchase of electronic resources.

A number of qualitative studies and analyses that identified factors related to successful programs mostly focused on print-based cooperative programs. Dominguez and Swindle researched the history of the Triangle Research Libraries Network’s cooperative programs from the 1930s to the early 1990s and identified seven factors that promoted successful collection development. Butler described seven law library cooperative collection development programs and identified institutional culture, economic incentives, and increased interlibrary loan efficiency and effectiveness as factors that had contributed to program success. Hightower and Soete reviewed the physical science translation journal collaborative collection development project at the University of California. Based on the experiences and the problems encountered by the participating libraries they identified 12 strategies for successful collaborative collection management. Dannelly provided cases studies of OhioLINK and the Committee on Institutional Cooperation and identified characteristics common to productive programs. Based on his analysis of Latin American studies cooperative collection development projects, Hazen identified seven conditions for success. The projects studied by the CRL Best Practices Working Group included those that focused on electronic as well as print materials and on access, storage, and preservation. The group found best practices in the areas of communication and consultation, goals and focus, flexibility and adaptability, and technological structure.

Only a handful of researchers presented quantitative analysis of the benefits of cooperative programs. Erickson described the Tri-College University’s cooperative collection development program for books. He then presented the results of three historical studies in which effectiveness was measured by the savings resulting from the number of consortially purchased titles that each library did not need to purchase. The California State University Libraries’ study of their multicampus shared e-book collection included an analysis of use statistics and a user survey. The researchers identified strategies for expanding the e-book cooperative acquisitions program. Kingma compared the cost of interlibrary loan in one research library consortium with the savings that could be achieved through cooperative collection development and concluded that the savings would not cover the costs of coordinating consortium collection development. Scigliano’s analysis compared the costs and benefits of a database acquired through a consortial purchase with those of its paper counterpart. She calculated benefits in terms of the value of time saved by the users of the electronic resource and net library savings for the electronic versions. CRL’s Working Group for Qualitative Evaluation of Cooperative Collection Development developed performance measures for evaluating a cooperative project in terms of reduced costs, increased access to information, and increased use and user satisfaction.

The literature of the period also included case studies of how consortia and cooperative projects operated and functioned. Gammon and Zeoli reported on the “Not Bought in Ohio” cooperative collection development program for books. Curl and Zeoli reported on the CONSORT Libraries’ cooperative collection development project, which is based on
a shared approval plan. They presented a list of lessons learned based on their experiences with its development and implementation.177 Rohe, O'Donovan, and Hanawalt described three PORTAL libraries' projects, the most extensive of which was an effort to expand access to titles listed in *Books for College Libraries* at the 12 participating academic libraries.178 Dole and Chang described the use of the OCLC/AMIGOS Collection Analysis System to compare the monographic holding of the State University of New York (SUNY) University Center libraries.179 Dwyer described the California State University libraries' cooperative buying program and the process by which electronic resources were identified and evaluated for the core collection.180 A number of collection assessments for cooperative projects employed strategies and frameworks adapted from the Conspectus, a tool developed in the 1980s by RLG to facilitate the identification of collection strengths and weaknesses with the ultimate goal of coordinating regional and national collection development. Cochenour and Rutstein reviewed the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries' (CARL) experience conducting overlap studies, documenting collecting levels, and creating collection management reports in order to create a cooperative collection development environment.181

Medina and Highfill documented the history and development of the Network of Alabama Academic Libraries and that network's use of collection assessment methodologies based on the RLG Conspectus.182 The Alaska multitype library collection assessment project, described by Stephens, employed a modified Conspectus framework that evolved into the WLN Conspectus.183

**Collection Evaluation and Assessment**

All vital academic libraries employ some methods of collection assessment, and since 1990, interest in these efforts has been intense. A number of very useful reviews of the large body of collection evaluation and assessment literature were published, as were evaluation and assessment guides and manuals aimed at the practitioner.184 Most of the accounts of collection evaluation and assessment published since 1990 reported on the process of conducting evaluations on the local level and their outcomes. These local studies often employed multiple methodologies, included both collection-based and user-based assessments, and were conducted to inform decisions about subscription renewals, cancellations, and storage.

The literature included fewer reports of collection managers' efforts to develop or improve collection evaluation and assessment methodologies.

**Local Holdings Studies**

Many of the local holdings studies were facilitated by access to the National/North American Title Count, the OCLC/Amigos Collection Analysis System, and recently by R. R. Bowker's Ulrich's Serials Analysis System (USAS). Practitioners analyzed and compared all holdings, or holdings in selected subject areas, as the basis of their local collection assessments. Dole used the OCLC/AMIGOS Collection Analysis System to compare monograph holdings of one ARL library with those of a peer group chosen by the university president and a peer group consisting of similarly ranked ARL libraries. Her analysis yielded information on overlap with these peer groups and identified collecting patterns that needed to be changed.185 Perrault and others conducted an evaluation of the monograph holdings at 28 community college libraries in Florida and found that the overall median age of their materials was 24 years. They also calculated the median age and provided a distribution analysis of date of publication by subject area.186 The researchers conducted a follow-up survey to assess the impact of their analysis.187 Paskoff and Perrault sampled the shelflist to profile the Louisiana State University library collection by age and language of publication, duplication, and subject distribution.188 Metz and Gasser used USAS to analyze serials subscriptions held by the members of the Virtual Library of Virginia and used their data to identify potential new publisher partners.189

Pancheshnikov compared the percentage of books and serials pertaining to agricultural sciences courses in the University of Saskatchewan Library with the percentage available in the National Agriculture Library.190 Webster assigned National Title Count Classification categories to history courses offered at the University of Central Arkansas and compared that library's holding in those categories with holdings of peer institutions. He then compared the results with student enrollment data in order to identify collection strengths and weaknesses.191

Dodd and Gyeszly compared the business collection shelflist count at Texas A&M University with ARL peer institution holdings to identify collection gaps.192 Grover used data from the National Shelflist Count to analyze Brigham Young University Library's foreign language and area
studies collections. He compared holding with five randomly selected libraries and with all participating libraries and then compared the circulation of these materials with that of the total collection.\textsuperscript{193} Ciliberti reported on the use of the OCLC/AMIGOS Collection Analysis System as part of a pilot methodology to assess special education and counseling monographs.\textsuperscript{194} Lotlikar employed list checking, along with circulation data, to assess the political science collection at Millersville University.\textsuperscript{195}

**Use**

Use studies employed a wide range of measures, including circulation, in-house use, interlibrary loan data, and vendor-supplied use statistics. Green used the slip method to record use of current journal issues and factored in the length of time each title had been available in order to develop a usage index for science and engineering journals.\textsuperscript{196} Chrzastowski and Olesko reported the results of three studies conducted between 1988 and 1996 at the University of Illinois in which use data were collected from shelving counts, interlibrary loan returns, and circulation returns.\textsuperscript{197} The sweep method was used by McBride and Behm to gather data for their year-long study of print and microfilm journal use. The results helped them identify titles for retention, storage, and cancellation.\textsuperscript{198} Dole and Chang reported on the journal use surveys and analyses conducted in the early 1990s at SUNY Stony Brook. The methods they used to measure collection demand included shelving counts, faculty rankings of journals to which the libraries subscribed, and analyses of titles cited by faculty and doctoral students.\textsuperscript{199} Ruppel analyzed monographs borrowed through interlibrary loan at the University of Southern Indiana Library and determined that the majority were indicators of subject needs, favorably reviewed, recent publications, and easy to obtain. She concluded that a buy-on-demand program would be appropriate.\textsuperscript{200}

Several other researchers incorporated faculty rankings or other measures of faculty evaluation into their use studies. Lent’s study of the women’s studies journal collection at the University of New Hampshire focused on faculty reading habits. Her analysis compared data from a faculty survey of journal titles they read and browsed with subscribed titles, titles included in databases heavily used by students, and interlibrary loan statistics.\textsuperscript{201} Bustion and Eltinge asked faculty at George Washington University to rank journals on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being essential to instruction and research and 5 being not related to the instruction and research program. The researchers compared rankings by department with price data and used these findings to identify titles for cancellation.\textsuperscript{202} At Louisiana State University Medical Center, Tucker surveyed faculty to identify the importance of subscribed titles to the department’s work. She used these data, along with use, cost, and impact factor to cancel subscriptions.\textsuperscript{203}

Knievel, Wicht, and Connaway analyzed the English language monograph collection at the University of Colorado at Boulder, using interlibrary loan and circulation in combination with holdings data. Their findings demonstrated the importance of combining different types of data for collection development decision making.\textsuperscript{204}

Ochola employed “percentage of expected use” and “ratio of borrowings to holdings” measures to analyze interlibrary loan and circulation data to evaluate the monograph collection at Baylor.\textsuperscript{205} Littman and Connaway compared the use of print and electronic versions of books in the libraries at Duke University and found that, although the patterns of use by subject were similar, the electronic versions were used 11% more than the print.\textsuperscript{206} Bailey found that between 2003 and 2004 the use of netLibrary books increased while the use of print materials decreased.\textsuperscript{207} Chrzastowski, Blobaum, and Welshmer studied the use of Beilstein’s *Handbuch der Organischen Chemie* at the University of Illinois and University of Delaware. Based on the low level of use they found and the title’s high subscription price, they concluded that it was cost-ineffective.\textsuperscript{208} Black analyzed the cost effectiveness of the College of St. Rose library’s journal collection in terms of price per use, expenditure per enrollment, enrollment per subscription, and journal use per enrollment.\textsuperscript{209} Samson, Derry, and Eggleston reported on efforts at the University of Montana-Missoula to review the networked resources collection using cost, subject coverage, and content overlap as well as usage data.\textsuperscript{210}

**Citation Analysis**

Practitioners used citations from theses and dissertations, student papers, faculty publications, and textbooks and other course materials to help assess the adequacy of their collections. Herubel compared serial citations in philosophy dissertations written at Purdue University with library holdings to determine the extent to which the library provided in-house support...
for dissertation research. Sylvia and Lesher used citations in psychology and counseling theses and dissertations, along with cost-per-use and shelving statistics, to evaluate the collection at St. Mary’s University in San Antonio. Smith conducted a longitudinal study of the usefulness of the University of Georgia Library collection to graduate students by analyzing dissertation and thesis citations and comparing cited works to works held by the libraries. Haycock investigated citations to monographs and journals included in 43 education dissertations written at the University of Minnesota and used the data to determine journal retentions and cancellations. She also calculated the serial-monograph citation ratio and compared it to ratios found by other researchers. In order to develop a rank-ordered list of serials, Waugh and Ruppel explored citations from dissertations and theses on workforce education and applied a weighting formula to reflect the frequency with which each title was cited across all of the source documents included in the study. Sylvia conducted an analysis of citations in graduate and undergraduate student psychology papers. Leiding analyzed the citations in advanced undergraduate research papers written at James Madison University in terms of material type, publication date, format, and discipline. She compared citations with library holdings to determine levels of local availability. Using undergraduate papers written at four institutions, St. Clair and Magrill analyzed citations by subject of paper, formats cited, numbers of citations, and publication date.

By and large, researchers who studied citations in faculty publications focused on science and, to a lesser extent, social science disciplines. Hughes used journal titles cited by molecular and cellular biologists at Pennsylvania State University, titles in which these faculty published, and Journal Citation Report data to create a core list of titles as part of a larger collection assessment project. Lascar and Mendelsohn examined citations in publications by structural biologists, along with anecdotal data on journal use from these faculty, and used the results to support a proposal for additional journal subscriptions. Crotteau reviewed citations in biology faculty publications and Journal Citation Reports to evaluate library support for these researchers. He then conducted a survey to determine how these faculty authors obtained cited titles not held in the library. Haas and Lee assessed the adequacy of the forestry journal collection at the University of Florida by studying titles faculty cited and the journals in which they published.

Lightman and Manilov used faculty citations to and in their publications, along with comparisons to standardized lists and availability at other libraries, to assess Northwestern's economics collection. Similarly, Dykeman investigated citations to monographs, periodicals, proceedings, other serials, technical reports, theses, and government documents included in publications authored by Georgia Institute of Technology faculty, and Schaffer examined citations in psychology faculty publications at Texas A&M University by material type, subject, date, availability as electronic full text, and source of electronic full text. Gao and Yu’s study of citations in publications by faculty in the departments of surveying and mapping at Wuhan University enabled them to identify collection strengths and gaps. Stelk and Lancaster evaluated the religious studies collection at the University of Illinois by checking the bibliographic references in the religious studies course textbooks. Rupp-Serrano based a needs assessment of social work students on materials cited in course syllabi.

Student Surveys
Prior to the introduction of LibQUAL+, which measures student expectations and perceptions about, among other things, collection adequacy, very few local collection evaluations included a student opinion component. Weaver administered a survey to undergraduate students in selected social sciences, humanities, and life science courses and conducted follow-up interviews with course instructors as a means of assessing the library’s local book collection. At Oakland University, Condic surveyed students about the types of materials they would purchase in a tight budget environment and their satisfaction with the library’s book and journal collection. At the University of Northern Colorado, Rathe and Blankenship gathered patron opinions about the importance and usefulness of the recreational reading collection.

Methodological Studies
The researchers conducting methodological studies tested the effectiveness, usefulness, and/or accuracy of collection evaluation methods. In some cases, their purpose was to better understand what they were measuring, and in others, it was to develop better evaluation tools.
Holdings
In an effort to develop a core list of titles for undergraduate libraries, Hardesty and Mak performed an overlap study of the holdings of 427 undergraduate libraries. The wide divergence they found in the titles owned led them to conclude that such a core list did not exist.215 Siverson developed a method of scaling standard bibliographies in order to introduce local collecting priorities into the interpretation of the results of the checklist collection evaluation method.212

Using the measures of existing collection strength specified in the Music Conspectus documents of 17 RLG libraries, McGrath and Nuzzo tested the hypotheses that “existing collection strength” can serve as a proxy for shelflist counts. After correlating 138 LC ranges across the libraries and within individual libraries, they concluded that the existing collection strength measure can be used as a proxy for shelflist within individual libraries but cannot be used to compare libraries.213 White developed “brief tests of collection strength,” a methodology for assigning or verifying Conspectus collection levels without conducting extensive holdings comparisons and analyses.214 Twiss conducted two “brief tests” on the Soviet history collections in five libraries and compared the results with the levels these libraries had assigned to their collections. His findings supported the validity of White’s methodology and illustrated the ease with which it could be applied.215 To identify the strengths and weaknesses of both evaluation methods, Benedetto Beals and Gilmour used the “brief test” method and OCLC’s WorldCat Analysis System to analyze the zoology collections in three academic libraries.216 In his study of the composition of WorldCat records, Bernstein provided evidence that the range of holdings for the Conspectus’ Research Level should be revised.217

Use
Britten and Webster identified characteristics of books that actively circulated to develop an assessment methodology that could serve as an alternative to costly, time-consuming use studies.218 Banks also studied relationships between several characteristics of books and circulation. She found shelf level to be the strongest determinant of circulation.219 Selth, Koller, and Briscoe studied the circulation and in-house use of books in a large research library and found evidence to contradict the results of previous studies in which the two types of use were highly correlated.220 In a test of widely held assumptions about how often students browse to identify useful library resources and about the need to develop just-in-case collections, Ridley and Weber found that student browsing was uncommon.241 Use of transaction log data to describe e-book use was explored by Connaway and Snyder. They identified unobservability and the ability to conduct both micro and macro analyses as advantages to this method, but identified the large quantity of data in these logs and other issues related to how they collect and store data as drawbacks to their use.242

A study of the use of current issues of journals by Sauer found that unused titles continue to receive little or no use after they are bound or replaced with microfilm.243 Naylor compared the results of a journal reshelving study and a self-reported use study conducted at the same research library and discovered that the reshelving method reported higher use.244

Although research on the meaning and validity of vendor-generated use statistics is still in its infancy, the literature includes a small body of methodological studies. Davis studied title use reported by HighWire Press and found that the user population could be estimated based on the number of downloads and that this relationship was consistent over time and across institutions.245 Culpepper compared the usage reports generated by three database vendors with locally produced usage reports and faculty assessments of the utility of specific databases in order to demonstrate the usefulness of the vendor reports.246 In response to concern over the lack of standardization of vendor-supplied use measures, Bauer developed two indexes, one to measure change in print usage and another to measure change in electronic resource usage based on statistics the library tracked in-house, rather than data obtained from publishers and vendors.247

Duy and Vaughan addressed the need for standardized vendor statistics by studying the relationship between locally collected usage data of electronic resources at North Carolina State University and the vendor-supplied usage data. Findings indicated that over the course of a year, the data collected by the libraries’ Web server logs and those provided by the vendors showed similar use patterns, but that the quantitative measures were not the same.248 In their study of vendor-supplied usage data for electronic journals, these authors found a statistically significant correlation between these data and print usage data for journals in chemistry,
between the types of vendor-supplied use statistics with those preferred by New Zealand academic collection development librarians. Their data support the need for customizable usage statistics.

**Citation Analysis**

Beile, Botte, and Killingsworth explored the validity of using doctoral dissertation citations to evaluate collections by comparing citations in dissertations written at three institutions in terms of their quality and availability in the home libraries. They found that the quality of the sources cited varied and that doctoral students tended to cite materials available to them. The researchers concluded that citations studies could be used to identify local use but advised caution when using them to assess collection adequacy. Zipp determined that theses and dissertation citations could serve as surrogates for faculty publication citations in evaluating research collections. Millson-Martula and Watson compared the effectiveness of determining undergraduate serial needs by using citations from student papers, reshelving and ILL data, and surveys and concluded that the citation method was the most effective indicator of met and unmet needs.

Nisonger demonstrated the bias inherent in averaging Impact Factor data from multiple years and proposed an adjusted Impact Factor as an alternative. He also addressed the question of whether the rate of self-citation affected journal rankings and concluded that it did not. Altman and Gorman studied the relationship between Impact Factor and journal use to determine if Impact Factor data could substitute for the more costly-to-collect use data. They concluded that it was not an effective predictor of use. Chung found that Impact Factors could not be used as substitutes for local citation scores and developed a method of combining these two scores to measure the cost-effectiveness of a journal collection. Working only with mathematics journals, Moline concluded that there was no relationship between price per character and Impact Factor. Dilevko and Atkinson developed a procedural model for determining the quality of journals without Impact Factors. Kreider correlated the global citation data from Journal Citation Reports with the Local Journal Utilization Report for the University of British Columbia and found that high global citation counts correlated with local citation counts but that this correlation became weaker as the number of counts decreased. Goldstein found that impact factors and ranking were correlated with, and therefore could predict, local use of chemistry journals in a small departmental library. Coleman calculated measures of journal affinity, association, and consumption factor for the *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* and contrasted these with the journal's Impact Factor in order to illustrate the limitations of the Impact Factor as a measure of journal value. An and Qiu found a statistically significant correlation between Journal Impact Factors and the Web Impact Factors of the journal Web sites for 42 Chinese engineering journals.

Lancaster and others explored the possibility of using the relationship between scatter and journal availability to evaluate collections in departmental libraries, the library system to which they belong, and an overarching library network. Calhoun developed a model of an academic library serial collection using titles included in several abstracting and indexing services and explored the correlation between journal subject category rank and union holdings rank in order to determine if the correlation could be extended to the arts and humanities literature.

**Conclusion**

The studies that exerted the most influence during the past decade and a half were those that documented the shrinking national and local collections. These were conducted early in the 1990s, and none of the later studies matched their impact. They quantified what collection managers intuitively knew was happening, and the jolt they gave to the profession affected immediate collection management practice and laid the foundation for the profession's interest in changing the scholarly communication process.

The most useful studies for collection manager's day-to-day work were those that provided data on collection growth, prices, and expenditures over time. These also contained some analyses, but they were primarily important as sources of reliable, comparable data that collection managers could use to advocate for new funding and plan for ubiquitous budget reductions. Studies that described the way collection management was carried out at other academic libraries were also valuable to practitioners. Since 1990, surveys and, to a lesser extent, other types of quantitative studies provided snapshots of how member libraries were organized.
for collection management, trained their bibliographers, selected their information resources, documented their collection practices, and allocated their acquisitions funds. Qualitative studies were also published that described how libraries managed their collections of electronic resources and participated in cooperative collection development. Unfortunately, the literature included far fewer studies that could help practitioners measure the effectiveness of these collection management processes.

Collection evaluation and assessment was arguably the most active collection management research category. Much of this research employed multiple methodologies or at least multiple methods of measuring the variables under study. Researchers conducted both user- and collection-centered evaluations. Collection evaluations and assessments were predominantly local efforts motivated by budgetary considerations, and most operationalized “collection value” as “use.” However, this category also included research on the evaluation methods themselves, the purpose of which was to improve assessment accuracy, the quantity and quality of data that could be collected, and/or the ease or efficiency with which evaluations could be conducted. As a group, these studies, along with those that addressed collection size and growth, constituted the best-designed and most methodologically sophisticated and interesting research.

The previous examples notwithstanding, overall the collection management research literature was limited in the breadth of methodologies and statistical analyses employed, as well as in the scope of problems addressed. It was predominantly survey- and case study–based and, with the exception of annual statistics on library operations and industry sales, most studies were conducted only once; the literature included few reports of follow-up or replication studies. The majority of researchers used only basic descriptive statistics to analyze their data. Many never fully explored the relationships among the variables in their studies, even when the data they would have needed to do so were presented in the results of the study. The research literature was also limited in scope in that most of it focused on collection management inputs and processes. Collection managers conducted most of their research in order to gather the information they needed to continue to function within a climate of unrelenting change. However, what they learned frequently had a short shelf-life. As Peter Hernon observed:

[With the pace of change so great, it can be difficult to produce research having long-term value—conceptually and practically. Change and managerial needs may outpace the ability of researchers to deliver insights useful to the future, let alone the present. In some instances, by the time that researchers have gathered and presented the data, a new culture with new needs and solutions may have emerged.]

In an environment in which colleges and universities are increasingly under pressure to demonstrate and quantify the value of the educational experience they offer, the agenda for future collection management research must focus on effectiveness, outcomes, and impact. At the very least, collection managers will need to move from describing the components of the collection management process to assessing process effectiveness, a task that will grow increasingly more complicated as new information resource formats, open-access content, and mass digitization projects alter the concept of the academic library collection. Beyond that, they will need to employ sophisticated research designs and data analysis to learn more about student and faculty information needs and preferences, and their use of the information resources available to them. Data from this type of research will more effectively inform collection managers’ day-to-day decision making and longer range planning and will enable them to contribute to library-wide efforts to identify outcomes and assess the impact of collections and services.
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