

Academic Books of the Future: An Initial Literature Review

Scope of this review

This is an early stage review of literature relevant to a study of possible futures for academic books in the arts and humanities. It does not claim to be comprehensive, and we plan to add to it during the course of the project. Indeed, we would welcome suggestions and comments on how it might be added to, amended and improved. In the meantime, we should draw attention to a number of gaps and limitations:

- i. The review is based to a large extent on searches primarily in the SCOPUS database, which focuses in the main on scholarly journals. The coverage of books and book chapters in SCOPUS is much less comprehensive, and reports and other grey literature are hardly covered at all.
- ii. Related to this, we have not attempted to cover the rich array of material in social media.
- iii. The search covered only literature in the English language, and hence it does not cover the many important issues relating to academic books in other languages, whether in Europe and Latin America, in Asia, or in the global south.
- iv. The review touches only tangentially on the rich range of literature relating to developments in the digital humanities, and in particular that relating to new techniques and forms in the production and dissemination of critical editions.
- v. Although variations between disciplines are a recurrent theme in the review, the review does not attempt systematically to examine the experiences and perceptions of different disciplines in relation to how they typically seek to present and disseminate research findings
- vi. Similarly, the review does not cover the extensive literature on the value of the arts and humanities, and within that, the part that books play in creating that value
- vii. Although the review lays some emphasis on the role that monographs play in enhancing the status of researchers, there is no systematic coverage of their role career progression for early career researchers, or of differences in the experiences of researchers in different disciplines, or between men and women.

We shall seek to address the most significant of these limitations in the early stages of this project, and also to add to the depth of our coverage on matters relating to the economics of publishing; and to address any other gaps to which readers may draw our attention.

The shape of the literature

This review covers a number of different bodies of literature, each with its own priorities, methods, assumptions, strengths and weaknesses. In order to keep a tight focus we have been relatively selective about the studies that are considered. The studies reported on range from large-scale surveys of academics to qualitative studies involving just a handful of subjects; and from individual case studies to large scale bibliometric analyses. They also vary in perspective: from studies conducted by librarians (which dominate the journal literature) to those conducted by publishers (much less common) or by members of the research community (where the perspectives of readers and authors may differ). It should also be noted that many studies lump together the humanities and social sciences (there is very little reference to the creative and performing arts); and many studies from a library perspective do not distinguish between monographs, critical editions and edited volumes of essays on the one hand, and text books and other learning resources on the other.

Surveys and qualitative studies

Some survey studies focus upon a particular discipline (Andersen, 2000), set of institutions (Tenopir et al, 2012; Estabrook & Warner, 2003), set of roles within an institution (Cronin and La Barre, 2004), members of an organisation (British Academy, 2005) or some other framework. Surveys often struggle to achieve high response rates and many studies focus on descriptive reporting of their findings; and many result in a ‘grey literature’ report instead of or in addition to articles in peer-reviewed journals. We have included such reports where we have identified them.

Qualitative studies into the behaviour of small groups of participants can provide in-depth insights, but there are obvious dangers in attempting to extrapolate from them to make general claims. Many such studies are bounded in some way by a specific discipline (Bulger et al, 2011; Rutner & Schonfeld, 2012), a department within an institution (Harley et al, 2010; Bulger et al, 2011; King et al, 2006), an institution itself (Buchanan et al, 2005), or a particular role or career stage (Estabrook & Warner, 2003).

Some of the studies we report on use a mixed-methods approach, combining interviews or focus groups with surveys in order to triangulate findings. Again, many of these studies are not published as peer-reviewed journal articles, but again we have included them within the review.

Bibliometric studies

Bibliometric and citation studies use as their raw data information drawn from databases, samples of research outputs, or other collections of published academic work, to understand networks of influence and reuse between scholars. The well-known problems with citation are magnified in the humanities. Standard citation databases such as Web of Science do not have good coverage of humanities outputs (Cullars, 1998, Engels et al, 2012; Nederhof et al, 2010); and Hicks (2004) adds that such databases rarely achieve good coverage of non-English-language outputs. Patterns of monograph citations are different from journal citation patterns routinely used as a basis for these studies (Lariviere et al 2006, Tang, 2008) and the reliance on old monographs as primary sources in certain humanities fields may affect the average age of citations (Thompson, 2002). In the creative arts, outputs such as novels, music performances do not include citations at all, meaning that the network of influence around them cannot be understood by looking at who they cite (Creaser et al, 2010). Andersen (2000) discusses the ‘obliteration by incorporation effect’ – that is to say, work that informs the cited work is not itself cited.

Other critiques relate more to the theory that underpins citation studies. As Fry et al (2009b) argue, bibliometrics tends to treat citation decisions as though they have a rational, empirical explanation; the reality is that a researcher’s decision to cite something can be influenced by a number of what they call ‘human decisions’ which cannot be captured in a simple numerical analysis. Larivière et al (2013) explore the large literature on why people make citation decisions, highlighting in particular that motivations can change throughout a researcher’s career). Hargens (2000) suggests citation context analysis as a methodology to understand the point that researchers are trying to make with a particular citation. Despite these limitations, citation studies provide a useful insight into how researchers use material within their disciplines, and they are therefore included within this review.

Theoretical studies and opinion pieces

A further set of literature might be considered as coming from a more humanities-based tradition of analysis. The approach is based upon argument or theory, with references to previous studies rather than to original data collected from surveys, interviews or bibliometric analysis. A final set of

literature might broadly be termed opinion pieces or personal reflections on trends in scholarly communications; these are often found in conference papers, editorials or professional journals. We have included relatively few of either of these types of study in our review

The roles of monographs

Communicating research findings to peers

Sharing knowledge with peers to build a scholarly literature is central to the purposes of researchers in writing and publishing monographs on the one hand and journal articles on the other. Harley et al (2010) find in relation to journal articles that scholars prefer a combination of high-impact publications in flagship publications with smaller, niche ones designed to target particular audiences. The appropriate outlet depends upon the audience for the content. Huang & Chang (2008) argue that researchers choose the language in which they publish their work in order to reach their target audience through the publication outlet where they think they will get most feedback from their peers. In their case studies, King et al (2006) found similar results for English-language literature researchers publishing books, who would choose a press that was well-known and respected in their particular sub-field, rather than one which might have the ‘glossiest’ appeal. There is overlap, here, between the drive to communicate with peers and the desire to achieve maximum credit and prestige for work; the two issues are closely connected.

Quality assurance and peer review appear in many studies. A number of interview-based case studies find peer review to be absolutely central to publication, and new forms of scholarship must be seen as undergoing rigorous peer review in order to be accepted (Bulger et al, 2011; Harley et al, 2010; King et al, 2006). But scholars also make frequent criticisms of the peer review process and of editorial power (Harley et al, 2010). And Engels et al (2012) mention, almost in passing, that when selecting a sample for their study of changing patterns in HSS publishing they struggled to identify peer-reviewed books because most publishers do not submit all of their books to peer review. More data on this would be helpful – it is possible that the authors are referring to edited volumes or books that are peer reviewed at different stages in the writing process. Overwhelmingly, researchers remain in favour of the *principle* of peer review, feeling that it helps them as authors to improve their work and as readers to select the most appropriate content – but the *practice* of peer review is not accepted as an unquestioned good and researchers have other, often discipline-specific, ways of identifying important information.

There are many other drivers to publish, beyond communicating with one’s peers, and some studies suggest that these may be in tension with the desire to build a scholarly literature and share research findings, particularly in relation to books. For example, Harley et al (2010) found some concern in their interviews with humanities researchers that the growing two-book requirement for tenure in US universities in history and classics might affect the quality of output – that researchers are writing in order to be promoted rather than because they have original ideas which deserve to be communicated. They also found that archaeologists have reservations about traditional publication outlets such as journals and monographs, which may restrict the amount of supplemental materials that are needed to communicate research findings effectively. Rutner and Schonfeld (2012), in a case study of US historians, find some researchers who would prefer to use digital methods to communicate their research outputs nonetheless publish a book because it is necessary for career advancement. King et al (2006) cite an English-language literature interviewee who considers the reliance on books to be ‘stultifying’ (p.23), preventing researchers from communicating in the format best suited to their material – for example, digital media or a series of journal articles.

Recognition and reward

Publications are core to many systems of recognition and reward in academia, especially in the US, where, for example Cronin & La Barre (2004) surveyed a number of language and literature departments and found academic excellence and a contribution to scholarship at the heart of many tenure and promotion guidelines. In a cross-disciplinary case study, Harley et al (2010) found that service and teaching count for little tenure and promotion decisions without an outstanding publication record. Although speaking at conferences and maintaining networks are important to career advancement, the publication aspect is in most cases non-negotiable (King et al, 2006; Harley et al, 2010). Nevertheless, formal guidelines often refer obliquely to the kinds of scholarship and publication that are expected in different disciplines, especially if they are generalised and not tailored to a specific department, which leaves those appointing with a measure of discretion (Cronin & La Barre, 2004).

High-level agreement on the importance of publications for career advancement, is thus accompanied by recognition that there are several factors which might influence what is considered to be a 'significant' publication. Disciplinary cultures play an important role (Fry et al, 2009b), but can vary significantly within a broad field: King et al (2006) in their interviews with anthropologists find that books are, in general, expected for promotion, but that anthropologists working from a more biological background feel that journal articles are as important. On the other hand Wulf (2008) expresses concern that in research evaluation, journal articles are now rated more highly than the books which have formed the foundation of anthropology as a discipline. She contends that the nature of anthropology with its field studies, qualitative issues and extensive ethnographic materials, means that the space of a monograph is needed in order to make a full argument; and that the shift to journal articles has brought a shift also to theory as distinct from the reporting of fieldwork. From the perspective of legal studies, Baetens et al (2014) note that while the production of a monograph used to be the key to joining the academic profession, a series of articles based on a PhD thesis are now the norm; and that the assumption is that academics lack the time to read books.

Cronin & La Barre (2004) find that both between and within institutions, expectations for language and literature departments vary and can be set out at a very local level, shared between several departments or captured in a single institution-wide handbook. Harley et al's interviews with researchers find an impression that 'second-tier' institutions have different performance standards for their researchers than the most competitive, and that this is to be welcomed, but that problems arise when teaching-focused institutions adopt the standards of research-focused ones.

The role of books, and specifically monographs, within tenure and promotion decisions is particularly marked in some areas. Estabrook & Warner's 2003 survey of university faculty in anthropology, history and English in CIC institutions found a strong emphasis on books among historians; 82.9% agreed that a book should be required for tenure. English faculty were less convinced, with 46.6% of respondents agreeing with the statement, and only a minority of anthropologists (17.9%) believed that a published book was a necessary precondition of tenure. The interviews with department chairs which accompanied this survey showed a clear expectation that faculty should have a book published or in-press before being considered for tenure. And this expectation seemed to have increased in recent years; 89.2% of faculty in these disciplines tenured since 2000 had published a book at the time of tenure, but only 64.2% of those tenured before 1980 (Estabrook & Warner, 2003). A later survey of modern language departments found that 88.9% of departments in Carnegie Doctorate-granting institutions ranked publication of a monograph as important or very important for tenure. There is a marked distinction between these top-ranking institutions and Masters and Baccalaureate universities, where 44.4% and 48.0% respectively find monographs important or very important; this rather

supports Harley et al's findings about the different expectations of different levels of institution (Stanton et al, 2007; Harley et al, 2010).

This expectation about books is not always formalised in universities' written statements about tenure and promotion: Cronin & La Barre's study found it was quite uncommon to see a book mentioned explicitly in the tenure and promotion criteria, although this might be because the department was using general university-wide rather than discipline-specific criteria. A handful of institutions attempted to draw some kind of equivalence between a certain number of journal articles and a book - the norm appears to be somewhere between 5 and 7, as distinct from the RAE and REF's 2:1 ratio (Cronin & La Barre, 2004). Similarly, King et al (2006) found that it is unusual to see a book explicitly mentioned in English language-literature contracts, but that an assumption exists nonetheless that one should have been written.

Other, less traditional, types of output were more problematic for tenure and promotion committees. Some humanistic disciplines are already used to judging non-textual output such as music or works of art (Harley et al, 2010). In general, however, studies seem to find that both individual and organisational assessment systems do not give enough weight to non-traditional outputs (Harley et al, 2010; Bulger et al, 2011). Part of the problem is the vicious cycle described by Harley et al: since no-one knows how to judge them, no-one puts them forward, and no-one ever learns how to judge them. Cronin & La Barre (2004) describe a resistance to change - even from print to digital versions of traditional outputs - among senior faculty. King et al (2006) found younger scholars reluctant to publish electronically because they feared it might prejudice their chances of tenure; and Stanton et al's 2007 survey of doctorate-awarding institutions found that 65.7% of English and foreign language departments had no experience of evaluating monographs in electronic format. Although Estabrook & Warner (2003) found that heads of department were beginning to consider outputs such as critical editions, memoirs and creative materials in promotion decisions, monographs remain a standard.

Engagement with the wider public

Public engagement and outreach have become increasingly important for all researchers, but evidence from the humanities is mixed. Huang & Chang (2008) cite a 1989 study which found that HSS departments in the Netherlands published a relatively large number of non-scholarly outputs - magazine articles or trade books - compared to their STM counterparts. A newer study by Kyvik (2003) looking at Norwegian faculty found that 64% of humanities and 60% of social science researchers had published what they termed a 'popular science' article, compared to 38-44% of researchers in STM disciplines.

This said, case studies by both Harley et al (2010) and Bulger et al (2011) find that researchers in many disciplines do not feel that non-academic audiences are interested in their research, though there are differences between disciplines and subjects here, with - for example - music theory perceived to be of less interest to the general public than, say, 20c history. Only archaeologists saw public engagement as important to the success of their research: in other disciplines interviewees highlighted the risk of being perceived as a 'public intellectual' (rather than a serious scholar) if publications that are primarily public-facing outweighed a strong scholarly record (Harley et al, 2010).

Thinking and writing in different formats

Some in-depth qualitative studies found that researchers consider the discipline of writing a book to be very important. Palmer and Neumann (2002, p.100) argue that 'the act of writing is formative', and ideas emerge and mature through the process of writing at length. King et al (2006, p.21) cite an English-language literature interviewee who says that 'the medium in which we, ourselves, construct our arguments is book-based'. Huang & Chang (2008,) argue that many researchers choose to publish

in their native language (where this is not English) because their ‘thinking may be deeply intertwined with their language expressions’, again indicating the close relationship between thinking and the writing process. On a more practical level, Rutner & Schonfeld (2012) find evidence of historians using potential chapters to organise their notes and sources before they begin to write the book, showing yet another way that research and writing are intertwined.

Interviewees in many of these studies were also concerned about the way that external pressures might affect the process of writing a book, and the development of intellectual ideas. Harley et al (2010) found some – though not universal – concern about the growing pressure for a two-book requirement for tenure in history and classics, leading young researchers to waste time on second books that are not, in fact, very good, rather than developing new ideas through a slower writing process. Looking at pressures from the other direction, Cronin & La Barre (2004) quote a director of graduate studies in Harvard’s English department who is concerned that commercial pressures might prevent young researchers from experiencing the training of writing a book, if they cannot subsequently get it published – although, as the authors note, if the benefit is in writing the book, perhaps it is not necessary to publish it in order to achieve the positive outcome.

There are of course variations between disciplines here, as well as relationships between different formats that are in principle available to researchers, and the value attached to them. Heath et al (2008) highlight some of the distinctive features of the arts and humanities; but much of the literature referring explicitly to authors in different disciplines focuses on issues relating to increasing specialisation, to the framing of what might become a book, and to the relationships between authors and publishers. From a radical digital humanities perspective, Reid (2011) investigates the intersection of mobile technologies and social media in the digital humanities including conference backchannels and networked research communities and argues that, even for those who continue to publish in traditional genres on traditional subjects, the ‘development of these digital assemblages are (sic) transforming compositional practices’. From a more traditional publisher’s perspective, Mason (2009) provides advice on how young scholars should approach academic publishers, on how to change a thesis into a publishable book, and on how publishers go about evaluating, contracting and producing books.

In relation to history, Herubel (2008) talks of a disciplinary environment where there is a drive towards more specialization and the use of periodization and discrete themes, and how this exerts pressure on the scholarly communications system as historians seek to disseminate their scholarship through channels that address their intellectual and historiographic orientations and preoccupations. Dalton (2008) surveyed over 1400 historians and found that the emphasis on the bottom line in university presses has had an impact on the topics historians have chosen to investigate. He also found, however, that there was no agreement on the kind of books that history needs, and that many historians would like to see more attention paid to what individuals who are interested in history but are not themselves scholars would like to read. Survey respondents also revealed a reluctance to publish in formats that are available only electronically; and that most of them were *not* finding it more difficult to get their books published than they did earlier in their careers.

Rigney (2010) argues that concepts of narrative in history writing have been changing over time, even as they have been implicitly modelled on monographs as the medium for telling stories. But the primacy of the stand-alone monograph can no longer be taken for granted, he argues, since digital media ‘provide a new theoretical model for viewing historical narrative in terms of its social production by multiple agents across different platforms. Logan (2013) nevertheless emphasises the importance of authors’ establishing conceptual boundaries as they develop book projects, and of

focusing on a clear central thesis with well-organised transitions to key subthemes that enrich the structure of a monograph.

One of the more important initiatives aimed at developing and legitimising new modes of historical scholarship has been Gutenberg-e, a digital publishing program sponsored by the American Historical Association (AHA), with support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Wittenberg (2009) found that it was successful in facilitating collaboration between authors and publishing staff to create new models of scholarship and writing; and in changing attitudes toward digital publications. But he noted that the time and costs involved in creating them exceeded expectations; and argued that continued experimentation was necessary to keep up with authors' growing expectations in publishing digital scholarship. Seaman et al (2012), is more negative, arguing that the initiative evolved, under pressure to become economically sustainable, into a traditional publishing enterprise bent on making books cheaper and paying for itself in the process. Instead of transforming scholarship, it became a means to shore up the existing system of scholarly publishing. Nevertheless, it produced a handful of innovative works of digital scholarship, experimented with new forms of scholarly collaboration, and highlighted opportunities for an expanded audience for specialized academic work. Despite his reservations, therefore, Seaman suggests that Gutenberg-e showed the potential of digital technology to create things which scholars value and thereby sustain the scholarly enterprise over the long term.

As a scholar in Victorian literature and culture, on the other hand, Stauffer (2011) argues that digital resources have developed outside the well-settled infrastructure that has supported the academic book. Digital scholarship is variable and dynamic, involving experimental platforms, emergent collaborations, competing standards, rapidly-evolving technologies, and unfamiliar genres. Because digital projects are more process than finished product (they are never done in the way a book is), they have tended to elude the reviewers in scholarly journals. As a result of this unsettled environment, digital scholarship still abides in the shadows of the printed monographs, articles, and editions by which we have long measured achievement in the field.

Saffle (2010) reflects from a musicological perspective on the new opportunities for self-publishing, locating them in the long history of self-publishing from the 17th century onwards.

Monographs alongside other channels of communication

It is a commonplace that researchers in the humanities tend to regard monographs as the predominant, most important, formal published outlet for their work (Creaser et al, 2010; Fry et al, 2009a; Huang & Chang, 2008; Engels et al, 2012). Books are seen as giving an opportunity to develop ideas fully, in a way which is not possible, for example, through a series of journal articles (Cronin & La Barre, 2004). In Estabrook & Warner's study, 46.8% of humanities researchers felt that a book was needed in order fully to develop their argument and ideas; a further 25.4% felt that while their work could be published as a series of articles, they would rather present it in a single book. Again, disciplinary differences are evident here: 65.6% of historians felt that their ideas needed a book, compared to 38.7% of English researchers and 30.5% of anthropologists (Estabrook & Warner, 2003). Becher & Trowler (2001) make a close link between the nature of an academic's research and their preferred output type, describing researchers as either 'urban' – focused on a narrow area of study – or 'rural' – ranging across a number of themes or topics – with the former more likely to publish journal articles and the latter more likely to publish books.

Which publisher?

Once the medium of publication is decided, researchers must choose where to place their book or article. Prestige is important here, and university presses seem to be considered the most prestigious outlets for humanities books according to two US-based case studies (King et al, 2006; Thompson,

2002). However, other, very practical, factors may also come into play when deciding where to publish. For example, Harley et al find that permissions to reproduce content can be very expensive in subjects such as music, history or art history, and that subventions do not always cover costs. Estabrook & Warner (2003) find that 24.5% of faculty surveyed have been asked for a subvention for one or more of their books, and that in 90% of cases the cost was more than \$1000. A focus group within the same study identified a concern that large subventions may begin to look like paying to publish, and an impression that books with lots of pictures are best published with European presses.

Other channels and forms of output

Researchers may have other types of output that they wish to share formally. Fry et al (2009a) find that more than half of humanists consider datasets to be 'not applicable' as a research output; Harley et al (2010) find that many archaeologists expect that data to be shared as a public-good 'commons'. On the whole, however, most disciplines do not seem to expect that data will be shared as a matter of course, possibly reflecting difficulties in defining what 'data' might be in some disciplines.

Other types of published output may be more field-specific. For example, Oppenheim & Summers (2008) found that only 38% of outputs from music researchers for the 2003 RAE exercise were written research, while 52% were practice-based research and 12% fell within the catch-all 'other' category. In the 2008 RAE, the written outputs rose to 49% of the total, perhaps indicating an increased conservatism on the part of researchers at least in what they choose to submit to the panels, if not what they are actually publishing.

Of course, most scholars do not restrict communication with their peers to formal publications, and there are a number of more informal channels that they may use to test and share early-stage ideas. Conferences are perhaps the most common of these. Compared to other disciplines, researchers in the humanities are least likely to see conference presentations or posters as a very important research output, followed by social scientists (Fry et al, 2009a). It is interesting that conferences are rated highly, in other studies, as a way for researchers to develop and maintain the networks which will help them to achieve career advancement (King et al, 2006; Harley et al, 2010). Harley et al (2010) find in their case studies that conference proceedings allow humanists to disseminate early findings, something which may be particularly important in fields with 'long lags to monograph publication' (p22). King et al (2006) observe some English-language literature researchers beginning to use listservs and emails as a replacement or addition to in-person conversations at conferences, as a way of sharing early ideas. Bulger et al (2011) find similar behaviour among philosophers, who use the PhilPapers website to share their work in progress. However, formal archival publication remains very important, and pre-publication repositories have in no way replaced traditional journals (Harley et al, 2010; King et al, 2006; Bulger et al, 2011).

Reading books and other sources for research

Researchers in the humanities build their research upon a very broad range of resources. One study describes humanities researchers as dealing with a 'complexity deluge, dealing with a multiplicity of types of information, much of it highly dispersed, difficult to find and complex to use' (Anderson et al, 2010, p.3781). While humanities researchers may have their own 'core' collection of resources – primary sources, archives, secondary texts – this is supplemented by additional information as a project progresses (Palmer & Neumann, 2002).

The interdisciplinary nature of much research in the humanities can make it particularly difficult to identify a 'core' literature in many research areas (Palmer & Neumann, 2002; Hicks, 2004). A 1987 survey of inter-library loan requests by humanities researchers over a two-year period found that more

than 50% of scholars had asked for material from five discrete areas of knowledge – general, humanities, history, social science and science (Watson-Boone, 1994).

Citation studies

It is clear, however, that in most humanities disciplines books play an important role in scholars' research. A 1985 citation study found that researchers in numerous humanities disciplines prefer to cite books over journals (Watson-Boone, 1994). A more recent citation study, looking at outputs submitted to the UK's RAE exercises in 2003 and 2008, finds that humanities researchers cite the most books, on average, with fewer citations from social studies, and very few from STM (Creaser et al, 2010). Tang (2008) cites a number of studies which show that books are more heavily cited in humanities and, to a lesser extent, social sciences, compared to STM disciplines. He also found in an analysis of 750 randomly selected monographs in a range of HSS and STM disciplines that non-citation rates are much lower than for journal articles; and that the citation half-life of scientific monographs was *higher* than that for HSS. Yates et al (2007), however, found that in communications studies, both the percentage of references to monographs and the average number of monograph references per article fell between 1995 and 2005, and that the most frequently referenced monographs were those published in the previous 10-20 years. We have not found any similar studies of other subjects/disciplines.

There is some evidence to suggest that 'the journal and the book literature form different worlds' – although they overlap, they each retain a distinct identity (Hicks, 2004, p.7). Authors who write books, cite books; the same is true for journal articles (Tang, 2008). Creaser et al (2010) found within their sample of outputs submitted to the RAEs in 2003 and 2008, 64% of citations in books were to books, compared to 27% of citations in books which were to journal articles. Cronin et al (1997) find, in sociology, that there are two distinct populations of highly-cited authors, one for journals and a second for books. This may link into other research which finds that books are more likely than journal articles to cite primary sources: in nineteenth-century American/British literary studies, 47.8% of citations in monographs were to primary sources, while only 32.5% of citations in journals were to primary work. Since primary sources are often themselves monographs, this might explain at least part of the separation (Thompson, 2002).

One of the effects of online availability of journal back files was studied by Smyth (2011), who found that student dissertations in history, psychology and education were making greater use of those backfiles than previously. He shows significant differences between the three disciplines, but speculates that the trend towards the greater use of journal backfiles may drive students towards monographs with a greater range of publication years.

Following the introduction of Thomson-Reuters' book Citation Index in 2011, Leydesdorff et al (2012) found that book chapters in edited volumes could be highly-cited; but that while books contain many citing references, they are relatively less cited than journal articles, perhaps because of their slower circulation. They also suggest that it is possible to distinguish bibliometrically between monographs and edited volumes; and that monographs may be underrated in terms of citation impact or overrated using publication performance indicators because individual chapters are counted separately. Great care is therefore needed in analysing and interpreting the data from the BKCI. Torres-Salinas et al (2014) also analyse the limitations of the BKCI, and point out that differences in citation scores are high in STM, but much less so in the humanities. They also note that books from university presses (which seem to comprise only a small part of the index) have much higher scores than those from commercial presses.

Thelwall et al (2014) find another interesting difference between citation scores for monographs and journal articles. For the scores for single-author monographs are much higher than for multi-author ones, which is of course the opposite of what occurs with journal articles (at least in STM; we have not found any studies of the difference between singly and multiple author citation scores for journal articles in HSS).

Gorraiz et al (2014) show the perhaps not-surprising result that book reviews enhance citation scores: books that are reviewed do not remain uncited, and accrue very high mean numbers of citations. Whether this is the result of the reviews themselves, or simply confirms the judgements of journal and other editors in selecting books to be reviewed is not clear.

Given the limitations of citation scores as a means of evaluation, some commentators have suggested other means of assessing the quality and impact of scholarly books. Gimenez-Toledo et al (2009 and 2013) have identified, following surveys of Spanish academics, key indicators of the quality of publishers that can be used as an indicator of the quality of books produced by researchers¹. Snijder (2013) takes a different tack, based on a finding that almost 45% of the usage of e-monographs comes from non-academics. He suggests that measures of usage could be a useful addition to the existing tools to measure the scholarly and social impact of books in the humanities and social sciences.

Researchers as readers of books and other material

Given the known limitations of citation studies, it is interesting that surveys of researchers as readers – asking about their behaviour, rather than extrapolating from their citation patterns – found similar patterns. Tenopir et al's study found that humanities researchers read, on average, 20.50 books or book chapters per month. The equivalent figure for social scientists is 9.02 – lower, but more than the next-highest discipline, engineering/technology, at 5.27 books or book chapters per month. Interestingly, there appears to be a correlation between book reading and age – the older you are, the more books you are likely to read per month (Tenopir et al, 2012). Survey evidence also suggests that humanists see books as more important than social scientists: 90% of humanities respondents to a recent survey said monographs or edited volumes are 'very important' to their research activity, compared to 60% of social scientists. They are also more likely to assign monographs or chapters to their students (Housewright et al, 2012).

Humanities researchers also make significant use of relatively old content, compared to other disciplines. Tenopir et al (2012) find that around half of the 'last articles read' in the critical incident component of their survey were more than 6.5 years old; a quarter were more than 15 years old. Hargens (2000) finds distinctive patterns of usage in humanities, social sciences and STM disciplines in relation to the age of the work cited, and shows that research in the two social science disciplines of the total seven considered in his study are particularly reliant on 'foundational' (i.e. older) work. Thompson (2002) concludes that humanists use material from a broad age spectrum, rather than simply using old material.

New technologies

Much research in this area has focused upon humanists and their ongoing fondness for print. Ithaka (2006) identify that researchers across all disciplines believe that they will be more dependent on electronic resources in the future than they are now, but that humanists believe this to a lesser extent. The same study found that humanists were least comfortable transitioning to e-only journal collections, and that they had a particularly strong preference for at least some libraries maintaining print collections for safety (although this preference was noticeable across all disciplines: this finding

¹ Metz et al made a similar suggestion from a US perspective in 2007.

was confirmed in a repetition of the survey in 2012 (Housewright et al, 2012). Bulger et al (2011) also find that humanities researchers are not ready to move away from print collections and manuscripts, but that they are prepared to use digital resources for their work.

Indeed, it would be unfair to classify humanities researchers as wilful Luddites, and several studies find interesting hybrid use of print and digital material. Just over a decade ago Schreibman (2002) suggested that the ‘underlying philosophy of texts and textuality’ of many computing projects in the humanities, instantiated in the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) was a mark-up system intended for representing already-existing texts. The result was that many such projects were conceived as producing digital resources (‘libraries’) rather than monographs. The hope was that as technologies developed, other theories might be adapted to serve as a basis for conceiving research outputs more akin to e-monographs than digital libraries.

Things have moved on since then, although we are as yet far from realising the vision set out by Darnton (2007), who suggested that ‘sooner or later, most monographs will probably have to be published on the Internet’ and that the preferred format might be, as for his study of the French book trade in the late 18th century, for them to be presented in discrete chunks (chapters?). Nevertheless, Bulger et al (2011) find that researchers will move between print and digital versions of the same text, using whichever is more appropriate to their research needs. The British Academy (2005) found a similar result in a survey of HSS researchers: they asked, in a situation where print and electronic versions of content are available, which one respondents would prefer to use. 34% preferred electronic and 38% preferred print, but 28% said that they would use either, depending upon the reason for use. Similarly, Housewright et al (2012) found that researchers felt certain types of book use, such as searching for a topic or exploring references, were easier in digital formats, whereas others – reading in depth, for example, are easier in print (these findings aggregated responses from researchers across all disciplines). By extension, it is perhaps unsurprising that several studies find humanities researchers unwilling to adopt new technology simply for novelty’s sake: they will only do so if it is useful. Watson-Boone drew this out as a key finding of her 1994 study; Bulger et al identified the same behaviour in 2011. Researchers are more likely to adopt new technologies if they fit with existing research patterns and behaviours (Palmer & Neumann, 2002; Collins et al, 2012).

There are of course other drivers that may affect researchers’ uptake of digital resources. Bulger et al (2011) find that humanities scholars are easily deterred from using digital resources if they are not intuitive. Rutner & Schonfeld (2012) find some evidence among historians that those with tenure felt more comfortable experimenting with digital methods or outputs. The British Academy (2005) found several issues to do with supply and availability which may limit uptake of digital resources. At the time of writing, organisations responsible for supplying resources (they give examples of the British Library, the National Archives, museums and university libraries) were aware of the need to engage with e-resources but making only ‘modest attempts to grapple with the problems involved’ (p.36). Moreover, digital products presenting themselves as secure long-term storage solutions ‘appear and then disappear with unpleasant rapidity’ (p.6); a particular problem for researchers who are heavily reliant upon historic or old materials for their work. Though this study is relatively old, considering the rapid pace of developments in the digital environment, more recent studies suggest the problems are not entirely solved – for example, Bulger et al (2011) highlight the problem of partial digitisation and non-availability of primary resources, while Housewright et al (2012) find a continued reluctance on the part of humanities researchers to rely exclusively upon digital resources for long-term availability and access; there is a particular antipathy to relying exclusively upon electronic versions of books.

The research process

New technologies affect the research process at all stages from resource discovery onwards. Citing research from 1986, Watson-Boone (1994) suggests that only 3.5% of humanities researchers had used the library's online catalogue, while work in 1990 found that humanities faculty preferred card catalogues or citations to source information over computerised databases. By 2005, however, the British Academy survey found that 47% of researchers used Google and other services to identify resources for their research. In 2006, Ithaka found that humanities researchers tend to begin their searches using the online library catalogue; and when the study was repeated in 2012, Housewright et al found that arts and humanities researchers (like those in other disciplines) are most likely to begin their research with a general purpose internet search engine, followed by a specific electronic resource. Search typically implies using keywords rather than browsing through collections (Watson-Boone, 1994; Bulger et al, 2011) and some researchers miss the serendipity which was more common when scanning library shelves, particularly in history (Harley et al, 2010). Other studies have identified the important role of search engines in helping researchers to identify primary resources they may want to use (Rutner & Schonfeld, 2012).

Once they have identified relevant resources, researchers then have to decide whether to access them in print or electronic format. Availability (as distinct from accessibility, which will be discussed later) plays an important role. Many studies identify researchers' concerns that the content they need is not available to them in electronic format. Selective digitisation occurred as a concern for historians in Harley et al's study (2010), while Bulger et al (2011) identified a similar concern among musicologists. In another study, humanities researchers felt that online systems did not hold enough old content (Palmer & Neumann, 2002). Electronic availability may be a particular problem for books: 78.2% of respondents to the British Academy survey said that the books they need are not available to them in e-format (British Academy, 2005). But new technologies may also be improving the availability of certain types of research material – for example, original sources located in overseas archives which are now much easier for researchers to reach (British Academy, 2005; Bulger et al, 2011; King et al, 2006) or images from national institutions (Ithaka, 2006). And Rutner & Schonfeld (2012) find widespread use of digital cameras among historians who want to create their own copies of archival materials.

Other issues affect a researcher's decision about whether to use print or electronic versions of the resources they need. Studies identify a strong feeling among researchers that electronic versions are not yet simple replacements for print versions of the same work. Such findings typically relate to primary sources where, for example, Bulger et al (2011) discuss the importance for researchers working in music of markings on original manuscripts. In some cases, the preference for print can be less about utility and more about field-specific norms: one musicologist reports 'I do feel pressure to work more with originals than with the digital images because of the traditions of the field' (Bulger et al, 2010, p.34). Palmer & Neumann (2002) have similar findings.

But there is also a strong preference for print for secondary works, including print books (Tenopir et al, 2012), although again this seems to vary by discipline: Houghton et al (2004) cite research showing that 66% of law and 56% of business researchers used e-resources for research most or all of the time: only 37% of social scientists and 25% of humanities researchers said this. Several studies note an interesting 'hybrid' approach to print and electronic resources, selecting the most appropriate format for the purpose of use. For example, both Bulger et al (2011) and Rutner & Schonfeld (2012) find humanities scholars who use Google Books to discover or skim the content of books they either already own or are thinking about buying. Bulger et al (2011) also found that many researchers cite the print version of a book even if they have used (partially or primarily) the electronic version. This

probably reflects standard behaviour in the field, but it also suggests that citations studies are likely to underreport the usage of electronic resources: this may explain why Thompson (2002) found very low citations to digital media in her study of monographs and periodicals in nineteenth-century British and American literary studies.

Access to electronic resources is by no means guaranteed. Even where content has been digitised, the British Academy (2005) survey found that potential users may be limited by not having a subscription, only being able to access electronic resources when onsite at the library or even not understanding how to use the services providing access. Researchers in smaller institutions or with no institutional affiliation were most likely to experience these challenges. On the other hand, Ellison (2007) argues that the internet has increased the ability of authors to reach their readers outside the confines of top peer-reviewed journals, while some interviewees in King et al's (2006) study noted that their work is accessed far more often through copies placed on their personal websites than through the formal publisher channels.

Once researchers have found the content that they want to use, most of them store and organise it in highly-individual ways, often relating to projects that they are currently working on. This is a well-developed habit for print resources (Watson-Boone, 1994). Researchers working with electronic resources often maintain these practices, creating mini-databases using software like Excel to record and store useful information that they need (Bulger et al, 2011; Rutner & Schonfeld, 2012). These studies do not, however, uncover evidence of researchers using new electronic tools specifically designed to store and track research outputs in an online environment: rather, they use standard software and files stored locally on their machines or external memory drives.

There is a consensus that new technologies have accelerated and improved the research process. The British Academy (2005) survey found that 68% of respondents felt their research had changed as a result of working with e-resources, in terms of accelerating discovery, making it easier to locate and access material, working more rapidly with data and communicating more effectively with colleagues – but these changes were more likely to be identified by older than younger respondents. The authors suggest that young researchers have developed their working practices in a digital environment and therefore see the opportunities offered by new technologies as less of a change. King et al (2006) observed similar reactions from English-language and literature researchers: new technologies make resource discovery and use easier, and democratise research with open list-servs which permit anyone to join and participate. Harley et al (2010) have similar findings across the they consider, as do Bulger et al (2011). Houghton et al (2004) suggest that new technologies support collaborative research, but mostly in fields where collaboration is already common; Collins et al (2012) draw similar conclusions.

Many of these studies also consider whether new technologies have fundamentally changed research methodologies and research questions; but there is no strong consensus. Studies traditional humanities fields tend to find that researchers believe new technologies have not changed their fundamental work: the 'careful analytical research process' as one study put it (Harley et al, 2010, p18). The British Academy (2005) study found that 65% of respondents either disagreed with or did not respond to the proposition that e-resources are sufficiently different to offer new research possibilities. Similarly, Bulger et al found that most of their case study researchers felt that new technologies made it possible to answer long-existing research questions that would previously have been impracticable, but did not suggest new questions. However, studies targeted on researchers using more advanced technologies, such as digital humanists, found more evidence of changing research questions, particularly when researchers work in partnership with tech developers. Anderson et al (2010) talk about the 'mutual shaping' of e-research structures that occurs in these situations, offering new

perspectives on established research questions (Anderson et al, 2010, p.3781). Bulger et al (2011), considering the development of a specific digital humanities resource, identify the collaboration between humanities researchers and tech developers as an important opportunity to drive forward not just technical possibilities but also underlying theoretical approaches. So it seems that this kind of development is possible but not, as yet, especially widespread in the humanities.

Research outputs

Some researchers want to explore how new technologies can support communication of their research findings. As was noted earlier, perceptions of peers and particularly hiring and promotion committees are critically important for researchers thinking about exploring new ways of communicating research outputs. Harley et al (2010) find that established scholars have more flexibility in experimenting with new ways of communicating outputs: by contrast, untenured scholars are unwilling to present non-traditional publications as part of their tenure packages as review committees often do not know how to evaluate them. They also found that researchers working in newer or less-established departments are more willing to take risks with formats of scholarly outputs; this is often a conscious decision to help carve out a niche identity and is supported by their employing university. King et al (2006), in their work with English-language literature scholars found similar results; with a strong emphasis on the importance of legitimation from the field itself for new formats of research output. Interviewees felt that change would not be achieved by administrators writing new forms of publication into tenure and promotion guidance; it would only come from a bottom-up movement from within the field itself. Estabrook and Warner (2003) concur, finding that the number one concern about e-publishing among faculty is that it will not be rated as highly as print by promotion and tenure committees. Fry et al (2009b) find that tradition means that the monograph remains dominant in the humanities, even though other outlets might do a better job of communicating research findings.

If any such bottom-up movement within the field is to occur, peer review is certain to remain at the heart of it. Harley et al (2010) suggest that experiments in communication are occurring in every field in their study, but that they are 'taking place within the context of relatively conservative value and reward systems that have the practice of peer review at their core' (p.13). Blogs, for example, are often rejected as a waste of time because they are not peer reviewed, although they may be used to identify developments in the field. King et al (2006) found a perception that electronic-only publication means no peer review; even those who understand that this is not the case are concerned that their colleagues, reviewing job or funding applications, may not. However, the anthropologists in their study suggested that online-only journals may struggle, not because they are online-only, but because they are new; in general, new journals without a reputation struggle to establish themselves, regardless of publication format. King et al record that English-language literature academics suggested peer review may need to evolve for e-resources by including some measure of persistence and stability for long-term availability. This ties into concerns about the technical integrity and long-term preservation of research outputs made available in electronic format (British Academy, 2006).

Studies identified researchers who are already experimenting with new types of output, but the definitions of 'new' were perhaps rather broad. The British Academy (2005) survey found that 51% of respondents were e-resource creators, although this includes contributions to journals with an online presence, and putting papers on a departmental or other website as well as e-books and other more innovative forms of resource. Other studies also found a surprisingly narrow understanding of new technologies. Although the British Academy (2005) study suggests that electronic workflows can speed up the creation and sharing of information, the general perception was very much around digital content which is more like a reproduction of a print book than to a new type of digital discourse. Harley et al (2010) probably came closest to this kind of change, identifying innovators in

book-based fields who used hyperlinks, graphics, video and audio in their work to enhance content, but even these might be considered quite limited. As noted earlier, Rigney(2010) in history and Stauffer (2011) in Victorian studies identify the scope for new models for creating, presenting and disseminating scholarly work; but also the constraints presented by deeply-entrenched cultural norms, and a paucity of support from institutions or publishers.

In what they claim as the first in-depth study of the role, value and future of the monograph, Williams et al (2009) found, based on interviews with seventeen arts and humanities academics at UCL, that monographs were seen as essential for career progression. Indeed, monographs were so entrenched in disciplinary cultures that it was hard to see much change, at least in the short term. Monographs are seen as critically important because they allow for the development and formulation of complex arguments and prolonged sets of ideas. Their special value thus lies in their length, complexity and multi-faceted nature. While stressing the importance of guarantees of permanence, Williams and his colleagues nevertheless also foresaw a future that might encompass, among other things, the publication of more 'less-scholarly' monographs, the rise of more small presses, more books based on interdisciplinary and collaborative work; and a variety of e-formats.

While studies such as this provide useful pointers, it is important that they should be followed up with more studies in other institutions and countries, and repeated as technologies and affordances develop. As Ward et al (2009) stress from the disciplinary context of geography, it is important not to generalise simply from UK or US experience. Structural changes in the global publishing industry affect the writing and publishing of research monographs in varying ways in different countries, not least because of differences in how academic performance is assessed.

Library perspectives

The digital revolution has brought with it substantial changes in the roles that academic libraries play within their institutions, and a shift from being simply a physical space to a combined physical and digital space. Most university libraries now run repositories as one means of delivering digital content to their users. Libraries remain heavily used, by students in particular. But as libraries seek to adapt to behaviours and expectations of their users, they have in recent years begun to explore the development of new services, including data curation and, in the US in particular, direct involvement in the publication of works produced by members of staff in their host institutions.

Since libraries are such an important part of the market for academic books, it is important to consider how their activities, and changes in them, might influence possible futures for such books. Much of the literature in the public domain relating to the roles of libraries in relation to books emanates from the US, where librarians who are either tenured or on a tenure track are obliged to sustain a publication record. Key themes in the literature relate to collection development, acquisition processes and policies; administrative and life-cycle costs; studies of usage; and in the last decade in particular, the shift towards e-books. The boundaries between these themes are, of course, porous. It is also important to stress that most of this literature does not distinguish between different kinds of books: while it may be assumed that the experiences of both libraries and users differ markedly in relation to text books and course readers, monographs and edited collections, critical editions, reference works and so on, the literature provides very little information on those differences.

Collection development: acquisition policies and practices

The literature on acquisition policies and practices, and on collection development, is extensive; much of it focuses on the selection and management of collection content, with a relatively small sub-set focusing on the management of funds within the context of overall library budgets. Crofts et al examined in 1999 the relationships between circulation, expenditure and student enrolment in

different disciplines, and build a model for allocating funding to each subject/discipline so that it 'realistically reflects subject demand' (Crotts 1999). Clendenning et al (2005) outline the processes that collection managers use to meet expenditure targets without overspending, while van Duinkerken et al (2008) describe a new funding structure and process that better reflects the needs and goals of the Texas A&M library and its users. Holley et al (2005) examine the online services for the sale and purchase of out-of-print books pointing out that such services have effectively blurred the distinction between in-print and out-of-print material; that out-of-print material is less expensive than in-print; that retrospective buying projects are feasible; and that purchase may be a reasonable alternative to inter-library loan (ILL).

Most libraries purchase books from aggregators rather than direct from publishers, and many of them use approval plans, especially for printed books. Jacoby (2008) found a slight decline in the number of books acquired through such plans, but a correlation between the size of the book budget and the likelihood that a US library would make use of approval plans. Brantley (2010), on the other hand, asserts on the basis of a study of 21 members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) that approval plans are inadequate for collecting from small publishers, or from scholarship that crosses disciplinary boundaries; and that 'the need for expert selection cannot be overstated'. Lawson et al (2012) also address the issue of collection development in interdisciplinary areas, and find that librarians lack formal support mechanisms for this, and tend to rely on external resources to help identify interdisciplinary materials; tools for in-depth searches of publishers' catalogues would help librarians in this work.

It is a commonplace in the literature that library budgets for the purchase of monographs has been, and is increasingly, constrained by the rising amounts and costs of STM journals, and the priority given to them over HSS monographs (see, for instance, Adema et al 2010). Between 1986 and 2003, the median expenditure of ARL libraries in North America on monographs rose in cash terms by 66%, as compared with 260% for serials; and the median number of monographs purchased was static, at 32.6k, while the median number of serial titles rose by 14%, from 15.9 to 18.1k.

In that context, a key development over the past few years has been the growing popularity, again especially in the US, of 'patron-driven acquisition' (PDA) as a model for collection development. It is often associated with e-books and e-journals, with programmes introduced by NetLibrary, Ingram, Digital EBL and others; but in fact it has a longer history associated with printed books. Swords (2011) provides a history of PDA as well as some analysis and guides to good practice, while Tyler et al (2010) assess the results of a programme initiated at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries in 2005 through the ILL department, examining costs against rates of circulation, and other measures. Proponents of PDA promote it as a way to ensure that libraries meet user demands for new titles and to avoid the long-standing problems of books purchased but not used, and books wanted but not purchased. De Fino et al (2011) point out PDA requires significant changes to library technical services and workflows; and Polanka (2009) gives a short account of the implications for a small university. Anderson (2011) provides a useful guide to what PDA does and does not mean.

McLure et al (2012) report that PDA had by 2012 become the 'primary mechanism used to provide [Colorado State University's] academic user community with book access'; but that as the system was introduced, e-books made accessible via this model 'received more use through browsing than sustained use or download, but relatively little use overall'. Nixon et al (2011) give accounts of PDA for printed books at three large research-intensive US universities, and explore new PDA programs for e-books.

Administrative and life-cycle costs

The costs of purchasing, cataloguing, processing, issuing, curating and preserving books have long been a concern for librarians, particularly in a context where significant proportions of the books they purchase are never circulated (gathering data on 'usage' of physical books on open shelves, of course, is in most circumstances impossible). One option has been to contract out some or all of this work; and the need for cataloguing at local level has long questioned in a context where services such as OCLC's WorldCat, as well as suppliers such as Dawson and Coutts, can provide high-quality catalogue records.

Slight-Gibney (1999) examined whether it would be cost-effective to outsource the cataloguing and final processing work, but found that cost alone would not be sufficient reason to do so, or to purchase shelf-ready books. Lawrence et al (2001) developed a methodology, based on data from ARL libraries, to determine the life-cycle costs of acquiring and maintaining books. They found that these costs far outweighed the purchase price of the books, and argued that the cost structure of a research library is largely driven by its monograph collection. Nevertheless, purchase costs are clearly important, and the rise in monograph prices is frequently mentioned in the literature, but seldom studied. Barnes et al (2005) report on a session at the 2004 Charleston conference at which librarians, publishers and vendors discussed how they might make practical compromises on costs and pricing in order to ensure the ongoing viability of monograph publishing. And in one discipline, music, there has been a regular series of analyses of the costs of monographs and scores reflected in the *Notes, The Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association* (Short 2002, Hicker 2007, Baunach 2013). They show that average prices have fluctuated between \$30 and \$58, between 1996 and 2012, with variations between country and language of publication (English language being the most expensive, followed by German). The average for all publications in 2012 was \$51.50.

Fowler et al (2003) anticipated cost reductions in administrative and professional costs as libraries adopted new technologies, but found that new initiatives were added to work processes, and service enhancements meant that costs had actually risen in their library (Iowa State University). Attitudes towards purchasing 'shelf-ready' books have changed in recent years, in the face of budgetary constraints in libraries; Roker and Williams (2011) have described how a small university in the UK (Buckinghamshire New University) has responded to staff cuts by moving to a system of purchasing shelf-ready books through a 'quotes ordering' system with a major supplier.

Usage: print and e-books

The longstanding interest of librarians in circulation and usage received a strong stimulus as a result of the shift to online provision of e-books and e-journals. There is an extensive literature on the usage of e-journals which we shall not review here. But from c2005, there has been growing interest in analyses of the usage of e-books alongside print. The key problem with this literature from the perspective of the current study is that it can tell us little about the usage of e-monographs. Nevertheless, there may be some useful pointers.

Christianson et al (2005a) found that when the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET) in the US provided a shared e-book collection, usage differed markedly for pairs of books that were accessible in both print and e-form, and concluded that e-books meant something different for their users than the print equivalent. An Ebrary survey (McKeil 2007) suggested, however, that three-quarters of librarians try to avoid duplicating print and e-books, partly because they were uncertain about readers' preferences. Christianson (2005b) also found that ranked use of e-books by number of titles closely fit a power curve, and that there were marked differences by subject, with usage highest in computing,

technology and some sciences, but much lower in the humanities and social sciences. Marked subject differences are found also with print books, of course, as shown by Knievel et al (2006).

At about the same time, Bennett et al (2005) found that in the UK while those who knew about e-books found them useful, many users of other e-resources were unaware of e-books, even when their libraries had extensive holdings. Ebrary's survey (McKeil 2007) also noted this problem, along with reading difficulties on the devices then available, and platforms that were difficult to use. Meanwhile Blummer (2006) noted in the US that there was renewed interest in e-books, and that libraries were using e-book technologies to facilitate information finding as well as to expand collections while reducing costs. He also urged, however, that in order to maximise the use of e-books, libraries should play an active role in the development of the technology, as well as negotiating licences and pricing models favourable to libraries. By 2007, however, Herson et al were finding that faculty and students in literature, as well as economics and medicine, were frequent users of e-books, while Berger-Berrera (2008) noted the important role played by the ACLS humanities e-book programme, but Carr(2006) pointed to the still (and perhaps growing) use of journals by humanities scholars. Grudzien et al (2008) noted the role of e-books in meeting the needs of off-campus students.

Ebrary's survey (McKeil (2007)) found that faculty opinions were more important than publisher brands in determining librarians' decisions on which e-books to purchase. This marked a change from the position 10 years earlier, when Metz(1996) found that collection development librarians were strongly influenced by their views of the reputations of different publishers; and the Ebrary finding was not supported by the OOpen User Needs study in 2010 (Adema et al 2010), which again reported that publisher brands were used by librarians as key indicators of quality.

But some concerns were being expressed about copyright, licences and digital rights management (DRM). Owen et al (2008) in a report on e-books in research libraries prepared for the Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL) expressed concerns about models (adopted for instance by NetLibrary and Libwise) that allow access to e-books by only one person at a time, and about the use of DRM to restrict printing, copying, and saving. Ebrary, Safari and other aggregators, on the other hand, licence content in bulk and offer simultaneous access to multiple users. The report recommends the adoption of industry wide format standards to facilitate use on a variety of platforms, and changes to DRM systems to make e-books viable for libraries and to avoid conflicts with copyright law. More generally the report noted a discrepancy between the interests of libraries and publishers: publishers seek to protect intellectual property through licensing agreements and DRM, whereas libraries wish to provide widespread access to e-books through shared platforms and with full rights of use within the limits set by copyright law.

The change in the tone of studies of e-books and their use was particularly noticeable by this stage. Walton (2008) noted that while a few years earlier, studies indicated that e-books were not well-received, libraries were now reporting high rates of use. Nevertheless, he spoke of faculty and student preference for print over e-books, and 'forced adoption and user adaptation' to e-books, especially in small institutions. A survey by Springer (2008) suggested that researchers' adoption of e-books through libraries had been successful, with the main benefits seen as convenience, accessibility, and facilities such as full-text search. On the other hand, the report noted some challenges for users and for libraries: 'Users are not reading e-books cover-to-cover but...approach them as a resource for finding answers to research questions. E-books ...will require libraries to think differently about how to accommodate the needs of users as their e-book collections grow. Viewing e-books through the lens of traditional print book usage might cause libraries to miss important opportunities for enhancing the user research experience.'

Ball (2009) argued that 'it has become unimaginable' for libraries to provide information without e-books. He also urged the importance of enabling readers to look through a book chapter by chapter, but also to gain a quick overview; of arrangements for concurrent usage and use for ILL; and of uniform technical standards. At around the same time, the JISC National E-Books Observatory was reporting² that nearly 65% of staff and students had used e-books either for work or study or leisure purposes; but that a majority of them were at that stage using e-books supplied by their library. It also confirmed the finding of the earlier Ebrary survey (McKeil 2007) that the library OPAC, not Google, was the primary route to access to e-books³. Along with the Springer White Paper, the JISC Observatory also noted platforms and interfaces that were difficult to use and to navigate, and annotation tools that did not work well. Focus groups with librarians indicated that the main benefits for libraries and their users were remote access, reducing the need for multiple copies, and the elimination of problems in managing short-loan collections. They also suggested opportunities for enhancements to services, such as hyperlinking, that were impossible with printed books.

At the same time, Diez et al were still reporting in 2009 on the need for librarians, at least in Spain, to take more active steps to help their users understand the growing complexity of the information landscape and the increasing range of e-resources available for researchers. Maron et al (2008) made a similar recommendation, adding that e-books offer libraries a way to cope with increasing amounts of information material, and to save on physical storage space.

But the use of e-books has changed rapidly. Adema et al (2010) show similar levels of readership and reading on screen as the JISC Observatory and McKeil, but reported that HSS scholars stated that their most important method for discovering e-books was Google, not library catalogues. This might have been because, as East (2006) had noted, the subject indexing of monographs (in this case, in philosophy) in A&I databases and in library OPACs was inadequate, and that there was a need for need for full-text databases such as Oxford Scholarship Online and JSTOR to incorporate improved search facilities, either by automatic generation of subject-rich document surrogates, or by the incorporation of author-generated metadata. Adema also indicated that most of the usage of e-books took the form of 'dipping in and out' or reading a single chapter rather than reading more substantial proportions of the book. This confirmed a finding of Levine-Clark (2007) and has implications, as Adema and others note, for the kinds of metadata supplied for e-books. They also indicate that permanent and quick access, along with full-text search were the most highly valued services associated with e-books, while hyperlinking, and annotation potential, along with 'Web2.0' kinds of services such as user-generated content were much less valued.

The emergence of e-readers, especially the Kindle, had a major impact. Clark (2009) reported on the popularity of a Kindle e-book lending programme at Texas A&M University and argued that 'e-book devices offer sophisticated users a reading option that fits many needs'; Savova et al (2012) reported on a similar programme at McGill University. Croft et al (2009) noted a relatively modest increase in student usage of e-books, but also that most students did not rate as important the ability to download an e-book to a hand-held device. Dewan (2012) reviewed the literature on e-books and notes a 'disparity' between their reception in the population at large as distinct from the academic world, where print still remained important to faculty and students. Nevertheless, he argues that given

² In its final report and in a series of articles by Nicholas et al. Note that the Observatory project was in effect focused on e-textbooks

³ In 2004, Somers et al noted that the quality of the bibliographic services accessible on the web and provided by commercial enterprises such as Amazon compared favourably with those provided by national libraries

advances in technology, the adoption of the EPUB3 format, and the 'ubiquity' of mobile devices, e-books can be expected increasingly to replace print in academic libraries.

But one of the key challenges for libraries has been the terms on which publishers make e-books available to libraries. The CARL report (Owen, 2008) had raised concerns about preservation and guarantees of continued access. Four years later, Lynch (2012) argued that publishers had not yet developed appropriate business models for pricing and distributing e-books, and that while this issue is 'up in the air', libraries should communicate their needs to publishers, and thus help to create a model that benefits both publishers and libraries (and thus the public). McLure et al (2012) find that although e-books are no longer a new phenomenon, users differ in their perspectives on desirable and undesirable e-book characteristics, and on levels of preference for print over e-books and vice versa. But Rojeski (2012) finds that e-books are popular with students, and enjoy higher levels of usage than print reserve collections.

Cassidy et al (2012) look at the use of e-books by graduate students and faculty, and highlight differences in attitudes, behaviours and perceptions between users and non-users. Yet again, however, (and still) they point to some researchers' lack of awareness of what is on offer from the library. Lamothe (2012a), however, finds at Laurentian University in Canada a strong relationship between the size of the e-book collection and levels of usage: e-monographs show significant levels of usage once very large academic e-book packages have been added. Tewell (2013) finds similarly that usage is strongly related to collection size, and suggests the need for further analysis of the relationships between usage and academic programme size. Lamothe also found, however, (Lamothe 2012b) that while all groups of users use e-reference material, doctoral students were the main users of e-monographs; and that (Lamothe 2013) that titles purchased as individual items from NetLibrary and MyiLibrary were used more heavily than those purchased as a bundle from SpringerLink (Tewell records a similar finding).

In a context where academic libraries are continually updating their strategies to take account of digital and online developments (see, for example, Thomas (2012) for a case from Australia), Guthrie (2012) urges publishers as well as librarians to pay special attention to usage data and the behaviour of users, and to provide support for users during what he foresees as a longish transition. He believes that, in contrast to the relatively swift transition to e-journals, the transition to e-books is likely to be delayed by current economic constraints, competing proprietary formats for books and readers, and the lack of specialised facilities to support academic research.

In the meantime, Tenopir et al (2012) report, drawing from their work for JISC on *Scholarly Reading and the Value of the Library* and earlier studies that both journals and books remain important as reading sources for scholars in the humanities, but that the patterns of reading from the two sources are quite different, and that most of the reading of books stems from scholars own print collections. And library studies continue on the usage of print books. Tucker (2009) shows that overall use of the monograph collection at the University of Nevada had declined over the previous five years; and that (in contrast to findings for e-books) books purchased on approval plans had slightly higher use than those purchased individually. Cheung et al (2011) found that in Lingan University, Hong Kong, book check-outs rise through the first five to seven years after purchase, but then stabilise; and books checked out in their first year will continue to be used in subsequent years, while those not used in the first year are likely to remain unused. Ladwig et al (2013) find that at the University of Notre Dame patterns of first usage do not, as is often asserted, by subject. Regardless of subject, books not used within a very few years are unlikely to be used subsequently. On the other hand, Kellsey et al (2012) undertook a citation analysis of monographs published by faculty at the University of Colorado between 2004 and 2009, and showed that a quarter of the sources cited were over 25 years

old. Usage studies of these kinds are important in a context where libraries are under pressure to release space for the development of new services such as information commons, teaching and learning centres and so on. The release of space by relegating books to off-site storage, or disposing of them altogether, is thus of critical importance (Lugg (2012)).

Library consortia

Consortial arrangements and ILL have long been a prominent feature of the academic library landscape, and the pressures noted above have added to the perceived benefits of such arrangements. The International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC) has grown to over 160 members, with a heavy concentration in the US. Wiley et al (2011) describe the operation of the CARLI consortium in Illinois, which uses a shared online catalogue to allow users to borrow print books from across the 76 members., and provide some analysis of usage by category, publisher, and subject. Jensen (2012) makes suggestions for the usage and collection data that are needed to underpin consortia's decisions on acquisitions and collection management. Kieft et al (2012) present a vision of libraries defining their mission in terms of collectively, rather than individually, seeking to meet the needs of students and researchers; and discuss the steps that might be necessary to achieve such a vision. There have been suggestions in the UK that the UK Research Reserve, whose members are creating a collective collection of print journals based primarily at the British Library, should extend its activities to cover monographs as well. So far, however, no practical steps have been taken to adopt such a move.

But consortia are no longer restricted to print material. Consortia such as OhioLink and the California Digital Library provide digital content to their members, including e-books. Davis et al (2012) report on the establishment and operation of the Scholars Portal Book Platform in Ontario, which allows university libraries to host their e-book collections in one location, rather than relying on publishers for content delivery. Lippincott et al (2012) report on the challenges for consortial sharing presented by e-books as distinct from journals, and on a summit which brought together librarians, publishers and e-book vendors to discuss how best to meet those challenges. Stambaugh (2013), building on her experience as Shared Print Manager at the California Digital Library, develops a vision for sharing print monographs, emphasising the need for experiments to see what works, for a discovery layer, and new thinking about governance and protocols.

Publisher perspectives

Literature available in the public domain on matters relating to academic book publishing from the perspective of publishers is noticeably slight when compared with that coming from librarians.

Talk of a monographs crisis goes back to the 1990s. In a report of a conference sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), the Association of American University Presses (AAUP), and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Winkler (1997) talked of the 'death of the monograph' being 'near at hand' as a result of tightened library budgets and increasing scholarly specialisation. She also noted, however, that data to document the crisis was hard to find, and that some of the fears stemmed more from changes in the fields in which books were being published. Others pointed to failures in marketing (Wood 1997) or in creative thinking and effective strategies (Lipscombe 1999).

Greco et al (2003 and 2008) state that the average sale of monographs fell from c1500 in the 1970s to 200-300 by early years of the 21st century; and that the average price of a university press book rose by 13.6% between 1989 and 200, while scholarly books published by commercial presses rose by

23.2%⁴.. Thompson (2005) estimates that print runs have fallen from 2-3000 in the 1970s to half that figure, with sales in the majority of cases less than 750. Such figures are hard to verify, and do not take account, of course, of the shift since the 1970s to small print runs accompanied by ease of making further small runs as demand warrants. *Some basic data about the numbers of academic books published, sales and so on, are available for the UK in the annual PA Statistics Year Book, and from the American Association of University Presses.*

In the UK, a series of publications analysing the roles of the various parties involved in the publishing process for monographs, and assessing such issues as costs, authoring and editorial responsibilities and challenges stemmed from JISC's E-Lib programme. Armstrong et al (2000 a, b and c) noted the early caution or reluctance of publishers in adopting e-publishing (while noting that CDRoms were much more common in the UK than the US); the views of many scholars and publishers that e-publication was not suitable for scholarly work; concerns about quality, trust and authenticity, along with preservation and permanence for web-content; and problems relating to bibliographic control and quality. As well as considering issues relating to the physical form and content of e-monographs, they urged the need for user studies to examine what works best.

At around the same time, Lindsay Waters, the Executive Editor for Humanities at Harvard University Press (Waters, 2001) was pointing to a deeper crisis, which he attributed largely to universities' demands for two books for tenure. Too many poor-quality books (which would have been better presented as much shorter essays) were being published by early-career researchers ; and no-one - even academics - wanted to read them. The AAUP's figures showed increased numbers of publications through the 1990s as publishers tried to keep cash income up while per-title sales were flat or falling. A vicious cycle was being created by publishers' desperately producing more books to stay alive, the increasing use by universities of 'adjunct professors' (teaching-only staff on short-term contracts) to save money, and the rising demands of tenure committees who had effectively outsourced their decisions to university presses. He urged publishers to be more selective, and to 'help scholars figure out how to write books that will appeal to a broader audience'.

Three years later, Higgins (2004) suggested that print-on-demand had brought increases in sales for at least some publishers. But by 2007, an Ithaka report (Brown et al 2007) found that many US university presses had struggled to adapt to changing needs; that some had become disconnected from their host university's mission; and that many were struggling to make the transition to e-publishing. While some presses were beginning to change, especially seeking to build better connections with the research strengths of their universities, the core need was to build collaborations between presses and libraries

Some US university presses, including Columbia, Stanford and California, were already beginning to experiment with online publishing, while continuing to offer print versions alongside the new e-books. There were concerns about the costs of online publishing, however, along with questions about the readiness of researchers in the humanities (and US university tenure committees) to accept e-books, how to organise e-publishing, publication formats, pricing and so on. But by 2007 there was increased interest in the potential for increased speed of publication and the reduced costs of storage, and also the potential of a networked environment in which new forms of scholarship could be conducted, arranged and contextualised (Henry, 2007); and Greco et al (2008) posed the question 'Should university presses adopt an open access [electronic publishing] business model for all their scholarly books?'. As a report from the EU-funded OAPEN project noted, however, (OAPEN 2010),

⁴ But note that the US consumer price index rose by 38.9% over that period, so that in real terms, if not cash terms, the price of books fell

publishers have not yet substantially modified the nature of the products themselves. But following Steele (2003) and the authors of the earlier Ithaka report (Brown, 2007), the OAPEN report also foresaw that the role of publishers was changing from content providers to service providers, with opportunities for the development of services that integrate research processes and outputs, creating online research environments for scholars.

As Henry (2007) noted, however, publishers face considerable obstacles, including the cost of migration to a digital model while continuing to face the overheads of inventories and standard production costs. Other concerns related to uncertainties as to whether the scholarly community would continue, however irrationally, to perceive e-books as less respectable than print; fears about copyright infringement and piracy on the one hand, and the implementation and reception of DRM. In the face of these and other difficulties, James (2011) plotted the declines of the scholarly book and the university press in Australia. Derricourt had in a slightly earlier study (2008) noted an especial problem for those working on Australian topics, and urged research funders to meet the costs of publication. James, on the other hand, argues (in contrast to the common view in the US that university tenure committees are in a counterproductive pact with publishers seeking to preserve – but in fact to destroy – monographs) that the problem in Australia is universities' devaluing monographs, and reducing the incentives for scholars to produce them. He urges the need for more funding, careful list diversification; creative commissioning; cross-subsidisation; and the savvy use of electronic and traditional forms of publishing.

The success of Oxford Scholarship Online (Goldsworthy, 2006), the launch of the e-book services by all the major scholarly publishers, and of new services from aggregators such as EBSCO, ProQuest, Coutts and Dawson (Harris 2014) all indicate that at least some of the problems may be on the way to being overcome. But Clement (2011) found that university presses in the US were still struggling. They had tried different editorial tactics and publishing strategies, but broader economic developments had constrained their ability to succeed. The larger presses, such as Chicago, had been able to weather the storms, but smaller presses remained highly vulnerable.

And the OAPEN user needs report (Adema 2010) shows publishers still uncertain about how best to respond to e-books, with major publishers remaining primarily equipped to service the print market, and approaching e-books as something of an add-on. Uncertainties about core technical formats (XML, HTML, EPUB, PDF?)⁵ remained, along with some complaints that librarians were providing no clear messages,; and the continuing discussions about DRMs merely added to the confusion. Nevertheless, Adema et al found that most publishers were reasonably confident that they were not threatened by disintermediation, so long as they focused on developing and sustaining strong brand identities, building on their relationships with authors, and through the selection and *preparation* of content of the highest quality before they are presented to the public. In this scenario, quality control and high-end discovery and navigation services are at the core of the services that publishers have to offer. And concerns about quality made publishers uneasy about user-generated content.

Both Steele (2003) and the Ithaka report of 2007 foresee libraries taking a greater role in publishing, both through their repositories and through greater linkages with university presses. Such thinking has been especially prominent among librarians in the US, many of whom see integration between university presses and libraries as the most effective way forward; Clement, as one example, describes a model of such integration as practised at Utah State University. Adema and Schmidt (2010) argue similarly from the perspective of the Netherlands-based OAPEN project. And an AAUP survey in

⁵ New tools for converting from one format to another continue to emerge, from Ixxus and many other organisations

2012 suggests that 77% of library respondents and 34% of press respondents agree that publishing should be part of the library's mission. In a recent report for the Mellon Foundation, Esposito (2014) considers whether university presses might join together to market at least a proportion of their books direct to consumers, rather than relying on aggregators such as YBP and Coutts for library sales, and Amazon for what he estimates at c40% of their total sales (including some library sales). He concludes by urging smaller university presses to focus on a small number of subject areas linked to the research strengths of their host institutions, and to outsource to external providers all their operations apart from editorial decision-making.

In some ways Esposito's analysis chimes with the concerns expressed by Cross (2011) about the need to ensure the survival of 'small, specialised and non-profit publishers as avenues of intellectual and academic discourse'; and his suggestion that libraries should, through their collection development strategies, take special heed not to favour large commercial presses as the expense of smaller ones.

Pochoda (2012) sees a more profound shift as the analogue gives way to a digital scholarly publishing system whose configuration is still in flux, but will be inherently amorphous and characterised by contested authorisation of diverse content. The analogue system for monographs is still dominant financially, however, while the nascent digital system has not coalesced.

Open access

The Directory of Open Access Books currently records over two thousand books from 79 publishers across the world, just under half of them in the humanities. By far the largest presses represented in terms of OA books are the university presses of Amsterdam and the Australian National University.

The OAPEN User Needs report (Adema et al, 2010) considers the case for open access in general terms, the reasons why it has been slower to take off – even for journals - in the humanities and social sciences than in STM, and some of the barriers relating to books in particular. It also notes some degree of scepticism among scholars that OA would lead to large increases in access or readership for monographs, which will rise significantly, as one publisher put it, only if OA is accompanied by effective marketing. Nevertheless, it points to OA as one of the key mechanisms for tackling the inefficiencies of the current monograph publishing system, which like many others it characterises as being in crisis.

Since the launch of the OAPEN project, and its sister OAPEN-UK, a number of OA book initiatives have come to the fore, both from established publishers (including Bloomsbury Academic, Palgrave and De Gruyter) and newer organisations such as Open Humanities Press, Open Book Publishers, Open Edition, Open Library of the Humanities, Ubiquity Press and Knowledge Unlatched. A useful summary is provided in the special OA monographs supplement published by Insights (2014) of key developments, including the different OA models being employed (OA PDFs, OA HTML, OA all formats, crowdfunding, freemium models, delayed OA, library consortial purchasing etc); and also of some of the issues that are arising, including funding and financial models and implications, publication charges, licensing, permissions from rights-holders, author views, the roles of libraries and aggregators as well as publishers, DRMs, discovery systems, preservation for the long term, Green OA via repositories, and the potential for greater impact for OA monographs. Pinter (2012) provides an early account of the development of the Knowledge Unlatched initiative, which has since completed its first round of publications.

Some global trends

Some basic data about the numbers of academic books published, sales and so on, are available for the UK in the annual PA Statistics Year Book, and from the American Association of University Presses.

At a global level, Kishida et al (1997) used the machine-readable files of the International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS) to analyse the production of social science monographs by country and by language; but there appears to have been no similar analysis for the arts and humanities. A number of bodies—UNESCO, the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), the International Publishers' Association (IPA), and the International Booksellers' Federation (IBF) have in recent years sought to explore potential pilot projects to collect national bibliographic statistics. But lack of funds has precluded any further work. Dickey (2011) presents the results of an analysis of the bibliographic profiles of six countries, based on data mining of the WorldCat database. Whether such techniques can be used to analyse trends in the publication of academic books is not clear.

Studies of the production of academic books in individual countries do not appear in the recent literature, with the exception of two studies of Russia, where Bushnell (2007) finds that scholarly book production has doubled since 1995, led by private scholarly imprints, which have tripled, and a study published a year later (Bushnell et al 2008) analyses trends in Russian book publishing more generally in 2006.

References

- Adema, J et al (2010) From service providers to content producers: new opportunities for libraries in collaborative open access book publishing *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 16(S1):28–43,
- Al, U. et al (2006) 'Arts and humanities literature: Bibliometric characteristics of contributions by turkish authors' *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 57,8 pp 1011-1022
- Andersen, Heine (2000) 'Influence and reputation in the social sciences – how much do researchers agree?' *Journal of Documentation* 56(6) pp 674-692
- Anderson, Rick, (2011) What Patron-Driven Acquisition (PDA) Does and Doesn't Mean, Scholarly Kitchen blog 31 May 2011
- Anderson, Sheila, Blanke, Tobias and Dunn, Stuart (2010) 'Methodological commons: arts and humanities e-Science fundamentals'. *Phil Trans A*, **368**, pp3779-3796
- Baetens, F. (2014) The dissemination of international scholarship: The future of books and book reviews *Leiden Journal of International Law* 27,3 pp 559-569
- Ball, R. (2009) E-books in practice: The librarian's perspective *Learned Publishing* 22,1 pp 18-22
- Barnes, M.(2005) Book pricing: Publisher, vendor, and library perspectives *Collection Building* 24,3 pp 87-91
- Baunach, Kerri (2012) Prices of music monographs and scores as reflected in Notes 2007-2012, *Notes* 70,2 pp 249-256
- Bennett, L. et al (2005) E-books in academic libraries *Electronic Library* 23,1 pp 9-16
- Berger-Barrera, J. (2008) ACLS humanities E-book: An examination *Collection Building* 27,3 pp 118-120
- Blummer, B.(2006) E-books revisited: The adoption of electronic books by special, academic, and public libraries *Internet Reference Services Quarterly* 11,2 pp 1-13
- Brantley, J.S. (2010) Approval plans, discipline change, and the importance of human mediated book selection *Library Collections, Acquisition and Technical Services* 34,1 pp 1-24
- British Academy (2005) *E-resources for research in the humanities and social sciences: A British Academy Policy Review*. British Academy, London.
- Brown, Laura et al (2007) *University Publishing in a Digital Age*, Ithaka Report
- Buchanan, George, Cunningham, Sally Jo, Blandford, Ann, Rimmer, Jon and Warwick, Claire (2005) 'Information Seeking by Humanities Scholars' *Proc, ECDL 2005*
- Bulger, Monica, Meyer, Eric T., de la Flor, Grace, Terras, Melissa, Wyatt, Sally, Jirotko, Marina, Eccles, Katherine, Madsen, Christine (2011). *Reinventing research? Information practices in the humanities*. RIN, London.
- Bushnell, J.(2007) The diversification of Russian scholarly publishing, 1995-2005 *Slavic and East European Information Resources* 8,2-3 pp 7-20
- Bushnell, K. et al (2008) The Russian book market in 2006 *Slavic and East European Information Resources* 9,3 pp 326-335

- Carr, P L (2006) 'Beyond the monograph: the uses of journal literature by humanities scholars at Mississippi State University' *Collection Management*, 30,2 pp 3-17
- Cassidy, E.D. et al (2012) Not in Love, or Not in the Know? Graduate Student and Faculty Use (and Non-Use) of E-Books *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 38,6 pp 326-332
- Cheung, S. et al (2011) Monograph circulation over a 15-year period in a liberal arts university *Library Management* 32,6 pp 419-434
- Christianson, M. et al (2005) Electronic or print books: Which are used? *Library Collections, Acquisition and Technical Services* 29,1 pp 71-81
- Christianson, M.(2005) Patterns of use of electronic books *Library Collections, Acquisition and Technical Services* 29,4 pp 351-363
- Clark, D.T. (2009) Lending kindle e-book readers: First results from the texas A&M university project *Collection Building* 28,4 pp 146-149
- Clement, R.W. (2011) Library and university press integration: A new vision for university publishing *Journal of Library Administration* 51, 5-6 pp 507-528
- Clendenning, L.F. et al (2005) Secrets for managing materials budget allocations: A brief guide for collection managers *Library Collections, Acquisition and Technical Services* 29,1 pp 99-108
- Collins, Ellen; Bulger, Monica E. & Meyer, Eric T. (2012) 'Discipline matters: Technology use in the humanities' *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 11(1-2), 76-92
- Court, J (2002) 'Bibliographies and notes as a separate online publication: A novel trend in support of scholarly publishing' *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 34,1 pp 43-52
- Creaser, Claire, Summers, Mark AC and Oppenheim, Charles (2010) 'What do UK academics cite? An analysis of references cited in UK scholarly outputs' *Scientometrics*
- Croft, R. et al (2010) E-books revisited: Surveying student e-book usage in a distributed learning academic library 6 years later *Journal of Library Administration* 50,5 pp 543-569
- Cronin, Blaise and La Barre, Kathryn (2004) 'Mickey Mouse and Milton: book publishing in the humanities'. *Learned Publishing* 17, pp85-98
- Cross, R L 'Digital books and the salvation of academic publishing' *Bottom Line* 24,3 pp 162-166
- Crotts, J. (1999) Subject usage and funding of library monographs *College and Research Libraries* 60,3 pp 261-273
- Cullars, J.M (1998) 'Citation characteristics of English-language monographs in philosophy' *Library*
- Dalton, M S (2006) 'A system destabilized: scholarly books today' *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 37,4 pp251-269
- Dalton, M.S. (2008) The publishing experiences of historians *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 39,3 pp 197-240
- Darnton, Robert (2007)' Old books and e-books' *European Review* 15,2 pp165-170
- Davis, K. et al (2012) Building an e-book library: Creating a platform for everything *International Journal of the Book* 9,1 pp 143-148

- de Fino, M. et al (2011) New Roads for Patron-Driven E-Books: Collection Development and Technical Services Implications of a Patron-Driven Acquisitions Pilot at Rutgers *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship* 23,4 pp 327-338
- Derricourt, R. (2008) For a few dollars more: A future for scholarly books in Australia? *Learned Publishing* 21,1 pp 15-21
- Dewan, P. (2012) Are books becoming extinct in academic libraries? *New Library World* 113,1 pp27-37
- Díez, L.A. et al (2009) E-books in Spanish academic libraries *Electronic Library* 27,1 pp 86-95
- Dowling, W.C. (1997) Saving scholarly publishing in the age of Oprah: The Glastonbury project *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 28,3
- East, J.W. (2006) Subject retrieval of scholarly monographs via electronic databases *Journal of Documentation* 62, 5 pp 597-605
- Ellison, Glenn (2007) *Is peer review in decline? Working Paper 13272*. National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Engels, Tim C.E., Ossenblok, Truyken L.B., Spruyt, Eric H.J. (2012) 'Changing publication patterns in the Social Sciences and Humanities' *Scientometrics* 93 pp373-390
- Estabrook, Leigh & Warner, Bijan (2003) *The Book as the Gold Standard for Tenure and Promotion in the Humanistic Disciplines*. Committee on Institutional Cooperation
- Fowler, D.C. et al (2003) Monographs Acquisitions Time and Cost Studies: The Next Generation *Library Resources and Technical Services* 47,3 pp 109-124
- Fry, Jenny; Oppenheim, Charles; Creaser, Claire; Johnson, William; Summers, Mark; White, Sonya; Butters, Geoff; Craven, Jenny; Griffiths, Jill and Hartley, Dick (2009a) *How and why researchers publish and disseminate their findings. Supporting paper 3: Report and analysis of researcher survey*. Research Information Network, London
- Fry, J., Oppenheim, C., Creaser, C., Johnson, W., Summers, M., White, S., Butters, G., Craven, J., Griffiths, J., Hartley, D. (2009b) *Communicating knowledge: How and why researchers publish and disseminate their findings. Supporting paper 4: Literature review*. Research Information Network, London.
- Garand, James C. (2005) 'Integration and Fragmentation in Political Science: Exploring Patterns of Scholarly Communication in a Divided Discipline' *Journal of Politics* 67(4) pp979-1005
- Gelfand, J.M. et al (1997) Academic libraries and collection development implications for grey literature *Publishing Research Quarterly* 13,2 pp15-23
- Giménez-Toledo, E. (2009) Assessment of humanities and social sciences monographs through their publishers: A review and a study towards a model of evaluation *Research Evaluation* 18,3 pp201-213
- Giménez-Toledo, E. (2013) Evaluation of scientific books' publishers in social sciences and humanities: Results of a survey *Research Evaluation* 22,1 pp 64-77
- Gorraiz, J. (2014) The power of book reviews: A simple and transparent enhancement approach for book citation indexes *Scientometrics* 98,2 pp 841-852
- Greco, Albert et al (2008) 'Should university presses adopt an open access [electronic publishing] model for all their scholarly books?' in *Open Scholarship: Authority, Community and Sustainability in the Age of Web 2.0*, eds Leslie Chan and Susanna Mornati

- Grudzien, P. et al (2008) Do Off-Campus Students Use E-Books *Journal of Library Administration* 48, 3-4 pp 455-466
- Guthrie, K.M. (2012) Will Books Be Different? *Journal of Library Administration*
- Hargens, Lowell L (2000) 'Using the Literature: Reference Networks, Reference Contexts, and the Social Structure of Scholarship'. *American Sociological Review*, 65(6) pp846-865
- Harley, Diane, Acord, Sophia Krzys, Earl-Novell, Sarah, Lawrence, Shannon, King, C. Judson (2010) *Assessing the Future Landscape of Scholarly Communication: An Exploration of Faculty Values and Needs in Seven Disciplines*. CSHE, UC Berkeley.
- Harris, Sian 'Aggregators increase options for libraries and publishers' in *Research Information* April/May 2014
- Henry, Charles, (2007) Rice University Press: Fons et origo, *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 10,2
- Hernon, P. (2007) E-book Use by Students: Undergraduates in Economics, Literature, and Nursing *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 33,1 pp 3-13
- Hérubel, J-P v M (2008) 'Historical scholarship, periodization, themes, and specialization: Implication for research and publication' *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 39,2 pp 144-155
- Hicker, Paula (2007) Prices of music monographs and scores as reflected in Notes, 2001-2006 *Notes* 64,2 pp 248-255
- Hicks, Diana (2004) 'The four literatures of social science' in Henk Moed (ed) *Handbook of Quantitative Social Science and Technology Research*, Kluwer Academic
- Higgins, S.W. (2004) Print on-demand is boosting availability of books and journal issues - And that's good for sales! *Learned Publishing* 17,1 pp 39-42
- Holley, R.P. et al (2005) The effect of the Internet on the out-of-print book market: Implications for libraries *Library Collections, Acquisition and Technical Services* 29,2 pp 118-139
- Houghton, John W; Steele, Colin; & Henty, Margaret (2004) 'Research practices and scholarly communication in the digital environment' *Learned Publishing*, 17(3) pp231-249
- Housewright, Ross; Schonfeld, Roger C. & Wulfson, Kate (2012) *Ithaka S+R Jisc RLUK UK Survey of Academics 2012*, Ithaka S+R
- Huang, Mu-hsuan and Chang, Yu-wei (2008) 'Characteristics of Research Output in Social Sciences and Humanities: From a Research Evaluation Perspective'. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 59(11) pp1819-1828
- Irwin, K. (2008) Comparing circulation rates of monographs and anthologies of literary criticism: Implications for cooperative collection development *Collection Management* 33, 1-2 pp 69-81
- Ithaka S&R (2006) *Final Report to The Andrew W. Mellon Foundatin. Measuring Faculty Attitudes towards Electronic Resources: Ithaka Research Study*. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.
- Jacoby, B.E. (2008) Status of approval plans in college libraries *College and Research Libraries* 69,3 pp 227-240
- James S (2011) Flogging a dead book? *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 42,2 pp 182-204
- Jankowski, Nicholas W et al (2013) 'Enhancing Scholarly Publications: Developing Hybrid Monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences' *Scholarly and Research Communication* 4,1.

- Jensen, K. (2012) Data-Driven Decisions for Library Liaisons: Exploring Strategies for Effectively Managing Diminishing Monograph Collections *Collection Management* 37,1 pp 9-22
- Kellsey, C. et al (2012) Overlap between humanities faculty citation and library monograph collections, 2004-2009 *College and Research Libraries* 73,6 pp 569-583
- Kieft, R.H. et al (2012) Collective Collection, Collective Action *Collection Management* 37,3-4 pp 137-152
- King, C. Judson; Harley, D; Earl-Novell, Sarah; Arter, Jennifer; Lawrence, Shannon; Perciali, Irene (2006) *Scholarly Communication: Academic Values and Sustainable Models* Centre for Studies in Higher Education, UC Berkeley
- Kishida, K. et al (1997) International publication patterns in social sciences: A quantitative analysis of the IBSS file *Scientometrics* 40,2 pp 277-298
- Knieval, J.E. et al (2006) Use of circulation statistics and interlibrary loan data in collection management *College and Research Libraries* 67,1 pp 35-49
- Kyvik, Svein (2003) 'Changing trends in publishing behaviour among university faculty, 1980-2000' *Scientometrics* 58(1) pp35-48
- Ladwig, J.P. et al (2013) Are first-circulation patterns for monographs in the humanities different from the sciences? *Library Collections, Acquisition and Technical Services* 37, 3-4 pp 77-84
- Lamothe, A.R. (2012) Comparing Usage Patterns Recorded between an Electronic Reference and an Electronic Monograph Collection: The Differences in Searches and Full-Text Content Viewings *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship* 24,2 pp 101-118
- Lamothe, A.R. (2013a) Comparing Linear Relationships Between E-Book Usage and University Student and Faculty Populations: The Differences Between E-Reference and E-Monograph Collections *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship* 25, 1 pp 1-15
- Lamothe, A.R. (2013b) Comparing usage between selective and bundled e-monograph purchases *Collection Building* 32, 3 pp 116-121
- Langston, M. (2003) The California State University E-book pilot project: Implications for cooperative collection development *Library Collections, Acquisition and Technical Services*, 27, 1 pp 19-32
- Larivière, V (2006) 'The place of serials in referencing practices: Comparing natural sciences and engineering with social sciences and humanities' *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 57, 8, pp 997-1004
- Lariviere, Vincent; Sugimoto, Cassidy R. and Bergeron, Pierrette (2013) 'In Their Own Image? A Comparison of Doctoral Students' and Faculty Members' Referencing Behaviour'. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 64(5) pp1045-1054
- Lawal, I.O.(2006) Electronic reference works and library budgeting Dilemma *Acquisitions Librarian* 19,37-38 pp 47-62
- Lawrence, S.R. et al (2001) Life cycle costs of library collections: Creation of effective performance and cost metrics for library resources *College and Research Libraries* 62,6 pp541-355
- Lawson, K. et al (2012) Interdisciplinarity on campus: How the publishing world is responding *Collection Building* 31,1 pp 4-10

- Levine-Clark, M. et al (2007) Electronic books and the humanities: A survey at the University of Denver *Collection Building* 26,1 pp 7-14
- Leydesdorff, L. et al (2012) "Books " and "book Chapters " in the Book Citation Index CIBKCI) and Science Citation Index (SCI, SoSCI, A&HCI) *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 49,1 pp 1-7
- Lindholm-Romantschuk, Y. et al (1996) 'The role of monographs in scholarly communication: An empirical study of philosophy, sociology and economics' *Journal of Documentation* 52,4 pp 389-404
- Lippincott, S.K. et al (2012) Librarian, Publisher, and Vendor Perspectives on Consortial E-Book Purchasing: The Experience of the TRLN Beyond Print Summit *Serials Review* 38,1 pp 3-11
- Lipscombe, T. (1999) The golden age of scholarly publishing *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 30,3 pp 143-145
- Logan, C A, (2013) 'Shaping and owning the boundaries of a book' *History of Psychology* 16,3 pp 217-221
- Lonsdale, R E et al (2000a) 'New perspectives in electronic publishing: an investigation into the publishing of electronic scholarly monographs' *Program* 34,1 pp 29-41
- Lonsdale, R E et al (2000b) 'Scholarly monographs: why would I want to publish electronically' *Electronic Library* 18,1 pp 21-28
- Lonsdale, R E et al (2000c) ' Electronic scholarly monographs: issues and challenges for the UK' *Learned Publishing*, 13,1 pp 15-24
- Lugg, R. (2012) Data-driven deselection for monographs: A rules-based approach to weeding, storage, and shared print decisions *Insights* 25,2 pp 198-204
- Lynch, K. (2012) E-books: The future for publishers and libraries *Collection Building* 31,2 pp 78-80
- McKeil, Allen (2007) *Ebrary's Global eBook Survey*
- McLure, M. et al (2012) Patron-driven e-book use and users' e-book perceptions: A snapshot *Collection Building* 31,4 pp 136-147
- Maron, Nancy L. and K. Kirby Smith, *Current Models of Digital Scholarly Communication: Results of an Investigation Conducted by Ithaka for the Association of Research Libraries*
- Mason, Tony (2009) 'Approaching Academic Publishers' *European Political Science*, 8
May 1996
- Metz, P et al (1996) A Reputational Study of Academic Publishers *College and Research Libraries* 57,3,
- Milloy, C et al (2011) OAPEN-UK: An open access business model for scholarly monographs in the humanities and social sciences *Information Services & Use* 31 pp 249-258
- Nederhof, A.J. (2005) ' Bibliometric monitoring of research performance in the social sciences and the humanities: A review' *Scientometrics* 66,1 pp 81-100
- Nederhof, Anton J., van Leeuwen, Thed N. and van Raan, Anthony F. J. (2010) 'Highly cited non-journal publications in political science, economics and psychology: a first exploration' *Scientometrics* 83 pp363-374

- Newman, Michael L and Sack, John (2013) 'Information workflow of academic researchers in the evolving information environment: an interview study' *Learned Publishing* 26 pp123-131
- Nixon, Judith et al (2011) *Patron-Driven Acquisitions: Current Successes and Future Directions*, Routledge
- Owen, Victoria et al (2008) *E-books in research libraries: issues of access and use, prepared by the CARL Copyright Committee Task Group on E-Books*.
- Palmer, Carole L. and Neumann, Laura J. (2002) 'The Information Work of Interdisciplinary Humanities Scholars: Exploration and Translation'. *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 72(2) pp85-117.
- Pinter, F. (2012) Open access for scholarly books? *Publishing Research Quarterly* 28,3 pp 183-191
- Pochoda, P (2012) The big one: The epistemic system break in scholarly monograph publishing. *New Media and Society* 15, 3 pp 359-378
- Polanka, Sue, (2009) Patron-Driven Acquisition, *Booklist*, 105(9-10),
- Rebarcak, P.Z. et al (1996) The economics of monographs acquisitions: A time/cost study conducted at Iowa State University *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory* 20,1 pp65-76
- Reid, A. (2011) Social media assemblages in digital humanities: From backchannel to buzz *Cutting-Edge Technologies in Higher Education* 3 pp 321-338
- Rider, M.M. et al (1996) PromptCat issues for acquisitions: Quality review, cost analysis and workflow implications *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory* 20,1 pp 9-21
- Rigney, A (2010) 'When the monograph is no longer the medium: historical narrative in the online age' *History and Theory* 49,4 pp 100-117
- Roker, Belinda and Williams, Catherine, (2011) Achieving more with less: acquisitions in hard times, *SCONUL Focus* 52
- Rutner, Jennifer & Schonfeld, Roger C. (2012) *Supporting the Changing Research Practices of Historians*. Ithaca S+R
- Saffle, M (2010) 'Self-publishing and musicology: Historical perspectives, problems, and possibilities' *Notes*, 66,4 pp 726-738
- Savova, M. et al (2012) McGill library makes E-books portable: E-reader loan service in a Canadian academic library *Portal* 12,2 pp 205-222
- Schreibman, S (2002) 'Computer mediated texts and textuality: theory and practice' *Computers and the Humanities*, 36,3
- Slight-Gibney, N. (1999) How far have we come? Benchmarking time and costs for monograph purchasing *Library Collections, Acquisition and Technical Services* 23,1 pp 47-56
- Seaman J T et al ' (2012) 'Sustainability and the scholarly enterprise' *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 43,3 pp 257-293
- Short, B H (2002) Prices of music monographs and scores as reflected in Notes, 1996-2001 *Notes* 59,2, pp 301-309
- Smyth, J.B (2011) 'Tracking trends: Students' information use in the social sciences and humanities, 1995-2008' *Portal* 11,1 pp551-573

- Snijder, R. (2013) Measuring monographs: A quantitative method to assess scientific impact and societal relevance *First Monday* 18,5
- Somers, M. (2004) Finding bibliographic information about books on the WWW: An evaluation of available sources *Online Information Review* 28,1 pp 33-42
- Springer (2008) *eBooks – the end-user perspective*, Springer White Paper
- Stambaugh, Emily (2013) Curating Digital Collections- Reinventing Shared Print: A Dynamic Service Vision for Shared Print Monographs in a Digital World, *Against the Grain* September 2013.
- Stanton, Domna C.; Bérubé, Michael; Cassuto, Leonard; Eaves, Morris; Guillory, John; Hall, Donald E. & Latham, Sean (2007) 'Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluation Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion' *Profession* pp9-71
- Stauffer, A.M. (2011) Digital scholarly resources for the study of victorian literature and culture *Victorian Literature and Culture* 39,1 pp 293-303
- Steele, Colin, (2003) 'Phoenix Rising: new models for the research monograph', in *Learned Publishing*, 16,2
- Swords, David (2011). *Patron-Driven Acquisitions: History and Best Practices*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Steele, C (2003) 'Phoenix Rising: new models for the research monograph?' *Learned Publishing* 16,2 pp 111-122
- Tang, Rong (2008) 'Citation Characteristics and Intellectual Acceptance of Scholarly Monographs' *College & Research Libraries*, July 2008, pp.356-369
- Tenopir, C., Volentine, R. and King, D. W. (2012) 'Article and book reading patterns of scholars: findings for publishers' *Learned Publishing* 25(4) pp 279-291
- Tewell, E.C. (2013) Increased size of e-book collection positively impacts usage but may reach critical mass *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 8,3 pp 61-63
- Thelwall, Mike and Sud, Pardeep (2014) 'No citation advantage for monograph-based collaborations?' *Journal of Infometrics* 8 pp276-283
- Thomas, E. (2013) The digital strategy: A new era in e-book provision at UniSA *Insights* 26,2 pp 174-179
- Thompson, Jennifer Wolfe (2002) 'The Death of the Scholarly Monograph in the Humanities? Citation Patterns in Literary Scholarship' *Libri* 52 pp121-136
- Torres-Salinas, D.et al (2014) Analyzing the citation characteristics of books: Edited books, book series and publisher types in the book citation index *Scientometrics* 98,3 pp 2113-2127
- Tucker, J.C. (2009) Collection assessment of monograph purchases at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas libraries *Collection Management* 34, 3 pp 157-181
- Tyler, D.C. et al (2010) Just how right are the customers? An analysis of the relative performance of patron-initiated interlibrary loan monograph purchases *Collection Management* 35,3 pp 162-179
- Utter, T. et al (2009) The scholarly communication process within the university research corridor (michigan state university, the university of michigan, and wayne state university): A case study in cooperation *Resource Sharing and Information Networks* 20,1-2 pp3-17

- vanDuinkerken, W. et al (2008) Creating a flexible fund structure to meet the needs and goals of the library and its users *Library Collections, Acquisition and Technical Services* 32,3-4 pp 142-149
- Walton, E.W. (2008) From the ACRL 13th national conference: E-book use versus users' perspective *College and Undergraduate Libraries* 14,4 pp 19-35
- Ward, K et al ((2009) 'The future of research monographs: an international set of perspectives' *Progress in Human Geography* 33,1 pp 101-126
- Waters, Lindsay. (2001) The tyranny of the monograph and the plight of the publisher *Publishing Research Quarterly* 17.3 pp 19-25.
- Watson-Boone, Rebecca (1994). 'The Information Needs and Habits of Humanities Scholars', *RQ*, 34(2) pp. 203-215
- Westgate, H.J. (2012) E-books: Discussions of production, content, and future at the 2011 Frankfurt Book Fair *New Library World* 113, 7 pp 400-404
- Wiley, L. et al (2011) A domestic monograph collection assessment in Illinois academic libraries: What are we buying and how is it used? *Interlending and Document Supply* 39,4 pp 167-175
- Williams, P et al (2009) 'The role and future of the monograph in arts and humanities research' *Aslib Proceedings* 61,1 pp 67-82
- Winkler, K (1997) Academic Presses Look to the Internet to Save Scholarly Monographs *Chronicle of Higher Education*
- Wittenberg, K (2009) The Gutenberg-e project: opportunities and challenges in publishing born-digital monographs' *Learned Publishing* 22,1 pp 36-41
- Wood, C. (1997) Marketing scholarly publishing: Monographs as lite beer *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 28,4
- Helena Wulff (2008) What is happening to the anthropological monograph? Live Debate at the EASA conference in Ljubljana 2008 *Social Anthropology* 17,2
- Yates, S.D (2007) An examination of the use of monographs in the communication journal literature *Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian* 26,1 pp 39-51
- .