

# **USER PERCEPTIONS OF OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS**

**Analysis of a Questionnaire Compiled by the National Academies Forum**

**for Teachers and Researchers**

**Relating to the Availability of Overseas Monographs in Australian Libraries**

**July 1998**

**For further information, please contact:**

**Dr Stephen Foster  
Executive Director  
National Academies Forum  
GPO Box 119  
CANBERRA ACT 2601  
Tel: (02) 6247 8087  
Fax: (02) 6248 6287  
naf@anu.edu.au**

**Martin O'Hare  
Indonesia & Southwest Pacific Consultants  
PO Box 3  
MAWSON ACT 2607  
Tel: (02) 6286 4717  
Fax: (02) 6286 5976  
martino@bigpond.com**

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
SUMMARY .....	4
DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRE.....	6
ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS.....	7
DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARY .....	7
THE IMPORTANCE OF OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS .....	8
AVAILABILITY OF OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS.....	9
CHANGES IN THE AVAILABILITY OF OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS .....	12
THE IMPACT OF CHANGES.....	14
COLLECTIONS POLICIES FOR OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS .....	16
PROVIDING BOOKS FOR COURSES.....	18
INTER-LIBRARY LOANS FOR OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS.....	20
THE FUTURE.....	22

**USER PERCEPTIONS OF OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS**

**INTRODUCTION**

The National Academies Forum, the National Library of Australia and the Council of Australian University Libraries are jointly undertaking research relating to the availability of overseas monographs in Australian libraries. Access to monographs published overseas is recognised as a major issue confronting Australian libraries.

As part of the project, the National Academies Forum produced a questionnaire to gather the views of teachers and researchers in various fields of study. While the questionnaire was developed to generate some quantitative data, the Forum was broadly interested in user perceptions of the relevant issues and invited teachers and researchers to detail specific comments and concerns. The responses to the questionnaire are analysed in the accompanying report.

The project will culminate in a National Academies Forum/National Library Round Table on Access to Overseas Monographs through Australian Libraries, which will be held at the National Library on 28 August 1998. The Round Table will generate recommendations which are likely to have a significant impact on policies relating to the national collections.

## SUMMARY

A survey on the availability of overseas monographs in Australian libraries was completed by 82 academic respondents in 10 fields of study: American Studies, Environmental Management, Anthropology, Southeast Asian Economics, Medicine, Agriculture, British History, Japanese History, Classical Languages and Literature, and Physics.

The work of respondents in their field of study is *mostly research* (35%) or *a similar emphasis on teaching and research* (34%). The majority of respondents describe their institutional library either as *a central library with smaller branches* (42%) or as *one large central library* (35%).

Respondents broadly represent institutions in the higher education and research sector, without over-representation of any one institution.

### The importance of overseas monographs

The great majority of respondents (85%) considers that access to overseas monographs is *very important* to their research activities. In a typical working week, respondents refer to nine overseas monographs.

### Availability of overseas monographs

On average, 61% of a respondent's needs for overseas monographs is satisfied by the respondent's own institutional library. The remaining needs are satisfied largely by personal purchases (40%) and inter-library loans (28%).

Most respondents find visiting other libraries *very inconvenient* (51%) or *moderately inconvenient* (38%).

Most respondents (82%) report no problems in accessing foreign language monographs. However, the availability of overseas monographs published more than five years ago is viewed as a problem by one-third of respondents.

### Changes in the availability of overseas monographs

Most respondents (66%) attribute changes in the availability of overseas monographs in their own library to decreasing funds, decreasing purchases, and increasing prices.

While some respondents have problems accessing specialised monographs, most respondents (62%) do not identify a specific problem area in their field of study. Of those who comment (38%), several infer 'the problem seems to be general rather than particular'.

### The impact of changes

A little over half the respondents (55%) state that changes in the availability of overseas monographs has impacted on their research and teaching activities. The remainder (45%) make no comment or perceive little or no impact on their research and teaching activities. Respondents in Classical Languages and Literature, Anthropology and British History are most inclined to perceive change and identify problems. Respondents in Physics generally perceive far less impact with several noting 'we rely much more on journals'.

The main impacts of change on research include greater use of inter-library loans and electronic sources, and more reliance on overseas visits for research purposes. The impact of change on teaching is felt most strongly at postgraduate level.

### **Collections policies for overseas monographs**

Most respondents (68%) perceive a change in their library's collections policies over the past five years due to decreased budgets. The change is more apparent for serials than for monographs.

Most respondents (79%) are satisfied with their library's acquisition system for overseas monographs, and consider their system to be reasonably consultative and democratic.

### **Providing books for courses**

Respondents are generally satisfied with the provision of overseas monographs for existing courses, and report that resource implications for new courses are subject to increasing scrutiny. However, the availability of overseas monographs appears to have little effect on the creation or abolition of courses.

### **Inter-library loans for overseas monographs**

51 respondents (62%) make an average of 3 inter-library loan requests in a typical month during term or semester. 38% of respondents do not use inter-library loan requests. Almost half of those who use inter-library loan requests use it one or less times per month during semester. On average, 82% of inter-library loan requests (both within Australia and overseas) are satisfied in 24 days.

73% of the respondents who use inter-library loan requests are happy with the proportion of requests satisfied and the rate of response. 27% express dissatisfaction.

### **The future**

A large majority of respondents (78%) do not feel that the electronic provision of overseas monographs is a satisfactory alternative to traditional printed works.

To improve access to overseas monographs in Australian libraries, respondents suggest, in order of frequency:

1. institutional specialisation and cooperation.
2. more funding.
3. increased on-line access.
4. improved inter-library loan system.

## DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Table 1. Distribution and Response to Questionnaire

Field of Study	Number Distributed by E-mail	Number Distributed by Post/Fax	Total Distributed	Responses Received	Percentage Response
American Studies	51		51	6	12%
Environmental Management	45		45	3	7%
Anthropology	44		44	6	14%
Southeast Asian Economics	63	15	78	4	5%
Medicine	62		62	4	6%
Agriculture	48		48	3	6%
British History	16	31	47	12	26%
Japanese History	48	2	50	8	16%
Classical Languages & Literature	147	1	148	16	11%
Physics	28		28	20	71%
Total (82)	552	49	601	82	14%

601 questionnaires were distributed in 10 separate fields of study (see Table 1). Most questionnaires were distributed by e-mail from the National Academies Forum, while a small proportion was forwarded by post. In a few cases, on request from addressees, the questionnaire was forwarded by facsimile.

The size of the sample was determined largely by the size of the field and the availability of e-mail addresses. The comparatively large sample for Classical Languages and Literature was obtained from a single e-mail address list entitled *Classics and Related Fields at Australian Universities*. This list includes academics in the fields of classical archaeology and history. In most cases, the address lists were compiled by 'word of mouth', commencing at known concentrations of academics in particular fields.

82 responses were received, a response rate of 14%. There was a very high response for Physics (71%), a high response for British History (26%), and average response rates for Japanese History (16%), Anthropology (14%), American Studies (12%), and Classical Languages and Literature (11%). The comparatively small samples in fields outside Physics, Classical Languages and Literature, and British History, make inter-field comparisons problematic.

The response rate within fields of study is not necessarily an indication of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The high response for Physics, for example, is probably due to the use of a single e-mail address (one of 28) which reached a sizeable but unknown number of physicists around Australia. In other cases, respondents passed the questionnaire to colleagues or departmental secretaries distributed the questionnaire to relevant staff. A percentage of e-mails (around 10%) was not delivered due to an incorrect e-mail address, unknown recipient, change of e-mail address, or transcription error in the compilation of e-mail address lists. Some addressees advised that the questionnaire was not completed due to their absence over the semester break. For these reasons, it is difficult to judge the actual reach of the questionnaire. Additionally, the response rate may have been influenced by the length and complexity of the questionnaire, corruption of electronically transmitted data, irritation with the increasing occurrence of marketing surveys, satisfaction with the status quo, and so on.

Not all respondents answered all questions. Consequently, the number of responses in the analysis varies from question to question and within questions. A small number of respondents wrote a letter highlighting a particular concern but did not complete the questionnaire.

**ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS**

**Does your work in your main field of teaching and/or research involve: mostly teaching; mostly research; somewhat more teaching than research; somewhat more research than teaching; a similar emphasis on teaching and research?**

**Table 2. Teaching Versus Research**

Field	Mostly Teaching	Mostly Research	More Teaching	More Research	Similar Emphasis
American Studies		2	1		3
Environmental Management		2			
Anthropology	1		3		2
Southeast Asian Economics		2			2
Medicine		3			1
Agriculture			1		1
British History	1	5	2		3
Japanese History		1	1		4
Classical Languages & Literature		2	8	1	5
Physics		10	3	2	5
Total (77)	2 (2%)	27 (35%)	19 (25%)	3 (4%)	26 (34%)

*The work of respondents in their field of study is mostly research (35%) or a similar emphasis on teaching and research (34%). 25% of respondents selected somewhat more teaching than research. Respondents for Physics are more involved in research than teaching, while the converse holds for Classical Languages and Literature.*

**DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARY**

**How would you describe your institutional library: one large central library; a central library with smaller branches; a multi-campus library structure; other (please describe)?**

**Table 3. Description of Institutional Library**

Field	One Large Central Library	Central Library with Branches	Multi-Campus Structure	Other
American Studies	3	1	2	
Environmental Management	2			
Anthropology	2	3		1
Southeast Asian Economics	2	1	1	1
Medicine	3	1		
Agriculture		3		
British History	4	5	1	1
Japanese History	2	2	1	1
Classical Languages & Literature	6	8		2
Physics	4	9	5	2
Total (79)	28 (35%)	33 (42%)	10 (13%)	8 (10%)

*The majority of respondents describe their institutional library either as a central library with smaller branches (42%) or as one large central library (35%).*

**THE IMPORTANCE OF OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS**

How important is access to overseas monographs for your research activities: very important; moderately important; not important? On average, how many overseas monographs would you refer to during a typical working week?

**Table 4. Importance of Access to Overseas Monographs for Research and Number of Overseas Monographs Referred to in a Working Week**

Field	Very Important	Moderately Important	Not Important	Monographs per Week
American Studies	6			15,2,5,3,3
Environmental Management	2			7,2
Anthropology	5	1		8,4,10,12,5,1
Southeast Asian Economics	4			0,3,2,5
Medicine	2	1	1	0,1,2,1
Agriculture	3			3,2
British History	11			30,1,10,15,15,15,12,4,5,6,5
Japanese History	5		1	2,4,5,2,1,6
Classical Languages & Literature	16			6,20,10,30,3,4,2,50,5,30,120,2,20,16,10,20
Physics	12	5	3	2,1,1,1,0,0,3,5,1,0,0,2,2,5,5,7,40,0,5,3
Total (78)	66 (85%)	7 (9%)	5 (6%)	665/76=9

*The great majority of respondents (85%) considers that access to overseas monographs is very important to their research activities. A large minority of respondents for Physics (40%), and half the respondents for Medicine, regard such access as moderately important or not important to their research activities.*

*The average number of overseas monographs referred to by respondents in a typical working week is 9. The average varies considerably within the fields of study, with the highest usage in Classical Languages and Literature (22 monographs per week) and British History (11).*

**AVAILABILITY OF OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS**

**What proportion of your needs for overseas monographs is satisfied by your own institutional library?**

**Table 5. Satisfaction of Needs by Own Institutional Library**

Field	Needs Satisfied by Own Library	Average
American Studies	0.9, 0.65, 0.1, 0.65, 0.8, 0.75	64%
Environmental Management	0.9, 0.7, 0.3	63%
Anthropology	0.6, 0.6, 0.6, 0.2, 0.7, 0.9, 0.9	60%
Southeast Asian Economics	0.9, 0, 0.9, 0.5	58%
Medicine	0.7, 0.25, 0.05, 0.5, 0.5	38%
Agriculture	0.85, 0.9, 0.85	87%
British History	0.5, 0.75, 0.5, 0.5, 0.6, 0.6, 0.7, 0.6, 0.7, 0.7	62%
Japanese History	1.0, 0.5, 0.7, 0.15, 0, 0.7	51%
Classical Languages & Literature	0.01, 0.9, 0.5, 0.7, 0.6, 0.9, 0.5, 0.75, 0.4, 0.9, 0.2, 0.75, 0.5, 0.6, 0.8, 0.8, 0.8	61%
Physics	0.7, 0.3, 0.2, 0.8, 0.8, 0.8, 0.95, 0.3, 0.2, 0, 0.5, 0.8, 0.8, 0.9, 0.5, 0.96, 0.9, 0.9, 0.8, 0.75	64%
Total (78)		61%

*On average, 61% of a respondent's needs for overseas monographs is satisfied by the respondent's own institutional library. This figure holds true in five of the six largest samples (Physics, Classical Languages & Literature, British History, Anthropology, American Studies).*

*Twenty-seven respondents (35%) said that half, or less than half, of their needs for overseas monographs is satisfied by their own institutional library.*

**How are your remaining needs for overseas monographs satisfied: inter-library loan; personal borrowing from other libraries (reciprocal borrowing); reading the works in other libraries; electronic access; personal purchases; other?**

**Table 6. Satisfaction of Remaining Needs for Overseas Monographs**

Field	Inter-Library Loan	Personal Borrowing - Other Library	Reading in Other Libraries	Electronic Access	Personal Purchase	Other
American Studies	0.6, 0.05, 0.6	0.15, 0.3	0.33, 0.5	0.1, 0.33, 0.05	0.3, 0.34, 0.75, 0.75, 0.5, 0.4	
Environmental Management	0.65, 0.6	0.15, 0.05		0.1, 0.1	0.1, 0.35, 0.8	
Anthropology	0.1, 0.25, 0.3, 0.1, 0.3, 0.1	0.1, 0.2, 0.1, 0.3	0.1, 0.1	0.1	0.7, 0.75, 0.5, 0.6, 0.4, 0.8	0.1
Southeast Asian Economics	0.5, 0.2	0.2	0.05	0.1	1.0, 0.1, 0.8	
Medicine	0.65		0.4		0.35, 1.0, 0.6	1.0
Agriculture	0.9	1.0	0.05	0.65, 0.05	0.35	
British History	0.2, 0.4, 0.1, 0.4, 0.1, 0.05, 0.45, 0.7, 0.35, 0.3, 0.33	0.4, 0.05, 0.15	0.4, 0.3, 0.1, 0.8, 0.05, 0.5, 0.5, 0.33		0.2, 0.1, 0.6, 0.5, 0.1, 0.9, 0.45, 0.15, 0.15, 0.2, 0.34	0.1
Japanese History	0.7, 0.25, 0.1	0.25, 0.2	0.75, 0.3, 0.4		1.0, 0.75, 1.0, 0.3	1.0
Classical Languages & Literature	0.5, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.5, 0.9, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.6, 0.03, 0.2, 0.5, 0.1, 0.8, 0.3	0.02, 0.7, 0.1, 0.15	0.45, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.1, 0.7, 0.2, 0.05, 0.4, 0.8	0.2	0.03, 0.1, 0.4, 0.1, 0.1, 0.95, 0.1, 0.8, 0.3, 0.5, 0.2, 0.3, 0.15, 0.2, 0.7	0.1, 0.27, 0.2
Physics	0.5, 0.05, 0.8, 0.4, 0.7, 0.1, 0.8, 0.5, 0.1, 1.0, 0.25, 0.2	0.01, 0.2, 0.05, 0.2	0.05, 0.05, 0.4, 0.1, 0.05, 0.05	0.5, 0.05, 0.3, 0.5	0.35, 0.1, 0.84, 0.15, 0.2, 0.4, 1.0, 1.0, 0.85, 0.5, 1.0, 0.75, 0.8	0.65, 0.9, 1.0, 0.1, 0.5
Total (77)	21.71 (28%)	5.03 (7%)	10.26 (13%)	3.03 (4%)	31.05 (40%)	5.92 (8%)

The remaining needs for overseas monographs (outside the respondent's institutional library) are satisfied predominantly by personal purchases (40%) and inter-library loans (28%). Electronic access (4%) is the least used method for satisfying remaining needs for overseas monographs.

**When you are obliged to visit other libraries because your own library does not hold particular overseas monographs, do you regard this as a significant inconvenience: very inconvenient; moderately inconvenient; not inconvenient? When you have completed searching, about what proportion of your needs remains unsatisfied?**

**Table 7. Convenience of Visiting Other Libraries and Unsatisfied Needs**

Field	Very Inconvenient	Moderately Inconvenient	Not Inconvenient	Unsatisfied Needs
American Studies	3	3		0.1, 0.1, 0, 0.1, 0, 0.1
Environmental Management	1	1		0, 0.15
Anthropology	2	3		0.2, 0.1, 0.1
Southeast Asian Economics	2		1	0.6, 0.1
Medicine	1	1		0.1
Agriculture	1	1	1	0.1, 0, 0.05
British History	3	5	3	0.05, 0, 0.2, 0.1, 0.02, 0.03, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2
Japanese History	1	4	1	0, 0.25, 0.1, 0, 0.75, 0.2
Classical Languages & Literature	9	7		0.1, 0, 0.1, 0.1, 0.01, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05, 0.15, 0.2, 0.05, 0.1, 0.05, 0.1
Physics	14	2	2	0, 0, 0.1, 0.05, 0.05, 0.2, 0.02, 0.2, 0.3, 0.1, 0.1, 0.15, 0.05, 0.1, 0.04, 0.05, 0.1, 0.15
Total (72)	37 (51%)	27 (38%)	8 (11%)	6.82/64=11%

Most respondents find visiting other libraries very inconvenient (51%) or moderately inconvenient (38%).

On average, 11% of a respondent's needs for overseas monographs remains unsatisfied after completing a search.

**Is there a specific problem relating to the availability of overseas monographs published in a foreign language or languages? If so, please elaborate.**

**Is there a specific problem relating to the availability of overseas monographs published more than five years ago? If so, please elaborate.**

**Table 8. Problems Relating to Foreign Language Monographs and Monographs Published Over Five Years Ago**

Field	Foreign Language Monographs: Problem Reported	Foreign Language Monographs: No Problem/ No Response	Older Monographs: Problem Reported	Older Monographs: No Problem/ No Response
American Studies (AS)		6	1	5
Environmental Management (EM)		2	2	
Anthropology (An)	1	5	1	5
Southeast Asian Economics (SAE)		3	1	2
Medicine (M)		4	1	3
Agriculture (Ag)		3	1	2
British History (BH)	1	10	7	4
Japanese History (JH)	4	3	1	6
Classical Languages & Literature (CLL)	6	10	4	12
Physics (P)	2	18	6	14
Total (78)	14 (18%)	64 (82%)	25 (32%)	53 (68%)

*Most respondents (82%) report no problems or offer no comment on accessing foreign language monographs, with the major exception of respondents from Japanese History (57%) and a minority of respondents from Classical Languages and Literature (38%).*

*The availability of monographs published more than five years ago is seen as a problem by one-third of respondents (32%) but not by the majority (68%). The main concerns are that 'monographs go out of print with amazing speed', 'books out of print are very difficult to obtain', and that older monographs are 'difficult to obtain in libraries which will lend'. These concerns are reflected evenly throughout the fields of study, except in British History where 64% of respondents report a problem.*

#### **Comments by respondents on foreign language monographs**

- near impossibility of getting some Indonesian monographs (An).
- unreasonable to expect libraries to hold extensive collections in foreign languages (An).
- La Trobe routinely disallows all requests for books in languages other than English (BH).
- we have shrunk down to an English language only ghetto (BH).
- specialist works in Japanese not always met by Australian libraries (JH).
- Japanese books published during World War II are rarely available in Australian libraries (JH).
- sometimes romanisation of Japanese authors not correctly done - this causes problems in locating (JH).
- German, French or Italian monographs are expensive to obtain on document delivery from overseas (CLL).
- books are increasingly expensive and our dollar continues to decline in value (CLL).
- no market here for books on ancient Greece and prices are high (CLL).
- difficult to obtain books from continental Europe or the Middle East (CLL).
- increasingly not being purchased by Australian libraries (CLL).
- translation of relevant foreign language monographs into English is a problem for me (P).
- technical books from Russia are always a problem (P).

#### **Comments by respondents on monographs published more than five years ago**

- inconvenience and short delays occur as older monographs are hidden away in library stores (AS).
- limited availability when they are out of print (EM).
- books out of print are very difficult to obtain (EM).
- monographs go out of print with amazing speed (An).
- very hard to find, often can't purchase (SAE).
- if they are unavailable here, I ask a colleague overseas to fax me the relevant pages (M).
- my problem relates to very old monographs, published before 1920 (M).
- a higher proportion is available (M).
- hard to obtain (Ag)
- I use early printed books in their original editions and historical literature from the 17th century onwards - disappointed that the NLA will no longer purchase other than Australian and Pacific material (BH).
- most are out of print (BH).
- shorter print runs have meant that if unavailable from a library obtaining a personal copy can be very expensive or impossible because book is out of print (BH).
- increasing difficulty in finding pre-1914 European history imprints in Australia (BH).
- some monographs for late 19th and early 20th centuries unavailable (BH).
- most libraries will not lend rare books/periodicals or anything before 19th century (BH).
- can prove impossible to obtain books published in Europe even in the last 10 years. It is difficult to locate these books in libraries which will lend (CLL).
- many out of print, but books on Egyptology published 100 or more years ago are still relevant (CLL).
- have been waiting four weeks for a book published in Germany in 1922 (CLL).
- failure of publishers to advertise adequately and keep back stocks; deteriorating exchange rate (CLL).
- problem is more with recent than older monographs because of purchasing cuts (CLL).

- sometimes out of print (P).
- more likely to be tracked down when libraries were better funded (P).
- those before 1900 scarce in Australia (P).
- there are books I can't buy or order (P).
- it is hard to get hold of out of print monographs (P).

## CHANGES IN THE AVAILABILITY OF OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS

**What changes have you perceived over the last five or so years in the availability of overseas monographs from: your own library; other libraries; electronic sources? Within your own field of study, is there a greater problem in some areas than others? If so, which are the problem areas?**

**Table 9. Perceived Changes Over Past Five Years in Availability of Overseas Monographs and Problems in Own Field**

Field	Own Library		Other Libraries		Electronic Sources		Problems in Own Field	
	Yes	No/N/a	Yes	No/N/a	Yes	No/N/a	Yes	No/N/a
American Studies	3	1	1	3		4		4
Environmental Management	1	1	1	1	1	1		2
Anthropology	4	2	1	5	3	3	4	2
Southeast Asian Economics		3		3	1	2		3
Medicine	2	2		4	1	3	1	3
Agriculture	3		3		3			3
British History	11		10	1	2	9	4	7
Japanese History	2	5	2	5		7	3	4
Classical Languages & Literature	15	1	8	8	2	14	11	5
Physics	9	11	3	17	4	16	6	14
Total (76)	50 (66%)	26 (34%)	29 (38%)	47 (62%)	17 (22%)	59 (78%)	29 (38%)	47 (62%)

*Most respondents (66%) comment on changes in the availability of overseas monographs in their own library, but fewer respondents (38%) comment on changes in the availability of overseas monographs in other libraries. In both cases, most comments refer to decreasing funds, decreasing purchases of monographs, and the increasing price of monographs.*

*Most respondents (78%) have no comment on changes in the availability of overseas monographs from electronic sources. Those who comment refer to the increased availability of electronic sources (but not for monographs).*

*While some respondents have problems accessing specialised monographs (particularly in Anthropology and Classics), most respondents (62%) do not identify a specific problem area in their field of study. Of those who comment (38%), several infer 'the problem seems to be general rather than particular'.*

### Comments by respondents on changes in own library

much slower to arrive (AS); funds falling, less monographs purchased (AS); reduction in number (AS); decreasing because of price (EM); declining attention to collection building (An); decrease and slower to arrive (An); decrease (An); library budgets cut severely (An); main impact has been reduction in journals, not monographs (An); no changes observed (An); fewer monographs purchased (M); libraries buy fewer - cost high (M); less (Ag); decreased purchases (Ag); facilities for sourcing material for purchase and ILLs have improved considerably (Ag); library less able to meet my needs than in the 1970s due to cost cutting and increased prices (BH); decline (BH); fewer monographs due to budget cuts (BH); declining purchases (BH); fewer new books, missing or damaged books not replaced (BH); fewer new books, many libraries seem to stick with major publishers eg. OUP, CUP (BH); decline in purchase of overseas publications (BH); fewer new books (BH); fewer purchases of second-hand books (BH); shrinking collections due to shrinking funds (BH); refusal of head of school to authorise (JH); fewer purchases (JH); fewer (CLL); fewer (CLL); declining due to exchange

rate and reduced funding (CLL); decrease in availability (CLL); reduced (CLL); library not keeping up with modern language publications in Italian, French and German (CLL); buying dependent on fund-raising activities of staff and NGOs (CLL); 25% reduction on journal subscriptions for classics (CLL); steep decline (CLL); can't buy the same number (CLL); less purchased (CLL); many fewer (CLL); marked decrease, this year 20% (CLL); reduced funds (CLL); some cut-back (CLL); extreme reduction in funds for purchasing (P); substantial reduction in book vote (P); fewer purchased but barely inconvenienced (P); fewer (P); rapid decline, continual cuts (P); fewer available (P); continued decline in stock (P); improved access (P); decrease in overseas monograph purchases (P); reductions due to contracting budgets (P).

**Comments by respondents on changes in other libraries**

reduction in number (AS); decreasing because of cost (EM); same (An); less (Ag); decreased purchases (Ag); more crowded, greater delays (BH); decline (BH); fewer monographs due to budget cuts (BH); declining purchases (BH); fewer new books (BH); shrinking collections due to shrinking funds (BH); fewer purchases (JH); fewer (CLL); fewer (CLL); declining (CLL); much reduced (CLL); cut back on buying and serial holdings (CLL); reduced purchasing and erratic ordering (CLL); less purchased (CLL); many fewer (CLL); substantial reduction in book vote (P); decreased (P); continued decline in stock (P); improved access (P).

**Comments by respondents on changes in electronic sources**

increasing but not a replacement for hard copy (EM); no use to me (An); increase (An); you can't read it on a bus (An); many more available (An); increasing (SAE); improved (M); more (Ag); greater accessibility of basic reference material (BH); available for journals but not for old monographs or new books (BH); little use so far (BH); research more convenient due to Telnet and China-Japan-Korea cataloguing system (JH); have used databases but have had to follow up with books (CLL); no impact (CLL); not available for monographs (CLL); more material now on-line (CLL); of little use for my work (CLL); little yet available (CLL); some available (P); increased access/availability (P); improving (P); increased (P); no perceptible on-line monograph availability (P).

**Problem areas identified by respondents in own field of study**

more serials than monographs (An); my requests often fall outside budget or are slow to arrive (An); deficiencies across the board (An); easier to get library to buy books for UG courses than for lone reader doing advanced research on a specialised topic (An); most libraries will not buy in the autonomic nervous system because it is a specialised area (M); keeping up with current literature (BH); tight in all areas (BH); decline in purchase of local histories (BH); gaps in dead serials holdings (BH); intelligence history material (JH); pre-war Japanese language texts (JH); French and Dutch colonial works (JH); access to edited conference volumes and new editions (CLL); cost of access to electronic data on Dead Sea scrolls - one volume on CD-ROM is \$3000 (CLL); language-oriented subjects go first (CLL); no overseas monographs policy (CLL); problem seems to be general rather than particular (CLL); cost of archaeological reports and serials is rocketing eg \$400-500 for a monograph not uncommon (CLL); it is all a problem (CLL); papyrology, epigraphy, numismatics (CLL); problem in particular sub-fields of classical archaeology (CLL); expensive collections of documents (CLL); we cannot afford them any more (P); monographs before 1900 (P); no journals of relevance (P); Russian publications (P); book purchases in libraries now tend to reflect the research interests of current academic staff. Hence problems for new staff/fields (P); serials (P).

## THE IMPACT OF CHANGES

**If you have perceived changes, what impact have these had on your research activities? And your teaching activities?**

**Table 10. Impact of Change on Research and Teaching**

Field	Impact of Change	
	None/No Response	Comment on Impact
American Studies (AS)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)
Environmental Management (EM)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
Anthropology (An)	1 (17%)	5 (83%)
Southeast Asian Economics (SAE)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
Medicine (M)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)
Agriculture (Ag)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)
British History (BH)	3 (27%)	8 (73%)
Japanese History (JH)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)
Classical Languages & Literature (CLL)	2 (12%)	14 (88%)
Physics (P)	13 (65%)	7 (35%)
Total (78)	35 (45%)	43 (55%)

*A little over half the respondents (55%) state that changes in the availability of overseas monographs has impacted on their research and teaching activities. The remainder (45%) make no comment or perceive little or no impact on their research and teaching activities. Respondents in Classical Languages and Literature, Anthropology, and British History are most inclined to perceive change and identify problems. Respondents in Physics perceive far less impact, with some noting 'we rely much more on journals'.*

*The main impacts of change on research include greater use of inter-library loans and electronic sources, and more reliance on overseas visits for research purposes.*

*The impact of change on teaching is felt most strongly at postgraduate level, although undergraduates compete more for available resources.*

### **Comments by respondents on the impact of change on research**

- increasingly difficult without making significant purchases of overseas material (AS).
- cost cutting in serials and microfilm materials (AS).
- when research funds permit, I employ a RA to keep an eye on literature and follow up interesting possibilities (An).
- curtailed (An).
- I have to buy more books and go to specialised collections (An).
- when one doesn't have, one does without. I buy whatever I can. If a book is important, I want to have my own copy (SAE).
- I have a network of helpful librarians in Melbourne and Sydney (M).
- much easier to access the availability of new material through electronic sources (Ag).
- good electronic abstracts have made reference work much easier (Ag).
- more ILL requests (BH).
- makes it more difficult and frustrating (BH).
- life is more difficult (BH).
- reduced scope of research (BH).
- fairly minimal as yet (BH).
- some delays in access to overseas monographs (BH).
- less access to research works, more costly ILL, cutting one's losses and disregarding valuable sources not available (BH).
- material not current enough (JH).
- electronic search has facilitated literature search (JH).
- increased energy and time spent on accessing books (CLL).
- slowed publication (CLL).

- I tend to consider it selfish to request books relating only to my personal research (CLL).
- slight inconveniences eg ILL (CLL).
- more ILL which can take weeks if not months (CLL).
- spend more time looking for books. Have to put off research until I can go overseas (CLL).
- work is slowed down. I have only been able to manage by annual visits to libraries in Germany (CLL).
- completely impossible for me to research in the area covered by my doctoral work (CLL).
- ILL seems reasonably efficient. I'm always shocked, visiting foreign libraries, at how much we don't have, and worry that my published papers are naive (CLL).
- I have to get overseas (CLL).
- less emphasis on purchasing new editions and classical texts (CLL).
- reduced purchases, more reliance on electronic information (CLL).
- have to spend time overseas to complete research (CLL).
- major (CLL).
- slows down progress (CLL).
- big impact when the monographs are not on electronic archives (P).
- little, we rely much more on journals (P).
- many more sources of information now, especially on the Internet (P).
- tend to rely more on the Web, therefore getting a biased reporting (P).
- greater time commitment (P).

**Comments by respondents on the impact of change on teaching**

- cutbacks in monograph purchases threaten core course readings - students must compete for access to limited holdings for essays (An).
- now use US literature on historical archaeology more (An).
- it is hard to direct students to the latest work when it is unavailable. I have to include tutorials on web and CD-ROM searching techniques (An).
- less significant, since my teaching is to undergraduates only (An).
- I find myself lending more books to postgrads (An).
- there are now more journals but we cannot buy new without cancelling old - so there are whole lots of material I do not see... we are not keeping up (BH).
- less impact, since the students are reading less and less (BH).
- books may not be available to students, let alone in multiple copies (BH).
- increasingly poorly supported (BH).
- clear decline in purchase of latest research (BH).
- harder to expose students to research monographs (BH).
- near impossible to refer students at QUT to recent monographs in European history (BH).
- material not current enough (JH).
- I tend not to request books that students cannot use (CLL).
- very little, except at honours or postgraduate level (CLL).
- have built up a good basic library of my own for teaching (CLL).
- UG teaching not affected, but PG students having difficulties (CLL).
- I have to travel to Sydney at least annually and do a huge amount of photocopying (CLL).
- PGs need to visit a decent overseas library... I fear losing our best PG students as a result of the facilities here (CLL).
- greater problems compiling bibliographies for otherwise viable courses (CLL).
- noticeable (CLL).
- leaves some gaps in areas treated; discussion not always up-to-date (CLL).
- probably improved, if I had time to read the education material which has expanded (P).
- compromise of academic standards (P).
- trend away from multiple copies of monographs causes difficulties for students (P).
- considerable - students do not buy many books these days (probably as they are expensive). The idea of a student's own personal library seems to have lapsed. Students expect the library to have multiple copies. Increasingly, this expectation is not fulfilled (P).

**COLLECTIONS POLICIES FOR OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS**

The following questions relate to your own institutional library, in so far as they bear on your own teaching and research activities. What changes, if any, have you perceived in your library’s collections policies over the last 5 years? Who makes decisions on what to buy? How, if at all, do members of your teaching and/or research section contribute to the process of deciding whether or not to buy relevant monographs? Are you satisfied with the decision-making process? If not, why? If you are not satisfied, in what ways do you think the decision-making process might be improved?

**Table 11. Collections Policies for Overseas Monographs**

Field	Perception of Change		Who Makes Decisions to Buy?			Satisfied with Process?	
	None/No comment/ Positive comment	Negative perception (decreased budget)	Library on advice	I do/ Individuals	Department or School/ Library Committee	Yes	No
American Studies (AS)	1	3	2	1	1	4	
Environmental Management (EM)	1	1	2			2	
Anthropology (An)	1	5	1	1	4	4	2
Southeast Asian Economics (SAE)			1	1		3	
Medicine (M)	2	2	2		2	3	
Agriculture (Ag)	1	2	2		1	3	
British History (BH)	1	10	4	3	3	4	6
Japanese History (JH)	1	5		3	2	2	3
Classical Languages & Literature (CLL)	5	11	3	5	7	15	1
Physics (P)	10	10	6	4	9	17	3
Total/Percentage	23 (32%)	49 (68%)	23 (33%)	18 (26%)	29 (41%)	57 (79%)	15 (21%)

Most respondents (68%) perceive a change in their library’s collections policies over the past five years. Of these, most see decreasing budgets as the main influence of change. The change is more apparent to respondents for serials than for monographs.

The purchasing process for overseas monographs typically involves academic recommendation, screening of recommendations by departments and libraries, and purchase by libraries.

Most respondents (79%) are satisfied with their library’s acquisition system for overseas monographs, and consider their system to be reasonably consultative and democratic. In view of decreasing funds, there appears to be a reluctant acceptance by respondents of the need for increased screening and accountability. Several respondents report that a well argued case will result in a purchase by their institutional library.

**Comments by respondents on collections policies, acquisition of overseas monographs, decision-making process, and ways to improve decision-making process**

- better communication and definition of roles and responsibilities among librarians and academics (An).
- our administrative staff not qualified to rank requests for monographs to library (An).
- library staff now more discriminating - if the case is good, they buy the book (An).
- fine so far, but higher budget allocation needed (An).
- given tight budget, we’re stuck with a screening system by departmental library liaison person and library (An).
- monographs requested by departments and usually purchased (An).
- with decreased funding, purchases are more closely targeted to specific research needs. Journals held in regional CSIRO or academic libraries may be cancelled as part of the rationalisation process (Ag).
- we are not able to compete with the resources available to scholars elsewhere (BH).

## NATIONAL ACADEMIES FORUM: USER PERCEPTIONS OF OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS

- given financial restraints, decisions are fairly reasonable though monograph vote often squeezed by cost of scientific serials (BH).
- larger budget needed, and a library administration more attuned to humanities (BH).
- particular requirements of specific disciplines need to be more closely addressed (BH).
- greater staff input needed into decisions regarding resource management (BH).
- acquisitions librarian routinely over-rules staff requests - no appeals or explanations (BH).
- we collude with colleagues when proposing expensive titles eg microfilm sets. Library is now less open about its policies eg. expenditure on dubious electronic gadgetry (BH).
- there should be a library specialist in each area responsible for the actual ordering in targeted collections, with the advice only of academic staff - most of whom have no time these days to develop library collections (BH).
- academic staff not consulted by head of school (JH).
- under-representation in humanities (JH).
- library liaison officer spends money buying books of interest to him/her (JH).
- acquisitions could be handled more rationally with input from a properly qualified bibliographer/librarian (JH).
- we order and as long as it is not too highly priced, it will be bought (CLL).
- system OK - it's just that there's no money to allocate in the first place (CLL).
- we have occasional meetings to discuss recommendations within allocated budget (CLL).
- reduction in purchases of overseas journals (CLL).
- we don't have time. Ideally, libraries would have subject specialists to compile lists for consideration by academic staff (CLL).
- largely satisfied except there is no time to do it properly (CLL).
- need academic librarians who understand requirements of academics (CLL).
- attempt to tie purchases to quantitative criteria eg. department publication output (CLL).
- decimation of monograph and serial collections (P).
- most requests are routinely granted (P).
- more library search routines; more soft copies available (P).
- the convenience of electronic access is to be commended (P).
- the institution needs to frame its priorities for collection better, and cooperate more effectively with other institutions (P).
- greater emphasis on formula funding to the detriment of science and engineering (P).
- deterioration of serials collection but no change on monographs for which we are well resourced (P, 2 responses).
- members of department make recommendations to department rep who in turn makes request to library - a good system (P).
- The Physics Library Committee meets regularly with the Physics Branch Librarian and decides what will actually be ordered - until recently, usually most of them (P).

## PROVIDING BOOKS FOR COURSES

### How does your institution ensure that existing courses are adequately resourced with overseas monographs?

*Respondents refer to a coordinated process of request to the library for monographs, an evaluation of requests by the library, and in most cases, a satisfactory resolution of requests ('we order, they buy, as long as the orders are reasonable'). However, the pressure of decreasing budgets is reflected in comments such as 'we have to tailor our courses to the resources'.*

#### Comments by respondents on their institution's resourcing of existing courses

- up to staff to order, responsibility of staff within budget (7 responses).
- it doesn't, they don't, it can't (7 responses).
- demand by course coordinator, up to unit coordinators, liaison with course supervisors (3 responses).
- through advice from departments (2 responses).
- academic's recommendations, input from academics (2 responses).
- library/academic suggestions, library asks for suggestions from lecturer, academics invited to request monographs, liaison between delivering staff and subject librarian (4 responses).
- library does a search of existing resources.
- library requests changes to departmental teaching needs each semester.
- encouraged to use web resources.
- library buys monographs.
- library purchases - text books ordered semester before subject offered.
- we order, they buy, as long as the orders are reasonable.
- lecturer decides on books, and library buys them if they don't already have them.
- requests from staff members invariably granted. Closed reserve system and restricted undergraduate section facilitates access for students.
- library staff assess course outlines to determine recommended texts and ensure sufficient copies are available.
- text books notified to bookshop, monographs notified to library.
- we specify texts one year in advance.
- we are obligated not to prescribe books that are not held.
- typically students are now encouraged to purchase text books - cannot rely on library to have enough copies (P).
- we apply for book donations eg Japan Foundation.
- library will ask to use department's library funds.
- lecturers prepare anthologies of photocopied material.
- we have to tailor our courses to the resources.
- library has a budget for undergraduate courses.
- library chops serial subscriptions, seeks book lists.
- with difficulty through purchasing policy.
- cutting back on other activities eg. research (2 responses).
- purchases for existing courses made from central library funds by a readers adviser after suggestions from staff.

**How does your institution ensure that new courses are adequately resourced?**

*Respondents note that the resource implications for new courses are subject to close scrutiny by institutions, particularly library staff. Respondents note a reluctance by libraries to expend additional resources on monographs without a compensating reduction elsewhere.*

**Comments by respondents on their institution's resourcing of new courses**

- lecturer's responsibility, up to staff (5 responses).
- they don't, it can't, it doesn't (6 responses).
- special central funds, possible to apply for special funding for new courses (3 responses).
- there is provision for a special start-up allocation, but if the unit's projected income from enrolments does not justify the expenditure, the academic Senate will reject it.
- resource question is part of the approval process (3 responses).
- library does a search of existing resources.
- routine to check available resources.
- routine to answer sections on adequacy of library resources.
- have to consult library.
- librarian must certify adequate resources exist for new courses.
- library must formally accept its commitment to the initiative.
- no new courses if significant library purchases required.
- proposals for new courses must be discussed with library before going before a faculty.
- librarian has to approve new course proposals.
- new courses requiring additional expenditure unlikely to be approved by librarian.
- we have to provide 'bricks' of photocopied articles. Essential reading placed in short loan.
- library buys monographs.
- advance planning with course supervisors.
- China course received special funding.
- don't - we always answer 'no resource implications'.
- library asks for suggestions from lecturer.
- academics invited to request monographs.
- cutting back existing courses.
- library spends the money and buys the books.
- these books are charged against the department's budget allocation like any other.
- no support without outside funding if there is extensive need for new library collections.

**Are you aware of cases in which the availability of overseas monographs has influenced the creation of new courses or the abolition of existing ones?**

*No. 51 responses (90%).*

*Yes. 6 responses (10%), due in part to the cost implications of proposed courses.*

**INTER-LIBRARY LOANS FOR OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS**

**How many inter-library loan requests for overseas monographs would you make in a typical month during term or semester? On average, what proportion of these requests are satisfied? On average, how long (days) does it take your requests to be satisfied? Are you happy with the proportion of requests satisfied and the rate of response? If not, why not?**

**Table 12. Inter-Library Loans for Overseas Monographs**

Field	No of ILL Requests per Month	Proportion of Requests Satisfied	Days to Satisfy Requests	Satisfied with ILL Requests?	
				Yes	No
American Studies (AS)	2, 1, 1	0.9, 1.0, 1.0	10, 10, 17	3	
Environmental Management (EM)	4, 5.5	1.0, 0.8	30, 18	2	
Anthropology (An)	1, 3, 1, 10, 1	0.8, 0.9, 1.0, 0.95, 1.0	21, 30, 10, 10, 17	4	1
Southeast Asian Economics (SAE)	3, 2	0, 0.6, 0.9	12, 10	2	1
Medicine (M)	1	1.0	7	1	
Agriculture (Ag)	0.2, 1.5	0.9, 1.0	14, 17	2	
British History (BH)	15, 2.5, 3, 5, 3, 0.5, 1, 3	0.9, 0.75, 0.8, 0.8, 0.8, 0.8, 0.33	16, 14, 21, 10, 28, 30, 90, 28	3	5
Japanese History (JH)	1, 1, 2	0.5, 1.0, 1.0	14, 14, 14	3	
Classical Languages & Literature (CLL)	13, 2.5, 3, 4, 2.5, 1, 3.5, 1, 1.5, 10, 25, 0.5, 0.25, 3	0.75, 1.0, 0.9, 0.9, 1.0, 1.0, 0.7, 0.5, 0.9, 0.9, 0.6, 0.5, 0.8, 0.7	14, 10, 30, 17, 30, 45, 21, 60, 18, 18, 45, 42, 150, 60	7	6
Physics (P)	0.05, 0.25, 0.5, 4, 0.25, 0.5, 0.5, 3, 1, 0.25, 1	0.9, 0.9, 0.95, 1.0, 0.95, 0.9, 0.5, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0, 0.9	10, 21, 30, 14, 20, 7, 20, 10, 7, 3	10	1
Total/Average	156/51 = 3 per month	42.6/52 = 82% satisfied	1,214/50 = 24 days	37 (73%)	14 (27%)

*51 respondents (62%) make an average of 3 inter-library loan requests in a typical month during term or semester. Over one-third of respondents do not use inter-library loan requests. Almost half of those who use inter-library loan requests use it one or less times per month during semester.*

*On average, 82% of inter-library loan requests (both within Australia and overseas) are satisfied in approximately 24 days.*

*73% of respondents who use inter-library loan requests are happy with the proportion of requests satisfied and the rate of response. Those who express dissatisfaction (27%) state the time taken to satisfy requests is too long and the percentage of requests satisfied is not high enough. Several respondents comment on the high cost of inter-library loans. Others mention that overseas libraries are reluctant to lend monographs.*

**Comments by respondents on inter-library loans**

- don't use ILL, none, nil (16 responses).
- make very few ILL requests, rarely used (3 responses).
- I would not bother given the cost. If I truly needed a monograph I would buy it or get a friend in the USA to photocopy a relevant section.
- very expensive, so rarely undertaken.
- cost of overseas ILL is prohibitive (unless the work is crucial).
- I don't think I would bother as it takes 6-8 months to get an ILL for a journal article.
- I would try to buy it if possible.

## NATIONAL ACADEMIES FORUM: USER PERCEPTIONS OF OVERSEAS MONOGRAPHS

- obviously would prefer 100% and instantaneous [75% of this respondent's requests satisfied within 14 days].
- quicker responses [than 21 day average for this respondent] would be more convenient.
- we cannot request ILL of overseas monographs.
- by the time the book arrives [average of 16 days estimated by this respondent], I am hard pressed to remember what it was needed for and have to rely on notes. Here I do not wish to blame ILL staff who are good and helpful. It is the nature of ILL.
- the rate of satisfaction [75% for this respondent] is too low to achieve a reasonable level of research and the rate of response [average 2 weeks within Australia, 4 weeks overseas] is often deplorable but this can be the fault of the postal service as much as the lending library.
- not happy with speed of response [3 weeks to 3 months for this respondent].
- it usually takes too long (sometimes a year!) and I generally buy the book myself or wait until I am in Germany and can visit a specialist library there. Many older books will not be lent by other libraries because they are too valuable or too fragile.
- they will not bring in a book from overseas, only a photocopy of one, and if the book is too old to be deemed copyable, then I don't receive it.
- too long to satisfy request.
- somewhat slow [average of 60 days for this respondent].
- not happy with proportion of requests satisfied [50% for this respondent] or time of response [20 days].
- happy with proportion of requests satisfied, not happy with rate of response.
- response time could be quicker.
- not happy but resigned. Many of my requests go the British Library which is also understaffed and overburdened.
- cannot publish research without the missing items [60% of this respondent's requests satisfied].
- overseas libraries are often reluctant to lend to Australian libraries. Facilities for document delivery between countries are improving.

## THE FUTURE

**In relation to material from overseas, do you consider that commercial on-line information providers are likely to offer a satisfactory alternative source of information to traditional printed works?**

**Table 13. Attitude to On-Line Access to Overseas Monographs**

Field	On-Line Information a Satisfactory Alternative?		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
American Studies (AS)	2	4	
Environmental Management (EM)		1	1
Anthropology (An)		5	
Southeast Asian Economics (SAE)		3	
Medicine (M)		3	
Agriculture (Ag)	1	1	1
British History (BH)		9	1
Japanese History (JH)		5	1
Classical Languages & Literature (CLL)	1	12	3
Physics (P)	3	15	2
Total (74)	7 (10%)	58 (78%)	9 (12%)

*A large majority of respondents (78%) does not think that electronic provision of monographs is a satisfactory alternative to traditional printed works. The readability of monographs is considered the main disadvantage to electronic provision. Cost is another factor. However, on-line access to journals and catalogues is more favourably accepted by respondents.*

### **Comments by respondents on the provision of monographs by electronic means**

- for some areas yes, for others no (AS).
- the future is on-line full text monographs with pay for use structure (AS).
- on-line service is still sketchy and expensive (AS).
- no, difficult to read and not portable. Library seems to see this as a way out of budget problems but it isn't (AS).
- would anyone be prepared to stare at a screen long enough to read a book that way? Would their occupational safety people let them? (An).
- no - there is more in monographs than information (An).
- who would want to pay the cost of downloading, collating and binding them? (An).
- yes for journals, no for monographs (M).
- extremely difficult to read on screen, and half-tone photographs are terrible quality (M).
- unlikely because of expense and unwillingness to hold rarer titles (M).
- it will be many years, if ever, before the bulk of monographs is available electronically. Many problems remain including copyright, fair use, archiving, and cost (Ag).
- no, and it worries me that monograph resources may be diverted (BH).
- no, not in books. Possibly in book reviews and articles (BH).
- not for books, for serials yes (BH, 2 responses).
- unlikely in my lifetime (BH).
- not for scholarly monographs, especially in non-English languages (JH).
- no, no way (JH).
- no, not for the sort of work I do (CLL).
- printed material seems OK, graphic and photographic material concerns me (CLL).
- no, I typically require access to archaeological journals reaching back into last century. I have yet to see any back issues on-line (CLL).
- demand is low - print runs rarely exceed 500 - and we have a lot of traditional publishers who do not even have catalogues on-line, let alone e-mail addresses (CLL).
- noooooo! (CLL).
- a minor field like classics will not warrant the expense of putting material on-line (CLL).
- yes, but suspect current inefficient forms of distribution too lucrative for publishers (CLL).

- not in medium term (CLL).
- not for monographs (P).
- commercial publishers are very grasping. They do not offer electronic access unless one gets the printed copies (P).
- no, you can't beat a book for readability and accessibility (P).
- not if they are more than a few pages long. Traditional printed works are much easier to read and leaf through, and greatly superior to print-outs (P).
- they are not ever going to put complete books on-line. For serials it might go that way. You want to hold a book in your hand. If you download 300-400 pages it makes it awfully bulky and inconvenient relative to a nicely bound book (P).
- in my field of physics, while leading the way in on-line serials, there is no movement I know of in on-line serials (P).

**Do you have ideas about how the Australian library system could be changed over the next few years to improve access to overseas monographs?**

*Respondents suggest, in order of frequency:*

1. *institutional specialisation and cooperation - 26 responses.*
2. *more funding - 12 responses.*
3. *increased on-line access - 10 responses.*
4. *improved inter-library loan system - 6 responses.*

**Comments by respondents on improving access to overseas monographs**

- more money (AS).
- forget purchases and encourage on-line pay for use distribution with libraries acting as clearing houses for academic use (AS).
- on-line seems to be the way to go but as yet there is not a huge number of serials available in my field (AS).
- I would like to see monographs archived electronically so that out of print books could be accessed readily (AS).
- some initiative to tackle the price disadvantage compared to the USA, UK, etc (An).
- given the inevitable budget constraints, joint buying among universities in a single region (eg. Southeast Queensland) might be the best solution. There would have to be a very efficient ILL system and that would cost money. Maybe it would be easier to push for electronic access (with thoroughly refereed electronic publications) (An).
- larger budget allocations, stronger Australian dollar (An).
- yes, follow the Perilous Pauline and just print money (An).
- extend ILL system to overseas material (SAE).
- yes, but the present government would not accept them (SAE).
- more consortia approaches to joint purchasing, resource sharing (M).
- it will only change if funding is adequate (M).
- continue to contribute to on-line access and services (Ag).
- I think we probably need to concentrate certain collections in certain areas, to retain access within the country. Speedier ILL would be great, but how? (BH).
- more reciprocal buying and borrowing (BH).
- we need more money and a stronger dollar, for starters (BH).
- NLA should be the national resource for researchers, particularly for those of us focused on non-Australian topics as these tend to be poorly defended in budget cuts (BH).
- bulk purchases from major academic publishers (BH).
- conglomerates of state libraries picking up responsibility for NLA non-priority areas (BH).
- a coordinated approach to library acquisitions, specialisation, and electronic copies (BH).
- revive proposal to create Pacific National Science Library. Return to the idea of a national bookstack - one science, one social science. Persuade NLA that Australian interests derive from Europe. Wake up dormant NLA Board (BH).
- if we do decide to focus - eg on Melbourne Uni for early modern, where the collection is strong - then how do people in WA gain access? (BH).
- build up specialist collections in specific libraries - as long as works are available from other institutions by ILL (BH).

- lend new journals on ILL - but I know that this is impossible (JH).
- the on-going drive towards institutional specialisation and cooperation would seem the best approach (JH).
- China-Japan-Korea cataloguing system could be improved (JH).
- it takes money to buy the books, have them catalogued, and provide space for them (JH).
- a reasonable level of funding for a start (CLL).
- allocate certain periodicals to certain libraries - need all libraries hold *Philogus*? (CLL).
- more funding (CLL).
- there are many books and periodicals of which it is important to have a single copy somewhere in Australia so that ILL can be arranged more quickly than from overseas libraries (CLL).
- there could be more cooperation between ANU and the NLA (CLL).
- it is essential to make ordering less haphazard. This requires time from trained professionals. I don't know where this time is going to come from, as libraries too are shedding staff (CLL).
- I think the German system is worth considering. There one institution is chosen to be a special centre for a particular subject. The library receives special funding for acquisitions in that area. The goal is to collect everything that is published in that area. In this way there is one library in the country where one knows one will find everything one wants in one's area. A specialist in the relevant area is attached to do the ordering of books (CLL).
- an increase in library resource budgets would be a start. If journals' contents - rather than just their indices - were put on-line and made available world-wide, this would help, but for archaeological articles there are always plates, and illustrations still do suffer somewhat when digitised, and take up a lot of space (CLL).
- no, other than more money and a more efficient ILL service. Our holdings have gone from first-rate 15 years ago to second-rate now... (CLL).
- not without a massive injection of funds (CLL).
- an informal division of subject areas between different academic libraries (CLL).
- specialist collections built up and maintained as a national facility (CLL).
- only through increased financial support (CLL).
- cooperate with overseas libraries to place more material on-line; bypass conventional publishers; establish standards of software and presentation at international level (CLL).
- more awareness of internationalism of research and publications - irrelevance of language and place of publication (CLL).
- buy CD versions and provide them on-line (P).
- the obvious, but hard to implement one of negotiating holdings between institutions (P).
- they should take a united approach on their purchases (P).
- coordination (P).
- my access to overseas monographs is excellent. A bigger problem is accessing publications in obscure journals, conference proceedings, and internal reports (P).
- as long as one library, eg National Library, holds every one, that is probably sufficient (P).
- greater cooperation in rationalising purchases (P).
- reciprocal exchanges of our academies with learned academies overseas (P).
- improved cooperation between libraries (P).
- there is a clear need for a coherent and cooperative approach by all university libraries in Australia to solve the problem. The NLA needs to take a leading role in defining the requisite policy and direction. This is clearly lacking at present and calls for changes at the very top leadership level in the NLA (P).
- for me it is not a problem. I guess this survey is driven by people in the arts (P).
- improved on-line access to library catalogues through the WWW. NLA to play a leading role (P).
- access to monographs is not an issue in most fields of science. The real issue is access to international journals which is becoming worse (P).
- Australia needs a Library of Congress as a backstop. In addition, each institution should have an appropriate, nationally coordinated, acquisitions policy (P).
- lower prices for overseas monographs! Book prices in Australia (exchange rates aside) have always been artificially high (P).