

**How We Did(n't do) It:**

**Reflections on Structural Change in an Academic Library**

Peter Zimmerman

Head, Information Services Department

Leddy Library, University of Windsor

[pzimmer@uwindsor.ca](mailto:pzimmer@uwindsor.ca)

## Abstract

The University of Windsor's Leddy Library recently struck a committee to examine its public service functions (collections, reference, and information literacy) with an eye towards departmental restructuring. This paper adopts a theoretical perspective to explore the challenges faced by the committee, focussing on the influence of conflicting modern and postmodern models of librarianship.

## Introduction

The University of Windsor's Leddy Library recently underwent an examination of its public service functions (collections, reference, and information literacy) with an eye towards a possible departmental restructuring. A committee, known as the Collections/Reference Working Group, was the focal point of the restructuring exercise. This paper explores the activity of the Collections/Reference Working Group from a theoretical perspective to try to gain insight into the results of the committee's work. I will adopt something of a narrative framework, starting from the historic events of the committee's existence, but using those to probe some philosophical issues that were evident throughout, attempting to shed some light on the nature of those issues from a postmodern viewpoint. It should be made clear from the outset that the issues discussed in this paper were not necessarily explicitly discussed by the working group; rather, they provide one possible perspective on the undercurrents which affected or influenced the working group's task.

## Context

The University of Windsor, situated in Windsor, Ontario, Canada, is a mid-sized, comprehensive university, which in the Canadian context means offering a wide range of undergraduate and graduate programs including professional degrees, and having a significant amount of research activity. The University offers more than 130 graduate and undergraduate programs in nine faculties to a student base of approximately 16,000 full- and part-time students.

The Leddy Library is the main library on the University of Windsor campus, serving all subject areas except the Faculty of Law. The Library's collection consists of about three million volumes, over 17,000 electronic journal titles, smaller collections of e-books and audiovisual resources, and several hundred thousand data sets. The Library's operational configuration consists of the University Librarian and one Associate University Librarian as administrators, a librarian complement of 21, and approximately 60 support staff. The librarians are members of the Windsor University Faculty Association and have academic, but not full faculty, status.

Like many academic libraries, the Leddy has parallel academic and operational structures. In academic terms, the librarians make up what at Windsor is called an Academic Administrative Unit equivalent to a non-departmentalised faculty, with the University Librarian equivalent to a dean. The University Librarian chairs a quasi-collegial advisory body, the University Library Administrative Committee, consisting of all Leddy librarians, two elected support staff, and three student representatives. Operationally, the Leddy Library

is divided into five departments: Access Services (including circulation), Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services (including cataloguing), Collections Services, Reference Services, and Systems. Librarians are assigned primary responsibilities in one of these departments, and most librarians have secondary responsibilities in one or more of the other departments. Support staff are generally assigned duties in only one department. Librarians function as department heads.

The working group whose activities were the starting point for the ruminations in this paper was struck from the membership of the Collections and Reference departments. The Collections department is home to six librarians, all of whom have secondary responsibilities in Reference. The Reference department, in turn, is home to nine librarians, of whom seven have secondary responsibilities in Collections. Most Collections and Reference librarians are assigned a standard list of responsibilities, each attached to a department:

#### Reference

- reader service, including general and specialized reference, subject bibliographies, and preparation of library guides
- contribution to the Library's web presence
- information literacy

#### Collections

- subject-based collections work
- liaison with academic departments
- contribution to electronic licenses and consortia

While there are clear distinctions between the two areas, there is considerable overlap in terms of both membership and subject expertise. For example, while liaison is assigned as a

collections responsibility, information literacy and specialized reference clearly have a liaison component as well.

The Leddy Library undertook a strategic planning process in 2004-2005, during which a number of issues were discussed pertaining to the structure of the Reference and Collections departments. The Strategic Planning Steering Committee sought feedback through staff focus groups, a staff retreat, and through the work of strategic planning subcommittees. The resulting Operations Strategic Plan gave significant consideration to governance issues and set out as its first goal the evaluation of mandates and priorities for all departments in the Library. With reference to the Reference and Collections departments, an additional priority was established to investigate whether the existing structure best served the needs of the institution. The Plan laid out in general terms the reasons why alternative structures were to be considered:

There have been significant changes in resources and services and it has been a long time since each department has engaged in an in-depth discussion about how those changes affect service delivery, staffing and workflow. The interaction between the Collections Department and the Reference Department was seen as in particular need of review as the activities in each department overlap significantly yet structurally are maintained separately. . . .<sup>1</sup>

A meeting of all librarians and staff with primary or secondary responsibilities in Collections or Reference was held May 15, 2005. At this meeting, it was decided the departments would jointly strike a committee consisting of two librarians and two support staff from each

department, a total of eight members. The Collections/Reference Working Group held its first meeting May 25, 2005, and agreed to continue meeting weekly with a rotating chair and secretary. The Working Group was given a mandate to examine the structure, goals, and priorities of the Collections and Reference Departments. Given the fact that 13 of the 15 librarians in the two departments had responsibilities in both areas, one of the key recommendations of the Working Group was to be whether the Departments should merge or stay separate, whether some other operational configuration should be considered, and whether the application of primary and secondary responsibilities should be refocused or eliminated. The Working Group's task was divided into two phases. The first phase would look specifically at structural issues, and the second would make recommendations on priorities, staffing, resource, and workflow implications that would result from any structural change. As will be seen, the Working Group, of which I was a member, was ultimately unsuccessful in completing even the first phase of its mandate.

### Some Theory

In part, the impetus for the Leddy Library to undertake this exercise was internal. As mentioned above, the working group was formed out of a strategic planning process that received considerable feedback regarding tensions in the structure and functioning of the two departments. However, it can be argued that the source of those tensions arises in large part externally, or at least in terms of the Library's relationship to the external world. For the

purposes of this paper, I will take the position that libraries are fundamentally modern institutions struggling to adapt to survive in a postmodern era.

A number of researchers have applied postmodern theory to libraries, and I will not attempt a comprehensive summary. It is in the nature of the postmodern that there is no straightforward definition of the term. Nevertheless, it will be useful to examine a sample of the work that has been done in this area. Muddiman provides a workable summary of the challenges of the postmodern world:

In these “new times” we seem to experience the antithesis of orderly progressive transformation: we must thrive, we are told, on chaos. Our “information” society is one that is saturated by signs: a place of complexity and puzzle, of transience and surface. In this hyperactive world we experience a contemporary crisis of knowledge, of simultaneous information overload and information poverty. Fragmentation, multiplicity, disorganisation typify our times. The networked age is, perplexingly, “post” modern.<sup>2</sup>

Muddiman puts forward three aspects of postmodernism that can be applied to the current situation in libraries: 1. postmodernism is viewed as an explicit critique of modernism; 2. postmodern theory sees the age of information as a restructuring of capitalism resulting in the commodification of information; and 3. “[t]heorising the ‘end of grand narratives’ such as Marxism or positivist science, academic postmodernists characteristically engage in a quest for new disciplinary configurations and methodologies based on pluralism and relativism.”<sup>3</sup> Each of these requires some explication.

The rise of modernism is typically understood to have taken place during the late 18th Century Enlightenment period, characterised by developing notions of empiricism, rationality, and scientific progress. Libraries would be at the centre of this project, contributing to the development of the public sphere, processing and organising society's knowledge for maximum benefit, and creating spaces and methods to control an accepted body of public knowledge. The fullest expression of the modernist library would be found in the progressive librarianship movement of the mid-20th Century. Here, the library would serve a dual purpose, disciplining and storing social memory and disseminating that knowledge back to society, with the librarian acting as expert in the necessary systems of documentation and communication: "libraries were to be the supreme form of rational social organisation in that they imposed order upon the chaos of human thought and made the resultant knowledge available for the good of mankind."<sup>4</sup> In practice, the application of empirical, modernist principles to the organisation of knowledge results in libraries imposing on information objects a system of control and classification similar to that which science finds in the natural world.<sup>5</sup> In this, librarianship has more in common with the positivist branches of the social sciences, in which the empirical scientific model and its methods are applied to society.<sup>6</sup> From the postmodern perspective, the library itself becomes an emblem of order and control, and the librarian becomes the guardian of order.<sup>7</sup> Postmodernism provides a critique of librarianship which "has essentially become a discourse of control rather than liberation."<sup>8</sup> Embodied in the stereotypical image of the stern, forbidding librarian is a network of power relations in which "the librarian's domain is that of the



creation and maintenance of order, and the library user represents a threat to that order.”<sup>9</sup> To the modernist sensibility, the library strives toward an ordered perfection in which every text has its place, and the ideal library becomes one that is never used. At this extreme, order becomes the end in itself, often to the detriment of the library user.

The modernist period described above is generally perceived to have come to an end at some point in the latter half of the 20th Century, with the advent of the postmodern.

Muddiman sees the postmodern era as coterminous with the age of information which, by the end of the 20th Century, had replaced the modernist mass society with decentralised, flexible processes of production and consumption, with information (and information management) playing a critical role: “The economy is networked, global in its reach, but local in its focus and dynamics. Information and its technologies serve as a crucial catalyst and enabler in this shift, through the networking of processing systems capable of transforming and transmitting vast amounts of data.”<sup>10</sup> Information has supplanted public knowledge from its central organising role in society, and the only value derived from knowledge is in its performative capacity to improve the functioning of the economic system. Thus the restructuring of capitalism leads to an approach to information management that strips librarianship of many of its central values. Modern, progressive librarianship, criticised as contributing to a culture of privilege in which predominantly European, male, positivist perspectives dominate, nevertheless incorporated “a set of values and ideas based on the enlightenment project incorporating an ethos of progress through the diffusion of public knowledge for the general

good.”<sup>11</sup> Postmodern capitalism replaces this ethos with one based on the commodification of information for the sole purpose of increasing wealth.\*

Muddiman’s third aspect of postmodern theory, regarding the end of “grand narratives”, is picked up by a number of other authors. It is a natural extension of the modernist attitude, applying empiricist or positivist principles to history, to find in the idea of progress the presence of metanarrative (or, more accurately, a number of conflicting metanarratives) which purports to provide a true explanation of human history, behavior, and meaning. Naturally, through such metanarratives, certain groups and perspectives are privileged. Yoder makes specific use of Lyotard in tracing the postmodern breakdown of metanarrative into a series of local narratives: postmodern society is composed of disparate communities defined geographically, demographically, or virtually, each of which defines its own truth from which flow local values, language games, and symbols. “This is problematic for libraries, institutions that have historically thrived on metanarratives, ranging from the liberating quality of knowledge, to the sacred authority of texts, to the vision of a society as ordered as the Library institution.”<sup>12</sup> The breakdown of metanarratives can be further fragmented to the level of the individual. Public knowledge, seen as objectively defined, and having been collected and controlled by librarian experts, is replaced by new forms of knowledge, typically though not exclusively communicated through electronic networks,

---

\* There is, of course, a rival perspective which sees the solution to the problem of commodification in the growing open source movement. While the term “open source” applies most strictly to software development, the principal, often under the heading “open access”, has been adopted by an increasing number of content publishers. As of this writing, the Directory of Open Access Journals lists 2,496 titles all of which exercise peer-review or editorial quality control (DOAJ). Arguably, the open source movement is itself the result of a shift in thinking that is characteristically postmodern, away from centralised (predominantly economic) control towards distributed responsibility and a “do it yourself” ethic.

expressing potentially endless group and individual identities.<sup>13</sup> The library, with its traditional reliance on objectivity, authority, and expertise, becomes increasingly challenged as our users find empowerment through alternate narratives some of which deny the very need for libraries to exist.

### Exploring Change

The Collections/Reference Working Group spent a great deal of time talking about change in general and specific changes that confront libraries and librarians. The discourse of change will be familiar to anyone who has read professional literature in just about any field: change is not only occurring, but it is constant and permanent, and to manage successfully is to manage for change. It would be inaccurate to suggest that my colleagues on the working group universally shared my interest in postmodernism as providing a possible frame for understanding the changes we identified—indeed, some might even strenuously disagree—but we were certainly in agreement that the phenomenon of change was of central concern to the major library functions under discussion: collections, reference, and information literacy.

On the collections side, new methods in content creation (weblogs, wikis, print on demand, etc.) coupled with changes in the scholarly publishing world (not least among these, the increasing trend towards open access) require new approaches to collections development.<sup>14</sup> The blurring of boundaries among authors, publishers, distributors, granting agencies, and libraries, as well as the blurring roles among librarians in collections, cataloguing (metadata), and systems, are leading to significant changes in the academic

publishing cycle and in the library's role.<sup>15</sup> The deterioration of traditional information hierarchies, with the resulting uncertainty about the role of libraries, present significant challenges.<sup>16</sup> The very concept of "the library" has become considerably more fluid than in the past. Many universities, the University of Windsor among them, are moving to a "learner-centred" model which may be in conflict with the traditional "collection-centred" focus of academic libraries. The continuing impact of reduced resources, a vendor marketplace in flux, perpetual technological change, and the concomitant evolution in the skill-sets needed by librarians must also be taken into consideration.<sup>17</sup>

For reference, the transition to a postmodern world raises a number of concerns. Arguably, our primary reference service points—the reference desks—no longer serve the majority of our patrons. In the Leddy Library, we have reached a point where the level of remote use is comparable to, if not greater than, traditional in-house use. We have experimented with methods to serve remote patrons, through email and chat, but other possibilities (perhaps including web forums, wikis, or other interactive virtual spaces) may well be the way of the future. We have also done some work with empowering staff at the circulation desk to answer basic reference questions, and we note that other institutions have experimented with combining the reference and circulation desks. In addition, we have traditionally understood the bibliographic instruction function as a subset of reference service. However, with the adoption of an information literacy model, this function has become much more significant both in terms of the goals of the institution and the work involved. An information literacy program requires considerable collaboration with faculty

and a learner-centred approach to teaching. Indeed, the Leddy Library's Information Literacy Policy, adopted in 2003, commits the Library to developing information literacy programs that (among other things) recognise multidisciplinary, include active and collaborative learning activities in a learner-centred approach, and focus on critical thinking and reflection.<sup>18</sup> These characteristics can all be seen to have evolved out of the milieu of postmodern theory discussed above.

The Collections/Reference Working Group deliberated through the summer of 2005, discussing these issues and their implications for our Library in considerable detail. There emerged three major areas of tension within the group: the nature of specialisation or expertise for librarians, the extent to which the library can and should become user-centred, and the nature and role of information literacy. As mentioned above, in our context the large majority of librarians assigned to the Reference and Collections Departments are expected to contribute (either as a primary or secondary area of focus) in three areas: collections, reference, and information literacy; but the evenness with which librarians are expected to distribute their work among these three areas is not always clear or consistent. At one end of this spectrum we have what could be called a liaison model, where librarians organize their work around the academic departments to which they have been assigned liaison responsibilities, and at the other end we have what could be called a specialist model, where librarians specialise in one of the three library functions.

The specialist model equates fairly closely to the modernist vision of the librarian acting as expert, as the gatekeeper to knowledge who imposes order and meaning on the

chaotic universe of texts. Stover, speaking specifically about reference librarianship, posits a need for a non-expert approach to the reference transaction. The concept of the expert relies on the modernist notion of an objective knowledge base separate from and independent of the knower. The expert, by the ability to make use of this knowledge, is privileged, legitimised, and placed in a position of power over those who approach the expert for guidance or assistance.<sup>19</sup> In Stover's analysis, this dynamic is characteristic of the reference interview; however, a similar analysis can be made with regard to other areas of the library. For Radford, the power dynamic is embedded in the very structure of the library itself. Through our collection and classification activities, we create a large and complex structure of information objects, and those same systems which we claim are designed to facilitate access to use of the collection can become barriers for users who must "engage with the rationality of the library directly and must submit to its version of the order of things"<sup>20</sup> in order to find what they need. Indeed, it is a simple thing to extend this analysis to the selection of the texts that make up the raw materials of this "rationality". As the disciplinary areas in which we collect in an academic setting themselves become increasingly blurred, as interdisciplinarity becomes more common, and as localized narratives (i.e. those not considered canonical in the traditional disciplines) gain in significance, the notion of selecting for our collections only the best or most appropriate materials becomes increasingly problematic.

Stover posits as a solution, at least regarding the reference interaction, the adoption of an attitude based on postmodern movements in psychotherapy in which the notion of expertise shared between client and (for our purposes) librarian is central: expertise becomes

embedded in the interaction rather than in the expert. Simply put, “the librarian as non-expert does not impose the ‘answer’ on the client, but rather works with the client to seek solutions in a collaborative manner.”<sup>21</sup> Again, this approach is consistent with possible solutions in other areas of library activity as well. Radford’s critique, while addressing the library as whole, speaks directly to both collections and cataloguing issues. Computer-based searching frees the user from the discipline imposed by the library, and the librarian becomes a guide not to the retrieval of a particular answer in a specific text, but to the creation of new relationships among texts created during the search process. In the postmodern library, “there is no longer a canon to turn to and master. Everything is potentially valuable or worthless, depending on its position in the temporary contexts that are created in individual library searches.”<sup>22</sup> A user-centred approach becomes key to the functioning of the postmodern library. (In academic libraries we might prefer the term learner-centred, which differs from user-centred, but not so significantly as to require elaboration here.) User-centeredness arises quite naturally from the breakdown of metanarratives, the validation of the local and individual, and the undermining of the notion of the expert. Our users do not consider the library central to their information universe; rather, users view the library as one entity in a complex, personal information space that includes personal collections and web resources.<sup>23</sup> In terms of the library’s electronic resources, users want the flexibility which an electronic environment can provide without the restrictions inherent in a fixed collection structure. Education becomes a process of disintermediation that allows and encourages our users to function independently.<sup>24</sup> The challenge for the librarian is to step down from the position of

authority to contribute to the learning process in such a way that empowers users, allowing and facilitating their agency in their own education.<sup>25</sup>

In some ways, the questions of expertise and user-centeredness are central to discussions of information literacy. In the Leddy Library context, one element of our discussion was the simple, utilitarian question of whether an information literacy program which has grown significantly in both size and importance should remain housed in the Reference Department, would be better served in an omnibus department responsible for all of collections, reference, and information literacy, or might perhaps be best situated in a smaller department dedicated to information literacy alone. As an emerging discipline within librarianship, information literacy can be understood to originate in a postmodern approach to librarianship. Unlike bibliographic instruction, information literacy inheres in the learner. Where bibliographic instruction is centred on the library, usually focussing on a specific resource or subject area, information literacy is learner-centred and outcomes based. Indeed, information literacy extends well beyond the library: one fundamental goal of information literacy is to enable “learners to master content and extend their investigations, become more self-directed, and assume greater control over their own learning.”<sup>26</sup> The skills associated with information literacy can be seen as central to the creation of local or personal narratives. In focussing beyond the retrieval of information and placing a priority on critical thinking skills and the evaluation of information sources, information literacy provides tools for the creation of new knowledge and its incorporation into novel and emerging perspectives. Finally, as it seeks to promote an understanding of the cultural, economic, ethical, legal, and



social issues surrounding the use and production of information, information literacy can provide something of an antidote to some of the more negative aspects of the postmodern world, such as commodification and consumerism, superficiality, and the fragmentation of knowledge.<sup>27</sup> As academic libraries increasingly develop and promote a user-centred approach to learning outcomes, the implications of information literacy policies/programs permeate well beyond the areas of reference and instruction. For example, approaches to collection development can move from being curriculum-centred, as they have traditionally been, to learner-centred, where the focus becomes the student experience: “What we are suggesting is developing a collection, regardless of format, that meets curricular needs but also addresses the interdisciplinary nature of learning outcomes; recognizes the disparate intellectual, cultural, and social needs of a diverse student body; and supports the library’s outcomes for information literacy.”<sup>28</sup>

## Conclusion

As mentioned, this paper is not intended to describe in detail the activities of the Collections/Reference Working Group. In some ways, it is more of an extended riff on some of the issues that came up, told strictly from the perspective of one member. However, it was mentioned above that the group ultimately failed in its task, and so it remains to tell the final chapter of that story. The working group met weekly (indeed, some weeks more than once) from the end of May until mid-October, 2005. We began by seeking input from our colleagues in the two departments, seeking specific advice from a number of colleagues whose

roles in the Library we hoped would provide important insight. We discussed the pros and cons of a variety of departmental configurations at length, keeping our colleagues in the departments up to date along the way. In September, we distributed a document to our colleagues outlining what we believed to be the most viable restructuring options along with an overview of possible ramifications of each. After collecting and deliberating on feedback on the structural options document, the working group decided by a strong (though not unanimous) majority to recommend that the two department structure be maintained. The names of the departments would be changed to reflect their priorities, and one librarian position (the digital services librarian) would move from Reference to Collections. Finally, information literacy would remain part of Reference, but the information literacy librarian would become a coordinator position to reflect the growing importance of that area. In some respects, then, it is unfair to say that the working group failed in meeting its mandate, in that we did successfully complete the first phase of that mandate, admittedly considerably behind schedule, in making recommendations on the structural configuration; and having come to the conclusion that the structure should not change significantly, it made sense to have the second phase of the mandate (priorities, staffing, resource, and workflow implications) transferred to the departments to handle separately.

However, an interesting thing happened when the recommendation came forward. On October 25, 2005, a second joint departmental meeting of Collections and Reference was held (the first had been when the working group was struck). At that meeting, a vote was taken to approve the working group's recommendation, and it failed. I call this interesting,

because I believe we had communicated effectively with our colleagues in the departments. I believe they fully understood the issues, and judging by the discussion prior to the vote being taken, they had thought deeply. It may be foolish to attempt a pat explanation of how or why this outcome occurred, but clearly for many there is an appetite for greater change than the working group had recommended. I believe it is possible to situate this result in the postmodern discourse described above. To a certain extent, it would be an oversimplification to suggest that the committee took an explicitly modernist view and was outvoted by our postmodern colleagues. Nevertheless, the working group's recommendation arguably grew out of a traditional understanding of the role and functions of libraries and librarians, especially in two areas. First, the working group clearly preferred a model based on librarian expertise within the context of a narrowly defined library function—a model of expertise which maintains a librarian-centred focus at the expense of user-centeredness, and which I have shown is definitively rejected from a postmodern perspective. Second, and more importantly, we clearly failed to address adequately the challenge presented by the growing importance of information literacy, which I have argued requires a very different understanding of the interaction between librarians and patrons than the traditional, modernist approach. In some ways, information literacy is exemplary of the challenges facing academic libraries, as we increasingly apply interdisciplinary understandings to the task of creating a learner-centred environment that empowers our users and encourages them, ultimately, to take control of their individual information landscapes.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Leddy Library, Operations Strategic Plan. Online. (2005) Available: <http://www.uwindsor.ca/units/leddy/leddy.nsf/OperationsStrategicPlan.pdf> (May 9, 2006).

<sup>2</sup> Dave Muddiman. "Towards a Postmodern Context for Information and Library Education." *Education for Information* 17 (1999), pp. 1-19.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Gary P. Radford. "Flaubert, Foucault, and the Bibliotheque Fantastique: Toward a Postmodern Epistemology for Library Science." *Library Trends* 46 (Spring 1998), pp. 616-634.

<sup>6</sup> Brenda Dervin. "Information—Democracy: An Examination of Underlying Assumptions." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 45 (July 1994), pp. 369-385.

<sup>7</sup> Radford. "Flaubert, Foucault," p. 619.

<sup>8</sup> Muddiman. "Towards a Postmodern Context," p. 7.

<sup>9</sup> Radford. "Flaubert, Foucault," pp. 618-619.

<sup>10</sup> Muddiman. "Towards a Postmodern Context," p. 8.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>12</sup> Amanda R. Yoder. "The Cyborg Librarian as Interface: Interpreting Postmodern Discourse on Knowledge Construction, Validation, and Navigation within Academic Libraries." *portal: Libraries & the Academy* 3 (2003), pp. 381-392.

<sup>13</sup> Muddiman. "Towards a Postmodern Context," p. 13.

<sup>14</sup> Roy Tennant. "Collection Development Today." *Library Journal* 130 (May 15, 2005), p. 28.

<sup>15</sup> Dorner, D. G. "The Blurring of Boundaries: Digital Information and its Impact on Collection Management." *International Yearbook of Library and Information Management* (2000/2001), pp. 15-44.

- <sup>16</sup> Sonia Bodi & Katie Maier-O'Shea. "The Library of Babel: Making Sense of Collection Management in a Postmodern World." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 31 (March 2005), pp. 143-50.
- <sup>17</sup> Lisa M. Covi & Melissa H. Cragin. "Reconfiguring Control in Library Collection Development: A Conceptual Framework for Assessing the Shift Toward Electronic Collections." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 55 (Feb. 15, 2003), pp. 312-325.
- <sup>18</sup> Leddy Library, Leddy Library Information Literacy Policy. Online. (2003) Available: <http://www.uwindsor.ca/units/leddy/leddy.nsf/ILpolicy.pdf> (May 9, 2006).
- <sup>19</sup> Mark Stover. "The Reference Librarian as Non-Expert: A Postmodern Approach to Expertise." *The Reference Librarian* 87/88 (2004), pp. 273-300.
- <sup>20</sup> Radford. "Flaubert, Foucault," p. 621.
- <sup>21</sup> Stover. "The Reference Librarian as Non-Expert," p. 287.
- <sup>22</sup> Radford. "Flaubert, Foucault," p. 631.
- <sup>23</sup> Hur-Li Lee. "The Concept of Collection from the User's Perspective." *Library Quarterly* 75 (2005), pp. 67-85.
- <sup>24</sup> Atkinson, Ross. "Toward a Redefinition of Library Services," in *Virtually Yours: Models for Managing Electronic Resources and Services*, edited by Peggy Johnson & Bonnie MacEwan (Chicago: American Library Association, 1999), pp. 3-21.
- <sup>25</sup> Yoder. "The Cyborg Librarian," p. 384.
- <sup>26</sup> Association of College and Research Libraries, Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. Online. (2000) Available: <http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/standards.pdf> (May 9, 2006).
- <sup>27</sup> Yoder. "The Cyborg Librarian," p. 387.
- <sup>28</sup> Bodi & Maier-O'Shea. "The Library of Babel," p. 145.