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‘When libraries served more as warehouse utilities, data-driven decision-making was crucial. Now as more of our work increasingly revolves around forming complex relationships and ongoing interactions, a more humanistic approach is required for growth and improvement’ (Mathews 2014, p. 461)

Introduction

Our review of social developments in higher education (HE) showed how key trends such as the shift from an elite to a mass system, coupled with the drive for social inclusion and reductions in public funding against a backdrop of digitalisation and globalisation are shaping policies, pedagogies and professions for the 21st century. Significant developments include the expansion and diversification of student services to support larger heterogeneous populations through educational and social transitions, including the adoption of lifecycle models and a commitment to educating the whole student; a renewed focus on the so-called third mission of universities, which puts their responsibilities to the economy and society on a par with their roles in learning, teaching and research; and the resurgence of a global student-led movement to decolonise the academic curriculum, the HE sector and the whole scholarly knowledge system, which has foregrounded difficult questions for institutions around colonialism, Eurocentrism and racism, and also forced a step-change in evolving relationships with students as partners.

The present chapter returns to the narrative on the social turn in HE with a closer look at the service responses of academic libraries to the many complex challenges of the 21st century. The chapter adopts a topical structure and concentrates on areas where the social transformation of HE is having a major impact on library work. We start with a classic business dilemma, the challenge of serving very large diverse populations with different needs at different times in ways that are affordable, equitable and inclusive. We next review library participation in university strategies for socioeconomic development based on reaching out to business and the local community, then switch to the global arena with
library strategies for international students. The following sections deal with two other areas where librarians have assumed broader responsibilities, namely student wellbeing and literacy development, while our final section provides a selective review of the growing body of work using intellectual and social capital and related concepts to provide insights into academic library resources, roles and relationships.

The topical arrangement enables us to pull out significant developments, such as the strengthened commitment of libraries to helping students manage their learning journeys from before they enter HE to after they leave the academy; and the broader interpretation of their educational responsibilities that librarians have now assumed, which extends beyond the academic development of students to their personal and social needs. Together such developments suggest significant job enlargement with librarians facilitating both lifelong and lifewide learning for larger student populations. Many of the service enhancements identified have been accomplished by extending or adapting existing jobs, notably via the well-established role of academic liaison librarian and its variants (such as personal and first-year librarians, international and student-service liaisons). Finally, the role of librarians in literacy development is an important recurring theme: library teaching has expanded substantially in recent decades, which is evident in the many references to literacy occurring throughout the chapter, the array of different literacies that librarians are promoting, and the range of pedagogies they have adopted for diverse contexts.

Mass customisation and lifecycle thinking

A key theme of 21st century work in HE and beyond is the blurred boundaries between different areas and roles, notably between ‘third-stream’ and mainstream functions and between academic activities and student services, manifest in cross-boundary collaborations, multi-professional teams, the integration of service interventions in academic curricula and vice versa. Weaver (2013, p. 103) describes ‘the seismic shift’ in relationships ‘between libraries and their client base, libraries and their counterpart support services, and libraries and their institutions’, noting the UK trend of universities physically co-locating and/or structurally merging library and other professional services into new organisational units, known as ‘super-convergence’ to distinguish them from prior models combining libraries with technology and/or learning support. Such units are designed to provide ‘seamless, integrated services’ and may include ‘careers, welfare and counselling, student administration, chaplaincy support, student finance, learning development, study skills and programme administration’ in addition to library, IT and media (Heseltine et al. 2009; Weaver 2013, p. 104).

Setting aside organisational arrangements, the general trend is towards holistic services in HE delivering life-wide support for the personal and social development of students, with libraries assuming an ‘extended role in the retention and progression of students across the multiple transition points’ of the student journey and indeed ‘in the life of students’, instead of concentrating on their academic needs while ‘on course’ (Weaver 2013, pp. 103, 114). The concept of lifewide learning originated in adult education and literacy as an outgrowth of the lifelong learning movement as a broader three-way conception of learning that acknowledges the potential benefits of informal learning on-the-job, in everyday life and
civic participation, alongside formal learning through educational institutions and non-formal learning via workplace training or professional networks (Clark 2005, p. 52; Desjardins 2003, p. 15; OECD 2001, p. 18). It is also associated with broader conceptions of how learning represented by human (and social) capital contributes to personal, psychological and social well-being.

In HE, Norman Jackson (2008, p. 3; 2011) has promoted the concept via a pioneering life-wide experiential learning award ‘for commitment to Professional, Personal and Social Development’ at the University of Surrey in line with a vision of ‘whole life’ learning that links lifelong and life-wide learning with personal wellbeing. Similar thinking informs the AACU integrative learning initiative in the US, which is about ‘Fostering students’ abilities to integrate learning – across courses, over time, and between campus and community life’ (Huber & Hutchings, 2004, p. 13) and the connected curriculum at University College London through which students ‘make connections across subjects and out to the world’, ‘connect academic learning with workplace learning’ and ‘connect with each other, across phases and with alumni’, where ‘curriculum’ includes ‘not only planned teaching and learning activities and curricular content but also the students’ lived experiences of learning while they study’ (Fung 2016, pp. 31, 32). In turn, academic libraries are facilitating ‘whole life’ learning by reviving recreational reading collections ‘to help students create connections between what they learn inside and outside of the classroom’ (Hallyburton, Buchanan & Carstens 2011, p. 110) and teaching information literacy from ‘multiple life perspectives’ to support the personal, professional and academic needs of students (Ruleman et al. 2017).

Weaver (2013) uses a four-stage model of the student journey lifecycle (pre-entry, first-year, on-course, employment or further study) to review library contributions to student transitions and success. Student lifecycle models rarely feature in the library literature, but it is evident that academic librarians are now designing services that are not just tailored to disciplinary needs, but customised to different life-cycle stages (and life-style requirements). Figure 5.1 draws on multiple sources to provide an overview of the much fuller range of support now provided by academic libraries, contextualised by the change drivers previously elaborated.

**Pre-arrival and orientation**

Library outreach to school students prior to university entry is a long-established strategy in the US, but has evolved from talks and tours into multifaceted interventions in schools, on campus and via websites to develop information literacy (IL) and support educational transition (Adeyemon 2009; Burhanna & Jensen 2006; Collins 2009; Martin, Garcia & McPhee 2012). Such programs serve multiple purposes, such as building community relations, bridging digital divides and promoting HE, as well as introducing academic resources, reducing library anxiety and helping student recruitment, and have gained momentum from technology developments and continuing efforts to improve access to HE for underrepresented groups. Libraries in the UK have similarly contributed to institutional strategies for widening participation through pre-entry interactions with schools, often enlisting current students to serve as ambassadors for workshops and visits (Ackerley & Wilson 2012; Stewart 2005).
University libraries in Australia have used Higher Education Participation and Partnerships (HEPP) program funding awarded to their parent institutions to recruit staff specifically to enhance transitional support for students with low socioeconomic status (LSES) and promote social inclusion. Both Western Sydney and Monash University Libraries rejected the deficit model of support that treats LSES students differently and instead created and delivered skills programs to all first-year students (Dewi & Manuell 2014; Reading 2016). UK librarians have recognised the need to support transition to study and ‘learning before arriving’ for students entering Master’s programs; Murphy and Tilley (2019) describe an open educational resource developed at Cambridge as a pre-arrival intervention for a heterogeneous home and international student population to help students with academic practices and identity formation in their discipline.

US librarians have responded to the first-year experience (FYE) movement in the sector both by participating in institutional activities (such as orientation, first-year seminars and learning communities) and by developing their own customised programs, including provision for early-college high-school students, first-generation students, ESOL/international students and leisure book clubs. They have formed FYE interest groups within professional associations (ACRL, RUSA) and created specialist roles in libraries such as First-Year and Personal Librarians to extend and strengthen their contributions (Moniz & Moats 2014; Pun & Houlihan 2017). Burhanna and Jensen (2006, p. 510) note such positions have strategic significance in ‘making a strong institutional commitment to the first-year success of students and the library’s role in this success’.

First-year Librarian positions emerged in the 1990s with growth in institutional initiatives to improve support for incoming students and reduce drop-outs before year two; other titles include First-Year Engagement Librarian, First-Year Experience Librarian and First-Year Success Librarian (Angell 2018; Peacock 2013; Todorinova 2018). Coordinating IL instruction for first-years is generally a core responsibility, along with other activities (centrally-
managed and library-organised) providing a full spectrum of student support from academic advising to social wellbeing. Examples include summer bridge programs (high school to college transition), new student orientations, student organisation fairs, first-year writing programs, career research workshops, common reading programs and residence hall outreach, in addition to handling general queries and hosting social events (Angell 2018; Peacock 2013). Liaising and collaborating with student services and academic units emerges as critical to providing coherent support; service partners include admissions, advising, careers, counselling, health, residences and tutoring, as well as academic departments, writing centres and student organisations (Angell 2018; Todorinova 2018).

Personal Librarian (PL) programs also go back to the 1990s and earlier, but were not widely adopted until the 2000s and later when libraries began to step up efforts to connect with incoming students in a more proactive way and at a more personal level, recognising the need to support new students both academically and socially. PL programs may cover all students, but generally concentrate on first-years or target groups such as first-generation, indigenous, transfer or international students (Lafrance & Kealey 2017; Moniz & Moats 2014). Both general and targeted programs are essentially about giving personal attention to the individual needs of a heterogeneous group, on the basis that one-size-fits-all models of orientation and outreach are no longer adequate for the diverse student population of the 21st century (Lafrance & Kealey 2017). The model assigns each student a named librarian (typically existing reference or liaison librarians) as their personal contact for help to make the library more accessible. Librarians typically introduce themselves and the program via a customised video, welcome email, pre-or post-arrival letter, or postcard handed out at a required event (MacDonald & Mohanty 2017).

PL programs are less about providing special or extra services and more about new ways of communicating and connecting with students. However, in practice they significantly augment what the library offers by building relationships with students, forming community for students and prioritising engagement of students to support their academic and social integration and success (MacDonald & Mohanty 2017). As Resnis and Natale (2017, p. 144) explain ‘Personal Librarianship aims to foster relationships beyond the point-of-need with a focus on sustained communication between the librarian and students’, and the personal connection and individual relationship then enables enhanced, personalised service.

**Employability and careers**

Libraries have responded to the employability agenda by contributing to institutional and departmental programs and aligning their reference and instruction services to jobsearch and workplace requirements, often collaborating with other services, such as career centres (Hollister 2005; Pun & Kubo 2017; Tyrer, Ives & Corke 2013). Librarians have highlighted important contextual and functional differences between academic and workplace IL and across different employment sectors, compounded by misunderstandings among stakeholders about the scope and applicability of IL (Crawford & Irving 2011; Quinn & Leligdon 2014). In the UK, SCONUL (2015) has produced a ‘graduate employability lens’ on its Seven Pillars model of IL, as part of an Employability Toolkit that includes case studies and a review on ‘how graduate employability relates to information ‘know-how’ (Goldstein 2015a). Library interventions here are expanding from IL to information and digital literacy, with a particular focus on the role of social media in job seeking, personal branding and
professional networking as ‘e-professionalism’ (Mawson & Haworth 2018; Skoyles, Bullock & Neville 2019).

The University of Sheffield case illustrates the value of cross-university multi-partner collaborations in developing student-centred employability interventions aligned with institutional strategies and disciplinary needs. Supported by a holistic Information and Digital Literacy Framework ‘for education, employment and citizenship’, the Library has partnered with the careers service, enterprise unit and skills centre on workshops leading to an Academic Skills Certificate; collaborated with careers and enterprise staff on a commercial awareness workshop that has been integrated into a careers course for biologists as well as being delivered via the information skills program and the career management skills course; and created an Employability LibGuide that features video clips and case studies of students and alumni discussing workplace IL, commercial awareness and employability (Mawson & Haworth 2018). Similarly, at Macquarie University, the Library, Biological Sciences, and Careers and Employment combined discipline-based knowledge, transferable skills and career management skills to incorporate ‘career information literacy’ and employability into a final-year capstone course (Lin-Stephens et al., 2019).

**Academic entrepreneurship and community engagement**

Figure 5.2 draws on library literature from the past several decades to show the many different areas where academic librarians are contributing to so-called ‘third mission’ activities that involve engagement with business and the community beyond the campus.
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Innovation and enterprise

Library support for university work with industry goes back to the 1980s with services for science parks and corporate users that ranged from basic access to books, journals and reference resources to preferential use of specialist databases and information consultancy, the latter often for a subscription or fee (Luther 1989; McDonald 1985). Libraries in America, Europe, Asia and Africa continue to support both incubated and mature companies located on science and technology parks associated with their parent institutions, with some parks using the benefits of specialised library and information resources to attract new tenants (Aportela-Rodríguez & Pacios 2019). University of Toronto Libraries provides a market intelligence service to science and technology entrepreneurs in partnership with an urban innovation hub adjacent to campus supporting the institutional research commercialisation strategy; embedded librarians work alongside business advisors to deliver free value-added services (Fitzgerald, Anderson & Kula 2010).

The growth of tech transfer and entrepreneurship programs on campuses has expanded the role of business librarians beyond managing collections and instruction for business faculty and students to involvement in campus-wide initiatives, such as entrepreneurship cross-training, interdisciplinary education and technology commercialisation programs. They now promote business information competency to a broader audience, supporting faculty and students from diverse disciplines in multiple venues (including university spin-offs and business start-ups), providing market research and business planning resources to sci-tech entrepreneurs, and contributing to institutional economic development strategies by using their resources and expertise to raise their university’s profile with local businesses (MacDonald, 2010). Business librarians collaborate with diverse university organisations and community agencies, including business school entrepreneurship centres, university career centres, alumni groups, technology incubators, small business development centres, chambers of commerce, economic development offices, statewide initiatives and multi-agency associations that include public libraries (Feldman n 2014).

They also collaborate with library colleagues (notably engineering librarians and data-visualisation specialists) to deliver ‘entrepreneurial information literacy’ for innovation hubs or institution-wide entrepreneurship education (Klotzbach-Russell, Rowley & Starry 2021). The 21st century makerspace movement has stimulated university-industry-community collaborations for innovation and entrepreneurship, creating opportunities for libraries to have a more prominent role in incubation facilities. Ohio University established CoLab in the Library as a central unifying resource to ‘bridge’ entrepreneurship on campus and in the surrounding region, and ‘leverage siloed resources and expertise’ to facilitate cross-pollination of ideas and projects (Mathuews & Harper 2019). Similarly, at California State University, Northridge, the Library collaborated with the Colleges of Business, Engineering and Arts on an expanded makerspace in an evolving ‘innovation ecosystem … a continuum of services and spaces distributed across campus’, with the library location providing both practical tools and ‘readily available assistance with researching and writing business plans as well as intellectual property issues such as copyright, patents, and trademarks’ (Stover, Jefferson & Santos 2019, pp. 144, 146).

Other libraries have experimented with co-working spaces as alternative workspaces for independent entrepreneurs, contract workers and other self-employed professionals in an
effort to build real-world networking/learning communities on campus that contribute to entrepreneurship education and demonstrate the economic value of the library (Lumley 2014; Schopfel, Roche & Hubert 2015). The ability to create and sustain relationships across campus and community emerges as a challenging but critical issue for successful library engagement with academic entrepreneurship.

Communities and citizens

Civic engagement became an issue for academic librarians around the turn of the century, though many had long served their local communities by offering access to collections (via exhibitions and borrowing) and teaching information skills to school students to support their transition to HE. John Shuler (1996) was an early advocate of civic librarianship on campus, using a multi-capital perspective to redefine the role of government document librarians facing the shift from print collections to electronic information. Invoking the model of civic (or public) journalism, he argues ‘to reclaim their traditional rhetoric “documents to the people,”’ [government information librarians] have to reformulate a new relationship among their physical, human, and social capital’ by moving ‘from passive collection development practices ... into a more active program of citizen outreach and education [as] community information organizations’ (Shuler 1996, pp. 422, 423). Thus, as civic librarians, ‘government information librarians must explore the idea of participatory community involvement’ and ‘create a form of social capital that supports active citizen participation, public problem solving, and deliberative dialogue’ (Shuler 1996, p. 424).

Academic librarian Nancy Kranich (2001, p. 41) assumed intellectual leadership of the library community engagement and civic education movement, using her ALA presidency to promote the responsibility of ‘all types of libraries and librarians’ to build social capital ‘for the whole community and society’, by preparing citizens for civic participation and providing ‘real and virtual community commons ... where citizens can work together on personal and community problems ... in cyberspace as well as in public buildings’. Walter and Goetsch (2009, p. 11) differentiate current understandings of university public engagement from its public service predecessors of extension and outreach by its ‘focus on collaboration between campus and community to address common concerns and the mutual benefit that accrues to partners on both sides as the result of engagement activities’, following academic scholarship, which generally contrasts the one-way transactions that position outreach as doing things for people with the two-way interactions that characterise engagement as doing things with people, usually in the context of a continuing relationship.

Engagement is thus more purposeful and more ambitious than outreach, concerned ‘to address real-world problems and improve local communities’ and ‘to address the needs and opportunities of society’ (Walter & Goetsch 2009, p. 11). Librarians have been urged to move beyond reactive ad hoc individual efforts and institutionalise external relations work as central to their mission and to ‘look beyond traditional services to deliver innovative programs and services that enhance their institutions’ abilities as engaged institutions’ (Courtney 2009, p. 5). Surveys of community/public engagement in academic libraries worldwide reveal a mix of library-managed and institution-led provision that can be broadly categorised as extending access to collections, promoting literacy/lifelong learning and providing civic/community spaces (Dunne 2009; Leong 2013; Walter & Goetsch 2009). Practitioner case studies from the past two decades confirm library spaces, librarian
expertise and institutional collections all have ‘a vital role to play in civic engagement efforts on campus’ (Ryan & Swindells 2018, p. 623), especially when creatively combined to advance community agenda. Table 5.1 synthesises a range of sources to illustrate the wide variety of activities and programs initiated by libraries in Asia, Europe and North America.

Table 5.1. Library responses to community engagement agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collections/information</th>
<th>Learning/research support</th>
<th>Space/events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic information centres</td>
<td>Civic literacy education</td>
<td>Deliberative forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linked open data</td>
<td>Digital preservation advice</td>
<td>Lecture series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online heritage exhibitions</td>
<td>Co-created learning packages</td>
<td>Reading clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative digitisation</td>
<td>High school visits/workshops</td>
<td>Bilingual poetry readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community history portals</td>
<td>Digitisation workshops</td>
<td>Film screenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowdsourced metadata</td>
<td>Offsite technology training</td>
<td>Research cafes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer-based transcription</td>
<td>Health literacy collaborations</td>
<td>SciPop talks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-created collections</td>
<td>Community teaching partnerships</td>
<td>Science-themed exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User-led classification schemes</td>
<td>Service-learning mediation</td>
<td>Co-produced exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University partnership archives</td>
<td>Community research support</td>
<td>Wikipedia edit-a-thons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-centred repositories</td>
<td>Citizen science facilitation</td>
<td>Open Access Week events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen science LibGuides</td>
<td>GIS Day programs</td>
<td>NaNoWriMo* activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*National Novel Writing Month (https://nanowrimo.org)

Engaged libraries have moved beyond partnering with other cultural heritage institutions on digitisation programs to working with local organisations and individuals on knowledge exchange projects to preserve and ‘publish’ both historical and contemporary hidden materials, using public scanning events and oral history interviews to collect both analog and born-digital items, and thereby create, document and contextualise community and family histories as resources to support academic and community research and learning (Cho 2011; Gwynn, Henry & Craft 2019; McIntosh, Mangum & Phillips 2017). Libraries are also repurposing their institutional repositories as expertise locators (expert finders) to support institutional knowledge exchange endeavours (Sidorko & Yang 2011) and as public archives for digital artefacts (project documentation and final outputs) from community-centred work, such as campus events and community-based teaching and learning (Makula 2019; Miller & Billings 2012; Moore, Collins & Johnston 2020).

The overall picture is impressive, yet committed practitioners express disappointment at the varying levels of civic participation across the profession, with some academic librarians preferring a campus focus for community building and others operating in outreach mode rather than real engagement. Kranich (2010) provides some examples of college and university libraries serving as public fora and working with civic partners, but notes limited involvement in the widespread community-based service-learning (SL) movement. A decade later, she reiterates the call to serve as ‘civic agents’ and a ‘practice ground for democracy’, but acknowledges many are only starting to move up the Public Participation Spectrum (https://www.iap2.org/page/pillars), operating at the ‘informing’ level (as depositories for government and community information and creators of civic engagement LibGuides and archives), with only a few ‘involving, collaborating with and empowering future citizens on
the issues of the day’ (Kranich 2019, p. 199). She calls for a more interactive role in public problem-solving and urges librarians to strengthen civic literacy by extending IL teaching beyond college and career to the ‘third c’ of citizenship.

Library engagement in SL lags behind participation at institutional level, with many early examples limited to learning experiences on campus for librarianship students. Later literature shows librarians collaborating with faculty on SL courses in other disciplines and also initiating stand-alone library/literacy courses in collaboration with community partners (Blodgett 2017; Marrall 2014; Sweet 2013; Nutefall 2016). Proponents of SL point to evident synergies with both traditional library values (democracy, diversity, lifelong learning, public good, service, social responsibility) and current professional concerns, such as critical thinking and social justice education; but they also acknowledge the impact of SL on library practice in IL, collection development, reference work, institutional repositories, exhibition content and collaboration spaces, in facilitating access to a wider range of resources and facilities for students, faculty and community partners (Branch, Nutefall & Gruber 2020; Nutefall et al. 2021; Yates 2014). Yates (2014) describes a more strategic role where her university library hosts and partners the campus SL centre.

A similar situation emerges with citizen science (CS), where librarians seem surprisingly reluctant to get involved, despite the obvious synergies between CS goals and library roles in science literacy, open access, scholarly communication, data and media labs, visualisation studios and co-creation/maker spaces, and also the natural alignment of CS with library commitments to widening access, empowering people (particularly underrepresented groups) and building community on and beyond campus (Cohen et al., 2015; Harrington 2019). Most volunteer-based research in libraries still has a humanities focus and is more accurately described as ‘citizen humanities’ or crowdsourcing cultural heritage, but a group of European research libraries is now actively involved in CS and has documented a set of roles for libraries as well as producing initial guidance on library support for CS projects, which draws on emerging practice in Europe and the US (Hansen 2021, Ignat et al. 2018).

Internationalisation, multiculturalism and global citizenship

Literature on the internationalisation of academic libraries started to emerge in the 1990s and now includes surveys, case studies, review articles and books. It concentrates on services and support for international students (previously referred to as ‘foreign’ or ‘overseas’ students), but also covers other areas that feature in institutional internationalisation strategies, notably study/education abroad (overseas programs for ‘home’ students in institutional and now community settings), the development of international branch campuses and the restructuring of academic curricula to promote global competence and global readiness for global citizenship (Click, Wiley & Houlihan 2017; Green 2013; Hughes 2001; Kutner 2019; Kutner & Armstrong 2012; Lindell 2008; Pun, Collard & Parrott 2016; Stevens & Campbell 2006; Whitehurst 2010).

The literature largely reflects US library experiences and perspectives, but contributions from Australia, Canada and the UK indicate that issues and responses have been remarkably consistent across time and place. Many reported challenges relate to the prior experience of international students with different education and library systems, often combined with
language/communication issues (verbal and non-verbal) and other cultural/societal differences (Click, Wiley & Houlihan 2017). Hughes (2001) uses the terms ‘culture shock’, ‘study shock’ and ‘library shock’ to signal the severity of problems for many incoming students, which extend to racism (overt or perceived) and health issues (physical and emotional). She argues the ‘international-friendly library’ facilitates the social adjustment of students as well as their academic progress and serves ‘an important role as a contact, information and referral centre’ with campus-wide and community links, ideally with a designated physical space for internationals in addition to an information point and dedicated web pages.

Libraries have responded by customising and augmenting services to ease the transition to new systems and procedures for students and their families, with relationship building and partnership working emerging as a key theme here. Box 5.1 shows the range of strategies documented over the past two decades (Amsberry & Snavely 2011; Kenney & Li 2016; Kutner & Armstrong 2012; Mawhinney & Zhao 2017; Senior et al. 2008; Sheu & Panchyshyn 2017; Stevens & Campbell 2006; Toner 2019; Whitehurst 2010). Introducing case studies of The globalized library, Luckert and Carpenter (2019, p. x) observe ‘academic librarians are approaching their international students as whole people with a host of emotional, social, and intellectual concerns that intersect to inform students’ experiences on American campuses’, which is evident in ‘efforts to make these students feel welcome and included’ throughout their time on campus. The annual reception for international students and their families at Kent State University exemplifies such enhanced levels of social engagement (Sheu & Panchyshyn 2017).

- Customised services – tailored versions of standard services (e.g., induction/orientation programs, web/social media pages, course/study guides, information/academic skills sessions and international reference/liaison librarians)
- Augmented services – enhanced services for particular groups (e.g., welcome messages, audio tours, library guides and newspaper collections in alternative languages; special/annual social events for international students)
- Global learning – rethinking the content, depth and breadth of information literacy education in response to institution-wide initiatives to infuse global understanding across disciplinary curricula
- Student ambassadors – multi-lingual peer support and knowledge-sharing (e.g., in-person/online assistance, native-language tours and social-media outreach)
- Blended teams – combining disciplinary expertise with language proficiency/cultural knowledge at point of need (e.g., pairing a subject librarian and area studies librarian)
- Library glossaries – English-language or multi-lingual explanations of terminology
- Service partnerships – library collaborations with other units (e.g., international offices, admissions offices, orientation programs, language centres, counselling services, health services, student unions, multicultural centres and international student associations)
- Cross-cultural/intercultural competence – culturally competent staff and practices (e.g., cultural awareness training, culturally responsive teaching and sociocultural literacy).

Box 5.1. Library strategies for supporting international students
Many authors stress the need for interventions that develop cultural awareness, understanding and sensitivity among library staff to improve intercultural communication and cross-cultural capability. Scholars also advocate a sociocultural perspective on IL to develop culturally inclusive and responsive library teaching (Blas 2014; Foster 2018; Hicks 2019; Hughes et al. 2016). Libraries evidently need a policy/strategy for internationalisation to identify services that may need highlighting, adjustment or development for both incoming international students and outgoing study-abroad students. Senior et al. (2008) urge libraries to formulate their own international strategy, based on their institution’s strategy/policy and reflecting institutional missions and objectives. Witt, Kutner and Cooper (2015) found US libraries actively contributed to campus internationalisation, but lagged behind institutional efforts in levels of activity and priority, with a perceived lack of focus and few references to internationalisation in their missions.

Kenney and Li (2016, pp. 8, 14) similarly argue that libraries need to shift from a passive supporting position to a proactive participating role and become more deeply engaged, integrated and embedded in the planning and management of international work at their institutions; they need to realign ‘towards an engagement-centered structure’ enabling teamwork that blends disciplinary expertise with language/cultural knowledge at the point of need and must develop the mindset that international students are integral to their efforts (rather than exceptional) and internationalisation is everyone’s business and a whole library responsibility’. Senior et al. (2008, p. 23) note good customer care, jargon-free library publications and accommodating different learning styles are ‘equally relevant to both home and international students’, but ‘it is also important that international students realise that their needs are recognised and addressed’ and ‘helpful to badge certain services and facilities which help international students adapt to the host country’s libraries’.

The ‘debate over exclusivity versus inclusivity’ (Senior et al., 2008) is a significant strategic issue applicable to other minority groups in higher education, which captures the library version of the wider educational challenge ‘to affirm cultural diversity and advance world unity’ (Rawlings-Sanaei 2017, p. 66), namely how to balance personalised help, social inclusion, targeted support and universal service in the contemporary academic library.

**Academic success and student wellbeing**

The development of libraries as learning centres and information commons offering a wider range of services to meet the academic, personal and social needs of students through co-located, collaborative and integrated multi-professional teams prepared the ground for major involvement in campus-wide efforts to protect student mental health and promote their overall wellbeing. New and remodelled libraries emphasise an integrated learning environment and integrated student support, with facilities such as multi-faith prayer and contemplation rooms, cafes with vending machines open 24-7 and one-stop information and referral to counselling services, disability support, careers advice and academic tutoring (Lewis 2010; Orgeron 2001). Literature shows an upsurge in library initiatives related to student wellbeing as institutions acknowledge its contribution to academic success and commit to mental health and wellbeing as a strategic priority. Student wellbeing is now a
top trend in libraries, which are ‘well-positioned to help, due to their central locations, longer operating hours, and perception as a safe space’ (ACRL 2020, p. 275).

ACRL (2020) highlights mental and spiritual wellbeing and development of neurodiversity support, particularly for autistic students, as featured in recent literature (Anderson 2021; Cho 2018; Shea & Derry 2019). Hinchliffe and Wong (2010) proposed a ‘wellness wheel’ model (based on Hettler 1980) for planning and design of integrative student-centred services to facilitate holistic development in the learning commons environment, using six dimensions of wellness as a strategy framework to deploy collections, displays, events, workshops and spaces to support the emotional, physical, social, occupational and spiritual growth of students in conjunction with their intellectual development, partnering with other campus units to educate the whole student. The social dimension emphasises formal and informal social interaction and awareness in the context of community membership and social responsibility. Ramsey and Aagard (2018) also reference Hettler in their case study, while Brewerton and Woolley (2017, pp. 16, 24) use Maslow’s (1943) ‘hierarchy of basic needs’ (physiological, safety, love, esteem, self-actualisation) to frame their efforts ‘to support the “whole student”’ and help student ‘go from stressful to successful’, along with the ‘five ways to wellbeing’ (connect, be active, take notice, keep learning, give) currently promoted as public (mental) health messages in the UK (Aked & Thompson 2011).

The various wellbeing models adopted are all based on the principle of holism. While Maslow’s hierarchy is a theory of human motivation, his characterisation of healthy people is referenced in literature on wellness interventions in educational settings and on mental health care and recovery. In the academic library context it has the advantage of giving more prominence to critical issues threatening student success in the current environment (such as food insecurity, housing problems and money worries), and encouraging libraries to consider how they can help. Bladek (2021, p. 5) describes two basic strategies adopted by library wellbeing programs: inserting the library into institution-wide initiatives or joining with other campus units; and incorporating wellness into existing library functions, such as providing access to information, the latter including ‘modifying, extending and adding services’ in response to institutional priorities and student needs.

Joining, collaborating and partnering with other campus units is a recurring theme in the literature that covers a spectrum of co-operative relationships, ranging from signposting library users to relevant campus services (a traditional referral service), through hosting wellbeing activities delivered by other units (as a convenient comfortable space), to partnering at the level of ‘deep collaboration’ (Horton 2013, p. 66), where effective delivery is dependent on expertise or other significant inputs from two or more parties; examples include librarians asking counselling and health staff to assist with materials selection for collections and displays on mental health topics, and librarians contributing modules on researching employers to courses on career management (Bladek 2021; Cox & Brewster 2020; Hinchliffe & Wong 2010). Some libraries formalise their relationships with students services through liaison programs, assigning librarians to units such as student success, disability services, careers centre, counselling, international office, multicultural centres and residential life (Miller & Pressley 2015).
Table 5.2 shows the widening array of library-led and campus-collaborative wellbeing initiatives in Canada, the US and UK, including developments based on collections, services (often events) and space (see, for example, Bladé 2021; Cox & Brewster 2020; Henrich 2020; Hines 2017; Rourke 2020; Terrile 2021; Walton 2018).

Table 5.2. Library interventions to promote student wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collections/information</th>
<th>Services/events</th>
<th>Space/equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable textbooks</td>
<td>Extended opening</td>
<td>Universal design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary bestsellers</td>
<td>Stress busters</td>
<td>Balance chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic novels</td>
<td>Therapy animals</td>
<td>Therapy lamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby books</td>
<td>Board games</td>
<td>Meditation mats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel guides</td>
<td>Colouring tables</td>
<td>Standing workstations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-help titles</td>
<td>Craft making</td>
<td>Treadmill desks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio books</td>
<td>Mindfulness workshops</td>
<td>Brain-sensing headbands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindle readers</td>
<td>Yoga classes</td>
<td>Digital-detox teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading groups</td>
<td>Pop-up gyms</td>
<td>Reflection spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular magazines</td>
<td>Nutrition advice</td>
<td>Napping stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer health information</td>
<td>Late-night snacks</td>
<td>Relaxation areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet displays</td>
<td>Food banks</td>
<td>Maker spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource guides</td>
<td>Vaccination clinics</td>
<td>Wellness rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Libraries also use their websites, Facebook pages and other social media channels to provide information for students with disabilities and to promote health and wellbeing by highlighting relevant resources, services and events offered by the library, university or others, with links for appointments with campus services (such as accessibility, counselling and financial aid). Librarians are using LibGuides to provide information, advice and guidance on healthy living and wellness topics, including spiritual care and social issues. Some libraries have a Q&A section where users send questions and concerns via an anonymous online form with responses posted on the website.

Library literature on supporting autistic students advocates applying universal design (UD) principles to physical spaces and pedagogical strategies for formal instruction and individual learning support (Anderson 2021; Braumberger 2021; Cho 2018; Shea & Derry 2019). UD originated in architecture during the 1970s, but has been adopted and adapted for multiple settings, particularly in education with the development of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) in the 1990s and early 2000s. UD take-up in libraries is growing, both for physical spaces, and for web sites, help desks, learning resources and instructional activities (Chodock & Dolinger 2009; Vautier 2014; Zhong 2012). Instead of designing things for the ‘average’ user and making adjustments for different needs, UD recognises diversity as the norm and plans accordingly, which results in better experiences for everyone, as well as enhancing accessibility and inclusivity for people experiencing difficulties in interacting with resources and facilities.

While the recent surge in library support for mental health and wellbeing evidently reflects developments at institutional and national levels, it is also consistent with prior trends in the profession towards person-centred services and community building reflected in the
growth of PL programs (Moniz & Moats 2014; Nann 2010) and partnering with student services to educate the whole student and support student success (Swartz, Carlisle & Uyeki 2007; Weaver 2008).

**Expanding literacies and library pedagogies**

ACRL (2021) highlights ‘additional literacies being taught by librarians across all spheres’ (such as data, digital, financial, maker, privacy and science literacy) as a significant contemporary development. In practice, academic libraries have been engaging with a continually expanding array of literacies for more than three decades – long before the establishment of IL standards for the sector – but the pace of change has evidently quickened over the past decade, as a result of changing student demographics, continually advancing technologies, repositioning of subject-specific literacies as general education requirements and innovative thinking within the academic library community. Table 5.3 traces the history of library engagement with such multiple literacies, showing how library thinking and practice has followed and occasionally led the development of literacy thinking and practice in education, the professions and society.

The development of formal IL models and standards around the turn of the century (e.g., ACRL 2000; SCONUL 1999) was quickly followed by heated debate on their scope and conceptualisation in view of theories of related/competing literacies emerging in the participatory Web 2.0 environment and repeated calls for the profession to revise, rethink, reframe, reconceptualise and reclaim IL for the 21st century (Marcum 2002; Ward 2006; Buschman 2009; Markless & Streatfield 2009; Mackey & Jacobson 2011; Kutner & Armstrong 2012; Secker & Coonan 2013; Whitworth 2014; Hicks 2016). Critics variously referenced New Literacy Studies (Street 1993); the New London Group’s (1996) pedagogy of multiliteracies, including multilingual/multicultural and multimodal literacies (Cope & Kalantzis 2009); Tyner’s (1998) model of tool and representational literacies; and Lankshear and Knobel’s (2000; 2007) concept of new/postmodern literacies among others. The consistent message was library frameworks lagged behind the current thinking and practices of literacy scholars, teaching librarians and student learners.

Existing models were criticised as skills-based, linear-sequenced and library-centric. They were also denounced for Eurocentric and Anglo-American biases that ignored the cultural diversity and social practices of contemporary HE. SCONUL’s (2011) revised Seven Pillars model and the new ACRL Framework (2016) offer broader, more holistic conceptions, taking account of related multiple literacies and moving towards the practice-based focus adopted by literacy theorists. The Seven Pillars revision resulted in a core model supplemented by ‘lenses’ facilitating application in specific real-world learning contexts that reflect current sector concerns, namely digital literacy, open content, research, graduate employability and evidence-based practice in healthcare (Dalton 2013; Goldstein 2015b). The Framework was informed by both the emergent reframing of IL as an overarching *metalliteracy* emphasising critical agency (Mackey & Jacobson 2011) and the pedagogical frameworks of *threshold concepts* (Meyer & Land 2003) and *backward design* (Wiggins & McTighe 2005).
Table 5.3. Library engagement with multiple literacy developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiliteracies</th>
<th>Infoliteracies</th>
<th>21C literacies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; Modes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Breadth &amp; Depth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lifelong &amp; Lifewide</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-Literacy (Beatty &amp; Mountifield, 2006; Martin, 2006)</td>
<td>Visual literacy (Harris, 2005; Rockenbach &amp; Fabian, 2008)</td>
<td>Health literacy (Keane, 2009; Lantzy, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infoliteracies</strong></td>
<td><strong>21C literacies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sustainability literacy</strong> (Carter &amp; Schmidt, 2014; Stark, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer &amp; information literacy (Shapiro &amp; Hughes, 1996; Sreenivasulu, 1998)</td>
<td>Data (information) literacy (Carlson et al., 2011; Stephenson &amp; Caravello, 2007)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial literacy (Kirkwood &amp; Evans, 2012; Klotzbach-Russell et al., 2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical literacies (Stonebraker et al., 2017; Swanson, 2004)</td>
<td>Archival/primary source literacy (Archer et al., 2009; Morris et al., 2014)</td>
<td>Financial literacy (Li, 2012; Reiter, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transliteracy (McBride, 2012; Wilkinson, 2011)</td>
<td>Copyright literacy (Repanovici et al., 2018; Joseph et al., 2020)</td>
<td>Civic literacy (Cope, 2017; Shuyler &amp; Chenevey, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital &amp; information literacy (Hallam et al., 2018; Reedy &amp; Goodfellow, 2014)</td>
<td>Algorithmic literacy (Kampa &amp; Balzer, 2021; Ridley &amp; Pawlick-Potts, 2021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yet, the search for more holistic and inclusive information literacy conceptions and pedagogies continues, with additional impetus coming from the current movement to decolonise and indigenise academic libraries; notably in Canada, where librarians have been exploring the development of indigenous information literacy (Chong & Edwards 2022; Loyer 2018). Loyer (2018, p. 145) introduces her discussion with the now familiar call for educators to attend to the whole student experience, reminding us that ‘librarians need to address the student’s whole self – mental, emotional, spiritual, and physical – in information literacy instruction’. Practitioners accordingly stress the vital importance of building relationship between students and instructors, leaning towards experience-centred models of information literacy that recognise the emotional challenges of student research and the need for reciprocal relationships.

In tandem with the expanding literacy agenda, librarians have evolved their pedagogies, exploring different learning theories and experimenting with alternative teaching practices to fit the changing environment. Along with factors referenced above, influences include development of institutional teaching strategies, creation of new learning spaces and activist movements within the sector and society. The turn of the century brought a shift from behaviourist to constructivist learning models as practitioners began moving from teacher-centred methods (lectures, demonstrations, workbooks, tutorials) to more interactive learner-centred experiences exploiting the capabilities of the Web to facilitate active, creative online learning (Dewald 1999; Woodard 2003). The shift towards teacher as guide/facilitator/co-learner continued with adoption of social constructivist and sociocultural learning theories, emphasising social and cultural aspects of learning, conceptualised as an interactive, collaborative social process (Bowles-Terry, Davis & Holliday 2010; Wang 2007). Participatory Web 2.0 technologies then led towards connectivism as a theory based in the digital world that views learning as a continual process based on social networks connecting people, technology and information (Farkas 2012; Guder 2010).

Librarians have also responded to social and cultural diversity in a student population including people with diverse linguistic and educational backgrounds and different learning styles and preferences, by following universal design principles to make IL accessible and inclusive (Chodock & Dolinger 2009; Zhong 2012) and adopting culturally-relevant, asset-based pedagogies in response to multicultural needs (Foster 2018; Morrison 2017). With many US colleges and universities incorporating the AACU high-impact practices (HIPs) into their educational strategies, libraries are contributing to learning communities and other effective educational practices both through instruction and via their collections and facilities (Crowe 2015; Murray 2015). Examples of emergent space-based pedagogies include constructionist learning, which is associated with makerspaces and other settings where learners solve problems by constructing a physical or digital artefact (Carnagey, May & Weaver 2014; Beatty 2016) and studio pedagogies adopted by librarians supporting interdisciplinary design courses or hosting writing centres in collaborative spaces (Nichols, Williams & Ervin 2020; Zaugg & Warr 2018).

Critical pedagogy (or the related concept of critical library instruction) is another key theme as part of the critical librarianship movement that includes critical information literacy (Doherty & Ketchner 2005; Swanson 2004; 2005). Hip-hop pedagogy is an example of culturally-relevant, reflective pedagogical praxis adopted by critical library instructors
(Arthur 2015; Ellenwood 2013; Jacobs 2008). Critlib proponents argue the profession must take a stronger stance on issues such as social justice, antiracism and decolonisation by embedding such values into every area of academic libraries including instruction and IL. Critics of the 2000 IL Standards acknowledge the 2016 Framework incorporates more critical perspectives, but some argue it is still not fit for purpose and have called for explicit integration of information social justice and antiracist information literacy into the Framework (Rapchak 2019; Saunders 2016). Librarians have also responded to the global movement to decolonise HE by using critical race theory to audit and review academic reading lists (Crilly, Panesar & Suka-Bill 2020) and to develop academic skills and IL workshops on Decolonising Research Methods and Open Access for Resistance Researching (Clarke 2020). Contemplative pedagogy is a nascent practice among US librarians stressing reflection and critical thinking, which has been linked to both sustainable development and critical librarianship movements (Charney & Colvin 2018; Duffy, Rose-Wiles & Loesch 2021).

**Capital perspectives in academic librarianship**

There are two distinct strands of capital-based work in academic librarianship: one exploring the potential of intangible assets (IA) as *intellectual capital* (IC), largely derived from business management and economics literature that deals with strategy and accounting; and another concerned with *social capital* (SC), drawing primarily on theories from sociology and political science, but also on management and economics literature spanning intellectual and social capital. A few library scholars, notably Tim Schlak (2015) and Stephen Town (2018), draw on both perspectives. Library interest in IA/IC goes back to the 1990s when the subject gained prominence in relation to knowledge management and practitioners began considering the potential of IC frameworks for auditing intangible knowledge resources on behalf of their institutions (Corrall 1998; Dakers 1998). The focus shifted in the 2000s, as librarians started exploring the incorporation of performance measures/indicators for IAs into library assessment frameworks to demonstrate value to their institutions. Table 5.4 provides examples of IC frameworks developed for academic libraries in Australia, Finland, Greece, Thailand and the UK, showing how library scholars have adopted, adapted and augmented the established tripartite framework of human, relational (or customer/market) and structural (or organisational/infrastructural) capital.

Three of the five studies reference the Kaplan and Norton (1992; 2004) Balanced Scorecard as a direct or indirect influence on their work, confirming its wide appeal as a strategic management tool in the private and public sectors. Iivonen and Huotari (2007) use classic IC scholarship to define the different sub-components of their framework. Corrall and Sriborisutsakul (2010, p. 283) augment the tripartite model with a library-specific fourth category of *Collection and Service assets* as ‘the end-products of core knowledge-based processes in libraries ... derived from a combination of human, structural and relationship assets’. Cribb (2005) follows Kaplan and Norton (2004) in incorporating their three asset types (with minor modification) into the Learning and Growth perspective of the Bond University Library Balanced Scorecard (a ‘sub-scorecard’ of the University scorecard).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>Human assets</td>
<td>Library capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tangible capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intangible assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/</td>
<td>Structural capital</td>
<td>Organisational/structural</td>
<td>Structural assets</td>
<td>Library momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td>capital</td>
<td>capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Systemic process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Relational capital</td>
<td>Relational capital</td>
<td>Relationship assets</td>
<td>Library relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Relational capital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consciousness and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>congruence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communities and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Causality and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comeback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collection and service</td>
<td>Library virtue</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, Town (2015, p. 239) describes an overarching Value Scorecard for the University of York Library that supplements measures from an existing Balanced Scorecard to provide ‘a fuller, richer picture’ and document achievement of value, not just vision and strategy. Indeed, their novel scorecard intentionally is (or can be) both unbalanced and complex to fit the real-world context of academic libraries. Though not formally part of his framework, Town (2018, p. 30) evidently sees SC as a component of relational capital, using the term ‘relational social capital’ in his preamble, where he cites key SC theorists (Bourdieu, Fukuyama, Putnam, Lin) and explains how ‘the research library invests in social relations to gain access to resources to enhance expected returns [as] a means to generate further benefits for its community’.

The SC literature on academic libraries is more varied in focus and theoretical framing. Librarians have used the concept to gain insight into library and information use, to develop and enhance IL interventions and to articulate library contributions to campus life and the wider community. Stevens and Campbell (2006) use human and social capital theories to contrast economic and humanistic conceptions of lifelong learning and discuss how IL can (and should) prepare students for civic engagement. More recently, librarians have used a Bourdieusian cultural-capital perspective to consider how the design and delivery of reference services and instruction can help first-generation students succeed at university by developing their ‘library cultural capital’ and repositioning information literacy as ‘academic cultural capital’ (Borrelli et al. 2019; Folk 2019).
Ramsey (2016) argues librarians need to move beyond connecting users with conventional information resources and focus on building connections between people to build SC that will support their academic and professional success and personal well-being; suggested strategies include prioritising group activities in IL classes and engaging students through social networking sites, as well as providing meeting spaces for student groups and partnering or hosting other student services. Others have a more ambitious vision of academic libraries as ‘third spaces’ building SC for the campus and surrounding communities by partnering external organisations, and hosting gaming tournaments, lecture series and other social gatherings, thus enacting community engagement as their campus and library missions (Frey & Codispoti 2010; Lehto, Toivonen & Iivonen 2012).

Several librarians discuss the role of social media in building SC for libraries. Solomon (2013) argues social media work is essentially about long-term relationship management and uses a banking analogy to argue that librarians need to balance their SC deposits and withdrawals to add value, build trust and promote reciprocity. Garofalo (2013) also emphasises roles in developing relationships, building communities and demonstrating value to the academy, arguing libraries can use SC accumulated through curriculum support and research assistance to make additional connections via social networking. Other research uses a social/relational capital perspective to examine networks and relationships of individual librarians and gain critical insights into factors affecting performance of key roles in libraries, including engagement/liaison librarianship (Bracke 2016; McBurney et al. 2020; Schlak 2016) and management/library leadership (Schlak 2015; Lombard 2018). O’Bryan (2018) uniquely looks at the development and use of political capital by library leaders.

**Conclusion**

Our review of library service developments in response to the challenges represented by social trends and changes in HE and society is a story of continuing efforts by librarians to rethink, redefine and reposition their offerings for a more diverse, more remote and often conflicted student community. While library literature documents myriad initiatives at a micro level, from a macro perspective we detect the overarching trends that largely characterise contemporary academic librarianship. First, librarians have extended their interactions with students upstream and downstream, acknowledging that most students will benefit from informed help with managing their transitions towards, within and through their HE journey, which is manifest in offering tailored support prior to entry, in the first year and for life after graduation. Secondly, along with life-course support, libraries have expanded the scope of their offer, recognising their central place in the habits, minds and lives of students makes them ideally positioned to become a life-wide resource that complements academic guidance, with personal support and social facilities, thus enacting the emergent student service philosophy of educating the whole person.

Life-wide support for cognitive, behavioural and emotional wellbeing now permeates all areas of library work, from collection building and space planning to facilities management and literacy development. Key strategies adopted for the coherent delivery of stage-based,
holistic support to diverse, heterogeneous populations include the creation of additional library liaison and coordinating roles to build relationships with individual students, student groups and other student-facing services, in addition to the formation of collaborations and partnerships with campus units, external agencies and community groups; the latter are becoming more prevalent as libraries step up their involvement in third-mission activities with convergence of the knowledge exchange and open access/open science agenda. Developing and managing relationships, building and sustaining communities, and strengthening identity and belonging (especially for minority groups) will be central tasks for librarians moving forward, suggesting social skills and cultural competence as priority areas for professional development. Intellectual and social capital concepts and theories can help to build critical understanding of social networks and relationships in academic libraries but we need more empirical work to test and validate library conceptual frameworks.

References


[https://www.sconul.ac.uk/publication/focus-46](https://www.sconul.ac.uk/publication/focus-46)


[https://digitalcommons.du.edu/collaborativelibrarianship/vol9/iss2/8/](https://digitalcommons.du.edu/collaborativelibrarianship/vol9/iss2/8/)


[https://doi.org/10.29087/2013.5.2.01](https://doi.org/10.29087/2013.5.2.01)


[https://doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2016.1225552](https://doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2016.1225552)

[https://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.431](https://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.431)


Orgeron, E., (2001). Integrated academic student support services at Loyola University: the library as a resource clearinghouse. *Journal of Southern Academic and Special Librarianship*. **2**(3). https://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v02n03/orgeron_e01.htm


