

Weeding as a Sustainable Practice: Ethical Implications for Library Collection Management

Y. Hormiyo^{1*}, K.L. Mahawar²

Abstract

Libraries continually refine their collections to ensure they remain relevant, reliable, and representative of their users' needs. However, the process of weeding raises pressing ethical and environmental concerns. This study reframes weeding as a practice of ethical stewardship and sustainable collection management rather than a routine technical procedure. It introduces the Ethical-Sustainability Weeding Framework (ESWF), a conceptual model integrating ethical responsibility, Institutional transparency, and ecological accountability. The ESWF encompasses five interrelated dimensions: policy development, sustainable disposal alternatives, ethical safeguards, and documentation and review. Together, these dimensions guide libraries towards systematic, transparent, and environmentally conscious deselection practices. By emphasizing recycling, donation, and digital preservation, the framework promotes circular use of resources and mitigates environmental impact. The study argues that embedding ethical and sustainable principles into weeding not only optimizes library resources but also reinforces libraries' social responsibility, ecological commitment, and long-term collection integrity.

Keywords: Weeding, deselection, sustainability, ethics, collection management, library collection management

INTRODUCTION

Libraries weed out damaged, outdated, or low-circulating materials to maintain a high-quality collection (Thangjom,[1-38] 2022). It ensures that resources remain relevant and accessible, meeting the needs of users.[39] However, weeding out library collections is a time-consuming (Zuber, [40]2012) and challenging process (Proctor,[30] 2021), requiring careful decision-making to balance collection quality with ethical and sustainability considerations. Many libraries are assuming physical books are only useful if actively read (Donovan, [8]2020) has intensified debates around sustainability and ethics in collection deselection.

*Author for Correspondence

Y. Hormiyo
E-mail: hormiyo0502@gmail.com

¹Research Scholar, Department of Library and Information Science, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

²Professor, Department of Library and Information Science, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

Received Date: February 05, 2026

Accepted Date: February 12, 2026

Published Date: February 23, 2026

Citation: Y. Hormiyo, K.L. Mahawar. Weeding as a Sustainable Practice: Ethical Implications for Library Collection Management. International Journal of Trends in Humanities. 2026; 3(1): 13–19p.

Weeding practices often result in enormous resource waste, with discarded books and materials ending up in landfills, contributing to environmental degradation and resource inefficiency. This raises ethical concerns, as libraries are responsible not only for providing equitable access to knowledge but also for implementing environmentally responsible disposal plans. The shift to sustainable development methods in libraries requires an ethical framework that prioritizes transparency, stakeholder engagement, and responsible resource management. Sustainable weeding practices emphasize recycling, repurposing, and redistributing withdrawn materials rather than just

discarding them. Ethical principles ensure fairness, inclusivity, and accountability in decision-making processes, including deselection decisions. Libraries must therefore establish well-documented policies grounded in objective criteria that balance institutional priorities, user expectations, and broader societal values. By implementing ethical and sustainable weeding practices, libraries not only preserve the integrity of their collections but also reinforce their role as socially responsible institutions committed to environmental stewardship.

This study adopts a conceptual approach that synthesizes existing scholarship on library ethics and sustainability to propose a unified framework, the Ethical-Sustainability Weeding Framework (ESWF). The ESWF aims to guide libraries towards ethical decision-making, environmental responsibility, and sustainable collection management.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Weeding is the process of deselecting or removing library collections that no longer serve their intended purpose, ensuring that collections remain relevant and useful (Hibner & Kelly, [13] 2023). It serves as an evaluative tool, helping librarians to identify outdated, redundant, or low-circulating materials (Lee, [19] 2009a), and complements acquisition by ensuring a balanced and functional collection (Bull & Downey, [5] 2024). As libraries adapt to special and technological changes, systematic weeding becomes essential for optimizing space and enhancing access (Deptula, [7] 2025; McHale et al., [28] 2017), yet weeding is not always a routine practice in many libraries (Bull & Downey, [5] 2024), primarily due to the lack of formal policies (G. Khan & Bhatti, [17] 2024; Smith, [35] 2012).

Weeding as a Sustainable Practice

Weeding is integral to sustainable collection management, enabling libraries to remain adaptable by removing outdated or underused materials (Lewontin, [23] 2023). However, sustainability in weeding is often hindered by institutional resistance, a lack of policies, and concerns over losing valuable resources (Khan & Bhatti, [17] 2024). A well-structured, scheduled weeding routine, rather than sporadic efforts, can enhance efficiency and reduce burnout among library staff (Bull & Downey, [5] 2024). Sustainable library management encompasses environmentally conscious practices such as controlled disposal, effective pest management, and responsible handling and disposal of obsolete materials (Rachman et al., [31] 2023). Passive weeding strategies, such as minimizing reliance on large-scale storage and preservation systems, can effectively reduce resource consumption and environmental impact in libraries (Bastidas-Spence, [1] 2025). Moreover, reusing or redistributing deselected materials through donations, digital preservation, or recycling reinforces libraries' role in promoting circular economy practices (Bull & Downey, [5] 2024). A discipline-specific approach is crucial for weeding, particularly in fields like the humanities, where older materials may hold historical and research significance (McAllister & Scherlen, [27] 2017). Ethical stewardship requires libraries to ensure diversity in their preserved materials, engage the community in decision-making processes, and maintain transparency (Lewontin, [23] 2023; Weintraub et al., [39] 2018). A well-documented and transparent weeding policy builds institutional support and reduces opposition from staff and users (Hibner & Kelly, [13] 2023). Sustainability extends to digital collections, where licensing restrictions and access agreements complicate equitable access to information (Weintraub et al., [39] 2018). Prioritizing resource sharing, responsible management, and environmental awareness reflects the principle of sustainable librarianship, ensuring that collection management remains socially equitable, environmentally responsible, and economically viable for both present and future needs (Jackson, [15] 2022; Mathiasson & Jochumsen, [26] 2024).

Ethical Considerations in Weeding

The ethical dimensions of weeding involve understanding the librarian's responsibility to act with honesty, objectivity, and loyalty to the user community (Bazirjian, [2] 2022; Strauch & Strauch, [36] 2022). Transparent weeding process fosters understanding and acceptance among stakeholders (Hibner & Kelly, [13] 2023). At the same time, ethical tensions arise when deselection results in loss of

historical or unique materials that may still hold cultural or scholarly significance (Khan & Bhatti,[17] 2024). Overreliance on circulation statistics or superficial assessments risks undermining the intellectual and cultural diversity libraries are mandated to preserve (Namhila,[29] 2017). Ethical weeding requires a nuanced balance of removing obsolete materials and safeguarding historical and scholarly integrity (Lewontin, [23]2023). These principles extend to digital resources, where ownership, licensing, and perpetual access shape long-term collection management decisions (Weintraub et al.,[39] 2018).

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The study aims to:

- examine the ethical and sustainable dimensions of weeding practices in libraries
- assess the challenges and policy gaps affecting responsible deselection
- propose the Ethical-Sustainability Weeding Framework (ESWF) to promote responsible and transparent collection management

WHY BECOME OBSOLETE?

Obsolescence in library collections is an inevitable phenomenon, shaped by the evolving dynamic of scholarship, pedagogy, technology, and cultural change. Once considered authoritative, resources gradually lose their relevance when they fail to meet the needs of contemporary academics and users. These causes can be understood across several dimensions:

- *Advancement of knowledge*: The obsolescence of library materials is strongly influenced by the rapid advancement of knowledge, particularly in fields where research progresses quickly. Dorta-González & Gómez-Déniz [9](2022) demonstrate that the aging of research literature varies significantly across disciplines, with scientific fields exhibiting faster rates of obsolescence due to a continuous stream of new discoveries. Even once-authoritative materials can quickly lose relevance as emerging studies reshape the knowledge landscape, reflecting the dynamic nature of scholarly information.
- *Change in curriculum or research trends*: Library collections mirror institutional priorities. When academic programs are revised or research interests shift, resources tied to outdated courses or discontinued areas become less useful (Swan,[37] 2002). Obsolescence here reflects a misalignment between static collections and dynamic educational agendas.
- *Superseded editions*: Updated editions embody contemporary standards, methodologies, and data. Earlier versions, while historically valuable, lose credibility for current teaching and research purposes. As Faber et al.[10] (2023) noted, retaining obsolete editions without clear justification risks distorting the dissemination of knowledge.
- *Cultural and social irrelevance*: Beyond academic trends, collections become obsolete when they no longer reflect prevailing cultural values or inclusive perspectives. Neglecting contemporary topics or inclusive viewpoints can disconnect collections from users' realities and community needs. To maintain relevance, libraries must regularly update materials to mirror evolving social values and academic priorities (Blick, [3]2015; Keller et al., [16]2003; Manoff, [25]1993).
- *Lack of use or demand*: Patterns of circulation and access provide measurable indicators of obsolescence. Materials that remain unused over extended periods signal declining user relevance. Evidence-based deselection, grounded in usage statistics, supports efficient and user-centered collection management (Hibner & Kelly,[13] 2023; Line & Sandison, [24]1974).
- *Physical deterioration*: Wear, mold, stains, and damage undermine the readability, presentation, and longevity of materials. While rare or archival works may merit preservation, most deteriorated items become unsuitable for active collections without costly conservation (Huo,[14] 2023; Slate, [34]2001).
- *Availability of better alternatives*: The proliferation of digital resources has transformed access to information. Superior alternatives, more comprehensive, accessible, and user-friendly, accelerate the obsolescence of older print materials (Herring, [12]2005). This rapid expansion of digital content intensifies challenges related to collection relevance and spatial constraints,

compelling libraries to implement systematic weeding strategies that strategically integrate traditional holdings with digital formats (Hibner & Kelly, [13]2023; Seymour,[33] 1972).

- *Shifts in language and terminology*: Changes in subject vocabularies and terminology reduce the accessibility of older works. As Buckland,[4] (2012) and Line & Sandison[24] (1974) noted, literature can become obsolete not only through outdated content but also through outdated descriptors, which limit discoverability and use.

Obsolescence arises not from a single cause but from the interaction of intellectual, curricular, cultural, technological, and physical factors. Recognizing these drivers equips libraries to manage deselection more strategically, sustaining collections that are both current and contextually relevant.

ETHICAL-SUSTAINABILITY WEEDING FRAMEWORK (ESWF)

Drawing on existing scholarship, this study proposes the ESWF as a structured model to guide library practices. The framework emphasizes ethical responsibility, institutional accountability, and sustainable practices across five interrelated dimensions:

- *Policy development*: A written, transparent weeding policy is essential to ensure systematic and consistent deselection aligned with institutional goals. Such policies provide objective criteria, reduce bias, and foster stakeholder trust by clarifying why and how materials are removed (Hibner & Kelly,[13] 2023). In contrast, the absence of policy often results in ad-hoc, inconsistent practices driven by space constraints or individual judgment (Bull & Downey, [5]2024). Studies reveal that 61% of university libraries in Pakistan did not engage in systematic weeding due to a lack of formal policies (Khan & Bhatti, [17]2024). The ALA recommends that every library adopt comprehensive policies that incorporate selection, deselection, and reconsideration, with models like CREW and the MUSTIE criteria offering practical guidelines (Larson,[18] 2008).
- *Sustainable disposal alternative*: Deselected materials must be managed in an environmentally responsible way to avoid reputational and ecological risks. Preferred strategies include donations, resale, recycling, and digital archiving, which extend the lifecycle of resources while fostering community engagement (Hibner & Kelly,[13] 2023; Strauch & Strauch, [36]2022). Creative approaches, such as upcycling, further transform outdated items into functional or artistic products, strengthening sustainability and perception (Calvert, [6]2018).
- *Ethical safeguards*: Libraries must evaluate the historical, cultural, and academic values of materials before disposal. Discarding culturally or historically significant items risks ending collective memory and scholarly heritage (Leonowitz, [21]2023). As (Bazirjian, [2]2022) noted, ethical weeding requires careful consideration of scholarly worth, particularly in academic institutions entrusted with preserving diverse knowledge traditions.
- *Documentation and review*: Recording weeding decisions and conducting periodic reviews ensure accountability, transparency, and alignment with institutional missions. Documentation helps justify decisions, guide further weeding, and balance present needs with long-term preservation (Francis, [11]2012; Reed-Scott, [32]1985). Case studies, such as the selective weeding of specialised collections (Leslie & Martinez,[22] 2015), demonstrate the importance of integrating traditional weeding with innovative review models to maintain academic and historical integrity.

In sum, the ESWF provides a comprehensive framework that situates weeding not merely as a technical task but as an ethical and sustainable responsibility. By embedding clear policies, engaging stakeholders, adopting environmentally friendly disposal strategies, safeguarding heritage, and documenting best practices, libraries can align their collection management with institutional goals and global sustainability values.

DISCUSSION

This study contributes to the evolving discourse that positions weeding as a dynamic and context-dependent component of library collection management. While earlier scholarship has primarily emphasized systematic deselection and space optimization (Bull & Downey,[5] 2024; Hibner & Kelly, [13]2023), this study extends the perspective by integrating ethical and sustainability dimensions through the ESWF. The framework bridges operational efficiency with moral accountability, aligning with Jackson[15] (2022) assertion that sustainable librarianship must incorporate both environmental and social responsibilities. Unlike studies that evaluate weeding through functional or quantitative parameters (Lee, [20]2009b; Proctor, [30]2021), the ESWF emphasizes qualitative judgment, ethical considerations, and stakeholder engagement as essential components of responsible deselection. This orientation supports (Lewontin,[23] 2023) and (Rachman et al., [31]2023), who advocate for reducing ecological footprints through recycling, reuse, and transparent governance. Furthermore, the framework reinforces the preservation of culturally and historically significant materials during the deselection process.

The ESWF also strengthens earlier calls by Francis [11](2012) and (Reed-Scott [32](1985) for accountability and procedural consistency through its emphasis on documentation and periodic review. Its inclusion of sustainable disposal alternative response to contemporary demands for environmentally conscious librarianship. Collectively, this framework advances an integrative model that reconciles institutional imperatives with ethical and ecological stewardship, offering a holistic approach to sustainable collection management.

CONCLUSION

Weeding, guided by ethical and sustainable principles, extends beyond routine maintenance to embody the moral and ecological responsibilities of libraries. The ESWF provides a structured model that integrates transparency, accountability, and sustainable disposal practice, thereby addressing both operational and moral dimensions of collection management. By aligning with ethical standards and sustainability principles, the ESWF provides libraries with a roadmap for transparent, inclusive, and ecologically responsible deselection practices. Its adoption can enhance institutional accountability, reduce environmental impact, and preserve cultural integrity.

REFERENCES

1. Bastidas-Spence MF. Sustainable Practices Applied to the Environmental Management of Archival Collection Storage Spaces at the Southwest Wing in the National Maritime Museum in London, UK. *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*. 2025 Jan 2;64(1):46-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01971360.2023.2197106>
2. Bazirjian R. 135 The Ethics of Library Discard Practices. In *Legal and Ethical Issues in Acquisitions* (pp. 135-146). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315859668-15>
3. Blick WM. Pulp poets and superhero prophets: A case for popular culture in academic library collection development. *Community & Junior College Libraries*. 2015 Apr 3;21(1-2):5-10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763915.2015.1111069>
4. Buckland MK. Obsolescence in subject description. *Journal of documentation*. 2012 Mar 2;68(2):154-61. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220411211209168>
5. Bull J, Downey A. Not a Special Project Anymore: Creating a Culture of Sustainable Deselection and Gifts-In-Kind with Limited Staffing. *Technical Services Quarterly*. 2024 Jan 2;41(1):64-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07317131.2023.2300512>
6. Calvert P. No more late night dumpster runs—recycle and upcycle unwanted library books. *Public Library Quarterly*. 2018 Apr 3;37(2):222-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01616846.2018.1465789>
7. Deptula M. To weed or to keep: a renovation–driven weeding project of the health sciences library reference collection with a focus on the last institutional copies—a case study. *Medical reference services quarterly*. 2025 Jan 2;44(1):55-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763869.2025.2453718>

8. Donovan JM. Keep the books on the shelves: Library space as intrinsic facilitator of the reading experience. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 2020 Mar 1;46(2):102-104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2019.102104>
9. Dorta-González P, Gómez-Déniz E. Modeling the obsolescence of research literature in disciplinary journals through the age of their cited references. *Scientometrics*. 2022 Jun;127(6):2901-2931. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04359-w>
10. Faber FT, Eriksen MB, Hammer DM. Obsolescence of the literature: A study of included studies in Cochrane reviews. *Journal of Information Science*. 2023 Apr;49(2):437-447. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515211006588>
11. Francis M. Weeding the reference collection: A case study of collection management. *The Reference Librarian*. 2012 Apr 1;53(2):219-234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763877.2011.619458>
12. Herring MY. A gaggle of Googles: limitations and defects of electronic access as panacea. *InLibraries and Google* 2014 Apr 23 (pp. 37-44). Routledge. 37-44. https://doi.org/10.1300/J136v10n03_05
13. Hibner H, Kelly M. Making a collection count: a holistic approach to library collection management. *Elsevier*; 2023 Jan 30.83-98 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-443-15365-5.00005-7>
14. Huo H. Library books: Aging and preservation. *BioResources*. 2023 Jul 1;18(3) 4386-4387 <https://doi.org/10.15376/biores.18.3.4386-4387>
15. Jackson L. *Libraries and Sustainability: Programs and Practices for Community Impact*. René Tanner, Adrian K. Ho, Monika Antonelli, and Rebekkah Smith Aldrich, eds. Chicago, IL: ALA Editions, 2021. 176p. Paper, \$49.99 (ISBN: 9780838937945). *College & Research Libraries*. 2022 Sep 2;83(5):860. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.83.5.860>
16. Keller MA, Reich VA, Herkovic AC. What is a library anymore, anyway?.8(5) <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v8i5.1053>
17. Khan G, Bhatti R. Revitalizing library collection: A critical look at collection weeding practices at university libraries in Pakistan. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. 2025 Dec;57(4):1161-1171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006241269138>
18. Larson J. *CREW: A weeding manual for modern libraries*. Texas State Library and Archives Commission; 2012. <https://archive.org/details/crewmethod12>
19. Lee M. Weeding is not just for gardeners: A case study on weeding a reference collection. *Community & Junior College Libraries*. 2009 Jul 20;15(3):129-135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763910902979460>
20. Lee, M. (2009b). Weeding Is Not Just for Gardeners: A Case Study on Weeding A Reference Collection. *Community & Junior College Libraries*, 15(3), 129–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763910902979460>
21. Leonowitz S. Interpreting post-conflict values: conservation decision-making for Bosnian war-damaged manuscripts from the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Journal of the Institute of Conservation*. 2023 Sep 2;46(3):192-204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19455224.2023.2251642>
22. Leslie S, Martinez I. Assessment and Weeding of a Clinical HIV/AIDS Collection in an Academic Library: A Case Study. *Collection Management*. 2015 Jul 3;40(3):149-162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2015.1040570>
23. Lewontin A. Book Review: *The Weeding Handbook: A Shelf-by-Shelf Guide*. *Library Resources & Technical Services*. 2023 Apr 26;67(2):63. <https://doi.org/10.5860/lrts.67n2.23>
24. Line MB, Sandison A. PROGRESS IN DOCUMENTATION: 'obsolescence' and changes in the use of literature with time. *Journal of documentation*. 1974 Mar 1;30(3):283-350. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb026583>
25. Manoff M. Academic libraries and the culture wars: The politics of collection development. *Collection Management*. 1993 Jan 18;16(4):1-7. https://doi.org/10.1300/J105v16n04_01
26. Mathiasson MH, Jochumsen H. The Sustainable Library: A retrospective case study of a public library sharing initiative. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. 2024 Dec;56(4):1057-1070. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006231190131>

27. McAllister AD, Scherlen A. Weeding with wisdom: tuning deselection of print monographs in book-reliant disciplines. *Collection Management*. 2017 Apr 3;42(2):76-91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2017.1299657>
28. McHale C, Egger-Sider F, Fluk L, Ovidia S. Weeding without walking: A mediated approach to list-based deselection. *Collection Management*. 2017 Apr 3;42(2):92-108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2017.1318729>
29. Namhila EN. The predicament of library value. *IFLA journal*. 2017 Jun;43(2):141-149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0340035216686981>
30. Proctor J. Weeding the Zs: a collaborative rightsizing project in A large academic library. *The Serials Librarian*. 2021 Nov 17;81(3-4):239-245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2021.1995927>
31. Rachman, Y.B., Ratnasari, W. and Tambunan, S.M.G., 2023. Preventive conservation: environmentally friendly sustainable current practices in Asian libraries. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*. 16 (1): 197–210. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-08-2023-0128>
32. Reed-Scott J. Implementation and evaluation of a weeding program. *Collection management*. 1985 Aug 26;7(2):59-67. https://doi.org/10.1300/J105v07n02_05
33. Seymour CA. Weeding the Collection: A Review of Research on Identifying Obsolete Stock Part 1: Monographs. *Libri*. 1972;22:137. <https://doi.org/10.1515/libr.1972.22.2.137>
34. Slate JH. Not fade away: Understanding the definition, preservation and conservation issues of visual ephemera. *Collection management*. 2001 Jul 30;25(4):51-9. https://doi.org/10.1300/J105v25n04_06
35. Smith SL. Weeding considerations for an academic music collection. *Music Reference Services Quarterly*. 2012 Jan 1;15(1):22-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10588167.2012.647601>
36. Strauch K, Strauch B. *Legal and ethical issues in acquisitions*. Routledge; 1990. 1-156 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315859668>
37. Swan PG. Academic departmental library collections as curriculum trend indicators. *Collection building*. 2002 Dec 1;21(4):161-165. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01604950210447403>
38. Thangjom EZ. Weeding of Printed Books at Rev BM Pugh Library of Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat. *International Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science and Technology*. 2022 Jul 12;9(7):15-20. <https://doi.org/10.47856/ijaast.2022.v09i07.003>
39. Weintraub TS, Greene B, Sipman G. Weeding a shared e-book collection: Collaboration across a consortium. *College & Research Libraries News*. 2018 Oct 4;79(9):506. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.79.9.506>
40. Zuber P. Weeding the Collection: An Analysis of Motivations. In 2012 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition 2012 Jun 10 25.1470.1 - 25.1470.13. <https://doi.org/10.18260/1-2--22227>