

MASTER'S THESIS IN LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE
FACULTY OF LIBRARIANSHIP, INFORMATION, EDUCATION AND IT

Going digital?

The work processes with e-books at academic libraries in Sweden

Bert Kunzmann



UNIVERSITY OF BORÅS

© Bert Kunzmann

Partial or full copying and distribution of the material in this thesis
without permission is forbidden.

English title: Master thesis: Going digital? The work processes with e-books at academic libraries in Sweden

Author(s): Bert Kunzmann

Completed: 2024

Abstract: Research regarding e-book management at academic libraries is scarce, especially referring to Swedish university libraries. The work with e-books regarding selection, acquisition, promotion etc. can give insight into the stance towards e-books and their use at Swedish academic libraries. Challenges and problems such as accessibility, licensing as well as DRM restrictions may hinder e-books from becoming worthy complements to printed books. This thesis gives more insight into the acquisition, work and distribution and general working processes with e-books at Swedish academic libraries. A total of eight Swedish university libraries with 13 representatives agreed to participate in semi-structured interviews. The main results are that selection and acquisition of e-books are both influenced by librarians themselves and by user demand, and that e-books are frequently used and sometimes even favored over print books. Complex licensing and DRM restrictions may lead to e-books not being fully appreciated, which is further complicated due to a lack of promotion of e-books by academic libraries. Academic e-books are offered in English due to a lack of Swedish titles. In some situations, print books are acquired, e.g. if electronic titles are not available or too expensive. Both formats have advantages and disadvantages regarding access, availability, usage and preference. While print books are cheaper and offer a tactile experience, e-books can be read by multiple users simultaneously and do not require storage space in contrast to print books.

Keywords: E-book, print book, academic library, acquisition, collection management, Open Access, Digital Rights Management, licensing

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Research problem.....	1
1.2	Research goal and research questions.....	2
1.3	Limitations.....	3
1.4	Thesis structure.....	4
2	PREVIOUS RESEARCH.....	5
2.1	Search strategy.....	5
2.2	Definition of the term “e-book”.....	6
2.3	Literature about acquisition, licensing, DRM, and promotion of e-books.....	8
2.3.1	E-book selection criteria.....	8
2.3.2	Acquisition models.....	10
2.3.2.1	DDA.....	10
2.3.2.2	EBA.....	12
2.3.3	Accessibility of e-books.....	13
2.3.4	Restrictions on use: licensing and DRM.....	14
2.3.5	Cost of e-books.....	15
2.3.6	Benefits and drawbacks of e-books.....	16
2.3.7	Marketing and promotion of e-books.....	19
2.4	Open Access and academic publishing.....	22
2.5	Collection development management.....	24
2.5.1	Collection development policies.....	24
2.5.2	E-book management process.....	25
3	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	26
3.1	Practice theory.....	27
3.2	Application of theory.....	31
4	METHODOLOGY.....	33
4.1	Qualitative research using semi-structured interviews.....	33
4.2	Participants and institutions.....	35
4.3	Interview guide.....	38
4.4	Research ethics.....	39
4.5	Interview process.....	40
4.6	Coding and analysis.....	41
5	RESULTS.....	42
5.1	Workflow of e-books at academic libraries.....	42
5.1.1	Motivation and criteria for purchase.....	43
5.1.2	Availability, accessibility and usage.....	45
5.1.3	E-book acquisition processes and models.....	47
5.1.3.1	Packages, subscriptions, title by title.....	47
5.1.3.2	Acquisition models: EBA, DDA.....	49
5.1.4	Cost of e-books.....	51
5.1.5	Promotion of e-books.....	52
5.1.6	E-book languages.....	53
5.1.7	DRM, licensing, credits.....	54
5.2	Open Access.....	56
5.3	Print versus digital.....	58

6	ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION.....	60
6.1	E-book management and user influence.....	60
6.2	Selection criteria for e-books.....	62
6.3	Acquisition models EBA and DDA.....	65
6.4	Accessibility through licensing and credits.....	66
6.5	Promotion: challenges and possibilities.....	68
6.6	Challenges for acquisition of print and digital.....	70
6.7	Academic libraries as a web of practices.....	72
7	CONCLUSION.....	76
	REFERENCE LIST.....	78

Appendix 1: Email sent for recruitment of the study's participants

Appendix 2: Interview guide, English

Appendix 3: Interview guide, Swedish

Appendix 4: Consent form

1 Introduction

As the working processes within academic libraries regarding acquisition of academic e-books in Sweden has been a topic that was rather neglected in recent research (Maceviciute et al., 2014), the motivation for this thesis is to gain more knowledge into this topic. The working processes with academic e-books from their selection, acquisition, purchase, licensing and promotion can give insight into the academic stance towards and common practices with academic e-books. Vasileiou et al. (2012b) and Blummer & Kenton (2012) give an overview over the e-book management process which includes crucial stages such as identifying acquisition librarians, conducting trials, choosing a supplier and negotiating licensing options, implementation of metadata records, e-book maintenance etc. As the author of this thesis is currently situated in Sweden and due to the fact that there is only limited research on the topic of e-books and e-book collection management within Swedish academia, a research paper that analyzes and evaluates these processes with regard to the authors aforementioned would be a useful and even a necessary addition to the field.

1.1 Research problem

Although e-books are offered and used at academic libraries, research literature regarding this topic is scarce. While searching for a research topic for this thesis, it became obvious that the topic of e-books at academic libraries has been neglected in the research literature, specifically with regard to selection, acquisition, Digital Rights Management (DRM) and promotion. As there is a lack of research literature regarding academic libraries and the working processes with e-books, a scientific paper on this subject is needed in order to enhance the knowledge in this specific area. Maceviciute et al. (2014) also refer to the lack of research regarding Swedish academic libraries. In their paper, the authors find that the primary reasons of e-book acquisition at academic libraries in Sweden are users' needs. E-books can be a solution to some of the libraries' problems such as a lack of relevant print titles. Moreover, availability and accessibility are also seen as driving factors for e-book acquisition at Swedish academic libraries, as Maceviciute et al. (2017) point out in their study. In her research paper, Byström (2012) compares e-book packages from different suppliers at Uppsala University Library and concludes that statistics regarding the acquisition of these packages are misleading and not comparable. As a consequence, acquisition librarians would make wrongful decisions, thus making it difficult to defend e-book acquisitions. As the aforementioned research papers are relatively old and there is a lack of recent research literature regarding the selection and acquisition processes of academic e-books in Sweden, it is therefore interesting and hopefully also fruitful to gain more knowledge into this field which can also possibly lead to a better understanding of the working processes with e-books at Swedish academic libraries. The stance of the library staff as well as the management process regarding the selection, acquisition, promotion as well as perception of e-books by scholars shall give more insight into recent developments.

1.2 Research goal and research questions

As previously mentioned, the aim of this paper is to analyze and evaluate the topic e-books at academic libraries in Sweden. The research goal specifically is to gain more knowledge regarding several processes that are essential within academic libraries, here set in Sweden. The research shall therefore cover processes that are presented in Vasileiou et al. (2012b) and Blummer & Kenton (2012) who present several stages within the e-book management process that are necessary for ensuring sustainable e-book collections. What are criteria for selection of e-books before the purchase process is initiated? Here, it is interesting to analyze how academic libraries acquire e-books and which acquisition models are used in this process, this either being evidence based acquisition (EBA) and demand drive acquisition (DDA). Further, are e-books acquired in packages or via title by title by the academic library? Another topic is Digital Rights Management (DRM) and further licensing of e-books. Here, focus is on the question if there are any problems that limit e-book access due to complicated licensing and limitations regarding access. Open Access (OA) is another issue that is of interest at academic libraries. As OA e-titles are accessible without any DRM restrictions, it shall be analyzed how the work with these e-books differ from e-books that are DRM restricted. Moreover, promotion of e-books is another issue that shall be focused on. It shall be analyzed how academic libraries promote e-books so that library users become aware of their existence. Here, it is interesting to analyze if there are any policies that deal with the promotion of e-books. Further, it shall be elaborated if there are any differences between print and e-book regarding selection, acquisition etc. The research questions in this thesis are as follows:

RQ.01: How does the acquisition process of academic e-books work and what are selection criteria for e-books?

RQ.02: How do the libraries work with Digital Rights Management, Open Access and the promotion of e-books?

RQ.03: What are the differences regarding workflows and perceived advantages and disadvantages of e-books in contrast to printed books?

The first research question RQ.01 refers to the overall work from selection, acquisition and use of e-books in academic libraries. Questions raised in this regard are, for instance, what are criteria for selection of e-books at the library, is there a media plan with a certain budget or does the library lack a distinct plan for e-books? Are they acquired title by title or as part of an e-book package, or is the acquisition process guided by other rules, regulations and actors? Attention should also be at different acquisition models such as EBA and DDA that are used in the process.

With research question RQ.02, the focus is on processes related to e-books, here DRM and Open Access and promotion of e-books. For instance, how does DRM affect e-book usage and are there any hindrances regarding access? How are e-books promoted at the library in order to gain a wider user base?

The third research question RQ.03 refers to the institutions' stance and work with printed academic (text)books and e-books. Regarding the acquisition process, it shall be analyzed if there are certain titles or subject areas where print or digital are preferred, and what are reasons for purchasing either format. Questions raised in this context also refer to cost effectiveness, accessibility and availability of titles, and if there are certain requirements that lead academic institutions to purchase either print or e-books, and opinions towards benefits and drawbacks of either format.

A total of 13 representatives from eight Swedish academic libraries agreed to participate in semi-structured interviews. As the interview participants are all employed at different academic libraries in different areas of Sweden, it would be interesting and stimulating to receive a more diverse set of answers. Therefore, a study with representatives from different academic institutions seems to be a better qualitative research approach and may yield qualitatively better responses that can answer the research questions that are asked above.

To conclude, analyzing and evaluating the process selection, acquisition, DRM, OA and promotion of e-books at Swedish academic libraries seems to be an interesting approach, as there is only a limited amount of research literature about this specific topic. The writing of this thesis shall therefore be regarded as an opportunity to collect recent data regarding individual academic libraries across Sweden and their specific work with e-books. Another point that shall be clarified is that this study is not concerned with audiobooks due to several reasons. First, the scope of the current study is sufficient for analysis and evaluation. Second, audiobooks could be regarded as a separate research topic that needs investigating in a different paper.

1.3 Limitations

This study is not without limitations. As this study has only a few interviews from representatives of different Swedish academic libraries (eight interviews were conducted by the time the thesis was finished), it does not attempt to make general assumptions for other academic institutions or libraries. The answers provided by the interviewees should not be considered to be generalizations for other library staff at other Swedish university libraries. Participants in this study come from a variety of libraries that serve faculties such as the Biomedicine, Social Sciences, Humanities and Theological faculty as well as librarians that are not linked to any faculty but are working e.g. in media division or scholarly publishing. Furthermore, this study should be seen only as an analysis and evaluation of workflows made by representatives from a selection of academic institutions in Sweden. As the interviews were conducted with individuals, their opinions and experience may differ from their fellow colleagues and superiors. As data for this study is limited, generalizations cannot be made for other academic libraries and their work with e-books. In this sense, it would be false to make assumptions for other academic libraries in Sweden and other European countries as well.

1.4 Thesis structure

This thesis concerning the use of e-books in Swedish academia is divided into seven distinct chapters. The first chapter represents the introduction where I explain the aim, background and motivation of the study and what makes it a valuable complement to other papers in this research area. Chapter 2 entails previous literature about the topic and mentions studies and research papers that have already dealt with the issue of e-books, here concerning academic libraries, and either by using a quantitative or qualitative research approach. Furthermore, a definition of the term “electronic book” or “e-book” shall be given, as a proper explanation of the term itself builds upon the research within this topic. Research literature will be referred to in relation to the research questions asked in this thesis. What shall be further given space is literature about acquisition, licensing, Digital Rights Management (DRM) and marketing as well as promoting e-books within academic libraries which can be seen as important information for this part. It should be noted that unlike in other scientific papers, the approach on materiality and affordance or user experience shall not be of prime interest in this thesis. However, in order to cover the most important aspects of this rather broad topic, a section regarding print versus electronic books shall give insight into this specific topic, as this may give a deeper understanding of the importance of e-books and why they are preferred or discarded by certain user groups. In chapter 3 the theoretical background regarding e-books is presented, here with regard to practice theory by Schatzki (1996, 2002, 2005). Practice theory here is used to explain practices individuals enact when working with e-book acquisition and other management processes. Chapter 4 concerns the methodology used for this study. Here, the qualitative research process shall be explained in relation to the interviews given by the respondents. Further, the academic institutions with the representatives who participated in this study are presented. In chapter 5, the results of the semi-structured interviews are presented as individual sections and topics that became apparent in the interviews. First, acquisition models and selection criteria that are worked with at the libraries are presented. Accessibility and availability of e-books are further outlined together with problems that can occur when working with e-books. Topics such as cost, DRM, Open Access and promotion represent different stages in the working processes with e-books, and will be also given further attention in this section. In chapter 6 the results are evaluated in terms of how the results answer the study’s research questions and how they relate to the results presented in the literature review in chapter 2 and the theoretical framework presented in chapter 3. Chapter 7 presents the conclusion. Here, the study’s findings are to be summarized and set into further context i.e. what do the results and the corresponding analysis and evaluation of said results mean for the research area and how future research can be conducted. Additionally, the sources used for this thesis are presented in the bibliography. Furthermore, the consent form for the participants as well as the interview guide and the E-mail sent to the academic libraries for recruitment are included in the appendix to this paper.

2 Previous research

In this chapter, previous research in relation to the research questions shall be presented. As previously mentioned, research regarding e-books within Swedish academia is limited. Therefore, the research presented here deals with the adoption of e-books in academic libraries primarily set in European countries, whereas some papers refer to studies conducted beyond the borders of the EU. Moreover, models regarding the workflows with e-book that are presented from other countries can give insight how Swedish academic libraries deal with this topic, either in a similar or different way. Thus, the results of previous research about e-books should be considered with a sense of doubt as different countries and people may have different attitudes towards e-resources in general and e-books in particular. In particular, the results may differ from those in other countries where digitization has not been successfully been implemented in academic libraries.

2.1 Search strategy

The search for research articles that are similar in content and that correspond to the research topic and questions is a difficult task with respect to the vast opportunities within the field. As a result, peer-reviewed articles were searched via various databases and library OPACs that are linked to the field of library and information science (LIS), or even archive studies. The initial search was conducted using the Primo webpage through the University of Borås. As a student at the University of Borås, I could access the OPAC as well as various databases that could be accessed without any charge. From this point, databases such as EbscoHost, LISA, Taylor & Francis, ScienceDirect, ACM Digital Library, Emerald and Web of Science were approached with the goal of finding relevant research articles.

In order to find the proper research articles that fit the topic as well as the research questions, I used different search queries (and various combinations) such as e.g. *e-books*, *print*, *digital*, *electronic reading*, *e-reading devices*, *academic libraries*, *acquisition e-books*, *distribution e-books*, *licensing*, *marketing*, *promotion*, *Digital Rights Management*, *Open Access* etc. To find studies that were conducted using the qualitative method, I further searched for research articles with key words such as *qualitative method*, *interviews*, *students*, and *academia*. Also, I used various combinations of the terms previously mentioned so that the results were better to search for. Moreover, I took advantage of the ‘snowballing’ technique which means that the references or bibliographic entries for each research article was the basis for further research on the topic. An example regarding this technique can be described as follows. The article’s references are analyzed and pursued in another article as well etc. This process of ‘snowballing’ (Wildemuth, 2017, p. 128) is then continued until the topic is considered saturated or that no new information can be extracted from the papers and research articles. Moreover, the references were then compared to the search entries in the databases and then adjusted by using search queries that properly fit the searches mentioned earlier.

The findings regarding research articles are divided into several parts. The acquisition, licensing and distribution as well as DRM will be given most attention, here regarding academic libraries and librarians that have e-books as one of their main working and/or research fields. Other research areas that are of interest in this thesis are marketing, promotion of e-books in academic libraries, the financial aspect i.e. the cost for the libraries, as well as the topic of Open Access. Benefits and drawbacks of e-books shall also be given further attention, here from both the users' and librarians' point of view.

2.2 Definition of the term “e-book”

Before the working processes with electronic books shall be explained together with its advantages, problems etc., first the term “e-book” itself shall be defined. As there is a variety of different definitions and usages concerning the term, the most prevalent and usable definitions are presented as follows. Generally, the term e-book here means the electronic book that is read (just as a physical book) and not an audiobook (either on CD, DVD or digital) that can be listened to. It should also be noted that it is not relevant here if an e-book is a digitized version of a previously printed book or a “born digital” book (Tedd, 2005, p. 58), as both are read in the same way and serve the same purpose. E-books that are of interest in this thesis are foremost academic non-fiction titles (e.g. e-textbooks with one or several authors), multimedia books that could contain audio and video applications, reference books such as encyclopedias and dictionaries, or books that were originally published in print and later transferred to the digital format (Tedd, 2005, pp. 61-62).

As definitions concerning e-books are vast in number, additional examples by different researchers can be given here. According to Armstrong et al. (2002, p. 217), e-books can be described as electronic texts of any size, extent or composition, published and accessible electronically on an electronic device with a screen. Landoni (2003, p. 168) points out that e-books should at least present the physical layout of a printed book, or the structure of a printed book in order to familiarize users with its idea and purpose. Other authors (Soanes and Stevenson, 2004; Secker, 2004; Reitz, 2004) refer to e-books as an electronic or digital version of a printed book, regardless if the e-book is a digitized version of an available print book or “born digital”. Also, due to the fact the e-books are to be read on computers and other electronic devices, they should provide access and opportunities that are not possible with printed books such as interactive browsing, searching and making annotations as well as hyperlinks which connect to Internet content.

As Anuradha & Usha (2005, p. 663) point out in a different study, an e-book can be described as the digital version of a print book that has been changed into an e-text. E-books can therefore be presented and accessed via a computer screen either through a network with Internet connection or another device such as an e-reader using a distinct file format. Given their digital nature, e-books have special features that printed books do not, such as hyperlinks, text searching and imbedded multimedia objects such as video and audio.

The National Information Standards Organization (NISO) stated in 2005 that e-books are digital documents, are comparable to printed books, and that have the inbuilt possibility for text search. The use of e-books is thus defined by the ability to read them through dedicated software and hardware (i.e. e-reader or computer). One has to acknowledge that due to its digital nature, an e-book can only be read via a screen, either on a computer or an e-reader. This makes a clear and precise definition of the term difficult as users and librarians alike might think of e-books as in terms of hardware and not content. As content is integral to both a printed and an electronic book – a book literally provides information through its form –, e-books are primarily regarded as digital books that have content (as have printed books). Furthermore, the form in which both versions are presented differ, yet its purpose shall be to access the information written in the book. For a printed book, the form or medium is paper and ink, and an e-book requires a screen and corresponding hardware in combination with software in order to work properly.

Considering the varying and multifaceted definitions by multiple authors, the common ground of research available include the following characteristics when defining e-books. An e-book is similar to a printed book in presentation and content (e.g. layout, pages). Furthermore, an e-book can either be a digitized version of a printed book or be “born digital” (Armstrong, 2008, p. 197). Hardware and software are essential for accessing and using e-books; users can read them either on their computer or a dedicated e-reader with the accompanying software. Accordingly, Vassiliou & Rowley (2008, p. 363) define e-books as a “digital object with textual and/or other content, which arises as a result of integrating the familiar concept of a book with features that can be provided in an electronic environment”. Another prevalent characteristic of e-books is that they feature “search and cross reference functions, hypertext links, bookmarks, annotations, highlights, multimedia objects and interactive tools” (Vassiliou & Rowley, 2008, p. 363). The first part of the definition is rather stable yet the latter part concerning technologies used when reading e-books is subject to change as electronic books could be read differently in the future, depending on technological progress. To conclude, the definition of the term “e-books” that is stated by Vassiliou & Rowley (2008) and other sources will not be the last resort in this regard.

In this thesis, e-books are referred to as being either born digital, or digitized versions of print books. E-books in this context can also refer to titles that are distributed both in a print and a digital format. E-book access that is of interest here is via a computer or mobile device such as a cell phone or e-reader. E-books that are referred to in this thesis are not necessarily required to have the same layout as printed books, i.e. it can be a text without any pagination present. Via a user interface, it can be possible for users to make annotations and highlight texts, though this is not applicable to all e-books, depending on the publishers’ webpage. In summary, the term “e-book” used in this paper refers to a broader definition, thereby including older and more recent titles that are used at the academic libraries. This should also be regarded as a method to gain a bigger picture of the work with e-books in general, as opposed to focusing on a specific type of e-books (such as e.g. e-books that are born digital).

2.3 Literature about acquisition, licensing, DRM, and promotion of e-books

Selection criteria and acquisition models for e-books are to be dealt with in the first part by referring to Walters (2013a), Polanka (2011), Fisher et al. (2012), Vasileiou et al. (2012a) and Evans & Saponaro (2005). Commonly used restrictions regarding access, use and licensing shall be discussed with help of Walters (2013a, 2013b, 2014) and Armstrong & Lonsdale (2005) and Martin & Mundle (2010). Other sources concern marketing and promotion of e-books at academic libraries with regard to the e-book market (Vasileiou & Rowley, 2011; Tedd & Carin, 2012; Dolnicar & Lazarevski, 2009), and additionally benefits and drawbacks of e-books are to be addressed and their use in contrast to print books (Muir et al., 2009; Mangen et al. 2013; Pálsdóttir, 2019).

2.3.1 E-book selection criteria

Reasons for selecting certain e-book titles are manifold as several criteria have to be taken into consideration before any acquisition can be performed. As Armstrong & Lonsdale (2005, p. 39) note, factors for selecting and acquiring are loan statistics, reading lists or part of curricula, and print copies. In their study, the authors also observe that librarians tend to purchase titles on their own and not necessarily due to the will of publishers. E-book titles shall be selected with aforethought, as cost is also a prevalent factor regarding building and maintaining a collection. The fact that e-books are more expensive than print books may tighten library budget even further. Moreover, another study by Vasileiou et al. (2012a, p. 23) reveals similar results. Main selection criteria for librarians are differing business models, licensing problems and DRM restrictions. Also, content currency is mentioned as a criterium which means that recent material should be purchased instead of titles that are out of date.

Further, cost is a driving factor for the selection and purchase of e-book titles. Coghill (2019) mentions that many problems that libraries face are related to budgets and cost effectiveness. As the budgets available for acquisition varies annually, the amount of media that can be purchased varies accordingly. In a worst case scenario, there might be no financial opportunities left when faced with severe budgets cuts. E-book titles may be more expensive than print, and suppliers may charge a separate fee for e-books which is not included with print versions. Yet, it should be noted that there is the widely used method of purchasing e-book packages. Thus, the price per title will be reduced significantly. According to Walters (2013a), e-book packages seem to be cost-efficient when the price is counted per title. Yet, there is also the risk of a lower quality of the overall package due to titles that are deemed irrelevant or uninteresting for the subject covered. Here, the cost per relevant title has to be considered, which might lead to a higher cost and many unimportant titles that the libraries cannot use and users are not willing to read. If an e-book package is delivered with titles that have inferior quality to the remaining titles of the package, one can consider another method, title-by-title acquisition, in order to be certain that only those titles are bought that are actually used and that are essential for the academic curriculum.

Armstrong & Lonsdale (2005) refer to their findings regarding management of e-book collections at academic institutions. In their study on UK academic libraries, several selection criteria regarding collection management and development were considered. During the selection process, focus is set on e-textbooks as the prevalent item that shall be part of a digital collection at academic libraries. Reason for this is that textbooks are seen per se as a part of the academic curricula and thus meant to be used by the target group, in this case students and researchers. Reference books and e-monographs are also an essential part of a collection, yet apparently not as frequented as e-textbooks.

As Walters (2013a) points out, the acquisition of e-books can be done either by individual book, i.e. by title, or by purchasing packages that are in line with the preferences of the academic institution. The selection of packages depends on the subject field the library is interested in. These subjects are usually bound to the specialized fields universities and colleges are affiliated with. Libraries, and therefore librarians, decide on their own whether they prefer either model. Yet, each approach has its advantages and disadvantages. Title-by-title acquisition means that librarians have more control over the whole process. Conversely, e-book packages offer the opportunity to acquire many titles for a lesser and presumably more reasonable price, at the expense of other criteria such as quality or if the titles are of relevance for the academic institution. Yet, Polanka (2011) concurs that one also has to consider that the packages themselves are subject to change. If, for example, some titles have become obsolete, they can be replaced by more recent titles. Another problem with purchasing e-book packages is the lack of control over their content, as Walters (2013a, p. 196) argues. Libraries are also in danger of acquiring titles they do not want or need when purchasing e-book packages. Another possibility would be a rental model where titles would not be purchased but rented for a certain amount of time.

Concerning selection problems and challenges of e-book collections, Evans & Saponaro (2005, p. 163) mention four categories, referring to content, access, support and cost. Regarding content, librarians have to consider whether the titles are relevant for the collection as a whole and whether the information contained will be up to date even when longer periods of time will have passed. It should also be considered when titles are to be updated. Other categories referring to issues with content are quality, accuracy, and data currency, as well as long term availability of the titles. Further, it should be evaluated whether the selection and acquisition of an e-book is more profitable and if the e-book itself is more valuable than an existing print version. The second category, access, refers to availability of the content provided by the library and also to compatibility with the current library system and catalog (OPAC). The authors mention licensing as another issue related to access, i.e. licenses for single or multiple users who can access the content. Accessibility issues also concern search engines and user interfaces that should be important assets for searching, finding and accessing e-content. Moreover, it should be assessed where, when and how users gain access to the content. The fact that users can access the material at any place at any time should therefore be the main goal when working with e-books and e-resources. The third challenge in selection is support, referring to training and skills of library staff and users when working and using electronic content. The fourth issue of selection is cost, hereby referring to selection of the most cost effective format, furthermore subscription fees and material as well as administrative costs.

2.3.2. Acquisition models

Different acquisition models of e-books are addressed in the following section. Here, the two distinct models that are of interest for the thesis are evidence based acquisition (EBA) and demand driven acquisition (DDA), also referred to as patron driven acquisition (PDA) or sometimes mentioned as pay-per-view (PPV) in the research literature, are presented together with their benefits and challenges in the acquisition process.

2.3.2.1 DDA

According to Polanka (2011), DDA (demand driven acquisition) is centered on the user and is thus also called patron driven acquisition (PDA), or sometimes also pay-per-view (PPV), which means that a fee is only paid for the titles that patrons actually use. This means that libraries offer e-titles for the patrons to be used. Once a certain limit is reached regarding number of uses or number of requested pages, the e-title is purchased automatically. Moreover, metadata records (such as MARC records) in the library OPAC are provided for library patrons. If they consider a title relevant, they click on it, and the library receives an invoice for said title. As effective as this model might seem, it can lead to unwanted costs as it is not always certain whether a library user actually wants to read a specific title or not. Therefore, human error is a crucial factor in this case. Polanka (2011) concludes that DDA might be a solution to many of today's problems considering budget problems.

Fisher et al. (2012, pp. 164-165) add that with an acquisition model such as DDA, library users can access the titles they want to use, thus relieving the library from further costs. As the authors argue, the patrons' need is center of this model. If content is needed by the users, it is accessible and thus available. Thus, it is a very cost-effective method as the library is only paying for the content that is demanded by the patrons, given that their demands are modest. If their demands are too high and lead to a financial burden for the institution, then different models might be considered. Benefits of this model are flexibility and time efficient acquisition, thus spending less work on collection development and more on user satisfaction. This model can be regarded as being cost effective due to the library only paying for titles that are needed and read. Drawbacks of this model are, however, that not all titles are available or that they have to be purchased or made available for purchase together with other titles within an e-book package. Thus, Fisher et al. (2012, p. 165) argue that this acquisition model might be more useful for smaller libraries that have a more loyal user base than for larger institutions. Coghill (2019, pp. 25-27) refers to DDA as having both its benefits and disadvantages. The main advantage for librarians is the fact that they would not select a package of titles that are not relevant. Thus, the selection and acquisition process is more efficient if users choose individual titles themselves. Yet, those titles should be evaluated by librarians and bought with regard to the library budget, relevance for the collection as a whole and, if it is an academic library, the current curriculum. According to Coghill (2019), a problem with DDA is that university or college students need specific titles for their classes which some publishers do not offer, or that specific e-book titles are not available.

In contrast, another study from the Swinburne University of Technology Library (Davies, 2017) yields different results. Here, DDA is used with an additional access model, ATO (access to own). While DDA based on short term loans (STL) were considered not to be feasible enough for the institution, ATO was considered in an experiment. With DDA based on STL, fees are paid for each loan. If the title is automatically purchased after a certain amount of loans, the institution pays the price and an additional charge for more users, if applicable. Here, an STL charge for an e-book loan cannot be ascribed to the purchase later in the process. ATO based DDA here is different as loan fees per title are steps to a resulting purchase. Further, once the loan fees reach the amount of the purchase price of the e-book, the title is automatically purchased without any extra costs, except if the institution wants to increase user number licenses. Here, the prime goal of implementing DDA is that it is regarded as being cost effective to pay a fee if a title is seldomly used, and to purchase an e-book if it is used frequently. According to Davies (2017, p. 41), DDA – regardless if it is based on either STL or ATO – has proven to be a successful asset in e-book loan statistics because this method is considered sustainable as well as cost effective and a useful indicator for future acquisition processes. In another study, Schroeder & Boughan (2018) point out similar results when DDA, STL and ATO were implemented as acquisition models at the Harold B. Lee Library which is situated at Brigham Young University. Schroeder & Boughan (2018, p. 35) address benefits of these models such as access to titles that were not possible to purchase using conventional acquisition models. Also, the cost benefit ratio is more feasible for the institution using these models in contrast to purchasing print. Yet, a general drawback still seems to be that many titles are not read by users, thus impairing effectivity and efficiency of the e-book collections.

A different study by Kwok et al. (2014, p. 156) refers to DDA (referring to JSTOR, YBP/Ebrary and Wiley) as a successful and beneficial acquisition model that was initiated at the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST) library. Although the life span of the individual titles is deemed to be relatively short and DRM restrictions to be irritating for users, DDA can nevertheless be regarded as a supplement to other purchasing models, and a useful asset for users when searching for specific titles within e-book collections. Also, the authors point out that the DDA models at the specific HKUST library was implemented and expanded over a longer time span, thus gathering different actors which proved to be beneficial for the working processes. According to the authors (Kwok et al., 2014, p. 157), the cooperation between the different actors is realized by vendors, commercial aggregators, one publishing house and a University Press aggregator.

2.3.2.2 EBA

EBA (evidence based acquisition) can be regarded as an effort to avoid title-by-title acquisition. Here, libraries have to pay an upfront fee in order to access the content of an e-book package over the time span of one year. Within this time frame, users have access to the package. After this time frame, librarians evaluate usage statistics of the individual titles and choose which titles to purchase (Proctor, 2015, p. 2). Thus, libraries have evidence of which titles are actually read by users and which titles should not be part of the acquisition.

A study by Yilmaz & Unal (2022) refers to e-book acquisition via the EBA model. Here, the authors analyze the cost-benefit situation at Hacettepe University Libraries. In their study, the authors emphasize the responsibilities by the libraries for EBA to be successful. While the purchasing process using the EBA model in the long term may lower costs by focusing on titles that are actually used and thus benefitting tight library budgets, it can be of disadvantage for smaller institutions that only have limited experience with collection management. Also, institutions should work with the selection process as follows. Statistics on usage from previous collections should be considered as well as recent user profiles, budgets and quality/quantity of the proposed EBA model. Moreover, metadata records should be complete and maintained throughout the whole process which would be beneficial for both the library IT system and the user base. Another study by Tran & Guo (2021) analyzes EBA e-book acquisition in STEM fields and conclude that EBA serves as a valid supplement to STEM e-book collections. As users in STEM subjects want to read recently published material, EBA here can satisfy the need for up to date e-book monographs. The authors note that EBA can also be applied to other fields such as medicine, humanities and social science as it would be more time and cost effective than DDA. The authors conclude that EBA enables librarians to make more informed decisions regarding title selection as only those titles are selected that are read by users.

Bucknell (2012) argues that both DDA and EBA have advantages and disadvantages, depending on the selection and purchasing methods and the intentions of the institution. The author argues that e-book as well as print packages can be regarded as wasteful as most of their content is never read by users. Yet, e-books have the advantage of not being a waste of physical space, as opposed to print books. Moreover, libraries would be at a cost advantage with e-book collections as fees would be lower than with print books as shipping and packaging costs are eliminated. According to Bucknell (2012, p. 57), DDA can be beneficial for libraries as only the content that is used will actually be purchased. DDA has disadvantages that may not be preferred by the user base. Issues are, among others, that DDA packages can be more expensive than acquisition via EBA, thus forcing the institution to decrease the amount of titles in the package. Also, there may be additional costs to the library for specific DDA titles. DDA may lead to many titles being selected by the librarians themselves and not by the users, making the purchasing process more complicated with more resources being used. Further, there is the possibility of many titles not being used, thus creating much “noise” (Bucknell, 2012, p. 59). The major benefit of EBA is that most of the titles available in the package will be used as opposed to DDA where this distinction is not always clear.

2.3.3 Accessibility of e-books

The following part shall give an overview over challenges both libraries and patrons face when dealing e-books today. Here, challenges concerning access, discovery, sharing and usage of e-books shall be further explained, by referring to Walters (2013b), Culbertson et al. (2011), Martin & Mundle (2010) etc. According to Walters (2013b, p. 98), many e-book vendors use their own online database and interface of the titles they want to make available and distribute to partnering libraries. These online databases face some problems such as complicated search functions, unreliable classification schemes, missing navigation or a confusing search interface. These can be regarded as downsides for both users and libraries. Moreover, multiple databases require multiple user accounts and login data, and a lack of standardization between these different databases can cause distress among users. Furthermore, there are several problems connected to the use of library catalogs (OPACs). As e-books are, like printed books, part of the cataloging system, search queries by patrons should yield correct results. Yet, there are other challenges e.g. if there should be one entry for both the printed and the digital version of the same book or two separate records; if it is more clear for the user to have one catalog entry for different versions of the same e-book or individual records. The latter point is of interest as it is applied in many library catalogs, as Culbertson et al. (2011) explain. To have one entry for different editions or versions of a book has many advantages such as a clear structure of each respective OPAC entry, a less confusing search experience, and the focus on content rather than appearance. It is also a matter of efficiency and clarity if different versions of the same book can be accessed easily through one record. Due to MARC records being the standard metadata format – i.e. provider-neutral records that apply to all versions of a book or other item –, individual records for each version of one e-book have become more or less obsolete.

According to Martin & Mundle (2010, p. 232), there are three distinct problems related to metadata MARC records that are distributed by vendors; that being problems with access, with loading, and with the quality of the records themselves. Access issues in this context refer to the inability for the user to use the e-book; load issues mean that the records cannot, for any reason, be transferred to the catalog system; and record quality issues refer to the ability by the patron to successfully identify the records in the given catalog system. Other examples of such record quality issues are, among others: incorrect data such as ISBN; missing data such as publication information, subject heading etc.; information given solely in another language; poorly converted metadata; grammatical errors; errors in description and classification. Similarly, a study by Young (2012) agrees that records provided by third party vendors also happen to be erroneous. Common issues are incomplete, incorrect or missing data or records that are obsolete or out of date. There are several criteria librarians have to consider when asking the question whether they decide on records distributed by vendors or third parties. Criteria are, according to Rossmann et al. (2009), whether the records come for a whole e-book package or only for a certain part of the package; whether records of third parties are of higher cost; whether MARC records are available and be individually for each library or be shared through a consortium; whether the records are attained before or after the e-books are delivered; and whether URLs, URIs or DOIs are up to date and functioning.

2.3.4 Restrictions on use: licensing and DRM

The issue of leasing and licensing is a recurring topic when dealing with e-books. Research has been conducted thoroughly by various authors who shall be referred to here, e.g. Walters (2013a, 2014), Armstrong & Lonsdale (2005), Coghill (2019), and Eschenfelder (2008).

Walters (2013a, p. 192) points out that there are several leasing models with e-books, that being annual lease (annual fee paid by the library), perpetual lease (fee paid by the library once), and lease per use (bill paid by library according to items used). Annual payments for access to e-book collections that do not change in size are financially not feasible (in contrast to e-journals where more issues are added continuously). As noted by Armstrong & Lonsdale (2005), restrictions by the publishers and distributors of electronic books on their usage and sharing represent severe hindrances for academic libraries to work in this field. As technology advances, apparently so do the hindrances on the use of certain technological developments. The most common restrictions on the use of electronic books are licensing and DRM restrictions, which in turn further hinder users to access e-books.

According to Eschenfelder (2008, p. 208), these restrictions can be divided into the categories “soft” and “hard” restrictions. Soft restrictions in this case are shortcomings or deliberate mechanisms that prevent users from accessing certain functions or discourage users to do a task such as printing or saving, leading to users’ discontent. Moreover, other limitations (Walters, 2014, p. 88) can be of essence for soft restrictions such as navigational problems (hidden icons and menu bars), functional problems (saving a collection of documents instead of one document), legal problems (warning messages that refer to legal actions). These soft restrictions may be counteracted by certain actions such as multiple sessions or different browser settings. Nevertheless, they demonstrate disadvantages of modern e-book usage. In contrast, hard restrictions are set to prevent (i.e. not merely discourage) users from actions like saving and printing despite the settings of the working operating system.

As Coghill (2019) argues, due to DRM restrictions patrons cannot use these services intensively which in turn can lead to irritation and frustration. As a satisfying user experience is the basis for future use of services, publishers may develop their strategy in this regard. Yet another issue with user experience is the circumstance that taking notes and annotations is difficult when accessing e-books, a problem that is widely known among institutions. Other restrictions on the use of e-books concern e.g. viewing, printing and downloading. In terms of viewing, licenses can prohibit users from accessing more pages than they would need to read.

2.3.5 Cost of e-books

As e-books are not published for mere altruistic purposes, publishers and vendors as well as libraries are interested in their price (Walters, 2013a, p. 198). If purchased per title, academic e-books cost more than printed books, as opposed to fiction that would sell at a lower or the same price as the printed book. On the other hand, some e-books represent the printed version of the book that is out of print or otherwise not available anymore. E-book packages seem to be cost-efficient if the price is counted per title. Yet, there is the disadvantage of inferior quality of the overall package due to titles that are deemed uninteresting for either the library or the users, or both. Here, the cost per relevant title has to be considered, which might lead to a higher cost and many low quality titles that the libraries cannot use and patrons are not eager to read. If an e-book package is delivered with more inferior quality titles than those titles that are of actual value, as Walters (2013a) argues, one can consider title-by-title acquisition instead, in order to be certain that only those titles are bought that are actually used.

Several research studies (Schroeder & Boughan, 2018; Rao et al., 2018; Carrico et al., 2015) deal with the cost-usage benefit of e-book collections by referring to different acquisition models such as EBA and DDA. A common result of the research literature is that these models have a financial benefit over conventional purchasing models such as title by title, or even print. In their study from the University of Florida where different acquisition models were applied, Carrico et al. (2015, p. 110) conclude that PDA is the most cost efficient model, especially regarding fields within the Humanities and the Social Sciences. On the contrary, e-books covering STEM and MED subjects were not as beneficial regarding costs. For the latter, EBA is considered a better alternative. Schroeder & Boughan's (2018, p. 35) study show similar results with DDA. The authors address the cost benefit ratio as being more feasible for the institution using DDA in contrast to purchasing print. A common problem is yet that many valuable titles are not read by the user base, thus compromising the overall goal of the e-book collection. Rao et al. (2018, p. 100) conclude in their study on cost effectiveness that although e-books are more expensive than print books across all subjects, their popularity among users and researchers is still high, therefore suggesting a hybrid model in which both digital and print books are present. It is stated that publishers tend to set higher prices on academic e-titles that are more frequented by users and lower prices on e-titles that are not commonly used, thus creating a difficult stance regarding purchase. The authors point out that a hybrid model with both print and e-titles would counteract this dilemma and benefit reading opportunities.

Another study by Kont (2020) at the Tallin University of Technology Library observes that short term loan is up to 20% cheaper than purchasing an e-book. This is apparently due to the fact that procedures concerning short term loan take less time and require less financial resources than e-book purchase. The authors further mention that short term loan is an effective way to give access to titles that libraries do not want or need to purchase. The authors also note that automatic purchases after only one use should be treated carefully as it is not certain if the titles will be used or not. Therefore, librarians have to be skilled to estimate whether specific titles are more frequented by users. If usage for a title increases, then purchase should be more cost and time effective.

2.3.6 Benefits and drawback of e-books

The disadvantages and advantages of e-books, in this case e-textbooks (Millar & Schrier, 2015, p. 171), as seen by students as well as researchers, shall be outlined in this section. Naturally, those who favor e-books use them for the portability and versatility that they offer. The opportunity to have access to an electronic book all the time combined with its portability, and them not taking any physical space, is an advantage over a printed book. As Davy (2007, p. 99) points out, full-text search, the ability to search for keywords in the text and the possibility to use hyperlinks would make e-books a useful supplement. Additionally, ebooks are offered with a variety of file extensions (such as epub, PDF etc.) and can be read not only on a computer but various other devices, for instance e-readers like the Kindle or on an Ipad, or even cell phone. Other reasons in favor of e-books concern financial and economic motivations, as a study by Subba Rao (2001, p. 250) shows. Reasons are the possibility to print out certain pages instead of the whole text and the fact that e-books are available instantly on the Internet via stream or after the file download. In contrast to print, e-books may offer better readability due to backlit screens. Concerning ecological factors, e-books can be an alternative to printed books as they do not require or destroy any natural resources (such as trees being cut for books). Yet, electronic books require a device that enables the user to read them initially, a device that is produced using natural resources as well.

Drawbacks of e-books are, as are their benefits, manifold and dependent on the user behavior as well as familiarity with electronic books. According to Anuradha & Usha (2006, p. 51), there were multiple technological problems regarding e-books. According to the authors, there may be difficulties in the compatibility of hardware (device) and software (application, file extension, DRM). Another reason may be that university students and researchers simply not know of the possibility of reading e-books at their institution, a problem that is aimed at marketing and PR. Other problems occur when a permanent Internet connection is required yet not available, and that problems with downloading and streaming of individual e-books occur. Subba Rao (2001, p. 250) describes other disadvantages of electronic books such as the costs of e-readers, the lack of standard formats among the products as well as the encryption that comes with e-book files. This problem also aims at the issue of compatibility i.e. if files in different formats can be read by various devices. Additionally, according to Rowlands et al. (2007, p. 509), other problems with e-books are that they are difficult to read, annotate and bookmark; that taking notes while reading is more difficult than with printed books; and that issues with DRM lead to unsatisfied users and a negative reception of e-books as a whole. On a different note, Buczynski (2010) describes that the most prevalent problem with e-books is that many patrons have no knowledge of their existence and that there are problems with their usage. For the first part, libraries ought to increase their marketing strategies and open more communication channels with their user base. For the latter part, Buczynski (2010, p.14) mentions that although patrons have many different opportunities reading e-books with e.g. e-readers and computers in different file formats, problems occur when eventually implementing the e-book software into the hardware and users becoming irritated and frustrated with occasionally confusing user interfaces.

Furthermore, benefits and drawbacks of e-books are different from printed books primarily due to their digital nature (Vassiliou & Rowley, 2008). According to the authors, advanced technological skills and equipment is needed in order to access and read an e-book. Benefits of e-books for users are, among others, keyword searching, customizable user interfaces, hyperlinks, making annotations, accessing audio and video files as well as the possibility for online chat. A variety of software is compatible with e-books, such as web browsers and a variety of e-readers, as long as the file format provided is supported. Also, parts of e-books can be copied or printed out, as long as they are DRM free. DRM restrictions may prohibit copying and printing, which in turn is a major drawback of e-books. Other disadvantages are, to name a few, that user and search interfaces are not standardized i.e. each e-reader and reading software has their own unique interface and technical environment, thus leading to irritating or confusing responses and reactions by users. Additionally, according to Vassiliou & Rowley (2008, p. 359), benefits for libraries are the lack of physical labour such as unpacking and shelving, saving costs as no physical space such as shelves are used, instant access to titles and secured storage on computer servers. Disadvantages for libraries and their staff may be issues with maintenance and licensing, and the fact that advanced IT skills are required in order to use e-books and the IT infrastructure.

Concerning use and perception of e-books used by students, there is a large amount of research literature on this topic and shall only be briefly outlined here. According to the vast majority of sources (Mizrachi, 2015; Baron et al., 2017; Foasberg, 2014; Pálsdóttir, 2019), students' preferences depend on 1) the type of e-books and 2) their respective lengths. If a shorter academic text is given both as digital and print alternative, the students' preferences are almost alike. Yet, regarding longer scientific texts (e.g. e-textbooks), students are more likely to read and comprehend the printed version (Singer & Alexander, 2017, p. 162). Apparently, students can focus better on the main idea and concept of a research or scientific article or book if they are analog media (Singer & Alexander, 2017; Foasberg, 2014). Other studies seem to support the observation that it is common for students to have difficulties focusing on electronic texts in contrast to print. In general, students show better reading comprehension in printed books. Reasons for this trend are manifold, as various studies have pointed out (e.g. Jeong, 2012; de Oliveira, 2012; and Su, 2022). These findings can be summarized as follows: eye fatigue or eyestrain can be caused by staring at a screen for a longer amount of time, inexperience with electronic books, lack of interest or a lack of knowledge that the academic institution offers e-books are the main causes why students seem to have difficulties using, reading and comprehending electronic books. The preference for printed texts could also stem from the nature of the technology provided. For instance, the scrolling mechanism is inevitable for reading e-books but becomes apparently irritating after a certain amount of pages. Also, text navigation proves to be challenging when working with e-books as sometimes there is a lack of page numbers or chapters, and readers are often not able to go back in the text and look up previous text lines (Mangen et al. 2013, p. 65). Research regarding use and perception of e-books by academic staff and researchers is scarce. In a study by Mulholland & Bates (2014, p. 495) concerning the use and perception of electronic books by academic staff, results are that quite a large amount of respondents has heard of the possibility of downloading e-books at their university but rarely used them due to a lack of

marketing by the institution. Concerning user behavior, it becomes clear that most academic staff only browses e-books instead of reading them, thus implying that the use of electronic books is merely a brief interaction than a thorough research, as could be seen with students' responses in similar studies. Here, the benefits of e-books include, as in studies with university students, their accessibility and the possibility to use them remotely off campus, as well as their interactivity with applications such as Internet hyperlinks and search tools. A number of disadvantages were also mentioned, such as eyestrain due to screen resolution and prolonged screen reading, a lack of relevant titles, and navigational and software problems.

Yet another study (Jamali et al., 2009, p. 37) received a total of 16,000 responses from students and scholars from 123 different universities, yielding similar answers as the previous studies. Benefits of e-books are, among others, their searchability, convenience regarding no physical space is needed for storage, and the fact that they are cost effective and ecologically friendly as no natural resources are exploited. Furthermore, e-books were regarded as a supplement to printed books for learning and researching topics, and a necessity if the printed version was out of stock. Yet, the problem with a lack of awareness and promotion of e-books is also found here. More patrons would be willing to use electronic books if communication efforts would had been better. The authors (Jamali et al., 2009) mention a variety of disadvantages concerning e-books such as being dependent on a working Internet connection, difficulties with concentration and focus, difficulties with file formats and compatibility with devices, and problems concerning different operating systems. Another problem is the issue of DRM in e-books, meaning that they may not be supported by the operating system.

A study by Ketron & Naletelich (2016) refers to the hedonic and emotional aspects of reading e-books as opposed to print books. The study's goal is to investigate the effect of e-readers on users' perception of and connection with e-books. The authors hereby use self-concept theory as a basis for their analysis, and examine the users' stance towards electronic and print books by relying on this theory. The authors want to discover hedonic differences regarding the perception and use of e-books and print books, and consequently if users prefer either format. Results are that while e-books are considered to be easily accessible and usable due to their portability, users criticize a lack of personal connection to the electronic book. In contrast, print books offer users a tactile experience which in turn leads to emotional or hedonic response. These findings correspond to self concept theory and demonstrate that print books are considered to be an extension of the own self. Further, it is noted by the authors that the hedonic experience that print books offer could not be replaced by e-books, as print apparently is connected with users' emotions. These findings are further supported by what other authors describe as barriers that inhibit the use of e-books. Blummer & Kenton (2012) mention hardware standards, overpricing, licensing and operability problems as barriers that may hinder the adoption of e-books. Durant & Horava (2015) refer to different reading experiences regarding e-books and print books. Reading print books accordingly engages the brain in a different way than reading on screen. The study shows that reading print engages users in a deeper reading experience, while reading on screen helps users in pattern recognition and decision making.

2.3.7 Marketing and promotion of e-books

Although marketing and promotion are not necessarily seen as cornerstones in an academic library environment, this issue is nevertheless important for e-books as the knowledge about their existence in the library catalog is limited at best. According to Kaur (2009), as libraries are non-profit organizations and therefore altruistic in nature, the concept of marketing, which is specifically aimed at selling products and services to a client, may seem like out of place and too difficult for librarians to handle. Yet, as customer service can be seen as a form of marketing, libraries are responsible for “selling” their services and make their values clear to the users. Thus, more patrons become aware of the libraries’ presence and values and therefore would become more successful in achieving their goals (Kaur, 2009, p. 456). Social marketing, as Kotler (1979) suggests, should also be applied to non-profit organizations such as libraries. Marketing here should be considered as creating a higher value to the services they offer, and not as selling a certain product. It is not revenue that is interesting to libraries, but rather the service to their users. According to Kotler (1979) and Kaur (2009), libraries should be seen as altruistic institutions that aim for a better society by providing access to knowledge (i.e. through books and Internet connection) and public service.

If the libraries’ main goal is to gather knowledge and information for their target audience, then a proper marketing plan is of essence for this approach to work. According to Kwan et al. (2023), marketing can be realized through the well-known marketing mix strategy using the 4P method, that being product, place, price and promotion. For service institutions like libraries, this method can be further enhanced by three more methods, that being people, physical evidence, and process. According to the authors, this mixed marketing strategy is regarded as the most used and influential, as it entails both material (product, place and money) as well as social aspects (referring to individuals or customers) in the marketing process. Being an important part of marketing, promotion can thus be described as making a product, organization or, in the case of libraries, product or service known to the target group at which said product or service is purposefully aimed. This should in turn induce public awareness and thus lead to a product being sold (for profit organizations) or a service being executed (for non-profit organizations).

Another strategic marketing technique that aims at promoting libraries’ services and products to the target group is presented by Islam & Islam (2009, p. 128). The authors use a five stage model derived from Ojiambo (1994) that marks five stages of which can help libraries apply marketing strategies. These five stages are: determining resources for libraries; competitor identification; user identification; initiating a marketing strategy; and marketing mix method. The first stage entails determining the goals of the library and a corresponding marketing plan. In the second stage, potential competitors are identified, these being both non-profit and for-profit organizations. The third stage identifies different groups of potential library users and their needs, a process that the authors describe as segmentation. In the fourth stage, goals for the marketing plan are identified and specific strategies developed in order to reach them. Also, a schedule should be established. The last stage includes communication efforts and public relations as well as establishing product policies and distribution channels. Contact with users is ensured and feedback encouraged.

In order for non-profit marketing to be successful, libraries first have to ascertain the target group(s) that they want to serve. According to Bruce (1995, p. 77), the person or party who interacts with the non-profit organization can be divided into two groups. First, there are end customers that are involved in the whole process from beginning to end such as clients, users, patrons or local community. Second, there are intermediary parties that are included in the process but are not the target group, such as e.g. government agencies.

As several studies (e.g. Rowlands et al., 2007; Shelburne, 2009; Mulholland & Bates, 2014) point out, there is a lack of knowledge about e-books at universities and colleges and that print is preferred over digital. Thus, the promotion of electronic books to library patrons may be a further step to make the library's collections more accessible and furthermore to make users more accustomed to the digital environment the library offers. Moreover, it might change the users' reading behavior in favor of electronic books in the long term. Naturally, patrons have to have certain IT skills concerning e-books in order to use them appropriately. Yet, empirical research regarding marketing and promotion of e-books at public as well as academic libraries is scarce.

According to Vasileiou & Rowley (2011, p. 627), marketing here can be defined as a process that requires a preparation, organization and execution. The process includes the planning and execution of goods, ideas, price and services with the goal of reaching an exchange between the organization and its user base and others involved in the process. In their research regarding marketing and promotion at academic libraries, the authors conducted a study at seven different US academic libraries, from medium to large in size and their digital collections ranging from 9,000 to 500,000 e-books. Research findings are that in most cases, a coherent marketing and promotion plan concerning e-books was either nonexistent, not planned or only partially present. The most frequently used promotion tools for the awareness of e-books are mainly the libraries' webpages, the catalog system OPAC, and user education (teaching opportunities with several or one-on-one sessions). Tools that are used by a number of respondents are, among others, e-mail, events at the library, and virtual learning environments. Some of the least used tools include word-of-mouth, flyers, newsletters, and bulletins (Vasileiou & Rowley, 2011, p. 632). Similar results are also mentioned in another study by Kennedy (2011) that found a total of 38 marketing strategies, the most popular and successful being brochures, E-mails, and surveys. This study also identifies an apparent lack of ambition among librarians regarding the promotion of electronic resources at the libraries, and that a consistent marketing strategy or plan is missing, as well as a clear budget. Yet, librarians seem to easily identify the target group. On the other hand, academics and scholars can be a part of promoting e-books or e-resources in general to students, but this should not be seen as a serious attempt for libraries in their marketing strategy, as only a minority of academics would be eager to promote e-books for their students, as Vasileiou & Rowley (2011) point out. Even then, as has already been pointed out by previous research, would students prefer print over digital books. In their study, the authors further refer to possible future plans by library staff and academics to improve e-book marketing at their respective institution. Among others, suggestions include a literacy project, the implementation of an online chat module, course meetings, a guide distributed both in print and digitally, e-book lists with new titles, and in-person sessions.

Similarly, a different study by Lonsdale & Armstrong (2010, p. 189) finds that several promotional strategies are needed for academic libraries to become more visible for its user base. As proper marketing plans are scarce, institutions have to rely on mainly improvised ad-hoc strategies such as newsletters, promotion via the library's webpage, posters and bookmarks, workshops and other kind of training, and last but not most important through the institutions' own OPAC. The last mentioned might be the best opportunity for patrons to both access the library's catalog and learning about the use of e-books simultaneously. Yet, the fact that one has to access the catalog implies that patrons first have to acquire proper IT knowledge and skills in order to use e-books. The authors also observe that there is an overwhelming lack of marketing and promotion within academic libraries. Reason for this circumstance is, according to the authors, that academic staff rather prefers the printed version and therefore neglect the importance of digital alternatives.

A study conducted by Dolnicar & Lazarevski (2009, p. 277) shows that marketing for non-profit organizations is a difficult task, yet a rewarding opportunity. As libraries are non-profit, they are not necessarily oriented at market developments. Thus, other strategies and rules have to be followed so that the institutions can achieve their goals. Such strategies can be divided into several steps, such as the identification of the customer or client base (market segmentation), the building of a brand or image of one's own message (advertising), and communication with the target group through various channels such as e-mail, chat or in person (place). According to Dolnicar & Lazarevski (2009) and Andreasen & Kotler (2003, p. 49), non-profit organizations such as libraries have to put the user as focus of interest, in a customer-centered approach that relies on the clients' consuming behavior, needs and wishes. This can be seen as a contrast to an organization-centered approach that profit organizations use for their marketing plans. The results of their study demonstrate that there is a lack of marketing strategies and plans, although existing strategies would be beneficial for the institutions. While the consensus is that the most important issues are public relations, fundraising and advertising, many crucial parts of marketing are neglected by non-profit organizations. These include marketing research, a marketing plan, media relations, product development and pricing.

Several studies (e.g. Muhammad & Zhiwei, 2021; Choi & Joo, 2021; Kaushik, 2016) refer to social media as a recent method for libraries to gain a wider readership. Services included are Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc. According to Jain (2014), promotion via social media can be more beneficial for libraries than traditional marketing methods, as they are described as saving more time and being more cost-effective, and that social media allows staff to be more creative regarding developing marketing strategies. Furthermore, the user base is considered to be more accessible due to social media communication being a form of an extended direct dialog. Further, social media can help libraries become more visible to future users. Due to social media being available to multiple users at once, it can also be a platform for discussion among users and library staff (Kaushik, 2016). Social media can thus also encourage the development of creative platforms where users can interact, and librarians can inform about new arrivals, events and recent developments. Challenges for implementing social media in library marketing are, as a study by Choi & Joo (2021) mentions, a lack of staff, resources and expertise, and IT problems.

2.4 Open Access and academic publishing

As several authors (Crawford, 2011; Carvalho et al., 2023; Loan, 2011) point out, Open Access (OA) content is accessible and available to all its users online, free of charge. Contents can be read, downloaded, distributed and printed without any legal incriminations (Crawford, 2011). Further, authorship and copyright are generally protected and guaranteed via licensing. Osborne (2015, p. 637) also mentions accessibility as a crucial feature of OA content, as OA allows researchers to communicate among their peers, and additionally gain a wider audience, even among readers not necessarily being affiliated with academia. The main focus point when dealing with OA are scientific journals and articles and, albeit to a lesser degree, e-books. Motivations for acquiring OA content can be manifold, as Crawford (2011) points out. The author mentions several pragmatic arguments of OA for its readers and also publishers. For instance, research can be made more useful by publishing research results directly to a wider readership. It would also be beneficial for funders of the research projects as they would receive a return on investment. Additionally, Crawford (2011) argues that OA would be a financially better and more feasible model than e.g. a subscription as OA is produced at a lower overall cost. Likewise, libraries may also profit from OA content as it improves long term access and thus benefits long term preservation of electronic content.

There are three international meetings where the term OA was officially introduced into the mainstream alongside their respective statements (Crawford, 2011). These are the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI), the Berlin Declaration of Open Access to Knowledge in the Science and Humanities, and Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing. One of the outcomes of the BOAI is that it encourages academic OA publishing, here with two different approaches. The *Green Open Access* (Turgut et al., 2022) approach is aimed at self-archiving, meaning that researchers save their articles in open repositories. According to Córdón García & Córdón García (2013), repositories are units where digital material like documents are collected, created by scholars and researchers, while following certain rules and specifications such as e.g. interoperability, long term preservation, self-archiving and OA. There are different types of digital repositories, e.g. institutional (documents are created within the institution), disciplinary (i.e. discipline or a certain subject), and centralized (based on a geographical location). The second approach is the *Golden Open Access* (Carvalho et al., 2023; Turgut et al. 2022), whereby researchers publish their own work in OA journals (i.e. articles) or in OA books (i.e. chapters). Benefits for authors of scientific OA papers is that publishing leads to more visibility and thus increased demand and reading of said papers. Scientific research of certain authors is therefore more frequented, read and cited by fellow academics (Córdón García & Córdón García, 2013). There is also the possibility that authors of OA papers, although not being reimbursed for their work, may be more acknowledged by the scientific community due to their research being widely accessible for free for all users.

Although OA has many benefits for researchers, readers and libraries, it can also lead to challenges in several aspects. According to Pinfield (2015, p. 620), the areas where OA can cause problems can be divided into four main points, that being cost and sustainability; mandate compliance; problems regarding

communication channels; and policies and technical infrastructures. According to the author, OA can cause problems in these areas as institutions show an increasing demand for OA content that should be implemented. Rather than being an exclusive tool for only a few interested researchers, OA has generally become a more accepted asset for libraries. Therefore, as Pinfield (2015, p. 620) argues, libraries could invest in a long term transition period for OA implementation. Several other authors (Chang, 2017; Frederick, 2020; Osborne, 2015; Ross-Hellauer et al., 2022) mention additional problems and challenges that are associated with OA. The authors address several points of criticism towards OA, e.g. problems regarding the quality and trustworthiness of research together with the peer review process; copyright issues and ethical questions; publishing via paywalls; an over-representation of certain authors; predatory publishing; and an apparent lack of transparent evaluation. Furthermore, the term OA itself faces criticism as 'open' is regarded as being an imminent feature to science (Watson, 2015). Additionally, the term OA might be misinterpreted as the goal of this movement originally concerned the dissemination of information instead of content accessibility (Swan, 2006). Other problems regarding OA e-books in terms of administration and maintenance are the integration of OA titles in the digital environment, i.e. metadata records in online catalogues, the lack of identifiers such as DOI or ISBN, as well as the lack of a comprehensive usage data collection (Neylon et al., 2018). Other challenges concern long term preservation, e.g. insufficient or erroneous implementation of digital preservation in repositories (Barrueco & Termens, 2022). Further, online repositories containing OA content may be inaccessible due to improper management and maintenance (Mannocci et al., 2022), which can also be considered a challenge to long-term preservation.

In their study on OA e-books in Social Sciences, Lamani et al. (2018) use DOAB (Directory of Open Access Books) as a basis for further analysis, with the objective to analyze usage trends within the DOAB, also taking subject and language into account. Here, authorship patterns and growth of e-books and pagination trends are discussed. The results show that the majority of e-books are published from 2011-2016, with an ever increasing growth in of e-books on the DOAB. Subjects covered are e.g. anthropology, ethnology, gender studies, communication, media and LIS, etc. The majority (~90%) of the 1,200 e-books available are licensed under Creative Commons and the rest under similar rules and regulations, with non-commercial goals as one of the main tenets of the project. In terms of quality of the content produced, Lamani et al. (2018, p. 143) stress that most e-books are from renowned publishers such as Springer and others that further underline the high standard of the resources provided. Concerning authorship, approximately half of the e-books were written by one author, the rest by two or more authors. Referring to language, English is most used within e-books (~58%), whereas the rest of the texts are written in languages such as German, Spanish, French etc. The use of English may contribute to a wider readership and better resonance with fellow researchers and scholars, as English is the standard mean of academic communication. In contrast to the study conducted by Lamani et al. (2018) which aimed at the Social Sciences, Loan & Refhat-Un-Nisa (2015) analyze trends of OA e-books in Science and Technology, using DOAB as a basis. The study yields similar results as the previous one insofar that OA e-books are found in all relevant subjects of Science and Technology and that the texts are peer-reviewed and come from renowned publishers, indicating above average quality.

2.5 Collection development management

In this section regarding collection development, Evans & Saponaro (2005) and Johnson (2018) give background information on processes referring to collection development policies, while Lee & Boyle (2004) refer to selection and acquisition processes in order to build a comprehensive and sustainable e-book collection. It should be mentioned that Evans & Saponaro (2005) refer to the process of collection development management in general terms (i.e. regardless of print or digital books or resources), and Lee & Boyle (2004) specifically cover the issue of e-book collections. Additionally, Vasileiou et al. (2012b) and Blummer & Kenton (2012) build upon Lee & Boyle (2004) regarding selection processes and further give a detailed overview over the working processes that are necessary for successful and sustainable e-book management, together with problems and challenges during the process.

2.5.1 Collection development policies

According to Evans & Saponaro (2005, p. 52), collection development policies provide a sound framework for librarians to act upon. As people tend to have different opinions about decisions and different approaches towards certain decision making processes (in this case the content of the collections), written guidelines that support the libraries' selection and acquisition framework can be of help. Collection development policies therefore can be regarded as a point of reference within the selection process. These policies feature certain characteristics and have furthermore many uses and work towards certain goals. These include, among others, priorities concerning the collections themselves and the organizational and administrative processes; guidelines for inclusion and exclusion; reduction of personal bias in the selection process; ensuring consistency regardless of time and personnel; rationalizing budgets; assessment of the collection development program. Lee & Boyle (2004, p. 9) further add that such policies should refer to the collections strengths and drawbacks, identify and ascertain the user base which the collection is aimed at as well as trying to satisfy their needs through a sound and thorough collection policy. The overall goal of such a policy, the authors point out (Lee & Boyle, 2004, p. 9), should be to meet the information and reading needs of the user base in the most efficient way possible. Moreover, a collection development policy should be apt to change as circumstances may vary and changes during its lifespan and that of the libraries have to be met accordingly.

Johnson (2018, p. 89) mentions several elements that collection development policies should include in order to be valuable assets in libraries and for library collections. These include, to name a few, the libraries' missions, goals and objectives; responsibilities for collection development; budgeting and funding; selection criteria; acquisition models such as e.g. patron driven acquisition or pay per use, if applicable; formats and genres that are used and their motivations (e.g. textbooks, fiction, music sheets, games); information about special collections; work with user recommendations; copyright; collection maintenance (together with storage and deselection); collection evaluation; and resource sharing agreements. According to Johnson (2018, p. 88), the overall purpose of collection development policies is to give librarians a thorough document with clarifications over workflows and operating principles.

2.5.2 E-book management process

Regarding e-book management processes at academic libraries, Vasileiou et al. (2012b, p. 289), hereby building on Evans & Saponaro (2005) and Lee & Boyle (2004), highlight several stages together with accompanying activities and challenges. The assessment of collection development policies is the first stage in the management process. Here, guidelines and frameworks for the policy are initiated as well as the policy managed and developed. Problems that can arise are e.g. why e-books should be preferred over print books, and if the policy aligns with procedures and strategies set by the universities. Concerning the e-book budget, activities in this stage are setting a budget and starting control processes. A common problem here can be limited budgets for libraries while simultaneously receiving increased demand for e-books. During the discovery phase, problems occur when e-books are not available but demanded, and trying to work with suppliers that are neither approved nor contracted by the library. Also, a lack of bibliographical control can further lead to issues. In the selection and evaluation phase, the e-book title is being evaluated and a supplier chosen as well as purchasing and licensing options being made. Issues in this phase are e.g. criteria for title selection, licensing and purchase models that set restrictions on user demands, high cost for e-books and ensuring collection development goals. In the next stage, licenses are negotiated which can yet cause problems concerning complicated licenses and the archiving of e-books. Challenges in the next stage, cataloging and delivering e-books, can be libraries' internal problems with with proper cataloging procedures, a lack of or low quality metadata records provided by vendors, and problems with compatibility and the implementation of metadata records in the libraries' IT system. During the marketing and promotion phase, marketing strategies for e-resources are established and future plans for e-books assessed. Problems in this process refer to the application of proper promotion tools, time and budgetary constrains and limitations, and a lack of e-book availability. One of the last stages represents monitoring and reviewing, hereby meaning evaluating and analyzing usage statistics. Challenges in this phase are e.g. a lack of quality regarding usage statistics, a proper data collection and users' stances towards e-books. In the last stage in the management framework, Vasileiou et al. (2012b, p. 289) mention renewal and cancellation of e-books as primary activities, while issues that can occur are focused on how to counteract consequences of said cancellations, and if renewals of e-books are feasible for libraries.

Additionally, Blummer & Kenton (2012, p. 76) refer to challenges regarding e-book acquisitions and e-book management and highlight different stages in this process. These stages include: educated and skilled library staff working with acquisition is to be selected; initiating a trial access to first evaluate and assess different platforms; evaluate valuable e-references; consider currency in e-book packages; licensing for one or multiple users; and evaluating e-book platforms due to several criteria such as e.g. availability of titles, 24/7 accessibility, highlighting and searching text, downloading options. Blummer & Kenton (2012, p. 69) also refer to problems in this acquisition process such as e.g. lack of material, cost of e-books in contrast to print, and complicated price and licensing structures. Further, in order for e-book collections to be sustainable for future use, maintenance procedures have to be initiated and tools for management to be developed such as e.g. a records management system.

3 Theoretical framework

This chapter is concerned with theories and concepts that are used as a theoretical background in this study. As theoretical frameworks are manifold and their approach and contents multifaceted, not the whole theory but important parts are presented here. In this thesis, the author explores the work with e-books at academic institutions, foremost acquisition criteria but also DRM, Open Access, e-book licensing and promotion. Questions in this context also refer to the strategies, selection criteria, accessibility and usage of academic e-books. How do academic librarians act and react or reason when dealing with these questions, and what are criteria for e.g. title by title acquisition in contrast to e-book packages? When is the purchase of a printed book more reasonable than an e-book, or vice versa? What are routine practices within the e-book management process and what characterizes the individual stages in the whole process? What kind of practice bundles are involved in the management process in general and the acquisition process in particular? Practice theory here is used to explain the individuals' recurring practices with the working processes of e-book acquisition etc. Here, practice theory, by considering Reckwitz (2002, 2017), Nicolini (2012, 2017) and Schatzki (1996, 2002, 2005), can be a valuable basis for further analysis. Practice theory furthermore addresses the comprehension of knowledge based practices (Nicolini, 2012). Although there are a number of authors (e.g. Foucault, Heidegger, Wittgenstein etc.) who contributed to practice theory, the main focus here is on a more recent and revised version of practice theory by Schatzki who interprets human actions as a nexus or web of practices.

It should be noted that while reviewing the data for the results and analysis sections, the author of this thesis chose an inductive approach (Bryman, 2016, p. 26; Wildemuth, 2017, p. 319), meaning that categories and themes represent the outcome of the research conducted. This means that after the interviews were finished and transcribed, the concepts and framework were established and investigated. This opportunity proved to be fortunate as the circumstances of the interviews could not have been anticipated beforehand. During the interviews, the selection process for e-books together with various management processes such as licensing, DRM and promotion of e-books were discussed. For instance, acquisition is advanced by both knowledge and skills of the librarians and the demand by the users. This led to the conclusion that practice theory can be applied as it helps to illustrate practices of people being a part of and interacting with the physical world. Moreover, Schatzki (2005) describes organizations as social phenomena where social practices take place, and organizations entail various practice bundles (e.g. the selection and acquisition process) and material arrangements (e.g. office spaces). The libraries presented in this thesis represent organizations where a multitude of practices occur, collide and interweave, thus connecting actions, tasks and projects into a variety of practice bundles, thus forming a web of practices (Schatzki, 2002).

3.1 Practice theory

As practice theory is a vast field of differing concepts influenced by many authors such as Bourdieu, Heidegger, Wittgenstein, and due to the fact that a unified theory of practice theory does not exist (Nicolini, 2012), certain parts and key elements of the theory of practice shall be explained in this section. Thereafter, the focus is on Schatzki (1996, 2002, 2005) and his work on practice theory. According to Reckwitz (2002, p. 244), practice theory is a form of cultural theory whose fundamental characteristic is of “having recourse to symbolic structures of meaning.” This means that not all cultural theories are also part of practice theory, rather that practice theory is a branch of its own alongside mentalism and textualism.

Nicolini (2017, p. 99) furthermore mentions the social dimension of actions within practice theory. Here, actions performed by individuals are important for the study of social phenomena such as (re)production and change. As actions are performed by using material resources, the way and the purpose of the (inter)action are of essence. Reckwitz (2002, p. 250) describes practice as a pattern of actions that can be acted upon multiple times, thus reproducing the practice. The actors in this pattern (hereby both via the mind and the body) then realize or carry out the practice, both via movements by the body and behavior of the mind towards this movement, the latter itself having knowledge of and desires for the action or practice. Practice and practice theory therefore can be a useful tool for a better understanding of the world. In this thesis, the focus regarding practice theory is on the works of Schatzki (1996, 2002, 2005) who offers a revised and enhanced version of the theory of practice.

Schatzki’s theory of practice builds upon the work by Wittgenstein and Heidegger, i.e. that people do things that make sense for them to do. This also means that people react to the circumstances in life on the basis of what makes sense for them. This precondition that is not defined as decision making but which is rather described as an internal process is what Schatzki understands as “action intelligibility” (Schatzki, 2002, p. 75). This concept is yet not to be understood as rationality but rather as while there are various things and actions that are rational to do, people choose to perform practices “that are signified to them as the ones to perform” (Schatzki, 1996, p. 188). In contrast, rationality does not influence people’s actions. Action intelligibility, according to Schatzki (1996), is also not to be understood as obeying social rules. People can behave differently than what a set of rules or laws expects them to do, e.g. smoking in a non-smoking area. Practices can thus also be seen as unreflective reactions i.e. “not governed by conscious thoughts” (Nicolini, 2012, p. 164). Yet, this does not mean that practices are entirely meaningless. Rather, practices, actions and reactions have meaning, thought and a purpose and people carrying out these practices do so according to their preconceptions and conditions in life. People carrying out practices do so due to understanding and attunement (Nicolini, 2012, p. 164). Here, understanding refers to the logical aspect regarding the structuring of an action, whereas attunement refers to personal preferences or what Schatzki (1996, p. 122) refers to as “the locus of the affective component” of human behavior. The term ‘practice’ here is the main factor for comprehending human behavior and practices are important as they represent “horizons of intelligibility” (Nicolini, 2012, p. 164).

According to Schatzki (2002, p. 155), the world can be regarded as a web or a vast nexus of entirely differing practices and orders, stating that “practices are linked together as one gigantic, intricate, and evolving mesh”. Schatzki’s (2002, p. 73) basic understanding of practices are that they represent sets of sayings and doings. These sets can be hierarchically organized and also consist of other actions such as tasks and projects. Here, practices are linked together, overlap, diverge, are opposed to each other, thus creating a web with its own space and time. Schatzki (2005, p. 471) further adds time to practice theory by stating that practices are seen as “open-ended spatial-temporal manifolds of actions”. Here, settings of space as well as time serve as the basis for actions, thereby influencing on the way these activities are realized. The qualifier ‘open’ in ‘open-ended’ insinuates that actions can take place continuously over any amount of time, and that these activities can be influenced or interrupted by unexpected factors. Therefore, practices do not exclusively rely on routine actions but are also influenced by other factors, these being internal and/or external (Nicolini, 2012, p. 164). Spatial and temporal settings can furthermore be a marker for certain practices that can be carried out under these specific circumstances. Furthermore, materiality is of essence when describing actions by individuals that are done by using objects, such as books, either print or digital. The materiality of certain objects enable usage i.e. how actors in their interaction with things use them. This, according to Schatzki (2002, p. 80) means that practices entail distinct purposes that the actors ought or are willing to pursue. This is what Schatzki (2002) describes to be a part of the teleoaffective structure mechanism.

Furthermore, the actions that are involved in practices consist of four main processes, that being 1) practical understandings (i.e. abilities relevant for actions), 2) rules (i.e. instructions and principles), 3) teleoaffective structures (i.e. hierarchically ordered tasks and projects), and 4) general understandings (Schatzki, 2002, pp. 77-82). These four main elements of Schatzki’s theory of practice are further explained in the following section. During the performance of a practice, actions are connected by practical understanding. The term refers to abilities related to actions that are part of a practice, in particular “knowing how to X, knowing how to identify X-ings, and knowing how to prompt as well as respond to X-ings” (Schatzki, 2002, p. 77). Practical understanding means that participants within a practice know how to perform and recognize parts of the practice and its tasks and projects. Several sets of sayings and doings being connected by practical understandings refers to the fact that these two sets depict the same understanding of the practice, so that the action performed would be intelligible from one person to another, given that the participants are competent. In summary, actions that are part of a practice are connected by practical understanding in the case if the members or participants of the practice have a mutually intelligible judgement of what do to, and when a majority of these participants decide upon what is the most reasonable approach (Nicolini, 2012, p. 165). Moreover, practical understanding “executes the actions that practical intelligibility singles out” (Schatzki, 2002, p. 79). This means that practice is not decided beforehand and that actions are not determined by habitus or personal beliefs. Performing a practice thus can be described as dealing with a task or situation by using intelligibility. In turn, intelligibility refers to the specific situation, features and characteristics of an action, and the participants performing it themselves being active bearers of the action (Nicolini, 2012, p. 166).

The second element which connects sayings and doings of a practice are called 'rules' (Schatzki, 2002, p. 79). Rules are defined as basic tenets, instructions or explicit articulations that in turn specify and direct people how to perform certain actions. Thus, rules arrange a group of actions and link their components (i.e. tasks and projects) into complex groupings. It also means that people who are performing actions (i.e. sayings and doings) consider and act under the same rules. When faced with a decision of what to do, people will consider the rules that apply to the situation and decide appropriately, i.e. what makes sense for them to do. The purpose of rules is that they influence the future path of practices and activities. Therefore, as rules shape the outcome of future actions, they are given and enforced by people who have a certain authority and therefore power (Nicolini, 2012, p. 166).

The third element of Schatzki's theory is called teleoaffective structure. The structure combines sayings and doings into a comprehensive practice, and is described as a "range of normativized and hierarchically ordered ends, projects, and tasks, to varying degrees allied with normativized emotions" (Schatzki, 2002, p. 80). The term 'normativity' in this context refers to acceptability and to oughtness or how actions should be done. Normativized emotions are here referred to as emotions and moods of the state of mind regarding the outcome or end of a practice, i.e. losing a game leads to sadness whereas winning a game leads to happiness. Teleoaffective structures consider the performance of a practice. This means that practices spread out into a certain direction that makes sense for the actors performing the practice. Practices are here considered as a "set of ends" consisting of a variety of tasks and projects that shall be carried out by actors (Schatzki, 2002, p. 80). Ends in this case do not necessarily have to be goals that are consciously considered by the actors as the teleo-affective structure can be different from the actors' goals. Activity here is controlled by practical intelligibility which is ruled by the state of mind which in turn entails mental conditions that are learned and instructed (Schatzki, 2002, p. 81). As ends, projects and tasks and practices are open ended due to the teleoaffective structure, disputes and conflicts are consistent with practice. This also means that practices can develop depending on situation and circumstance. A conflict can be solved by finding an agreement between the actors of what can be allowed in a practice (Schatzki, 2002, p. 83).

The fourth element is general understandings, i.e. reflexive or uncontrolled understandings of the tasks and projects that actors are participating in, and which lead to practical intelligibility which in turn leads to an action (Nicolini, 2012, p. 167). General understandings are a part of individual practices and define or influence how practices are performed and in which way these are expressed within this performance (Schatzki, 2002, p. 86). According to Welch & Warde (2017, p. 183), general understandings can be things such as concepts and categories, e.g. nations and organizations (as collective concepts), ethnicity (as membership categories), or commonly shared beliefs, ideas or fates. Moreover, general understandings can spread over multiple practices and be ordered across practices that are interlinked (Hui et al., 2017). The fact that general understandings can spread over and suffuse many practices at once can lead to utterances by individuals that relate to practices to be perceived as being an appearance of general understandings. This means that by being able to understand the general understanding of one practice, the understandings of other practices will also be understood.

Another feature of practices is that they form social phenomena (Nicolini, 2012, p. 173), and social relations happen within a nexus of practices that are interconnected. Practices can also be seen as collective events where participants are acting together with tasks and projects. Interaction, in this context, can be seen as an outcome of a practice. Moreover, practices play a crucial role in the formation of social orders and the grouping or ranking of people within these social orders, e.g. working in an office has a different social order than working at a factory. According to Schatzki (2002, pp. 38-47), social orders are organized by four major social processes, that being 1) chains of action, 2) commonalities and orchestration, 3) prefiguration actions, and 4) material arrangements. The first concept, chains of action, refers to actions being in successive order. The second principle, commonalities and orchestration, refers to the circumstance that the actors of a practice are doing the same task or project together without previous agreement. The third process, prefiguration actions, refers to possibilities and limitations of future actions. The fourth element, material arrangements, refers to sites or spaces where practices take place. In this sense, spaces and settings of objects and people as well as properties of objects such as materials are a crucial part of the social dimension of practice theory. As people coexist in material settings, their lives are also influenced by the objects and environment they live in. Last, it should be stated that people interacting and social order (material arrangements within a social setting) are the result of a web of practices which has a certain order (Nicolini, 2012, p. 176). For instance, offices, hospitals and libraries are the effect or outcome of the social practices that are carried out together by multiple actors in different material arrangements i.e. places and settings. In these different social and material settings, multiple practices are performed and sometimes overlap. In summary, practice is “a temporally evolving, open-ended set of doings and sayings linked by practical understandings, rules, teleoaffective structure, and general understandings” (Schatzki, 2002, p. 87). As practices are performed through social and material orders, it can be noted that social orders are also the setting of said practices. Thus, as Nicolini (2012, p. 174) points out, “practices establish the orders through which they transpire and proceed, perpetuate, and change”. Moreover, relationships between practices can occur, i.e. tasks or projects can result in several practices which in turn can lead to the initiation of more practices as an outcome. In consequence, chains of actions can result in chains of multiple practices, leading to a web or nexus of actions, orders and practices linked together with social-material arrangements in a socio-historical spacetime (Schatzki, 2002, p. 155).

Schatzki (2005, p. 473) describes organizations as social phenomena where social practices take place, and organizations entail various practice bundles and material arrangements. Schatzki (2005, p. 475) suggests three procedures that help analyzing and evaluating the practices in organizations. First, the actions that the organization consists of shall be identified. Second, the practice-arrangement bundles that are part of the actions shall be determined. Third, other arrangements of practices that are linked to practice-arrangements shall be established. To find connections between practices and to identify practice-arrangements bundles, focus shall be on “commonalities and orchestrations in their actions, teleological orders, and rules; chains of actions, including harmonious, competitive, and conflictual interactions; material connections among nets; and the desires, beliefs, and other attitudes that participants in one net have toward the other nets” (Schatzki, 2005, p. 476).

3.2 Application of theory

While analyzing practice-arrangement bundles of organizations, an overview or abstract of social events and their working processes as well as inner relations should be identified. In this thesis, academic libraries are organizations which entail a variety of actors, bundles of practices and material arrangements. Practice theory according to Schatzki (1996, 2002, 2005) shall be applied to this thesis as follows. Schatzki (2005, p. 473) describes organizations as social phenomena with different actors, and as places with bundles of practices and material arrangements. The academic libraries presented in this paper serve as organizations i.e. places and settings with material arrangements where social practices take place. Practices at academic libraries are manifold, e.g. practices regarding research, administration, consultation, social meetings etc. Material arrangements at academic libraries are e.g. different departments, teams and working groups with their meeting rooms and offices, connected via lines of communication or administration. Practices at academic libraries are further part of practice-arrangement bundles that represent other departments, either connecting or overlapping or even conflicting. Practices overlap e.g. when actions are part of several practices or when elements of practices are part of different bundles. Connection of practices (Schatzki, 2005, p. 474) occur when actions that are part of different practices lead to practice chains (e.g. research), or when actions that are part from different practices share the same material arrangements as other practices (e.g. working at an office). Individual practices are part of the organizational process so that they, although sometimes overlapping or even conflicting (thus leading to disputes), are not incompatible with each other so that continuation of actions and practices is preserved.

In the course of this thesis, the acquisition process as well as other elements of working processes such as promotion, DRM and licensing can be considered practices that consist of a multitude of actions, tasks and projects. Moreover, there are chains of actions and practice-material bundles. For instance, the acquisition process consists of several steps that can be seen as multiple action chains being part of practices which are set in different material arrangements (e.g. office spaces). Such practice bundles within the acquisition process are: the selection of skilled staff that is responsible for the process as a whole; criteria for the selection of e-books; communications with vendors and publishers as well as negotiating licensing; the purchase of either individual e-books or e-book packages; purchase via EBA, DDA, or credits; selection of OA titles; download of metadata records, and promotion of e-books. The actions and practices involved in this process have the same goal which is the selection and acquisition of e-books, and other processes involved. Here, practices can be connected (e.g. selection leading to purchase), overlap (e.g. selection of titles either as purchase or as OA) and conflict when the practice bundles are not sustainable (e.g. cancellation of purchase or discontinuation of an e-book subscription). Practices within an academic library can also interact, e.g. purchase is proposed by a librarian, which is then counteracted by staff responsible for finances (i.e. e-book packages being too expensive). The department then makes decisions and communicates with executives within the institution (head librarian), and further outside the library i.e. with publishers and vendors. Actors who initiate and execute practices at an academic library are library staff such as head librarian and acquisitions librarian, but also staff responsible for licensing and IT for download of metadata records etc. Other

actors involved in the process are users who read the e-books that are made available by the library. Here, different sets of interest can lead to conflict. Users may have other reading interests than library staff. Such conflicts can be solved through direct communication with either party involved.

As previously mentioned, Schatzki (2002, pp. 77-80) considers four elements that practices consist of, namely practical understandings, rules, teleoaffective structure and general understandings. Within the scope of this thesis, these elements can be applied as follows. Practical understandings are, according to Schatzki (2002, p. 77) actors “knowing how to X, knowing how to identify X-ings, and knowing how to prompt as well as respond to X-ings”. Academic librarians working with the acquisition process know how to identify important and crucial tasks in the process; they know which criteria are to be applied for the selection of individual e-books and e-book packages. Further, library staff knows how acquisition models such as EBA and DDA work as well as licensing and DRM. The skills and action intelligibility that librarians require for the work with e-books are therefore given. Rules that are “explicit formulations, principles, precepts, and instructions that enjoin, direct or remonstrate people to perform specific actions” (Schatzki, 2002, p. 79) are given at the academic libraries that are part of this paper. Rules are here administered via acquisition plans and policies managed by the institutions themselves. As can be seen in the results section of this thesis and the literature review, policies or plans regarding promotion and marketing of e-books are scarce or even non-existent at academic libraries, thus implicating that libraries either do not know how to promote e-books, or do not consider the promotion of the format as being necessary. Teleoaffective structures here means “a range of normativized and hierarchically ordered ends, projects and tasks, to varying degrees allied with normativized emotions and even mood” (Schatzki, 2002, p. 80). Applied to academic libraries, it can be stated that practices (e-book acquisition) consist of tasks and projects (selection, purchase, licensing) that are in hierarchic or consecutive order (i.e. selection before purchase). An emotional dimension can be applied if there are preferences for either print or digital versions of the same title. As can be seen in the results section of this paper, there are differing attitudes towards electronic and print, and these attitudes are mainly due to emotional bias and personal preferences. If the acquisition of titles does neither require the electronic nor the print format, then personal preferences and emotional preconditions may play a role with the purchase process. Moreover, the decision whether print or e-book is purchased relies on more factors than just emotional. If either medium is more expensive, the librarian responsible for the acquisition process may act differently, which can be seen as a practice not being congruent with the users’ preferences. It shall be considered that practices performed by humans are not done in a vacuum but in interaction with different actors (i.e. students, researchers) who want either print or digital books. Therefore, the decision making process of acquiring either version is not entirely based on emotional but also on financial factors. General understandings in this paper can be applied to the fact that the actors involved (library staff, library users) consent to the fact that acquisition of e-books is important for the exchange and mediation of knowledge though different media (i.e. electronic versus print books). Also, it should be noted that the actors who are responsible for the acquisition process usually agree to the same basic principles and ideas within the process as their colleagues. One tenet in this case is to give library users and researchers access to e-books.

4 Methodology

The research questions are aimed at how Swedish academic libraries that are presented in this study work with e-books (regarding selection, acquisition, promotion etc.). Semi-structured interviews were conducted as they prove to be a useful method in qualitative research (Bryman, 2016; Wildemuth, 2017). In contrast, a survey would not yield satisfying results as quantitative research would merely lead to results based on quantity, thus not including the deeper meaning and understanding for the results. Thus semi-structured interviews may yield better results as the underlying reasons and motivations for certain behavior and characteristics can be evaluated better. Also, receiving answers from several respondents will result in more multifaceted answers than statements from only a few participants (Wildemuth, 2017, p. 256). Interviews were conducted with the library staff that either worked as librarians for acquisition of e-books or library staff that were concerned with purchase of e-media in general. This approach is said to be useful as different answers lead to different interpretations of the same topic. Further, a large amount of relevant results can be drawn from the interviews that in turn benefit a more coherent evaluation of the data received (Silverman, 2022, p. 6).

4.1 Qualitative research using semi-structured interviews

The qualitative approach focuses on a deeper understanding of the research subject. With this approach, the goal is to evaluate and understand concepts, motivations and/or opinions, gain more insight into a specific problem and also find new ideas that can lead to further research. Wildemuth (2017, p. 318) refers to this approach as a way of understanding social reality in a scientific manner. The research questions that were asked in the beginning of this thesis aim at a deeper knowledge of the working processes in academic libraries. Therefore, a qualitative approach seems to be a better method for conducting the study than a quantitative approach that would merely result in numbers yet would not answer the questions that require a deeper knowledge of the research problem. Moreover, interviews give the opportunity to ask follow-up questions and thus further enhance the scope of the paper as well as give more insight into the topic of e-books in Swedish academia. As is commonly done with semi-structured interviews, both the interviewer and the interviewee are given more opportunities for e.g. follow-up questions, in contrast to a survey where questions and answers are more limited. Interviews with open-ended questions would allow the participants more room to explain their opinions and furthermore emphasize interesting topics and even add topics to the discussion that were not part of the interview schedule. The respondents would also have the opportunity to answer in more detail, as no official time limit was set to the interviews. Theoretical saturation will eventually be achieved when the individual interviews yield the same results and thus cover all necessary topics and themes necessary for data analysis (Wildemuth, 2017, p. 139).

As qualitative research is different from a quantitative approach, the concepts of validity and reliability should be dealt with in a different manner. Wildemuth (2017, p. 323) and Bryman (2016, p. 390) suggest the term trustworthiness as a valid term for qualitative research. Lincoln and Guba (1985), here cited from Wildemuth (2017, p. 323), suggest the categories included in trustworthiness are credibility, transferability, confirmability, and dependability. Poortman and Schildkamp (2012, p. 1732) further suggest similar criteria used in quantitative research, but applied to qualitative research. According to the authors, the criteria considered important for qualitative research are controllability, objectivity, reliability, and validity. Concerning controllability, i.e. accurate and precise language and testability (Poortman and Schildkamp, 2012, p. 1733), direct citations from the interviews with the participants are provided in the chapters regarding results and further analyzed in the analysis and discussion chapters. Moreover, the research problem and the theoretical framework are presented in detail and the research methods used for the study are also elaborated in its respective section. Furthermore, the analysis, discussion as well as the conclusions deduced from the results are presented clearly and unambiguously.

Concerning reliability (consistency) and validity (accuracy) (Bryman, 2016, p. 390), this study aims at serving both via a thorough consideration of these concepts during the interview process. Poortman and Schildkamp (2012, p. 1732) refer to reliability as being ensured by using “a systematized approach to data collection that is consistent with the research questions”. Therefore, a careful planning of the interviews beforehand is crucial. The interviews were planned by writing the interview questions according to the research questions. Moreover, the equipment used was also evaluated as well as the interviews being recorded in order to assure objectivity and to minimize mistakes during the interviews. The interview guide used in the conversations should ascertain that all participants were approached in the same way. Reliability (i.e. whether the study can be replicated) is generally ensured as all participants were asked the same questions from the interview schedule. Moreover, the interview process was conducted in the same manner from beginning to end for each interview opportunity, i.e. the participants were asked to sign a consent form; names were to be anonymized; the interview be recorded, transcribed and evaluated afterwards; the same questions from the guide be asked for all participants. As previously mentioned regarding semi-structured interviews, the respondents could answer more freely to the questions and furthermore add their own opinions and thoughts to the interviews that may seem important for the interview topic. This would lead to a variety of answers derived from the same interview questions. Further, the data gathered in the process was handled and thematic analysis and coding considered in the same way for all interviews. The limitations of reliability are due to the fact that absolute reliability cannot be guaranteed as the setting and course of the study cannot be replicated in minute detail, yet the prerequisites can be repeated carefully. The validity of the study is ensured by the selection of the interview participants, all of them being librarians at academic university libraries in Sweden. Yet, absolute validity cannot be guaranteed as it would be difficult to draw general conclusions for all academic libraries in Sweden, given that only a total of eight participating institutions were available for the research study.

4.2 Participants and institutions

The qualitative study was performed with a total of 13 participants from eight Swedish university libraries. A schedule of the participants and the institutions they are situated at is given below. As the interviews took place in Sweden during and after the summer break, not all members of the library staff could be available. The participants were recruited as follows. As the focus of this research study as to understand the working processes of e-books at academic libraries in Sweden, here also with emphasis on acquisition, licensing, DRM etc., librarians working with these questions were primarily considered to be useful participants. To find appropriate library staff, each academic library was contacted via E-mail (see appendix 1) via the head librarian. As a complete staff listing is not available at all institutions, this was the most reasonable way of finding suitable personnel. The head of the library would then forward the E-mail to the staff responsible for the work with e-books. This could include librarians working with acquisition, digital management or (digital and/or analogue) collection development. The E-mail was sent to several academic libraries in Sweden, 15 in total. Criteria for the selection of potential candidates were that the institutions were situated in Sweden and house a university library. The selection of the university libraries was done over the Internet by searching for suitable institutions that were in vicinity of the researcher's residence, that being in Southern Sweden. This was intentional as interviews on site at the libraries could be held more efficiently than at libraries in the far north of the country. Yet, this approach can also be considered biased as universities in Northern Sweden would be neglected. A more objectively sound research should have included institutions from a more geographically diverse selection. Due to time constraints and the fact that both the author of this study and several of the library representatives were more inclined to communicate via personal on site interviews rather than distant video sessions, the selection of the libraries presented in the study is focused on the South of Sweden.

As the interview questions cover issues regarding acquisition and also a variety of other topics, it was initially requested by the researcher to have at least two respondents for each interview session. Thus, one respondent could be responsible for general acquisition issues and another participant who is responsible for questions regarding licensing and DRM. As a result, some institutions opted for one librarian whose expertise covered mainly all aspects of the research questions and interview topics and who could give a broad and general overview over the institution's acquisition policies and working processes with e-books. Other institutions chose to have representatives from different university faculties who have expertise regarding e-books, yet from their own different point of views. This in turn can be seen as an advantage as this circumstance can give the researcher more insight into similarities and differences with the work of e-books and how these issues are managed at different university branches.

Regarding the institutions selected, it was not of interest for the author of this study whether the universities' subject orientation was in technology (e.g. STEM fields), social sciences, or others. In fact, responses from institutions with different subject areas can be considered beneficiary as a variety of different answers might increase the quality of the study. Out of the 15 institutions that were informed about the study, a total of eight institutions

agreed to participate. The number of participants varied according to the preferences of the individual institutions. Five interviews were conducted with one librarian present, while the remaining interviews had either two or four representatives present. The participants in the interviews were interested to answer the interviewer's questions so that qualitatively good answers were given throughout, and after eight interviews the material provided reached saturation i.e. the respondents gave the same or similar answers that were seen appropriate for further analysis and evaluation. It was essential throughout the interview process that 1) the respondents were interested and competent enough to give reliable, coherent and sound answers and that 2) the interviewer provided the proper framework with a clear structure and usable questions. It shall be noted here that seven of the eight interviews were conducted on site at each respective university library or academic institution. This method was chosen primarily due to the fact that the relation between researcher and library staff is more personal and thus more susceptible to questions and answers that go into more detail, thus receiving a more detailed picture into the organization by being physically more close to the respondents (Bryman, 2016, p. 470). As the method chosen are semi-structured interviews, a preplanned interview guide that includes necessary questions can be completed by adding more questions, if needed. The interview guide is also inevitable as the researcher has to be certain that all questions be talked about in all interviews (Wildemuth, 2017, p. 256). One of the interviews was conducted via the online conference tool Zoom. This was mainly due to time constraints by the researcher. The questions were the same as with the on site interviews, yet the conversation was partially inhibited by the distance of the two participants and the technological aspect i.e. poor screen resolution and audio quality. All questions (including follow-up questions) were included in this interview. Also, the audio of the session was recorded and then later used in the analysis process of the study, and no video recording of the sessions remains.

The schedule regarding the interview sessions together with the anonymized participants are given in the table below. Included are also the place of the interview setting (either on site or via video conference) as well as the date and the number of participants and their respective roles at the academic libraries. The representatives are from different academic libraries that are housed at Swedish universities and university colleges. The universities also are different regarding their specialization of subject areas, e.g. one is rather a technical college while other institutions focus on social sciences and medicine, while another university college offers their students and researchers economy and mathematics. For this study to be comprehensive and cover subjects from a wider scope, one point was also to gather representatives from different faculties, such as biomedicine, engineering and the humanities. As can be seen in the interview schedule below, several representatives are not affiliated with a particular faculty but rather work as acquisition librarians or librarians as part of the libraries' media division. In summary, the participating academic institutions show a multifaceted picture, and the accompanying libraries play a crucial part in offering and delivering information to its user base, i.e. students and researchers. It should be of interest how representatives from academic libraries with different academic background work with concepts e.g. selection, acquisition, licensing, usage and promotion of e-books. Differences as well as similarities concerning these topics can give further knowledge, insight and probably solutions to recurring problems that occur in these work processes.

Table 1

Interview schedule with participation

Interview number	Place	Date (YY-MM-DD)	Number of participants	Role of participants, division/department	Coded participation
#1	University library	2023-06-21	1	Librarian, University services	P01
#2	University library	2023-06-26	1	Librarian, Professional services	P02
#3	University library	2023-08-24	1	Librarian, Department for acquisitions	P03
#4	University library	2023-08-25	1	Librarian, Department of Information	P04
#5	University library	2023-08-31	2	Librarian, Media division	P05
				Librarian, Media division	P06
#6	University library	2023-09-07	4	Librarian, E-resources and library search systems	P07
				Librarian, E-resources and library search systems	P08
				Librarian, Media team, Biomedical Libraries	P09
				Librarian, Media Team, Social Sciences Libraries	P10
#7	University library	2023-09-14	2	Librarian, Social Sciences Faculty library	P11
				Librarian, Libraries of the Joint Faculties of Humanities and Theology	P12
#8	Zoom (video conference)	2023-09-21	1	Librarian, Information Resources and Scientific Publishing	P13

4.3 Interview guide

The corresponding interview guide (see appendix 2 in English, appendix 3 in Swedish) was created in part by communication with the supervisor and a pilot interview in June 2023, conducted in Zoom. The pilot interview was conducted with a representative from the University of Borås who volunteered to be in the interview. The 30 minute test interview yielded satisfying results, concluding that the questions contained in it would be used as a guideline for the upcoming research interviews. The finished interview guide (Wildemuth, 2017, p. 250; Kvale et al., 2014) should be regarded as having the core questions for the interview, yet it should be noted that follow-up questions or ad-hoc questions that arise during the interview are not included. After the first two interviews were finished, it was decided both by the supervisor and the author of the study that a question regarding the use of a specific LGBTQ plan or policy to be discarded due to two reasons. First, the answers to the questions were not detailed enough to be part of a thorough analysis. Second, it became clear during the advanced stages in the interview process that there is no need for this question as the topic is not deemed relevant at academic libraries, in contrast to public libraries where there is a different approach towards LGBTQ literature that academic institutions apparently seem to be lacking. As a result, the topic was subsequently discarded.

The structure of the interview guide is as follows. First, administrative aspects of the institution were addressed such as occupation by the participants and their respective role at the academic library. Additionally, acquisition criteria of e-books were discussed, and who are the personnel in charge of acquisition and selecting specific e-book titles. Moreover, how many e-books are acquired annually and if there is a media budget for e-books (or alternatively, a lack thereof). Further, questions regarding licensing, the use of DRM and Open Access were asked plus questions concerning if there is a strategy of deleting e-books once they have become out of date or obsolete. The last part refers to the acceptance and feedback of e-books by the users, in this case students, teachers, or the librarians themselves. Questions regarding similarities and differences in the working processes of print books in contrast to e-books were asked at a later stage in the interviews. These questions refer to the librarians' work with print books and e-books and how these two formats differ considering selection, acquisition etc. in the libraries' administrative work. The very last questions referring to future trends of e-books and print should be taken with a sense of doubt as technological development is an ongoing process and difficult to ascertain. It should be noted that it was the researcher's duty to ask clear questions that cover the subject areas of the interview. It was also important to avoid personal or intimate details as this would be against the guidelines of the University of Borås, as it would compromise the interview as a whole by including insincere questions that would conflict with academic guidelines. It should be noted that the third research question was initially aimed at the work with e-journals (originally motivated as a complement to e-books), yet this approach was discarded at a later stage during the assessment of this thesis. The reason for this is primarily due to the fact that the topic of e-journals is beyond the scope of this research study, but it can be considered a topic that could be analyzed and evaluated with a separate research paper.

4.4 Research ethics

As previously mentioned, research ethics are a crucial part of academic research. The interviewer should respect the guidelines set by the university of Borås. The research study should therefore be in line with the *Good Research Practice* (2017), together with requirements for proper ethics within the humanities and social sciences presented by the Swedish Research Council, *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning* (2002). Requirements in the documents mentioned above are foremost regarding consent by the interviewees, confidentiality by all the participants, and usage of the material gathered by the researcher. Before the interviews took place, the researcher had contacted members of each respective library and informed them about the structure of the interviews; that they should be held only with representatives from the institution, and that they be recorded provided that the interviewees gave their consent beforehand. The consent forms were provided by the University in Borås and slightly altered by the researcher to fit the interview structure and content (see appendix 4). The consent forms were signed before the interview started. It was also mentioned that the participants could refrain from their consent at any time. Apart from the voice recording, the names and the occupation or work description of the participants were mentioned, these being the only personal data that were used in the interviews. Data regarding age and sex were excluded as they were considered not necessary for this study by the researcher. No other personal or sensitive information was asked during the interview. For the Zoom interview, the only recording that was used in the analysis and evaluation process was an audio recording. The names from each of the participants that were recorded during all of the interview sessions were later anonymized and are not presented in the text of this thesis. According to the guidelines in *Good Research Practice* (2017, p. 40), anonymization removes the connection between individuals and the information given by them. Thus, it should not be possible to deduce a person's identity from the data provided in the text. Accordingly, the names of the participants were not given and the information that might identify individuals and their link to any institution was removed. Yet, it can be argued if total anonymity is guaranteed in any qualitative study that uses interviews as research method as "a determined enquirer could, usually by a process of elimination, guess at or even discover the identity of research subjects if enough geographical and/or biographical information is available in the published research report" (Iphofen, 2009, p. 92). Considering this dilemma, the researcher of this study was careful to anonymize the respondents' identities. The participants were informed that the data gathered from the interviews are treated confidentially and will not be given to any third parties. The interviews were recorded with both a dictaphone and a mobile phone with inbuilt recording software (see 4.5 on the interview process), and transcribed afterwards. The transcription was then authorized by the participants of the study. Although digital recordings are technologically superior to analogue tape recordings (Bryman, 2016, p. 482), it can nevertheless occur that words and phrases are omitted or misunderstood, thus leading to false transcriptions. The authorization of the interview transcripts is considered an important step as the respondents acknowledge the contents of the interview as well as their participation in the interview. Once the final version of the text of the thesis is finished and reviewed, digital copies of the interviews are to be deleted due to GDPR reasons.

4.5 Interview process

The equipment used for the interviews by the interviewer were a dictaphone, Olympus Digital Voice Recorder WS-853, with mp3 as recording format, and an iPhone 12 mini with inbuilt voice recording software. Additionally, the online conference tool Zoom was used in one of the interviews. The online tool Zoom was used as time constraints forbid the interviewer to be present on site. In this instance, the interviewer recorded the session with the accompanying recording software provided by Zoom. The remaining interviews were conducted on site at each respective university library. The interviews were then transcribed by the author of the study and thereafter authorized by the interviewees. As is custom with qualitative research, the interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis and then divided into themes and categories. The themes derived from the interviews were the basis for further analysis, according to the research questions outlined in the introduction of the thesis.

After the respondents signed the consent form and the participants (including the interviewer) presented themselves and their working area, the interview process was initiated. The interviews were conducted either on site or, in one case, via online conference using Zoom. The approximated interview duration lasted from 44 min up to 1h38min, depending on how much was said by the respondents. The last mentioned can be seen as an outlier, yet the average interview length was around 50 minutes where the participants could give as much information as they intended. The researcher was willing to ask follow up questions that should give a deeper and better understanding of the working area. The researcher allowed the participants to talk as much and as freely as possible, hence the longer interview durations. Most of the interviews were held with one participant, two interviews with two and one with four participants. This should yet not be seen as a large amount of respondents as the outcome of the interviews depends on the communication between the researcher and the interviewees and whether they were talkative or not. In fact, an interview with more participants would result in one or two persons talking for the most time and the remaining few only giving little or no answers. During the interview process, the researcher acknowledged the respondents' different backgrounds and let them talk and answer freely without a limited time frame, in order to make sure that they would give honest and reliable answers. This was also realized by having small pauses after the participants answered each of the questions. Thus, the respondents could add meaningful information they deemed was necessary for further conversation. Regarding language used in the interview process, it should be noted that five out of the eight interviews for the study were conducted in Swedish, the remaining three in English. Citations in Swedish are translated into English by the author of this study, with regard to its content and the persons involved. There is no altering of the meaning of the individuals' citations and opinions, as the translation of the text from Swedish to English is done carefully and with respect to the participants' original answers. It should also be mentioned that the answers and opinions provided by the interviewees are subjective and entirely their own. No adjustments or falsifications have been made on the statements of the participants as this would not be in line with the university's guidelines on research methods and as this would compromise the study's goal.

4.6 Coding and analysis

Once the interviews were authorized and verified by the respondents, the coding and analysis process was initiated. The process used here was that of open coding (Bryman, 2016, p. 569), i.e. data that is considered important to answer the research questions was collected. The working mechanism of this process is to condense and summarize the data into several units and themes, thus providing answers to the research questions that were formulated in the introduction to this thesis. The subsequent analysis of the themes and categories derived from the data leads to the results that will be presented in the study (Wildemuth, 2017, p. 319; Bryman, 2016, p. 568). This process of data reduction leads to the topics being concise and usable for further analysis and evaluation. The subsequent process of analysis and interpretation of the data accumulated then leads to the results of the study conducted. The data required for the analysis of the given data was initially collected by recording the interview sessions. The interview transcripts, once authorized by the participants, were then printed out and assessed by using a rather simple technique, pen and paper. Moreover, similar themes and topics were also colorized in order to gain a better overview over the data. Computer software such as MS Word and Excel was used in order to arrange the material and condense and cut it into several distinct sections. During the analysis of the interview transcripts several of the topics that are individual sections in the final thesis text correspond to interview questions, i.e. the questions regarding DRM or Open Access that were initially asked during the interview sessions were taken as their own topics in the results section. Other topics that were identified later during the coding process were e.g. the dichotomy between print and digital books as well as the accessibility, availability and cost effectiveness of e-books. Moreover, topics that were discussed were the differing acquisition models DDA and EBA as well as the credits model, and, considering language, the fact that most academic e-textbooks are distributed in English instead of Swedish. These topics were not known to the researcher beforehand. Through follow up questions, more information was gathered for these specific topics which was then included in the results section. Here, the coding process led to these distinct topics become their own separate sections in the results chapter. The last step in the process, reconceptualizing the given data (Kvale et al., 2014), was to gather all data necessary to deduce and draw conclusions and to write descriptions. It should also be noted that initially, e-journals were a part of the analysis and evaluation of this thesis. Questions regarding working processes with e-journals were also asked during the interviews. Yet, at a later stage in the evaluation and assessment process, the approach towards e-journals was discarded due to the fact that the scope of this study should be limited to e-books. It was decided by the author that e-journals would need an individual academic paper in order to be fully appreciated as a research subject.

5 Results

In this section, the results of the interviews with the 13 representatives from eight university libraries are presented as follows. First, a more general approach towards the role or occupation of the participants at the libraries was the focus of the interviews. Afterwards, the acquisition process together with opportunities and problems with selection and purchasing models were part of the session. Several issues such as accessibility, cost, as well as the need for e-books in an academic setting were addressed in this first section. Afterwards, the problems concerning licensing and DRM restrictions are the focus of the second part of the interview, debating the motivation and work with DRM in academic e-books. Furthermore, Open Access e-books are addressed and how they differ from e-books that are distributed with DRM. In the last part of the interview sessions, the differences between print books and e-books regarding the topics aforementioned are of interest, together with the benefits and drawbacks both formats have with regard to the general selection and acquisition process, and issues such as licensing, accessibility and promotion.

5.1 Workflow of e-books at academic libraries

As the focus of this paper is set on academic libraries, different acquisition models as well as the reasons for purchasing e-books shall be part of this section. Moreover, the issues of accessibility and availability as well as the financial aspect regarding e-books shall be of interest here. Furthermore, acquisition models such as EBA and DDA are presented and the librarians' work with these models. A rather interesting topic is the promotion or visibility of e-books at academic libraries, as this issue is often neglected by the research literature and the institutions alike. In the results section of this paper, it should be noted that the librarians' point of view regarding e-book acquisition is of essence. Yet, it shall also be mentioned that the acquisition process of e-books is connected to user demands, as these are the academic libraries' primary clients. Thus, user demand is important and shall also be addressed in this part, yet from a librarian's point of view. Librarians in the interview sessions unanimously answered that the primary motivation for acquisition is user demand. Thus, the interviews and corresponding answers by the respondents should be considered with the presupposition of user based acquisition, i.e. the acquisition process is centered on user demands and needs. Since e-book users were not part of the interview process, the interview participants served as reference point when asked about the users' stance towards and practices with e-books, i.e. here in terms of accessibility and with regard to the general workflow of e-books. As e-books are not purchased for their own sake, the demand for e-books or motivation for purchasing e-books is dependent on the readers and institutions alike. Reasons and selection criteria for e-book acquisition as well as other working processes such as DRM and licensing will also be addressed in the following section.

5.1.1 Motivation and criteria for purchase

During the interviews with several representatives from eight different university libraries, the question concerning reasons for purchase of e-books was asked as one of the prime topics. Here, the most common answers by the participants refer to outside factors. The reasons or motivation for purchase of e-books are as follows. E-books can be 1) part of the students' curriculum, 2) demanded by the students or researchers as a purchase proposal (i.e. also referred to as title by title acquisition), 3) purchased due to their technical features as well as other advantages over print books (such as accessibility, cost factor in a subscription model etc). Regarding the first issue, e-books can be part of the curriculum of specific courses, meaning that the teachers are a driving factor for the purchase of e-books. This answer was given by several respondents. As two participants answered, the restrictions during the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020-2021 might have had an impact on the teachers' stance towards e-books in general. As a result, they can be more eager to allow or even request either whole e-books or certain chapters over print books to be part of the curriculum. Requests by teachers can be an advantage for libraries as they receive information about the material that is of interest for their courses. It was argued by some of the participants that, as it would not be feasible for libraries to purchase titles that are not used, requests by teachers are useful as librarians know that the e-books are read and needed. The second reason for acquiring e-books are direct purchase proposals by the students or researchers. Most participants in the interviews responded to the question why academic libraries purchase e-books in this way. As P05 points out, the library is acquiring e-books according to the users' needs and demands, "We work with user based acquisition". This means that the acquisition process is determined by the publishers' supply, users' demands and the librarians' knowledge what should be part of e-collections. Here, user demand is required for the selection and acquisition process. Several interview respondents state the same precondition for purchasing e-books, i.e. that user based acquisition is the key motivation for e-book acquisition. Direct purchase proposals have both advantages as well as disadvantages, as P05 points out. An advantage is that the library is informed which specific titles are requested and needed by the users, one of the main actors in the e-book management process. A disadvantage of this model can be that students would ask for e-books that are not necessarily of importance for the teaching at the university, but would rather satisfy a personal need for themselves. An e-book that is requested and used by only one student would not be beneficial for the library. Likewise, purchase proposals by researchers can both be beneficial and of disadvantage. As some of the respondents answered, researchers know about current trends within academic publishing and are eager to read e-books in their specific area. A purchase of a certain e-book would therefore be of advantage as it is implied that the title is read. Yet, as one respondent pointed out, there may be the possibility that researchers working at the university might request e-books they had written themselves. According to the respondent, this could be regarded as a rather selfish reason for purchase which in turn can be seen as being detrimental to ethical principles of the academic community. A third reason that was mentioned by several participants was that there are advantages of e-books over print books. Several answers by the majority of participants are mentioned as follows below. The answers can be separated into two distinct groups. These are benefits for libraries and benefits for users.

For libraries, the acquisition of e-books can lead to less administrative work. As several respondents answered (e.g. P11, P13), the purchasing process of e-books is rather simple and straightforward. Once the e-book is paid for, the publisher sends it electronically within a couple of days. Then, metadata such as MARC records or other metadata records are added by the staff in charge of e-book acquisition. Metadata is either fetched automatically and can be altered manually afterwards. Regarding printed books, this process would require several days or weeks, according to the respondents. E-books in this regard have an advantage as the administrative work is seen to be more time efficient than with printed books, as several participants answered. As one librarian answered, the physical aspect of printed books may be counterproductive. Printed books need more work as they have to be unpacked and put on a shelf (which is considered manual labor), they require labels for identification and furthermore take space on a bookshelf. As other respondents (P6, P11) add, printed books require shelf space, a circumstance that can be problematic as available rooms may be too tight or that rents are too high for additional storage, either at the library or at a storage facility. In contrast, the work with e-books is said to be more efficient as it craves less time and resources. The statement from two librarians (P11, P13) in this regard was that once the e-books are downloaded, they are implemented in the library's catalog system and thus the main work with them is finished, i.e. they can be used once they are registered and metadata is downloaded. The majority of librarians responded during the interviews that the imminent usage after the implementation of the titles and metadata is a major benefit of e-books.

For users, e-books are of advantage regarding their availability and accessibility, concepts that are further explained in the next section. E-books can be accessed instantaneously and are available at any time. They can also be accessed by a large number of users, depending on the licensing which is in turn an administrative issue for librarians. The fact that they can be accessed by multiple users simultaneously means that there is no waiting line for borrowed items, as is the case with printed books. Neither is there an overdue fee as the use of e-books either do not have a time limit or access is prohibited automatically by the system. If e-books are available as Open Access (OA) titles, there are no limitations at all regarding numbers of users and loan time, which can be seen as a crucial benefit for users. One librarian answered (P10) that they try to acquire OA titles when possible at their faculty as these are the only titles with the fewest restrictions regarding DRM, licensing etc. According to P10, this in turn is welcomed by users, especially students and researchers.

The e-book acquisition process is described by several participants as time and resource efficient and has also benefits for users, as they can access e-books within a short time frame, for instance when students are about to write their exams. Here, as one respondent explains (P10), due to the short time frame e-books can be acquired in, libraries are capable of purchasing e-book titles on short notice. For instance, students are then able to read e-textbooks shortly before their examinations, assumed that the libraries agree on their specific proposals and that the purchasing model which is used in the acquisition process allows purchases within such a short time frame.

5.1.2 Availability, accessibility and usage

As previously mentioned, motivations for purchasing e-books in general are, apart from user demands, predominantly availability and accessibility. As the interviews were conducted, the principles of availability and accessibility were frequently mentioned by the respondents, implying their importance for users. The two terms shall be explained as follows. Availability in this context refers to the fact that an e-book is present in the libraries' IT system, i.e. it has been acquired by the library staff and metadata records have been downloaded and implemented into the catalog. Another important issue considering availability is also visibility, meaning that e-books have to be described explicitly as a digital resource in the system, opposed to a printed book. Users have to be made aware of the fact that there is a distinction between print and e-books in the library catalog system in order to make their decision which format to use. Accessibility, on the other hand, refers to the way e-books are then accessed, e.g. via platforms provided by the publishers, and which problems can occur when using e-books. Advantages of e-book accessibility are, among others, that the titles can be used 24/7 and by multiple users simultaneously, provided that licensing allows a higher number of users. Problems regarding accessibility are, as mentioned in the chapter on previous research literature, related to DRM restrictions (for instance, downloading and printing e-titles) set by the publishers, and licensing issues, i.e. only one user at a time can access the content in contrast to multiple users.

All respondents stated that the two principles aforementioned are necessary and crucial for the processes that are worked with at academic libraries. The importance of these two concepts, availability and accessibility, shall be further explained as follows. The first step in making a title available is purchasing the item. Reasons for purchase were described in the previous section. The common denominator is that there has to be a need for titles in order to purchase them. Different parties involved are students, teachers and researchers who can to a certain degree influence the libraries' acquisition process. Different acquisition models are described further below in another section. As the respondents mentioned, in order for library patrons to use an e-book, they have to be made available first. The metadata records shall be published in the libraries' system and further noted how the title is accessible, i.e. a link is given that leads to the publisher's external webpage. In order for users to find the titles, specific promotional efforts can be done, as is outlined in another section about marketing and promotion of e-books. The first access point for library users is the libraries' own catalog system. Here, they can search after titles they are interested in. The titles that are made available are then provided with a link, and can either be Open Access or e-books with DRM restrictions. Thus, as several respondents stated, e-books are made available to their users.

Accessibility of the titles that are made available is another issue that can be complicated and multifaceted, as several of the participants mentioned. Accessibility was the feature that was most mentioned during the interviews regarding acquisition and usage. One question the interviewer asked was whether the academic institutions prefer to purchase the print or digital version of a book; several answers refer to the users' preference for either format, yet most of the librarians' stance show a clear preference for digital. The motivation for this decision is in all cases the apparent advantages of digital

over print, and in a specific sense accessibility. The librarians' opinions in this regard do not differ, for them the opportunity for users to access the content is the most important feature when dealing with e-resources, which are in this case predominantly e-books, e-journals, databases etc. As several respondents pointed out, users are able to access most of the e-book content provided all the time without any restrictions, yet this proves to be accurate only for reading the content online. DRM restrictions regarding printing and downloading certain chapters are dealt with further below in a different section. Also, the fact that multiple users can access an e-book title simultaneously was seen by multiple respondents as an advantage in contrast to print books, as long as licensing would not restrict usage to a limited amount of readers. Furthermore, the fact that distance students, i.e. students who are not residing in the university's area, are able to access e-books is often neglected. Yet, this is an advantage over print books as distance students can read e-books without entering the library facilities, as was mentioned by some of the respondents in the interviews. Accessibility in this sense provides more opportunities for library patrons to use the content, regardless of format. The physical format does not have these specific features and therefore lacks certain accessibility features that the electronic format entails. Regarding the usage of e-books, one should also point out that reading behavior can be entirely different from print to electronic books. As was said by several respondents, print books are read when users want to read the whole book, whereas e-books are usually not read in their entirety. E-books are, according to the answers, more likely to be read per chapter instead. The expression "from cover to cover" (Swedish *från pärm till pärm*) was used by several respondents in the interviews when referring to reading behavior of print books. As one participant answered (P13), print books are considered for long term reading and e-books for short term reading. As several other study participants responded, reasons for this reading behavior can be e.g. that the tactile experience of printed books is more suited for longer periods or that the screen resolution of many e-readers are at least in part responsible for reading only a few chapters of an e-book. As stated by the respondent (P13), another reason for this can also be that students only have to read individual chapters of a book, according to their curriculum. Teachers may thus be reluctant to base their teaching contents solely on reading e-books, so that they only include e-book chapters in their curriculum and not the whole book. Another participant states that reading e-books is more likely to be treated like reading scientific research articles. As articles that are part of e-journals are read individually, there may occur a shift from reading a whole e-book to only a few chapters as this approach suits the teaching goals better, as one librarian mentions.

One particular issue that was mentioned briefly was the Covid-19 pandemic and its effects on e-book availability and usage. Several librarians noticed a change primarily in the teachers' stance towards the availability of e-book titles. During and after the pandemic, teachers were apparently more willing to include e-books or chapters as part of their teaching plans. E-books were also used more during the pandemic as physical attendance at campus was prohibited. The development in digital resources was a beneficial factor for students, researchers and teachers to further access the teaching contents regardless of physical attendance. As the Covid-19 pandemic and its long lasting effects on e-book usage was not a specific topic during the interviews, the issue was not further investigated by the interviewer or the participants.

5.1.3 E-book acquisition processes and models

The following section shows the results regarding the topics of the e-book acquisition process and the corresponding acquisition models that are used to purchase e-books at academic libraries. The first section covers the working processes such as e-book packages, subscriptions and title by title acquisition and the workflows connected to them, as well as benefits and recurring problems with these topics. The second section further explains the two most used e-book acquisition models, EBA (*evidence based acquisition*) and DDA (*demand driven acquisition*) as well as acquisitions via the credits system. Preferences for either model and reasons for using or disregarding a specific purchasing model together with their advantages and disadvantages, as was mentioned by the interview participants, will be illustrated in this section.

5.1.3.1 Packages, subscriptions, title by title

All respondents in the interviews replied that they acquire e-book titles mainly via e-book packages, subscription and title by title, though in varying degrees. The main part of the discussion and criticism towards these different models was the control over the content, i.e. if the individual titles are usable for the institution and if the titles are valuable (in terms of quality) for the library to be accepted. Most control over the acquisition of individual titles is, according to the respondents, title by title acquisition as it allows librarians to decide whether a purchase is valid, if it can be delayed to a later date or if a purchase is considered unnecessary or unfeasible. As several respondents (e.g. P03, P06) state, title by title acquisition is centered on the users' interest and need for purchase, thus being user controlled acquisition. "First and foremost, we purchase that which is demanded by the users", as P03 point out. Direct purchase proposals by users are part of this category. As most participants answered, librarians often purchase the individual titles that are proposed by users. Yet, if certain titles are considered not to be of academic quality or too expensive, there is also the possibility to either buy the print version of the book or deny a purchase. The latter is yet seldomly done, as most of the respondents (e.g. P04, P07) answer. A tool that is used by academic libraries and which was frequently mentioned by the respondents was GOBI library solution by Ebsco, a service that many institutions have a contract with. This concerns mainly the purchase of individual e-book titles. As P03 continues,

"We have obtained contracts with around 20 suppliers and publishers. This means that we send our orders to GOBI and they take care of all the administrative work. They ensure that our orders are processed and sent to the right supplier or publisher. They ensure that we receive a message if a title is available, and they also send an invoice. We do not have so much communication with the publishers themselves. [...] Our GOBI contract allows us to purchase from Ebsco and ProQuest, meaning that we can get access to e-books from many different publishers."

Other publishers are, according to the respondent, smaller publishers that do not have their own online platform but allow access to their e-books via different aggregators. Also, the titles provided by these aggregators often have no DRM restrictions so that they can be used without any limitations by the users. Other librarians (P04, P06) mention that sometimes titles have DRM limitations, and as a result users need a dedicated program such as e.g. Adobe Digital Editions in order to download and read the content. As the respondents further point out, this circumstance is not perfect for both users and librarians as it makes the experience more difficult and challenging. As P04 further explains, one of the main problems when trying to access and read e-books is the implementation with Adobe Digital Editions which in turn also requires an Adobe ID. Respondent P04 further continues: “This gives quite a high threshold for the user to understand the concept of Adobe Digital Editions and the Adobe ID. The problem is that if you have downloaded a book, and you have it in Adobe Digital Editions for a week or 30 days, and you make notes in that one, those notes will disappear when the loan runs out. We always tell our students not to download the e-books if it is on the platform that uses DRM.”

As was mentioned before, purchase via title by title acquisition allows librarians to have more control over the whole process. A disadvantage of this model is that some publishers do not offer their e-books as individual titles so that libraries are forced to purchase via different models such as e-book packages or subscriptions. Yet, e-book packages and subscription models often lack this scale of control that librarians want, as was discussed in the interview sessions. As one librarian answered (P11), subscription is regarded less than e-book packages as staff has no direct influence on any subscription content. As one participant (P11) continues, “You are not allowed to keep anything. Purchase via title by title is much more safe. When you bought it, it is yours and you can keep it.” The main problem with subscription models is accordingly that the institution pays a relatively high amount of money for a service that seems to be disadvantageous. A major drawback of the subscription model is that the library cannot save e-book titles after the subscription ended, thus leading to a large amount of content being lost. This situation is worsened due to the fact that the format used here is digital. A print subscription would mean that the individual issues can be kept, which is not possible with e-books or e-journals. If a subscription of an e-resource is cancelled either by the library or the supplier or publisher, the content is lost. In this case, as some respondents say, it is a waste of money if the content cannot be saved or kept otherwise. Another librarian answered similarly to the issue of control over and quality of e-book subscription models, “I would say that the packages that we buy are of high quality, but when it comes to our subscriptions it can happen that it is not that good” (P05). This is also due to the fact that the working process with e-book packages is different from subscriptions, as librarians often use EBA (evidence based acquisition) with packages. Other participants (P03, P13) add to the discussion regarding subscription that this model is rather unpredictable although aggregators seem to be focused on good quality content. Access to the content can be lost if the subscription is no longer valid or cancelled. “Titles disappear and are added, and here we do not have any possibility to influence this. This is quite of concern for us when working with subscription packages, as we do not know if a popular e-book title suddenly disappears from our package”, as one respondent (P13) mentions in the discussion.

The acquisition of e-book packages in this regard seems to be a more popular model among the librarians who participated in the interviews. As many libraries use EBA as a model, they can control at least to some part the acquisition process of e-books. As several respondents point out, a package is purchased for a deposit sum and the individual titles are free to use by library patrons, under a limited amount of time. After this time period has passed, the library chooses only those titles that were used, thus considering that the e-books will further be used as well. Titles that were not used are discarded, and the final sum is paid without the titles that are not needed. As several participants mention, this can be seen as a form of user demand as the librarians only purchase the titles that were actually used. One participant (P03) states that although more titles are purchased via e-book packages than are actually needed, this model can nevertheless be seen as cost and resource effective as many titles are used by library patrons. The amount of e-books that are used further indicates the quality and usability of the package. Publishers that are responsible for the content provided and which the academic libraries have agreements with are e.g. Springer, Taylor & Francis Routledge, and Elsevier and Cambridge University Press, etc. As was mentioned by several respondents in the interviews, these publishers are trusted by librarians to provide decent quality and quantity of relevant content, regarding individual titles as well as e-book packages.

5.1.3.2 Acquisition models: EBA, DDA

The different acquisition models that are used within academic libraries for purchasing e-book packages are EBA (*evidence based acquisition*), DDA, (*demand driven acquisition*), and the credits system, yet with varying success among the institutions. In this study, the respondents' stance towards either of these models were different, yet with a tendency in favor of EBA. As most respondents stated, EBA can be regarded as an indicator which books are read by the library patrons. The use of certain titles is crucial if librarians shall decide which titles can be kept and which titles should be discarded from the package. Several participants pointed out that this feature is a main advantage of EBA over DDA. As P11 states, "We have access to many titles, and later in the process we choose which titles we buy. This is what evidence based means, we have to know how many times people have read certain books." Conversely, experience with DDA is considered as being more difficult and complicated as library staff has no direct influence on the selection process of the e-book titles themselves. As P11 notes,

"We tried it for over one and a half year. It was a lot of work to choose which titles should be included in the DDA stock. This was also due to the fact that ProQuest was our supplier, and they had an odd classification system and strange titles, so we were forced to remove a lot beforehand. This is a rather unsafe system, we had to put a lot of effort in to it and had little control. For us, it was ineffective."

The work with EBA is favored by many librarians as books are first supplied with a deposit of a certain amount. Afterwards, they can evaluate user statistics of each individual title and then choose the titles that were most frequently used, while other e-book titles are not taken into consideration. Thus, library staff has more control over the content of the acquisition process, as most respondents answered. As P06 and P03 further mentioned, EBA can also be regarded as a sort of user controlled acquisition process as only e-books that are used are considered to be important and will be bought by the library. As P04 further states, “In this way, this kind of acquisition model is user controlled because we can see if a book has been used, and we buy what is used.” Participant P01 responded that they use EBA instead of DDA due to similar reasons. Here, it can be deduced that academic libraries are not forced to use all different acquisition models available but can choose which model suits their working methods and media plan best. According to the answers collected in this study, EBA, if used by the academic library, seems to have many advantages over DDA and is thus used more as an acquisition model. Moreover, EBA can also be considered more effective and useful than the purchase of individual titles. If important titles such as textbooks that are part of the curriculum are situated in an EBA, then it could be more cost and time efficient to buy the specific titles together with other books that are also considered necessary, as P03 notes. This means that these titles are then purchased individually and not as part of an e-book package. Participant P13 also mentions that DDA is inferior to EBA as librarians have more control over the titles they deem interesting, which is not the case with DDA: “We stick to EBA. We have more control as librarians when it comes to EBA in comparison to DDA. We can choose ourselves what content we like. [...] If you have DDA there is a risk that your private reading behavior triggers the outcome”, hereby referring to the acquisition librarian’s personal preferences that could negatively influence the selection of relevant titles.

Other respondents mention that they neither use EBA nor DDA, or did so in the past but restrained their effort due to several reasons. Respondent P07 stated that at the library they are situated at they do not use either EBA or DDA, here other types of acquisition are favored such as subscription and title by title acquisition. This is due to the fact that they had rather underwhelming experience with both models. As P07 continues,

“We have tried EBA, but also DDA which is demand driven acquisition, and we had mixed experience with both. [...] The problem with DDA is that we as librarians are not involved at all in the process, regarding what is chosen. With EBA we can choose which titles we want to keep at the end of a period, depending on what ideas we have about that.”

Yet, although EBA might have advantages over DDA, there is also a method of applying both acquisition models. Respondent P04 mentions that they acknowledge both models and see them as complementary instead of opposing each other. As P04 continues regarding DDA, “We have a platform where we set up an account and have a lot of titles that are accessible on the platform. When people use it the first and second time, it costs us only a small amount for that loan. The third time a user is using the same book, it is automatically purchased. We also have EBA, which is evidence-based acquisition.” P04 further stated that they have no preference for either model, EBA or DDA, and

that they use the advantages of both models, which means that they are rather seen as complements. Instead of abandoning one model, the two models can be seen as a supplement or addition as both models have advantages, as P04 further mentions: “The DDA is on an aggregated platform which have titles for many different publishers. The EBA only has one publisher with these titles. So actually they complement each other.” Moreover, EBA and DDA may be of advantage when acquiring a certain title in a collection that is not available via title by title acquisition, as P04 continues:

“Sometimes, you might get a request for a book that is only available within a package, and then you have to take a look at the package and see if it is interesting enough to buy. You can also look at access denials and see if there are a lot of titles that users have been trying to reach, but never could because we don't have access to them. If we can see that there are a lot of books on a specific subject we can talk to the publisher and see if they have a subject collection for that particular one.”

A rather interesting observation was made by one of the participants regarding the acquisition of e-books. Whereas other participants (e.g. P03, P11) claim that the e-book belongs to the institution when purchased, P05 states that librarians or academic libraries cannot own the e-books themselves, but only buy the license to use them. This can be seen as a stark difference to printed books where libraries actually buy and own these items. On the other hand, e-books cannot be lent among users (i.e. students and researchers) or between libraries as they lack a physical form. Therefore, several respondents pointed out that e-books are not shared but used, and they are not owned but licensed. The lack of physical and tangible features makes e-books special as while the content is accessible and readable like a printed book, their usability and availability is different. To summarize, in contrast to print books, e-books are intangible and can therefore not be owned, as they can only be used.

5.1.4 Cost of e-books

During the interviews that were conducted for this thesis, the issue of library budgets and cost were mentioned frequently. When asked if there exist separate budgets for print and e-books, a different set of answers was provided by the participants. The respondents' answers can be distinguished into three groups; that separate budgets exist for either print or digital, that one budget exists for acquisition which is then distributed among print and digital, and that they have not the necessary information about a specific e-books budget.

Furthermore, when asked about the price of e-books opposed to printed books, all respondents answered that e-books are more expensive than printed books. A follow-up question by the interviewer was aimed at the reason for purchase of e-books. If e-books are more expensive, then what are reasons for not buying printed books. This topic addresses not only the institutions themselves but also financial issues, i.e. libraries are more prone to budget cuts and therefore often suffer from financial constraints. Reasons for purchasing e-books were unanimously accessibility and availability. According to several respondents, the motivation for the acquisition of e-books despite their high

price is that, if several users access one and the same title, the cost-usage ratio becomes more feasible than for a printed book, provided that there are no further limitations regarding DRM or other access restrictions. In this case, as several librarians argue, licensing is of importance, i.e. unlimited licenses are necessary if the goal for the libraries shall be that as many users as possible are able to access e-books. If licensing issues prohibit that an unlimited amount of users can access a specific title, a credits model can be applied instead. The procedure of this model is that a sum is paid in advance for so-called ‘credits’ which represent how many times a specific title can be used during the time span of one year. The advantages of this system, as noted by e.g. P03 and P11, are that several users have access to the titles simultaneously, and that it is a cost-efficient method when the titles acquired are counted per user.

5.1.5 Promotion of e-books

As was mentioned in the section regarding previous research literature, promotion of e-books seems to be largely neglected by academic libraries. Most respondents answered in a similar manner, i.e. that there is no existing plan or policy concerning the marketing or promotion of electronic books. Yet, some participants answered that there were various attempts at making the existence of e-books visible to library users. These attempts were met with different grades of success, and many are either done by a small group of people or were abandoned indefinitely. One should notice that in this context, several of the interviewees (P05, P11, P13) would rather use terms such as ‘to make visible’ or ‘to make aware’ (Swedish *synliggöra*) instead of promotion or marketing, as the term marketing may be connected with businesses that aim at making profit, which is often not the case with libraries. For instance, several participants (P04, P12) answered that attempts for promotion of e-books are done via the internet. For instance, social media such as Facebook, newsletters and e-mails can be sent to various faculties so that recipients become aware of the existence of e-books. Furthermore, one librarian answered that another way of making e-books visible – despite them not being physical – is to set bookmarks in printed books that are also available as e-books. Likewise, it was said (P04, P06) that attempts were made with QR codes set on shelves where the print edition of a book was also available as an e-book. These attempts were later not brought further due to different reasons, e.g. the users would not react to the codes being important. Additionally, a more complicating factor with this effort was that in order for library patrons to scan the QR code, there has to be both a printed and an electronic version of the book. If an e-title is “born digital” and therefore not available in print, users would not know of the existence of the title while visiting the library. Other measures for promoting or making e-books visible that were mentioned in the interviews were e.g. TV screens in the library showing references to e-books, or hangouts on the university’s bulletin board. Yet, the most frequent answers by librarians regarding the promotion of e-books are that users (i.e. students and researchers) of the academic libraries are required to find e-book titles themselves via the libraries’ own online catalog search. The apparent need for an e-book would be assumed if users are browsing the library’s online catalog system. The author of this study then commented that users first have to know about the existence of e-books before they can access them, but this comment was rejected by most

participants due to the fact that according to the libraries' loaning statistics, e-books are nevertheless frequently read and therefore do not need to be promoted or advertised. Regarding promotion of e-books, two respondents (P04, P12) stated that the academic institution they were situated at promoted an e-resource monthly via social media, in Swedish *månadens e-resurs*. This, according to the respondents, could entail either e-books or databases, with the purpose of making library users aware of these services. Moreover, other answers include that promotion of e-books and e-resources can be achieved by meeting the library patrons on site at the university library. Students can also meet library representatives digitally via video conference which could be regarded as a method to further make aware of the possibility to use e-books. Respondent P10 answered the question whether they want a marketing plan or not, "We rather do not want a marketing or promotion plan, [...] we have to be responsive and on time." Here, it can be seen that the focus regarding use, promotion and the whole working process itself with e-books are the users. Hence, the work processes at the academic libraries investigated in this study, including acquisition, promotion, licensing etc., are centered on user demands, thus referring to what several respondents described as user based acquisition.

5.1.6 E-book languages

As was discussed in the interviews, most e-books that are acquired and requested are written in English, seldomly in another language such as French, Spanish or German (P08). Several librarians answered that Swedish publishers for academic literature do not cooperate with libraries in such a way that they sell e-books to them. Instead, students and researchers are required to pay for Swedish academic e-books themselves, either for the printed version or for the e-book, if available. This, as two librarians (P10, P11) noted, was due to the fact that publishers want to ensure their monopoly over the current market situation in Sweden. The motivation behind this, as was suggested by some participants (P03, P11), was that publishers want to maintain control over their whole collection, print as well as digital. This means that e-books shall be treated like print editions regarding acquisition and distribution. According to the participant, the intent of the publishers of Swedish academic textbooks is that titles should not be exchanged among users without any registration. Rather, each copy of the title should belong to one individual user. By doing so, publishers can claim ownership over their content, as one librarian mentioned (P05). Interestingly, another respondent (P02) claimed that their institution apparently is the only academic library in Sweden that offers Swedish e-books, primarily fiction. The respondent argues that there should be a variety of content offered by academic libraries. This means that, as the students are occupied with their learning material, they should also have the time for leisure reading, as the respondent mentioned. All other participants responded that they do not have Swedish e-books as the publishers do not want to cooperate with academic libraries in this way. Although there is an apparent need foremost by students to read Swedish e-textbooks, the publishers continue to not offer them to academic libraries. As one respondent (P12) mentioned, there should be more licensing opportunities for university libraries so that they can offer more titles to library patrons, except for Open Access titles as these are freely available and accessible by users, i.e. without any DRM limitations.

5.1.7 DRM, licensing, credits

The issue of Digital Rights Management (DRM) was one of the prime discussion points in the interviews. DRM here refers to a mechanism included in the e-book platform that prevents users from copying and changing e-book contents. As several participants mentioned, this is a way of the publisher to remain in control of e-books regarding their content. Most respondents also state that this approach is rather disadvantageous for library patrons. One way to circumvent this obstacle would be either to purchase the e-book or, in order to use the e-book properly in this case, to read it online. Yet, as some librarians (P03, P10, P11) mentioned, reading online is not an ideal alternative as annotations in the e-book may disappear when closing or refreshing the browser. Moreover, despite DRM restrictions regarding content, there can be also limitations regarding reading time. An e-book may be only accessible for a certain amount of time (such as e.g. 28 days), and then has to be downloaded again in order for it to be used (P03, P04). The amount of content that can be downloaded or printed out in total could be ~20% of the whole e-book, as some librarians suggested (P11). The remaining content has thus to be read online, or purchased otherwise, either as an e-book or in print format.

In this context, not only availability and accessibility of e-books and the corresponding DRM restrictions are of importance, but also how many users can read the content that is made available. Here, licensing is another main problem that can lead to problems, as most respondents answered. Licensing in this context refers to the number of users who can read the content provided simultaneously. There is often the possibility to acquire licenses for one, three or unlimited users. According to most of the respondents, this system is often confusing and complicated and can lead to problems, such as the content being available for one but not multiple users, i.e. that others have to wait for their turn to access the content. As P03 mentions, “If a user is inactive, for example they sit for five or ten minutes and do not use the service, it can happen that they are thrown out of the service, and they did not have the time to finish their book. We try to prevent this, and sometimes we do not buy e-books as textbooks if we know that there are e.g. 150 students who want to read it. It is not reasonable to only have a license for three users, it will only lead to frustration. Instead we purchase the printed books.” Thus, there is the opportunity for the library that if unlimited access is not available as a licensing option, to purchase the print book instead of the e-book.

As some librarians stated (P03, P04, P10), if the e-book is read by more than only one user, then more licenses can be purchased, even up to unlimited licenses. Here, users are able to indirectly ‘control’ the purchase of e-books as librarians can interpret the usage of the individual titles in their statistics (P03, P07). As mentioned before, most librarians stated in the interviews that they primarily purchase e-books that are requested and read by users, thus referring to ‘user controlled’ acquisition. Yet, this approach can also be misleading as one cannot always ascertain the usage of an individual title. On the other hand, the issue concerning licensing also depends on whether the item is part of the curriculum or not. As P03 continues, “Ebsco and ProQuest have a service. When we purchase books which only they offer and no other publisher, and we do not have any other information that the item is not a textbook, then we assume that it is only this one person who is interested in the book. Then we

purchase a user license only for one user.” Here, the library has the opportunity to purchase the e-book for one user at a time (i.e. not multiple users) only if they know that it will not be used by another person. Another librarian (P10) also states that this approach with a ‘one user license’ exists albeit only for individuals who share an academic interest in the e-book, e.g. researchers or Phd students. As P10 continues, “We always want to buy e-books with unlimited users, if the price is right. But it can also happen that we receive a purchase proposal from a Phd student and we get the feeling that it is only this Phd student who will read this book. The we purchase only for one user, in the end this is cheaper for us.” These restrictions (i.e. referring to DRM and licensing) lead some librarians to question the actual purpose of DRM and thus rather option for OA content to be accessible for their users, if available. Another advantage of OA e-books is that the content is free to use for every user, regardless of being academic or non-academic. Users who are not affiliated with an academic institution can access the OA content, which is seen as a benefit by several respondents. One common problem that was mentioned regarding OA content (which can also be applied to e-books that are not OA) are that the publishers’ internet platforms may have a confusing layout which makes it difficult for users to navigate and read the content. Conversely, some librarians (e.g. P07, P05) answered that OA e-books can be considered an alternative to e-books with DRM restrictions. As DRM sets boundaries to the accessibility of e-books, OA can in this case be seen as a useful complement.

Yet another licensing method is buying access to e-books via credits. According to this system, librarians purchase a certain amount of credits for a deposit sum under a time period of one year, and thus users have access to the content under this time period. Each credit here represents one user who has unlimited access to the available title. When conducting the interviews with the participants, this model was perceived with mixed results. A positive feature (P13) of this model is that it is rather flexible in the usage of the title. For the amount of credits purchased, users can access the titles. For instance, if the title is an e-textbook, the time the title is used is usually set around the date of examinations. The title is then not widely used anymore for the rest of the term, as P13 argues, thus making this model rather flexible and focused on usage. Yet, a common problem with this model is that the amount of credits is often exhausted quickly, and have to be purchased again in the next term, which usually is in the beginning of the next year. As P04 mentions,

“Each time an e-book is used, one credit is used. You only have a certain amount of credits for that. So let's say that you have 300 credits and you have a countdown for every use of that. If it is a heavily used book and the credits run out, then you can actually purchase another copy of the e-book. You cannot see that you have one or three or five books as an end user, but I can see it at the back end that we have actually purchased more than one e-book. If we have purchased a book January 1st, and the credits run out last of October, then we get new credits January 1st next year. And then the book will be available again. If we see that it is heavily used, then we purchase another copy of it. If it is not heavily used, then the credits will not run out. [...] I know some of the big universities have some trouble with this, the fact that the credits run out too quickly for them. It all depends on how many students you have and the courses and so on.”

Consequences in this case can be that users (i.e. students and researchers) are irritated by the seeming lack of content if credits are no longer available. It can be thus problematic to inform users about the availability of a title, as P07 states: “It is a pedagogical problem because in a course with many students the credits can run out after only one or two months, and then the title can be unaccessible for 10 months.” It was mentioned by several participants (P04, P05, P09, P10) that the credits method is not to be favored due to these circumstances. Rather, the alternative favored by some librarians in this case is to purchase titles that are DRM free and with unlimited users. Yet, this option is not always available. Another possibility is to purchase the print book instead if all other options prove to be unfeasible, as P12 points out. The advantage of print over digital here can be described as follows. A print book, as several librarians point out, is often cheaper than an e-book as it does not entail any DRM restrictions, and research demonstrates that print is more popular among students than e-books as it is easier to make annotations and learn the content of the book. Yet, as was previously mentioned in the chapter about accessibility, e-books are often the first choice when acquiring academic titles and textbooks as they are accessible to multiple users as opposed to print which is only usable for one reader at a time. Yet, as another participant mentioned (P12), there should be more reasonable and thorough e-book licenses for the institutions to work with so that both librarians and users can take advantage of this model. For instance, researchers and teachers can then access e-book titles they need for their classes or research respectively.

5.2 Open Access

As was mentioned frequently during the interviews by several participants, Open Access (OA) e-books offer the opportunity to access content that usually does not have any DRM restrictions. OA e-books are generally linked via the libraries’ own online catalog, leading to the publishers’ webpage. It was mentioned that the libraries do not have any further control over the OA content as this is mainly directed by the publishers themselves. Some participants (P03, P10) stated that e-book licenses with only one or three simultaneous users can be a frustrating experience for library users. If the licenses aforementioned are the only option (i.e. one or three users), then the some libraries tend to acquire OA e-books instead, if available. As the respondents stated, since licenses for one or three users would lead to library users being irritated and frustrated due to accessibility issues, OA content would therefore be the only reasonable solution that would satisfy the users’ needs. As was argued by the librarians, this opportunity would treat users more fairly and would relieve the library from problems regarding accessibility. Another benefit for users regarding OA content is that it is not only available to academic users (i.e. students, teachers, researchers), but also to users outside of academia. Thus, OA content also has a societal dimension as all users can access it, regardless of occupation or affiliation with academia or not. When dealing with OA e-books, accessibility and availability for the user are the main focus for acquisition. Researchers can publish their work in OA, yet this is seen as a complex process as academic e-books are often written on commission, as P02 stated. Researchers first have to make an agreement with the publisher if they want to publish OA e-books. As participant P02 continues,

“Researchers sometimes have grants so that they can pay for the whole e-book or some chapters, in order for the chapters or the whole e-book to be Open Access. That is nothing that we are really involved in because at the moment we don’t pay those grants for Open Access fees when it comes to books. But if it is a book published by the University, these are always Open Access. But when it comes to academic publishers, you have the option quite often, but it is very expensive I think.”

OA, although being a model for free access, is not entirely free of charge but can also lead to additional costs for libraries as well. These costs refer to book processing charges, as P07 further explains:

“It is also a directive by the government to publish themselves in OA. Many funders also want that they should publish in OA. It is difficult to limit OA in this context. Earlier, there was a publication fee that was paid by a researcher and a subscription fee that was paid by the library. But now all fees will be paid by the library which means that the library needs more money from the university. This is quite hard to understand.”

Additional costs for publishing in OA can also arise if researchers want to publish their work, as P01 further points out:

“In most cases researchers are publishing maybe a chapter in a book and paying for making it Open Access. If a researcher [...] would like to publish an e-book or a chapter in a book then they would have to pay, but I don't think that this is being done much yet. In some cases they pay for journal articles but not for e-books as far as I know.”

Several participants responded that they acquire OA e-books via an Open Access database for electronic books, DOAB. Metadata records are then fetched in order to make OA content visible in their system. Benefits of OA e-books was frequently mentioned, e.g. that users have unlimited access to freely available and accessible content. Yet, it was also mentioned that users often have limited knowledge regarding OA content and some participants note that users tend to ignore OA entirely. It was noted that libraries should make users more aware of OA content by e.g. including metadata records to OA e-books. As several participants noted, while OA e-books have benefits for users regarding accessibility and availability, making them visible for them can be a problem as users first have to know about their existence. Hence, proper marketing strategies would be needed for this issue to be managed.

5.3 Print versus digital

Regarding the advantages and disadvantages of both digital and print books, it was asked during the interviews what the participants' stance was towards either format. The answers given, here from a library users' point of view, were very similar throughout and can be summarized as follows. Print as well as digital books have both advantages and disadvantages that make them unique. E-books are available and accessible all the time by multiple users (assuming licensing and DRM regulations allow users to access them) and can be stored in electronic devices such as e-readers. Although they are more expensive than print, e-books can be read by many users simultaneously and thus lower the costs per individual use. Print books are cheaper and more used in longer reading sessions instead of e-books that are primarily used for shorter texts. On a different note, e-books cannot be stolen and they do not take any physical space on the library shelves, thus making the working processes with the digital format more time and resource efficient than with printed books that require more extra physical work (e.g. labels and packaging). Benefits of print books are, according to the interviewees, the tactile experience and the fact that the physical presence of the book makes the reading process easier in order for the users to comprehend the material. Drawbacks of e-books are complicated licensing problems, DRM restrictions and usability issues on e-readers such as low screen resolution, eye fatigue and confusing user interfaces. Print books, on the other hand, present the content directly without any restrictions and easily readable on paper. It was said by several participants (P04, P05, P12, P13) that e-books are read chapter wise and not in their entirety, whereas print books are usually read for longer and coherent periods of time. The answers given by the librarians suggest that the format at least in part demands the usage, i.e. e-books are more likely to be read for superficial information seeking and print is used for more thorough and in-depth reading. Moreover, the fact that e-books are not suitable for interlibrary loans is not necessarily understood to be a disadvantage. As publishers want to have control over their content, interlibrary loan is prohibited through licensing issues.

Another question referring to print versus digital media was asked at the end of the interviews, hereby asking the participants whether they are of the impression if the printed book will be replaced by the e-book. Answers in this context can refer to personal experiences, recent trends in academic publishing or similar. Several respondents state that although the e-book has a number of advantages (e.g. accessible by multiple users), the printed book will not be replaced in the near future due to the need for print. Academic libraries may still need a print copy of a textbook as a reference if e-titles are not available (P07). Also, most respondents mentioned that Swedish e-textbooks are not available for academic libraries due to licensing issues and problems with publishers that do not want to cooperate with academic libraries. Instead, users either have to purchase the e-book or loan the print version, if available.

Several other librarians also stated that the usage of e-books is linked to the subject and the curriculum. In the humanities, e-books are not primarily read in the courses except for English e-textbooks. Humanities and other subjects such as the social sciences apparently demand print books due to the fact that Swedish e-books that are necessary for the courses are not available for academic libraries (P12). Thus, print books with the same content are still in

demand by the teachers and students alike. Although the future of print books cannot be foreseen, an interesting idea was forwarded by one participant (P11) who mentioned that the generation gap may be of importance regarding print versus digital books. If e-books become more popular during the next decades, then there may be a chance that the print book will be regarded as a peculiar item from the past. Yet, in order for this to happen, a technological shift would be necessary so that e-books become widely accepted and used. This step in digital development has yet to come, and therefore print is still demanded and used by many people. As was said during the interviews, in order for e-books to become the leading reading format, users have to be born and accustomed with this kind of technology in order to fully appreciate it.

Conversely, the results regarding e-journals were different to e-books. The number of printed academic journals is, as some respondents (P13, P07) pointed out, already declining or at a degree that is considered negligible. Instead, e-journals are far more prevalent than printed journals. As was mentioned by some participants (P05), the adoption of e-journals was far more successful than that of e-books due to several reasons. First, the content is usually DRM free so it can be accessed, downloaded and printed out without any restrictions, by an unlimited amount of users. In contrast, e-books often are bound to DRM and licensing which can further cause accessibility and performance problems. Considering these issues, and according to several interview participants, the e-book has yet to become a fully appreciated (i.e. by larger parts of society and/or academics) successor of the printed book.

From the data gathered in the interviews it can be concluded that at the present moment, digital and print books can be seen as complementary formats as both have their benefits and drawbacks, as was stated by several of the respondents. A clear preference for either format could therefore not be deduced, as the topic of digital versus print books is multifaceted and influenced by several other factors, these being of social, technological and cultural nature. As was mentioned in the interview sessions, it can be pointed out that the e-book, as of now, is not seen as a successor of the printed book but a complement if the features that print entails would not satisfy the users' needs and reading behavior. Further, the fact that print books and e-books are demanded by users at academic libraries demonstrates that a rivalry between these two formats is apparently not present, and that both serve as complements to each other.

6 Analysis and discussion

In this chapter, the results given in the previous results chapter are to be analyzed by referring to the chapter on previous research literature and the theoretical framework. Different stages regarding the e-book acquisition and management process such as the work with licenses, DRM and promotion shall be given further attention according to the thesis' aim which is understanding the working processes with e-books at academic libraries in Sweden.

6.1 E-book management and user influence

The results of the interviews conducted for this thesis show that the workflows and mechanisms in how e-books are selected, acquired and generally managed are complicated and based on many concepts that have to be considered. Throughout the interviews, librarians answered that users are the basis for acquisition in the first place as well as the access to recent academic e-books, as was also considered by Maceviciute et al. (2014) in their study. According to the interview respondents, user based acquisition is one of the main principles that was a prevalent motivation for purchase of e-books. Librarians also mentioned the selection process as being challenging as there can occur many problems within the process. For instance, problems with publishers and vendors that set high prices for e-books and e-book packages, as was also pointed out by Walters (2013a) in his study. It is important to note that e-book acquisition that emphasizes on users as the prime motivation for purchase also needs a proper management structure and acquisition policy. Such policies can be seen as a point of reference within the selection process and for e-book management process as a whole. As Evans & Saponaro (2005) note, these policies have many uses including priorities concerning the collections and the organizational and administrative processes such as rationalizing budgets and the assessment of the collection development program. Thus, if e-book acquisition and collection management shall be sustainable, user based acquisition should be included in collection development policies if the main driving factor for the acquisition of e-books is the user. Lee & Boyle (2004) claim that such policies should include users as a main motivational factor for acquisition. The authors note that acquisition librarians should identify and ascertain the user base which the collection is aimed at as well as trying to identify their needs through a sound and thorough collection policy. The goal for such user centered policies should be to meet the information needs of the user base most efficiently. As several authors such as Vasileiou et al. (2012b) and Blummer & Kenton (2012) focus on the e-book management process from a mere cost-benefit and administrative point of view, policies for e-book acquisition should also include user needs as a main motivation for purchase. As the aforementioned literature is relatively old at the time of writing this thesis, it can be argued whether recent developments within acquisition policies set the user at the centre of attention within the selection and acquisition management process. For the libraries that are part of this thesis, user based acquisition is the driving factor for e-book acquisition, a motivation that should be a prerequisite for acquisition policies at other libraries as well.

One distinct aspect that has to be mentioned is the general acquisition process, here with regard to Evans & Saponaro (2005) and Johnson (2018). According to the authors, the whole working process (regardless of print or electronic books) is initiated with selection, followed by acquisition. Yet, this model could be redacted as other factors change the process entirely. Due to the fact that new acquisition models such as e-book packages and user based acquisition (e.g. EBA, DDA) exist and are frequently applied by academic libraries, the model concerning collection development could be altered. Therefore, user based acquisition, i.e. the influence of users in the selection and acquisition process should be considered as a driving factor as well. Relying on usage statistics for subsequent selection and acquisition does in turn contradict the models by Evans & Saponaro (2005). By referring to statistics, selection takes place nearly without intervention by library staff and is merely based on assumptions, i.e. that e-book packages that were selected and purchased before will also be acquired in the future. This also means that libraries could endanger e-book collections by cancelling package subscriptions merely due to low usage statistics. In summary, the model regarding collection development that is used by Evans & Saponaro (2005) should be updated by implementing user influence, here with regard to e-book collections and e-book acquisition models such as EBA and DDA. As the authors' model is primarily focused on the acquisition of print, an additional model referring to electronic books and resources that also includes user based acquisition would be beneficial for libraries and the process of e-book collection management. This also means that libraries should mention in their collection development policies that e-books and e-book packages should be worked with (regarding selection and acquisition) in a different way than print books as the latter requires other working mechanisms than e-books. A clear distinction between digital and print should therefore not be avoided. From the interviews it can be deduced that all academic libraries have a certain acquisition plan, and that all libraries work with recurring issues and concepts such as e-book accessibility and availability, metadata records and usage statistics which is crucial for future e-book acquisition. As was mentioned by several respondents, the selection and acquisition process is complicated as many different factors have to be considered. Further, the workflow regarding e-books is also multifaceted with problems and challenges referring to licensing and implementation of metadata records etc. The fact that it was unanimously said that users and user accessibility are the primary reason or motivation for e-book acquisition may further be a critical issue in future acquisition. Academic libraries in this context have to focus on their user base and try to meet their demands regarding e-book content, access and usability. Given the right circumstances and attractive features that support e-book usage, the future of e-books and e-book acquisition as well as distribution could be very engaging and interesting with this kind of electronic format. Yet, a common problem that was mentioned in the interviews was that there is sometimes no clear division between the budgets regarding print or electronic books and/or media. A division between both formats would be an element of more thorough acquisition policies, and it would benefit libraries as the distribution of books (either print or digital) would then be a distinctive part of acquisition statistics. Thus, academic libraries should reevaluate their media budgets and create more distinct divisions between budgets for print and e-books.

6.2 Selection criteria for e-books

As was mentioned throughout the interviews, selection criteria for e-books or e-book packages are manifold. Answers by the interview participants cover such criteria as cost-effectiveness (regarding e-book packages) and benefits over print copies. Other criteria for selection of individual titles are that they have to be part of the curricula and reading lists (that being foremost e-textbooks) or are explicitly requested by either teachers or students. These criteria are also mentioned in Armstrong & Lonsdale (2005). Foremost, it has to be ascertained that skilled and educated library staff is in charge of the acquisition process, a precondition that Blummer & Kenton (2012) refer to in their study on e-book management. This was also a recurring issue in the interviews with representatives from the academic libraries. Yet, this issue was not regarded as a problem since all libraries involved in this study have employed librarians with appropriate skills and education. Another criterium is that libraries purchase only e-book packages from trusted publishers, provided that the content of the packages is of interest for the libraries, as is also one major point in Evans & Saponaro (2005). Moreover, librarians have to consider whether the titles are relevant for the collection as a whole and that individual titles do not become obsolete, as is also mentioned by the authors regarding the acquisition process (Evans & Saponaro, 2005, p. 163) and which is further given attention in Polanka (2011). Additionally, librarians shall be aware that the content of e-books packages is subject to change, meaning that if titles become obsolete, they can be replaced by more recent titles by the publishers.

Cost is also a major criterium for selection of e-books, here especially e-book packages. Interview respondents answer that packages have the advantage of being cost effective as the cost per title is reduced in contrast to title by title acquisition, as is also pointed out by Walters (2013a) and Coghill (2019) regarding library budgets and costs of e-books. Referring to cost effectiveness of e-books, according to Evans & Saponaro (2005), it should be evaluated whether the selection and acquisition of an e-book is more profitable than purchasing a print version of the same title. According to Walters (2013a) and Rao et al. (2018), e-book packages are cost-efficient when the price is counted per title, yet one also has to consider that there is the risk of a lower quality of the overall package as there can be titles included in the package that are either irrelevant or not useful for the library. This problem was also addressed in the interviews. Respondents answered that there have not yet been any problems or conflicts with the quality of e-book publishers and that they trust that the publishers packages that are of high quality throughout. Yet, due to the fact that e-books are more expensive than print books, purchase that is solely based on e-books can be of financial disadvantage for libraries over a longer period of time, especially regarding title by title acquisition. A solution for this problem is proposed by Rao et al. (2018), hereby referring to a hybrid model where both digital and print books are present. As publishers tend to set higher prices on academic e-titles that are more frequented by users and lower prices on e-titles that are not commonly used, a solution for this dilemma could be achieved by implementing a hybrid model where both formats are present and librarians could choose from. Rao et al. (2018) point out that a hybrid model with both print and e-titles would benefit users (regarding availability and accessibility of relevant titles) and libraries (regarding the cost effectiveness of the acquisition process) if the results are evaluated over a longer period of time.

It was also pointed out in the interviews that the lack of control is a recurring problem with the acquisition of e-book packages. Here, librarians have only limited control over the content regarding the purchased titles, a circumstance that is also mentioned in Walters (2013a). This also means that librarians would lose control over the selection of individual e-book titles with the subscriptions of e-book packages, as was mentioned by several interview respondents. This dilemma implies that libraries would also be in danger of acquiring titles they do not want or need when purchasing e-book packages. During the interviews, some librarians were aware of the lack of their own participation in the selection process when purchasing e-book packages. The majority responded that the lack of influence on the selection of e-books would not influence the acquisition process negatively as a whole as they rely on the publishers and the quality of the e-book packages' content. Walters (2013a) in this case refers to the possibility of initiating a rental model where titles would not be purchased but instead rented for a certain amount of time. Alternatively, the author also suggests title by title acquisition as an alternative if packages are not suitable for the interests of acquisition librarians. It was also mentioned in the interviews that e-book packages should be assessed by librarians before they are purchased due to titles not being useful for the collection, a problem that is also mentioned by Polanka (2011) regarding the value of e-book packages. The author adds that one also has to consider that the packages themselves are subject to change. It can happen that e.g. some titles have become obsolete and thus have to be replaced by more recent titles. Therefore, acquisition librarians should consider the selection of e-book packages so that content that is not useful or obsolete is discarded, as Vasileiou et al. (2012a) propose in their research. The authors further mention that content currency is a selection criterium which means that recent material should be purchased instead of titles that have become out of date, a circumstance that was further mentioned by several interview participants.

Yet another method of evaluating the acquisition of e-books packages is that subscriptions of e-book packages can be cancelled if individual titles or the whole package are not used or only seldomly used. Librarians would then choose cancellation and either change the supplier or purchase other packages that seem more valuable for the library's collections, a procedure that was mentioned while talking to the interview participants and furthermore mentioned in Vasileiou et al. (2012b) who refer to the e-book management process. Here, the authors consider renewal and cancellation of e-books as activities that are of importance if e-book packages are not sustainable due to insufficient content. Thus, the e-book acquisition process therefore has to be evaluated and packages either be renewed or subscriptions be cancelled if needed. Additionally, given that librarians only have limited control over e-book packages, one might argue that selection of individual titles may be of advantage for libraries as they would only purchase titles that are requested by users. This issue is also mentioned in Walters (2013a) as an alternative to the acquisition of packages, yet it would also mean rising costs for libraries and fewer titles being available for users. Thus, a compromise would be advisable that would benefit both parties in this regard.

As e-book packages are expensive and librarians do not want to waste media budgets on items that are not used, another method with regard to the e-book acquisition process is analyzing and evaluating usage statistics, as Armstrong & Lonsdale (2005) suggested as an option for e-book acquisition. Several interview participants also mentioned usage statistics as an indicator for purchasing e-books, yet this option was not mentioned as being the primary factor. According to Armstrong & Lonsdale (2005) and Walters (2013a), by evaluating statistics, librarians may receive information about which titles and/or which subjects are read by users and if purchasing larger e-book packages would benefit libraries as the price per title is reduced. Moreover, as was pointed out during the interview sessions, usage considering recently purchased content is relatively low to content that has been used over a longer period of time. Thus, statistics can be skewed in favor of already established titles at the expense of new titles that have not been used to a certain extent. Instead of focusing on usage statistics on relatively new e-book packages librarians should rather refer to other elements of acquisition policies such as user based acquisition which is centered on the users' needs. If user based acquisition is not the basis for e-book collection development, one could rather argue for policies being an asset for properly organized and also sustainable collection management, as Johnson (2018) points out in his research paper. According to the author, the purpose of such a policy is to give librarians a thorough exposition over management workflows and corresponding operating principles within libraries, a circumstance that is also a point of discussion in Evans & Saponaro (2005). Collection development policies should therefore include the aim of e-book collections based on financial prerequisites (i.e. if the library budget allows purchase of e-books and e-book packages) and user needs (i.e. titles that are requested by students, researchers and teachers who represent the prime user base at academic libraries). There are some methods librarians choose in order for a package to be of adequate quality, as was mentioned by the participants during the interviews. For instance, librarians choose purchasing e-book packages from a renowned publisher such as Springer, Routledge or Cambridge University Press. The fact that trusted publishers are a key element for ensuring quality of collections is also an issue discussed in Vasileiou et al. (2012b). The communication and interaction between these different actors can lead to the proper content being purchased. If adequate subject collections are considered to be a useful and sound addition to the libraries' collections, librarians would choose the publishers they consider to be best suited. While librarians do not have any direct influence on the content of e-book packages, another method used is that of different models such as EBA which was mentioned throughout all the interviews.

Another selection criterium that causes problems for Swedish academic libraries and that was frequently mentioned during the interviews was that e-textbooks are not available in Swedish. It was mentioned by the respondents that academic libraries do not have an existing contract with publishers regarding Swedish e-textbooks. Although they are demanded by users, academic e-books in Swedish would not be part of e-book stock at academic libraries. Thus, as several librarians noted, the solution to this problem can be twofold. Either the academic institution relies on English e-books (or other languages), or purchases the Swedish print version instead. In order to prevent irritation among users and offer a more diverse set of e-titles, publishers should offer their content also in Swedish as this would benefit libraries and users.

6.3 Acquisition models EBA and DDA

During the interviews with representatives from different Swedish academic libraries, it became clear that there is no consensus on which acquisition model is best suited for e-book acquisition. Several respondents stated that EBA may be of advantage since only those titles are purchased that are actually used. Other respondents answered that DDA, although being an alternative to EBA, also leads to problems regarding the acquisition process and to issues with publishers, a stance which is against Polanka's (2011) research which states that DDA might be a solution for libraries regarding the acquisition process. Thus, a definitive answer can not be given since the acquisition process is dependent on several factors including the communication between publishers, vendors and the libraries themselves. Another response from the interviews was that they do not work with either model but instead use a different acquisition model, that being title by title. This is grounded in the fact that the respondent mentioned difficulties regarding other acquisition models. The answers given in the interviews thus do not support some of the claims that several papers have given on the work with EBA and DDA. Polanka (2011) and Fisher et al. (2012) refer to DDA being a cost effective method for e-book acquisition. Yet, this stance was not supported by several of the interview respondents who mentioned that DDA can cause problems regarding selection of relevant titles and further problems with publishers. Fisher et al. (2012) argue that DDA might be more suitable for smaller libraries than for larger institutions, so that DDA might not be the best model for academic libraries.

With EBA and DDA, demand can be regarded as another method for assuring that the quality of the packages' content remains high. If titles are accessed by users, libraries can ensure that the titles are also in demand. Thus, a purchase of said titles can be justified. On the contrary, this purchasing model also has drawbacks considering the librarians' influence and responsibility of the content provided. While a benefit of EBA and DDA is that only those titles are purchased that are in fact used, the influence by librarians is not entirely secured as the decision making process is indirectly guided by the user. This problem was also stated by several interview participants, yet it is not directly addressed in the research literature which primarily focuses on cost-benefit analysis of e-book acquisition. Another disadvantage of both models is that librarians do not know about the costs of the packages, i.e. at the beginning of the process it is yet unclear how many titles are needed and then eventually purchased. Thus, budgetary issues remain a problem that has yet to be solved. Although a majority of the research literature presented in this paper regard both models, EBA and DDA, as being valued acquisition models as they are based on user demand (Polanka, 2011; Coghill, 2019; Kwok et al., 2014; Bucknell, 2012), the interview results in this study show a more diverse set of answers regarding both acquisition models. While EBA was regarded as being one of the better options for acquisition due to a relatively simple workflow and good cost effectiveness, some of the interviewees responded that problems arose with publishers, a circumstance that was not covered in any extent in the research literature. Regarding cost-usage benefit, several studies (Schroeder & Boughan, 2018; Rao et al., 2018; Carrico et al., 2015) point out that the acquisition models EBA and DDA have a financial benefit over conventional purchasing models such as title by title or print. For instance, Carrico et al. (2015) conclude that DDA is the most cost efficient model, especially

regarding fields within the humanities and the social sciences. Considering STEM and MED fields, the authors see EBA as a better suited option regarding costs. Yet, academic libraries are responsible for choosing either model (or none). Some representatives of the academic libraries that are part of this study were not convinced that either model was the best suitable option for e-book acquisition, hence there is no consensus among them about this topic. Although budgets for e-book acquisition are a driving factor in the process, user based acquisition is a term that was frequently used in the interviews, thus focusing on the target group. In this sense, research presented in this study in chapter 2 is rather out of date as several other factors than budgetary issues are interesting for libraries and the e-book acquisition models. Instead of focusing merely on budgets and cost effectiveness, the relationship and communication with publishers are also crucial factors in this process.

6.4 Accessibility through licensing and credits

Regarding accessibility and usage of e-books, it was mentioned frequently in the interviews that many librarians favor a licensing model that benefits users, thereby referring to an acquisition model that sets users at the center of the process. As licenses for only one user seem according to several respondents to be ineffective considering the available resources, many librarians are in favor of unlimited licensing models. By implementing this model, benefits for users would be better accessibility if titles are available to many users at once. Alternatively, librarians can use a credits model i.e. individual tokens or 'credits' are paid by the library and used once the titles are accessed. While this approach may seem appropriate for popular e-books, several interviewees in this study responded that this has proven to be a difficult process as the credits purchased are often expended before the end of a term so that specific titles cannot be used anymore. Librarians often mentioned complicated licensing processes that are to be negotiated with aggregators and publishers, a fact that is also present in Walters (2013b) regarding the role of publishers and vendors and the accessibility of e-books on online databases. Here, as Walters (2013b) points out, user accessibility is not always ensured as differing databases and user interfaces that lack specific functions such as search interfaces or the possibility to copy or download chapters can hinder the acceptance of e-books among users. This fact was also mentioned in the interviews i.e. that DRM can set limits to accessibility of content, thus leading to irritation and frustration among users, a fact that is also mentioned by Coghill (2019) and Eschenfelder (2008) regarding DRM limitations. Here, Eschenfelder (2008) refers to 'soft' and 'hard' restrictions in terms of accessibility of e-books. 'Soft' restrictions such as navigational problems or hidden search fields and 'hard' restrictions such as preventing users from printing and downloading content, as is described by Eschenfelder (2008) and further Walters (2014) as being user restrictions, were also part of the discussion with the interview participants. Further, it was mentioned in the interviews that the work with metadata records was sufficient and that there are no further complications. The consensus among interviewees was that the proper work with metadata records is essential for accessibility of e-book titles. If records are missing or incomplete, users cannot find the title. This circumstance is also mentioned in Martin & Mundle (2010). The authors claim different problems with insufficient metadata

records, e.g. the inability to access titles and erroneous transfer of the data into the library catalog. As metadata records were not mentioned in the interview sessions as being a part of the working process that would lead to accessibility problems, it is assumed that communication as well as cooperation between libraries and publishers and aggregators would be satisfying for both parties. Although the main work processes are under control and lead to a working environment for users, further improvements regarding accessibility on the part of the publishers and vendors are of essence if publishers and vendors do not want to displease readership. This may also be a point of further discussion for future acquisition models, i.e. librarians ascertain that only those databases are worked with that provide databases with user centered interfaces and, if possible, either without any or only 'soft' DRM restrictions. As this approach may seem presumptuous towards publishers and vendors, it can yet have the effect of abandoning or reducing DRM limitations for users if proper communication is secured. As a lack of standardization between different databases can cause distress among users – as is also mentioned in e.g. Walters (2013b) – improvements regarding a unifying standard between different platforms would ensure a better user experience and thus improve the users' reading experience, and hence also feedback. Several librarians also mentioned during the sessions that e-book acquisition would be less cumbersome if rules and contracts regarding licenses would be easier and more in line with the university libraries' goals. If publishers and aggregators would be willing to acknowledge the libraries' intention of better user service, then selection and acquisition would be made more efficient and directed at user demand. In turn, librarians can influence the acquisition process by negotiating with publishers considering better licensing options.

In future e-book acquisition models, the working processes with Open Access (OA) e-books could become more prevalent than it is today. As OA content is free for every user to access and read, librarians would avoid complicated licensing and other rules and regulations set by publishers. This was also mentioned in the interviews i.e. that OA content can be preferred over ordinary e-book purchase with DRM. This is due to the fact that OA offers users access to e-books without any restrictions, a circumstance that is also mentioned in Osborne (2015) and Crawford (2011). Osborne (2015) furthermore mentions accessibility as an important feature of OA content, as OA allows researchers to communicate among their peers, and further gain a wider readership due to being accessible without any restrictions, and this would also apply to users who are not part of academia. DRM limitations might be an issue that could be solved in the future if publishers are more eager to accept demands set by librarians and users, in such a way that copying and printing either chapters or whole books will be made available and that there are more homogenous rules and regulations regarding DRM as a whole. As several interview participants stated, DRM restrictions not only are a burden for users but also for librarians as they are forced to explain to users why certain services are not available or limited for them, thus leading to users being irritated and frustrated as well as to more stress for library staff. E-book acquisition policies may therefore also include OA e-books being part of the acquisition process if negotiations with publishers and aggregators regarding DRM are not feasible or satisfying. As e-book acquisition based on user needs is a prime factor for purchase, OA content with its versatility may be a reasonable alternative to common e-book acquisition with DRM limitations.

6.5 Promotion: challenges and possibilities

As was frequently discussed in the interview sessions, while there usually is a policy regarding e-book selection and acquisition, a marketing or promotion policy seems to be lacking. This, in turn, could prove to be detrimental to the working process with e-books as a whole as current or future users could be ignorant that e-resources in general and e-books in particular even exist, a dilemma that is mentioned in the research literature (e.g. Rowlands et al., 2007; Shelburne, 2009; Mulholland & Bates, 2014). The main reason why the knowledge about e-books among library users is limited is apparently that librarians have missed the opportunity to implement a proper promotion strategy for e-books. As can be derived from the interviews, promotion of e-books also seems to be a rather difficult task as many attempts to make users acquainted with e-books were only short-lived. Therefore, the promotion of electronic books can be seen as a necessary step to make the library's collections more known and accessible for users. Examples from the interviews regarding strategies in order to raise awareness for e-books are, e.g. newsletters, bookmarks, advertisement on library TV screens, and social media communication. These findings are also present in the literature review, for example in Kennedy (2011) and Vasileiou & Rowley (2011). The authors lament the rather unsuccessful attempts by librarians to gain a wider audience through promotional advances, yet also draw possible solutions for future promotional projects. Possible procedures include literacy projects, online chat modules, course meetings, a guide distributed both in print and digitally, e-book lists with recently purchased titles, and personal sessions with librarians, teachers and researchers who can inform about the benefits of e-books. Another approach not present in the research literature but mentioned in the interviews is the use of QR codes for promotion of e-books. Here, QR codes are inserted in a print version of a title that is also available as an e-book. Users then have to scan the code, thus accessing the electronic version of the title. Yet, according to the respondents, this method proved to be not feasible as users would not consider QR as being necessary for e-book search.

Lonsdale & Armstrong (2010) further refer to strategies such as newsletters, the library's webpage, bookmarks, workshops and the libraries' own OPAC. The last mentioned strategy was also proposed by a majority of the interview respondents for this thesis, i.e. that users have to find e-books themselves rather than relying on advertisements on the part of the library. A problem for this approach is yet the fact that users ought to have proper IT skills in order to use e-books. The fact that librarians rely on users' IT skills when finding e-books seems to be a rather negligent approach. Rather, in order to better promote e-books at academic libraries, several authors (Kaur, 2009; Kwan et al. 2023; Islam & Islam 2009) suggest marketing schemes similar to those used in for-profit organizations. According to Kwan et al. (2023), marketing can be realized through the marketing mix strategy using the 4P method, i.e. product, place, price and promotion. For libraries, three more methods can be added, i.e. people, physical evidence, and process. According to the authors, this mixed marketing strategy is very influential as it entails both material (product, place and money) as well as social aspects (referring to individuals or customers) in the marketing process. By making a product, in this case e-books at academic libraries, known to the target group, that being library users, the relation between product and target group can be improved. Thus, through personal

communication, users can become more aware of e-books and use them accordingly. Kaur (2009) interprets customer service as a marketing method that relies on personal interaction with the target group, and sees this strategy as being a promotional effort. As customer service can be seen as a form of marketing, libraries are thus responsible for “selling” their services and make their values clear to the users.

In order to successfully implement a clear marketing strategy, Islam & Islam (2009) propose a five stage model derived from Ojiambo (1994) that marks five stages of library marketing. These stages are: determining resources for libraries; competitor identification; user identification; initiating a marketing strategy; and marketing mix method. This or a similar strategy should be applied by libraries in order to generate a more structured and sophisticated approach towards marketing their services and products, in this case e-books. Additionally, according to Dolnicar & Lazarevski (2009) and Andreasen & Kotler (2003), user focus is of essence when applying a marketing strategy. Libraries should use a customer-centered approach that relies on the clients’ consuming behavior, needs and wishes. The authors claim that a successful promotion plan includes identification of the customer or client base, the building of a brand or image of one’s own message, and communication with the target group through channels such as e-mail, chat or in person. Further, the authors conclude that these strategies should also entail marketing research, a marketing plan, media relations, product development and pricing.

Another approach that libraries can use to promote products and services are social media (i.e. Facebook, Instagram, Twitter etc.). Several participants in the interviews responded that they at least partially used social media as a method for promoting e-books. Yet, as there is no proper strategy or policy that addresses e-book promotion as being a long term commitment, social media was not regarded as a successful method for the academic libraries that participated in the study. Yet, several studies (Muhammad & Zhiwei, 2021; Choi & Joo, 2021; Kaushik, 2016) refer to social media as a popular and quite successful method for libraries to address users. Jain (2014) concludes that promotion via social media can be very beneficial for libraries due to being more time and cost-effective, and that social media allows staff to be more creative regarding developing marketing strategies. Social media thus provides librarians and users a platform for communication, discussion and the exchange of ideas, as is also mentioned in Kaushik (2016). The user base is thus more accessible as social media communication here is considered to be a form of an extended direct dialog between the different actors. According to these findings, it can be stated that in order to successfully implement a promotion strategy for libraries, librarians should compose a thorough policy which includes the target group (library users), the product (e-books) and the channel of communication. The latter in this case is using social media as a method for the promotion of e-books, here also in form of a dialog between librarians and users. Thus, users become more aware of the product (e-books) being offered to them which eventually leads to more usage of e-books in the long term. Moreover, library staff has to be educated in how to efficiently work with promotion and marketing strategies regarding e-books. As there seems to be a lack of motivation among librarians for promoting e-books – a problem that is addressed in research literature and in the interviews –, educated and motivated personnel is needed to achieve better promotional efforts.

6.6 Challenges for acquisition of print and digital

Despite the fact that e-books have many benefits such as instant information access, ease of use and full-text search, the acquisition of print books is still relevant according to interview respondents. Advantages of e-books over print that were mentioned by the interviewees were e.g. instant availability of relevant titles, the possibility to search for keywords in the text and use hyperlinks for further information, as well as better readability due to backlit screens in contrast to print books. These statements are also present in the research literature by several authors (Davy, 2007; Subba Rao, 2001; Vassiliou & Rowley, 2008) who suggest several benefits of e-books over print. Jamali et al. (2009) further mention ecological factors that favor the purchase of e-books, i.e. no natural resources are exploited, as opposed to print books. Moreover, librarians stated that a practical reason why e-book acquisition is beneficial for libraries is that e-books do not require any physical space, thus lowering costs, a fact that is also mentioned in Vassiliou & Rowley (2008). Here, the authors refer to the purchasing process as being not as physical as with the acquisition of print, i.e. there is no physical labour involved such as unpacking and shelving. Moreover, e-books eventually save costs for libraries as no physical space such as shelves or rooms are used. Yet, the purchase of print is nevertheless necessary, according to several answers given in the study interviews. This is primarily due to reasons of demand, availability and cost. In this case this means that the acquisition of print books is advised by librarians if e-books are not available or too expensive, or that it was explicitly requested by library users. Here, print is seen as a useful supplement if e-books are either not available, too expensive or not being requested by users. This circumstance in this case, i.e. the print book being considered a convenient addition to e-books, is also mentioned as a benefit of print by Jamali et al. (2009). The authors also refer to print books being demanded if e-books are not available by the publisher, a circumstance that was also stated in the interviews. Print can also be seen as a substitute to e-books if necessary. Further, reading behavior of electronic and print books differ, as was discussed by the interview respondents and the research literature, here in Mulholland & Bates (2014) regarding user and reading behavior of print and electronic books. In their study on reading behavior of the different formats, the authors conclude that academic staff rather browses e-books instead of reading them, and that there is more in-depth reading regarding print books. In the latter case, users apparently have a more personal relationship to print due to tactile experience which e-books lack. This situation was also considered by the interview respondents who stated that they feel more connected to the features of a physical book. In contrast, an e-book itself is intangible (though a mobile phone or computer on which the e-book is read is) which may lead to users feeling disconnected to the electronic format. This was mentioned by several librarians in the interviews and by authors such as Ketron & Naletelich (2016) and Durant & Horava (2015) in their research papers. In their study, Ketron & Naletelich (2016) refer to the hedonic and emotional aspects of reading e-books as opposed to print books and hereby want to discover hedonic differences regarding the perception and use of e-books and print books, and if users prefer either format. Results of the research study are that while e-books are easily accessible and usable, users criticize a lack of personal connection with them. In contrast, print books offer users a tactile experience which apparently leads to an emotionally pleasing response, according to the authors.

The authors also mention that the hedonic experience that print books offer could not be replaced by e-books, as was also stated by several interview respondents when asked about reading preferences regarding electronic and print books. In yet another study, Durant & Horava (2015) refer to different reading experiences regarding e-books and print books. While reading print apparently engages users in a deeper reading experience, reading e-books on a screen helps users in pattern recognition and decision making. Interview participants for this thesis gave similar answers and opinions regarding the reading behavior of users, i.e. that reading behavior regarding e-books and print books differ significantly. E-books are, according to the interviewees, usually read per chapter and not as a whole book, whereas print books are more commonly read in their entirety. This, according to several of the respondents, is due to the physical nature of both formats, electronic and print. Users feel emotionally connected to print as it offers a haptic experience, and hence read print books for a longer period of time. In contrast, e-books, though more accessible through in-text search, are also used for browsing and quick reading, as was noted in the interviews and by Mulholland & Bates (2014). Several librarians pointed out that either format, print and electronic, should be seen as complements and not as competitors. As one format entails features that the other lacks (i.e. tactile experience of print versus immediate access of e-books), both formats are supplements and should be considered equally regarding the acquisition process. In this sense, both print and e-books have different features that can be of use in different situations. With title by title acquisition, print can be a better option than electronic as e-books are often purchased in packages and are more expensive when purchased per title, as is also mentioned by Walters (2013a). In turn, packages are usually acquired as e-books due to cost effectiveness and lack of storage space. To summarize, important factors considering acquisition of print or electronic are usage and the users' intentions. Accordingly, librarians should implement both print and e-book acquisition in acquisition policies and give users a choice when requesting a title, that being either print or electronic. The interview participants in this study stated that they have specific rules regarding the acquisition of print and e-books which is also written in the corresponding acquisition policies. In this case, when an individual title is demanded by users, it is usually acquired as an e-book unless users request print. Librarians thereby consider several factors for the acquisition such as e.g. cost and availability. This guideline should be implemented in e-book management policies as it gives users and librarians the possibility to assess when either print or e-book can be purchased, depending on situation and context.

6.7 Academic libraries as a web of practices

The theoretical framework that was established in chapter 3 represents the basis for further analysis in this section, here with focus on Schatzki's (1996, 2002, 2005) theory of practice which describes the world as being inhabited by people whose actions form a vast web of practices (Schatzki, 2002). Practice theory can be applied to the acquisition process and the workflows of academic libraries as follows. There are primarily two separate main groups of interest in the acquisition process, here being library staff who are in charge of the purchasing process, and users who read and request e-books. Each group acts under distinct preconditions which make sense to them, and these actions further form chains of actions which lead to practices that cohere and sometimes conflict, thus creating a web of practices (Schatzki, 2002). From the librarians' point of view, analysis in this context is directed at e.g. strategies, selection criteria, accessibility and usage of academic e-books. For instance, what are criteria for title by title acquisition of print books in contrast to acquisition of e-book packages, and which chains of actions are present in this process? What kind of practice bundles are involved in the management and acquisition processes? From the users' point of view, what are selection criteria when choosing print or electronic book when given the choice between either format? What chains of actions or requirements have to be fulfilled if users abandon e-books for print, or vice versa? The academic libraries presented in this paper serve as organizations, in terms of places and settings with material arrangements where social practices take place. The role of academic libraries as organizations which house a vast set of practices shall be focused on in this paper, since Schatzki (2005) also describes organizations as social phenomena where social practices take place, and that these practices consist of practice bundles and material arrangements. Schatzki (2002) describes four elements that practices consist of, being 1) practical understandings, 2) rules, 3) teleoaffective structure and 4) general understandings. According to the results of this thesis presented in chapter 5, these elements can be applied as follows.

With practical understandings, Schatzki (2002) explains that actors are "knowing how to X, knowing how to identify X-ings, and knowing how to prompt as well as respond to X-ings". The academic librarians presented in this paper know about the individual working processes such as selection, acquisition and distribution of e-books and how the processes involved differ from those regarding print books. Librarians also use their knowledge and skills to assume if individual titles or e-book packages are not worth the purchase due to e.g. low quality or high cost. They know how to react if e.g. titles are not available or out of stock, or how to react if users request print instead of e-book although the latter is more cost effective. Action intelligibility (Schatzki, 2002) is described as being an internal process that is separate from rationality. The term means that people choose to perform practices "that are signified to them as the ones to perform" (Schatzki, 1996). Librarians with their skills and knowledge know how to perform the actions and practices they ought to do according to action intelligibility. Furthermore, people who carry out practices do so because of understanding and attunement. Understanding in this case refers to the logical aspect regarding the structuring of an action, while the latter refers to personal preferences or, according to Schatzki (1996), "the locus of the affective component" of human behavior. As can be seen in the results section of this paper, librarians know how acquisition

models such as EBA and DDA work as well as licensing, DRM and processes regarding Open Access. For instance, the acquisition process is structured in several stages that have to be performed in order for a purchase to be realized. These stages are also part of research in Evans & Saponaro (2005), Johnson (2018) and Vasileiou et al. (2012b) whose research covers distinct stages in the acquisition process. As was discussed in the interviews, stages are e.g. selection of titles and e-book packages, negotiation and communication with publishers and aggregators, licensing of e-book titles, work with DRM, the implementation of metadata records, and choosing between e-book and print book if necessary. For instance, if e-book packages from a renowned publisher do not align with the library's guideline regarding quality, or if the titles do not fit the subject area, librarians can choose to not purchase the item or, if it is a subscription based acquisition, cancel the subscription entirely. Further, another example is licensing and DRM. Several interview respondents stated that they prefer unlimited licenses for users of e-books. Yet, there was also a statement from one informant that e-books with a license for only one user can be purchased if that specific user is the only one reading the specific e-book title. Here, the practice of e-book acquisition which in itself consists of a chain of actions (selection, evaluation, negotiation with aggregator and user etc.) is a practice that makes sense for the librarian involved in the process due to their skills, knowledge and action intelligibility which are required for this position. Another example is the distinction between e-book and print book in the acquisition process. The preconditions that relate to selection of either format are different, and librarians shall decide which format should be purchased based on the situation and context. In the interview sessions, participants responded that e-books are generally preferred as the working processes are more time and cost effective than with print books, especially regarding packages. Therefore, librarians consider e.g. costs and storage space and act accordingly, which is also documented in the acquisition policies set by the academic libraries. Further, if users explicitly demand print books or if e-titles are not available, librarians then choose to purchase print, thereby considering the wishes of users and the availability of e-books. Here, the librarians' practical understandings and action intelligibility that are part of the practice of e-book acquisition show that actors have to have an understanding of how things work depending on the situation and communication with other actors (in this case library users) involved. These practices are therefore in line with Schatzki's (2002) concept of practical understanding which refers to actors knowing how to perform and recognize parts of the practice. Further, action intelligibility is also ensured as librarians know how to work and proceed with e-books and print books as well as the actions, practices and processes that are connected to these approaches.

Rules represent the second element of a practice and, according to Schatzki (2002), connect sayings and doings of practices. These are defined as basic principles, instructions or explicit articulations that specify and direct peoples' behavior regarding what to do and how to perform certain actions. Further, rules arrange groups of actions and link their components (tasks and projects) into complex groupings. Referring to the results gathered from of the interviews, rules are explicitly written in the acquisition policies regarding individual actions and practices regarding e-book management. The interview participants of this study refer to policies as being guidelines for further use, e.g. the respondents unanimously referred to user based acquisition as the main

motivation for purchase. This criterium is written in the acquisition policies which further serve as a basic set of rules and principles for the working processes with e-book acquisition. Also, the user base is commonly defined as being part of academia such as students, teachers and researchers, and librarians consider these actors and their needs. The existence of such acquisition policies also means that actors involved in the process (i.e. library staff) will consider and act under the same rules. The actors will consider the rules and decide according to the situation. Referring to these policies, it was mentioned throughout the interviews that promotion and marketing of e-books (or books in general) is not explicitly written in the documents. This in turn means that there are no rules or guidelines related to e-book promotion. Librarians answered that the lack of promotion is due to the fact that users have to find the e-titles themselves, and that former approaches regarding promotion did not succeed. The lack of promotional effort can also be due to the problem that librarians either do not know how to promote e-books, or do not consider the promotion of e-books to be necessary or fruitful. As the purpose of rules in this context (Schatzki, 2002) is that librarians influence the future path of practices and activities, it can be noted that e-book promotion is a field that has to be addressed and further evaluated by librarians in order to meet the needs and requirements of their user base.

The teleoaffective structure combines sayings and doings into a comprehensive practice, and is described as a “range of normativized and hierarchically ordered ends, projects, and tasks, to varying degrees allied with normativized emotions” (Schatzki, 2002). Here, the term ‘teleoaffective’ means that practices spread out into a certain direction that makes sense for the actors of the practice. The term ‘normativity’ refers to acceptability and to oughtness of actions, meaning how they should be done by the actors involved in the practice. Practices are considered as a “set of ends” consisting of a variety of tasks and projects that shall be carried out by actors (Schatzki, 2002). Referring to the academic libraries presented in this study, the acquisition process works according to the teleoaffective structure that is described by Schatzki (2002). The whole working process consists of several stages, tasks and projects that in turn form the practice of e-book acquisition, eventually leading to the end goal, i.e. purchase of relevant titles, and providing requested literature to users. These tasks, projects and ends are hierarchically ordered as there is an ordered structure in the acquisition process, hereby referring to the results of the interviews and the e-book management process by Vasileiou et al. (2012b). In the acquisition process, the very first stage is the position of educated and skilled library staff working with acquisition. Further, a collection development policy has to be established and a budget be established before any items can be acquired. In the next step, librarians assess and evaluate e-book titles and packages that are suited for the university or faculty (i.e. according to the subjects taught at the institution). This also means that other factors such as licensing are to be negotiated and trials be considered. Next steps include cataloging and delivery of the titles, followed by promotion and user education. Last steps entail user evaluation by using statistics, as well as renewals and cancellations, if necessary. These stages are also present in the interview results of this study, i.e. hierarchically structured tasks and projects that are a prerequisite for the acquisition process to be successfully completed. Further, as practices are open ended due to the teleoaffective structure, disputes and conflicts regarding e.g. selection and purchase can occur (Schatzki, 2002).

This in turn means that the actors involved have to find an agreement. Examples from the interviews are e.g. that negotiation with licensing can cause problems with publishers, as DRM limitations set boundaries to the usage of e-books. Here, some respondents answered that they either come to an agreement with the parties involved, or cancel the acquisition and refer to print books or OA titles instead. Here, the teleoaffective structure leads to the end goal of e-book acquisition, although the original goal of acquiring proper e-book titles is not fulfilled, thus demonstrating that the teleoaffective structures are subject to change. Another example from the interview sessions is the acquisition of e-book versus print book. If, for instance, users demand print books instead of e-books, the acquisition process may be hindered as acquisition librarians would rather purchase the electronic title. Thus, both actors have to agree on a specific outcome if the main goal (i.e. acquisition) shall be reached. According to the respondents of this study, librarians would act according to the users' proposal and buy print instead of an e-book, provided that the rules and principles of the acquisition process are not violated. Disputes can be solved by communication, thus reaching a solution (Schatzki, 2002). General understanding in this case refers to understandings of the tasks and projects that actors are participating in and that are shared with the other actors, here e.g. that the purchasing process is based on user centered acquisition, i.e. users are the reference point for e-book acquisition, thus giving the practice meaning.

As practices form social phenomena, the practices within an organization between different actors can also be considered collective events where participants are acting together. Thus, social relations happen within a web of practices that are interconnected, thus forming social orders that happen at the workplace, in this case libraries and offices (Nicolini, 2012). Schatzki (2002) refers to social orders as being organized by chains of actions, commonalities, prefiguration actions, and material arrangements. Regarding the acquisition processes at the libraries presented in this thesis, chains of actions entail the successive order of actions that are part of the acquisition process such as the selection of titles, budgetary issues, communication with other staff, licensing etc., set in succeeding order. Commonalities refer to the circumstance that the actors of a practice are doing the same task or project together without previous agreement. The academic librarians in this study are all affiliated with the acquisition process and work together to reach the same goal. Material arrangements refer to sites or spaces where practices take place. Here, spaces and settings of objects and people create the social dimension of practice theory. The academic libraries in this thesis are all university libraries with offices where librarians meet, discuss and socialize, thereby having agreements or conflicts. In this social and material setting, multiple practices are performed and can also overlap. The setting of social interaction itself (i.e. libraries) represents the social dimension of practice theory. Schatzki (2005) describes organizations as social phenomena where social practices take place, and libraries entail various practice bundles and material arrangements. The academic libraries in this study are organizations where practice-arrangement bundles occur that are linked to practices. The main practice described in this thesis is e-book acquisition, consisting of tasks and projects (selection, licensing, promotion) within material settings (offices). To conclude, academic libraries serve as a setting for social practices where different practice arrangement bundles are carried out, overlap and collude, and eventually leading to an end goal, thus creating a vast web of practices (Schatzki, 2002).

7 Conclusion

The main goal of this thesis is to gain more insight into the workflows of Swedish academic libraries and in particular their work with e-books regarding e.g. acquisition models, DRM, Open Access, promotion, budgetary issues etc. Research questions that are of interest in this process are as follows:

RQ.01: How does the acquisition process of academic e-books work and what are selection criteria for e-books?

RQ.02: How do the libraries work with Digital Rights Management, Open Access and the promotion of e-books?

RQ.03: What are the differences regarding workflows and perceived advantages and disadvantages of e-books in contrast to printed books?

In order to answer these questions, 13 librarians from eight university libraries in Sweden agreed to participate in semi-structured interviews. Questions asked covered a vast field of subjects with regard to e.g. acquisition models such as EBA and DDA, OA publications, benefits and drawbacks of print and digital books etc. The results of the interviews show that while academic libraries may take different approaches towards the work with e-books, the main working mechanisms referring to acquisition (title by title, EBA and DDA) are similar.

The first research question can thus be answered by referring to the acquisition models that were part of the interviews and the research literature. Most libraries work with title by title acquisition and EBA. E-books are often purchased in packages from renowned publishers. Selection criteria for e-books are manifold, yet it can be stated that e-titles should cover subjects that are relevant for the university and/or the faculties of the university. Further, users have an important part in the acquisition process as EBA and title by title purchase are also influenced by user demands. In the interviews it became obvious that many academic libraries work with user based acquisition. All of the institutions that were part of the interviews also have a certain media or acquisition plan regarding the selection of e-books, yet it was not always clear how the budget was divided between print and digital resources.

The second research question is aimed at the workflows with e-books. Results regarding this question are multifaceted, to summarize it can be stated that many librarians agree that DRM restrictions at least partly inhibit the access to e-books and thus to some part impair their reputation among users. Yet, the reasons for publishers for implementing DRM restrictions are understandable considering copyright and production costs etc. DRM here serves as a control mechanism for publishers to prevent e-books to be unmanageable if an unlimited amount of users can access them 24/7 (in terms of e.g. copying and printing). Moreover, libraries also set limits to print books such as only one user per title and a limited user time. Thus, the topic of accessibility should not be an issue from a user's point of view. Yet, DRM can often lead to frustration among users, as was mentioned by several interview respondents. Therefore, if publishers and aggregators were to abolish or at least make DRM more

favorable to use, users may develop a better relation with e-books, as was pointed out in the interview sessions. As several respondents mentioned in the interviews, Open Access would be another solution for unlimited access and use of e-books, yet the relatively low amount of relevant e-titles might counteract this approach. It was also mentioned that OA could be preferred over regular e-books if licensing with DRM would be too complicated or inefficient. At the writing of this thesis, OA could not be regarded as a proper solution for problems regarding DRM limitations. As was mentioned by all interview participants, a standard plan or policy concerning promotion of e-books is lacking, and attempts to make e-books more visible to users have either failed or were mostly ineffective. An approach towards a more effective promotion and marketing plan for e-books may be a subject for future research.

Regarding the third research question, it was obvious during the interviews that acquisition of print books is still relevant, although due to other reasons than e-book acquisition. Several librarians who were part of this study answered that print books can be purchased if e-books are not available or too expensive, or that it was explicitly requested by the library patrons. Considering benefits and drawbacks of print versus e-books, it was pointed out by librarians that users at academic libraries (i.e. students and researchers) are generally in favor of e-books due to their accessibility and the fact that they can be accessed by multiple users simultaneously. Disadvantages of e-books are DRM restrictions and the fact that proper IT skills are needed in order for users to read e-books. Print books are in this context considered a better solution for longer reading and study sessions, while e-books are preferred for reading fewer pages or only chapters of book. E-books further lack the tactile experience that print offers. Yet, as several librarians pointed out, print and electronic books should not be seen as competitors on the book market or at academic libraries. These two formats in this context should be regarded as complements rather than adversaries. Print books and e-books have different characteristics and entail features that can be applied in different situations. Here, it was made clear by the respondents that usage and the users' intent are crucial factors when reading either print or e-book. The fact that academic e-books are not yet widely accepted can be due to several reasons, e.g. technical problems such as user interfaces and accessibility issues such as DRM. This further complicates the acceptance of e-books, in contrast to e-journals that, according to the interviewees, have been more successful among users.

Considering the answers given by the librarians in the interview sessions, it can be concluded that the research questions above were answered and that the aim of this thesis, giving insight into the working mechanisms and workflows of Swedish academic libraries and their work with different acquisition models and e-book management has been fulfilled. Limitations of this study are of course that the libraries interviewed do not represent all academic institutions in Sweden or beyond. Other libraries may have different approaches towards acquisition, DRM and promotion as well as Open Access. Another issue that was only superficially covered during the interviews was the impact of the Covid pandemic that was prevalent during 2020 and the following years. Yet, the author did not further investigate this topic as it was neither part of the research questions nor the study's goal. Therefore, a possible relation between the Covid pandemic and a change in the perception and the usage of e-books can be part of future research.

Reference list

Andreasen, A. R. & Kotler, P. (2003), *Strategic Marketing for Non-profit Organizations* (6th ed.). Prentice-Hall.

Anuradha, K. T., & Usha, H. S. (2005). E-books access models: an analytical comparative study. *Electronic Library*, 24(5), 662–679.

DOI: 10.1108/02640470610707268

Anuradha, K. T., & Usha, H. S. (2006). Use of e-books in an academic and research environment: A case study from the Indian Institute of Science. *Program : Electronic Library and Information Systems*, 40(1), 48–62.

DOI: 10.1108/00330330610646807

Armstrong, C. (2008). Books in a virtual world: The evolution of the e-book and its lexicon. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 40(3), 193–206. DOI: 10.1177/0961000608092554

Armstrong, C., Edwards, L., & Lonsdale, R. (2002). Virtually there? E-books in UK academic libraries. *Program : Electronic Library and Information Systems*, 36(4), 216–227. DOI: 10.1108/00330330210447181

Armstrong, C., & Lonsdale, R. (2005). Challenges in managing e-books collections in UK academic libraries. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 29(1), 33–50. DOI: 10.1016/j.lcats.2004.12.001

Baron, N. S., Calixte, R. M., & Havewala, M. (2017). The persistence of print among university students: An exploratory study. *Telematics and Informatics*, 34(5), 590–604. DOI: 10.1016/j.tele.2016.11.008

Barrueco, J. M., & Termens, M. (2022). Digital preservation in institutional repositories: a systematic literature review. *Digital Library Perspectives*, 38(2), 161-174. DOI: 10.1108/DLP-02-2021-0011

Bruce, I. (1995). Do not-for-profits value their customers and their needs? *International Marketing Review*, 12(4), 77–84.

DOI: 10.1108/02651339510097757

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Bucknell, T. (2012). Buying by the bucketful: a comparative study of e-book acquisition strategies. *Insights the UKSG Journal*, 25(1), 51–60. DOI: 10.1629/2048-7754.25.1.51

Buczynski, J. A. (2010). Library e-books: Some can't find them, others find them and don't know what they are. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 15(1), 11–19.

Budapest Open Access Initiative, "Budapest Open Access Initiative," 14 February 2002, <https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read/>.

Blummer, B., & Kenton, J. (2012). Best Practices for Integrating E-books in Academic Libraries: A Literature Review From 2005 to Present. *Collection Management*, 37(2), 65–97. DOI: 10.1080/01462679.2012.660851

Byström, Karin (2012). Everything That's Wrong with E-Book Statistics : A Comparison of E-Book Packages. *Charleston Library Conference* (pp. 216-220). DOI: 10.5703/1288284315105

Carrico, S. B., Cataldo, T. T., Botero, C., & Shelton, T. (2015). What Cost and Usage Data Reveals About E-Book Acquisitions: Ramifications for Collection Development. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 59(3), 102-111. DOI: 10.5860/lrts.59n3.102

Carvalho, M., Boock, M., Todorova, T. Y., Martins, S., Braga, I., & Pinto, C. (2023). Author preferences for open access in Portugal: survey findings. *Library Management*, 44(3/4), 203–216. DOI: 10.1108/LM-10-2022-0090

Chang, Y.-W. (2017). Comparative study of characteristics of authors between open access and non-open access journals in library and information science. *Library & Information Science Research*, 39(1), 8-15. DOI: 10.1016/j.lisr.2017.01.002

Choi, N., & Joo, S. (2021). Understanding public libraries' challenges, motivators, and perceptions toward the use of social media for marketing. *Library Hi Tech*, 39(2), 352–367. DOI: 10.1108/LHT-11-2017-0237

Coghill, J. (2019). Patron-Driven Acquisition (PDA). *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*, 16(1), 25–27. DOI: 10.1080/15424065.2019.1596776

Cordón García, J. A., & Cordón García, J. A. (2013). *Social reading : platforms, applications, clouds and tags* (1st ed.). Chandos Publishing.

Crawford, W. (2011). *Open access what you need to know now*. American Library Association.

Culbertson, R., Madelstam, Y., & Prager, G. (2011). *Provider-neutral e-monograph MARC record guide*. Washington, DC: Program for Cooperative Cataloging. (Retrieved from <http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/bibco/documents/PN-Guide.pdf>)

Davies, T. (2017). The evolution of an e-book demand-driven acquisition programme at Swinburne University of Technology. *Insights the UKSG Journal*, 30(2), 36–46. DOI: 10.1629/uksg.354

Davy, T. (2007). E-textbooks: Opportunities, innovations, distractions and dilemmas. *Serials: The Journal for The Serials Community*, 20(2), 98-102. DOI: 10.1629/2098.

de Oliviera, S. M. (2012). E-textbooks usage by students at Andrews University: A study of attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors. *Library Management*, 33(8-9), 536–560. DOI: 10.1108/01435121211279894

Dolnicar, S., & Lazarevski, K. (2009). Marketing in non-profit organizations: an international perspective. *International Marketing Review*, 26(3), 275–291. DOI: 10.1108/02651330910960780

Durant, D. M., & Horava, T. (2015). The Future of Reading and Academic Libraries. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 15(1), 5–27. DOI: 10.1353/pla.2015.0013

Eschenfelder, K. R. (2008). Every Library's Nightmare? Digital Rights Management, Use Restrictions, and Licensed Scholarly Digital Resources. *College & Research Libraries*, 69(3), 205–225. DOI: 10.5860/crl.69.3.205

Evans, G. E., & Saponaro, M. Z. (2005). *Developing library and information center collections* (5th ed.). Libraries Unlimited.

Fisher, E. S., Kurt, L., & Gardner, S. (2012). Exploring Patron-Driven Access Models for E-journals and E-books. *The Serials Librarian*, 62(1-4), 164–168. DOI: 10.1080/0361526X.2012.652913

Foasberg, N. M. (2014). Student Reading Practices in Print and Electronic Media. *College & Research Libraries*, 75(5), 705–723. DOI: 10.5860/crl.75.5.705

Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning. (2002). Research Council.

Frederick, D. E. (2020). Scholarly communications, predatory publishers and publish or perish culture in the 2020s. *Library Hi Tech News*, 37(5), 1-11. DOI: 10.1108/LHTN-01-2020-0007

Good Research Practice. (2017). Swedish Research Council.

Hui, A., Schatzki, T. R., & Shove, E. (2017). Introduction. In A. Hui, T. R. Schatzki & E. Shove (Eds.). In A. Hui, T. Schatzki, & Shove, E. (Eds.), *The nexus of practices: Connections, constellations, practitioners* (pp. 98-113). Routledge.

Iphofen, R. (2009). *Ethical decision-making in social research: a practical guide*. Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1057/9780230233768

Islam, Md. S., & Islam, Md. N. (2009). Marketing of library and information products and services: A theoretical analysis. *Business Information Review*, 26(2), 123–132. DOI: 10.1177/0266382109104414

- Jain, P. (2014). Application of social media in marketing library & information services: A global perspective. *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection*, 2(2), 62-75.
- Jamali, H. R., Nicholas, D., & Rowlands, I. (2009). Scholarly e-books: the views of 16,000 academics: Results from the JISC National E-Book Observatory. *Aslib Proceedings*, 61(1), 33–47.
DOI: 10.1108/00012530910932276
- Jeong, H. (2012). A comparison of the influence of electronic books and paper books on reading comprehension, eye fatigue, and perception. *Electronic Library*, 30(3), 390–408. DOI: 10.1108/02640471211241663
- Johnson, P. (2018). *Fundamentals of collection development and management* (4th ed.). ALA.
- Kaushik, A. (2016). Use of Social Networking Sites Tools and Services by LIS Professionals for Libraries: A Survey. *DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology*, 36(5), 284-290. DOI: 10.14429/djlit.36.5.10283
- Kaur, K. (2009). Marketing the academic library on the web. *Library Management*, 30(6/7), 454–468. DOI: 10.1108/01435120910982140
- Kennedy, M. (2011). What are we really doing to market electronic resources? *Library Management*, 32(3), 144–158.
DOI: 10.1108/01435121111112862
- Ketron, S., & Naletelich, K. (2016). How e-readers have changed personal connections with books. *Qualitative Market Research*, 19(4), 433–452.
DOI: 10.1108/QMR-10-2015-0078
- Kont, K.-R. (2020). To buy or to borrow? Evaluating the cost of an eBook in TalTech library. *The Bottom Line (New York, N.Y.)*, 33(1), 74–93.
DOI: 10.1108/BL-07-2019-0100
- Kotler, P. (1979). Strategies for Introducing Marketing into Nonprofit Organizations. *Journal of Marketing*, 43(1), 37–44. DOI: 10.2307/1250756
- Kvale, S., Brinkmann, S., & Torhell, S.-E. (2014). *Den kvalitative forskningsintervjun* (3rd ed.). Studentlitteratur.
- Kwan, Y. K. C., Chan, M. W., & Chiu, D. K. W. (2023). Youth marketing development of special libraries in the digital era: viewpoint from the Taste Library with 7Ps marketing mix. *Library Hi Tech*. Advance online publication.
DOI: 10.1108/LHT-03-2023-0129
- Kwok, C. S. Y., Chan, D. L. H., Cheung, A. S.M., & Kan Wong, M. (2014). Demand-driven acquisition at HKUST library: the new normal. *Interlending & Document Supply*, 42(4), 153–158. DOI: 10.1108/ILDS-09-2014-0046

- Lamani, M. B., Patil, R. R., & Kumbar, D. B. D. (2018). Open Access E-books in Social Science: A Case Study of Directory of Open Access Books. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 38(2), 141-144. DOI: 10.14429/djlit.38.2.10890
- Landoni, M. (2003). Electronic books. In J. Feather & P. Sturges (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Information and Library Science* (2nd ed., pp. 168-171). Routledge.
- Lee, S. D., & Boyle, F. (2004). *Building an electronic resource collection : a practical guide* (2nd ed.). Facet.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Loan, F. A. (2011). Open access e-book collection on Central Asia in selected digital archives. *Collection Building*, 30(3), 126–130. DOI: 10.1108/01604951111146965
- Loan, F. A., & Refhat-Un-Nisa, R.-U.-N. (2015). Open access e-books in science and technology: A case study of directory of open access books. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 35(4), 304–309. DOI: 10.14429/djlit.35.4.8494
- Lonsdale, R., & Armstrong, C. (2010). Promoting your e-books: lessons from the UK JISC National e-Book Observatory. *Program : Electronic Library and Information Systems*, 44(3), 185–206. DOI: 10.1108/00330331011064212
- Maceviciute, E., Borg, M., Kuzminiene, R., & Konrad, K. (2014). The acquisition of e-books in the libraries of the Swedish higher education institutions. *Information Research*, 19(2), paper 620. <https://informationr.net/ir/19-2/paper620.html>
- Maceviciute, E., Wilson, T., Gudiniavičius, A., & Šuminas, A. (2017). E-books in academic libraries: results of a survey carried out in Sweden and Lithuania. *Information Research*, 22(3), paper 762. <https://informationr.net/ir/22-3/paper762.html>
- Mangen, A., Walgermo, B. R., & Brønnick, K. (2013). Reading linear texts on paper versus computer screen: Effects on reading comprehension. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 58, 61–68. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijer.2012.12.002
- Mannocci, A., Baglioni, M., & Manghi, P. (2022). “Knock Knock! Who’s There?” A Study on Scholarly Repositories’ Availability. *Linking Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries*, 306-312. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-16802-4_26
- Martin, K. E., & Mundle, K. (2010). Notes on Operations Cataloging E-Books and Vendor Records: A Case Study at the University of Illinois at Chicago. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 54(4), 227–237. DOI: 10.5860/lrts.54n4.227

- Millar, S. & Schrier, T. (2015). Digital or Printed Textbooks: Which do Students Prefer and Why? *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 15(2), 166–185. DOI: 10.1080/15313220.2015.1026474
- Mizrachi, D. (2015). Undergraduates' Academic Reading Format Preferences and Behaviors. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41(3), 301–311. DOI: 10.1016/j.acalib.2015.03.009
- Muhammad, A., & Zhiwei, T. (2021). Social media and library marketing. *Library Hi Tech News*, 38(10), 10–13. DOI: 10.1108/LHTN-09-2021-0056
- Muir, L.J., Veale, T. & Nichol, A. (2009). Like an open book? Accessibility of e-book content for academic study in a diverse student population. *Library and information research*, 33(105), 90-119. DOI: 10.29173/lirg157
- Mulholland, E. & Bates, J. (2014). Use and Perceptions of E-books by Academic Staff in Further Education. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(5), 492–499. DOI: 10.1016/j.acalib.2014.05.018
- Neylon, C., Montgomery, L., Ozaygen, A., Saunders, N., & Pinter, F. (2018). *The Visibility of Open Access Monographs in a European Context: Full Report*. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1230342
- Nicolini, D. (2012). *Practice theory, work, and organization: an introduction* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Nicolini, D. (2017). Is small the only beautiful? Making sense of 'large phenomena' from a practice-based perspective. In A. Hui, T. Schatzki, & E. Shove (Eds.), *The nexus of practices: Connections, constellations, practitioners* (pp. 98-113). Routledge.
- NISO (2005). *Information Services & Use: Metrics & Statistics for Libraries and Information Providers: Data Dictionary*. National Information Standards Organization.
- Ojiambo, J. B. (1994). Application of Marketing Principles and Techniques to Libraries and Information Centres. *Library Review (Glasgow)*, 43(2), 46–51. DOI: 10.1108/00242539410053886
- Osborne, R. (2015). Open Access Publishing, academic research and scholarly communication. *Online Information Review*, 39(5), 637-648. DOI: 10.1108/OIR-03-2015-0083
- Pálsdóttir, Á. (2019). Advantages and disadvantages of printed and electronic study material: perspectives of university students. *Information Research*, 24(2). <https://www.informationr.net/ir/24-2/paper828.html>
- Pinfield, S. (2015). Making Open Access work. *Online Information Review*, 39(5), 604-636. DOI: 10.1108/OIR-05-2015-0167

- Polanka, S. (2011). *No shelf required : e-books in libraries*. American Library Association.
- Poortman, C.L., & Schildkamp, K. (2012). Alternative quality standards in qualitative research? *Quality & Quantity*, 46(6), 1727-1751. DOI: 10.1007/s11135-011-9555-5
- Proctor, J. (2015). Demand-driven acquisition and the sunk cost model. *Collection Building*, 34(1), 2-5. DOI: 10.1108/CB-06-2014-0033
- Rao, K. N., Kumar, S., & Tripathi, M. (2018). E-book and print book price and desirability for university libraries: a comparative study. *Electronic Library*, 36(1), 82–102. DOI: 10.1108/EL-06-2016-0142
- Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2), 243–263. DOI: 10.1177/13684310222225432
- Reckwitz, A. (2017). Practices and their affects. In A. Hui, T. Schatzki, & E. Shove (Eds.), *The nexus of practices: Connections, constellations, practitioners* (pp. 114–125). Routledge.
- Reitz, J. M. (2004). *Dictionary for Library and Information Science*. Libraries Unlimited.
- Ross-Hellauer, T., Reichmann, S., Cole, N. L., Fessl, A., Klebel, T., & Pontika, N. (2022). Dynamics of cumulative advantage and threats to equity in open science: a scoping review. *Royal Society Open Science*, 9(1), 211032-211032. DOI: 10.1098/rsos.211032
- Rossmann, D., Foster, A., & Babbitt, E. P. (2009). E-book MARC records: Do they make the mark? *Serials*, 2(3), 46–50. DOI: 10.1629/22S46
- Rowlands, I., Nicholas, D., Jamali, H. R., & Huntington, P. (2007). What do faculty and students really think about e-books? *Aslib Proceedings*, 59(6), 489–511. DOI: 10.1108/00012530710839588
- Schatzki, T. R. (1996). *Social practices : a Wittgensteinian approach to human activity and the social*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schatzki, T. R. (2002). *The site of the social : a philosophical account of the constitution of social life and change*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Schatzki, T. R. (2005). Peripheral Vision: The Sites of Organizations. *Organization Studies*, 26(3), 465–484. DOI: 10.1177/0170840605050876
- Schroeder, R., & Boughan, R. (2018). Doing More with Less: Adoption of a Comprehensive E-book Acquisition Strategy to Increase Return on Investment while Containing Costs. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 62(1), 28–36. DOI: 10.5860/lrts.62n1.28

- Secker, J. (2004). *Electronic Resources in the Virtual Learning Environment: A Guide for Librarians*. Chandos Publishing.
- Shelburne, W. A. (2009). E-book usage in an academic library: User attitudes and behaviors. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 33(2), 59–72. DOI: 10.1016/j.lcats.2009.04.002
- Silverman, D. (2022). *Doing qualitative research* (6th ed.). Sage.
- Singer, L. M. & Alexander, P. A. (2017). Reading Across Mediums: Effects of Reading Digital and Print Texts on Comprehension and Calibration. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 85(1), 155–172.
DOI: 10.1080/00220973.2016.1143794
- Soanes, C. & Stevenson, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, (11th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Su, S.-F. (2022). Exploring students' attitudes toward university e-textbooks: Experiences, expectations, and preferences. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 54(3), 331–349. DOI: 10.1177/09610006211020096
- Subba Rao, S. (2001). Familiarization of electronic books. *Electronic Library*, 19(4), 247–256. DOI: 10.1108/02640470110402045
- Swan, A. (2006). The culture of open access: researchers' views and responses. In N. Jacobs (Ed.), *Open Access: Key Strategic, Technical and Economic Aspects* (pp. 63-73). Chandos Publishing.
- Tedd, L. A. (2005). E-books in academic libraries: An international overview. *The New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 11(1), 57–79.
DOI: 10.1080/13614530500417701
- Tedd, L. A., & Carin, W. (2012). Selection and acquisition of e-books in Irish institutes of technology libraries: A study. *Aslib Proceedings*, 64(3), 274–288.
DOI: 10.1108/00012531211244590
- Tran, C. Y., & Guo, J. X. (2021). Developing user-centered collections at a research library: An Evidence-Based Acquisition (EBA) pilot in STEM. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47(5), 102434-102434.
DOI: 10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102434
- Turgut, Y. E., Aslan, A., & Denizalp, N. V. (2022). Academicians' awareness, attitude, and use of open access during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 54(3), 350–362.
DOI: 10.1177/09610006211016509
- Vasileiou, M., & Rowley, J. (2011). Marketing and promotion of e-books in academic libraries. *Journal of Documentation*, 67(4), 624–643.
DOI: 10.1108/00220411111145025

- Vasileiou, M., Hartley, R., & Rowley, J. (2012a). Choosing e-books: a perspective from academic libraries. *Online Information Review*, 36(1), 21–39. DOI: 10.1108/14684521211206944
- Vasileiou, M., Rowley, J., & Hartley, R. (2012b). The e-book management framework: The management of e-books in academic libraries and its challenges. *Library & Information Science Research*, 34(4), 282–291. DOI: 10.1016/j.lisr.2012.06.005
- Vassiliou, & Rowley, J. (2008). Progressing the definition of “e-book.” *Library Hi Tech*, 26(3), 355–368. DOI: 10.1108/07378830810903292
- Walters, W. H. (2013a). E-books in Academic Libraries: Challenges for Acquisition and Collection Management. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 13(2), 187–211. DOI: 10.1353/pla.2013.0012
- Walters, W. H. (2013b). E-books in Academic Libraries: Challenges for Discovery and Access. *Serials Review*, 39(2), 97–104. DOI: 10.1080/00987913.2013.10765501
- Walters, W. H. (2014). E-books in academic libraries: Challenges for sharing and use. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 46(2), 85–95. DOI: 10.1177/0961000612470279
- Watson, M. (2015). When will “open science” become simply “science”? *Genome Biology*, 16(1), 101-101. DOI: 10.1186/s13059-015-0669-2
- Welch, D., & Warde, A. (2017). How should we understand ‘general understandings’? In A. Hui, T. Schatzki, & E. Shove (Eds.), *The Nexus of Practices* (pp. 195–208). Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781315560816-21
- Wildemuth, B. M. (2017). *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science* (2nd ed.). Libraries Unlimited.
- Yilmaz, D., & Unal, Y. (2022). Evidence-Based Acquisition at Hacettepe University Libraries. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 66(3), 130-. DOI: 10.5860/lrts.66n3.130
- Young, P. (2012). A Survey of Batch Cataloging Practices and Problems. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 29(1), 22–41. DOI: 10.1080/07317131..624450

Appendix 1: Email sent for recruitment of the study's participants

Hej!

Mitt namn är Bert Kunzmann och jag studerar biblioteks- och informationsvetenskap på Högskolan i Borås, samtidigt jobbar jag som biblioteksassistent i Vimmerby kommun. Nu skriver jag min Masteruppsats och undrar om ni har möjlighet att delta i några intervjuer, det gäller främst personal som jobbar med e-böcker. Jag skriver uppsatsen om e-böcker inom akademiska bibliotek, och därför är jag intresserad hur högskolebiblioteken i Sverige jobbar med dessa frågor. Min handledare på Högskolan i Borås och jag kom överens att göra intervjuer som forskningsmetod.

Intervjuerna ska handla om hur biblioteket köper in e-böcker, om det finns särskilda policies, hur ser processen ut från ackquisition till distribution etc. Intervjuerna ska hållas tillsammans med bibliotekspersonalen som är insatt i området e-böcker. Intervjuerna ska vara omkring 30 minuter och kommer att hållas antingen på plats i Linköping eller via Zoom, och ska spelas in med diktafon. Sedan ska intervjuerna transkriberas och användas till analysen i uppsatsen. De ska hållas antingen på svenska eller engelska, eftersom jag skriver min uppsats på engelska.

Forskningsfrågor in den här uppsatsen är (på engelska):

RQ.01: How does the acquisition process of academic e-books work and what are selection criteria for e-books?

RQ.02: How do the libraries work with Digital Rights Management, Open Access and the promotion of e-books?

RQ.03: What are the differences regarding workflows and perceived advantages and disadvantages of e-books in contrast to printed books?

Om ni är intresserade kan jag skicka ett samtyckesformulär där ni kan skriva era namn och skriva under att ni vill delta i undersökningen (dvs. ett samtyckesformulär per person). Förstås är allt frivilligt och ni kan återkalla ert samtycke om ni inte längre vill delta. Om ni har frågor är ni välkomna att skicka ett mejl till s2105943@student.hb.se

Tack i förhand. Jag ser fram emot av att höra av er.

Med vänliga hälsningar

Bert Kunzmann

Appendix 2: Interview guide, English

- What is your position within the university library?
- Is there a policy/plan for the university regarding the purchase/acquisition of e-books?
- What are criteria/requirements for selection and acquisition of e-books?
- What acquisition models do you use at your library? (demand driven, evidence based etc.)?
- What are reasons for acquiring/purchasing e-books (motivation, goal)?
- If there is an electronic and print version of a title, which format does the library acquire first (e-book, print, or both)?
- How many ebooks do you purchase annually? What are corresponding subject areas (e.g. humanities, economy, computer sciences, etc.)?
- Is there a budget for e-books? Has the budget changed over the past 5-10 years?
- What languages are the e-books you acquire written in (English, Swedish, German etc.)?
- Do you work with Open Access (OA) at your library? Do you have OA e-books which are free to use for everybody (including people outside university)? Are there extra costs involved for the library?
- How does the library work with DRM (Digital Rights Management)? How does the process work? How do you work with licensing (one, three or unlimited users)?
- Can e-books be downloaded by users? Can they be downloaded a limited number of times? Is there a time limit (e.g. 30 days)?
- How do you promote e-books at the library? Do you have a policy or plan regarding promotion and marketing of e-books?
- How are e-books perceived by the librarians (in terms of reading behavior, effective studying etc.)?
- Is there a policy/plan regarding storage and sorting out e-books that are not necessary (i.e. *weeding*)?
- Preference digital over print or vice versa? [personal opinion]

Appendix 3: Interview guide, Swedish

- Vad är din position här på universitetsbiblioteket?
- Finns det en policy angående inköp/förvärv av e-böcker?
- Vilka kriterier finns det angående utval och förvärv av e-böcker?
- Vilka modeller finns det angående ackvirering/inköp av e-böcker (demand driven, evidence based osv.)?
- Vad finns det för skäl att köpa e-böcker (motivation, syfte)?
- Om det finns en elektronisk och en tryckt version av en bok, vilket format ska biblioteket köpa in först?
- Hur många e-böcker köper biblioteket årligen? I vilka områdena (t.ex. humaniora, ekonomi, datavetenskap osv.)?
- Finns det en budget till e-böcker? Har det ändrats under de senaste 5-10 åren?
- Vilka språk har e-böckerna som ni köper in (en, sv, ty osv.)?
- Finns det Open Access här på biblioteket? Finns det OA e-böcker, som alla kan använda oavsett om det är studenter, lärarna eller utomstående? Finns det extrakostnader för biblioteket?
- Hur jobbar biblioteket med DRM (Digital Rights Management)? Hur fungerar processen? Hur fungerar licenser (obegränsad eller begränsad till ett, tre eller obegränsad antal användare)?
- Kan e-böcker laddas ner? Är det begränsad angående antal nedladdningar och angående tidsintervall (t.ex. 30 dagar)?
- Hur marknadsför ni e-böcker på biblioteket? Finns det en plan eller policy angående marknadsföring av e-böcker?
- Hur uppfattas e-böcker av bibliotekarierna (ang. läsbeteende, effektiv inlärning osv.)?
- Finns det en policy eller plan angående förvaring och sortering av e-böcker som inte är nödvändiga/som inte läses (dvs. *gallring*)?
- Preferens e-böcker eller tryckta böcker? [personlig åsikt]

Appendix 4: Consent form



HÖGSKOLAN I BORÅS

Library and Information Science
Bert Kunzmann, student, S2105943

2023-09-20

Consent for the collection and processing of personal data

As part of the course Master Thesis 32LMU1 B16V3 VT2023 at the University of Borås, I am conducting a study with the purpose of analyzing and evaluating the role of e-books (regarding selection, acquisition, licensing, DRM, distribution etc.) at Swedish university libraries.

I who am conducting the study would like you to provide certain information about yourself, more specifically your name and answers to a semi-structured interview regarding your role at the library and your responsibilities concerning e-books.

The personal data will be used to evaluate and get a picture of the administrative processes university librarians face when working with electronic books and journals.

The University of Borås is the controller of the processing, and the legal basis for the processing is article 6.1 (a) in the General Data Protection Regulation, GDPR, (consent).

The personal data will be used by me and may be made available to the teachers of the current course and central administrators at the university. The data may also be public documents, which means that anyone as a general rule may access it in accordance with the principle of free access to public records.

The personal data will be stored in the EU/EEA, or countries outside the EU/EEA that the EU Commission has determined to have an adequate level of protection, i.e. sufficiently high according to the GDPR. The data will be erased when it is no longer necessary.

The results of the study will be presented in anonymised form, so that no data can be traced to you.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you consent to the processing of your personal data as described above, you may withdraw your consent at any time whereby we will stop using your personal data. Because of legal requirements we may however be prevented from immediately erasing your personal data.

I hereby consent that University of Borås may collect and process my personal data as described above.

Signature

Name in block letters

Place and date