

Assessing Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA) Adoption Among Malaysian Academic Libraries

Aliyu Olugbenga Yusuf

Federal University of Lafia, Nigeria

Email: alibabaomoba1@gmail.com

Noorhidawati Abdullah

University of Malaya, Malaysia

Email: noorhidawati@um.edu.my



This study aims to explore the adoption of the Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA) model among Malaysian academic libraries. The study ensues the continuous increase in the proportion and cost of information resources (electronic and print) coupled with the current dwindling budget crushing libraries worldwide. It adopts questionnaires to elicit responses from 111 purposively selected librarians, specifically from Malaysia's academic libraries' acquisition units. This study revealed that some Malaysian academic libraries practice the user-initiated collection acquisition model, with modifications from the Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA) practiced in the developed world. Malaysian academic libraries adopt the stand-alone user-initiated collection development model instead of integrating the model with either the library OPAC or publishers 'databases as practiced by other libraries. The user-driven acquisition model is productive considering resource usage, library budget justification, and high return on investment (ROI), according to Malaysian academic libraries.

Keywords: Paton Driven Acquisition (PDA); just-in case; just-in-time; academic libraries; budget; disruptive; user initiated collection.

INTRODUCTION

Technologies have transformed our societies and disrupted how individuals, groups and organizations (education, financial, transportation, etc.), including libraries, render services and perform other functions. Several libraries have integrated technologies into their activities, which have disordered previous traditional ways of providing services. Technology implementation has, however, led to improved service delivery by incorporating several other functionalities. Library functions and services, such as collection acquisition, are now tilting



towards user-initiated practice, by inculcating a “just-in-time” model rather than the earlier “just-in-case” collection acquisition model deficient in user engagement. The “Just-in-case” model is a resource acquisition procedure adopted by libraries. It enables librarians to populate their library collections based on perceived patrons’ need. In contrast, the “just-in-time” model permits unavailable titles to be immediately ordered and made available instantly to patrons using the user-driven model (Kont, 2015). Collection acquisition is undoubtedly an essential function of the libraries that deal with the procurement of relevant resources to meet library users’ needs.

Library literature in the 1990s concentrated on the “changing”, “evolving”, “restructuring”, “transition,” and “shifting” paradigms of collections, services, libraries and needed for well-suited human resources from the perspective of libraries (Ameen & Haider, 2007). Careful analysis of library collections revealed that the “just-in-case” collection procurement model had been perceived ineffective in serving the library users’ needs. The ineffectiveness has led to several developments and suggestions for patron inclusion (user engagement) in their library collection development process (Kont, 2015).

The integration of patrons in library collection development has been more effective than the librarian selected model in addressing library users’ needs (Kont, 2015). Libraries that have commenced users’ involvement in their collection purchasing decision have discovered a suitable and worthwhile model. Numerous libraries have adopted and executed it using funds set-aside by libraries to address patron requests through their “book on request” initiative. Hence, collection development should not be seen as an end to itself, but rather a means to an end. Malaysia’s academic libraries have also faced dwindling budget and collection development issues, hence require access to the impact of the evolving user-initiated model on the collection development justification and tactics.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Earlier libraries’ collection development practices are perceived to be built on speculations, which focused on the “just-in-case” collection procurement initiative (Gilbertson et al., 2014). The speculative procurement model was perceived to be effective due to the high reliance on a printed resource (McCaslin, 2013). However, for modern libraries to perfectly meet their users’ needs, it is essential to shift towards the user-initiated collection development model considering the improved technology and the myriad of information resources



available. Over the years, the collection acquisition process has been fixed, and libraries have searched for new methods to reduce costs and boost their holdings (Kont, 2015). Libraries have tried several collection acquisition techniques to suit their users' needs, institutional missions, and at the same time, match their limited available budget. However, the recent "just-in-time" model through user engagement in the collection acquisition process has been discovered to be rich and more effective (Walker & Arthur, 2018).

The practice of the "just-in-time" collection acquisition is traced to the 1990s Japanese automotive initiative ("Just-in-time" (JIT) and Vendor Managed Inventory (VMI)). The JIT and VMI were initiated due to the Japanese automobile industries' inability to stockpile large volumes of an automotive product due to limited available resources (Dewland & See, 2015). These initiatives thereby paved the way for collaborations and partnerships of automobile companies and suppliers to access and share each other's inventory simultaneously without barriers or difficulties. Just like the JIT and VMI in the Japanese automobile, the "just-in-time" form of user-initiated collection acquisition model also enables libraries to grant users unrestricted access to publishers' huge collections. Instead of the library purchasing all the available collections, they grant users access to decide appropriate titles from the collections. The "just-in-time" model has, consequently, been described as user-initiated collection acquisition.

Users initiated collection acquisition is a user-driven collection procurement model adopted by several libraries. It is an emerging user engagement and disruptive collection acquisition mode land has been described by various authors and researchers using numerous acronyms and terms. Authors of different studies (Cramer, 2013; Emery, 2012; Kwok et al., 2014; Levine-clark, 2010; Yusuf, Abdullah, & Zaidi, 2018) described the concept as Demand-Driven Acquisition (DDA), while some others (Jones, 2011b; Nixon & Saunders, 2010; Tyler et al., 2013) called the model Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA). Herrera and Greenwood (2011) labelled the model as Patron initiated purchase (PIP), while Nabe et al. (2011) termed it Purchase on demand (PoD). Some author (Jones, 2011a; Nabe et al., 2011; Nixon & Saunders, 2010) called the model Book on Demand (BoD) and other varied terms. For this study, the model is perceived as Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA).

Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA) model is an emerging model of user-driven purchase, just like the Pay-Per-View (PPV) model associated with electronic journal purchasing (Fulton, 2014). In the early era of the user-initiated model, libraries adopted Inter-library Loan (ILL) to initiate a purchase (Shen et al., 2011). Several

programs on the PDA implementation have employed the Inter-library loan to facilitate the process. The ILL driven PDA allows the librarian to carefully reflect on the possibility of purchasing a title suggested by the patron instead of borrowing such a title for the short term. The ILL PDA model has been experimented with, by libraries, and discovered to have reduced costs incurred on ILL (Allison, 2013).

The ILL PDA model allows libraries to procure titles after patrons make a request and the request met some pre-specified criteria as indicated by individual libraries. The title will then be ordered for purchase by librarians instead of borrowing such titles at a cost from a different library.

PDA Adoption Trends

Studies have shown how library resources acquired using the speculative model are not put to adequate usage (Tyler et al., 2014). Considering the justifications for PDA, several libraries especially academic libraries, have adopted and practiced the model. Some libraries adopted the model as an experiment to test the model while some adopted it partially and others fully adopted it (Yusuf et al., 2018). Several libraries that practiced the PDA model and implemented it include the Pennsylvania Access, which was an on-going project sponsored by the Pennsylvania Department of Education in conjunction with the commonwealth libraries. The initiative helps serve more than 3000 libraries using Net library as a vendor (Shen et al., 2011).

The Purdue University Library was among the early adopter of the PDA model and the library also implemented the model using inter-library loan initiatives (Nixon & Saunders, 2010). Hong Kong academic libraries similarly implemented the PDA model to pave the way for new electronic resources acquisition. Hong Kong libraries' motivation behind the implementation of PDA was to transform their earlier adopted e-book landscape. The purchase decision was shifted from the librarians to users to discover and initiate titles purchase, especially when the predetermined threshold is met (Kwok et al., 2014).

In 2005, the University of Mississippi Library executed its users' initiated model using the interlibrary loan based procurement initiative. The library adopted the "out of book" vendor (Alibris) for this purpose. The patron request using this model and it is then routed through the centralized fund and then requires the approval of subject librarians (Herrera & Greenwood, 2011). The model was only effective for supplementing monographic collection as a total of 100 titles were purchased for five years period using the model. In 2009, the library adopted the



PDA pilot program to procure titles and the process is driven by the ILL method routing through a designated queue.

A study by (Macicak & Schell, 2009) also describes how the University of Texas (UT) 2007 initiative to provide library users with cutting-edge technology and economic resources has been implemented using PDA. The model leads to enhanced tools discovery that aid users search for electronic books without library hand-holding. UT likewise adopted Ebook Library (EBL) to pilot its PDA as a vendor. Kent State University Library (KSUL) in 2012 similarly implemented the PDA model of collection acquisition as a pilot initiative to procure e-books. The library employed procurement activities provided by vendors such as book jobber, ebrary, and Yankee Book Peddler (YBP) (Urbano et al., 2015). KSUL applied this model for granting access to a predetermined set of e-books to authorized library users using the library catalogue as a means of book discovery. Title usage was tracked cumulatively using several measures and purchases are usually triggered when a title met a specific threshold.

Ohio State University Libraries implemented its PDA model called “purchase-on-demand” program in 2008. The adoption of PDA by Ohio State University Libraries led to several issues and debates regarding the patron-driven and the librarian initiated acquisition (McCaslin, 2013). It is noteworthy that bulks of electronic books from Wake Forest University were purchased using the PDA model. The library adopted the Ebook Library (EBL) as its vendor and acquired over 215 titles (Cramer, Daugman, & Hanson, 2014). Oregon State University Libraries (OSUL) similarly adopted the PDA model in the same year. Both OSUL and Ohio state University libraries referred to the model as Purchase-on demand (POD) (Hussong- Christian & Goergen-doll, 2010), and used inter-library loans as a means to guide their purchase.

Justification for PDA Implementation

The implementation of PDA by libraries raised debates and reservations from authors, librarians and researchers concerning users deciding what should or should not be procured by their libraries. Some lines of argument were that users are not qualified to determine what libraries procured or not. Cramer (2013) mentioned that demand for titles using PDA might exceed libraries' limited available budget. (2014) stated that allowing patrons to decide titles to be purchased will only cater to the library users' immediate needs rather than institutional needs. Similarly, (Levine-clark, 2010) examines PDA's impacts on scholarly publishing concerning



who purchases published titles on narrow subjects if libraries are selective on title procurement. In the opinion of (Dahl, 2012), Dahl concluded that whatever model of PDA adopted by libraries, it is essential to involve librarians to help shape such collections.

Similarly, libraries have demonstrated several rationales for their implementation of PDA. The model has enabled libraries to negotiate initial deposit and deliberate on specific content the library is interested in (Proctor, 2015) rather than flood the library collection with irrelevant titles. Studies on PDA have likewise confirmed that titles purchased using the PDA model have more access and usage than the librarian selected purchases (Kerby et al., 2015). Kont (2015) further mentioned that the PDA model does not only cater for requesting patrons' immediate needs; it has been relevant for future usage of other library users. Titles acquired through PDA have similarly been professed to have more circulation guaranteed and appealed to both library users and librarians.

With PDA, libraries and users have solved more problems and have been exposed to more opportunities and more titles that would otherwise not be possible. The PDA model allows libraries to pay only for titles used or on the contrary, not pay for what is not put to use (Cramer, 2013).

PDA Control among Practicing Libraries

Several academic libraries have encouraged PDA's implementation as a viable collection development practice as a proactive development responsibility with their users. However, libraries have employed several techniques in the form of precautions to safeguards their PDA model from misuse. The majority of libraries do not publicize their implementation of PDA to their patrons. This allows patrons to organically initiate only titles they really needed and not test the model by initiating titles they do not need. In the PDA model, the collections that appeared in the library catalogue for procurement are usually based on libraries' parameters. Some libraries set their criteria based on the library's approval plans, subjects, publishers, readership level, cost, and other criteria. Typically, profiles for PDA are made to be broader than a book-based approval program, as not every title could be procured (Dahl, 2012).

Purdue University Libraries specified their PDA procurement criteria to include scholarly English language title, non-fiction publications published within five years, and a price cap of \$100 (which was later increased to \$150). The items should also meet a stipulated one week shipment period to the library (Herrera

&Greenwood, 2011). The criteria for PDA purchase by the University of Wisconsin was also benchmarked to items within the scope of the library collections and within three years of publication.

Cunningham Memorial Library, Indiana, just like the Purdue university libraries, specified criteria for their PDA model to include items published in 2000 or later with a price cap of \$100 and purchases from Amazon, which was the vendor adopted by the library (Comer et al., 2005). Further exploration of purchased items by (Comer et al., 2005), revealed that titles purchased yielded the fastest turnaround time at 80% and circulated more than once after inclusion in the collections. The study conducted by (Chan, 2004) PDA initiated by the University of Hong Kong Libraries permits users to request only for titles that are available for loans overseas. The initiative was perceived as cheaper than borrowing and faster and has an acceptable cost use ratio.

Ohio State University Libraries also specify purchase criteria for its PDA model. The program initiates purchase of titles if they meet the specific price cap, publication date and other set criteria just like other libraries (McCaslin, 2013). East Carolina University's Joyner also adopted PDA and extended its collection to include theses and dissertations which seem uncommon among other libraries. The criteria for dissertations to be included for purchase includes: must be in English language, non-fiction and be delivered in a week of request and relevant to the library collections. The criteria initially included both postgraduate and undergraduate students but was later restricted to postgraduate students alone, perhaps due to a shortage of funds (Herrera & Greenwood, 2011). Control for PDA helped libraries effectively manage their fund against mismanagement due to ordering priority.

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection and Sample Characteristics

This study was triggered based on researchers' interaction with few acquisition librarians in some Malaysian academic libraries. The interaction was to understand the collection development strategy and state of user-initiated procurement in their libraries. This study thereby adopted the quantitative research method using a survey (questionnaire). The survey was distributed to 137 participants comprising the chief librarians, acquisition and liaison librarians across the participating libraries in fifteen (15) randomly selected academic libraries in Malaysia. This survey method was undertaken to enable wider reach of appropriate audience. Participants were likewise purposively selected to ensure appropriate

and critical analysis of the subject matter (Kinner & Crosetto, 2009). This was also to ensure that respondents were selected based on their job specifications and experiences in collection acquisition and development, which is the theme of this study.

The librarians were requested to respond to the questionnaires on their library's awareness and adoption of the user-initiated collection acquisition (PDA). The questionnaires were distributed to the librarians through a delegated librarian who served as an intermediary between the researchers and other librarians in the selected academic libraries.

The survey questionnaire consisted of 31 questions and the responses are based on seven (7) point likert scale. The majority of the respondents (129) returned the questionnaire and 18 was found unusable after screening due to incompleteness and no response to some questionnaire items.

RESULTS

Respondents Demographics

The participating librarians have varied educational qualifications ranging from bachelor to Ph.D. Degree. The study discovered that the libraries have more master's degree holders (56.8%), trailed by bachelor's degrees (38.7%). The study has only one Ph.D. degree holder (0.9%), while (1.8%) is with PGD. The analysis of respondents from the questionnaire is described in detail in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Respondent characteristics

Variable	Category	No of respondents	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	17	15.3
	Female	94	84.7
Age	27-31	14	12.6
	32-36	36	32.4
	37-41	34	30.6
	42-46	13	11.7
	47-51	6	5.4
	52-57	7	6.3
Years of experience	1-5	14	12.6
	6-10	44	39.6
	11-15	31	27.6
	16-20	13	11.7

Variable	Category	No of respondents	Percentage (%)
Highest Level of Education	21-25	5	4.5
	No response	4	3.6
	Bachelor	43	38.7
	Degree	2	1.8
	PGD	63	56.8
	Master	1	.9
	PhD	2	1.8
	No response		

DISCUSSION

The instrument (questionnaire) was measured using the Software Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to assess the items' internal consistency using the Cronbach Alpha score. Cronbach alpha is a measurement to determine the consistency of the survey instrument. The Cronbach alpha demonstrates the degree to which items in the survey instrument are related. It is considered a measure of scale reliability, and the result shows an alpha coefficient of 0.936 for awareness and 0.719 for adoption. The Cronbach alpha values exceed the minimum recommended value of 0.70. Studies have suggested reliability scores above 0.70 as good reliability scores (McIntire & Miller, 2007).

Table 2

Reliability of items

Dimension	Numbers of questions	Cronbach alpha score
Awareness	15	0.936
Adoption	16	0.719

The mean scores for awareness and PDA adoption were computed by averaging their respective raw scores and were used as reflective indicators of the construct to determine PDA adoption. Awareness in this study is measured using 15 questions, while adoption has 16 questions. Both awareness and adoption have sub-dimension used to determine them. Awareness is made of sub-dimensions such as knowledge with four (4) questions, the familiarity of librarians with PDA, measured with four (4) questions, librarians discoveries about PDA is measured using (4) questions and librarian evaluation of PDA model is measured with three (3) questions in the questionnaire. The adoption of the PDA model is also measured using rationale with three (3) items, stages of PDA adoption measured with five (5), level of implementation of PDA with (5) items and prospect for PDA adoption measured with three (3) items as its sub-dimension.

Table3

Mean and Standard deviation scores PDA Awareness

No	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation
<i>Knowledge</i>			
1	I am aware that Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA) is an acquisition model driven by users.	5.18	1.130
2	I am aware that Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA) helps libraries to build better collections	5.20	1.094
3	I am aware that Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA) allows users to have access to unlimited collections	4.83	1.159
4	I am aware that Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA) can set criteria to initiate or exclude item for purchase	5.01	0.968
<i>Familiarity</i>			
1	The library I work for is familiar with activities that trigger purchases in PDA model	5.01	1.247
2	The library I work for is familiar with using Inter Library Loan (ILL) request in PDA model	5.10	1.279
3	The library I work for is familiar with vendors policies in PDA model	4.89	1.209
4	The library I work for is familiar with Short Term Loan (STL) in PDA model	4.51	1.249
<i>Discovery</i>			
1	I agree that PDA is of great benefits to libraries	5.19	0.920
2	I agree that PDA is of great benefits to patrons	5.33	0.888
3	I agree that PDA enhances interdisciplinary research	5.24	1.089
4	I agree that PDA is an economically sustainable model	5.07	1.173
<i>Evaluation</i>			
1	The library I work for has appraises the possibilities of integrating library and vendors' catalogue in PDA model	4.77	1.059
2	The library I work for has appraises initial deposit for implementation in PDA model	4.53	1.143
3	The library I work for has appraises how library budget is justified in PDA model	4.66	1.100

The mean score and standard deviation for the dimensions applied in the measurement of librarians and their libraries level of awareness about PDA are displayed in the table below. The highest mean score for the knowledge sub-dimension is 5.24, while the lowest is 4.14. The mean score from knowledge as a

sub-dimension for awareness displays a fairly high librarian knowledge about the PDA model. For the familiarity sub-dimension, the highest mean score recorded is 5.10, followed by 5.01, while the least recorded mean is 4.51. The mean score for familiarity as a sub-dimension for awareness indicates that librarians have a relatively high understanding of the PDA model.

The Discovery sub-dimension recorded the highest mean of 5.33 and trailed by 5.24, while the lowest in the sub-dimension is 5.07. The recorded mean score for discovery demonstrates a high level of discovery activities by librarians as regards PDA. Evaluation as the final sub-dimension for awareness recorded the highest mean score of 4.77 and the lowest of 4.56. This indicates a moderate level of evaluation although the mean scores are bit lower compared to the sub-dimension.

Table 4

Mean and Standard deviation scores for PDA Adoption

No.	<i>Adoption of Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA)</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation
	<i>Present library operation</i>		
1	The library I work for uses OPAC to showcase its resources.	5.80	0.942
2	The library I work for uses vendor Interface to display resources.	4.27	1.495
3	The library I work for uses STL to initiate title purchase resources.	4.14	1.217
4	The library I work for uses patron request to acquire electronic resources.	4.84	1.290
	<i>justification</i>		
1	I acknowledged Patron participation as priorities for PDA adoption	5.17	1.008
2	I acknowledged high collection usage as priorities for PDA adoption	5.12	1.219
3	I acknowledged effective budget utilization as priorities for PDA adoption	5.08	1.207
4	I acknowledged enriched collections as priorities for PDA adoption	5.16	1.187
5	I acknowledged Patron Satisfaction as priorities for PDA adoption	5.40	1.064
	<i>Level of implementation</i>		
1	The library I work for has implemented the Auto purchase option	3.33	1.317
2	The library I work for has implemented the Short term loan (STL) option	3.69	1.333

No.	<i>Adoption of Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA)</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation
	<i>Level of implementation</i>		
3	The library I work for has implemented the Evidence based Acquisition (EBA) option	4.40	1.397
4	The library I work for implemented the Free title browse before Purchase option	4.74	1.248
5	The library I work for implemented the Simultaneous Users Access to title option	4.86	1.148
<i>Prospect</i>			
1	Library I work for will commence PDA model	5.71	2.117
2	library I work for has being using PDA model	1.62	1.133

CONCLUSIONS

Adoption was theorized to result from awareness and perceived benefit of the innovation which subsequently affects individual or organizational intention to adopt or not adopt such innovation. The assertion was tested using a survey questionnaire to confirm and explain libraries adoption of PDA model. Adopter of innovation (Rogers, 2003) can be divided into five categories: innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggard. The decision to adopt specific innovation is influenced by the individual knowledge (awareness) about the innovation regarding its functionality, usefulness, relative advantage, complexity, result demonstration, and host of other factors. This study discovered that return on investment (ROI), cost, integration with the existing acquisition model, usage statistic, functionalities and accessibilities influenced libraries to be ready to adopt the PDA model or not. The Knowledge of these factors leads to readiness, which subsequently leads to the adoption of the model. Considering the continuous fall in budget of libraries and the increase in the growth of information resources available, it is important for libraries to consider the integration of patron in their collection development process. Many libraries have tried and confirmed the Patron Driven Acquisition Model's viability, which makes it apparent that the model is worth trying. Libraries in the developing world are yet to implement the model entirely, it is, therefore, advisable for these libraries to explore and find out how the model is implemented in other libraries and give the model a trial. This will enable them to sow the seed of transformation brought by technology in the evolving resources acquisition model. The libraries also need to consider PDA's effectiveness in budget implementation and collection usage boost in their respective libraries.

REFERENCES

- Allison, D. A. (2013). Collaborative collections. *The Patron-Driven Library Collections*, 91–117. <https://doi.org/10.1533/B978-1-84334-736-1.50005-2>
- Ameen, K., & Haider, S. J. (2007). Evolving paradigm and challenges of collection management (CM) in university libraries of Pakistan. *Collection Building*, 26(2), 54–58. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01604950710742086>
- Chan, G. R. Y. C. (2004). Purchase instead of borrow: An international perspective. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserves*, 14(4), 23–37. https://doi.org/10.1300/J110v14n04_03
- Comer, A., Lorenzen, E. A., & Fenner, A. (2005). Biz of acq-is purchase-on-demand a worthy model? Do patrons really know what they want? *Against the Grain*, 17(1), 75–78. <https://doi.org/Article>
- Cramer, C., Daugman, E., & Hanson, E. (2014). Facing faculty fears about embracing the ebook: communication strategies for liaison librarians. *Serials Review*, 40(3), 197–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2014.949399>
- Cramer, C. J. (2013). All about demand-driven acquisition. *Serials Librarian*, 65(1), 87–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526x.2013.800631>
- Dahl, C. (2012). Primed for patron-driven acquisition: a look at the big picture. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, 24 (February 2015), 119–126. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1941126X.2012.684557>
- Dewland, J. C., & See, A. (2015). Notes on operations: Patron driven acquisitions: determining the metrics for success. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 59(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.5860/lrts.59n1.13>
- Emery, J. (2012). The demand driven acquisitions pilot project by the orbis cascade alliance: An interview with members of the demand driven acquisitions implementation team. *Serials Review*, 38(2), 132–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.serrev.2012.04.008>
- Fulton, K. J. (2014). The rise of patron-driven acquisitions : A literature review. *Georgia Library Quarterly*, 51(3), 22–31.
- Gilbertson, M., McKee, E. C., & Salisbury, L. (2014). Just in case or just in time? Outcomes of a 15-month patron-driven acquisition of e-books at the University of Arkansas libraries. *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services*, 38(1–2), 10–20.
- Herrera, G., & Greenwood, J. (2011). Patron-initiated purchasing: evaluating criteria and workflows. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserves*, 21(1/2), 9–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1072303X.2011.544602>



- Hussong- Christian, U., & Goergen-doll, K. (2010). We 're listening: Using patron feedback to assess and enhance purchase on demand.*Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserves*, 20(5), 319–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1072303X.2010.517420>
- Jones, D. (2011a). On-demand information delivery : Integration of patron-driven acquisition into a comprehensive information delivery system.*Journal of Library Administration*, 51(7–8), 764–764. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.601275>
- Jones, D. (2011b). On-demand information delivery: Integration of patron-driven acquisition into a comprehensive information delivery system. *Journal of Library Administration*, 51(February 2015), 764–776. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.601275>
- Kerby, E. E., Trei, K., Laskowski, M. S., Abbott, J. A. M., & Norman, M. A. (2015). Collection building minding the gap: Ebook package purchasing.*Collection Building*, 34(4), 113–118. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CB-06-2015-0008>
- Kinner, L., & Crosetto, A. (2009). Balancing act for the future : How the academic library engages in collection development at the local and consortial levels.*Journal of Library Administration*, 49(4), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930820902832561>
- Kont, K.-R. (2015). How to optimize the cost and time of the acquisitions process? *Collection Building*, 34(2), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CB-01-2015-0003>
- Kwok, C. S. ., Chan, D. L. H., Cheung, A. S. M., Wong, M. K., S.Y. Kwok, C., L.H. Chan, D., S.M. Cheung, A., & Kan Wong, M. (2014). Demand-driven acquisition at HKUST library: the new normal. *Interlending & Document Supply*, 42(4), 153–158. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ILDS-09-2014-0046>
- Levine-clark, M. (2010). Developing a multiformat demand-driven acquisition model.*Collection Management*, 35(3–4), 201–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2010.486965>
- Macicak, S., & Schell, L. E. (2009). Patron-driven, librarian-approved: a pay-per-view model for e-books. *Serials: The Journal for the Serials Community*, 22(3), S31–S38. <https://doi.org/10.1629/22S31>
- McCaslin, D. (2013). Collection building through patrons: caltech library's kindle program.*Collection Management*, 38(3), 172–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2013.792308>
- Nabe, J., Imre, A., & Mann, S. (2011). Let the patron drive: Purchase on demand of e-books.*The Serials Librarian*, 60(1–4), 193–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/>



0361526X.2011.556033

- Nixon, J. M., & Saunders, E. S. (2010). A study of circulation statistics of books on demand: A decade of patron-driven collection development, Part 3. *Collection Management*, 35(3–4), 151–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2010.486963>
- Proctor, J. (2015). Demand-driven acquisition and the sunk cost model. *Collection Building*, 34(1), 2–5. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CB-06-2014-0033>
- Rogers, E. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovation*. Free Press.
- Shen, L., Cassidy, E. D., Elmore, E., Griffin, G., Martinez, M., Turney, L. M., Shen, L., Cassidy, E. D., Elmore, E., Griffin, G., Martinez, M., Turney, L. M., Manolovitz, T., Martinez, M., Turney, L. M., Shen, L., Cassidy, E. D., Elmore, E., Griffin, G., ... Turney, L. M. (2011). Head first into the patron-driven acquisition pool: A comparison of librarian selections versus patron purchases versus patron purchases. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, 23(3), 203–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1941126X.2011.601224>
- Tyler, D. C., Falci, C., Melvin, J. C., Epp, M., & Kreps, A. M. (2013). Patron-driven acquisition and circulation at an academic library: Interaction effects and circulation performance of print books acquired via librarians' orders, approval plans, and patrons' interlibrary loan requests. *Collection Management*, 38(February 2015), 3–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01462679.2012.730494>
- Tyler, D. C., Melvin, J. C., Epp, M., & Kreps, A. M. (2014). Don't fear the reader: Librarian versus interlibrary loan patron-driven acquisition of print books at an academic library by relative collecting level and by library of congress classes and subclasses. *College & Research Libraries*, 75(5), 684–704. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.75.5.684>
- Urbano, C., Zhang, Y., Downey, K., & Klingler, T. (2015). Library catalog log analysis in e-book patron-driven acquisitions (pda): A case study. *College & Research Libraries*, 76(4), 412–426. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.76.4.412>
- Walker, K. W., & Arthur, M. A. (2018). Judging the Need for and Value of DDA in an Academic Research Library Setting. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 1, 2010.
- Yusuf, A. O., Abdullah, N., & Zaidi, A. I. (2018). Bibliometric study of trends in Demand Driven Acquisition Publications. *Research Hub*, 4(2), 29–39.