

Interlibrary Loan of E-books in U.S. Academic Libraries

Xiaohua Zhu

Assistant Professor, School of Information Sciences, University of Tennessee

Lan Shen

Assistant Professor of Library Science, Purdue University Calumet

Acknowledgements: Special thanks to Emily Griffey for administrating the survey, assisting with data analysis, and providing feedback on versions of this paper.

Abstract

Academic libraries in the U.S. have witnessed the impressive growth of acquiring e-journals and e-books. Although interlibrary loan (ILL) of e-journal articles has become a standard practice, ILL of copyrighted e-books does not appear to be equally common. E-book ILL is often considered difficult or nearly impossible because restrictions for ILL are embedded in license agreements (or terms of use) and reinforced by technological measures. This paper discusses the perceived barriers to e-book ILL and their reflections on academic libraries' ILL /lending policies. More specifically, this paper reports the findings of a survey of ILL/lending policies on e-journals and e-books in 200 academic libraries in the U.S. The findings show the state of e-books in U.S. academic libraries and demonstrate the slow adoption of e-book ILL compared to e-journals. This paper reveals important perceptions and facts about e-book ILL in academic libraries, analyzes the obstacles and restrictions on e-book ILL, and identifies lending models and standardized practice for e-book ILL to accommodate user's needs and maximize the use of e-book resources.

INTRODUCTION

Academic libraries in the U.S. are acquiring more e-books, indicated by the e-books growth of 41 percent from 2011 to 2012 and the representation of 9.6 percent of academic libraries' total acquisitions budgets (Enis, 2012). However, as the rapid growth of electronic resources is changing the whole picture of library collections, changes in the resource sharing model have not kept the same pace. Sharing materials between libraries was a common practice in the print age, exemplified by the established tradition of interlibrary loan (ILL) in American libraries. In the digital age, resource sharing is as important as in the past, but the ILL practice has been challenged by changes in the information environment, especially the licensing model and digital rights management mechanisms. Therefore, it is imperative to discover the challenges and opportunities of using e-book ILL and promote the efficiency of academic library material sharing in general and populate the usage of e-book ILL in particular.

This paper is an effort to address the current state of e-book ILL in U.S. academic libraries. It reveals important perceptions and facts about e-book ILL in 200 academic libraries through analyzing ILL/lending

policies on e-books and the major technical and legal barriers to e-book ILL. Meanwhile the paper identifies lending models and standardized practices for e-book ILL to accommodate user's needs and maximize the use of e-book resources.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The relationship between e-book collection and ILL has been discussed since 2000 when Jackson (2000) pointed out that ILL is often the “deal breaker” in license negotiations, and publishers and vendors usually leave libraries with the option to purchase e-book access to the content with no ILL privileges, or refrain from purchasing the content at all (p. 19). Lynch (2001) pessimistically believed that license issue made a deadlock to e-book uses through ILL. Those opinions were supported by Garrod (2004) who argued that the single factor affecting e-book ILL “is publishers’ fear regarding unlicensed access to copyright materials” (p. 228). It seems that library scholars have agreed early on that the license restrictions created by publisher/vendor is the major factor affecting the practice of e-book ILL.

Consensus

A survey of the literature shows a consensus on the importance of e-book ILL in the digital age. Scholars believe that ILL service demonstrates effective collaboration through sharing library materials between libraries to ensure a wider range of information available to users and is still valuable in the current information environment (Farkas, 2011). In particular, in light of the trend that an increasing amount of material is being created digitally and the limited capacity of individual library collections becomes evident, providing effective interlibrary e-book service is vital (Woods and Ireland, 2008). As one study shows, the deficiencies in the library's electronic collection have a negative outcome on sharing information with patrons. Patrons appreciate ILL services that include electronic resources (McClanahan, et al., 2010). Another survey indicates that the majority of the respondents (59%), including both librarians and patrons, are somewhat to very concerned about ILL in the context of e-books (McKiel, 2007, p. 7). Scholars also agree that reducing costs is an obvious advantage for borrowing/lending library e-books as it can eliminate

the cost associated with print book scanning or photocopying, handling and shipping (Garrod, 2004; Woods and Ireland, 2008).

Obstacles in E-book ILL

In an attempt to summarize the discussions in the literature on e-book ILL, we categorize scholars' views into: the pessimistic and the optimistic perspective. Generally speaking, the pessimistic view focuses on the objective challenges and obstacles of populating e-book ILL, addressing the external factors and internal ILL models which are not controlled by librarian/staff. By contrast, the optimistic perspective insists on its possibility and feasibility if libraries and librarians could make proactive and innovative efforts.

Scholars holding the pessimistic view argue that "e-books continue to present a challenge for libraries in a way not encountered with the dissemination of electronic journals. Even in the scholarly community, for which e-books are well suited, acceptance is slow for a variety of reasons, such as access, standards, usability, TPMs and affordability (Woods and Ireland, 2008, 106). Furthermore, in Fracas's (2011) view, with the growth of the e-book market, librarians need to be subject-matter experts and "savvy about a variety of technological, legal and business issues surrounding e-books" (p. 24).

Many researchers have questioned the possibility of e-book ILL because license issue is essentially discouraging libraries to conduct and expand e-book ILL, thus, it "ultimately defeats the purpose of resource sharing for occasional needs when ownership or licensing is prohibitive for the borrower" (Woods and Ireland, 2008, 107). Other scholars expressed similar concerns that many e-books providers impose an outright ban on ILL, greatly restrict the amount of material that can be used, and restrict the ways in which it can be delivered (Connaway and Wicht, 2007; Hodges et al., 2010; Minčić-Obradović, 2011; Morris and Sibert, 2011; Nabe et al., 2011). These restrictions on sharing and using e-books often impinge on the fundamental mechanisms by which libraries make information available to patrons and "the limitations imposed by vendors negate the advantages that e-books might otherwise provide" (Walters, 2013, 6).

Besides, some argued that dealing with license issues is beyond librarians' capability and responsibility. For instance, as Lynch (2001) stated, libraries can do little aside from following the licensing

rules outlined by publishers. Indeed, ILL e-book "requires both negotiated license conditions and a technical capability that many libraries do not have access to" (IFLA, 2012, 9-10). As Wicht (2011) explained, it is quite understandable for publishers and vendors to limit use of e-books through license protection because "allowing ILL in this format would facilitate unlimited sharing of the digital copy and discourage libraries from purchasing their own copies, negatively impacting revenue" (p. 205).

Another pessimistic approach emphasizes the difficulty in processing e-books through the ILL system. For instance, some publishers allow libraries to fill e-book ILL requests at chapter-level, some vendors allow chapters for ILL only if the pages are first printed, then scanned and faxed or emailed, it makes the process of providing more than one chapter laborious and time consuming (Wicht, 2011, 207; Walters, 2013, 6). Although some libraries and/or consortia have created solutions such as a digital drop-box to expedite processing of Springer e-books, it still takes time for ILL staff to learn these new procedures and to understand if and how different e-books can be used for ILL (Wicht, 2011, 206).

Furthermore, some scholars concentrate on the conflicts between e-books and traditional ILL models. For example, e-book loaning is different from the standard licensing or purchase models for e-books because as a unique system it is "more suited to the temporary and virtual needs of libraries and their users than the available standard licensing and purchase business models" (Rice, 2006, 28). Likewise, Woods and Ireland (2008) state that librarians "have struggled with the dilemma of where e-books fit in the traditional ILL model" (p. 107).

The Optimistic View

By contrast, the optimistic scholars indicate that because local license agreements for electronic content have possible opportunities for negotiation, interlibrary loan librarians may make proactive efforts to solve the license restrictions. Algenio and Thompson-Young (2005) argue that although e-book business models and license issues could be "ugly realities," they are doable (p. 112). Radnor and Shrauger (2012) discovered that e-book licenses sometimes allow the loaning of e-book chapters or portions, although they are silent about loaning an entire e-book. Therefore, in their view, the knowledgeable librarians will be

capable of understanding how to "broaden the licensing terms to include, at a minimum, standard ILL terms for sharing portions of e-books and, if possible, securing rights to lend entire works" (p. 159).

One comment indicated optimistically that publishers are very interested in offering functionality "when it comes to the provision of resources to end-users, including ILL" (Galligan, 2012). What publishers need to do, as Ball and Rafael (2009) address, is to establish appropriate models in which the co-operative interlibrary loan system can make use of electronic media. The win-win models do exist that solve publishers' concern about unlimited multiple use of e-books (Ball & Rafael, 2009, 21). One scholar even advocates that it is necessary for libraries to conduct congressional lobby, "demanding better licensing rights from publishers as a condition of signing and encouraging open access e-book publishing" (Gee, 2007).

In some scholars' view, it is true that many licenses limit or prohibit the use of e-books in fulfillment of ILL requests, but librarians' irresponsible attitudes and unawareness have caused the situation to go from bad to worse. Radnor and Shrauger (2012) maintained that, in light of extra workflow, special handling, and additional staff time for processing, many ILL practitioners simply respond to e-book requests by claiming "ebooks are not available through ILL or to deflect all ILL requests for ebooks automatically" (p. 156). In addition, many librarians are not aware of the e-book license permissions provided by certain databases. Simply put, librarians' awareness is one of key obstacles to expanding e-book interlibrary loan. Many librarians decline to process any e-book requests through ILL due to lack of awareness and knowledge.

Substitutes for E-book ILL

After introducing a pay-per-view model designed to provide temporary rental access for e-books, McKiel (2007) is optimistic about e-books not licensed by libraries. His study demonstrates that a pay-per-view model may eventually replace the traditional ILL. "Everything" could become available theoretically if "librarians could reach beyond the limited resources of their institutions to support research" (McKiel, 2007, 7). Similarly, Watson mentions that since 2003 Ebook Library (EBL) has offered a form of short-term loan to subscribers of its platform and launched a set of short-term licensing options for libraries (Watson, 2004). Meanwhile, indicated by Galligan (2012), Mylibrary announced a partnership with OCLC in 2011. Through

this partnership, they had approved a selection of 30,000 e-book titles that would be available for short term loan access at a lending library. This reveals that publishers are making serious efforts to reach the balance between preserving intellectual property and maximizing sales (Galligan, 2012).

In addition to the short-term purchase models, scholars are also inspired by the consortium level purchasing models, such as the Demand-driven Acquisition (DDA) or Patron-driven Acquisition (PDA) (Levine-Clark, 2011). These models have been implemented by the 37 libraries of the Orbis Cascade Alliance (OCA). In 2009, the OCA started investigating ways to share e-books across their consortium and initiated a DDA pilot project in 2011 using the vendors EBL and YBP (McElroy & Hinken, 2011). As a result, "thresholds for purchasing were established based on use of the e-book, such as free browsing, paying a percentage of the purchase price for a short-term loan, and purchasing the e-book for the consortium" (Elliott, 2012).

Ultimately, given that both pessimistic and optimistic perspectives cover three main subjects-- including licensing, ILL models, and librarians' awareness and responsibilities--it is vital to conduct empirical studies designed to investigate academic libraries' practice in dealing with e-book requests through interlibrary loan. After all, perceptions and interpretations should be based on up to date, comprehensive, and measurable data.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Research Questions

The literature review reveals a few interesting points for further investigation. First, licensing is a commonly perceived obstacle to e-book ILL. Second, not all e-book licenses prohibit ILL—some licenses (e.g., Springer) do allow ILL, but many librarians are not aware of them. Third, technical problems (the actual ILL transactions) are also a commonly perceived obstacle. Fourth, some scholars are proposing alternatives, such as short term loan model and patron driven acquisition model to replace ILL. Based on these points in the literature, we designed a survey, aiming to answer the following questions from the self-reported, empirical data:

RQ1: Is e-book ILL a common practice in the U.S. academic libraries or not?

RQ2: If not, what are the perceived obstacles?

RQ3: Are ILL librarians aware that some licenses do allow e-book ILL?

RQ4: If ILL is not practiced, has PPV or PDA become a common substitute to ILL?

RQ5: Is e-journal ILL more widely practiced than e-book ILL?

Sampling

In this study, the sampling was based on the “Academic Libraries Survey: Public Use Data File: Fiscal Year 2010” data files from the Library Statistics Program established by the National Center for Education Statistics (2011). This data file contains survey data on 4,076 academic libraries in the U.S. with regard to their collections, expenditures, services, and staffing issues (Phan et al., 2011). One of the services covered in the data file is the amount of ILL transactions, including the total amounts of ILL provided by each library for returnable materials and non-returnable materials, separately; the total amounts of ILL received by each library for returnable materials and non-returnable materials, separately; and some other related data.

Because the purpose of the study is to investigate the e-book ILL activities, we intended to limit the sample space to academic libraries that have ILL activities and at least some electronic ILL transactions. The data set does not contain data on e-journal or e-book ILL, but the category on “non-returnable” materials arguably includes such activities. Therefore, we first selected, from the 4,076 libraries, libraries that have over 50 ILL transactions of non-returnable materials, which rendered the sample space to 1,504 academic libraries. We then randomly selected 200 libraries as the samples in this study. This sampling procedure ensured that we would get samples that have ILL activity and also ensured that we would not sample too many small academic libraries that did not deal with electronic transactions.

Survey Administration

Based on the research questions, the researchers designed a survey instrument and tested it on a few randomly selected libraries to improve the instrument. After several revisions, the instrument (Appendix A)

was finalized, including five major questions and one or more follow-up questions for each major question. The researchers also developed detailed instructions for survey administrators. The survey administrators first collected information from the internet, including URLs to the ILL department of each library, ILL policy on e-books if available, and telephone numbers to call the ILL librarian in each library. From July 15th to August 1st, the survey administrators called each library to conduct the survey. Results were first written on paper and then entered into a spreadsheet immediately after each telephone survey. A total of 162 telephone surveys were conducted at the end of the survey period, which rendered a response rate of 81%. Among the 38 libraries that did not respond to the survey, seven of them refused to answer the questions because of various reasons (ranging from being busy to confidentiality concerns), and 31 of them could not be reached by phone. Due to the timeframe of the survey, some libraries were closed or had limited hours. When reaching an answering machine, the survey administrators made two more attempts before giving up.

Tables 1 to 4 summarize the distribution of respondents across different categories. The respondents include 146 Baccalaureate-or-higher-degree institutions and 16 below-the-Baccalaureate institutions (Table 1); it includes 86 public institutions and 76 non-profit private institutions (Table 2). The full time equivalent (FTE) of the sample institutions ranges from 270 to 58,815 (Table 3). The expenditure of ILL ranges from 0 to 309,973 (Table 4). Table 5 presents the distribution of all sample institutions based on their total annual expenditure.

Level of Institution	Number of institutions	Percentage
Four or more years (Baccalaureate or higher degree)	146	90%
At least 2 but less than 4 years (below the Baccalaureate)	16	10%
Less than 2 years (below Associate's degree)	0	0%

Table 1: Distribution of sample based on level of institution

Type of Institution	Number of institutions	Percentage
Public institutions	86	53%
Private, non-profit, institutions	76	47%
Private, for-profit, institutions	0	0%

Table 2: Distribution of sample based on type of institution

FTE Number	Number of	Percentage
-------------------	------------------	-------------------

	institutions	
Less than 1,000	17	10.5%
1,000 to 2,999	42	26%
3,000 to 4,999	17	10.5%
5,000 to 9,999	34	21%
10,000 to 19,999	23	14%
20,000 or more	29	18%
Range of student enrollment	270- 58,815	/
Average student enrollment	10,009	/

Table 3: Distribution of sample based on FTE

ILL Expenditure	Number of institutions	Percentage
Less than 5,000	73	45%
5,000 to 29,999	46	28%
30,000 to 59,999	18	11%
60,000 or more	25	15%
loan Range of expenditures for document deliver/interlibrary	0- 309,973	/
loan Average expenditures for document deliver/interlibrary	30,009	/

Table 4: Distribution of sample based on ILL expenditure

Total Annual Expenditure	Number of institutions	Percentage
Less than \$499,999	20	12.3%
\$500,000 to \$1,999,999	51	31.5%
\$2,000,000 to \$4,999,999	46	28.4%
\$5,000,000 or more	18	11.1%
Data not available	27	16.7%

Table 5: Distribution of sample based on total expenditure

FINDINGS

E-book ILL Policy Statement

Among the 200 academic libraries, only five of them have e-book related ILL policies, while 195 libraries do not specify their ILL policy regarding e-books. All five libraries that have e-book ILL policies clearly state that e-books are excluded from materials that can be loaned. Although specific reasons are not given, some policies do imply that this is due to the terms of use for certain e-resources.

E-journal ILL

Although we have tried to limit the sample spaces to libraries that do provide at least some e-resource ILL, 27 libraries surveyed do not provide e-journal ILL (Table 6). Some of the comments raised by respondents are summarized in Table 7. Nine respondents stated that they simply did not lend electronic items. Seven of them mentioned licensing issues as the reason. Among libraries that do allow e-journal ILL, a majority of them mentioned that they allowed e-journal ILL as long as the licenses permitted ILL. Many of the respondents mention that e-journal articles must be printed before lending through ILL, which is a common practice with e-journal ILL. A few respondents stated that they only allowed lending e-journal articles if the print version was owned as well.

Answer	Number of Responses	Percentage
Yes	135	83%
No	27	17%
Total	162	100%

Table 6: E-journal ILL provision

Type of Answer	Type of Comment	Number of Times Mentioned
Yes	As long as licensing with vendor/database allows	67
Yes	Licensing agreements state that e-journal articles must be printed before lending through ILL	7
Yes	Only allowed to lend e-journal articles if the print version is owned as well	4
No	Do not have the necessary licensing to lend e-journal articles through ILL	7
No	Do not lend electronic items	9
Total number of comments		94

Table 7: Respondents' comments on e-journal ILL provision

E-books ILL—Whole Book

When asked whether their libraries would provide ILL for whole e-books when they receive such requests, a majority of the respondents answered no (Table 8). Table 9 summarizes the typical reasons for rejection. Some respondents mentioned multiple reasons. Not surprisingly, license issues came up most frequently—104 respondents mentioned the license restriction on ILL as a major obstacle. Technical

problems, such as lacking the means to perform e-book ILL transactions and the inability to download the whole e-book, were mentioned frequently. 25 respondents simply stated that this was their policy. For a few libraries, e-books were too new or too few for them to consider the ILL issue.

Six respondents provided more specific answers than a simple “no” - only Springer e-books can be loaned. However, one of them mentioned that loaning Springer books is very time consuming because chapters must be downloaded individually. Two respondents said they were unsure how to respond to whole e-book request. Two of the respondents answered yes to this question. One of them mentioned that the library only had a few e-books, and if license allowed, they would accept the whole-book ILL request. The other “yes” came from a medical library. The respondent said that they would accept such ILL request and send the e-book through DOCLINE, an ILL system developed by the National Library of Medicine.

Answer	Number of Responses	Percentage
Yes	2	1%
No	152	94%
Can only lend Springer e-books through ILL	6	4%
Unsure how to respond to a whole e-book request	2	1%
Total	162	100%

Table 8: Whole e-books ILL

Reason for Rejection	Number of Times Mentioned
License problem	104
Technical problem	49
Policy	25
Have very few/no e-books within their collection	5
E-books too recently added to the collection	3

Table 9: Reasons for rejecting whole e-books ILL requests

E-book ILL—Chapters

When it comes to ILL e-book chapters, the answers changed dramatically from the last question.

Table 10 summarizes the answers with regard to accepting e-book chapter ILL. Table 11 summarizes the ILL

methods mentioned by respondents, and Table 12 summarizes various reasons for rejecting e-book chapter ILL requests.

Among all respondents, 54 respondents said they did not provide e-book ILL even for chapters only. A little over half of the respondents stated they did provide e-book chapter ILL, with five of them mentioning that the chapter(s) must be below a certain percentage of the book or page length. Eighteen respondents never receive e-book chapter requests - some mentioned that this was because their e-books were not listed in OCLC WorldCat. Six respondents replied that they were not sure how to handle such requests.

Answer	Number of Responses	Percentage
Yes	83	51%
No	54	33%
Never receive such requests	18	11%
Unsure	6	4%
Other	1	1%
Total	162	100%

Table 10: E-book chapter ILL provision

When asked how they handled the e-book chapter ILL, 77 of the 83 respondents that answered yes to the last question provided answers. Most of them (55) stated that the chapter(s) would be downloaded as a PDF file and sent electronically. A number of them (20) mentioned that the chapter(s) would be printed first, and then either scanned or mailed to the requesting institution. One respondent answered that they would provide a username/password to the requesting user, which expires after 5 logins. Another respondent answered that they would send a link of the chapter to the requesting user. It is not clear what kind of link the respondent was referring to.

ILL Method	Number of times mentioned
Chapter is downloaded as a PDF and sent electronically	55
Chapter is printed then either scanned or mailed	20
Other Library's user is provided a Username/Password that expires after 5 logins	1
A link to the e-book chapter is provided to the other library's user	1
No response	6
Total number of responses	83

Table 11: Methods of e-books chapters ILL

Some of the respondents who answered “no” to the question about e-book chapter ILL provided reasons (Table 12). Licensing issues were mentioned most frequently - 24 times, followed by library policy - 9 times. Specifically, three respondents mentioned that their libraries had it set to auto deflect e-book requests in OCLC, which caused both whole and chapter requests to automatically be rejected. Four respondents mentioned technical issues for rejecting e-book chapter ILL requests.

Reason	Number of times mentioned
Licensing does not allow e-book chapters to be loaned through ILL	24
Policy does not allow e-book chapters to be loaned through ILL	9
Unable to lend e-book chapters for technical reasons	4

Table 12: Reasons for rejecting e-book chapter ILL requests

E-book ILL Requests—Whole Book

The rest of this section summarizes the survey results for questions about e-book ILL requests, i.e., whether ILL librarians will send e-book ILL requests to other libraries. Table 13 shows the majority of respondents (67%) do not send whole e-book requests to other libraries, while nearly one third of the respondents do. Two librarians mentioned that they would send the request only if it were a Springer e-book. For this question and its sub questions (see Appendix), there are a range of different comments (Table 14).

Answer	Number of Responses	Percentage
Yes	52	32%
No	108	67%
Would only request a whole e-book if it were a Springer Book	2	1%
Total	162	100%

Table 13: E-book ILL request—whole book

Type of Comment	Number of times mentioned
Whole e-book requests are never accepted by other libraries	25
Would attempt to locate a print version before requesting a whole e-book	20
Library has never had a situation where only an e-book version is available, but	15

would attempt to request the e-book	
Other libraries sometimes accept whole e-book requests	6
Unsure if other libraries accept or reject their whole e-book requests	2
Other libraries within their consortium accept whole e-book requests	1
Would check other library's policies regarding e-books before sending a request	1

Table 14: Typical comments for whole-book ILL requests

For those who did not send whole e-book ILL requests to other libraries, we asked whether PDA would be initiated since no print version is available for ILL. Among the 108 respondents, similar amounts of respondents answered “yes” and “no” to this question (Table 15). The comments that they gave are summarized in Table 16.

Answer	Number of times mentioned
Yes	56
No	52
Total	108

Table 15: Whether PDA will be initiated if no print version is available for ILL

Type of Comment*	Number of times mentioned
Patrons must initiate purchase requests through a subject specialist or acquisitions	7
ILL passes on purchase requests to acquisitions	8
Requested e-books are purchased if...	
Requested by a faculty member	5
the price is reasonable	4
the budget allows	3
the item is a good fit within the collection	3
the item relates to or is for a class	2
the item is new	2
the item has good reviews	1
Would purchase a print copy of the requested item	4
Do not purchase individual e-books, all e-books within their collection are through a subscription package	3
Do not purchase e-books	3
Cannot purchase requested items due to budget problems	2
Would locate a similar item within the collection, rather than purchase	3

Table 16: Comments on PDA

E-book ILL Request—Chapters

The last question in our survey deals with the ILL requests of e-book chapters. The results (Table 17) show that, compared to whole e-book ILL, respondents are much more likely to send e-book chapter ILL requests to other libraries. This result also corresponds to the data on e-book chapter ILL provision—about 51% respondents do provide chapter ILL and 33% do not (11% never received such request). When asked whether other libraries accepted their requests if they did send out such requests, only a small amount of respondents (8 out of 110) stated that such requests are usually rejected (see Table 18 for more detailed summarization). Respondents who do not request e-book chapters from other libraries provided a wide range of reasons, as summarized in Table 19.

Answer	Number of Responses	Percentage
Yes	110	68%
No	47	29%
Sometimes	2	1%
Unsure	3	2%
Total	162	100%

Table 17: E-book ILL request—chapters

Type of Answer	Number of times mentioned
E-book chapter requests are often/usually accepted by other libraries	40
E-book chapter requests are sometimes accepted by other libraries	21
E-book chapter requests are accepted about 50% of the time	7
E-book chapter requests are usually rejected	8
Librarian was unsure how often e-book chapter requests are accepted	5
They have never had a patron request an e-book chapter, but they would attempt to request the item	29
Total:	110

Table 18: Whether e-book chapter ILL requests are accepted

Type of Answer	Number of times mentioned
They would locate a print copy of the book and request the chapter from it instead	14

Because they do not loan e-book chapters, they do not request them	9
They assume other libraries are under the same licensing restrictions that they are and do not request this type of item	5
They purchase the requested e-book instead	5
Because e-book chapter requests are never accepted, they do not send these requests	3
They do not request any e-books (whole or chapter)	3
Policy has not been created regarding requesting e-book chapters, so they do not request these items	1
Policy does not allow e-book chapter requests	1
Shortage of staff/time prevents the requesting of e-book chapters	1
Technologically incapable of receiving/accessing e-book chapters	1
Unsure	1
This situation has never happened within their library	9
Total	53*

Table 19: Reasons for not requesting e-book chapters

* Respondents sometimes gave multiple reasons.

DISCUSSIONS

The survey results revealed important facts about e-book ILL in U.S. academic libraries. The most important fact is that e-book ILL has not become a common practice in U.S. academic libraries, especially in comparison with e-journal ILL. The survey results indicate that a majority of respondents (83%) provide e-journal ILL, but only 2 respondents provide whole e-book ILL. When it comes to e-book chapters, the responses are much more positive - 51% of the surveyed institutions provide e-book chapter ILL if they receive such requests. This is not surprising - e-book chapters resemble e-journal articles in many ways, and some e-book vendors do allow chapter ILL in their license agreements.

As many scholars (Connaway and Wicht, 2007; Hodges et al., 2010; Minčić-Obradović, 2011; Morris and Sibert, 2011; Nabe et al., 2011) pointed out in the literature, the major obstacle in e-book ILL, both with whole e-book and with chapters, is licensing restriction. Licensing problems were mentioned most frequently (104 times for e-book and 24 times for chapters) as the reason not to provide e-book ILL. For the

same reason, most of the surveyed institutions do not send whole e-book ILL requests to other libraries. However, the survey results may also indicate, even though only indirectly, a possible lack of licensing knowledge among ILL librarians. Many of the respondents did not seem to be aware that different e-book packages have different licensing terms for ILL, and they simply stated that e-book ILL was prohibited by licenses. Another indicator came from the unexpected finding about e-journal ILL - 17% surveyed institutions still do not provide e-journal ILL, and some of them mentioned licensing as the reason.

Lack of the technical means to provide e-book ILL is another obstacles frequently mentioned by the respondents (49 times for whole e-book ILL and 4 times for chapters). With whole e-books, although a number of ILL librarians are aware that Springer e-books can be loaned, they pointed out the technical difficulty with whole book ILL is that chapters must be downloaded individually. With e-book chapters, the surveyed institutions have been using various methods to practice ILL. Some of them are innovative methods, such as providing ID/password that can expire and providing links. The majority of respondents (55 out of 83) download each chapter as a PDF and send it electronically. Only 20 respondents stated that they needed to print out the chapter and then either scan or mail it as indicated by the literature (Wicht, 2011, 207; Walters, 2013, 6). Compared with e-journal article ILL, the technical solutions for e-book chapters are neither mature nor standardized. This is probably due to the ambiguity of the licensing terms with regard to ILL in many e-book packages, while the ILL provision in many e-journal products is more or less standardized (Eschenfelder et al., 2013). Given the similarities between e-book chapters and e-journal articles, the license terms and technical measures for e-book chapter ILL should be more uniform.

Results of this survey also touch upon the issue of patron-driven acquisition (PDA). If e-book ILL is not practiced in a library for various reasons, either licensing restrictions or the individual library's ILL policy, and no print version is available for ILL, a little over half of respondents did indicate that they would initiate PDA. It may be too early to say that PDA has become a common substitute to ILL, but more and more librarians are interested in this solution.

One of the interesting, yet unexpected, findings from this survey is that one medical library has been able to perform whole e-book ILL through the National Library of Medicine's "DOCLINE" tool. Since the research only included a few samples of medical libraries, we cannot generalize from the data whether medical libraries are more inclined to provide e-book ILL. It is worth further investigation, and the tool may serve as a good example for promoting and standardizing e-book ILL practice.

Another interesting finding is that, three respondents mentioned that their libraries automatically reject e-book ILL requests by setting auto deflect in OCLC/WorldCat and other respondents stated that they have never received e-book chapter ILL requests because their e-books were not listed in WorldCat. That is also worth additional study.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, based on the survey data, e-book ILL has not become a common practice in U.S. academic libraries, especially with whole e-books. E-book chapter ILL is relatively common, but still not as widely practiced as e-journal article ILL. Licensing restrictions and lack of technical means are the major obstacles perceived by librarians, but not all ILL librarians seemed knowledgeable about the license terms on ILL in different e-book packages. The technical means for e-book chapter ILL vary, and in general, they are much less standardized than means of e-journal article ILL. Because of the limitations on e-book ILL, the PDA is becoming a popular method to replace ILL to a certain degree.

The survey results also indicate the need and expectations for resource sharing among librarians. Discovering the problems and understanding the reasons are necessary step before proposing feasible solutions in addressing the lack of e-book ILL uses. As the next step, we will examine the details on issues related to license restrictions and ILL models in an attempt to seek creative solutions and opportunities of populating e-book ILL. Given that few, if any, people could predict the popularity of using e-journal ILL five years ago, we have enough optimistic reasons and confidence to the future development of e-book ILL in the next five years.

References

- Algenio, E. and Thompson-Young, A. (2005), "Licensing e-Books the good, the bad, and the ugly", *Journal of Library Administration*, 42(3/4), 113-128.
- 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.
- Ball, R. (2009), "E-books in practice: the librarian's perspective", *Learned Publishing*, 22, 18 -22.
- Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP) (2013), "Ebook acquisition and lending briefing", available at:
http://www.cilip.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Ebook%20Acquisition%20and%20Lending%20Briefing%20July%202013_0.pdf
- Enis, M. (2012), "Ebook collections surging: new data available from LJ, SLJ annual usage reports", *Library Journal*, available at: <http://www.thedigitalshift.com/2012/10/ebooks/ebook-collections-surging-new-data-available-from-lj-slj-annual-usage-reports/#academic>
- Eschenfelder, K. R., Tsai, T., Zhu, X., & Stewart, B. (2013), "How institutionalized are model license use terms? an analysis of e-journal license use rights clauses from 2000 to 2009", *College & Research Libraries*, 74(4), 326-355. available at:
<http://crl.acrl.org/content/74/4/326.full.pdf+html>
- Farkas, M. (2011), "Let's not borrow trouble" *American Libraries*, March/April, 24.
- Frederiksen, L., Cummings, J., Cummings, L., & Carroll, D. (2011), "Ebooks and inter-library loan: licensed to fill?", *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve* 21 (3), 117-131.
- Garrod, P. (2004), "E-books: are they the interlibrary lending model of the future?", *Interlending & Document Supply*, 32(4), 227-233.

Galligan, F. (n.d.), “Interlibrary loans in an eBook world, Swets Blog”, available at:

http://www.swets.com/blog/interlibrary-loans-in-an-ebook-world#.UgK__PXy0sE

Gee, W. (2007), “The conundrum of ebooks and interlibrary loan”, *Against the Grain*,

19(2), 22–28.

IFLA (2012), “IFLA e-lending background paper”, available at:

<http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/clm/publications/ifla-background-paper-e-lending-en.pdf>

Jackson, M. E. (2000), “Research collections and digital information: will there be a role for

interlibrary loan and document delivery services?,” *Journal of Library Administration*, 31(2), 15-25.

Lynch, C. (2001), “The battle to define the future of the book in the digital world”, *First Monday*,

6(6), available at: <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/864/773>

McClanahan, K., Wu, L., Tenopir, C., & King, D. W. (2010), “Embracing change: perceptions of e-journals by faculty members”, *Learned Publishing*, 23, 209-223.

McKiel, A.W. (2007), “Ebrary’s global ebook survey”, available at:

www.ebrary.com/corp/collateral/en/Survey/ebrary_eBook_survey_2007.pdf

Miller, R. (2011), “Dramatic growth”, *Library Journal*, 136 (17), 32-34.

National Center for Education Statistics, (2011), “Academic libraries survey public-use data file:

fiscal year 2010” [data file], available at:http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/libraries/aca_data.asp

Phan, T., Hardesty, L., Hug, J., Sheckells, C., (2011), “Documentation for the academic libraries survey (ALS) public-use data file: fiscal year 2010 (NCES 2011-367)”, National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Washington, DC, Available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011367.pdf>

- Radnor, M.C. & Shrauger, K.J. (2012), "Ebook resource sharing models: borrow, buy, or rent", *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve*, 22(3-4), 155-161.
- Rice, S. (2006), "Own or rent? A survey of e-book licensing models", *Against the Grain*, 18(3), 28-9.
- RUSA. (2001), "Interlibrary loan code for the United States", available at:
http://www.ala.org/Template.cfm?Section=InterLibrary_Loan&template=/ContentManagement/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=31579
- Walters, H. W. (2013), "E-books in academic libraries: challenges for acquisition and collection management", *Portal*, 13(2), 187-211.
- Walters, H. W. (2013), "E-books in academic libraries: challenges for sharing and use", *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 1-11.
- Wicht, H. (2011), "The evolution of e-books and interlibrary loan in academic libraries", *Collaborative Librarianship*, 3(4), 205-211.
- Woods, B. and Ireland, M. (2008), "Ebook loans: an e-twist on a classic interlending service", *Interlending & Document Supply*, 36(2), 105-115.
- Thompson, J.B. (2005), "*Books in the digital age: the transformation of academic and higher education publishing in Britain and the United States*", Polity Press, Cambridge.