

Assessing Digital Collection Availability and Quality to Support Academic Information Needs at UIN Madura

¹Hairul Agust Cahyono, Yanuastrid Shintawati²

¹UPA Perpustakaan, Universitas Islam Negeri Madura

²Universitas Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya

hairul@uinmadura.ac.id, yanuastrid@uwks.ac.id²

DOI: 10.30742/tb.v10i2.5907

Received: 20 May 2026

Revised: 7 September 2026

Accepted: 21 September 2026

ABSTRACT

Research Purpose. This study evaluates the extent to which digital collections provided by the UPA Library of Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Madura meet academic information needs in terms of adequacy, currency, accessibility, and usefulness. **Research Methods.** The study employed a descriptive qualitative approach. Data were gathered through direct observation, institutional documents, and semi-structured interviews involving two librarians, five lecturers, and six students. **Data Analysis.** Interview, observational, and documentary data were organized into themes, cross-compared, and interpreted iteratively. Source and method triangulation were applied to identify consistent patterns and divergent user experiences. **Results.** The digital collection ecosystem primarily consists of E-Library, Rumah Jurnal, Repository, and Etheses. Collectively, these platforms house 5,392 e-book titles, 30 institutional journals comprising 414 issues, 806 selected repository items, and 8,086 final-project records. Users reported that these resources effectively support teaching, research, assignments, and thesis preparation. Namun, they also highlighted uneven disciplinary coverage, shortages of specialized and international literature, access and reading restrictions, retrieval difficulties, limited service promotion, and intermittent network or server issues. **Conclusions.** The adequacy of digital collections cannot be judged solely by size; it inherently depends on disciplinary relevance, currency, accessibility, discoverability, and practical usability. This study contributes an integrated evaluative perspective by treating four functionally distinct digital platforms as a unified institutional information ecosystem while triangulating evidence from collections, management, and user experience. These insights underscore the need for subject-based collection updates, streamlined discovery and access, enhanced user assistance, more reliable infrastructure, and integrated usage analytics.

Keywords: *Academic Library; Collection Development; Digital Collections; Information Needs; UIN Madura*

A. INTRODUCTION

The academic value of a university library depends less on the sheer amount of material it holds than on its ability to connect users with resources aligned with their learning, teaching, and research activities. Collection management is, therefore, a continuing process of academic alignment. In a digital setting, this task becomes increasingly complex because users require up-to-date resources that can be reached beyond the library building and that reflect changes in curricula,

disciplines, and research priorities. Evaluating a digital collection consequently requires attention to relevance, currency, quality, and the conditions under which users can actually obtain and use the material.

Digital library resources encompass e-books, electronic journals, institutional repositories, digitized materials, audiovisual materials, and content created in digital form. Their significance is not confined to remote availability. Properly managed digital resources can reduce the effort required to locate academic evidence, preserve institutional intellectual output, and increase the visibility of locally produced scholarship. Borgman (2010) places digital scholarship within an information infrastructure shaped jointly by technology, organizational arrangements, and user practices. From a collection-management standpoint, Saponaro and Evans (2019) similarly argue that selection and evaluation should be informed by user demand, disciplinary balance, and institutional objectives. These perspectives provide the conceptual basis for this study: digital collection quality is understood as the interaction between content provision, institutional management, access conditions, and user practices. Thus, a collection may be numerically extensive yet academically inadequate when important subjects are underrepresented, materials are out of date, or access and discovery are difficult.

At UPA Library UIN Madura, digital resources are delivered through four principal services: E-Library, Rumah Jurnal, Repository, and Etheses. A preliminary review indicated that the more important issue was not the existence of these platforms, but the extent to which their content and access mechanisms aligned with the university's evolving academic requirements. Variation in disciplinary coverage, possible gaps between recorded holdings and user needs, and difficulties encountered during searching or document access warranted systematic investigation. The issue has become more pressing as the university expands its academic programs, creating demand for a wider range of specialized, up-to-date scholarly resources.

Prior scholarship suggests that digital collection development is most effective when understood as an iterative management process rather than a single acquisition event. Needs assessment and collection policies inform selection, while subsequent evaluations examine whether acquired resources remain relevant, accessible, and utilized (Achmad, 2021; Farodisa et al., 2024). Indonesian studies additionally emphasize accessibility, cooperation, legal considerations, and responsiveness to changing expectations as conditions for sustainable digital collections (Salmi Addin et al., 2024; Saputra, 2025). Meanwhile, international studies identify related pressures, including budget constraints, licensing models, institutional policies, and user involvement in electronic resource development (Awojobi & Uthman, 2022; Geuther et al., 2021). At the user level, awareness, connectivity, search skills, interface design, metadata, and findability influence whether an available resource can be converted into meaningful academic use (Ankamah et al., 2024; Mbughuni, 2025; Putra et al., 2026).

Despite these contributions, previous studies often examine acquisition policies, electronic resource usage, repository administration, and user experience as separate issues. This fragmentation limits the understanding of how purchased

resources, institutional publications, repository content, and final-project collections interact within a single academic information environment, and how their nominal availability translates into practical usability across different academic needs. This study, therefore, conceptualizes the E-Library, Rumah Jurnal, Repository, and E-theses as a digital information ecosystem: a set of institutionally connected but functionally distinct platforms whose value depends on the relationship among content availability, disciplinary alignment, access conditions, retrieval efficiency, management practices, and user experience. Accordingly, this study aims to assess (1) the forms and scale of available digital resources, (2) their alignment with academic information needs, (3) their quality in terms of relevance, currency, accessibility, and retrieval, and (4) how these dimensions jointly support academic activities at UIN Madura. The main contribution lies in evaluating both acquired and institutionally generated digital resources within a single integrated framework rather than as isolated services.

B. METHODS

This research adopted a descriptive qualitative design to examine digital collection provision at the UPA Library of UIN Madura within its institutional context and to understand how this provision relates to academic information needs. A qualitative approach was appropriate because the inquiry focused on management practices, user perceptions, and experiences accessing digital resources within the natural environment in which these experiences occur (Busetto et al., 2020; Creswell & Poth, 2018; Moleong, 2017). The site was purposively selected because the UPA Library is the core institutional unit responsible for organizing and providing information resources for the university's academic community.

Participants were purposively recruited based on their direct involvement with digital collections, either as managers or as academic users. The interview dataset comprised two librarians responsible for digital resources, five lecturers, and six active students. This sample was intended to provide complementary managerial and user perspectives rather than a statistical representation of every discipline. Data sufficiency was assessed qualitatively by examining whether additional accounts continued to yield substantively new themes, in line with the principle of information adequacy (Guest et al., 2006). Because disciplinary representation was not exhaustive, claims regarding subject-level gaps are interpreted as indicative patterns requiring broader verification. Participants were identified by role-based codes (L1–L2 for librarians, D1–D5 for lecturers, and S1–S6 for students) to preserve anonymity and enhance the transparency of the evidentiary basis.

Evidence was gathered through three complementary procedures. First, observations were used to identify the digital platforms, the types and visible quantities of resources, and the access facilities provided. Second, semi-structured interviews explored participants' perceptions of collection sufficiency, their utilization of digital resources for learning and research, searching and access experiences, and the barriers encountered. Third, documentary analysis examined

collection statistics, platform usage records, institutional provisions, and other written materials relevant to acquisition and access. Although this study did not formally register a specific ethics approval number or utilize automated transcription protocols, all research activities strictly adhered to institutional ethical guidelines, and interviews were manually transcribed verbatim. Integrating these three data sources allowed factual records to be cross-referenced and interpreted alongside nuanced managerial and user experiences.

Data analysis proceeded recursively rather than as a single, final-stage procedure. Qualitative evidence was reduced into relevant themes, organized to facilitate comparison of patterns across participant groups and documentary sources, and interpreted through continuous cross-checking against the raw data. Quantitative figures from institutional records were utilized descriptively to illustrate the scale and distribution of resources, rather than as standalone statistical evidence. Credibility was enhanced through source and method triangulation, specifically by examining areas of convergence and divergence among observations, participant accounts, and institutional documentation (Creswell, 2014). Because one author is institutionally affiliated with the research site, this multi-source triangulation also served as a critical safeguard against insider bias; consequently, this researcher positionality is acknowledged as a methodological consideration when interpreting the findings.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The institutional setting of the university has evolved considerably over time. UIN Madura originated from the Pamekasan branch of the Faculty of Tarbiyah at IAIN Sunan Ampel, founded in 1966, and subsequently transitioned through STAIN and IAIN statuses before achieving university status as UIN Madura in 2025. This institutional development significantly expanded the scope of academic programs, thereby diversifying the information demands placed upon the library. To support education, research, and community service, the UPA Library has developed a suite of digital services designed to complement its conventional physical holdings.

1. Digital Collection Infrastructure and Availability

Institutional records indicate that digital holdings are organized across four services that perform distinct but complementary roles. The E-Library primarily provides e-books acquired through purchases and donations. Rumah Jurnal functions as the primary dissemination channel for academic journals published within UIN Madura. The Repository accommodates a broader range of institutional and scholarly documents, whereas E-theses stores students' final projects. Viewed collectively, these platforms demonstrate that the digital collection expands through two distinct pathways: the acquisition of external resources and the accumulation of institutionally generated scholarly content.

Table 1. Main digital collection platforms at UIN Madura

Platform	Primary content	Documented scale
E-Library	E-books	5,392 titles / 5,396 copies
Rumah Jurnal	Institutional e-journals	30 journal titles / 414 issues
Repository	Books, articles, teaching materials, reports, proceedings, etc.	806 selected items
Etheses	Undergraduate and master's final projects	8,086 records

Source: UPA Library UIN Madura institutional records reviewed in this study.

Acquisition records for E-Library cover 2019–2024 and document 5,392 titles and 5,396 copies. Purchased materials account for 5,344 titles, making acquisition the principal source of growth, while donations contribute 48 titles or 52 copies. The documents reviewed contain no additional E-Library titles for 2025 or 2026. This finding is reported here as a documented acquisition pattern; its implications for currency and academic relevance are examined in the Discussion section.

Table 2. E-Library acquisition records

Year	Source	Titles	Copies
2019	Donation + purchase	456	456
2020	Purchase	505	505
2021	Purchase	536	536
2022	Purchase + donation	1,292	1,294
2023	Purchase + donation	1,929	1,931
2024	Purchase	674	674
Total	—	5,392	5,396

Source: UPA Library UIN Madura institutional records reviewed in this study.

Rumah Jurnal contains 30 journal titles representing 414 published issues within the examined dataset. While most titles publish biannually, three newly registered journals had not yet released an issue at the time of documentation. Consequently, the platform's scholarly contribution extends beyond the sheer volume of published issues; as an institutional publishing channel, Rumah Jurnal significantly enhances the discoverability and circulation of UIN Madura's research among students, lecturers, and the wider academic community.

The Repository dataset comprises 806 curated items deemed relevant for academic reference. Books constitute the largest category (436 items), followed by journal articles (217 items), research reports (78 items), conference proceedings (26 items), teaching materials (21 items), institutional guidelines (15 items), mass-media publications (9 items), and working papers (4 items). This distribution highlights the repository's robust function in preserving locally generated academic materials. Such content effectively complements purchased resources by systematically documenting the university's teaching materials, research outputs, institutional policies, and scholarly activities.

Table 3. Selected Repository content

Category	Items
Books	436
Journal articles	217
Research reports	78
Proceedings	26
Teaching materials (diktat)	21
Guidelines	15
Mass-media items	9
Papers	4
Total	806

Source: UPA Library UIN Madura institutional records reviewed in this study.

Etheses contained the largest number of records among the four platforms, with 8,086 undergraduate and master's final projects. These records represented 17 undergraduate programs and two master's programs. Some recently established programs had not yet produced graduates or deposited final projects, and doctoral dissertations were not represented in the dataset reviewed. Consequently, the aggregate total should not be read as evidence of equally strong coverage across disciplines. A more informative assessment would examine the distribution of Etheses records by study program and academic field.

2. Suitability to Academic Information Needs

The four platforms grow through different collection mechanisms. E-Library relies chiefly on e-book acquisition, whereas Rumah Jurnal, Repository, and Etheses expand through institutional publication and deposit. They also impose different conditions of access. Etheses allow retrieval by year, subject, program, or division, and author; master's theses are accessible in full text, while undergraduate theses are restricted to Chapters 1 and 4 under institutional policy. E-Library permits online reading on compatible devices but turns off downloading and screenshots. Repository and Rumah Jurnal maintain their own search and access interfaces. The reviewed records did not provide integrated usage statistics across all four services.

The librarians portrayed collection development as an attempt to match user needs within financial and technical constraints. L1 explained that selection decisions draw on user surveys, publisher catalogs, Semester Learning Plans (RPS), and the available acquisition budget. At the same time, L2 similarly emphasized the challenge of extending subject coverage as new programs generate additional requirements. Both identified budget efficiency measures, unavailable titles on partner platforms, users' limited understanding of registration and access procedures, and occasional network or local server disruptions as constraints. Current responses include collaboration with the university technology unit and external vendors, promotion of digital services, system improvement, and gradual enlargement of subject coverage.

Lecturers used the Repository, institutional e-journals, E-Library/e-books, and Etheses to prepare teaching materials, conduct research, and examine earlier

student work. Their general assessment of relevance was favorable, but disciplinary needs were not met equally. D1 emphasized insufficient access to international journals; D2 reported difficulty finding highly specific BKPI literature, particularly materials on inclusive guidance and counseling; and D3 highlighted limited references in the OBE curriculum and the need to replace older sources. Other lecturer accounts (D4–D5) reinforced concerns about unstable or slow connections, congestion during periods of heavy use, and insufficient promotion or guidance about available digital services.

Student accounts showed substantial variation in the frequency and purpose of digital-library use. S1–S3 described relatively regular use for papers and final assignments, whereas S4–S6 reported more occasional use. The resources mentioned most often were e-journals, e-books/E-Library, Repository, and Etheses. Most students considered these collections useful for coursework, yet some still searched outside the library when particular titles were unavailable. Several valued the platforms' practicality, whereas others reported locked or restricted documents, e-book reading quotas, unstable connectivity, and difficulty distinguishing among similar search results. These accounts distinguish the existence of a bibliographic record from the user's ability to discover and use it effectively.

Student accounts showed substantial variation in the frequency and purpose of digital-library use. S1–S3 described relatively regular use for papers and final assignments, whereas S4–S6 reported more occasional use. The resources mentioned most often were e-journals, e-books/E-Library, Repository, and Etheses. Most students considered these collections useful for coursework, yet some still searched outside the library when particular titles were unavailable. Several valued the platforms' practicality, whereas others reported locked or restricted documents, e-book reading quotas, unstable connectivity, and difficulty distinguishing among similar search results. These accounts distinguish the existence of a bibliographic record from the user's ability to discover and use it effectively.

DISCUSSION

I. Availability Beyond Collection Size

Taken together, the documentary and interview findings indicate that numerical size is an insufficient measure of collection adequacy. Librarians associated incomplete subject coverage with the expansion of academic programs and budget constraints. This management context helps explain the documentary finding that no new E-Library acquisitions were recorded after 2024. The important question is, therefore, whether resources can be renewed and redistributed in response to curricular and disciplinary change, rather than simply whether the library possesses a large number of titles. This interpretation accords with the view of collection development as a continuing sequence of needs assessment, selection, acquisition, evaluation, and adjustment (Achmad, 2021; Farodisa et al., 2024; Saponaro & Evans, 2019).

2. Alignment with Academic Information Needs

The degree of alignment between digital holdings and academic demand varies according to discipline and academic task. Lecturers and students generally found the collections relevant, but they also identified unmet demand for international journals, specialized BKPI literature, OBE curriculum resources, and specific titles. The librarians' use of user surveys and RPS documents offers a sound basis for selection. However, the findings suggest that this mechanism should be supplemented by recurring subject-gap mapping at the study-program level. Such an approach is compatible with literature emphasizing user needs, relevance, accessibility, and continuity as central considerations in digital collection development (Salmi Addin et al., 2024; Saponaro & Evans, 2019; Saputra, 2025).

Differences in student usage intensity and lecturer source preferences further indicate the limits of perception-based evaluation alone. Interviews establish that the platforms are used for academic work, but they cannot show how frequently or extensively individual resources are used. Future assessment would be stronger if interview evidence were paired with platform indicators such as searches, views, downloads, active-user counts, unsuccessful queries, and title-level use. These measures could reveal whether users' perceptions of adequacy correspond to observable patterns of resource use (He, 2024; Lowe, 2022).

3. Quality: Relevance, Currency, Access, and Retrieval

The findings also redefine digital-collection quality as an issue of both use and content. Lecturers generally considered the resources relevant but wanted more consistent updating. Students described restrictions on documents, locked content, e-book reading limits, unstable connections, and imprecise retrieval. Librarians, meanwhile, referred to server interruptions, limitations imposed by partner platforms, and gaps in users' knowledge of access procedures. These overlapping accounts demonstrate that bibliographic availability does not guarantee practical usability. The interpretation is consistent with (Borgman, 2010) and (Wilson, 1999), as well as studies showing that connectivity, user competence, metadata quality, interface characteristics, and findability shape the effective use of digital resources (Borgman, 2010; Ankamah et al., 2024; Kalimashe, n.d.)

4. Integrated Interpretation and Study Contribution

An integrated reading of the three evidence streams clarifies the study's contribution from the perspective of the digital information ecosystem. The four platforms are complementary rather than interchangeable: E-Library supplies externally acquired e-books; Rumah Jurnal disseminates institutional journals; Repository preserves diverse scholarly and institutional outputs; and Etheses concentrates student final projects. Their academic value, therefore, emerges from the connections among acquisition, institutional knowledge production, preservation, discovery, and access. Documentary sources identify what exists and its recorded scale; librarians explain selection, policy, budgeting, and technical constraints; lecturers and students show how those resources function in

academic practice. The resulting evaluative chain links availability, disciplinary alignment, currency, accessibility, retrieval, and usability. Unlike studies that isolate acquisition, repository implementation, or user experience, this ecosystem perspective shows that weakness in one component—such as outdated acquisition, restricted access, poor retrieval, or low user awareness—can reduce the practical value of otherwise substantial holdings (Farodisa et al., 2024; Putra et al., 2026; Salmi Addin et al., 2024).

The findings also extend prior literature in two ways. First, while previous studies commonly emphasize the benefits and uptake of electronic resources, the UIN Madura case demonstrates that aggregate collection growth can coexist with discipline-specific shortages and access friction. Second, institutional repositories and purchased e-resources are often evaluated separately, whereas the present evidence indicates that users move across these platforms based on task and availability. Five practical priorities follow: recurring subject-gap mapping at the study-program level, a regular renewal schedule, wider access to external and international scholarship, stronger promotion and access to literacy, and improved reliability of networks, servers, metadata, and retrieval mechanisms. The analytical novelty lies in treating four digital platforms as a single institutional information ecosystem by combining evidence from collections, managerial perspectives, and the experiences of two major user groups. This makes it possible to distinguish nominal availability from practical usability without obscuring discipline-specific gaps.

D. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that the adequacy of UIN Madura's digital collections is determined not by collection volume alone, but by the dynamic interaction among disciplinary relevance, currency, accessibility, discoverability, and practical usability. The four distinct platforms—the E-Library, Rumah Jurnal, Repository, and E-theses—constitute a complementary digital information ecosystem that effectively supports teaching, research, coursework, and final-project preparation. However, the operational value of this ecosystem is currently diminished by uneven subject coverage, shortages of specialized and international literature, access restrictions, retrieval difficulties, limited service promotion, and infrastructural instability.

Theoretically, this study offers an integrated evaluative perspective that connects acquired resources and institutionally produced scholarship within a single ecosystem while triangulating documentary evidence with both managerial and user experiences. In practice, the UPA Library should prioritize program-level subject-gap mapping, scheduled collection renewal, broader access to external scholarship, enhanced user guidance and promotion, and improved reliability of networks, servers, metadata, and retrieval systems. Furthermore, because consolidated usage analytics were unavailable and the participants represented a limited range of disciplines, future research should combine qualitative evidence

with platform-specific usage indicators and test this framework across a broader spectrum of study programs and higher education institutions.

REFERENCE

- Achmad, Q. N. (2021). Kebijakan Pengembangan Koleksi Perpustakaan: Formulasi, Implementasi Hingga Evaluasi. *Shaut Al-Maktabah : Jurnal Perpustakaan, Arsip dan Dokumentasi*, 13(2), 101-113. <https://doi.org/10.37108/shaut.v13i2.492>
- Ankamah, S., Gyesi, K., & Amponsah, V. (2024). Use of electronic resources in research and learning in a health sciences library in Ghana: An analysis of awareness and perception of users. *Information Development*, 40(2), 202-219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02666669221107378>
- Awojobi, E. A., & Uthman, K. O. (2022). Evaluation of Collection Development and Management in Selected University Libraries in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Ghana Library Journal*, 27(2), 259-272. <https://doi.org/10.4314/glj.v27i2.12>
- Borgman, C. L. . (2010). *Scholarship in the digital age : information, infrastructure, and the Internet*. (S.I.): MIT Press.
- Busetto, L., Wick, W., & Gumbinger, C. (2020). How to use and assess qualitative research methods. *Neurological Research and Practice*, 2(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42466-020-00059-z>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approach* (4^e éd.). London: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. ., & Poth, C. N. . (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. (S.I.): SAGE.
- Farodisa, N. N., Amar, S. C. D., & Rukmana, E. N. (2024). Literature review penelitian pengembangan koleksi di perpustakaan digital. *Informatio: Journal of Library and Information Science*, 4(2), 197-216. <https://doi.org/10.24198/inf.v4i2.53821>
- Geuther, C., Hoeve, C. D., & O'Reilly, F. (2021). Trends in content development and licensing of electronic resources. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, 33(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1941126X.2021.1871195>
- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How Many Interviews Are Enough? *Field Methods*, 18(1), 59-82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903>
- He, J. (2024). Navigating the New Normal: A Study on the Impacts of the Pandemic on Electronic Resource Management at Academic Libraries. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 28(2), 169-184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10875301.2024.2326946>
- Kalimashe, H. (n.d.). *User experience of an institutional repository: A study of OpenUCT with a focus on postgraduate students*.
- Lowe, R. A. (2022). The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the Use of Library-Licensed Electronic Resources: Using Data to Challenge Core Assumptions and Leveraging Disruption to Initiate Meaningful Strategic Change. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, 34(3), 259-268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1941126X.2022.2099046>

- Mbughuni, A. S. (2025). Competence in using open access institutional repositories for improved accessibility of research outputs: The case of selected academic institutions in Tanzania. *Alexandria: The Journal of National and International Library and Information Issues*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/09557490251400574>
- Moleong, L. J. (2017a). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Moleong, Lexy. J. (2017b). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Putra, S. J., Nurazza, A. F., Arham, Z., Durachman, Y., Waspodo, B., & Khalil, I. (2026). Evaluating User Satisfaction in Institutional Repositories through a Combined WebQual 4.0, EUCS, and Importance–Performance Analysis Approach. *Applied Information System and Management (AISM)*, 9(1), 183-192.
<https://doi.org/10.15408/aism.v9i1.46727>
- Salmi Addin, H., Anggraini, H., Nur Riya Putri Yenti, H., Wandan Sari, F., & Hidayat, I. (2024). Strategi Pengembangan Koleksi Perpustakaan Digital. *Media Informasi*, 33(1), 88-95. <https://doi.org/10.22146/mi.v33i1.11481>
- Saponaro, M. Zarnosky., & Evans, G. Edward. (2019). *Collection management basics*. (S.I.): Libraries Unlimited, an Imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC.
- Saputra, A. (2025). Policies, Methods, and Challenges in The Developing Digital Collections in University Libraries.
<https://doi.org/10.17509/edulib.v15i1.80034>
- Wilson, T. D. (1999). Models in information behaviour research. *Journal of Documentation*, 55(3), 249-270. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000007145>