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The question

SHOULD WE BE BUYING PRINT BOOKS OR E-BOOKS FOR THE LIBRARY?
Study of usage of Course Adopted Books available in print and e-

**SPRING 2013**
- 94% Print CABs
- 4% E-book CABs
- 2% Both print and e-book CABs
- Total: 96 titles

**FALL 2013**
- 88% Print CABs
- 7% E-book CABs
- 5% Both print and e-book CABs
- Total: 123 titles
The samples

- Titles from the Course Adopted Books list:

- Excluded from the study:
  - titles in the public domain;
  - multiple print copies;
  - available e-books, no MARC records in the catalogue
Research question:

- Do students tend to use print or e-books for their course readings? 
  *(looking to identify trends, but not to explain them)*

- Decision regarding format purchases for the CAB service.
What is a “use”? 

Print books:
- # of circulations
- # of renewals
- # of times the book is re-shelved – i.e. internal use
- length of the loan period
  - in days
  - in hours (for reserve)

E-books
- # of online sessions
- # of downloads
- # of section requests
- # of unique users
- # of pages viewed
- # of pages copied/printed
- length of online session in minutes
- length of downloads in days
1. Has the title been used at least once? [yes or no]

2. How many times per average each title has been used? [number of uses (checkouts, renewals, online access sessions, downloads) per used title]

3. Average scope of the usage per title [length of the loan/download, length of the online session, pages accessed]
Q1: Has the title been used at least once?

[yes or no]
Comparison in usage of print and e-CABs (at least one use)

**SPRING 2013**
(P+E SAMPLE OF 96 TITLES)

- E- only: 24%
- Not used: 19%
- Print only: 10%
- Both formats: 47%

**FALL 2013**
(P+E SAMPLE OF 123 TITLES)

- E- only: 15%
- Not used: 28%
- Print only: 20%
- Both formats: 37%
Comparison in usage of print and e-CABs (at least one use)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>electronic</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>print</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 2013: 29% used, 71% not used
Fall 2013: 43% used, 57% not used
Q2: How many times per average each title has been used?

[number of uses (checkouts, renewals, online access sessions, downloads) per used title]
Average number of uses per used title

Print uses
- Spring
  - 63 titles used 246 times
  - 3.90
- Fall
  - 77 titles used 594 times
  - 7.71

E-uses
- Spring
  - 74 titles used 1086 times
  - 14.68
- Fall
  - 67 titles used 823 times
  - 12.28
Average number of uses per used title

- **Checkouts**: Spring: 1.59, Fall: 1.59
- **Renewals**: Spring: 2.20, Fall: 6.17
- **Link+ requests**: Spring: 1.77, Fall: 2.10
- **Online sessions**: Spring: 11.80, Fall: 10.99
- **Downloads**: Spring: 5.28, Fall: 3.48
**Q3**: Average scope of the usage per title

[length of the loan/download, length of the online session, number of pages accessed]
Average scope of use per used title

- Reserve (h): Spring 8.4, Fall 5.6
- Time read online (h): Spring 6.3, Fall 3.8
- CAB loan (days): Spring 24.92, Fall 56.58
- Download length (days): Spring 15.68, Fall 30.36
- Pages viewed: Spring 344.56, Fall 297.65
More questions

- How does being a CAB affect the usage of a print book in comparison with other print books?
- Does the fact there is an e-book available for the same title affect the usage of a print CAB?
Usage of print books – at least one use

- Spring: 58% All CABs, 66% p+e CABs
- All shelflife of the whole print collection: 60%
- Fall: 63% All CABs, 57% p+e CABs
More questions

- How does being a CAB affect the usage of an e-book in comparison with other e-books?
- Does the fact there is a print book available for the same title affect the usage of an e-CAB?
Usage of e-books – average scope of use per used title

Pages viewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p+e CABs</th>
<th>e-CABs</th>
<th>All e-books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring EBL</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Ebrary</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall EBL</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Ebrary</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- Course Adopted Books are a good investment for the Library – in both formats
- The data does not show clear preference to one format vs. the other across the disciplines
- We have no justification to prefer neither print nor e- across the board and need to drill down into the data on a subject level
Next steps

- More data – including titles from syllabi and reading lists, and including data from other e-book providers.
- More data analysis – on a subject level
- More detailed analysis on the not used titles
- Correlating the usage data with other sources – surveys, qualitative data, anecdotal evidence – to try and figure out the “why”
E-book DDA service

- ~50,000 DDA titles from EBL (updating profile + manual additions)
- Autopurchase on 5th short term loan (STL)
- List price of titles used $347,600
- Spent $32,650 (9.3%):
  - 57 autopurchases @ $ 5,764
  - 2598 STLs @ $ 26,888
Summary of usage - # of uses

- Free browses: 2866 (44%)
- STLs: 2598 (40%)
- Autopurchase: 478 (7%) and 57 (7%)

Paid and Free categories are indicated by different colors in the bar chart.
Is our purchase trigger at the right place?

- 1 STL – 1594 titles (78%)
- 2 STLs – 237 titles (12%)
- 3 STLs – 66 titles (3%)
- 4 STLs – 83 titles (4%)
- Autopurchased (on 5th paid use) – 57 titles (3%)
  - 47 titles used again after autopurchase:
    - 28 titles used between 1 and 10 times
    - 13 titles used between 11 and 20 times
    - 5 titles used between 25 and 73 times
  - Of the 10 titles not used again after autopurchase, half were purchased in Feb.
Who uses the service?

89% of all use comes from students, 8% from faculty, 3% from staff.

20% of all faculty on campus and 18% of all students have used a DDA e-book at least once.

The average number of uses per individual user is: 3.65 for faculty, 4.64 for students, 3.34 for staff.
Which content is being used?

Unique titles by discipline

- **AH**: 470 (17.52%)
- **SS**: 1648 (61.42%)
- **ST**: 565 (21.06%)
Which content is being used?

Unique titles by subject

- Agriculture: 30
- Anthropology: 53
- Art & Architecture: 11
- Biological Sciences: 68
- Business & Economics: 19
- Chemistry: 206
- Computer Science: 179
- Education: 123
- Engineering & Technology Sciences: 183
- History & Auxiliary Sciences: 28
- Language, Linguistics & Literature: 1
- Library Science, Generalities &…: 22
- Law: 94
- Mathematics: 24
- Medicine: 27
- Music & Performing arts: 2
- Philosophy & Religion: 124
- Physical Sciences: 50
- Political Science: 257
- Psychology: 142
- Sociology: 444
Which content is being used?

Titles and number of uses by year of publication

Uses by year of publication  Titles by year of publication
Average number of uses per title varies between 2 and 3 for most publishers. Notable exception – NYU Press with 5.57 average uses per title.
At what time of day is the content accessed?

Sep 27 - Dec 23; Jan 21-Feb 25 (During the semester)

Dec 24 - Jan 20 (Winter break)
Data-driven e-book policies at Lafayette College Library
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Lafayette College profile:
    2,478 undergraduates (liberal arts and engineering)
    217 faculty

Library print collection profile:
    590,000 volumes
    8,000+ print books added in 2013
Select e-book offerings

ebrary Academic Complete (100,000+ titles)
   Subscription since 2010

ebrary patron driven acquisitions (37,000+ titles)
   • consortial effort with 5 other institutions
   • began Nov. 2012 with all triggers leading to purchases
   • after 6 months, switched to 3 one-day STLs before purchase
   • now:
     • 27 publishers
     • Only titles allowing STLs
What do users prefer?

- paper (83%)
- online (4%)
- no preference (13%)
Below is a list of ways you may use a scholarly monograph. Please think about doing each of these things with a scholarly monograph in print format or in digital format, and use the scales below to indicate how much easier or harder is it to perform each activity in print or digital format. Please select one answer for each item.

- Much easier in print format than digital
- Somewhat easier in print format than digital
- About the same in print and digital format
- Somewhat easier in digital format than print
- Much easier in digital format than print

- Reading cover to cover in depth
- Reading a section in depth
- Skimming in whole or in part
- Searching for a particular topic
- Exploring references
- Comparing treatment of ideas between monographs
Do users use e-books?

Academic Complete:
    1442 unique titles with at least 5 pages viewed

ebrary PDA:
    349 unique titles used by Lafayette in 12 months
Does it make sense financially?

Academic Complete:
  Price per title based upon use of unique titles: $3.71

Ebrary PDA:
  Our price per title based upon use by Lafayette: $58.67
  Our price per title based upon titles purchased across consortia: $46.71
Are STLs better than outright purchases?

8 months of data: 814 STLs

- 1 trigger (79%)
- 2 triggers (13%)
- 3 triggers (5%)
- 4 triggers (3%)
Is the consortial effort worth it?

1021 unique titles use in 12 months.

12% used by more than one institution:
- 109 used by two institutions
- 6 used by three institutions
- 4 used by four institutions
- 1 used by five institutions
- 0 used by six institutions
Current policies

Print is default format.

Duplicate formats only upon request.

Selectors use discretion in purchasing titles that might become available as PDA.

Avoid purchasing publisher packages of all e-books.
eBooks at Richmond

Kevin Butterfield, University Librarian
University of Richmond
Assessing the Numbers

- 4,249 professional and undergraduate students
- 250,000 eBooks available
- 142,000 “uses” recorded in 2012-2013
- Reviews conducted by Assessment Team, Library Fellows and Ethnographic Research Team
Usage by Source 2012-2013
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Ebrary
Safari Tech Books
ACLS Humanities Ebooks
Gale
EBSCOhost
SAGE Publications
Springer-Verlag
Brill
American Psychological Association
Elsevier
Wiley-Blackwell
Cambridge University Press
Salem Press, World Bank, and JHU Press
Usage Trends

- Use driven primarily by Ebrary and Safari Tech Books
- Changes tied to curricular fluctuations and first year seminars
Impact Assessment

- DDA program led to drop in firm orders
- Increased “uses” following discovery layer implementation
- Changing student attitudes toward technology / BYOD
- Heavier adoption in the social sciences, computer science and business
- Lighter adoption in the humanities, sciences, law
Buffet Line or Garbage Dump

- Content determines value
- Access determines use
- Curricular need determines adoption
THANK YOU!

QUESTIONS?

Maria Savova - maria_savova@cuc.claremont.edu
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