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Institutional Demographic & Collections

To develop our data-set, we exported and merged holdings with usage data (2010-2015) from each institution with the following parameters:

**Art & Architecture Print Books**
- Report holdings and circulation data from ELC
- LC Call Number
- Circulation (includes circ in and out house)
- Publication year

**Art & Architecture E-Books**
- Report ISBN COUNTER reports and break out e-book usage by:
  - Usage (Circ) = 1 use = 1 circulation
  - Usage (Section Req.) = use = 1 circulation
  - Format (print vs. e-book)
  - Vendor
  - ELM vs Non-ELM
  - Publisher
  - Publication year

Conclusions

Comparing print and e-usage is akin to comparing apples and oranges as print and e-books are different mediums.

Despite this, we were able to identify a few patterns:

**Usage “leanings” by LC Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC Class</th>
<th>Print-leaning</th>
<th>E-leaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture (NA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Architecture (NA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative Arts (NK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, Crafts, Printmaking (NJ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing, Design, Illustration (NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts (ND)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Art (NG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts (NH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography (NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture (NE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our combined data set, we identified 252 titles with overlapping holdings in both print and e, with the vast majority in the Visual Arts LC class (N).

Most used print books tend to be on more general topics, while most used e-books tend towards more specific research topics.

Further Questions

What might we learn about format preference (or “leanings”) by analyzing the usage for titles owned both in print and e?

How might we account for the lack of overlap between the most used print and e publisher lists?

What can we learn from looking at these results alongside turnover data for the collections?