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- Other research of note
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- Other applications for usage data
- Conclusion
COUNTER lists 130 publishers, vendors and hosting companies as COUNTER compliant for journals and databases.

Only 34 are listed as compliant for e-books and reference works.

Only 6 of these 34 are not in the journals list, or do not have a sister or parent company in the journals list.

Why the discrepancy:
- E-book publishers much more likely to use hosting companies, e-book vendors and aggregators as their only routes to market
- Much more complex market, different type of e-books, many sales models
- 11% of e-book publishers in the ALPSP report provided open access e-books for which usage data may not be recorded
ALPSP report – publishers provision of usage statistics for e-books

- COUNTER Compliant: 47%
- Not COUNTER Compliant: 36%
- COUNTER Compliant with Additional Statistics: 4%
- No Usage Statistics: 13%
Provision of usage statistics for e-books by publisher type

- COUNTER Compliant: 46.7% Commercial, 29.8% Not-for-profit
- Not COUNTER Compliant: 10.0% Commercial, 14.0% Not-for-profit
- COUNTER Compliant with Additional Statistics: 6.7% Commercial, 3.5% Not-for-profit
- No Usage Statistics: 36.7% Commercial, 52.6% Not-for-profit
The MPS Librarian Survey

- Tried to determine the difference in importance between e-journals and e-books usage reports for librarians
- Different behaviour between book and journals librarians
- Try to determine what is important for e-book librarians
- Background interviews to discover more about their use in the future
Methodology

- Survey undertaken in September 2010 using Survey Monkey
- Requests disseminated via: listservs, LinkedIn groups, CAUL and the UKSG e-newsletter
- Received 325 responses, 12 discounted as too incomplete
- Used Survey Monkey results and analysed raw data in spreadsheets to form statistics and graphs showing responses
Respondent profile – location

- USA: 39.9%
- UK/Eire: 32.6%
- Australia/New Zealand: 10.3%
- Western Europe: 9.6%
- Canada: 1.4%
- Africa: 1.4%
- Asia: 1.4%
- South America: 2.7%
- Central Europe: 1.0%
- Middle East: 1.0%
- Other: 0.0%
Respondent profile – closest description of area of responsibility

- E-resources: 32.9%
- E-journals/Serials: 20.1%
- Subject Librarian: 10.0%
- University Librarian: 8.3%
- Planning: 6.9%
- Reference: 5.5%
- Licensing Manager: 5.2%
- Deputy University Librarian: 3.8%
- Usage Expert: 2.4%
- E-books: 2.4%
- Consortium Manager: 2.1%
- E-learning: 0.3%
Direct responsibility for purchasing/cancellation decisions

- No: 45.3%
- Yes, all resources: 30.3%
- Yes, books and journals: 8.7%
- Yes, journals: 8.0%
- Yes, books: 4.9%
- Yes, other resources: 2.8%
Area of responsibility for decisions

- Online and Print: 79%
- Online only: 15%
- Print only: 6%
Librarians use usage statistics

- Yes: 96.7%
- No: 3.3%
COUNTER for journal holdings

- Yes: 86.7%
- No: 13.3%
COUNTER for e-books

- Yes: 65.7%
- No: 34.3%
Influence on purchasing decisions

- Yes: 85.7%
- No: 14.3%
Influence on decision makers decisions

- Yes: 89.8%
- No: 10.2%
Librarian ratings of COUNTER vs. Non-COUNTER statistics

![Bar chart showing ratings of COUNTER-compliant usage statistics and usage statistics that are not COUNTER-compliant, categorized by type of resource (e-journals, e-books) and level of usefulness.](image)
Librarian ratings consolidated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COUNTER-compliant usage statistics</th>
<th>Usage statistics that are not COUNTER-compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-journals</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-books</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Vital or Important**
- **Useful or Quite helpful**
- **Vaguely informative or Not useful at all**
New users of COUNTER e-book statistics in the next year

- Very Likely: 31%
- Quite Likely: 19%
- Not very likely: 33%
- Very unlikely: 17%
What does this tell us?

- Nearly all librarians use usage statistics
- Librarians need and want usage statistics and they strongly influence purchasing and cancellation decisions
- They are becoming more important for e-books and reference works
- COUNTER compliance is very important for librarians, non-compliant usage stats are not as highly valued
What doesn’t this tell us

- What librarians are doing with usage statistics, other than making purchasing and cancellation decisions
- What other factors are considered in those decisions
- What difference there is in the use of usage statistics for journals and databases vs. e-books and reference works
- Whether a lack of usage statistics is in any way prohibitive to libraries purchasing or subscribing to certain content and whether that is changing
Hard to find recent research on librarians use of usage statistics, it is mainly assumed:

- Listserv discussions
- Librarian presentations at conferences
- Using usage statistics in research

So:

- Most research uses usage statistics analysis to provide evidence of success, failure or change within an institution or across the industry
Other applications for usage statistics

- Usage statistics enable us to better understand the growth of the market
- Cost-per-use
- Evaluate big deals
- Evaluate publishers success with customers
- Inform and drive sales and marketing to customers
- Learn about customers and inform customer service
- Inform the need for end-user marketing for libraries
- Monitoring resources use over time
Research always uses comparable statistics, which is where COUNTER is invaluable:

- RIN report: E-Journals: their use, value and impact
- RIN/JISC report: One Year On: Evaluating the initial impact of the Scottish Higher Education Digital Library (SHEDL)
- Drexel Study: Comparing Library and User Related Costs of Print and Electronic Journal Collections
CIBER analysed usage statistics to gain the following picture:

On average, every registered library user (FTE) downloads 47 articles a year.

Nearly a quarter of Science Direct use is outside 9-5 working day, 15% is at the weekend.

In 3 years total use more than doubled, usage increases at a rate of 21.7% per year.
Researchers at top institutions behave differently
Researchers in different subjects behave differently
Gateways account for a large proportion of e-journal traffic
Usage is rising and cost-per-use is falling
High levels of use are associated with high levels of use
High levels of expenditure and high levels of use are associated with success in research outcomes
### SHEDL evaluation

- Increase in SHEDL usage outperforms the average (21.7%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>201,207</td>
<td>222,749</td>
<td>307,620</td>
<td>21,542</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>84,871</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>100,240</td>
<td>115,333</td>
<td>152,357</td>
<td>15,093</td>
<td>15.06%</td>
<td>37,024</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>266,707</td>
<td>341,331</td>
<td>499,825</td>
<td>74,624</td>
<td>27.98%</td>
<td>158,494</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>568,154</td>
<td>679,413</td>
<td>959,802</td>
<td>111,259</td>
<td>19.58%</td>
<td>280,389</td>
<td>41.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SHEDL cost-per-use improvement by publisher

- **Publisher A**
  - Cost per Use 2007: £0.90
  - Cost per Use 2008: £0.86
  - Cost per Use 2009: £0.76

- **Publisher B**
  - Cost per Use 2007: £1.52
  - Cost per Use 2008: £1.38
  - Cost per Use 2009: £1.15

- **Publisher C**
  - Cost per Use 2007: £2.86
  - Cost per Use 2008: £2.48
  - Cost per Use 2009: £2.05

£ Sterling
## Drexel Study

- Montgomery and King’s often cited: Comparing Library and User Related Costs of Print and Electronic Journal Collections (D-Lib, October 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Type</th>
<th>Subscription Cost</th>
<th>Recorded Use</th>
<th>Subscription Cost per Use</th>
<th>Operational Cost per Use</th>
<th>Total Cost per Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic Journals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Subscriptions</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>$3.20</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher’s Packages</td>
<td>$304,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregator Journals</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Text Database Journals</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>159,000</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$462,000</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Print Journals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Journals</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound Journals</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$17.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other things to do with usage data

For publishers:
- Address declining usage
- Address zero usage
- Utilise increasing usage
- Trials
- Using usage data during (and after) renewal season
- Assess seasonal changes and times of use
The future is bright, the future is COUNTing

COUNTER usage data enables:

- Research into the industry and market
- Libraries to evaluate and manage resources, and to better understand their end-users
- Publishers to better understand and to better serve their customers
- Potentially as a new metric for journals (JUF)
- Most of all librarians, need and want COUNTER compliant usage statistics.
Other projects to look at:

- Journal Usage Statistics Portal (JISC) – a collection of the usage data for all institutions, from publishers involved in the NESLi2 consortium deal
  [http://jusp.mimas.ac.uk/](http://jusp.mimas.ac.uk/)

- Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative (SUSHI) – a standard, which is designed to work with COUNTER reports, to enable automatic retrieval of usage data in a standard format (COUNTER release 3)
  [http://www.niso.org/workrooms/sushi](http://www.niso.org/workrooms/sushi)
Thank you

- A report of the MPS survey findings will be published in the next issue of Learned Publishing.
- The slides will be available on the STM website.

Any questions?
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