

Research, Teaching & Learning
*Scholarship and Libraries in Transition:
A Dialogue about the Impacts of Mass
Digitization Projects*

University of Michigan

March 10, 2006

Ann J. Wolpert

Massachusetts Institute of Technology



Mass digitization is an old story with journal formats.

- Significant volume of content since late 90's
- Research libraries increasingly deploy and have experience with digital format journals
- Perceived value is high
- Mental model of large scale digitization has shaped by journal articles and article-finding tools

E-journals could be absorbed by library practice more easily than e-books

- Databases were a clear improvement over print indexes
- Article vs bibliographic item
- Separate systems the norm
- Bibliographic instruction reinforces print book use
- Traditional higher education reinforces print book use

To date, E-books have not achieved a similar status.

- Out-of-copyright works have small audiences
- Markets often less well defined
- Popularity with researchers and learners less vivid
- Producers more diffuse and conservative
- Business models have struggled
- Have limited data to guide service development

The MIT Libraries surveyed faculty, students, and researchers, late 2005.

- We asked
 - What resources and services were important
 - How they seek and use information, esp.
 - Articles
 - Books
 - Facts
 - Priorities for resource and service enhancements
- We got
 - 46% response rate
 - Thousands of comments
 - Volunteers

Where e-resources are available, people vote with their mice.

- 85% regularly use online resources
- Of those who use e-resources at least 1/week
 - 43% in a library
 - 55% elsewhere at MIT
 - 36% off campus
- 32% were aware that they could use Google Scholar to access Libraries subscriptions
- 61% thought this feature was very important or essential

Resources themselves rank lower than finding tools in importance.

Rank order:

1. Barton (ILS)
2. VERA (ejournal and database gateway)
3. E-resources themselves
4. Print resources themselves

But Google Scholar now ranks 11th

Web sites consulted most frequently in studies or work

- Course management system(s)
- Libraries
- Google
- MIT home page
- Departmental home pages

When looking for full articles

- Top three places:
 1. Vera (Libraries gateway to e-subscriptions)
 2. Google/Google Scholar
 3. Barton (Libraries online catalog)
- Bottom places:
 1. Other search engines
 2. Print indexes

When looking for books

- Top three places:
 1. Barton (Libraries online catalog)
 2. Amazon
 3. Google
- Bottom places:
 1. E-book databases or gateways

When looking for facts

- Top three places:
 1. Google
 2. Wikipedia
 3. Printed handbooks, dictionaries, encyclopedias, etc.
- Bottom places:
 1. Individual databases
 2. Library staff

What students, faculty, and researchers want next:

1. A single interface to search across a variety of information sources
2. Expanded online content, especially older materials
3. More access to all library material via commercial search engines
4. A “wizard” to help choose the best tools for a topic

What might we learn from these responses

- Want help sorting through the chaos; the right kind of assistance matters
- People know that some high-value information may not be freely available
- Integration across sources is a priority
- Course management systems have become an information source
- People want to help design (or self-design) solutions

Ongoing market research will be necessary

- Could we develop standard questions?
 - What would they be...
- We should develop time series
- We must run the right experiments
- We need to maintain domain expertise
- We should devise/promote economic models that work for the academy