

# THE SURVEY OF LIBRARY DATABASE LICENSING PRACTICES, 2012 EDITION

© 2012 Primary Research Group Inc.

ISBN 157440-206-4



## Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	3
List of Tables .....	4
Survey Participants.....	18
The Questionnaire .....	20
Summary of Main Findings .....	28
Characteristics of the Sample.....	41
Chapter 1: Database Licensing Volume .....	42
Chapter 2: Renewals and Cancellations .....	49
Chapter 3: Mobile Computing .....	62
Chapter 4: Coverage of Blogs, Wikis, Listservs and Ezines .....	66
Chapter 5: Use of Consortiums.....	78
Chapter 6: Content License Pricing.....	84
Chapter 7: Disputes and Legal Expenditure .....	88
Chapter 8: Staff Time .....	90
Chapter 9: Contract Terms.....	94
Chapter 10: Usage Statistics .....	97
Chapter 11: Electronic Resources and Interlibrary Loan .....	100
Chapter 12: Use of Open Access Resources.....	103
Chapter 13: Use of Free Resources .....	112
Chapter 14: License Renewal Decision Making Process .....	115

## List of Tables

Table 1.1:	How much did your library spend for content licensed in electronic or combined electronic/print format in 2011? .....	42
Table 1.2:	How much will your library spend for content licensed in electronic or combined electronic/print format in 2012? .....	42
Table 1.3:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for directories?.....	42
Table 1.4:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for directories? Broken Out by Country .....	42
Table 1.5:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for directories? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	42
Table 1.6:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for journals? .....	43
Table 1.7:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for journals? Broken Out by Country .....	43
Table 1.8:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for journals? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	43
Table 1.9:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for e-books?.....	43
Table 1.10:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for e-books? Broken Out by Country .....	43
Table 1.11:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for e-books? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	44
Table 1.12:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for magazine/newspaper article indexes or full text?.....	44
Table 1.13:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for magazine/newspaper article indexes or full text? Broken Out by Country .....	44
Table 1.14:	How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for magazine/newspaper article indexes or full text? Broken Out by Type of Library.....	44
Table 1.15:	How many independent licenses for electronic content did your library maintain in 2011?.....	46
Table 1.16:	How many independent licenses for electronic content did your library maintain in 2011? Broken Out by Country .....	46
Table 1.17:	How many independent licenses for electronic content did your library maintain in 2011? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	46
Table 1.18:	How many independent licenses for electronic content did your library maintain in 2011? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	47

The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

Table 1.19:	How many independent licenses for electronic content did your library maintain in 2012?.....	47
Table 1.20:	How many independent licenses for electronic content did your library maintain in 2012? Broken Out by Country .....	47
Table 1.21:	How many independent licenses for electronic content did your library maintain in 2012? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	47
Table 1.22:	How many independent licenses for electronic content did your library maintain in 2012? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	48
Table 1.23:	How much did your library spend on e-book licenses in 2010?.....	48
Table 1.24:	How much did your library spend on e-book licenses in 2011?.....	48
Table 1.25:	How much will your library spend on e-book licenses in 2012?.....	48
Table 2.1:	What was your library's overall database renewal rate for all of its database contracts in the 2011-2012 fiscal or academic year? .....	49
Table 2.2:	What was your library's overall database renewal rate for all of its database contracts in the 2011-2012 fiscal or academic year? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	49
Table 2.3:	What was your library's overall database renewal rate for all of its database contracts in the 2011-2012 fiscal or academic year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	49
Table 2.4:	What will be your library's overall database renewal rate for all of its database contracts in the 2012-2013 fiscal or academic year? .....	49
Table 2.5:	What will be your library's overall database renewal rate for all of its database contracts in the 2012-2013 fiscal or academic year? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	50
Table 2.6:	What will be your library's overall database renewal rate for all of its database contracts in the 2012-2013 fiscal or academic year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	50
Table 2.7:	How likely are you to renew contracts for e-books in the next two years?.....	50
Table 2.8:	How likely are you to renew contracts for e-books in the next two years? Broken Out by Country .....	51
Table 2.9:	How likely are you to renew contracts for e-books in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	51
Table 2.10:	How likely are you to renew contracts for e-books in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	51
Table 2.11:	How likely are you to renew contracts for scholarly journals in the next two years? .....	52
Table 2.12:	How likely are you to renew contracts for scholarly journals in the next two years? Broken Out by Country .....	52
Table 2.13:	How likely are you to renew contracts for scholarly journals in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	52

The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

Table 2.14:	How likely are you to renew contracts for scholarly journals in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	53
Table 2.15:	How likely are you to renew contracts for directories in the next two years? .....	53
Table 2.16:	How likely are you to renew contracts for directories in the next two years? Broken Out by Country.....	53
Table 2.17:	How likely are you to renew contracts for directories in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library.....	54
Table 2.18:	How likely are you to renew contracts for directories in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	54
Table 2.19:	How likely are you to renew contracts for magazine and newspaper article oriented databases in the next two years? .....	54
Table 2.20:	How likely are you to renew contracts for magazine and newspaper article oriented databases in the next two years? Broken Out by Country .....	55
Table 2.21:	How likely are you to renew contracts for magazine and newspaper article oriented databases in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	55
Table 2.22:	How likely are you to renew contracts for magazine and newspaper article oriented databases in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	56
Table 2.23:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Humanities in the next two years? .....	56
Table 2.24:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Humanities in the next two years? Broken Out by Country.....	56
Table 2.25:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Humanities in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library.....	57
Table 2.26:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Humanities in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	57
Table 2.27:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Social Sciences in the next two years? .....	57
Table 2.28:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Social Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Country.....	58
Table 2.29:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Social Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	58
Table 2.30:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Social Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	58
Table 2.31:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Hard Sciences in the next two years? .....	59
Table 2.32:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Hard Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Country .....	59

The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

Table 2.33:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Hard Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	59
Table 2.34:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Hard Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	60
Table 2.35:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in Business and Finance in the next two years? .....	60
Table 2.36:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in Business and Finance in the next two years? Broken Out by Country .....	60
Table 2.37:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in Business and Finance in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	61
Table 2.38:	How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in Business and Finance in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	61
Table 3.1:	How important is it to you that your library's databases can be accessed through smartphones and other hand held digital devices? .....	62
Table 3.2:	How important is it to you that your library's databases can be accessed through smartphones and other hand held digital devices? Broken Out by Country .....	62
Table 3.3:	How important is it to you that your library's databases can be accessed through smartphones and other hand held digital devices? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	62
Table 3.4:	How important is it to you that your library's databases can be accessed through smartphones and other hand held digital devices? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	63
Table 3.5:	How much have you spent in the past year on licenses or other content purchases specifically for e-book reading devices or dedicated smartphone or tablet computer formats? .....	64
Table 3.6:	How much have you spent in the past year on licenses or other content purchases specifically for e-book reading devices or dedicated smartphone or tablet computer formats? Broken Out by Country .....	64
Table 3.7:	How much have you spent in the past year on licenses or other content purchases specifically for e-book reading devices or dedicated smartphone or tablet computer formats? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	65
Table 3.8:	How much have you spent in the past year on licenses or other content purchases specifically for e-book reading devices or dedicated smartphone or tablet computer formats? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	65
Table 4.1:	Would you like to see blogs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use?.....	66
Table 4.2:	Would you like to see blogs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Country .....	66

The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

Table 4.3:	Would you like to see blogs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	66
Table 4.4:	Would you like to see blogs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	66
Table 4.5:	Would you like to see wikis indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use?.....	66
Table 4.6:	Would you like to see wikis indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Country .....	67
Table 4.7:	Would you like to see wikis indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	67
Table 4.8:	Would you like to see wikis indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	67
Table 4.9:	Would you like to see listservs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use?.....	67
Table 4.10:	Would you like to see listservs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Country .....	67
Table 4.11:	Would you like to see listservs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	68
Table 4.12:	Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	68
Table 4.13:	Would you like to see ezines indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use?.....	68
Table 4.14:	Would you like to see ezines indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Country .....	68
Table 4.15:	Would you like to see ezines indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	68
Table 4.16:	Would you like to see ezines indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	69
Table 4.17:	Would you like to see podcasts indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use?.....	69
Table 4.18:	Would you like to see podcasts indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Country .....	69
Table 4.19:	Would you like to see podcasts indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	69
Table 4.20:	Would you like to see podcasts indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	69
Table 4.21:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to wikis in their full text databases? .....	70
Table 4.22:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to wikis in their full text databases? Broken Out by Country.....	70



The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

Table 4.23:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to wikis in their full text databases? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	70
Table 4.24:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to wikis in their full text databases? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	71
Table 4.25:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to blogs in their full text databases? .....	71
Table 4.26:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to blogs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Country .....	71
Table 4.27:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to blogs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	72
Table 4.28:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to blogs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	72
Table 4.29:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to ezines in their full text databases? .....	72
Table 4.30:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to ezines in their full text databases? Broken Out by Country .....	73
Table 4.31:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to ezines in their full text databases? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	73
Table 4.32:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to ezines in their full text databases? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	74
Table 4.33:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to listservs in their full text databases? .....	74
Table 4.34:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to listservs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Country .....	74
Table 4.35:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to listservs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	75
Table 4.36:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to listservs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	75

The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

Table 4.37:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to videos or podcasts in their full text databases? .....	76
Table 4.38:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to videos or podcasts in their full text databases? Broken Out by Country.....	76
Table 4.39:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to videos or podcasts in their full text databases? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	76
Table 4.40:	How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to videos or podcasts in their full text databases? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	77
Table 5.1:	In how many database licensing consortiums does the library participate?.....	78
Table 5.2:	In how many database licensing consortiums does the library participate? Broken Out by Country .....	78
Table 5.3:	In how many database licensing consortiums does the library participate? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	78
Table 5.4:	In how many database licensing consortiums does the library participate? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	78
Table 5.5:	Contracts through consortiums account for what percentage of the library's total licenses for electronic content?.....	79
Table 5.6:	Contracts through consortiums account for what percentage of the library's total licenses for electronic content Broken Out by Country .....	79
Table 5.7:	Contracts through consortiums account for what percentage of the library's total licenses for electronic content? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	79
Table 5.8:	Contracts through consortiums account for what percentage of the library's total licenses for electronic content? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	79
Table 5.9:	Over the past two years, how has the percentage of content licensing contracts purchased through consortiums changed? .....	80
Table 5.10:	Over the past two years, how has the percentage of content licensing contracts purchased through consortiums changed? Broken Out by Country .....	80
Table 5.11:	Over the past two years, how has the percentage of content licensing contracts purchased through consortiums changed? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	80
Table 5.12:	Over the past two years, how has the percentage of content licensing contracts purchased through consortiums changed? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	81

The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

Table 6.1:	By what percentage have prices increased for electronic and electronic/print combination journals in the past year?.....	84
Table 6.2:	By what percentage have prices increased for electronic and electronic/print combination journals in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	84
Table 6.3:	By what percentage have prices increased for e-books in the past year? .....	84
Table 6.4:	By what percentage have prices increased for e-books in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	84
Table 6.5:	By what percentage have prices increased for indexes and full text newspaper and magazine databases in the past year? .....	84
Table 6.6:	By what percentage have prices increased for indexes and full text newspaper and magazine databases in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	85
Table 6.7:	By what percentage have prices increased for directories in the past year? .....	85
Table 6.8:	By what percentage have prices increased for directories in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	85
Table 6.9:	By what percentage have prices increased for market research in the past year? .....	85
Table 6.10:	By what percentage have prices increased for market research in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	85
Table 6.11:	What was the approximate change in price of electronic content on business and finance licensed by your library in the past year? .....	86
Table 6.12:	What was the approximate change in price of electronic content on medicine and biochemistry licensed by your library in the past year? .....	86
Table 6.13:	What was the approximate change in price of electronic content on engineering licensed by your library in the past year?.....	86
Table 6.14:	What was the approximate change in price of electronic content on the humanities licensed by your library in the past year? .....	86
Table 6.15:	What was the approximate change in price of electronic content on social sciences licensed by your library in the past year? .....	86
Table 6.16:	What was the approximate change in price of electronic content on law licensed by your library in the past year? .....	86
Table 6.17:	What was the approximate change in price of electronic content on general news information licensed by your library in the past year?.....	87
Table 7.1:	How many hours of professional legal assistance did the library require for contract review or disputes in the past year?.....	88
Table 7.2:	How many hours of professional legal assistance did the library require for contract review or disputes in the past year? Broken Out by Country .....	88

The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

Table 7.3:	How many hours of professional legal assistance did the library require for contract review or disputes in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library.....	88
Table 7.4:	How many hours of professional legal assistance did the library require for contract review or disputes in the past year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	88
Table 7.5:	Has your library ever been threatened by a publisher or information vendor with any form of legal action for contract abrogation, non-payment or any other reason?.....	89
Table 7.6:	Has your library ever been threatened by a publisher or information vendor with any form of legal action for contract abrogation, non-payment or any other reason? Broken Out by Country .....	89
Table 7.7:	Has your library ever been threatened by a publisher or information vendor with any form of legal action for contract abrogation, non-payment or any other reason? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	89
Table 7.8:	Has your library ever been threatened by a publisher or information vendor with any form of legal action for contract abrogation, non-payment or any other reason? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	89
Table 7.9:	Has your library ever threatened a publisher or information vendor with legal action over nonperformance or other contract abrogation or for any other reason? .....	89
Table 8.1:	How much annual staff time is expended by your library in database maintenance in the following ways: keeping track of contractual terms, payment and review of invoices, renewing or canceling subscriptions and phone, email or other correspondence over downtime or other technical problems?.....	90
Table 8.2:	How much annual staff time is expended by your library in database maintenance in the following ways: keeping track of contractual terms, payment and review of invoices, renewing or canceling subscriptions and phone, email or other correspondence over downtime or other technical problems? Broken Out by Country .....	90
Table 8.3:	How much annual staff time is expended by your library in database maintenance in the following ways: keeping track of contractual terms, payment and review of invoices, renewing or canceling subscriptions and phone, email or other correspondence over downtime or other technical problems? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	90
Table 8.4:	How much annual staff time is expended by your library in database maintenance in the following ways: keeping track of contractual terms, payment and review of invoices, renewing or canceling subscriptions and phone, email or other correspondence	

The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

	over downtime or other technical problems? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	91
Table 8.5:	What percentage of your database vendors would you say sometimes deliver problematic invoices which you feel compelled to carefully check? .....	91
Table 8.6:	What percentage of your database vendors would you say sometimes deliver problematic invoices which you feel compelled to carefully check? Broken Out by Country .....	91
Table 8.7:	What percentage of your database vendors would you say sometimes deliver problematic invoices which you feel compelled to carefully check? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	91
Table 8.8:	What percentage of your database vendors would you say sometimes deliver problematic invoices which you feel compelled to carefully check? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	92
Table 8.9:	As a general rule, what percentage of the invoices that you receive for database products would you say are inaccurate? .....	92
Table 8.10:	As a general rule, what percentage of the invoices that you receive for database products would you say are inaccurate? Broken Out by Country .....	92
Table 8.11:	As a general rule, what percentage of the invoices that you receive for database products would you say are inaccurate? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	92
Table 8.12:	As a general rule, what percentage of the invoices that you receive for database products would you say are inaccurate? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	93
Table 9.1:	Which phrase best describes the extent to which your major database vendors adhere to contract terms regarding downtime, product availability and timeliness, billing, perpetual access and other contractual terms? .....	94
Table 9.2:	Which phrase best describes the extent to which your major database vendors adhere to contract terms regarding downtime, product availability and timeliness, billing, perpetual access and other contractual terms? Broken Out by Country .....	94
Table 9.3:	Which phrase best describes the extent to which your major database vendors adhere to contract terms regarding downtime, product availability and timeliness, billing, perpetual access and other contractual terms? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	94
Table 9.4:	Which phrase best describes the extent to which your major database vendors adhere to contract terms regarding downtime, product availability and timeliness, billing, perpetual access and other contractual terms? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	95
Table 10.1:	How has database usage at your library changed in the past year? .....	97

The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

Table 10.2:	How has database usage at your library changed in the past year? Broken Out by Country .....	97
Table 10.3:	How has database usage at your library changed in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	97
Table 10.4:	How has database usage at your library changed in the past year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	98
Table 10.5:	How successful have you been in negotiating reductions in database licensing prices when usage statistics show declining use? .....	98
Table 10.6:	How successful have you been in negotiating reductions in database licensing prices when usage statistics show declining use? Broken Out by Country .....	98
Table 10.7:	How successful have you been in negotiating reductions in database licensing prices when usage statistics show declining use? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	98
Table 10.8:	How successful have you been in negotiating reductions in database licensing prices when usage statistics show declining use? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	99
Table 11.1:	Which phrase best describes your library's attitude towards negotiating contract language on provision of interlibrary loan materials through email or other internet technology? .....	100
Table 11.2:	Which phrase best describes your library's attitude towards negotiating contract language on provision of interlibrary loan materials through email or other internet technology? Broken Out by Country .....	100
Table 11.3:	Which phrase best describes your library's attitude towards negotiating contract language on provision of interlibrary loan materials through email or other internet technology? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	101
Table 11.4:	Which phrase best describes your library's attitude towards negotiating contract language on provision of interlibrary loan materials through email or other internet technology? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	101
Table 11.5:	Have you ever used an e-book lending service? .....	101
Table 11.6:	Have you ever used an e-book lending service? Broken Out by Country .....	101
Table 11.7:	Have you ever used an e-book lending service? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	102
Table 11.8:	Have you ever used an e-book lending service? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	102
Table 12.1:	Does your library track patron use of open access journals? .....	103
Table 12.2:	Does your library track patron use of open access journals? Broken Out by Country .....	103
Table 12.3:	Does your library track patron use of open access journals? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	103

The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

Table 12.4:	Does your library track patron use of open access journals? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	103
Table 12.5:	What has been the rate of change in the use of open access journals by your patrons and staff in the past year? .....	103
Table 12.6:	What has been the rate of change in the use of open access journals by your patrons and staff in the past year? Broken Out by Country.....	104
Table 12.7:	What has been the rate of change in the use of open access journals by your patrons and staff in the past year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	104
Table 12.8:	Has the library ever paid an article processing fee for an author?.....	105
Table 12.9:	Has the library ever paid an article processing fee for an author? Broken Out by Country .....	105
Table 12.10:	Has the library ever paid an article processing fee for an author? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	105
Table 12.11:	Has the library ever paid an article processing fee for an author? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	106
Table 12.12:	What percentage of journal articles acquired from other institutions comes from the institutional digital repositories of other institutions or from a digital repository consortium? .....	107
Table 12.13:	What percentage of journal articles acquired from other institutions comes from the institutional digital repositories of other institutions or from a digital repository consortium? Broken Out by Country .....	107
Table 12.14:	What percentage of journal articles acquired from other institutions comes from the institutional digital repositories of other institutions or from a digital repository consortium? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	107
Table 12.15:	What percentage of journal articles acquired from other institutions comes from the institutional digital repositories of other institutions or from a digital repository consortium? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Resources in 2011 .....	107
Table 12.16:	Which phrase best describes your organization? .....	108
Table 12.17:	Which phrase best describes your organization? Broken Out by Country .....	108
Table 12.18:	Which phrase best describes your organization? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	108
Table 12.19:	Which phrase best describes your organization? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	109
Table 12.20:	What percentage of your institution's original published scholarly output in the past year is deposited in your library's institutional digital repository?.....	109
Table 12.21:	What percentage of your institution's original published scholarly output in the past year is deposited in your library's institutional digital repository? Broken Out by Country .....	109
Table 12.22:	What percentage of your institution's original published scholarly output in the past year is deposited in your library's institutional	

	digital repository? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	110
Table 13.1:	Many journal publishers now make access to back issues of their journals free to the public after an "embargo" period, often of 1-2 years. For journals that your library does not subscribe to, which of the following would you say is true? .....	112
Table 13.2:	Many journal publishers now make access to back issues of their journals free to the public after an "embargo" period, often of 1-2 years. For journals that your library does not subscribe to, which of the following would you say is true? Broken Out by Country .....	112
Table 13.3:	Many journal publishers now make access to back issues of their journals free to the public after an "embargo" period, often of 1-2 years. For journals that your library does not subscribe to, which of the following would you say is true? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	112
Table 13.4:	Many journal publishers now make access to back issues of their journals free to the public after an "embargo" period, often of 1-2 years. For journals that your library does not subscribe to, which of the following would you say is true? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	113
Table 13.5:	What percentage of total article requests from faculty or library patrons for journals that are not in your collection are satisfied by downloads or accesses of these free back files offered by some journal publishers? .....	113
Table 13.6:	What percentage of total article requests from faculty or library patrons for journals that are not in your collection are satisfied by downloads or accesses of these free back files offered by some journal publishers? Broken Out by Country .....	113
Table 13.7:	What percentage of total article requests from faculty or library patrons for journals that are not in your collection are satisfied by downloads or accesses of these free back files offered by some journal publishers? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	113
Table 13.8:	What percentage of total article requests from faculty or library patrons for journals that are not in your collection are satisfied by downloads or accesses of these free back files offered by some journal publishers? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	114
Table 14.1:	In the next year, what percentage of the library's content licensing contracts that come up for renewal does the library expect to renew? .....	115
Table 14.2:	In the next year, what percentage of the library's content licensing contracts that come up for renewal does the library expect to renew? Broken Out by Country .....	115



The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

Table 14.3:	In the next year, what percentage of the library's content licensing contracts that come up for renewal does the library expect to renew? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	115
Table 14.4:	In the next year, what percentage of the library's content licensing contracts that come up for renewal does the library expect to renew? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	115
Table 14.5:	How many databases did the library test on a free-trial basis within the past year? .....	116
Table 14.6:	How many databases did the library test on a free-trial basis within the past year? Broken Out by Country .....	116
Table 14.7:	How many databases did the library test on a free-trial basis within the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library .....	116
Table 14.8:	How many databases did the library test on a free-trial basis within the past year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 .....	116

## Survey Participants

Abbott Laboratories  
Agnes Scott College  
AgResearch LTD  
Alberta AIM  
Alberta Innovates-Tech Futures  
Appalachian State University  
Aurora University  
Austin Public Library  
Australian National University Library  
Baker College  
Botswana Technology Centre  
Bradley Public Library District  
Broward College  
California State University, Long Beach  
Carvajal Foundation  
Catholic University of America  
East Baton Rouge Parish Library  
Ecolab Inc.  
Elon University  
Foley Hoag LLP  
Fundación Universitaria Colombo Internacional  
Hancock County Library System  
Harrison College  
HSE (Ireland)  
Institute of Physical Rehabilitation of Québec  
Institute of Social Sciences at the University of Lisbon  
IRT-Perundurai Medical College  
Istanbul Technical University  
Johns Hopkins University/Entrepreneurial Library Program/Excelsior College Library  
Johnson County Library  
Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology  
L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library  
LAC Group at BP  
Library of Chinese Academic Science  
Library of Congress  
Marywood University  
Meadville Public Library  
National Agricultural Library  
National Technical University of Ecuador  
Otis College of Art and Design  
Pasadena Independent School District  
Pasadena Public Library  
Quincy University

Red Deer College  
Sacramento Public Library  
Santa Cruz Public Libraries  
Sarita Kenedy East Law Library  
Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt  
Sharif University of Technology  
South Staffordshire and Shropshire Healthcare  
State Library of Victoria  
State University of New York at Buffalo  
Stockton San Joaquin County Public Library  
Sultan Qaboos University  
Tampere University  
Technical University of Crete  
The New School  
University of Aberdeen  
University of Wyoming Libraries  
William Mitchell College of Law

## The Questionnaire

1. Contact Information

Name:

Organization:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

2. Which of the following best describes your organization?

(a) College or University Library

(b) Public Library

(c) Corporate Library

(d) Law Firm Library

(e) Other (please specify)

3. How much did/will your library spend for content licensed in electronic or combined electronic/print format (but not for print alone) in the following years? For academic institutions 2011 is the 2011-2012 academic year and 2012 is the upcoming 2012-2013 academic year.

2011:

2012:

4. How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for the following types of materials?

Directories:

Journals:

E-books:

Magazines:

5. In which areas of database content, defined by database content form (directory, journal, newspaper article, e-book, etc.) and also by subject (economics, psychology, physics, literature, etc.) does your organization plan to significantly increase or decrease spending over the next two years?

6. For each of the following years, how many independent licenses for electronic content (or electronic content combined with print) did your library maintain?

2011:

2012:

7. How much did/will your library spend for e-book licenses in the following years?

2010:

2011:

2012:

8. What was your library's overall database renewal rate (in percentage terms) for each of the following years for all of its database contracts?

2011-2012:

2012-2013:

9. How likely are you to renew contracts for each of the following mediums for the next two years?

E-books:

- (a) Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts
- (b) Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%
- (c) Likely to cut from 5% to 10%
- (d) Likely to renew at least 95%
- (e) Likely to renew all current databases
- (f) Do not have any databases in this area

Scholarly Journals:

- (a) Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts
- (b) Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%
- (c) Likely to cut from 5% to 10%
- (d) Likely to renew at least 95%
- (e) Likely to renew all current databases
- (f) Do not have any databases in this area

Directories:

- (a) Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts
- (b) Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%
- (c) Likely to cut from 5% to 10%
- (d) Likely to renew at least 95%
- (e) Likely to renew all current databases
- (f) Do not have any databases in this area

Magazine and Newspaper Article oriented Databases:

- (a) Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts
- (b) Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%
- (c) Likely to cut from 5% to 10%
- (d) Likely to renew at least 95%
- (e) Likely to renew all current databases
- (f) Do not have any databases in this area

Databases in the Humanities:

- (a) Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts
- (b) Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%
- (c) Likely to cut from 5% to 10%
- (d) Likely to renew at least 95%
- (e) Likely to renew all current databases
- (f) Do not have any databases in this area

Databases in the Social Sciences:

- (a) Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts
- (b) Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%
- (c) Likely to cut from 5% to 10%
- (d) Likely to renew at least 95%
- (e) Likely to renew all current databases
- (f) Do not have any databases in this area

Databases in the Hard Sciences:

- (a) Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts
- (b) Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%
- (c) Likely to cut from 5% to 10%
- (d) Likely to renew at least 95%
- (e) Likely to renew all current databases
- (f) Do not have any databases in this area

Databases in Business and Finance:

- (a) Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts
- (b) Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%
- (c) Likely to cut from 5% to 10%
- (d) Likely to renew at least 95%
- (e) Likely to renew all current databases
- (f) Do not have any databases in this area

10. How important is it to you that your library's databases can be accessed through smartphones and other hand held digital devices?

- (a) No real interest
- (b) Not particularly useful
- (c) Useful but not essential
- (d) Important for us
- (e) Essential for us

11. Has patron use of the iPad and other tablet computers had any impact on the use of electronic resources at your library? If so, what has been the impact and what do you expect in the near future?

12. How much have you spent in the past year on licenses or other content purchases specifically for e-book reading devices (such as Kindle or Nook) or dedicated smartphone or tablet computer formats?

13. Would you like to see the following types of resources indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? (Choose all that apply)

- (a) Blogs
- (b) Wikis
- (c) Listservs
- (d) Ezines
- (e) Podcasts

14. How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to the following in their full text databases?

Wikis:

- (a) Poor
- (b) Fair
- (c) Good
- (d) Excellent
- (e) Don't think that these resources should be included in databases

Blogs:

- (a) Poor
- (b) Fair
- (c) Good
- (d) Excellent
- (e) Don't think that these resources should be included in databases

Ezines:

- (a) Poor
- (b) Fair
- (c) Good
- (d) Excellent
- (e) Don't think that these resources should be included in databases

Listservs:

- (a) Poor
- (b) Fair
- (c) Good
- (d) Excellent
- (e) Don't think that these resources should be included in databases

Videos or Podcasts:

- (a) Poor
- (b) Fair
- (c) Good
- (d) Excellent
- (e) Don't think that these resources should be included in databases

15. In how many database licensing consortiums does the library participate (in which it has at least one active contract)?

16. Contracts through consortiums account for what percentage of the library's total licenses for electronic content?

17. Over the past two years, how has the percentage of content licensing contracts purchased through consortiums changed?

- (a) Remained about the same
- (b) Increased but by less than 5%
- (c) Increased by more than 5%
- (d) Decreased by less than 5%
- (e) Decreased by more than 5%

18. How could the consortium in which your institution participates better serve you? What steps might they take to help you get a better deal on database contracts?

19. In the next few years, do you expect to make a higher or lower percentage of your database purchases through consortia? Or will it remain about the same? Do you view consortia as a tool that you can increasingly utilize to reduce costs and extend your budget in tough times?

20. For the following types of content, how much have prices increased (in nominal, not inflation adjusted terms) for the following types of content in the past year? If you do not use a particular content form leave that box blank.

Electronic and Electronic/Print Combination Journals:

E-books:

Indexes and Full Text Newspaper and Magazine Databases:

Directories:

Market Research:



The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

21. What is the approximate change in price of the following type of electronic content licensed by your library in the past year? Leave blank if your library does not license that type of content.

Business and Financial Information:

Medical and Biochemical Information:

Engineering Information:

Humanities:

Social Sciences:

Legal Information:

General News Information:

22. Approximately how many hours of professional legal assistance (from lawyers within or outside of your organization) did the library require for contract review or disputes in the past year?

23. To the best of your knowledge has the library ever been threatened by a publisher or information vendor with any form of legal action for contract abrogation, non-payment or any other reason?

24. Has your library ever threatened a publisher or information vendor with legal action over nonperformance or other contract abrogation or for any other reason?

25. How much annual staff time (in hours) would you say is expended by your library (one full-time person spending all of their time would be about 1900 hours) in database maintenance in the following ways: keeping track of contractual terms, payment and review of invoices, renewing or canceling subscriptions and phone, email or other correspondence over downtime or other technical problems?

26. What percentage of your database vendors would you say sometimes deliver problematic invoices which you feel compelled to carefully check?

27. As a general rule, what percentage of the invoices that you receive for database products would you say are inaccurate?

28. Which phrase best describes the extent to which our major database vendors adhere to contract terms regarding downtime, product availability and timeliness, billing, perpetual access and other contractual terms?

(a) Never had any serious problems

(b) Most vendors are scrupulous but have had occasional issues

(c) Have had issues with a sizable minority of vendors

(d) Have had issues with many vendors

29. What are some of the most serious issues that you have had with database vendors whom you feel have not kept to contractual terms?

30. How has database usage at your library changed in the past year?
- (a) Increased substantially
  - (b) Increased modestly
  - (c) Remained about the same
  - (d) Decreased modestly
  - (e) Decreased substantially
31. How successful have you been in negotiating reductions in database licensing prices when usage statistics show declining use?
- (a) Not at all successful
  - (b) Generally unsuccessful
  - (c) Successful occasionally
  - (d) Often successful
  - (e) Usually successful
32. Which phrase best describes your library's attitude towards negotiating contract language on provision of interlibrary loan materials through email or other internet technology?
- (a) We have not really tried to negotiate any special language on this issue
  - (b) We have asked publishers to give us greater capacity to provide content via email in interlibrary loan request but without much success
  - (c) We have asked publishers to give us expanded leeway to provide content via email in interlibrary loan requests and have had success in negotiating better terms
33. Have you ever used an e-book lending service? These services allow you to "rent" or use a "pay per view" model to access an e-book for a brief time period, usually about 30 days.
- (a) Yes
  - (b) No
34. If you have used such services, how much did your library spend on them in the past year?
35. Does your library track patron use of open access journals?
- (a) Yes
  - (b) No
36. What would you say has been the percentage rate of change in the use of open access journals by your patrons and staff in the past year?
37. In the past year, has your library deferred, postponed, canceled or reduced the scope and cost of any subscription by substituting equally valuable open access journals? How has the growing prevalence of open access journals affected your licensing and procurement efforts?

38. Has the library ever paid an article processing fee for an author?
- (a) Yes
  - (b) No
  - (c) No, but our parent institution has paid such fees
39. Has your library or any other department at your organization made any effort to track submissions and publications by faculty in open access journals? If so can you describe this effort?
40. What percentage of journal articles acquired from other institutions (when your own library does not have a journal in its collection and needs an article for a patron) comes from the institutional digital depositories of other institutions, or from a digital repository consortium?
41. Which phrase best describes your organization?
- (a) Currently has an institutional digital repository
  - (b) Does not have an institutional digital repository but we are in the planning stage and will have one within 1 year
  - (c) Does not have an institutional digital repository but we are considering one and will likely have one within 2 years
  - (d) Does not have an institutional digital repository and do not expect to have one within the next 3 years
42. What percentage of your institution's original published scholarly output in the past year would you say is deposited in your library's institutional digital repository?
43. How has the growing use of institutional digital repositories impacted your library? Has it enabled your library to reduce costs or to shift resources to other needed areas?
44. Many journal publishers now make access to back issues of their journals free to the public after an "embargo" period, often of 1-2 years. For journals that your library does not subscribe to, which of the following would you say is true?
- (a) We make extensive use of these free offerings
  - (b) We use these free offerings to some extent
  - (c) We don't really make much use of them
  - (d) We don't really use them at all
45. What percentage of the total article requests from faculty or other library patrons for journals that are not in your collection are satisfied by downloads or accesses of these free back files offered by some journal publishers?
46. In the next year, what percentage of the library's content licensing contracts that come up for renewal does the library expect to renew?
47. How many databases did the library test on a free-trial basis within the past year?

## Summary of Main Findings

### Database Licensing Volume

Libraries in the sample spent a mean of \$1,113,292 on content licensed in electronic and combined electronic/print format in 2011. Spending on this content will increase by approximately 2.6% in 2012, to a mean of \$1,142,289, with some libraries spending as much as \$14,600,000.

In 2011, libraries in the sample maintained a mean of 185.04 independent licenses for electronic content. Libraries in the United States maintained a mean of 220 such licenses, while libraries in other developed countries maintained a mean of 158.23 licenses and those in developing countries maintained a mean of just 17. Libraries in the sample will maintain a mean of 23.52 more independent licenses for electronic content in 2012 than in 2011, with those in the United States increasing these holdings by about 15%, to a mean of 252.71. Public libraries will maintain a mean of 531.82 independent licenses for electronic content in 2012, whereas college libraries will maintain a mean of 133.24 and corporate and law firm libraries will maintain fewer than 28.

On average, libraries that spent \$100,000 to 500,000 on electronic content in 2011 maintained more independent licenses for electronic content than libraries that spent over \$500,000 on this content, though the difference may be accounted for by a single library which maintained a mean of 4,500 independent licenses for electronic content in 2011 and will maintain 5,500 such licenses in 2012. In 2012, libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content the previous year will maintain a mean of 10.47 independent licenses, while those that spent \$100,000 to \$500,000 will maintain a mean of 384.25 licenses and libraries that spent more than \$500,000 will maintain a mean of 262.29.

### Annual Spending on Database Licenses

Electronic licenses for journals (including those in combined electronic/print format) account for the bulk of electronic content spending, with libraries in the sample spending a mean of \$570,183 per year to this end. Libraries in the sample in the United States spend a mean of \$605,564 annually on electronic and electronic/print journals, whereas those in other developed countries spend a mean of \$564,184 and those in developing countries spend a mean of \$349,356. College libraries spend approximately \$832,231 per year on electronic journals, while corporate and law firm libraries spend a mean of \$1,163,250. In contrast, public libraries spend a mean of \$40,200 annually on electronic licenses for scholarly journals and other libraries spend about \$53,592.

Access to electronic directories cost libraries in the sample a mean of \$6,928 annually and a maximum of \$50,000. Libraries in the United States spend a mean of \$6,476 on electronic directories every year, while those in other developed countries spend a mean of \$7,947 and those in developing countries spend a mean of \$5,196. College libraries

spend a mean of \$10,187 on electronic directories per year, nearly twice the \$5,500 spent by public libraries and about 13% more than the \$9,000 spent by corporate and law firm libraries.

Electronic licenses for magazine and newspaper article indexes and full text databases make up a significant portion of content spending among libraries in the United States, which spend a mean of \$423,434 on these licenses per year. Libraries in other developed countries spend a mean of \$161,754 on licenses for magazine and newspaper article indexes and full text databases, while those in developing countries spend a mean of just \$6,997. All together, libraries in the sample spend a mean of \$332,913 on electronic and electronic/print licenses for newspaper and magazine databases per year and a maximum of \$4,500,000. Public libraries spend a mean of \$109,573 annually, while college libraries spend a mean of \$361,359 and corporate and law firm libraries spend a mean of \$1,253,000.

Libraries in the sample spend a mean of \$70,030 per year on electronic licenses for e-books, with much of this spending coming from corporate and law firm libraries, which spend a mean of \$193,333 on e-books annually. College libraries in the sample spend a mean of \$80,257 on e-books, while public libraries spend a mean of \$56,342 and other libraries spend less than \$10,000. Libraries in developing countries spend a mean of \$75,981 on e-books each year, rivaling the mean of \$85,346 spent by libraries in the United States and more than twice the mean \$32,026 spent by those in other developed countries.

Spending on e-book licenses by libraries in the sample totaled a mean of \$42,298 in 2011, up from a mean of \$35,762 in the year prior. This amount is expected to rise significantly in the coming year, to a mean of \$57,104, with some libraries planning to spend as much as \$425,000 on e-books in 2012. These changes reflect a 35% increase in e-book spending from 2011 to 2012, and an increase of approximately 60% over the last two years.

### **Overall Database Renewal Rate**

In the 2011-2012 fiscal year, the overall database renewal rate for libraries in the sample was approximately 92.56%. College libraries renewed a mean of 91.5% of their database contracts, compared with 90.23% among public libraries, 98.33% among corporate and law firm libraries, and 95.3% among other libraries. Libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 renewed a mean of 96.59% of database contracts, while those that spent between \$100,000 and \$500,000 renewed approximately 88.93% and libraries that spent over \$500,000 renewed a mean of 93.13%.

While public libraries will modestly increase the percentage of databases they will renew in 2012-2013, college libraries will reduce their renewal rate to a mean of 90.61%. Corporate and law firm libraries will renew a mean of 98.33% of their database contracts, the same percentage as the year prior, and other libraries will decrease their renewal rate by approximately 6%, to a mean of 89.3%. Libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on

electronic content in 2011 will renew a mean of 88.86% of database contracts, while those that spent more than \$500,000 will renew approximately 92.31%.

### **Renewals by Material**

17.54% of libraries in the sample are likely to renew at least 95% (but less than 100%) of their current e-book database contracts in the next two years and 52.63% will renew all of these contracts. 19.30% of libraries in the sample do not have any e-book databases, including 13.13% of libraries in the United States, 30.77% of libraries in other developed countries and 40% of libraries in developing countries. 55.56% of college libraries and 58.33% of public libraries will renew all contracts for e-book databases, though 20% of corporate and law firm libraries will likely cut between 10% and 25% of these contracts. Nearly a third of libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 do not have e-book databases and another 12.5% will 25% or more of their contracts for e-book databases.

Of the 14.29% of libraries in the sample that do not have databases for scholarly journals, most are public libraries, about 33.33% of which do not have databases in this area. 10.71% of libraries in the sample will cut 5% to 10% of scholarly journal contracts, whereas 19.64% will renew at least 95% of current contracts and 41.07% will maintain all of them. 60% of libraries in developing countries will renew all scholarly journal databases, compared with 41.67% of libraries in the United States and 30.77% of libraries in other developed countries. 43.75% of libraries that spent more than \$500,000 on electronic content in 2011 will renew all of their current scholarly journal contracts, while just 12.5% will cut more than 10% of these contracts.

3.57% of libraries in the sample expect to cut 25% or more of their current contracts for directories in the next two years, whereas 25% will renew all contracts and 44.64% have no databases in this area. The latter include 40.54% of libraries in the United States and 75% of those in other developed countries. College libraries will renew the greatest percentage of their directory databases, with 7.69% of these libraries renewing at least 95% of directory database contracts and 26.92% renewing all current contracts. 40% of corporate and law firm libraries, meanwhile, will cut from 5% to 10% of these contracts and 20% will cut from 10% to 25%. As many as 73.33% of libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 do not have any directory databases, compared with 44.44% of libraries that spent \$100,000 to \$500,000 and 29.41% of libraries that spent more than \$500,000.

Nearly 52% of libraries in the sample, including 100% of libraries in developing countries and 51.43% of libraries in the United States, will renew all current contracts for magazine and newspaper oriented databases in the next two years and another 13.46% are likely to renew at least 95% of these contracts. 15.38% of libraries do not have any magazine and newspaper databases, 11.43% of libraries in the United States and 40% of those in other developed countries. 50% of college libraries, 50% of corporate and law firm libraries, and 54.55% of public libraries will renew all current contracts for magazine and newspaper articles. 1.92% of libraries in the sample are likely to cut 25%

or more of contracts for these databases, all of these corporate and law firm libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011.

### **Renewals by Subject**

While no libraries in the sample will cut 25% or more of contracts for databases in the Humanities, 5.56% will cut between 10% and 25% of these contracts and another 5.56% will cut between 5% and 10%. Approximately 33.33% of libraries, including 80% of corporate and law firm libraries, 18.18% of public libraries and 16% of college libraries, have no databases in this area. 80% of libraries in developing countries and 41.67% of libraries in the United States will renew all current Humanities databases, though no libraries in other developed countries will do the same. 16.67% of libraries in the sample, including the same percentage of those in the United States and 27.27% of those in other developed countries, will renew at least 95% of contracts for databases in the Humanities.

80% of libraries in developing countries and nearly 45% of all libraries in the sample plan to maintain 100% of their contracts for databases in the Social Sciences over the next two years. 13.89% of libraries in the United States and 27.27% of libraries in other developed countries will renew at least 95% of these contracts, together accounting for 14.81% of libraries in the sample. 80% of corporate and law firm libraries currently have no databases in the Social Sciences, whereas 44% of college libraries and the majority of public libraries will renew all of their databases in this area. In comparison, just 26.67% of libraries that spent more than \$500,000 on electronic content in 2011 will maintain all current Social Science databases and 46.66% will cut contracts for these databases to some extent.

41.07% of libraries in the sample will renew all current contracts for databases in the Hard Sciences in the next two years. These include 44.44% of college libraries, 36.36% of public libraries and 20% of corporate and law firm libraries, another 60% of which will maintain at least 95% of these contracts. 30.36% of libraries in the sample do not have any databases in the Hard Sciences, including 37.5% of libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 and 38.89% of libraries that spent from \$100,000 to \$500,000. 12.5% of libraries that spent more than \$500,000 on this content in 2011 will cut 25% or more of their current contracts for Hard Sciences databases in the next two years, as will 5.41% of libraries in the United States.

In the next two years, 18.52% of libraries in the sample will renew at least 95% of their contracts for databases in Business and Finance and 48.15% will renew all of these contracts. 12.96% of libraries in the sample currently have no databases in this area and the same percentage plan to cut 5% to 10% of these databases. No libraries in developing countries will cut more than 10% of their contracts for databases in Business and Finance, though 8.11% of libraries in the United States will cut between 10% and 25% of such contracts and 9.09% of libraries in other developed countries will cut over 25%. 37.5% of libraries that spent over \$500,000 on electronic content in 2011 will renew all current contracts for databases in Business and Finance, compared with 53.33% of libraries that spent less than \$100,000 and 50% of those that spent between \$100,000 and \$500,000.

## **Mobile Computing**

7.02% of survey participants say that the ability to access databases through smartphones and other handheld devices is essential for their library and 33.33% categorize it as important. 50.88% of participants say that mobile access to library databases is useful but not essential, while 8.77% say it is not particularly useful or of no real interest. 14.29% of survey participants in libraries in developing countries regard mobile access to library databases as essential, compared with just 5.41% of participants in libraries in the United States and 7.69% of participants in libraries in other developed countries, though 35.14% of the former consider it important and 54.05% call it useful.

Nearly 45% of survey participants in college libraries feel that mobile access to databases is important to their libraries and another 10.34% consider it essential. In contrast, 83.33% of participants in corporate and law firm libraries and 63.64% of those in public libraries say that this access is useful but not essential, while 18.18% of participants in other libraries say it is not particularly useful. Libraries that spent more than \$500,000 on electronic content in 2011 seem to value mobile access more highly than do others; 10.53% of survey participants in these libraries call mobile access to databases essential and 47.37% categorize it as important.

Libraries in the sample have spent a mean of \$8,248 on content purchases specifically for e-reading devices, smartphones and/or tablet computers in the last year. Though most libraries in the sample have not spent anything on this content, libraries in the United States have spent a mean of \$12,361 and a maximum of \$170,000. College libraries have spent a mean of \$737 on electronic content for these formats, whereas public libraries have spent a mean of \$36,591 and corporate and law firms have spent nothing at all.

## **Coverage of Blogs, Wikis, Listservs and Ezines**

43.96% of survey participants, including 37.84% of those in the United States and 71.43% of those in developing countries, would like to see blogs indexed and covered in the full text databases currently in use at their library. 48.28% of survey participants in college libraries and 45.45% of those in public libraries would like blogs covered in their databases, though no participants in corporate or law firm libraries share their interest. Half of all survey participants in libraries that spent \$100,000 to \$500,000 on electronic content in 2011 would like blog coverage in their databases.

40.35% of survey participants would like wikis indexed and covered in the full text databases they currently use, with participants in libraries in developing countries and those at libraries which spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 leading the charge. 48.28% of college libraries and 45.45% of other libraries would prefer that wikis were covered in their current full text databases, whereas just 18.18% of survey participants at public libraries feel the same way.

Just 22.81% of survey participants would like to see listservs indexed and covered in the databases they currently use, many of them participants at libraries which spent less than



\$100,000 on electronic content in 2011, 40% of which would like to see these resources covered. 42.86% of survey participants in libraries in developing countries would like coverage of listservs in their databases, compared with 21.62% of those in libraries in the United States and 15.28% of those in libraries in other developed countries.

36.84% of survey participants would like ezines indexed and covered in the full text databases they currently use. These include 45.95% of survey participants in libraries in the United States, 15.38% of those in other developed countries and 28.57% of survey participants in developing countries. 42.11% of survey participants in libraries that spent more than \$500,000 on electronic content would like ezines covered in their databases, as would 38.89% of participants in libraries that spent \$100,000 to \$500,000 and 33.33% of participants in libraries that spent less than \$100,000.

About 63.16% of survey participants would like to see podcasts indexed and covered in their full text databases. 72.41% of survey participants in college libraries want podcasts included in their full text databases, along with 45.45% of survey participants in public libraries, 33.33% of those in corporate and law firm libraries, and 72.73% of those in other libraries.

### **Quality of Resources included in Databases**

In general, the majority of survey participants are dissatisfied with how their database vendors handle indexing and access to resources such as blogs, wikis, listservs, etc. In the case of blogs, 38% of survey participants say that their vendors do a poor job and 40% rate them as fair. 45.45% of participants in libraries in the United States feel that this service is poor, while 42.86% of survey participants in libraries in developing countries say that their vendors do an excellent job. 14% of survey participants feel that their vendors handle the indexing of and access to blogs excellently, including 40% of survey participants in corporate and law firm libraries, but 0% of those in public libraries and just 11.11% of participants in college libraries.

36.73% of survey participants, including 37.04% of public libraries and 40% of corporate and law firm libraries, believe that their database vendors do a fair job at indexing and providing access to wikis. More than 51% of survey participants in libraries in the United States say that their vendors do a poor job in this regard, whereas 20% of participants in libraries in other developed countries and 50% of those in developing countries rate their vendors as excellent. 27.27% of survey participants at libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 feel that their vendors handle indexing and access to wikis poorly, compared with 46.67% of libraries that spent \$100,000 to \$500,000 and 47.37% of those that spent more than \$500,000.

While 50% of survey participants at college libraries and 33.33% of those at public libraries feel that their database vendors do a poor job at indexing and providing access to ezines, just 20% of participants at corporate and law firm libraries and 12.5% of other libraries feel the same way. 16% of all survey participants, including 17.65% of participants in libraries in the United States and 28.57% of those at libraries in

developing countries, believe that their vendors do a good job with ezines, and 10% say that they do an excellent job. 44.44% of survey participants in libraries in other developed countries say that their vendors do a poor job at indexing and providing access to ezines and 55.56% say that they do a fair job. 2% of survey participants don't think that these resources should be included in databases, all from college libraries in developing countries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011.

48% of survey participants, including 61.76% of participants in libraries in the United States and 55.56% of those in college libraries, say that the database vendors used most frequently by their library do a poor job at indexing and providing access to listservs. 28.57% of survey participants in developing countries feel that their vendors do an excellent job at indexing listservs, compared with 5.88% of participants in the United States and 11.11% of those in libraries in other developed countries. 54.55% of survey participants at libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 say that their vendors do a fair job handling indexing and access to listservs, whereas the majority of participants at libraries that spent over \$100,000 feel that their vendors do a poor job.

Videos and podcasts are one of the few areas in which most survey participants are satisfied with how their vendors handle indexing and access. 30% of participants say that their vendors do an excellent job and 22% feel that their vendors do a good job, while just 14% of participants say that the quality of this service is poor, all from libraries in the United States. 10% of survey participants in public libraries, accounting for 2% of the sample in total, feel that video and podcasts should not be included in databases, while 30% feel that their vendors have done an excellent job. While no survey participants in corporate or law firm libraries feel that indexing and access to video and podcasts in their vendor provided databases are excellent, 80% say that their vendors have done a good job.

### **Use of Consortiums**

Libraries in the sample participate in a mean of 2.06 database licensing consortiums (in which they have at least one active contract). Libraries in developing countries participate in a mean of 2.6 such consortiums, whereas libraries in the United States and other developed countries participate in approximately 2.10 consortiums. Contracts through consortiums account for a mean of 44.56% of total licenses for electronic content among libraries in the sample, including 59.82% of licenses in college libraries and 36.91% of licenses in public libraries, but just 12% of those in corporate and law firm libraries. Libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 acquire a mean of 63.57% of their licenses for electronic content through consortiums, while those that spent \$100,000 to \$500,000 acquired just 34.78% of their licenses this way.

47.27% of survey participants say that the percentage of content licensing contracts purchased through consortiums has remained the same over the past two years. 16.36% of participants say that this percentage has increased by more than 5%, including 38.46% of survey participants in libraries in developed countries other than the United States and 16.67% of participants in libraries in developing countries. Public libraries have

experienced the greatest decrease in the percentage of contracts purchased through consortiums, 9.09% of survey participants at these libraries citing a decrease of more than 5% and 27.27% citing a decrease of less than 5%. Conversely, 40% of corporate and law firm libraries have increased the percentage of contracts they purchase through consortiums to some extent and none have decreased this percentage.

### **Content License Pricing**

Prices for electronic and electronic/print combination journals have increased by a mean of 5.88% in the past year for libraries in the sample. College libraries have experienced a mean 5.72% increase in the price of electronic journals, while public libraries have paid about 3% more and corporate and law firm libraries have paid a mean of 5.5% more. The price of e-books, meanwhile, has risen by a mean of 30.42%, with some survey participants reporting increases of 200% and 300%. College libraries have experienced a mean 9.47% increase in the price of e-books, while public libraries have observed a mean increase of 79.69%.

Libraries in the sample report a mean increase of 8.65% in the price of indexes and full text databases for newspaper and magazine articles over the past year. Corporate and law firm libraries have felt the brunt of these increases, some reporting price increases of up to 120%, while public libraries have fared somewhat better, experiencing a mean increase of 3.5%. Price increases for directories have been comparatively modest; public libraries have experienced a mean increase of 2.8% and corporate and law firm libraries report increases of about 2%. College libraries have experienced the biggest uptick in the price of directories in the past year, a mean increase of 5.44%.

Market research has increased in price by a mean of 4.9% in the past year. On average, corporate and law firm libraries have experienced a 9% increase in the price of these materials, while college libraries report a mean increase of 6.17% and public libraries report an increase of 2.83%.

For libraries in the sample, electronic content on business and finance has increased in price by a mean of 6.91% in the last year. The price of electronic content on medicine and biochemistry has increased by an average 5.5%, while the price of content on engineering has increased by a mean of 2.64% and a maximum of 7%. Libraries in the sample have experienced a mean 4.53% increase in the price of electronic content on the humanities in the last year and a mean 4.43% increase in the price of content on social sciences. Electronic content on law has increased in price by a mean of 5.05%, while the price of electronic content on general news information has surged by a mean 16.92%.

### **Disputes and Legal Expenditure**

In the past year, libraries in the sample required a mean of 8.02 hours of professional legal assistance for contract review and disputes. Libraries in the United States sought the most legal assistance, requiring a mean of 11.28 hours from lawyers within or outside their organization, while libraries in other developed countries required a mean of just

0.20 hours of legal assistance. Public and other libraries required more than 10 hours of legal assistance on average, whereas corporate and law firm libraries required a mean of 8.5 hours and college libraries required a mean of 5.11. Libraries that spent more than \$500,000 on electronic content in 2011 required a mean of 15.21 hours of legal assistance for contract review and disputes, compared with the mean 1.08 hours of legal assistance sought by libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content.

4.08% of libraries in the sample have at one time been threatened with legal action by a publisher or information vendor for contract abrogation, non-payment or other reasons. These include 9.09% of public libraries and 20% of corporate and law firm libraries, all located in the United States and all of which spent at least \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011. None of the libraries in the sample have ever threatened a publisher or vendor with legal action over nonperformance, contract abrogation or for any other reason.

### **Staff Time**

Libraries in the sample have dedicated a mean of 1,272 hours in annual staff time to database maintenance, including keeping track of contractual terms, payment and review of invoices, renewing and/or canceling subscriptions and phone, email or other correspondence over downtime or other technical problems. Libraries in developing countries have spent a mean of 1,135 staff hours on database maintenance of this kind, somewhat less than the mean 1,309 hours spent by libraries in the United States and the mean 1,201 hours spent by libraries in other developed countries.

Corporate and law firm libraries have dedicated a mean of 1,520 hours in annual staff time to database maintenance, whereas college libraries have spent a mean of 1,641 staff hours and public libraries have spent a mean of 865 hours on this work. Libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 expended a mean of 406 staff hours on database maintenance, while those that spent more than \$500,000 spent a mean of 2,214 hours this way.

### **Invoices**

Survey participants estimate that a mean of 22.53% of their database vendors sometimes deliver problematic invoices which library personnel are compelled to check carefully. Participants in libraries in the United States feel this way about approximately 21.87% of their database vendors, while participants in libraries in other developed countries feel that a mean of 29.55% of their vendors deliver problematic invoices. Survey participants in college libraries and those in corporate and law firm libraries estimate that about 28.21% and 29.2% of their vendors deliver problematic invoices which they must check, whereas participants in public libraries feel compelled to carefully check just 14.64% of their vendors' invoices.

As a general rule, survey participants estimate that a mean of 12.42% of the invoices that their library receives for database products are inaccurate. Libraries in other developed countries seem to encounter more difficulties in this regard than libraries in the United

States, with survey participants in these libraries reporting a mean of 27.73% of their invoices as inaccurate. Survey participants at corporate and law firm libraries estimate that a mean of 11.25% of their invoices are inaccurate, while those in college libraries put the number at 9.82%. Participants at public libraries, meanwhile, say that, as a general rule, a mean of 2.91% of the invoices they receive are inaccurate.

### **Contract Terms**

46.94% of survey participants report that their libraries have never had any serious problems with database vendors adhering to contract terms regarding downtime, product availability and timeliness, billing, perpetual access or other contractual terms. 32.65% of participants agree that most vendors are scrupulous but say that they have had occasional issues, whereas 12.24% have had issues with a sizable minority of vendors and 8.16% have encountered problems with many vendors.

Libraries in the United States seem to have somewhat better luck with regard to vendors adhering to contract terms than other libraries, though 11.76% have had issues with many vendors. 50% of libraries in the United States have never had any serious problems with their database vendors and 35.29% report occasional issues. 36.36% of libraries in other developed countries and 25% of those in developing countries have had issues with a sizable minority of vendors. 34.78% of college libraries have had occasional issues with vendors adhering to contract terms, as have 45.45% of public libraries and 25% of corporate and law firm libraries. 66.67% of libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 have never had any serious problems with vendors in this regard, while just 29.41% of libraries that spent more than \$500,000 have had a similar experience.

### **Usage Statistics**

About 47% of survey participants report a modest increase in database usage at their library in the past year, much of this accounted for by libraries in the United States, 53.13% of which increased used modestly and 15.63% of which increased use substantially. Database usage remained the same in approximately 36.17% of libraries in the sample, including 50% of corporate and law firm libraries and 38.1% of college libraries, and decreased modestly in 2.13% of libraries, all college libraries in other developed countries. 17.65% of libraries that spent more than \$500,000 on electronic content in 2011 observed a substantial increase in database usage in the past year, while 63.64% of libraries that spent less than \$100,000 experienced a modest increase.

Only 6.82% of survey participants say that their library is usually successful in negotiating reductions in database licensing prices when usage statistics show declining use, the bulk of these from libraries in developing countries, 40% of which are usually successful in this regard. 18.18% of libraries are not at all successful in negotiating such price reductions and 27.27% are generally unsuccessful. The 34.09% of libraries that are occasionally successful in negotiating reductions in prices for databases that show declining use include 40% of college libraries and 50% of corporate and law firm

libraries. 36.36% of survey participants at public libraries and 22.22% of those at other libraries say that their library is often successful at renegotiating prices.

### **Electronic Resources and Interlibrary Loan**

The vast majority of libraries in the sample have not made a significant effort to negotiate contract language with regard to the provision of interlibrary loan materials through email or other internet technology, but 11.11% have been successful in negotiating better terms, in which publishers give the library more leeway to provide content via email. 20% of libraries have asked libraries for more leeway but have not had much success, including 13.33% of libraries in the United States and 36.36% of those in other developed countries. Just 3.33% of libraries in the United States have been able to negotiate better terms, compared with 27.27% of libraries in other developed countries and 25% of those in developing countries. 90.91% of public libraries and 100% of corporate and law firm libraries have not really tried to negotiate any special language on this issue, whereas 20% of college libraries have negotiated successfully and 15% have negotiated and failed.

E-book lending services have been used by 4.17% of libraries in the sample, all of these college libraries located in the United States or other developed countries. 11.76% of libraries that spent more than \$500,000 on electronic content in 2011 have at one time used an e-book lending service, while no libraries that spent less than \$500,000 have done so.

### **Use of Open Access Resources**

While 10.42% of libraries in the sample track patron use of open access journals, just 3.13% of libraries in the United States do so. 27.27% of libraries in other developed countries and 20% of those in developing countries track use of open access journals, as do 9.09% of college libraries in the sample and 40% of other libraries. 16.67% of libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 track patron use of open access journals, compared with 6.25% of libraries that spent \$100,000 to \$500,000, 5.88% of those that spent more than \$500,000, and 33.33% of libraries for which this information is unavailable.

Among libraries that track this information, use of open access journals has grown by a mean of 16.85% in the last year. Libraries in the United States have experienced a mean 15.83% increase in the use of open access journals, while libraries in other developed countries have experienced a mean increase of 24.75%. Use of open access journals has jumped by a mean of 35% and a maximum of 70% in libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 and has risen by approximately 26.67% in libraries that spent over \$500,000.

18.75% of survey participants say that their library has at one time paid an article processing fee for an author and another 8.33% say that their library's parent institution has paid such a fee. 21% of libraries in the United States have either paid this fee or diverted the costs to their parent institution, as have 36.36% of libraries in other

developed countries and 50% of libraries in developing countries. No public, corporate or law firm libraries have ever paid article processing fees for an author, but 22.73% of college libraries have done so with money from their own budget.

### **Digital Repositories**

A mean of 12.87% of journal articles acquired from other institutions by libraries in the sample come from digital repositories or from a digital repository consortium. Libraries in the United States acquire a mean of 9% of these journal articles from digital repositories, compared with a mean of 11.14% among libraries in other developed countries and a mean of 36.67% among libraries in developing countries. College libraries acquire a mean of 23.29% of journal articles from other institutions from digital repositories and corporate and law firm libraries acquire approximately 35% through these means. Public libraries, on the other hand, acquire a mean of just 0.4% of journal articles from other institutions from digital repositories.

31.25% of libraries in the sample currently have a digital repository, including 21.88% of libraries in the United States, 45.45% of libraries in other developed countries and 60% of libraries in the sample in developing countries. Nearly 60% of libraries in the United States have no plans to develop a digital repository in the next three years and just 9.38% expect to have one within the next year. In contrast, all libraries in developing countries that currently do not have an institutional digital repository expect to have one in two years time. 45.45% of college libraries already have a digital repository and another 27.28% will have one in the next two years, whereas just 9.09% of public libraries and 0% of corporate and law firm libraries have a digital repository and most have no plans to acquire one in the near future.

Libraries in the sample that currently have a digital repository have deposited a mean of 35.91% of scholarly output published by their institution in the last year into their repository. Libraries in the United States have deposited a mean of 20.83% of these publications into their repository, while libraries in other developed countries have deposited a mean of 60% and libraries in developing countries have deposited about 45%. Libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 have deposited a mean of 30% of their scholarly output into digital repositories, whereas those that spent \$100,000 to \$500,000 have deposited a mean of 41.67% of this output and libraries that spent more than \$500,000 have deposited a mean of 25%.

### **Use of Free Resources**

Free back issues of journals, which are often made available by journal publishers after an embargo period of 1 to 2 years, are used extensively by 25.53% of libraries in the sample. 44.68% of libraries use these free offerings to some extent but not extensively, whereas 19.15% make little use of them and 10.64% do not use them at all. While more than 40% of libraries in the United States use free back issues of journals little or not at all, 63.64% of libraries in other developed countries and 50% of those in developing countries use these offerings extensively. 61.9% of college libraries and 50% of corporate

and law firm libraries use free back issues somewhat but not extensively, while 36.36% of public libraries do not use them at all.

Among libraries in the sample, a mean of 19.86% of total article requests from faculty or patrons for journals not in the library collection are satisfied by downloads or accesses of free back files offered by some journal publishers. Libraries in the United States satisfy a mean of 13.56% article requests for journals that are not in their collection through free offerings, while those in other developed countries satisfy a mean of 32.67% of such requests by these means. Libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 satisfy a mean of 37% of faculty and patron requests for journal articles not in the library catalog by accesses to free back issues. However, libraries that spent \$100,000 to \$500,000 on electronic content were significantly less able to satisfy these requests through the use of free back issues.

### **License Renewal Decision Making Process**

Over the next year, libraries in the sample will renew a mean of 89.36% of content licensing contracts set to expire. Libraries in the United States and other developed countries will renew a mean of more than 93% of these contracts, while libraries in developing countries will renew a mean of 51% and a minimum of 2%. College libraries will renew a mean of 94.53% content licensing contracts set to expire in the coming year, whereas public libraries will renew a mean of 90% and corporate and law firm libraries will renew a mean of 71.75%.

Libraries in the sample tested a mean of 10.26 databases on a free-trial basis within the past year. College libraries tested a mean of 14.9 such databases and a maximum of 120, compared with corporate and law firm libraries, which tested a mean of 5.5 and a maximum of 10. Libraries in the United States tested a mean of 8.13 databases in the past year, less than half the mean 17 tested by libraries in developing countries and considerably less than the mean 15.36 tested by those in other developed countries. Libraries that spent less than \$100,000 on electronic content in 2011 tested a mean of just 2.7 databases on a free-trial basis, while those that spent in excess of \$500,000 tested a mean of 18.94 databases.



## Characteristics of the Sample

### Country

	United States	Other Developed Countries	Developing Countries
Entire Sample	64.41%	22.03%	13.56%

### Type of Library

	College or University Library	Public Library	Corporate or Law Firm Library	Other
Entire Sample	50.85%	20.34%	10.17%	18.64%

### Total Spending on Content Licensed in Electronic Format (including Content in Joint Electronic/Print Format) in 2011

	Less than \$100,000	\$100,000 to \$500,000	More than \$500,000	Information Not Provided
Entire Sample	28.81%	30.51%	32.20%	8.47%

## Chapter 1: Database Licensing Volume

**Table 1.1: How much did your library spend for content licensed in electronic or combined electronic/print format (but not for print alone) in 2011? (in \$US)**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$1,113,292.13	\$305,885.00	\$4,500.00	\$14,500,000.00

**Table 1.2: How much will your library spend for content licensed in electronic or combined electronic/print format (but not for print alone) in 2012? (in \$US)**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$1,142,289.11	\$316,000.00	\$2,960.00	\$14,600,000.00

**Table 1.3: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for directories? (in \$US)**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$6,927.58	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$50,000.00

**Table 1.4: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for directories? Broken Out by Country (in \$US)**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	\$6,476.19	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$50,000.00
Other Developed Countries	\$7,946.73	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$45,000.00
Developing Countries	\$5,196.00	\$5,196.00	\$5,196.00	\$5,196.00

**Table 1.5: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for directories? Broken Out by Type of Library (in \$US)**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	\$10,187.36	\$1,487.50	\$0.00	\$50,000.00
Public Library	\$5,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$30,000.00
Corporate or Law Firm Library	\$9,000.00	\$5,500.00	\$0.00	\$25,000.00
Other	\$81.17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$487.00

**Table 1.6: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for journals? (in \$US)**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$570,182.91	\$65,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,193,806.00

**Table 1.7: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for journals? Broken Out by Country (in \$US)**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	\$605,564.33	\$96,000.00	\$0.00	\$4,400,000.00
Other Developed Countries	\$564,183.67	\$64,315.00	\$13,150.00	\$5,193,806.00
Developing Countries	\$349,356.00	\$197,106.00	\$3,212.00	\$1,000,000.00

**Table 1.8: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for journals? Broken Out by Type of Library (in \$US)**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	\$832,231.04	\$283,537.00	\$3,212.00	\$5,193,806.00
Public Library	\$40,200.00	\$2,000.00	\$0.00	\$275,000.00
Corporate or Law Firm Library	\$1,163,250.00	\$125,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$4,400,000.00
Other	\$53,591.83	\$44,683.50	\$700.00	\$159,597.00

**Table 1.9: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for e-books? (in \$US)**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$70,030.13	\$40,000.00	\$0.00	\$500,000.00

**Table 1.10: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for e-books? Broken Out by Country (in \$US)**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	\$85,345.50	\$40,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$500,000.00
Other Developed Countries	\$32,026.17	\$11,948.00	\$0.00	\$126,799.00
Developing Countries	\$75,981.00	\$75,981.00	\$51,962.00	\$100,000.00

**Table 1.11: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for e-books? Broken Out by Type of Library (in \$US)**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	\$80,256.54	\$55,000.00	\$0.00	\$500,000.00
Public Library	\$56,341.67	\$35,000.00	\$2,600.00	\$170,000.00
Corporate or Law Firm Library	\$193,333.33	\$130,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$400,000.00
Other	\$9,972.57	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$58,445.00

**Table 1.12: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for magazine/newspaper article indexes or full text? (in \$US)**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$332,912.95	\$40,000.00	\$0.00	\$4,500,000.00

**Table 1.13: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for magazine/newspaper article indexes or full text? Broken Out by Country (in \$US)**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	\$423,433.82	\$63,500.00	\$0.00	\$4,500,000.00
Other Developed Countries	\$161,753.73	\$2,536.00	\$0.00	\$1,272,600.00
Developing Countries	\$6,996.50	\$6,996.50	\$6,199.00	\$7,794.00

**Table 1.14: How much does your organization spend annually for electronic or electronic/print licenses for magazine/newspaper article indexes or full text? Broken Out by Type of Library (in \$US)**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	\$363,158.95	\$45,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,200,000.00
Public Library	\$109,572.73	\$60,000.00	\$0.00	\$450,000.00
Corporate or Law Firm Library	\$1,253,000.00	\$255,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$4,500,000.00
Other	\$28,158.67	\$3,250.00	\$0.00	\$137,000.00

**In which areas of database content, defined by database content form (directory, journal, newspaper article, e-book, etc.) and also by subject (economics, psychology, physics, literature, etc.) does your organization plan to significantly increase or decrease spending over the next two years?**

1. We plan to decrease spending in e-journal subscriptions of all subjects and sustain our e-books and e-database subscriptions
2. Journals
3. Increases in e-books and literature
4. Journals, e-books, theses, etc...
5. Law, management
6. Increase
7. Popular e-books were doubled from last year. We will increase directories to about 40,000.
8. E-books, especially legal treatises
9. Increase e-book and full-text database spending; maintain journal spending
10. Increase e-books in education, nursing, business, community college core collection
11. Increase in electronic journals in social sciences and perhaps e-books
12. Increase in energy, engineering, business management & accounting
13. E-books
14. E-books will be increased
15. None
16. No significant changes
17. E-books, databases (particularly one time purchases)
18. Unknown at this time. It will depend on the funding for the library provided in the congressional budget.
19. Significantly increase in humanities and social sciences (economics, psychology, etc...), as well as art, architecture and design
20. Budget will remain the same
21. Popular e-books and business subject databases
22. Increase e-books, decrease databases
23. Increase spending on e-books and full-text databases. Probably decrease spending on individual journals and reference sources.
24. Increase e-books in literature/fiction
25. We will increase. We subscribe to general multidisciplinary databases and whatever we can get that is art and fashion related. Also Lynda.com and Gnomon.
26. Journals and e-books, science
27. No change from current plans
28. Decrease database spending
29. None
30. We plan to start an e-book collection
31. We don't intend to increase content spending in the next two years
32. We plan to significantly decrease spending for serials (electronic and print) in all disciplines over the next two years
33. We plan on a 3-5% increase each year.
36. E-books, online journal content, life sciences, agricultural sciences
37. None
38. Our only source of journals is from full text databases. Subject areas are very broad: economics, healthcare leadership, change management, adult education, quality & process improvement in healthcare. We are a new library with a tiny startup budget. Hoping to increase spending over next few years.
39. E-books in engineering, nanotechnology, biotechnology, life sciences, petroleum engineering - maybe a slight increase
40. Increase spending in engineering, technology and sciences (math & physics)
41. Increase e-books in all subjects. Increase journals in all subjects, probably more so in STEM areas. Decrease directories.
42. Journals, e-books, and international law
43. E-books

## The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

44. Increase e-books in business and psychology
45. No plans to significantly change spending in the next two years
46. Health
47. Increase: digitized archives in history and literature. Decrease: multi-subject full text databases.
48. Don't know
49. Agriculture
50. Increase spending on data files in the sciences, e-books in general
51. Stay about the same
52. Decrease ALL because of crippling budget reduction
53. Interactive database for business/economics increase
54. Legal database (through cooperative agreement with Bar Association)
55. E-books, primarily fiction and popular nonfiction
56. Increase in e-content for popular magazines
57. Increase e-journal content, and perhaps e-book content. Subjects: business, economics, sciences (all).
58. No changes
59. Journals in social sciences and humanities

**Table 1.15: How many independent licenses for electronic content (or such content combined with print) did your library maintain in 2011?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	185.04	20.00	0.00	4,500.00

**Table 1.16: How many independent licenses for electronic content (or such content combined with print) did your library maintain in 2011? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	220.00	22.50	0.00	4,500.00
Other Developed Countries	158.23	30.00	0.00	1,400.00
Developing Countries	17.00	11.00	2.00	53.00

**Table 1.17: How many independent licenses for electronic content (or such content combined with print) did your library maintain in 2011? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	128.00	20.00	0.00	1,400.00
Public Library	438.82	12.00	0.00	4,500.00
Corporate or Law Firm Library	24.75	13.50	2.00	70.00
Other	127.00	127.00	54.00	200.00

**Table 1.18: How many independent licenses for electronic content (or such content combined with print) did your library maintain in 2011? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	9.27	8.00	0.00	30.00
\$100,000 to \$500,00	316.63	17.50	0.00	4,500.00
More than \$500,000	255.41	100.00	14.00	1,400.00
Information Not Available	18.75	11.00	0.00	53.00

**Table 1.19: How many independent licenses for electronic content (or such content combined with print) did your library maintain in 2012?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	208.56	22.00	0.00	5,500.00

**Table 1.20: How many independent licenses for electronic content (or such content combined with print) did your library maintain in 2012? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	252.71	23.00	0.00	5,500.00
Other Developed Countries	166.00	30.00	0.00	1,400.00
Developing Countries	19.00	11.00	3.00	60.00

**Table 1.21: How many independent licenses for electronic content (or such content combined with print) did your library maintain in 2012? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	133.24	22.00	0.00	1,400.00
Public Library	531.82	12.00	0.00	5,500.00
Corporate or Law Firm Library	27.50	17.50	3.00	72.00
Other	152.50	152.50	55.00	250.00

**Table 1.22: How many independent licenses for electronic content (or such content combined with print) did your library maintain in 2012? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

<b>Spending on Electronic Content</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Less than \$100,000	10.47	8.00	0.00	30.00
\$100,000 to \$500,00	384.25	18.50	0.00	5,500.00
More than \$500,000	262.29	150.00	14.00	1,400.00
Information Not Available	20.25	10.50	0.00	60.00

**Table 1.23: How much did your library spend on e-book licenses in 2010? (in \$US)**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Entire Sample	\$35,761.77	\$8,500.00	\$0.00	\$350,000.00

**Table 1.24: How much did your library spend on e-book licenses in 2011? (in \$US)**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Entire Sample	\$42,298.19	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$400,000.00

**Table 1.25: How much will your library spend on e-book licenses in 2012? (in \$US)**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Entire Sample	\$57,103.57	\$20,785.00	\$0.00	\$425,000.00



## Chapter 2: Renewals and Cancellations

**Table 2.1: What was your library's overall database renewal rate (in percentage terms) for all of its database contracts in the 2011-2012 fiscal or academic year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	92.56%	98.00%	50.00%	100.00%

**Table 2.2: What was your library's overall database renewal rate (in percentage terms) for all of its database contracts in the 2011-2012 fiscal or academic year? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	91.50%	96.50%	50.00%	100.00%
Public Library	90.23%	90.00%	75.00%	100.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	98.33%	100.00%	95.00%	100.00%
Other	95.30%	100.00%	75.00%	100.00%

**Table 2.3: What was your library's overall database renewal rate (in percentage terms) for all of its database contracts in the 2011-2012 fiscal or academic year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	96.59%	100.00%	85.00%	100.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,00	88.93%	90.00%	75.00%	100.00%
More than \$500,000	93.13%	96.50%	50.00%	100.00%
Information Not Available	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%

**Table 2.4: What will be your library's overall database renewal rate (in percentage terms) for all of its database contracts in the 2012-2013 fiscal or academic year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	91.23%	95.00%	50.00%	120.00%

**Table 2.5: What will be your library's overall database renewal rate (in percentage terms) for all of its database contracts in the 2012-2013 fiscal or academic year? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	90.61%	95.00%	50.00%	120.00%
Public Library	92.05%	90.00%	80.00%	100.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	98.33%	100.00%	95.00%	100.00%
Other	89.30%	96.50%	50.00%	100.00%

**Table 2.6: What will be your library's overall database renewal rate (in percentage terms) for all of its database contracts in the 2012-2013 fiscal or academic year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	88.86%	95.00%	50.00%	100.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,00	91.57%	92.50%	75.00%	100.00%
More than \$500,000	92.31%	97.00%	50.00%	120.00%
Information Not Available	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

**Table 2.7: How likely are you to renew contracts for e-books in the next two years?**

	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Entire Sample	5.26%	1.75%	3.51%	17.54%	52.63%	19.30%

**Table 2.8: How likely are you to renew contracts for e-books in the next two years? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
United States	0.00%	2.70%	5.41%	18.92%	59.46%	13.51%
Other Developed Countries	23.08%	0.00%	0.00%	23.08%	23.08%	30.77%
Developing Countries	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	40.00%

**Table 2.9: How likely are you to renew contracts for e-books in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
College Library	3.70%	0.00%	3.70%	22.22%	55.56%	14.81%
Public Library	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%	25.00%	58.33%	8.33%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	20.00%
Other	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	45.45%

**Table 2.10: How likely are you to renew contracts for e-books in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Less than \$100,000	12.50%	6.25%	12.50%	0.00%	37.50%	31.25%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%	27.78%	55.56%	11.11%
More than \$500,000	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	29.41%	58.82%	11.76%
Information Not Available	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%

**Table 2.11: How likely are you to renew contracts for scholarly journals in the next two years?**

	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Entire Sample	8.93%	5.36%	10.71%	19.64%	41.07%	14.29%

**Table 2.12: How likely are you to renew contracts for scholarly journals in the next two years? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
United States	8.33%	5.56%	8.33%	16.67%	41.67%	19.44%
Other Developed Countries	15.38%	0.00%	23.08%	30.77%	30.77%	0.00%
Developing Countries	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	20.00%

**Table 2.13: How likely are you to renew contracts for scholarly journals in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
College Library	7.69%	0.00%	7.69%	26.92%	46.15%	11.54%
Public Library	8.33%	8.33%	8.33%	8.33%	33.33%	33.33%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%
Other	18.18%	0.00%	18.18%	18.18%	36.36%	9.09%

**Table 2.14: How likely are you to renew contracts for scholarly journals in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Less than \$100,000	12.50%	12.50%	0.00%	12.50%	50.00%	12.50%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	5.56%	0.00%	16.67%	16.67%	27.78%	33.33%
More than \$500,000	12.50%	0.00%	18.75%	25.00%	43.75%	0.00%
Information Not Available	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%

**Table 2.15: How likely are you to renew contracts for directories in the next two years?**

	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Entire Sample	3.57%	8.93%	12.50%	5.36%	25.00%	44.64%

**Table 2.16: How likely are you to renew contracts for directories in the next two years? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
United States	5.41%	10.81%	16.22%	0.00%	27.03%	40.54%
Other Developed Countries	0.00%	8.33%	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	75.00%
Developing Countries	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	60.00%	20.00%

**Table 2.17: How likely are you to renew contracts for directories in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
College Library	7.69%	7.69%	15.38%	7.69%	26.92%	34.62%
Public Library	0.00%	16.67%	8.33%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%
Other	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%	81.82%

**Table 2.18: How likely are you to renew contracts for directories in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Less than \$100,000	0.00%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	13.33%	73.33%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	0.00%	11.11%	11.11%	5.56%	27.78%	44.44%
More than \$500,000	11.76%	5.88%	23.53%	5.88%	23.53%	29.41%
Information Not Available	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%

**Table 2.19: How likely are you to renew contracts for magazine and newspaper article oriented databases in the next two years?**

	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Entire Sample	1.92%	3.85%	13.46%	13.46%	51.92%	15.38%

**Table 2.20: How likely are you to renew contracts for magazine and newspaper article oriented databases in the next two years? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
United States	2.86%	2.86%	20.00%	11.43%	51.43%	11.43%
Other Developed Countries	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	30.00%	20.00%	40.00%
Developing Countries	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%

**Table 2.21: How likely are you to renew contracts for magazine and newspaper article oriented databases in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
College Library	0.00%	4.17%	16.67%	20.83%	50.00%	8.33%
Public Library	0.00%	9.09%	18.18%	9.09%	54.55%	9.09%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%
Other	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	45.45%	45.45%

**Table 2.22: How likely are you to renew contracts for magazine and newspaper article oriented databases in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Less than \$100,000	6.67%	6.67%	13.33%	0.00%	46.67%	26.67%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	0.00%	0.00%	11.76%	29.41%	47.06%	11.76%
More than \$500,000	0.00%	7.14%	21.43%	14.29%	50.00%	7.14%
Information Not Available	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	25.00%

**Table 2.23: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Humanities in the next two years?**

	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Entire Sample	0.00%	5.56%	5.56%	16.67%	38.89%	33.33%

**Table 2.24: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Humanities in the next two years? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
United States	0.00%	5.56%	8.33%	16.67%	41.67%	27.78%
Other Developed Countries	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	27.27%	0.00%	63.64%
Developing Countries	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%



**Table 2.25: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Humanities in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
College Library	0.00%	4.00%	8.00%	24.00%	48.00%	16.00%
Public Library	0.00%	18.18%	9.09%	9.09%	45.45%	18.18%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	80.00%
Other	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	18.18%	72.73%

**Table 2.26: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Humanities in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Less than \$100,000	0.00%	6.67%	0.00%	13.33%	46.67%	33.33%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	0.00%	5.56%	5.56%	11.11%	33.33%	44.44%
More than \$500,000	0.00%	6.67%	13.33%	26.67%	26.67%	26.67%
Information Not Available	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%

**Table 2.27: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Social Sciences in the next two years?**

	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Entire Sample	1.85%	7.41%	5.56%	14.81%	44.44%	25.93%

**Table 2.28: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Social Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
United States	0.00%	8.33%	8.33%	13.89%	44.44%	25.00%
Other Developed Countries	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%	27.27%	18.18%	36.36%
Developing Countries	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%

**Table 2.29: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Social Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
College Library	0.00%	8.00%	8.00%	20.00%	44.00%	20.00%
Public Library	0.00%	18.18%	9.09%	9.09%	54.55%	9.09%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	80.00%
Other	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	45.45%	36.36%

**Table 2.30: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Social Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Less than \$100,000	0.00%	6.67%	0.00%	13.33%	53.33%	26.67%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	5.56%	5.56%	5.56%	16.67%	44.44%	22.22%
More than \$500,000	0.00%	13.33%	13.33%	20.00%	26.67%	26.67%
Information Not Available	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%

**Table 2.31: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Hard Sciences in the next two years?**

	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Entire Sample	3.57%	5.36%	5.36%	14.29%	41.07%	30.36%

**Table 2.32: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Hard Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
United States	5.41%	8.11%	5.41%	13.51%	37.84%	29.73%
Other Developed Countries	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	18.18%	36.36%	36.36%
Developing Countries	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	16.67%	66.67%	16.67%

**Table 2.33: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Hard Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
College Library	3.70%	3.70%	7.41%	14.81%	44.44%	25.93%
Public Library	0.00%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%	36.36%	45.45%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%
Other	9.09%	0.00%	9.09%	9.09%	45.45%	27.27%

**Table 2.34: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in the Hard Sciences in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Less than \$100,000	0.00%	6.25%	0.00%	12.50%	43.75%	37.50%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	0.00%	5.56%	5.56%	16.67%	33.33%	38.89%
More than \$500,000	12.50%	6.25%	12.50%	12.50%	43.75%	12.50%
Information Not Available	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%

**Table 2.35: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in Business and Finance in the next two years?**

	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Entire Sample	1.85%	5.56%	12.96%	18.52%	48.15%	12.96%

**Table 2.36: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in Business and Finance in the next two years? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
United States	0.00%	8.11%	13.51%	18.92%	43.24%	16.22%
Other Developed Countries	9.09%	0.00%	9.09%	27.27%	45.45%	9.09%
Developing Countries	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	80.00%	0.00%

**Table 2.37: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in Business and Finance in the next two years? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
College Library	0.00%	3.85%	11.54%	26.92%	46.15%	11.54%
Public Library	0.00%	18.18%	9.09%	9.09%	54.55%	9.09%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
Other	9.09%	0.00%	9.09%	9.09%	54.55%	18.18%

**Table 2.38: How likely are you to renew contracts for databases in Business and Finance in the next two years? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Likely to cut 25% or more of current contracts	Likely to cut at least 10% but less than 25%	Likely to cut from 5% to 10%	Likely to renew at least 95%	Likely to renew all current contracts	Do not have any databases in this area
Less than \$100,000	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%	13.33%	53.33%	13.33%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	0.00%	5.56%	11.11%	16.67%	50.00%	16.67%
More than \$500,000	0.00%	6.25%	18.75%	25.00%	37.50%	12.50%
Information Not Available	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%

## Chapter 3: Mobile Computing

**Table 3.1: How important is it to you that your library's databases can be accessed through smartphones and other hand held digital devices?**

	No real interest	Not particularly useful	Useful but not essential	Important for us	Essential for us
Entire Sample	1.75%	7.02%	50.88%	33.33%	7.02%

**Table 3.2: How important is it to you that your library's databases can be accessed through smartphones and other hand held digital devices? Broken Out by Country**

Country	No real interest	Not particularly useful	Useful but not essential	Important for us	Essential for us
United States	0.00%	5.41%	54.05%	35.14%	5.41%
Other Developed Countries	7.69%	7.69%	38.46%	38.46%	7.69%
Developing Countries	0.00%	14.29%	57.14%	14.29%	14.29%

**Table 3.3: How important is it to you that your library's databases can be accessed through smartphones and other hand held digital devices? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	No real interest	Not particularly useful	Useful but not essential	Important for us	Essential for us
College Library	3.45%	6.90%	34.48%	44.83%	10.34%
Public Library	0.00%	0.00%	63.64%	36.36%	0.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	0.00%	83.33%	16.67%	0.00%
Other	0.00%	18.18%	63.64%	9.09%	9.09%

**Table 3.4: How important is it to you that your library's databases can be accessed through smartphones and other hand held digital devices? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	No real interest	Not particularly useful	Useful but not essential	Important for us	Essential for us
Less than \$100,000	6.67%	13.33%	66.67%	6.67%	6.67%
\$100,000 to \$500,00	0.00%	5.56%	55.56%	38.89%	0.00%
More than \$500,000	0.00%	5.26%	36.84%	47.37%	10.53%
Information Not Available	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	40.00%	20.00%

**Has patron use of the iPad and other tablet computers had any impact on the use of electronic resources at your library? If so what has been the impact and what do you expect in the near future?**

1. N/A, but expect impact in the future
2. No
3. We believe that it has had an impact, but we don't know what that impact is. Examining how databases work on mobile and smaller screens (like the iPad) is something the law library will do in the near future.
4. Minimal. We have left it to chance to only utilize vendor supplied/developed apps for non-PC/non-Mac desktop computers
5. We are seeing more and more iPads, among both faculty and staff. There has been interest and usage of downloadable e-books on these devices. We have provided training on this subject and will do more.
6. Not yet
7. No
8. The use of the tablets will increase
9. A few patrons did. The library should set proper user limit to access the database.
10. No
11. Not sure
12. Not yet
13. Currently our resources are only available on-site at the library, so I would have to say that impact has been minimal and would expect it to remain at that level in the near future
14. Redesign of the website in a responsive framework and we are now including use of mobile/tablets as a selection criterion for new acquisitions
15. None
16. Yes, it is important for downloadable popular items to have a mobile app
17. Need to be able to access content via iPad and smart phones (small mobile devices)
18. Increased e-book usage, which will continue to increase
19. It makes it easier to teach if participants have iPads
20. Some impact. I expect it to grow significantly.
21. Not that we have seen so far
22. No
23. Unknown
24. Not for now
25. Little impact
26. Yes. Use of popular e-book collection has doubled.
27. None

## The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

28. No, they have not used tablet computers yet. I think it is becoming important and will be very useful in the near future.
29. Many requests for content to be available for iPad and other tablets
30. No
31. To increase this service
32. Have not heard of any impact
33. Not yet, but we expect this to change within the next year or so
34. Not yet, unlikely the businesses will standardize on these tools anytime soon
35. Yes, users will most likely use vendor platforms easy to access by mobile apps - the easier to use, the more use that vendor's app will get
36. Can't tell what the impact is yet, but have received a number of requests
37. Just starting to happen. I'd expect that if they can't get our material through tablets/smartphone apps, they'll go elsewhere (to less reliable sources of information) and bypass library completely.
38. We expect an increase in patron use of iPads and other tablet computers within the library and among remote registered users
39. None
40. Not so far. Expect more requests for access this way in the future.
41. Not much impact yet. We expect use to increase because we implemented an iPad lending program and also use iPads in instruction sessions.
42. No impact yet
43. Good question to think about
44. Not that we're aware of
45. No known impact
46. Yes, it has increased usage of our e-book collections and we expect to continue to see usage increase
47. Increased e-book access and spurred our interest in providing popular magazine access
48. Minimal impact, as not many students can afford iPads
49. Not much impact yet, but should be 2013+
50. Slight, but expect it grow

**Table 3.5: How much have you spent in the past year on licenses or other content purchases specifically for e-book reading devices (such as Kindle or Nook) or dedicated smartphone or tablet computer formats? (in \$US)**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	\$8,248.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$170,000.00

**Table 3.6: How much have you spent in the past year on licenses or other content purchases specifically for e-book reading devices (such as Kindle or Nook) or dedicated smartphone or tablet computer formats? Broken Out by Country (in \$US)**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	\$12,361.11	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$170,000.00
Other Developed Countries	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Developing Countries	\$80.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$400.00



**Table 3.7: How much have you spent in the past year on licenses or other content purchases specifically for e-book reading devices (such as Kindle or Nook) or dedicated smartphone or tablet computer formats? Broken Out by Type of Library (in \$US)**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	\$737.04	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,500.00
Public Library	\$36,590.91	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$170,000.00
Corporate or Law Firm Library	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

**Table 3.8: How much have you spent in the past year on licenses or other content purchases specifically for e-book reading devices (such as Kindle or Nook) or dedicated smartphone or tablet computer formats? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011 (in \$US)**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	\$635.71	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00
\$100,000 to \$500,00	\$22,666.67	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$170,000.00
More than \$500,000	\$1,583.33	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
Information Not Available	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

## Chapter 4: Coverage of Blogs, Wikis, Listservs and Ezines

**Table 4.1: Would you like to see blogs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use?**

	Yes	No
Entire Sample	43.86%	56.14%

**Table 4.2: Would you like to see blogs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Yes	No
United States	37.84%	62.16%
Other Developed Countries	46.15%	53.85%
Developing Countries	71.43%	28.57%

**Table 4.3: Would you like to see blogs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Yes	No
College Library	48.28%	51.72%
Public Library	45.45%	54.55%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	100.00%
Other	54.55%	45.45%

**Table 4.4: Would you like to see blogs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Yes	No
Less than \$100,000	46.67%	53.33%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	50.00%	50.00%
More than \$500,000	31.58%	68.42%
Information Not Available	60.00%	40.00%

**Table 4.5: Would you like to see wikis indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use?**

	Yes	No
Entire Sample	40.35%	59.65%

**Table 4.6: Would you like to see wikis indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Yes	No
United States	32.43%	67.57%
Other Developed Countries	38.46%	61.54%
Developing Countries	85.71%	14.29%

**Table 4.7: Would you like to see wikis indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Yes	No
College Library	48.28%	51.72%
Public Library	18.18%	81.82%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	33.33%	66.67%
Other	45.45%	54.55%

**Table 4.8: Would you like to see wikis indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Yes	No
Less than \$100,000	60.00%	40.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	27.78%	72.22%
More than \$500,000	31.58%	68.42%
Information Not Available	60.00%	40.00%

**Table 4.9: Would you like to see listservs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use?**

	Yes	No
Entire Sample	22.81%	77.19%

**Table 4.10: Would you like to see listservs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Yes	No
United States	21.62%	78.38%
Other Developed Countries	15.38%	84.62%
Developing Countries	42.86%	57.14%

**Table 4.11: Would you like to see listservs indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Yes	No
College Library	17.24%	82.76%
Public Library	27.27%	72.73%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	16.67%	83.33%
Other	36.36%	63.64%

**Table 4.12: Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Yes	No
Less than \$100,000	40.00%	60.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	22.22%	77.78%
More than \$500,000	0.00%	100.00%
Information Not Available	60.00%	40.00%

**Table 4.13: Would you like to see ezines indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use?**

	Yes	No
Entire Sample	36.84%	63.16%

**Table 4.14: Would you like to see ezines indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Yes	No
United States	45.95%	54.05%
Other Developed Countries	15.38%	84.62%
Developing Countries	28.57%	71.43%

**Table 4.15: Would you like to see ezines indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Yes	No
College Library	31.03%	68.97%
Public Library	36.36%	63.64%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	33.33%	66.67%
Other	54.55%	45.45%

**Table 4.16: Would you like to see ezines indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Yes	No
Less than \$100,000	33.33%	66.67%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	38.89%	61.11%
More than \$500,000	42.11%	57.89%
Information Not Available	20.00%	80.00%

**Table 4.17: Would you like to see podcasts indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use?**

	Yes	No
Entire Sample	63.16%	36.84%

**Table 4.18: Would you like to see podcasts indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Yes	No
United States	62.16%	37.84%
Other Developed Countries	69.23%	30.77%
Developing Countries	57.14%	42.86%

**Table 4.19: Would you like to see podcasts indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Yes	No
College Library	72.41%	27.59%
Public Library	45.45%	54.55%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	33.33%	66.67%
Other	72.73%	27.27%

**Table 4.20: Would you like to see podcasts indexed and covered in the full text databases that you current use? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Yes	No
Less than \$100,000	66.67%	33.33%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	61.11%	38.89%
More than \$500,000	63.16%	36.84%
Information Not Available	60.00%	40.00%

**Table 4.21: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to wikis in their full text databases?**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
Entire Sample	40.82%	36.73%	6.12%	16.33%	0.00%

**Table 4.22: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to wikis in their full text databases? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
United States	51.52%	30.30%	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%
Other Developed Countries	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Developing Countries	16.67%	33.33%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%

**Table 4.23: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to wikis in their full text databases? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
College Library	51.85%	37.04%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%
Public Library	44.44%	33.33%	22.22%	0.00%	0.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	20.00%	40.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%
Other	12.50%	37.50%	12.50%	37.50%	0.00%

**Table 4.24: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to wikis in their full text databases? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content in 2011	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
Less than \$100,000	27.27%	45.45%	0.00%	27.27%	0.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	46.67%	40.00%	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%
More than \$500,000	47.37%	36.84%	5.26%	10.53%	0.00%
Information Not Available	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%

**Table 4.25: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to blogs in their full text databases?**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
Entire Sample	38.00%	40.00%	8.00%	14.00%	0.00%

**Table 4.26: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to blogs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
United States	45.45%	36.36%	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%
Other Developed Countries	30.00%	60.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%
Developing Countries	14.29%	28.57%	14.29%	42.86%	0.00%

**Table 4.27: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to blogs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
College Library	44.44%	40.74%	3.70%	11.11%	0.00%
Public Library	50.00%	30.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	20.00%	40.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%
Other	12.50%	50.00%	12.50%	25.00%	0.00%

**Table 4.28: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to blogs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content in 2011	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
Less than \$100,000	36.36%	45.45%	0.00%	18.18%	0.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	43.75%	43.75%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
More than \$500,000	44.44%	38.89%	5.56%	11.11%	0.00%
Information Not Available	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%

**Table 4.29: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to ezines in their full text databases?**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
Entire Sample	38.00%	34.00%	16.00%	10.00%	2.00%



**Table 4.30: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to ezines in their full text databases? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
United States	41.18%	29.41%	17.65%	11.76%	0.00%
Other Developed Countries	44.44%	55.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Developing Countries	14.29%	28.57%	28.57%	14.29%	14.29%

**Table 4.31: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to ezines in their full text databases? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
College Library	50.00%	32.14%	10.71%	3.57%	3.57%
Public Library	33.33%	33.33%	22.22%	11.11%	0.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	20.00%	40.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Other	12.50%	37.50%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%

**Table 4.32: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to ezines in their full text databases? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content in 2011	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
Less than \$100,000	36.36%	45.45%	9.09%	0.00%	9.09%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	40.00%	40.00%	13.33%	6.67%	0.00%
More than \$500,000	36.84%	31.58%	15.79%	15.79%	0.00%
Information Not Available	40.00%	0.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%

**Table 4.33: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to listservs in their full text databases?**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
Entire Sample	48.00%	34.00%	6.00%	10.00%	2.00%

**Table 4.34: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to listservs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
United States	61.76%	26.47%	5.88%	5.88%	0.00%
Other Developed Countries	22.22%	66.67%	0.00%	11.11%	0.00%
Developing Countries	14.29%	28.57%	14.29%	28.57%	14.29%

**Table 4.35: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to listservs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
College Library	55.56%	33.33%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%
Public Library	50.00%	30.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	40.00%	40.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%
Other	25.00%	37.50%	0.00%	37.50%	0.00%

**Table 4.36: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to listservs in their full text databases? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content in 2011	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
Less than \$100,000	27.27%	54.55%	0.00%	9.09%	9.09%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	56.25%	31.25%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%
More than \$500,000	66.67%	27.78%	0.00%	5.56%	0.00%
Information Not Available	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	60.00%	0.00%

**Table 4.37: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to videos or podcasts in their full text databases?**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
Entire Sample	14.00%	32.00%	22.00%	30.00%	2.00%

**Table 4.38: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to videos or podcasts in their full text databases? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
United States	17.65%	23.53%	26.47%	29.41%	2.94%
Other Developed Countries	10.00%	60.00%	0.00%	30.00%	0.00%
Developing Countries	0.00%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%

**Table 4.39: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to videos or podcasts in their full text databases? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Don't think that these resources should be included in databases
College Library	18.52%	37.04%	18.52%	25.93%	0.00%
Public Library	20.00%	30.00%	10.00%	30.00%	10.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	20.00%	80.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Other	0.00%	25.00%	12.50%	62.50%	0.00%

**Table 4.40: How good a job do the database vendors used most frequently by your patrons and staff handle the indexing and access to videos or podcasts in their full text databases? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

<b>Spending on Electronic Content in 2011</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Don't think that these resources should be included in databases</b>
Less than \$100,000	9.09%	45.45%	18.18%	27.27%	0.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	25.00%	31.25%	0.00%	37.50%	6.25%
More than \$500,000	10.53%	31.58%	36.84%	21.05%	0.00%
Information Not Available	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%

## Chapter 5: Use of Consortiums

**Table 5.1: In how many database licensing consortiums does the library participate (in which it has at least one active contract)?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	2.06	1.00	0.00	10.00

**Table 5.2: In how many database licensing consortiums does the library participate (in which it has at least one active contract)? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	2.10	2.00	0.00	9.00
Other Developed Countries	2.08	2.00	0.00	4.00
Developing Countries	2.60	1.00	0.00	10.00

**Table 5.3: In how many database licensing consortiums does the library participate (in which it has at least one active contract)? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	2.26	2.00	0.00	6.00
Public Library	1.73	2.00	0.00	5.00
Corporate or Law Firm Library	2.00	0.00	0.00	9.00
Other	2.36	1.00	0.00	10.00

**Table 5.4: In how many database licensing consortiums does the library participate (in which it has at least one active contract)? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	1.92	1.00	0.00	9.00
\$100,000 to \$500,000	2.00	1.00	0.00	6.00
More than \$500,000	2.06	2.00	0.00	4.00
Information Not Available	3.88	2.25	1.00	10.00

**Table 5.5: Contracts through consortiums account for what percentage of the library's total licenses for electronic content?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	44.56%	40.00%	0.00%	100.00%

**Table 5.6: Contracts through consortiums account for what percentage of the library's total licenses for electronic content Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	40.84%	30.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Other Developed Countries	57.54%	60.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Developing Countries	45.00%	50.00%	0.00%	95.00%

**Table 5.7: Contracts through consortiums account for what percentage of the library's total licenses for electronic content? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	59.82%	70.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Public Library	36.91%	25.00%	0.00%	95.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	12.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
Other	36.36%	30.00%	0.00%	100.00%

**Table 5.8: Contracts through consortiums account for what percentage of the library's total licenses for electronic content? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	63.57%	82.50%	0.00%	100.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	34.78%	30.00%	0.00%	90.00%
More than \$500,000	42.53%	31.50%	0.00%	95.00%
Information Not Available	40.00%	40.00%	10.00%	70.00%

**Table 5.9: Over the past two years, how has the percentage of content licensing contracts purchased through consortiums changed?**

	Remained about the same	Increased by less than 5%	Increased by more than 5%	Decreased by less than 5%	Decreased by more than 5%
Entire Sample	47.27%	16.36%	16.36%	10.91%	9.09%

**Table 5.10: Over the past two years, how has the percentage of content licensing contracts purchased through consortiums changed? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Remained about the same	Increased by less than 5%	Increased by more than 5%	Decreased by less than 5%	Decreased by more than 5%
United States	50.00%	16.67%	8.33%	11.11%	13.89%
Other Developed Countries	38.46%	7.69%	38.46%	15.38%	0.00%
Developing Countries	50.00%	33.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%

**Table 5.11: Over the past two years, how has the percentage of content licensing contracts purchased through consortiums changed? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Remained about the same	Increased by less than 5%	Increased by more than 5%	Decreased by less than 5%	Decreased by more than 5%
College Library	42.86%	21.43%	17.86%	3.57%	14.29%
Public Library	45.45%	9.09%	9.09%	27.27%	9.09%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Other	54.55%	9.09%	18.18%	18.18%	0.00%



**Table 5.12: Over the past two years, how has the percentage of content licensing contracts purchased through consortiums changed? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Remained about the same	Increased by less than 5%	Increased by more than 5%	Decreased by less than 5%	Decreased by more than 5%
Less than \$100,000	42.86%	14.29%	21.43%	14.29%	7.14%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	44.44%	16.67%	11.11%	22.22%	5.56%
More than \$500,000	55.56%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%	11.11%
Information Not Available	40.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%

**How could the consortium in which your institution participates better serve you? What steps might they take to help you get a better deal on database contracts?**

1. None
2. Email me!
3. We are pleased with current activities. Discounts are useful.
4. The consortium does not license legal materials. To the extent that it does, it would be useful if it pressed for current editions of e-books instead of the older edition. I am also not sure whether serving law libraries should be a consortium goal. What the consortium is useful for is for getting access to maybe one or two general purpose databases to get access to some general purpose material.
5. Administration support is limited (coordination of licenses, conditions, prices, invoicing)
6. They do a good job already. If there were more umbrella contracts with e-book vendors that would be good, but it is a vendor issue not a consortium issue.
7. To work better so it can be included other libraries, with more resources
8. Training (one to one)
9. Very good service
10. They need to negotiate better inflation rates and overall prices. Fees can be burdensome. Billing can be problematic.
11. Work with vendors who are not standard library vendors (i.e. lynda.com, turnitin.com as well as streaming video partners like Netflix, Hulu, iTunes, etc...)
12. Too divergent of needs in the consortia
13. Carolina Consortium is perfect, could not possibly improve. Lyrasis could improve by being more communicative and aggressive with discounts.
14. Include more databases in consortium offerings
15. They do a fairly good job already
16. Don't know
17. Include law specific databases
18. Supplier monopoly a problem
19. Review the databases it offers to increase offerings in the sciences. Develop a way to access content with "perpetual" license, after terminating a contract. Develop sustainable pay-per-view options. Add a Copyright Clearance Center annual license. Negotiate more aggressively.
20. More and better pricing for databases. Work on deals that are available to all members, not just a particular region of the consortium.
21. Be willing to take a tougher rather than roll over for the publishers
22. Reduction in subscription fees; negotiations, installment of our payments
23. Content in healthcare administration. Other vendors. Other products such as bibliographic management tools and e-books.
24. Allow us to participate/offer options to participate

## The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

25. Meetings to select database and conditions
26. Provide more information to help us troubleshoot problems, i.e. alerts for known problems, vendor contact names, emails, and phone numbers
27. Both of the consortia do a great job
28. Offer discounts on renewals
29. They already do a good job
30. When we are legally able to negotiate directly with vendors, we can always get a better price
31. Lower the price of package in negotiation for multiple schools in the system
32. Most of ours come through the state. Funding more resources would help, but unlikely.
33. We belong to CARLI and they are doing a great job
34. Perhaps if consortiums brokered deals for small subgroups of libraries within the consortium, we could get better deals on contracts
35. Increase the number of vendors they work with
36. We're fairly happy with consortial contracts. The issue is institutional licenses for such a small college (<1,000 FTE). Especially in the sciences, vendors have unrealistic pricing models.
37. Include more databases relevant to business

**In the next few years, do you expect to make a higher or lower percentage of your database purchases through consortia? Or will it remain about the same? Do you view consortia as a tool that you can increasingly utilize to reduce costs and extend your budget in tough times?**

1. I anticipate a lower percentage database purchase through our consortium due to decrease of funding. Yes, I do.
2. Yes
3. For next year, our organization will increase the percentage the purchases through contract
4. Yes
5. About the same
6. If the percentage rises, I think this will be because we cut some of the databases which aren't through a consortium. Talking about consortia is very difficult, because the main campus library (separate from the law library) tries to include access for law students in its purchases. So, it purchases from consortia, and then law students have access. If that access were cut off, it would not be crucial for the law library.
7. Consortia are a shortcut to save us from really having to think through some of the access and discovery problems that we have not equipped ourselves to make. We unashamedly use others work to follow them.
8. I expect consortial support to increase in importance due to changes at the state level (merging FCLA and CCLA). At the same time we will be increasing our own purchases and leases. Percentage wise it may be a wash.
9. Higher and yes, it is a tool to reduce costs
10. Yes
11. It will remain the same
12. Yes. Yes. Yes.
13. Remain the same
14. Same
15. It will increase somewhat as they bring new products on board, and take on some of the products that we renew. We use them when they can negotiate prices that are better than direct, so yes they do help during tough times.
16. Remain the same or lower
17. Higher. Our recent partnership with a large university has allowed the leasing of content to rise significantly. This tool provides better service and decreases the need to be physically present at the largest research institution for specific types of content relevant to our patrons.
18. Remain about the same
19. Hopefully more
20. Same; reduce costs
21. Yes, intend to buy as much through consortium as possible

## The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

22. About the same, yes
23. Higher. Consortia really help.
24. Probably less, usually costs more
25. It will be about the same. Yes, they are a tool, but state funding limits their ability to grow.
26. Higher
27. Higher. Yes.
28. Yes and no. Consortia are very helpful when it comes time to negotiate. If you need something specific for you documentation center, the consortia with its number of users may just increase the cost of a periodical. All of tem must be evaluated one by one.
29. Consortia are a very important tool, but it depends on what the consortia negotiate
30. About the same unless the consortium has some great deals. I would use them if they offered what I want/need.
31. About the same. No.
32. Always, we prefer to purchase our databases through consortia. Yes, I view consortia as a tool of access to more data.
33. Consortial pricing has allowed us to start our small library. Without the consortium we wouldn't exist - could not afford the pricing we were offered direct from the vendors. We hope to grow, pending pricing and budget constraints.
34. If options were available I would say it would be higher. It would be a tool that we could use to introduce more services to our staff.
35. Now the same. The consortium reduces the prices.
36. Probably more provided that it makes financial sense
37. Higher proportion
38. We expect to have a slow increase in the database purchases through our consortia
39. More if the price is better
40. Our consortial spending percentage will likely remain about the same. We use consortial purchasing when it's more economical than going direct to the vendor.
41. Lower
42. Don't know
43. It may be the way we have to go, but our local system is very loosely integrated and too small to make much difference in pricing. The state will probably decrease number of databases so in that regard a lower percentage, which then may be offset with local consortia, but I don't know.
44. About the same
45. If currently subscribed databases are made available thru our consortium, then we will subscribe through the consortium. Consortial purchasing is a benefit of membership.
46. I expect about the same, because as a large public library, we don't usually get a better deal by going through the consortia
47. Remain the same, but open to more consortial purchasing
48. Same. Georgia has good collaboration.
49. More
50. Higher. Yes, it will help to extend our budget.

## Chapter 6: Content License Pricing

**Table 6.1: By what percentage have prices increased (in nominal terms) for electronic and electronic/print combination journals in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	5.88%	5.00%	0.00%	15.00%

**Table 6.2: By what percentage have prices increased (in nominal terms) for electronic and electronic/print combination journals in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	5.72%	5.00%	3.00%	15.00%
Public Library	3.00%	4.00%	0.00%	5.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	5.50%	5.50%	5.00%	6.00%
Other	8.50%	9.50%	4.00%	10.00%

**Table 6.3: By what percentage have prices increased (in nominal terms) for e-books in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	30.42%	5.00%	0.00%	300.00%

**Table 6.4: By what percentage have prices increased (in nominal terms) for e-books in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	9.47%	3.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Public Library	79.67%	50.00%	3.00%	300.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	7.50%	7.50%	5.00%	10.00%
Other	16.67%	7.00%	3.00%	40.00%

**Table 6.5: By what percentage have prices increased (in nominal terms) for indexes and full text newspaper and magazine databases in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	8.65%	5.00%	0.00%	120.00%

**Table 6.6: By what percentage have prices increased (in nominal terms) for indexes and full text newspaper and magazine databases in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	5.57%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%
Public Library	3.50%	5.00%	0.00%	5.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	40.67%	2.00%	0.00%	120.00%
Other	6.50%	6.00%	4.00%	10.00%

**Table 6.7: By what percentage have prices increased (in nominal terms) for directories in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	4.15%	3.00%	0.00%	20.00%

**Table 6.8: By what percentage have prices increased (in nominal terms) for directories in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	5.44%	3.00%	0.00%	20.00%
Public Library	2.80%	4.00%	0.00%	5.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Other	3.67%	4.00%	0.00%	7.00%

**Table 6.9: By what percentage have prices increased (in nominal terms) for market research in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	4.90%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%

**Table 6.10: By what percentage have prices increased (in nominal terms) for market research in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	6.17%	3.50%	0.00%	20.00%
Public Library	2.83%	2.50%	0.00%	7.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%
Other	5.25%	5.25%	3.50%	7.00%

**Table 6.11: What was the approximate change in price (in percentage terms) of electronic content on business and finance licensed by your library in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	6.91%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%

**Table 6.12: What was the approximate change in price (in percentage terms) of electronic content on medicine and biochemistry licensed by your library in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	5.50%	5.00%	0.00%	10.00%

**Table 6.13: What was the approximate change in price (in percentage terms) of electronic content on engineering licensed by your library in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	2.64%	3.00%	0.00%	7.00%

**Table 6.14: What was the approximate change in price (in percentage terms) of electronic content on the humanities licensed by your library in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	4.53%	5.00%	0.00%	10.00%

**Table 6.15: What was the approximate change in price (in percentage terms) of electronic content on social sciences licensed by your library in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	4.43%	5.00%	0.00%	10.00%

**Table 6.16: What was the approximate change in price (in percentage terms) of electronic content on law licensed by your library in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	5.05%	5.00%	0.00%	20.00%

**Table 6.17: What was the approximate change in price (in percentage terms) of electronic content on general news information licensed by your library in the past year?**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Entire Sample	16.92%	4.00%	0.00%	300.00%

## Chapter 7: Disputes and Legal Expenditure

**Table 7.1: How many hours of professional legal assistance (from lawyers within or outside of your organization) did the library require for contract review or disputes in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	8.02	0.50	0.00	100.00

**Table 7.2: How many hours of professional legal assistance (from lawyers within or outside of your organization) did the library require for contract review or disputes in the past year? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	11.28	3.00	0.00	100.00
Other Developed Countries	0.20	0.00	0.00	2.00
Developing Countries	2.67	0.00	0.00	8.00

**Table 7.3: How many hours of professional legal assistance (from lawyers within or outside of your organization) did the library require for contract review or disputes in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	5.11	0.00	0.00	30.00
Public Library	10.80	3.00	0.00	80.00
Corporate or Law Firm Library	8.50	9.00	1.00	15.00
Other	10.30	0.00	0.00	100.00

**Table 7.4: How many hours of professional legal assistance (from lawyers within or outside of your organization) did the library require for contract review or disputes in the past year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	1.08	0.00	0.00	8.00
\$100,000 to \$500,000	7.93	1.50	0.00	80.00
More than \$500,000	15.21	9.00	0.00	100.00
Information Not Available	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00



**Table 7.5: Has your library ever been threatened by a publisher or information vendor with any form of legal action for contract abrogation, non-payment or any other reason?**

	Yes	No
Entire Sample	4.08%	95.92%

**Table 7.6: Has your library ever been threatened by a publisher or information vendor with any form of legal action for contract abrogation, non-payment or any other reason? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Yes	No
United States	5.88%	94.12%
Other Developed Countries	0.00%	100.00%
Developing Countries	0.00%	100.00%

**Table 7.7: Has your library ever been threatened by a publisher or information vendor with any form of legal action for contract abrogation, non-payment or any other reason? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Yes	No
College Library	0.00%	100.00%
Public Library	9.09%	90.91%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	20.00%	80.00%
Other	0.00%	100.00%

**Table 7.8: Has your library ever been threatened by a publisher or information vendor with any form of legal action for contract abrogation, non-payment or any other reason? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Yes	No
Less than \$100,000	0.00%	100.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	6.25%	93.75%
More than \$500,000	5.88%	94.12%
Information Not Available	0.00%	100.00%

**Table 7.9: Has your library ever threatened a publisher or information vendor with legal action over nonperformance or other contract abrogation or for any other reason?**

	Yes	No
Entire Sample	0.00%	100.00%

## Chapter 8: Staff Time

**Table 8.1: How much annual staff time (in hours) is expended by your library in database maintenance in the following ways: keeping track of contractual terms, payment and review of invoices, renewing or canceling subscriptions and phone, email or other correspondence over downtime or other technical problems?**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Entire Sample	1,271.89	975.00	3.00	6,000.00

**Table 8.2: How much annual staff time (in hours) is expended by your library in database maintenance in the following ways: keeping track of contractual terms, payment and review of invoices, renewing or canceling subscriptions and phone, email or other correspondence over downtime or other technical problems? Broken Out by Country**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
United States	1,308.97	975.00	3.00	6,000.00
Other Developed Countries	1,201.36	800.00	50.00	3,800.00
Developing Countries	1,135.00	1,500.00	5.00	1,900.00

**Table 8.3: How much annual staff time (in hours) is expended by your library in database maintenance in the following ways: keeping track of contractual terms, payment and review of invoices, renewing or canceling subscriptions and phone, email or other correspondence over downtime or other technical problems? Broken Out by Type of Library**

<b>Type of Library</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
College Library	1,641.10	1,000.00	3.00	6,000.00
Public Library	865.40	225.00	15.00	3,800.00
Corporate or Law Firm Library	1,520.00	1,500.00	1,000.00	2,080.00
Other	846.36	600.00	5.00	2,500.00

**Table 8.4: How much annual staff time (in hours) is expended by your library in database maintenance in the following ways: keeping track of contractual terms, payment and review of invoices, renewing or canceling subscriptions and phone, email or other correspondence over downtime or other technical problems? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	406.00	315.00	15.00	1,000.00
\$100,000 to \$500,000	886.60	800.00	24.00	1,900.00
More than \$500,000	2,214.12	1,900.00	400.00	6,000.00
Information Not Available	877.00	752.50	3.00	2,000.00

**Table 8.5: What percentage of your database vendors would you say sometimes deliver problematic invoices which you feel compelled to carefully check?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	22.53%	5.00%	0.00%	100.00%

**Table 8.6: What percentage of your database vendors would you say sometimes deliver problematic invoices which you feel compelled to carefully check? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	21.87%	5.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Other Developed Countries	29.55%	10.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Developing Countries	3.67%	1.00%	0.00%	10.00%

**Table 8.7: What percentage of your database vendors would you say sometimes deliver problematic invoices which you feel compelled to carefully check? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	28.21%	10.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Public Library	14.64%	5.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	29.20%	15.00%	1.00%	75.00%
Other	17.10%	5.00%	0.00%	80.00%

**Table 8.8: What percentage of your database vendors would you say sometimes deliver problematic invoices which you feel compelled to carefully check? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	11.82%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	25.44%	12.50%	0.00%	100.00%
More than \$500,000	29.13%	7.50%	0.00%	100.00%
Information Not Available	5.50%	5.50%	1.00%	10.00%

**Table 8.9: As a general rule, what percentage of the invoices that you receive for database products would you say are inaccurate?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	12.42%	5.00%	0.00%	100.00%

**Table 8.10: As a general rule, what percentage of the invoices that you receive for database products would you say are inaccurate? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	7.63%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%
Other Developed Countries	27.73%	10.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Developing Countries	2.50%	2.50%	0.00%	5.00%

**Table 8.11: As a general rule, what percentage of the invoices that you receive for database products would you say are inaccurate? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	9.82%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%
Public Library	2.91%	2.00%	0.00%	10.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	11.25%	10.00%	5.00%	20.00%
Other	28.30%	7.50%	0.00%	100.00%

**Table 8.12: As a general rule, what percentage of the invoices that you receive for database products would you say are inaccurate? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

<b>Spending on Electronic Content</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Less than \$100,000	21.82%	5.00%	0.00%	100.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	10.50%	5.00%	0.00%	45.00%
More than \$500,000	8.47%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%
Information Not Available	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%

## Chapter 9: Contract Terms

**Table 9.1: Which phrase best describes the extent to which your major database vendors adhere to contract terms regarding downtime, product availability and timeliness, billing, perpetual access and other contractual terms?**

	Never had any serious problems	Most vendors are scrupulous but have had occasional issues	Have had issues with a sizable minority of vendors	Have had issues with many vendors
Entire Sample	46.94%	32.65%	12.24%	8.16%

**Table 9.2: Which phrase best describes the extent to which your major database vendors adhere to contract terms regarding downtime, product availability and timeliness, billing, perpetual access and other contractual terms? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Never had any serious problems	Most vendors are scrupulous but have had occasional issues	Have had issues with a sizable minority of vendors	Have had issues with many vendors
United States	50.00%	35.29%	2.94%	11.76%
Other Developed Countries	36.36%	27.27%	36.36%	0.00%
Developing Countries	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%

**Table 9.3: Which phrase best describes the extent to which your major database vendors adhere to contract terms regarding downtime, product availability and timeliness, billing, perpetual access and other contractual terms? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Never had any serious problems	Most vendors are scrupulous but have had occasional issues	Have had issues with a sizable minority of vendors	Have had issues with many vendors
College Library	34.78%	34.78%	17.39%	13.04%
Public Library	54.55%	45.45%	0.00%	0.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%
Other	63.64%	18.18%	18.18%	0.00%

**Table 9.4: Which phrase best describes the extent to which your major database vendors adhere to contract terms regarding downtime, product availability and timeliness, billing, perpetual access and other contractual terms? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

<b>Spending on Electronic Content</b>	<b>Never had any serious problems</b>	<b>Most vendors are scrupulous but have had occasional issues</b>	<b>Have had issues with a sizable minority of vendors</b>	<b>Have had issues with many vendors</b>
Less than \$100,000	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	50.00%	43.75%	6.25%	0.00%
More than \$500,000	29.41%	41.18%	17.65%	11.76%
Information Not Available	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%

**What are some of the most serious issues that you have had with database vendors whom you feel have not kept to contractual terms?**

1. Delivered late
2. Downtime, access, products don't perform as advertised
3. I think the vendor technical support staff often don't know the product well, and so downtime lasts much longer than it should. Lack of technical support and customer service from vendors, combined with lack of technology skills in library staff means that often purchased products are not accessible. I don't view it as a contractual breach in the same way that intentionally cutting off access would be. Instead, I view it as snafu.
4. Plain language contracts that are not. Extent and number of changes to subscriptions (new, deleted, maintained) titles. Invoicing and payment is not accompanied by prompt access. Confirmation of title for sale (cleared for sale to a single country) has to be arranged across two sometimes three different countries for the one title let alone contract.
5. Invoicing for the same material twice, inaccurate record keeping between sales and technical support over content packages which we subscribe to
6. Not delivering a new product on time
7. Elimination of access (e.g. Blackwell Wiley turns off products until bill is paid, even if they send you the bill late), downtime, incorrect invoicing, double invoicing, billing issues
8. Reneging on remote access after contract is in place
9. Downtime as related to system bugs
10. None I can think of
11. Downtime and slow to correct errors
12. It's not so much that they aren't keeping to contractual terms but that there are errors, so effort is taken on the library side to ensure they adhere - this particularly applies to perpetual access
13. No issue whatsoever
14. Saying that content is available "to the present" when it is often 2-3 months behind. Changing content with insufficient notice.
15. Not giving grace access during renewal period (we use a subscriptions agent for most subs), not providing perpetual access in a usable form after our cancellation - provided the data but no platform or interface to access it
16. We had no issue in not keeping contractual terms. Some of vendors are not flexible in the editing the terms of contract in the initial negotiation.
17. None
18. Too difficult getting the contractual terms off them to tell!
19. Downtime
20. Problems accessing
21. Unannounced downtime lasting for hours or days
22. Billing and delivery
23. Lack of information when one vendor was bought out by another vendor
24. Renewal invoice was not sent last year. Access lapsed and it was problematic to reinstate.
25. Product didn't work as promised. Data integrity and accurate linking was suspect and technical support not able to come up with acceptable answers in an acceptable time frame.



## Chapter 10: Usage Statistics

**Table 10.1: How has database usage at your library changed in the past year?**

	Increased substantially	Increased modestly	Remained about the same	Decreased modestly	Decreased substantially
Entire Sample	14.89%	46.81%	36.17%	2.13%	0.00%

**Table 10.2: How has database usage at your library changed in the past year? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Increased substantially	Increased modestly	Remained about the same	Decreased modestly	Decreased substantially
United States	15.63%	53.13%	31.25%	0.00%	0.00%
Other Developed Countries	9.09%	36.36%	45.45%	9.09%	0.00%
Developing Countries	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Table 10.3: How has database usage at your library changed in the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Increased substantially	Increased modestly	Remained about the same	Decreased modestly	Decreased substantially
College Library	19.05%	38.10%	38.10%	4.76%	0.00%
Public Library	0.00%	63.64%	36.36%	0.00%	0.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Other	18.18%	54.55%	27.27%	0.00%	0.00%

**Table 10.4: How has database usage at your library changed in the past year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Increased substantially	Increased modestly	Remained about the same	Decreased modestly	Decreased substantially
Less than \$100,000	9.09%	63.64%	27.27%	0.00%	0.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	12.50%	56.25%	25.00%	6.25%	0.00%
More than \$500,000	17.65%	29.41%	52.94%	0.00%	0.00%
Information Not Available	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%

**Table 10.5: How successful have you been in negotiating reductions in database licensing prices when usage statistics show declining use?**

	Not at all successful	Generally unsuccessful	Successful occasionally	Often successful	Usually successful
Entire Sample	18.18%	27.27%	34.09%	13.64%	6.82%

**Table 10.6: How successful have you been in negotiating reductions in database licensing prices when usage statistics show declining use? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Not at all successful	Generally unsuccessful	Successful occasionally	Often successful	Usually successful
United States	16.67%	26.67%	33.33%	20.00%	3.33%
Other Developed Countries	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Developing Countries	0.00%	20.00%	40.00%	0.00%	40.00%

**Table 10.7: How successful have you been in negotiating reductions in database licensing prices when usage statistics show declining use? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Not at all successful	Generally unsuccessful	Successful occasionally	Often successful	Usually successful
College Library	20.00%	35.00%	40.00%	0.00%	5.00%
Public Library	18.18%	9.09%	27.27%	36.36%	9.09%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Other	22.22%	22.22%	22.22%	22.22%	11.11%

**Table 10.8: How successful have you been in negotiating reductions in database licensing prices when usage statistics show declining use? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

<b>Spending on Electronic Content</b>	<b>Not at all successful</b>	<b>Generally unsuccessful</b>	<b>Successful occasionally</b>	<b>Often successful</b>	<b>Usually successful</b>
Less than \$100,000	33.33%	33.33%	22.22%	0.00%	11.11%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	13.33%	20.00%	26.67%	33.33%	6.67%
More than \$500,000	18.75%	31.25%	43.75%	6.25%	0.00%
Information Not Available	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%	25.00%

## Chapter 11: Electronic Resources and Interlibrary Loan

**Table 11.1: Which phrase best describes your library's attitude towards negotiating contract language on provision of interlibrary loan materials through email or other internet technology?**

	<b>We have not really tried to negotiate any special language on this issue</b>	<b>We have asked publishers to give us more leeway to provide content via email in interlibrary loan requests but have not had much success</b>	<b>We have asked publishers to give us more leeway to provide content via email in interlibrary loan requests and have had success in negotiating better terms</b>
Entire Sample	68.89%	20.00%	11.11%

**Table 11.2: Which phrase best describes your library's attitude towards negotiating contract language on provision of interlibrary loan materials through email or other internet technology? Broken Out by Country**

<b>Country</b>	<b>We have not really tried to negotiate any special language on this issue</b>	<b>We have asked publishers to give us more leeway to provide content via email in interlibrary loan requests but have not had much success</b>	<b>We have asked publishers to give us more leeway to provide content via email in interlibrary loan requests and have had success in negotiating better terms</b>
United States	83.33%	13.33%	3.33%
Other Developed Countries	36.36%	36.36%	27.27%
Developing Countries	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%

**Table 11.3: Which phrase best describes your library's attitude towards negotiating contract language on provision of interlibrary loan materials through email or other internet technology? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	We have not really tried to negotiate any special language on this issue	We have asked publishers to give us more leeway to provide content via email in interlibrary loan requests but have not had much success	We have asked publishers to give us more leeway to provide content via email in interlibrary loan requests and have had success in negotiating better terms
College Library	65.00%	15.00%	20.00%
Public Library	90.91%	0.00%	9.09%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Other	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%

**Table 11.4: Which phrase best describes your library's attitude towards negotiating contract language on provision of interlibrary loan materials through email or other internet technology? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	We have not really tried to negotiate any special language on this issue	We have asked publishers to give us more leeway to provide content via email in interlibrary loan requests but have not had much success	We have asked publishers to give us more leeway to provide content via email in interlibrary loan requests and have had success in negotiating better terms
Less than \$100,000	80.00%	20.00%	0.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	68.75%	25.00%	6.25%
More than \$500,000	64.71%	17.65%	17.65%
Information Not Available	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%

**Table 11.5: Have you ever used an e-book lending service?**

	Yes	No
Entire Sample	4.17%	95.83%

**Table 11.6: Have you ever used an e-book lending service? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Yes	No
United States	3.13%	96.88%
Other Developed Countries	9.09%	90.91%
Developing Countries	0.00%	100.00%

**Table 11.7: Have you ever used an e-book lending service? Broken Out by Type of Library**

<b>Type of Library</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
College Library	9.09%	90.91%
Public Library	0.00%	100.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	100.00%
Other	0.00%	100.00%

**Table 11.8: Have you ever used an e-book lending service? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

<b>Spending on Electronic Content</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Less than \$100,000	0.00%	100.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	0.00%	100.00%
More than \$500,000	11.76%	88.24%
Information Not Available	0.00%	100.00%

## Chapter 12: Use of Open Access Resources

**Table 12.1: Does your library track patron use of open access journals?**

	Yes	No
Entire Sample	10.42%	89.58%

**Table 12.2: Does your library track patron use of open access journals?  
Broken Out by Country**

Country	Yes	No
United States	3.13%	96.88%
Other Developed Countries	27.27%	72.73%
Developing Countries	20.00%	80.00%

**Table 12.3: Does your library track patron use of open access journals?  
Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Yes	No
College Library	9.09%	90.91%
Public Library	0.00%	100.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	100.00%
Other	27.27%	72.73%

**Table 12.4: Does your library track patron use of open access journals?  
Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Yes	No
Less than \$100,000	16.67%	83.33%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	6.25%	93.75%
More than \$500,000	5.88%	94.12%
Information Not Available	33.33%	66.67%

**Table 12.5: What has been the rate of change (in percentage terms) in the  
use of open access journals by your patrons and staff in the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	16.85%	10.00%	0.00%	70.00%

**Table 12.6: What has been the rate of change (in percentage terms) in the use of open access journals by your patrons and staff in the past year? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	15.83%	10.00%	0.00%	50.00%
Other Developed Countries	24.75%	14.50%	0.00%	70.00%
Developing Countries	12.50%	12.50%	5.00%	20.00%

**Table 12.7: What has been the rate of change (in percentage terms) in the use of open access journals by your patrons and staff in the past year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	35.00%	35.00%	0.00%	70.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	8.17%	7.00%	0.00%	25.00%
More than \$500,000	26.67%	25.00%	5.00%	50.00%
Information Not Available	6.00%	2.00%	0.00%	20.00%

**In the past year, has your library deferred, postponed, canceled or reduced the scope and cost of any subscription by substituting equally valuable open access journals? How has the growing prevalence of open access journals affected your licensing and procurement efforts?**

1. No
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. No
6. We have not substituted subscriptions with open access journals
7. No. A little.
8. No
9. No
10. Some. We've bought BioOne and made sure we had the open access journals cataloged properly in the catalog, but haven't necessarily cancelled something on purpose for exchange by an OA journal.
11. No
12. No
13. Not at all yet
14. Slightly
15. No
16. No
17. Just beginning to do this
18. It seems to have no effect, though we do not track patron use of open access journals



The Survey of Library Database Licensing Practices, 2012 Edition

19. Just starting to track usage
20. No
21. Not yet, but we anticipate some changes in this area
22. Minimal changes
23. No
24. The growth of open access journals has not affected our licensing directions at this stage. We expect to review this in the next 2-3 years.
25. No
26. No
27. No
28. The open access movement hasn't affected our purchasing yet
29. No
30. Yes, we canceled our health information database. We look for open access alternatives when considering renewals and additions.
31. We've only been able to focus on the basics, so the open access options now available just helps us feel better about not having the funds to purchase more
32. No
33. Not yet
34. Yes

**Table 12.8: Has the library ever paid an article processing fee for an author?**

	Yes	No	No, but our parent institution has paid such fees
Entire Sample	18.75%	72.92%	8.33%

**Table 12.9: Has the library ever paid an article processing fee for an author? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Yes	No	No, but our parent institution has paid such fees
United States	18.18%	78.79%	3.03%
Other Developed Countries	18.18%	63.64%	18.18%
Developing Countries	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%

**Table 12.10: Has the library ever paid an article processing fee for an author? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Yes	No	No, but our parent institution has paid such fees
College Library	22.73%	63.64%	13.64%
Public Library	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Other	36.36%	54.55%	9.09%

**Table 12.11: Has the library ever paid an article processing fee for an author? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Yes	No	No, but our parent institution has paid such fees
Less than \$100,000	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	18.75%	75.00%	6.25%
More than \$500,000	29.41%	52.94%	17.65%
Information Not Available	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%

**Has your library or any other department at your organization made any effort to track submissions and publications by faculty in open access journals? If so, can you describe this effort?**

1. No
2. No, we wait for academics/faculty to offer them to the library. Because we don't employ staff to do this sort of work.
3. Do not know
4. Issues with local university lecturer and R&D department over infringement on an article published in a journal
5. No
6. Don't know
7. Not yet
8. No
9. No
10. No, just by word of mouth. One librarian has encouraged a lot of scholarly communication advocacy and he knows some examples by word of mouth.
11. No
12. Faculty note these publication in their CV which they update annually
13. No
14. No
15. Actually, we track publications for all researchers in different databases, not only OA
16. Unknown
17. No
18. No
19. No
20. I don't know
21. No
22. No
23. No
24. No
25. No
26. We are planning to initiate an institutional repository and these publications and submissions will be involved in that effort. We don't track them now.
27. No
28. No
29. No
30. No
31. Don't know
32. Not yet. Probably more prevalent in sciences.

**Table 12.12: What percentage of journal articles acquired from other institutions comes from the institutional digital repositories of other institutions or from a digital repository consortium?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	12.87%	2.00%	0.00%	90.00%

**Table 12.13: What percentage of journal articles acquired from other institutions comes from the institutional digital repositories of other institutions or from a digital repository consortium? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	9.00%	0.00%	0.00%	90.00%
Other Developed Countries	11.14%	5.00%	0.00%	50.00%
Developing Countries	36.67%	10.00%	10.00%	90.00%

**Table 12.14: What percentage of journal articles acquired from other institutions comes from the institutional digital repositories of other institutions or from a digital repository consortium? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	23.29%	10.00%	0.00%	90.00%
Public Library	0.40%	0.00%	0.00%	2.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	35.00%	10.00%	5.00%	90.00%
Other	3.71%	1.00%	0.00%	10.00%

**Table 12.15: What percentage of journal articles acquired from other institutions comes from the institutional digital repositories of other institutions or from a digital repository consortium? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Resources in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Resources	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	10.20%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	2.75%	1.00%	0.00%	10.00%
More than \$500,000	29.00%	10.00%	0.00%	90.00%
Information Not Available	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%

**Table 12.16: Which phrase best describes your organization?**

	<b>Currently has an institutional digital repository</b>	<b>Does not have an institutional digital repository but we are in the planning stage and will have one within 1 year</b>	<b>Does not have an institutional digital repository but we are considering one and will have one within 2 years</b>	<b>Does not have an institutional digital repository and do not expect to have one in the next 3 years</b>
Entire Sample	31.25%	10.42%	10.42%	47.92%

**Table 12.17: Which phrase best describes your organization? Broken Out by Country**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Currently has an institutional digital repository</b>	<b>Does not have an institutional digital repository but we are in the planning stage and will have one within 1 year</b>	<b>Does not have an institutional digital repository but we are considering one and will have one within 2 years</b>	<b>Does not have an institutional digital repository and do not expect to have one in the next 3 years</b>
United States	21.88%	9.38%	9.38%	59.38%
Other Developed Countries	45.45%	9.09%	9.09%	36.36%
Developing Countries	60.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%

**Table 12.18: Which phrase best describes your organization? Broken Out by Type of Library**

<b>Type of Library</b>	<b>Currently has an institutional digital repository</b>	<b>Does not have an institutional digital repository but we are in the planning stage and will have one within 1 year</b>	<b>Does not have an institutional digital repository but we are considering one and will have one within 2 years</b>	<b>Does not have an institutional digital repository and do not expect to have one in the next 3 years</b>
College Library	45.45%	13.64%	13.64%	27.27%
Public Library	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	90.91%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	75.00%
Other	36.36%	18.18%	9.09%	36.36%

**Table 12.19: Which phrase best describes your organization? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Currently has an institutional digital repository	Does not have an institutional digital repository but we are in the planning stage and will have one within 1 year	Does not have an institutional digital repository but we are considering one and will have one within 2 years	Does not have an institutional digital repository and do not expect to have one in the next 3 years
Less than \$100,000	27.27%	9.09%	9.09%	54.55%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	18.75%	6.25%	0.00%	75.00%
More than \$500,000	47.06%	11.76%	11.76%	29.41%
Information Not Available	25.00%	25.00%	50.00%	0.00%

**Table 12.20: What percentage of your institution's original published scholarly output in the past year is deposited in your library's institutional digital repository?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	35.91%	30.00%	0.00%	90.00%

**Table 12.21: What percentage of your institution's original published scholarly output in the past year is deposited in your library's institutional digital repository? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	20.83%	7.50%	5.00%	50.00%
Other Developed Countries	60.00%	70.00%	30.00%	80.00%
Developing Countries	45.00%	45.00%	0.00%	90.00%

**Table 12.22: What percentage of your institution’s original published scholarly output in the past year is deposited in your library’s institutional digital repository? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

<b>Spending on Electronic Content</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Less than \$100,000	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	41.67%	50.00%	5.00%	70.00%
More than \$500,000	25.00%	7.50%	0.00%	80.00%
Information Not Available	70.00%	70.00%	50.00%	90.00%

**How has the growing use of institutional digital repositories impacted your library?  
Has it enabled your library to reduce costs or to shift resources to other needed  
areas?**

1. No
2. (1) The growth of research only theses (compared to professional doctorates and minor theses) is a declared university priority outcome to attract funding. The library has not kept up with employing subject specialist catalogers to manage this original cataloging output. The growth of this area has not been met by increased/reviewed resources. (2) The university library has outsourced by default the original cataloging of research publications to the local state public library to manage CIP. As if the public library would have the specialists for an authentic bibliographic description and subject analysis and headings for the university's own departments, etc... This is an opportunity lost for cataloging staff and development of the library's services in reference and access/description. The savings have been spent on another institution (the public library) and returned to the university's budget as unspent moneys.
3. Yes, IR is very helpful
4. Under consideration since awareness has been raised
5. No
6. No big impact yet. Since it is still at the pilot stage, it takes more staff resources for design, testing, planning new workflow, etc... than before.
7. Perhaps. Easier to find theses and dissertations that before we would have spent a long time searching for in the ILL department to no avail, perhaps buying for someone.
8. It costs more to maintain a digital repository
9. Not significant yet
10. Minimal reduction
11. Not as yet
12. It had no impact. I wonder how a digital repository could reduce costs. Getting access to publications not available anywhere else, yes, but no cost reduction.
13. At present it has had no serious impact, but in the future I am sure it will impact our library
14. Unknown
15. Highly
16. It has not had an impact on acquisitions. We are still in the early growing stages.
17. No impact
18. The digital repository has not reduced costs or shifted resources to other areas. Most of our repository content is out of copyright content.
19. None
20. The IR will be a cost center for our library for the foreseeable future. I don't expect us to see any savings from having a repository for quite a few years.
21. No
22. IR costs are beyond our library's budget (\$17,000 annually last time I got a quote)

## Chapter 13: Use of Free Resources

**Table 13.1: Many journal publishers now make access to back issues of their journals free to the public after an "embargo" period, often of 1-2 years. For journals that your library does not subscribe to, which of the following would you say is true?**

	We make extensive use of these free offerings	We use these free offerings to some extent	We don't really make much use of them	We don't really use them at all
Entire Sample	25.53%	44.68%	19.15%	10.64%

**Table 13.2: Many journal publishers now make access to back issues of their journals free to the public after an "embargo" period, often of 1-2 years. For journals that your library does not subscribe to, which of the following would you say is true? Broken Out by Country**

Country	We make extensive use of these free offerings	We use these free offerings to some extent	We don't really make much use of them	We don't really use them at all
United States	9.38%	50.00%	25.00%	15.63%
Other Developed Countries	63.64%	36.36%	0.00%	0.00%
Developing Countries	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%

**Table 13.3: Many journal publishers now make access to back issues of their journals free to the public after an "embargo" period, often of 1-2 years. For journals that your library does not subscribe to, which of the following would you say is true? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	We make extensive use of these free offerings	We use these free offerings to some extent	We don't really make much use of them	We don't really use them at all
College Library	19.05%	61.90%	14.29%	4.76%
Public Library	9.09%	18.18%	36.36%	36.36%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%
Other	63.64%	36.36%	0.00%	0.00%



**Table 13.4: Many journal publishers now make access to back issues of their journals free to the public after an "embargo" period, often of 1-2 years. For journals that your library does not subscribe to, which of the following would you say is true? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	We make extensive use of these free offerings	We use these free offerings to some extent	We don't really make much use of them	We don't really use them at all
Less than \$100,000	30.00%	40.00%	10.00%	20.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	12.50%	37.50%	31.25%	18.75%
More than \$500,000	29.41%	58.82%	11.76%	0.00%
Information Not Available	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%

**Table 13.5: What percentage of total article requests from faculty or library patrons for journals that are not in your collection are satisfied by downloads or accesses of these free back files offered by some journal publishers?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	19.86%	10.00%	0.00%	80.00%

**Table 13.6: What percentage of total article requests from faculty or library patrons for journals that are not in your collection are satisfied by downloads or accesses of these free back files offered by some journal publishers? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	13.56%	10.00%	0.00%	80.00%
Other Developed Countries	32.67%	30.00%	4.00%	75.00%
Developing Countries	22.50%	22.50%	5.00%	40.00%

**Table 13.7: What percentage of total article requests from faculty or library patrons for journals that are not in your collection are satisfied by downloads or accesses of these free back files offered by some journal publishers? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	17.67%	10.00%	2.00%	40.00%
Public Library	2.50%	2.50%	0.00%	5.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	10.00%	10.00%	5.00%	15.00%
Other	30.90%	20.00%	4.00%	80.00%

**Table 13.8: What percentage of total article requests from faculty or library patrons for journals that are not in your collection are satisfied by downloads or accesses of these free back files offered by some journal publishers? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

<b>Spending on Electronic Content</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Less than \$100,000	37.00%	30.00%	5.00%	75.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	11.60%	7.50%	0.00%	40.00%
More than \$500,000	22.73%	10.00%	5.00%	80.00%
Information Not Available	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%

## Chapter 14: License Renewal Decision Making Process

**Table 14.1: In the next year, what percentage of the library's content licensing contracts that come up for renewal does the library expect to renew?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	89.36%	95.00%	0.00%	100.00%

**Table 14.2: In the next year, what percentage of the library's content licensing contracts that come up for renewal does the library expect to renew? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	93.19%	97.00%	70.00%	100.00%
Other Developed Countries	93.64%	95.00%	75.00%	100.00%
Developing Countries	51.00%	51.00%	2.00%	100.00%

**Table 14.3: In the next year, what percentage of the library's content licensing contracts that come up for renewal does the library expect to renew? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	94.53%	97.00%	70.00%	100.00%
Public Library	90.00%	90.00%	75.00%	100.00%
Corporate or Law Firm Library	71.75%	92.50%	2.00%	100.00%
Other	94.80%	99.00%	75.00%	100.00%

**Table 14.4: In the next year, what percentage of the library's content licensing contracts that come up for renewal does the library expect to renew? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	95.00%	100.00%	75.00%	100.00%
\$100,000 to \$500,000	92.31%	92.50%	75.00%	100.00%
More than \$500,000	93.65%	98.00%	70.00%	100.00%
Information Not Available	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%

**Table 14.5: How many databases did the library test on a free-trial basis within the past year?**

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Entire Sample	10.26	4.50	0.00	120.00

**Table 14.6: How many databases did the library test on a free-trial basis within the past year? Broken Out by Country**

Country	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
United States	8.13	5.00	0.00	65.00
Other Developed Countries	15.36	2.00	0.00	120.00
Developing Countries	17.00	3.00	3.00	45.00

**Table 14.7: How many databases did the library test on a free-trial basis within the past year? Broken Out by Type of Library**

Type of Library	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
College Library	14.90	8.50	1.00	120.00
Public Library	6.45	5.00	0.00	20.00
Corporate or Law Firm Library	5.50	4.50	3.00	10.00
Other	8.10	2.00	0.00	65.00

**Table 14.8: How many databases did the library test on a free-trial basis within the past year? Broken Out by Total Spending on Electronic Content in 2011**

Spending on Electronic Content	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Less than \$100,000	2.70	2.00	0.00	7.00
\$100,000 to \$500,000	4.69	4.00	0.00	10.00
More than \$500,000	18.94	10.00	0.00	120.00
Information Not Available	24.00	24.00	3.00	45.00