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Conclusions

Comparing print and e-use is akin to comparing apples and dragonfruit and raisins.

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

Usage “readings” by LC Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print-reading</th>
<th>E-reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorations</td>
<td>Design, Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>Photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Media</td>
<td>Sculpture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Further Questions

What might we learn by further analyzing the ratio between print use (circ) and e-use (section requests)?

How are the findings from our collaborative project transferrable to our individual institutions? What can we learn by comparing institutional usage data with aggregate data?

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

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

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