School of Information Faculty Publications

School of Information

2008

Florida University Libraries Collection Analysis Project

Authors: Anna H. Perrault and Diana Loper

Collection analysis for 26 Florida University Libraries using OCLC Collection Analysis product. The SUL project sponsored by FCLA to analyze the book collections of the Florida university libraries was conducted in 2008 utilizing the OCLC WorldCat Collection Analysis service (WCA). The study findings constitute a baseline assessment of the collections of the Florida university libraries.

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/si_facpub

Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

Florida University Libraries Collection Analysis Project

Conducted by Anna H. Perrault
Professor, University of South Florida
School of Library and Information Science

Assisted by Diana Loper, Graduate Student, SLIS

Table of Contents

Introduction and Summary

The SUL project sponsored by FCLA to analyze the book collections of the Florida university libraries was conducted in 2008 utilizing the OCLC WorldCat Collection Analysis service (WCA). The study findings constitute a baseline assessment of the collections of the Florida university libraries.

Scope of the Project

The SUL collection analysis report contains the following analyses for the bibliographic records for books of the aggregated group and the member libraries:

- Date of Publication for the aggregated SUL collection and individual library collections including analyses comparing 1995-1999 and 2000-2004 time periods and for the 2000-2007 time frame
- Subject analyses by date of publication and uniqueness by library
- Uniqueness and overlap, by library groupings, and individual libraries
- Language analysis by English and non-English; most collected languages by library and subject; unique records by language by library

Methodology

Data for this study were extracted from the OCLC WorldCat Collection Analysis module during spring and summer of 2008. All data for each of the different analyses were extracted within the same quarter. In the majority of the different analyses, data analysis and interpretation are focused on proportions of total book collection rather than on analysis by absolute numbers. The majority of the analyses are comparative within the SUL grouping to show relationships among the library collections and differences in collection profiles by libraries. Qualitative assessments are made by inference through the results of the quantitative analyses.

The data are just for books. E-books are included in the "books" categorization in the WCA. Throughout this report "collection" refers to book collections only, even if not specifically stated.

Twelve non-English languages were analyzed based on their number of records and percentages of total in the collections studied. Other languages had very small numbers of records that were not sufficient to include.

Several limitations are placed upon the results by the organization of data in the WCA product:

- Percentage of total collection by subject is largely governed by the constitution of the subject divisions in the WCA product.
- Uniqueness is magnified by variant editions of titles that have had many editions, such as in literature or textbooks, because each bibliographic record is counted

once, even though multiple records may be for the same title. Thus the term "record" is used and not "title."

While not inherent in the WCA product, another governing factor for library collections is the extent of the universe of publication by subjects and disciplines. The humanities disciplines have a much larger universe of publication than the sciences. The social sciences vary by discipline, but generally the social sciences fields have a larger universe of monographic publication than the sciences, but somewhat lesser than the humanities.

A problem with assessment of strengths and weaknesses is the lack of standards or benchmarks. Within the SUL the only benchmarks possible are the largest library collections which, as the analyses reveal, are different from the other general library collections. Comparison with the two ARL collections would be counter-productive for libraries that have a much lower number of bibliographic records, unless the goal is to attain the same level as those collections. In several places findings from a bibliometric study of the monograph records in WorldCat conducted by this analyst are used to furnish an external comparison for the SUL[1]. Library groupings were constructed by size of book collection and peer comparisons are shown within those groupings.

Summary of Significant Findings

<u>Overall</u>

- Size of collection is the single most determining factor in findings by uniqueness
- Founding date of the universities is an influence on the development of the book collections

<u>Date of Publication</u>

- By percentage share of total, the decades of the 1980s and 1990s each comprise one-fifth of total book collections.
- Within individual libraries, many subject divisions have their highest number of records in the 1970s and 1980s.
- From 1995-1999 to 2000-2004, the majority of the libraries have a decrease in number of records in the interval, 2000-2004, from the previous interval for 1995-1999.
- With the exception of **UCF**, the larger institutions all have a decrease in the number of records from 1995-1999 to 2000-2004. **Florida State University** has a 31% decrease; **West Florida** 26%; **UF** 17%; **USF** 16%; **FIU** 13%; and **North Florida** 11%. **FAU** has a smaller decrease at 8.5%.
- From 1995-1999 to 2000-2004, the majority of libraries show large declines in the medicine and health divisions. There are also huge declines in the number of Government Document records.

---

[1] The report of the study is available at http:// www.oclc.org/research/grants/reports/perrault

- With the exception of the **Florida State University College of Medicine** library, the health sciences collections all show substantial declines in both of the five-year intervals from 1995-2004.
- From 2000-2007, all but one of the general libraries had large declines in the division of Government Documents. In many of the libraries this was the subject division with the largest decline.
- The subjects with the next largest declines common to the majority of the libraries in the 2000-2007 time period were divisions in the health sciences and medicine. These subject divisions showed declines in both the general libraries and in the health sciences libraries.
- While the more specific subject divisions in the health sciences show decreases over time, the general Medicine division has the largest percentages of total of all the subject divisions in the 2000-2007 time period.
- The largest increases and also the largest decreases occurred in the special libraries from 2000-2007.
- The only pattern that is common to almost all of the libraries from 2000-2007 is that the uniqueness increases as the years become more current.

By Subject

- In the general libraries from 65% to 79% of the book collections are comprised of nine subject divisions. Of these are four humanities subject divisions (Language, Linguistics, Literature; History; Philosophy & Religion; and Art & Architecture), which together have the largest percentage of total of any of the broad subject areas. Three social sciences subject divisions (Sociology, Psychology, and Education); Business, and Government Documents are the other of the nine subject divisions. The remaining 21 subject divisions altogether range from 21% to 28% in percentage total of collections.
- Five of the subject divisions have their highest percentage in the 1970s: Chemistry; Geography & Earth Sciences; Library Science, Generalities & Reference; Music; and Physical Education & Recreation. Another seven subject divisions have their highest percentage in the 1980s: Agriculture; Government Documents; Health Facilities, Nursing & History; Health Professions & Public Health; Medicine by Body system; Medicine by Discipline; and Preclinical Sciences. The remaining subject divisions have their highest percentage thus far in the 1990s.
- Percentages of total book collection by subject division are similar for the SUL, ASERL, and a research libraries grouping in WorldCat.
- Many subjects in which current information is of utmost importance have their highest number of records in the 1970s and 1980s.

Uniqueness

- Twelve libraries have over 20% of collection in unique records.
- The **Ringling Museum Library** (54%) and the **Florida Solar Energy Center** (41%) have the largest percentage of unique records among the twenty-five

collections. The **University of South Florida Mental Health Institute Library** (38%) and the **University of Florida Health Sciences Library** (33%) also have high percentages of unique records.

- The two ARL libraries, **University of Florida** and **Florida State University**, also have high percentages of unique with 40% and 30%, respectively. Only one other general library has such a high percentage of uniqueness, **Florida Atlantic** with 30% unique records. The next libraries in size to the ARL libraries have close to the same percentages of unique, but far lower than the ARL libraries at 15%. The remaining general libraries have 13% or less unique records for books.
- The smaller general collections do not have a sufficient number of records to have larger percentages of unique.

Overlap

- The smaller general library book collections have the highest overlap within the SUL but not within the small library grouping. Smaller collections have higher overlap with the larger collections. Conversely, larger collections have lower overlap with those collections having fewer records.
- The law libraries have 20% to mid 30% range in overlap with the general library collections. The overlap indicates there is a core of materials that the general libraries have in common with the law libraries.
- The Business & Economics division was analyzed for overlap. All libraries have their highest overlap in Business & Economics with UCF, with just a few exceptions. UCF, USF, and UF have the same size collections by percentage share of total in Business & Economics and all three are at the top of overlap for the remaining libraries. As could be expected from the very high levels of overlap, uniqueness in records in Business & Economics is extremely low. For all of the libraries except UF, FSU and UCF, uniqueness is below 10% in Business & Economics.

Languages

- Only five libraries have above 10% of collection in non-English languages; another four libraries have between 5%-10% in non-English languages.
- The languages with the highest number of records in Florida university libraries are those traditionally emphasized in the humanities and arts.
- Spanish has the highest number of records of all the languages analyzed in the study
- French and German are second and third most collected with far fewer records than Spanish
- Portuguese and Italian are fourth and fifth most collected
- Hebrew, Russian, Chinese, Yiddish, and Polish round out the top ten
- Uniqueness is higher in non-English than in English
- The subject divisions that contain the majority of the non-English language records are Language, Linguistics, Literature; History; Philosophy & Religion; and Art & Architecture.