OpenGLAM Benchmark Survey: Preliminary Results from Finland, Poland, Switzerland and The Netherlands

Beat Estermann, 19 July 2015 – Wikimania, Mexico City

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 License.
Welcome!

- Introduction to the OpenGLAM Benchmark Survey Project
- Preliminary Results: Dutch, Finnish, Polish and Swiss Data Sets
- Implications for GLAM Outreach
- Outlook
Introduction to the OpenGLAM Benchmark Survey Project
What is the OpenGLAM Benchmark Survey about?

- Online survey conducted among heritage institutions throughout the world in 2014/2015.

- Focusing on questions related to digitization, exchange of metadata, open data/open content, semantic web, social media, crowdsourcing

- Inspired by an earlier pilot survey, carried out in Switzerland in 2012

- Organized in a federative manner, which means that the organization depends on volunteers and partners in each country
What do we want to achieve?

- **Measure the state of advancement** of OpenGLAM in the participating countries
- **Inform the GLAM community** about the latest developments in the area of OpenGLAM
- **Identify potential partners** for open data and/or crowdsourcing projects
- Use the study report as a communication instrument to **promote OpenGLAM**
- Provide **international comparisons**:
  - Allowing each country to see where it stands compared to other countries.
  - Provide the international OpenGLAM community with a tool that helps it better understand the particularities of each country
Overview of participating countries

Further countries are welcome to join; but hurry up!

Participation status (as of 10 July 2015)
- Dark Green: Completed
- Light Green: Initial commitment
- Yellow: Clarification needed / presently insufficient support

Overview: https://outreach.wikimedia.org/wiki/GLAM/OpenGLAM_Benchmark_Survey/Participating_countries

Underlying graphic file: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:BlankMap-World-v2.png Roke et al. (CC-by-sa)
Preliminary Results

- Dutch, Finnish, Polish, and Swiss Data Sets
- Focus on Open Content and Collaborative Content Creation / Crowdsourcing
# Dutch, Finnish, Polish, and Swiss Data Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CH (incl. FL)</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N institutions contacted[1]</td>
<td>1543 (11)</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N responses[2]</td>
<td>278 (2)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate[3]</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Archives</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Libraries</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Museums</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N inhabitants (2013)</td>
<td>8.1 mio.</td>
<td>5.4 mio.</td>
<td>16.8 mio.</td>
<td>38.5 mio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAM density (GLAMs/mio. inhabitants)</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

[1] Number of institutions which have been contacted (each institution is counted once, even if it has been contacted via several email addresses or through different channels, e.g. follow-up phone calls in addition to e-mail reminders).

[2] Number of institutions which have completed the questionnaire (almost) in full, i.e. institutions which have responded to at least 20 out of the 24 non-conditional questions of the questionnaire.

[3] For the purpose of the calculation of the response rate, institutions which have started to fill in the questionnaire but dropped out after question A2 as they did not correspond to the survey's definition of heritage institutions, are counted as responses.
Where do GLAMs stand with regard to...

...Open Data?
...Linked Data / Semantic Web?
...Digitization
...Open Content?
...Engaging Audiences on the Internet
...Collaborative Content Creation

What are the perceived risks and opportunities? (drivers vs. hindering factors)
What are the expected benefits?

Innovation Diffusion Model, Everett Rogers, 1962

![Innovation Diffusion Model](chart.png)
Finland, Poland, Switzerland, The Netherlands, all institution types combined, N = 584. Cases with «stagnation» / «discontinuance» have been ignored.

Diffusion of Innovative Practices among GLAMs

Share of institutions (%)

Innovators 2.5%
Early Adopters 13.5%
Early Majority 34%
Late Majority 34%
Laggards 16%

Collaborative content creation
Social media
Open content
Digitization
Linked data
Open data

- Advanced implementation
- Adoption
- Trial
- Evaluation
- Interest
- No interest

Finland, Poland, Switzerland, The Netherlands, all institution types combined, N = 584. Cases with «stagnation» / «discontinuance» have been ignored.
### Documentation: Thresholds / Rules for the Assignment of Cases to Innovation Adoption Stages (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No interest</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Adoption</th>
<th>Advanced implementation</th>
<th>Stagnation / discontinuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Data</strong></td>
<td>OD_interest = 0 (ODLD_interest = 0)</td>
<td>OD_interest = 1 (ODLD_interest = 1)</td>
<td>OD_metadata_5yrs_avg &gt;= 0.5%</td>
<td>OD_metadata_pres_avg &gt;= 0.5%</td>
<td>OD_metadata_pres_avg &gt; 10% AND OD_metadata_5yrs_avg &gt; OD_metadata_pres_avg + 10</td>
<td>metadata_pres_avg &gt; 50% AND OD_catalogues_pres &gt; 50%</td>
<td>OD_metadata_pres_avg &gt;= 0.5% AND OD_metadata_pres_avg &lt; 66% AND OD_metadata_5yrs_avg &lt;= OD_metadata_pres_avg AND imp_OD &lt;= 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linked Data</strong></td>
<td>LD_interest = 0 (ODLD_interest = 0)</td>
<td>LD_interest = 1 (ODLD_interest = 1)</td>
<td>LD_metadata_5yrs_avg &gt;= 0.5%</td>
<td>LD_metadata_pres_avg &gt;= 0.5%</td>
<td>LD_metadata_pres_avg &gt; 10% AND LD_metadata_5yrs_avg &gt; OD_metadata_pres_avg + 10</td>
<td>LD_metadata_pres_avg &gt;= 0.5% AND LD_catalogues_pres &gt; 50%</td>
<td>LD_metadata_pres_avg &gt;= 0.5% AND LD_metadata_pres_avg &lt; 66% AND LD_metadata_5yrs_avg &lt;= OD_metadata_pres_avg AND imp_LD &lt;= 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digitization</strong></td>
<td>DIGI_interest = 0</td>
<td>DIGI_interest = 1</td>
<td>DIGI_5yrs_avg &gt;= 0.5%</td>
<td>DIGI_pres_avg &gt;= 0.5%</td>
<td>(DIGI_pres_avg &gt; 10% AND DIGI_5yrs_avg &gt; DIGI_pres_avg +5) OR (DIGI_pres_avg &gt; 5% AND DIGI_5yrs_avg &gt; DIGI_pres_avg +10)</td>
<td>DIGI_pres_avg &gt; 50%</td>
<td>DIGI_pres_avg &gt;= 0.5% AND DIGI_pres_avg &lt; 66% AND DIGI_5yrs_avg &lt;= DIGI_pres_avg AND imp_DIGI &lt;= 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Documentation: Thresholds / Rules for the Assignment of Cases to Innovation Adoption Stages (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No interest</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Adoption</th>
<th>Advanced implementation</th>
<th>Stagnation / discontinuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Content</strong></td>
<td>OC_interest = 0</td>
<td>OC_interest = 1</td>
<td>OC_5yrs_avg &gt;= 0.5%</td>
<td>OC_pres_avg &gt;= 0.5%</td>
<td>(OC_pres_avg &gt; 10% AND OC_5yrs_avg &gt; OC_pres_avg +5) OR (OC_pres_avg &gt; 5% AND OC_5yrs_avg &gt; OC_pres_avg +10)</td>
<td>OC_pres_avg &gt; 50%</td>
<td>OC_pres_avg &gt;= 0.5% AND OC_5yrs_avg &lt; 66% AND OC_5yrs_avg &lt;= OC_pres_avg AND imp_OC &lt;= 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Media</strong></td>
<td>SM_interest = 0</td>
<td>SM_interest = 1</td>
<td>SM_types_1yr_num &gt; 0</td>
<td>SM_types_pres_num &gt; 0</td>
<td>(SM_types_pres_num &gt; 0 AND SM_types_1yr_num &gt; SM_types_pres_num) OR (SM_types_pres_num &gt; 1 AND SM_types_1yr_num &gt;= SM_types_pres_num)</td>
<td>SM_types_pres_num &gt; 3</td>
<td>SM_types_pres_num &gt; 0 AND SM_types_pres_num &lt; 4 AND SM_types_1yr_num &lt; SM_types_pres_num AND imp_ENGAGE &lt;= 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative Content Creation</strong></td>
<td>WPWM_interest = 0</td>
<td>WPWM_interest = 1</td>
<td>COLLAB_types_1yr_num &gt; 0</td>
<td>COLLAB_types_pres_num &gt; 0) OR Collab_prof_num &gt; 0</td>
<td>(COLLAB_types_pres_num &gt; 0 AND COLLAB_types_1yr_num &gt; COLLAB_types_pres_num) OR (COLLAB_types_pres_num &gt; 1 AND COLLAB_types_1yr_num &gt;= COLLAB_types_pres_num)</td>
<td>COLLAB_types_pres_num &gt; 2</td>
<td>COLLAB_types_pres_num &gt; 0 AND COLLAB_types_pres_num &lt; 3 AND COLLAB_types_1yr_num &lt; COLLAB_types_pres_num AND imp_COLLAB &lt;= 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adoption Rates According to Institution Type

- Open data
  - Archives: 37%
  - Libraries: 39%
  - Museums: 18%

- Linked data / semantic web
  - Archives: 2%
  - Libraries: 14%
  - Museums: 5%

- Digitization
  - Archives: 44%
  - Libraries: 23%
  - Museums: 20%

- Open content
  - Archives: 12%
  - Libraries: 9%

- Social media
  - Archives: 45%
  - Libraries: 57%
  - Museums: 66%

- Collaborative content creation
  - Archives: 16%
  - Libraries: 12%
  - Museums: 10%
Adoption Rates – Country Comparison

- Finland:
  - Open data: 30%
  - Linked data/semantic web: 6%
  - Digitization: 58%
  - Open content: 15%
  - Social media: 74%
  - Collaborative content creation: 26%

- Poland:
  - Open data: 28%
  - Linked data/semantic web: 4%
  - Digitization: 44%
  - Open content: 12%
  - Social media: 34%
  - Collaborative content creation: 13%

- Switzerland:
  - Open data: 18%
  - Linked data/semantic web: 10%
  - Digitization: 71%
  - Open content: 12%
  - Social media: 75%
  - Collaborative content creation: 8%

- The Netherlands:
  - Open data: 10%
  - Linked data/semantic web: 20%
  - Digitization: 38%
  - Open content: 31%
  - Social media: 70%
  - Collaborative content creation: 17%

Bar chart comparison among Finland, Poland, Switzerland, and The Netherlands.
Adoption Rates – Further Insights

- Heritage institutions with a **local/regional focus** are **less likely** to use **social media** than other institutions.

- The **institutions’ size** is **positively correlated with** the adoption of:
  - open data
  - linked data
  - social media use
  - collaborative content creation

- However, the **institutions’ size** is **not related to** their adoption of:
  - digitization
  - open content

- **Higher levels of public funding** are:
  - **positively related to** the adoption of **open data**
  - **negatively related to** the adoption of **open content**
Importance of Various Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging data</td>
<td>Digitization</td>
<td>Collaborative content creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% (28)</td>
<td>50% (50)</td>
<td>10% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23% (23)</td>
<td>21% (21)</td>
<td>23% (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% (16)</td>
<td>20% (20)</td>
<td>21% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% (11)</td>
<td>5% (5)</td>
<td>10% (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1 - Not important at all
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - Very important

N = 584
Desirability of Various Practices (Opportunities vs. Risks)

N = 584

- Exchanging data
  - 1 - Risks clearly prevail: 32
  - 2: 42
  - 3: 24
  - 4: 28
  - 5 - Opportunities clearly prevail: 27

- Open data
  - 1 - Risks clearly prevail: 28
  - 2: 27
  - 3: 28
  - 4: 24
  - 5 - Opportunities clearly prevail: 28

- Linked data / semantic web
  - 1 - Risks clearly prevail: 23
  - 2: 62
  - 3: 26
  - 4: 24
  - 5 - Opportunities clearly prevail: 29

- Digitization
  - 1 - Risks clearly prevail: 23
  - 2: 62
  - 3: 26
  - 4: 24
  - 5 - Opportunities clearly prevail: 29

- Open content
  - 1 - Risks clearly prevail: 29
  - 2: 26
  - 3: 24
  - 4: 24
  - 5 - Opportunities clearly prevail: 35

- Engaging audiences on the Internet
  - 1 - Risks clearly prevail: 30
  - 2: 30
  - 3: 30
  - 4: 30
  - 5 - Opportunities clearly prevail: 30

- Collaborative content creation
  - 1 - Risks clearly prevail: 23
  - 2: 23
  - 3: 23
  - 4: 23
  - 5 - Opportunities clearly prevail: 23
Open Data: Importance vs. Desirability

Open data: importance vs. desirability (in % of institutions; N = 475)

1 - Not important at all
2
3
4
5 - Very important

Motors

- Risks prevail
- Equal risks and opportunities
- Opportunities prevail

Motors
Open Content: Importance vs. Desirability

Open content: importance vs. desirability (in % of institutions; N = 466)

Motors
Collaborative content creation: importance vs. desirability

Collaborative content creation: importance vs. desirability
(in % of institutions; N = 438)

Risks prevail

Equal risks and opportunities

Opportunities prevail

Motors
Digitization as a Prerequisite for Open Content

Expected digitization activities over the next 5 years
(in % of institutions; N = 457)

- 80% or more
- 50-79%
- 20-49%
- 1-19%
- 0%

Average percentage of objects already digitized
## Digitization: Different types of objects (today / in 5 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Text based resources: already digitized</th>
<th>Two-dimensional visual resources: already digitized</th>
<th>Archival resources: already digitized</th>
<th>Threedimensional man-made movable objects: already digitized</th>
<th>Natural resources: already digitized</th>
<th>Geography based resources: already digitized</th>
<th>Time based resources: already digitized</th>
<th>Average percentage of objects already digitized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.2350</td>
<td>33.1997</td>
<td>14.9610</td>
<td>34.6153</td>
<td>25.1277</td>
<td>32.5258</td>
<td>32.3385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentiles</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0750</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>60.0000</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
<td>70.0000</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>67.5000</td>
<td>60.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Text based resources: digitized in 5 years</th>
<th>Two-dimensional visual resources: digitized in 5 years</th>
<th>Archival resources: digitized in 5 years</th>
<th>Threedimensional man-made movable objects: digitized in 5 years</th>
<th>Natural resources: digitized in 5 years</th>
<th>Geography based resources: digitized in 5 years</th>
<th>Time based resources: digitized in 5 years</th>
<th>Average percentage of objects expected to be digitized in 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.1520</td>
<td>51.7565</td>
<td>30.2012</td>
<td>53.9631</td>
<td>33.1538</td>
<td>44.9410</td>
<td>50.0706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentiles</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>15.0000</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
<td>45.0000</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>90.0000</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>95.0000</td>
<td>60.0000</td>
<td>88.7500</td>
<td>90.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Digitization Today – Country Comparison

Percentage of resources already digitized by the average institution (median)
(N is indicated for each object type; the values for natural resources are not shown due to the small sample size)
**Digitization in 5 Years – Country Comparison**

**Percentage of resources expected to be digitized in 5 years by the average institution (median)**

(N is indicated for each object type; the values for natural resources are not shown due to the small sample size)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of resources expected to be digitized in 5 years for different resource types and countries.](chart)

- **Finland**
  - Text based resources (318): 12% (3%)
  - Two-dimensional visual resources (317): 45% (45%)
  - Archival resources (251): 15% (10%)
  - Three-dimensional movable objects (279): 35% (50%)
  - Natural resources (39): 40% (50%)
  - Geography based resources (99): 30% (50%)
  - Time based resources (196): 28% (20%)

- **Poland**
  - Text based resources (318): 10% (10%)
  - Two-dimensional visual resources (317): 30% (45%)
  - Archival resources (251): 10% (10%)
  - Three-dimensional movable objects (279): 35% (50%)
  - Natural resources (39): 40% (50%)
  - Geography based resources (99): 30% (50%)
  - Time based resources (196): 30% (50%)

- **Switzerland**
  - Text based resources (318): 10% (10%)
  - Two-dimensional visual resources (317): 50% (50%)
  - Archival resources (251): 10% (10%)
  - Three-dimensional movable objects (279): 35% (50%)
  - Natural resources (39): 40% (50%)
  - Geography based resources (99): 30% (50%)
  - Time based resources (196): 30% (50%)

- **The Netherlands**
  - Text based resources (318): 10% (10%)
  - Two-dimensional visual resources (317): 50% (50%)
  - Archival resources (251): 10% (10%)
  - Three-dimensional movable objects (279): 35% (50%)
  - Natural resources (39): 40% (50%)
  - Geography based resources (99): 30% (50%)
  - Time based resources (196): 30% (50%)

The chart indicates the percentage of each type of resource that is expected to be digitized in 5 years by the average institution, with Finland leading in some categories and Poland following closely. The chart also highlights that digitization efforts are ongoing across various types of resources, with some countries showing higher percentages of digitization than others.
## Open Content: Different types of objects (today / in 5 years; in % of digitized objects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Text based resources: available as open content (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Two-dimensional visual resources: available as open content (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Archival resources: available as open content (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Three-dimensional man-made movable objects: available as open content (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Natural resources: available as open content (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Geography based resources: available as open content (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Time based resources: available as open content (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Digital interactive resources: available as open content (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Average percentage of objects presently available as &quot;open content&quot; (in % of digitized objects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6.3492</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>4.1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentiles</td>
<td>25 .0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 6.3492</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>4.1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 100.0000</td>
<td>66.6667</td>
<td>100.0000</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>70.0000</td>
<td>100.0000</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
<td>44.3254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Text based resources: available as open content in 5 years (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Two-dimensional visual resources: available as open content in 5 years (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Archival resources: available as open content in 5 years (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Three-dimensional man-made movable objects: available as open content in 5 years (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Natural resources: available as open content in 5 years (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Geography based resources: available as open content in 5 years (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Time based resources: available as open content in 5 years (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Digital interactive resources: available as open content in 5 years (% of digitized)</th>
<th>Average percentage of objects available as &quot;open content&quot; in 5 years (in % of digitized objects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>47.2222</td>
<td>42.6961</td>
<td>44.7570</td>
<td>39.7118</td>
<td>45.6349</td>
<td>60.3398</td>
<td>38.1857</td>
<td>28.1386</td>
<td>36.0464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>40.0000</td>
<td>30.6250</td>
<td>25.0000</td>
<td>22.2222</td>
<td>45.0000</td>
<td>81.6667</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>25.8681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentiles</td>
<td>25 .0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>11.8667</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 40.0000</td>
<td>30.6250</td>
<td>25.0000</td>
<td>22.2222</td>
<td>45.0000</td>
<td>81.6667</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>25.8681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 100.0000</td>
<td>100.0000</td>
<td>100.0000</td>
<td>88.5526</td>
<td>100.0000</td>
<td>100.0000</td>
<td>95.8333</td>
<td>50.0000</td>
<td>60.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of resources already made available as open content by the average institution (median)
(N is indicated for each object type; the values for natural resources are not shown due to the small sample size; “0%” value tags have been suppressed)
Open Content in 5 Years – Country Comparison

Percentage of resources expected to be made available as open content in 5 years by the average institution (median)

(N is indicated for each object type; the values for natural resources are not shown due to the small sample size)
Copyright Clearance as a Prerequisite for Open Content

What is the copyright situation of the objects in your collection?
(average percentages for each object type; N is indicated for each object type)

Note: The data may be somewhat biased as it does - by definition - not include the data from institutions who weren’t able to provide numbers regarding the copyright status of their objects.
D7: In the case of my institution, ‘open content’ is an important means...
Challenges Related to Open Content

D8: For my institution, these are important challenges related to ‘open content’...
Risks Related to Open Content

D9: For my institution, these are important risks related to ‘open content’...

N = 459
D3 - Under what conditions is your institution ready to make its content available on the Internet without receiving payment in exchange?

N = 457

- For education and research: 91%
- For non-profit projects: 81%
- For private use: 67%
- For non-profit projects which permit commercial use: 48%
- For commercial users: 18%
- Content needs to be linked to the institution’s name: 64%
- Works can only be used without modification: 59%
- Content needs to be linked to entry in online catalogue: N/A
14% of responding GLAMs have staff members who are involved in Wikipedia as part of their job (28% have staff members who are involved in Wikipedia either as part of their job or during leisure time)

- Wikimedia Commons: 4%
- Wikidata: 2%
Most popular crowdsourcing approaches

Note: The graph summarizes the data from the institutions which indicated that they are presently using at least one crowdsourcing approach or are planning to use one within the next year.
Purpose of crowdsourcing

**Note:** This question was asked only to institutions which indicated that they are presently using at least one crowdsourcing approach or are planning to use one within the next year.
Risks and Challenges of Crowdsourcing

Note: This question was asked only to institutions which indicated that they are presently using at least one crowdsourcing approach or are planning to use one within the next year.

Main risks and challenges of crowdsourcing

- Extensive preparation and follow-up required: 70%
- Difficulties to estimate the time scope: 67%
- Limited planning security: 57%
- The continuity of data maintenance is not guaranteed: 57%
- Little influence on results: 39%
- Anxiety among employees (loss of job, changes to roles and tasks, etc.): 14%

N = 132
What are the Implications for GLAM Outreach?

Summing up the main findings...
Diffusion of Various Practices

- **Digitization** is a widespread practice in the Dutch and Finnish GLAM sector, with adoption rates well above 50%. (Switzerland and Poland are lagging behind; there are considerable differences between countries and institution types).

- **The Use of Social Media** is a widespread practice in the Finnish, Polish, and Dutch GLAM sector, with adoption rates of 70% and more. (Switzerland is lagging behind; there are considerable differences between countries and institution types).

- **Open Data** and **Open Content** are about to diffuse within the GLAM sector; for Open Data we are observing an overall adoption rate of ca. 26%; for Open Content the adoption rate is about 17%. (The Netherlands are ahead of the other three countries; there are considerable differences between countries and institution types).

- **Collaborative Content Creation** is diffusing slightly more slowly than Open Data / Open Content (There are considerable differences between countries).
  - These findings are reflected in the importance accorded to the various practices; over 40% of respondents consider Open Data and Open Content as important; ca. 25% say so with regard to Collaborative Content Creation.
Prerequisites for Open Content

- Over the next 5 years we will see leaps in digitization activities and in freely licensed content. – Are we ready?

- 70% of institutions think that opening up content helps them better fulfill their core mission.

- In general, issues related to copyright clearance may be an excuse, but not a show-stopper regarding the opening up of content; across all object types, institutions may release at least 50% of their holdings as open content.

- When it comes to promoting the opening up of content, the present mindset of GLAMs poses two major challenges: their aversion against the prospect of commercial use of open content, and their reluctance to let third parties modify the content.
Challenges / Risks related to Open Content

- The **greatest challenges regarding open content** are the time effort and expense related to the digitization and the documentation of content. Other important challenges comprise the time effort and expense related to rights clearance, lack of staff skills as well as technical challenges.

- The **greatest risks associated with open content** are re-use of content without proper attribution or mis-use / mis-interpretation of the content. Another important risk are copyright infringements.

- Roughly one third of the institutions is worried about **issues related to rights clearance and tracking the use of the content**.

- When it comes to opening up content, loss of revenues, or diminished brand value are **only minor preoccupations**.
Involvement in Wikipedia

- Ca. 24% of GLAMs consider Collaborative Content Creation as important and believe that the opportunities prevail over the risks.

- Ca. 14% of GLAMs are already involved in Wikipedia.

- Wikimedia Commons and Wikidata still seem to play a minor role for GLAMs (with 4% and 2% of institutions involved).
What’s next?

- Data collection in further countries – Your support is appreciated… http://survey.openglam.ch
- Context analysis (searching for explanations for country differences)
- More detailed analyses – Feel free to join!
- Publication of country reports
- Publication of an international report in the first half of 2016
- Explore further uses of the GLAM inventory as a by-product of the survey
What else would you like to know?

- Discussion...
Thank you for your attention!

- **Contact Details:**
  - Beat Estermann
  - E-mail: beat.estermann@bfh.ch
  - Phone: +41 31 848 34 38

- **Project Portal:**
  - http://survey.openglam.ch