

California Digital Library
Melvyl Catalog Satisfaction Survey 2004 – Analysis
Last updated: 01/21/2005 by Felicia Poe

Background and Problem Statement

In August 2003, the current iteration of the Melvyl Catalog¹ was officially launched as a production system, and the legacy Melvyl Catalog was retired. Since that time, UC library staff have had the opportunity to use the Melvyl system to perform their full range of work tasks, including reference and research, teaching users in classes and across public service desks, providing interlibrary loan, and a host of other technical service functions.

Important enhancements to the current Melvyl Catalog that were not previously available in the legacy system include:

- More flexible search options, including keyword, phrase and proximity searching.
- Browsing by major indexes including author, title, subject, and call number.
- Ability to limit searches to electronic resources only.
- Display of foreign language materials using their native language characters.

Campus feedback is essential to CDL's understanding of how the Melvyl Catalog is being received by its user population, and many valuable suggestions for change have been implemented over time. Primary channels for receiving feedback include but are not limited to:

- Melvyl Catalog Comments & Feedback form (link provided in footer of every Melvyl page).
- CDL Helpline.
- Face-to-face conversations during campus visits throughout the year.
- Direct contact by a campus colleague to a CDL staff person, primarily via email.
- Users Council communication via email listserv.

The Melvyl Catalog Satisfaction Survey 2004 was conducted to determine the level of satisfaction of campus library staff for Melvyl, to surface issues of dissatisfaction of which CDL may not be aware, and to gain a feel for the general "pulse" of opinion about the catalog. To support CDL's ongoing effort to meet the bibliographic service needs of its library staff user community, the Melvyl Catalog Satisfaction Survey will be repeated on a regular basis. The data will be used to measure changes in library staff satisfaction with the Melvyl Catalog suite of services, to assess evolving user needs and expectations, and to gather recommendations for change.

Methodology

Using the WebSurveyor tool, an online survey was developed and made available via the web to UC library staff November 2-20, 2004. An invitation to participate in the survey, including the survey URL, was distributed on November 2, 2004 through the Users Council email listserv, and on November 10, 2004, via the CDLINFO Newsletter. All UC library staff were encouraged to respond.

Ellen Meltzer and Felicia Poe developed the survey. A total of nine questions were asked: four questions were closed-ended Likert scale, three questions were open-ended, and two were demographic in scope. A total of 150 responses were submitted; responses were received from staff at all ten UC campuses representing a broad range of work responsibilities, including but not limited to Reference/Instruction (34%), Circulation (14%), Interlibrary Loan (11%), Cataloging (9%), and Collection Development (8%).

¹ Based on the Ex Libris ALEPH product, version 15.3

Major Findings

Perception of ease-of-use and ease-of-teaching

Three closed-ended questions (five-point Likert scale) were designed to measure respondents' perception of how easy the Melvyl Catalog is to use personally, how easy it is for students and faculty to use, and how easy it is to teach in relation to other online resources.

In response to the statement, "The Melvyl Catalog is easy for me to use", 74% of the respondents answered affirmatively (*Strongly Agree, Agree*), 15% expressed neutrality (*Neutral*), and 11% expressed disagreement (*Disagree, Strongly Disagree*).

Q1. The Melvyl Catalog is easy for me to use.		
Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	29	19.6%
Agree	81	54.7%
Neutral	22	14.9%
Disagree	13	8.8%
Strongly Disagree	3	2.0%

In response to the statement, "The Melvyl Catalog is easy for students and faculty to use", 45% of the respondents answered affirmatively (*Strongly Agree, Agree*), 36% expressed neutrality (*Neutral*), and 19% expressed disagreement (*Disagree, Strongly Disagree*).

Q2. The Melvyl Catalog is easy for students and faculty to use.		
Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	5	3.4%
Agree	61	41.8%
Neutral	52	35.6%
Disagree	24	16.4%
Strongly Disagree	4	2.7%

In response to the statement, "Compared to other online resources, the Melvyl Catalog is easy to teach", 42% of the respondents answered affirmatively (*Strongly Agree, Agree*), 46% expressed neutrality (*Neutral*), and 12% expressed disagreement (*Disagree, Strongly Disagree*).

Q3. Compared to other online resources, the Melvyl Catalog is easy to teach.		
Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	6	4.1%
Agree	55	37.9%
Neutral	67	46.2%
Disagree	16	11.0%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.7%

User satisfaction with the Melvyl Catalog

In response to the statement, "My overall satisfaction with the Melvyl Catalog is:", 63% of the respondents expressed satisfaction (*Very Satisfied, Satisfied*), 19% expressed neutrality (*Neutral*), and 18% expressed dissatisfaction (*Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied*).

Q6. My overall satisfaction with the Melvyl Catalog is:		
Response	Count	Percent
Very satisfied	16	11.1%
Satisfied	74	51.4%
Neutral	28	19.4%
Dissatisfied	23	16.0%
Very dissatisfied	3	2.1%

In an effort to tease out the possible factors contributing to a respondent's level of satisfaction, cross-tabulation of overall satisfaction (Q6) with survey questions pertaining to primary work responsibility (Q9), perceived ease-of-use (Q1), and campus affiliation (Q8), were performed. Cross-tabulation charts are found at the end of this report; highlights include the following:

- Cross-tabulation of overall satisfaction (Q6) with primary work responsibility (Q9) indicates that the most satisfied staff are those with either Reference/Instruction or Interlibrary Loan responsibilities; less satisfied are those with Collection Development responsibilities.
- Cross-tabulation of overall satisfaction (Q6) with perception of personal ease-of-use (Q1) indicates that of the 90 respondents who expressed satisfaction with the Melvyl Catalog, 88 indicated they perceive the catalog as easy to use; of the 26 who expressed dissatisfaction with the Melvyl Catalog, 13 also disagreed with the statement that "The Melvyl catalog is easy for me to use."
- Cross-tabulation of overall satisfaction (Q6) with campus affiliation (Q8) indicates that the campus with the most "satisfied" respondents are UCSB (82%), UCLA (78%), and UCD (76%); most "dissatisfied" are UCSF (43%) and UCB (34%). (A full breakdown of respondents by campus affiliation is found later in this report.)

What respondents like most/least about the Melvyl Catalog

The survey included three open-ended questions, designed to allow respondents ample space to express what they liked *most* about the Melvyl Catalog, what they liked *least*, and finally, space for further comments. Responses to the open-ended questions were extensive, and a majority of respondents included commentary on several different issues. To analyze the responses, comments were broken down and categorized by subject and/or functionality.

Q4. What I like most about the Melvyl Catalog:

Response	Count	Percent
Open	110	73%

Most frequently mentioned “likes”:

- Ability to view holdings for all UC campuses; union catalog (30)
- Range of search types (17)
- Range of search indexes (17)
- “Request” feature (14)
- Optional search limits on both Basic and Advanced Search (10)
- Access to online resources (10)
- Ease-of-use (10)
- Robust, accurate, quick (9)

Q5. What I like least about the Melvyl Catalog:

Response	Count	Percent
Open	112	75%

Most frequently mentioned “dislikes”:

- Call number/location: inability to view info except in full display (20)
- Modify search: limited functionality (16)
- Circ status: lack of single display page for all holdings (12)
- Merge algorithm: inaccuracies, limitations (12)
- Inability to apply “NOT” operator to campus location, e.g., “and not at UCSB” (11)
- Truncation: limitations, “too many results”, general frustration (9)

Q7. Further comments:

Response	Count	Percent
Open	45	30%

A majority of respondents used the “Further comments” area to either deliver a final message of personal satisfaction / dissatisfaction, or to emphasize their likes (Q4) and dislikes (Q5). Responses include:

- “I actually don’t feel ‘neutral’ about Melvyl at all... what I actually feel is satisfaction with many features and strong dissatisfaction with a few important features.”
- “We have a very large and complicated system, I think Melvyl does well considering.”
- “The old Melvyl was better. CDL set such a high standard that no outside vendor can match it.”
- “The new version is definitely an improvement over the old version.”
- “It’s a tired old refrain, but the old Melvyl was better.”
- “You folks have done a great job with this system.”

Demographics

The survey included two closed-ended questions pertaining to respondent's campus affiliation and primary work responsibilities. A significant number of respondents (25%) identified their primary work responsibilities as falling into the category "Other"; of the 37 respondents indicating "Other", 17 list interlibrary loan responsibilities as primary. It is recommended that future surveys include categories for ILL/DDS, Archives/Manuscripts/Special Collections, Administrative, and Management.

Q8. Campus affiliation:		
Response	Count	Percent
UC Berkeley	38	25.9%
UC Davis	21	14.3%
UC Irvine	7	4.8%
UCLA	14	9.5%
UC Merced	1	0.7%
UC Riverside	5	3.4%
UC San Diego	26	17.7%
UC San Francisco	14	9.5%
UC Santa Barbara	11	7.5%
UC Santa Cruz	4	2.7%
Other	6	4.1%

"Other" responses: GTU (2), Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (1), California Historical Society (1), UCOP/DANR (located on Berkeley campus) (1), Getty Research Institute (1)

Q9. Check the box that most closely matches your primary work responsibility:		
Response	Count	Percent
Reference/Instruction	49	33.6%
Circulation	20	13.7%
Collection Development	12	8.2%
Acquisitions	7	4.8%
Cataloging	13	8.9%
Other technical services	5	3.4%
Systems	3	2.1%
Other	37	25.3%

"Other" responses include: ILL/DDS (16), Archives/ Manuscripts/ Special Collections (4), Administrative (2), Management (2), and many respondents with dual responsibilities.

Cross- tabulation: Q6 (overall satisfaction) with Q9 (primary work responsibilities)

Base Question	Did not answer	Ref/ Instruct	Circ	Collect Dev	Acquisitions	Catalog	Other tech services	Systems	Other
(Did not answer)	50% (1)	4% (2)			14% (1)				
Very satisfied		12% (6)				23% (3)			19% (7)
Satisfied	50% (1)	57% (28)	70% (14)	25% (3)	57% (4)	39% (5)	40% (2)	100% (3)	38% (14)
Neutral		14% (7)	25% (5)	42% (5)	14% (1)	8% (1)			24% (9)
Dissatisfied		12% (6)	5% (1)	25% (3)	14% (1)	23% (3)	40% (2)		19% (7)
Very dissatisfied				8% (1)		8% (1)	20% (1)		
Total Counts	2	49	20	12	7	13	5	3	37

Cross- tabulation: Q6 (overall satisfaction) with Q8 (campus affiliation)

Base Question	Did not answer	UCSD	UCSF	UCD	UCB	UCI	UCLA	UCM	UCR	UCSB	UCSC	Other
(Did not answer)				10% (2)			14% (2)					
Very satisfied		12% (3)	7% (1)	19% (4)	5% (2)		7% (1)	100% (1)		18% (2)		33% (2)
Satisfied	100% (1)	46% (12)	29% (4)	57% (12)	37% (14)	43% (3)	71% (10)		80% (4)	64% (7)	75% (3)	67% (4)
Neutral		27% (7)	21% (3)	10% (2)	24% (9)	29% (2)	7% (1)		20% (1)	18% (2)	25% (1)	
Dissatisfied		15% (4)	43% (6)	5% (1)	26% (10)	29% (2)						
Very dissatisfied					8% (3)							
Total Counts	1	26	14	21	38	7	14	1	5	11	4	6

Cross- tabulation: Q6 (overall satisfaction) with Q1 (easy for me to use)

Base Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(Did not answer)	3% (1)	4% (3)			
Very satisfied	48% (14)	3% (2)			
Satisfied	41% (12)	74% (60)	9% (2)		
Neutral		15% (12)	59% (13)	23% (3)	
Dissatisfied	7% (2)	5% (4)	27% (6)	69% (9)	67% (2)
Very dissatisfied			5% (1)	8% (1)	33% (1)
Total Counts	29	81	22	13	3