



---

## Online Librarian Survey

### -Response and Results

#### A. Respondents

The online survey was available via the COUNTER website for a six-week period between the beginning of July and mid-August. During that period 664 respondents completed the survey. Not all respondents completed all questions, which is why the totals in any given section do not necessarily add up to 664. The demographics of the responses broke down as follows:

##### **1 Type of library:**

Academic/higher education	417 (63%)
School	4 (<1%)
Public	82 (12%)
Corporate	49 (7%)
Governmental	35 (5%)
Hospital/health	39 (5%)
Other	31 (4%)

The results for corporate libraries, although included in the 'Total' column below, are reported separately, as it was felt that their responses might differ significantly from the academic/higher education libraries that represent the bulk of the responses.

##### **2 Online content of interest**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Journals	33 (5%)	7(15%)
Databases	59 (9%)	3(6%)
Both	562 (85%)	38(79%)

### **3 Size of library in terms of acquisition budget**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
\$0-50k	38(5%)	2(6%)
\$50k-200k	90(14%)	2(6%)
\$200k-500k	88(13%)	6(16%)
\$500k-1m	80(12%)	12(32%)
\$1m-5m	260(40%)	16 (40%)
\$5m+	85(13%)	0

### **4 Position of respondent**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Library director	121(18%)	10(23%)
Head of acquisitions	46(7%)	3(7%)
Head of computer services	29(4%)	1(2%)
Head of periodicals	40(6%)	5(11%)
Head of online services	97(14%)	6(14%)
Consortial director		0
Consortial administrator	7(1%)	2(5%)
Other	294(44%)	17(38%)

Note: few in the 'other' category provided further detail on their position.

### **5 Location of library**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
North America	393(60%)	24(49%)
South America	1 (<1%)	0
Europe	166(25%)	18(37%)
Asia	20(3%)	2(4%)
Australasia	58(8%)	0
Other	17(2%)	5(10%)

## B. Results: quantitative

### a. Types of reports

#### i. Journals

##### 1.1 Journal report 1: full text requests by month and journal

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	384(65%)	36(76%)
Desirable	153(26%)	8(17%)
Occasionally useful	35(6%)	3(7%)
Not needed	10(1%)	0

##### 1.2 Journal report 2: item requests by month, journal and page type

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	158(27%)	23(52%)
Desirable	229(39%)	17(39%)
Occasionally useful	148(25%)	4(9%)
Not needed	44(7%)	0

1.3 How useful would a similar report be that could be separated into 'subscribed' and 'non-subscribed' titles and a full list of subscribed and non-subscribed together.

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	155(27%)	23(54%)
Desirable	254(44%)	13(30%)
Occasionally useful	130(22%)	7(16%)
Not needed	31(5%)	0

##### 1.4 Journal report 3: total searches run

-total searches run per month

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	212(36%)	9(21%)
Desirable	159(27%)	12(28%)
Occasionally useful	159(27%)	19(44%)
Not needed	47(8%)	3(7%)

##### 1.5 Journal report 4: time of day report

-total items requested between one-hour periods during each month

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	18(3%)	2(5%)
Desirable	117(20%)	2(5%)
Occasionally useful	266(45%)	20(47%)
Not needed	181(31%)	19(43%)

#### 1.6 Journal report 5: day of week report

-total items requested each day of the week during each month

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	23(3%)	0
Desirable	119(20%)	3(7%)
Occasionally useful	266(45%)	23(55%)
Not needed	173(29%)	16(38%)

#### 1.7 Journal report 6: total daily activity report

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	35(6%)	3(7%)
Desirable	125(21%)	8(19%)
Occasionally useful	235(40%)	16(37%)
Not needed	180(31%)	17(37%)

#### ii. Databases

#### 1.8 Database report 1: total searches & sessions

- total number of searches run and sessions initiated per month

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	427(70%)	26(62%)
Desirable	124(20%)	5(12%)
Occasionally useful	43(7%)	10(24%)
Not needed	11(1%)	1(2%)

#### 1.9 Database report 2: time of day report

- total items requested between one hour periods during each month

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	34(5%)	2(5%)
Desirable	132(21%)	5(13%)
Occasionally useful	267(44%)	17(43%)
Not needed	171(28%)	16(39%)

#### 1.10 Database report 3: day of week report

-total items requested each day of the week during each month

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	34(5%)	1(3%)
Desirable	137(22%)	5(13%)

Occasionally useful	270(44%)	19(48%)
Not needed	161(26%)	15(36%)

1.11 Database report 4: total daily activity report

- total items requested each day of the week during each month

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	48(8%)	0
Desirable	143(23%)	8(20%)
Occasionally useful	234(39%)	18(44%)
Not needed	173(28%)	15(37%)

iii. General

1.12 Level of usage reporting

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Consortium	348(52%)	20(41%)
Institution	598(90%)	46(94%)
Department	355(54%)	34(69%)

1.13 Report on number of document requests broken down by IP range

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	95(16%)	14(29%)
Desirable	157(27%)	15(31%)
Occasionally useful	168(27%)	7(14%)
Not needed	155(26%)	11(22%)
Don't know	5(<1%)	2(4%)

1.14 Are IP ranges allocated to specific departments within institution?

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Yes	180(35%)	5(11%)
No	329(64%)	37(80%)
Don't know	6(<1%)	4(9%)

1.15 If 'yes', would usage reports at department level (perhaps defined by IP ranges or departmental passwords) rather than at institutional level?

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Yes	142(63%)	3(60%)
No	81(36%)	1(20%)

Don't know	2(<1%)	1(20%)
------------	--------	--------

1.16 How useful would a report be that broke down journal usage by the age of content?

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Essential	108(17%)	13(30%)
Desirable	300(47%)	18(41%)
Occasionally useful	189(29%)	10(24%)
Not needed	37(5%)	3(5%)

**b. Report delivery**

2.1 Preferred delivery formats (lowest number of points indicates strongest preference)

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Web page tables	2299	153
Tab separated text file	1859	148
Comma separated text file	1876	151
Microsoft Excel file	1314	84
PDF file	2444	183

2.2 Version of Microsoft Excel

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Excel 4	0	0
Excel 5	1 (<1%)	0
Excel 95	7(1%)	2(5%)
Excel 97	150(23%)	19(43%)
Excel 98	42(6%)	0
Excel 2000	392(61%)	22(50%)
Excel ME	7(1%)	1(2%)
Other version	33(5%)	0
Don't know	9(1%)	0

2.3 Operating system

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Windows 95	32(4%)	5(15%)
Windows NT	183(28%)	18(53%)
Windows 98	130(20%)	0
Windows 2000	224(34%)	5(15%)

Windows ME	6(<1%)	0
Windows XP	48(7%)	5(15%)
Mac	12(1%)	0
Linux	3(<1%)	0
Sun	1(<1%)	1
Other don't know	2(<1%)	0

#### 2.4 Internet browser used most frequently

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Explorer version 3	1(<1%)	0
Explorer version 4	10(1%)	2(4%)
Explorer version 5	255(38%)	32(67%)
Explorer version 6 or above	192(29%)	6(13%)
Netscape version 3	1(0%)	1(2%)
Netscape version 4	134(20%)	6(13%)
Netscape version 6 or above	47(7%)	0
Other	8(1%)	0
Don't know	8(1%)	0

#### 2.5 Report delivery preference

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Password controlled website	408(64%)	30(61%)
E-mail	227(35%)	19(39%)

#### 2.6 E-mail alert when data is updated

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Yes	516(93%)	38(100%)
No	33(6%)	0

#### 2.7 How frequently would usage reports be used

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Annually	46(7%)	0
Quarterly	180(27%)	14(29%)
Monthly	419(64%)	34(69%)
Weekly	7(1%)	1(2%)

#### 2.8 How timely should updates be, i.e. how long after end of reporting period

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Within two weeks	370(57%)	33(70%)
Within four weeks	261(40%)	14(30%)
Within three months	15(2%)	0

#### 2.9 Minimum amount of data

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Corporate</b>
Data from year-to-date only	67(16%)	3(6%)
Rolling 13 months of data	85(20%)	9(18%)
Rolling 25 months of data	58(13%)	3(6%)
All of last year's and this year's to date	232 (56%)	22(45%)
All of last two years and this years to date	205(49%)	12(25%)

### **C.Results: qualitative**

Only a minority of respondents made comments or suggestions. Of these, the most significant were on the following issues (in order of frequency raised (none was raised by more than 50 respondents):

- 1 'Requests' should take into account 'turnaways'.
- 2 PDF and HTML 'requests' can be combined
- 3 Database report 1 should include searches that have zero results
- 4 Categorising results by IP range is less important than being able to distinguish between 'onsite' and 'offsite' usage.
- 5 Price information on each journal would be useful to measure cost-effectiveness.
- 6 Combining usage statistics for journals in a given discipline would be useful

The following singular comments were made:

- 'Display the information in a more consortium-friendly manner' – i.e. there is too much detail for consortium managers.
- 'The report should contain all titles from a publisher, even if zero usage is recorded'
- 'If there are multiple access points to a journal (such as ECO/Ebsco Online) you would have usage stats from both'
- 'We need information for each partner in the consortium as well as for the consortium as a whole'
- 'Useful to report on the number of times a PDF fails to download'
- 'Indication of who the publisher is would be helpful'
- 'useful if we could subdivide it into user categories, eg staff, student, etc.'
- 'Consolidate monthly reports for a calendar year report'
- 'A monthly alert on journals that have received no usage in the past six months would be useful.'
- 'Does the rubric 'subscribed' vs 'non-subscribed' have a future.'
- 'For databases, it would be nice if the results could be broken down by service or vendor'

- ‘Search vs browse statistics are also useful. It helps librarians understand if clients are using the service as a complete database.’
- ‘Want to specify own time region.’
- ‘Too much detail and a waste of good bytes.’ (Journal report 6)
- ‘A top 10-50 journals report would be useful.’
- ‘JSTOR does an exemplary set of reports’
- ‘Department level reporting is essential because of department budgets’

Many respondents were very complimentary about the whole COUNTER project. Quotable examples are:

- ‘This is just what I have been hoping for. Thank you.’
- ‘This is a great project, we hope to hear more and want to participate. Thank you.’
- ‘Thank you. Thank you!’
- ‘This is a much needed service’
- ‘The COUNTER project appears to be one whose time has arrived. I am impressed at the thoroughness and quality of the work done so far.’
- ‘Great survey!’

#### **D. Corporate librarian responses**

The responses of corporate librarians in almost all cases conformed to those of the respondents as a whole. There were, however, noteworthy differences in the following responses:

- Allocation of IP ranges to specific departments: this was significantly less widespread in the corporate environment.
- Version of Microsoft Excel: a greater proportion of corporate respondents use Excel 97, and a lower proportion Excel 2000