4 User reactions to CIPACs: An exploratory empirical investigation

This chapter reports on the CIPAC user survey, a web-based investigation of users of card-image public access catalogues conducted as part of the present dissertation and presumably the first such study ever undertaken. As mentioned above, hardly any of the libraries that returned the CLQ had looked systematically at the reactions of their users to the provision of the respective card-image catalogue(s), nor has any study of this kind been mentioned in the literature.

4.1 Aims and objectives

The aim of this survey was to learn about the awareness, the behaviour and the opinions of CIPAC users, in order to gain some basic insight into the way they feel about and deal with this unusual type of OPAC.

The objectives of the user survey were to collect information, by examining an indicative group of such users, about aspects such as the frequency of use, their familiarity and problems with navigation, the use of CIPACs in comparison with their predecessors (card catalogues) and present-day "normal" OPACS, more specific features such as options for subject searching and circulation/loan, as well as their general (emotional) view of card-image catalogues. It was expected that the findings would contribute to the formulation of hypotheses on CIPAC reception and use.

4.2 Methodology

From the outset it was clear that the methodological approach had to be exploratory rather than descriptive (quantifiable) or explanatory (discovering causal relationships). A survey of the latter kind would have required a large representative sample and sophisticated (professional) survey techniques – both far beyond the intended scope of this dissertation. Besides, it would have been difficult if not impossible to define and identify the target population for a representative sample of CIPAC users. Also, given the fact that so far all that is known about CIPAC users is based upon the personal impressions of relatively few librarians and a number of email messages and entries in complaints books, it was felt that an exploratory survey was just the appropriate kind of investigation to undertake:
An exploratory survey, often conducted as qualitative research, can increase the researcher's familiarity with the phenomenon in question, it can help to clarify concepts, it can be used to establish priorities for future research, it can identify new problems, and [...] can be used to gather information with practical applications (Powell, 1997, p. 58–59).

4.2.1 Options for an exploratory survey

Originally, it had been envisaged to conduct personal, qualitative interviews of a small "purposive sample" (Trochim, 1999) of CIPAC users, preferably experienced rather than novice users, students and/or academics rather than librarians, and users with a humanities background (as CIPACs tend to cover older literature). Ideally, end-users knowledgeable about more than one type of CIPAC were regarded to be the most promising target group. However, after various attempts to identify a reasonable number of such individuals it became evident that this approach was simply not feasible.

The alternative was to undertake a web-based survey of CIPAC users that were to be recruited via newsgroups, mailing lists or other electronic bulletin boards – an approach that has become quite familiar in the last decade. The sample, in this case, would be of the "accidental, haphazard or convenience" kind, which is, in spite of its shortcomings, still "one of the most common methods of sampling" (Trochim, 1999). Accordingly, the method of asking questions would have to be a more structured one, as open, unstructured questions do not really lend themselves to self-administered questionnaires. Also, the size of the sample, which in the case of a web-based survey cannot really be pre-determined, was expected to be larger than in the case of personal qualitative interviews.

In order to gain some basic information and ideas for both the CLQ and the user survey, an extensive personal interview was conducted with the creator of the Austrian National Library's KatZoom software (Dikovich, 2000). During this talk the idea emerged to recruit respondents by means of a link to the web-questionnaire on the ONB's CIPAC-webpage rather than by the usual asking for participation through newsgroup messages etc. This idea was pursued further by including the following question into the CLQ:

Would you possibly agree to support my work by creating a temporary link (a clickable icon) on the web-page of your card-image OPAC that would point the users of your catalogue to a questionnaire that will be used for my dissertation?

1 Several of the heads of the historical and philological branch libraries in the University of Vienna were asked for their assistance but were not able to identify suitable candidates for such interviews.
By the end of January 2001, eleven libraries from four European countries had agreed to participate in the user survey by implementing such links on their CIPAC-webpages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Austrian National Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>University of Vienna Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innsbruck</td>
<td>University of Innsbruck Faculty of Theology Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Brno</td>
<td>Moravian Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>National Library of the Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Berlin Central and Regional Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>University Library, Freie Universität Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halle</td>
<td>Saxony-Anhalt University and State Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>Heidelberg University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Berne</td>
<td>Berne City and University Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-1: Libraries participating in the user survey

4.2.2 Topics in the survey

By the end of December 2000, a list of topics to be dealt with in the survey had been established, together with a provisional operationalization of these concepts (i.e. the specification of the kind of questions to be asked in order to cover the respective concept). This list included the following:

1. Characteristics of the respondent
2. Frequency and purpose of CIPAC use
3. Familiarity with CIPACs
4. CIPACs versus original card catalogues
5. CIPACs versus "normal" online catalogues
6. "This CIPAC"\(^4\) versus other CIPACs
7. Subject access
8. Interface to circulation/loan module
9. Integration of the CIPAC into the general web-OPAC
10. General evaluation of the CIPAC approach
11. Thanks for filling in the questionnaire and space for any further comments

The first list of topics and operational phrases was then further amended and modified. Item 9 was completely dropped, mainly because none of the participating libraries was

---
\(^2\) Several other libraries would have liked to participate, too, but either returned their questionnaires too late or were sent the CLQ only after the web-based survey had already started. The latter were libraries not known to be offering a CIPAC when the CLQ was sent out first, or libraries that implemented their CIPACs only in 2001.

\(^3\) This document is reproduced as Appendix C1.

\(^4\) The term "this CIPAC" refers to the card-image catalogue of the library that a given respondent would be thinking and talking about.
offering an interface of this kind. Other items were slightly shortened in order to avoid the final questionnaire becoming too difficult or too long.

4.2.3 Questionnaire design

The next step was the design and creation of the questionnaire, of which versions in three languages were required. The original version was written in English – not only for inclusion into the present dissertation, but also for being used in the fieldwork. This version was subsequently translated into German and into Czech.

The actual creation of the questionnaire relied in many respects on the recent book *Mail and Internet Surveys* (Dillman, 2000), particularly on

- the principles for writing survey questions,
- the principles for constructing the questionnaire,
- the suggestions for surveys on the World-Wide-Web.

4.2.4 Implementation

After the questionnaire had been drafted it turned out that the Vienna University of Technology Library (UBTUW) would support the survey by letting the author use its web-server and by providing disk space there. This made it possible to implement several library-specific versions of the welcome screen and the questionnaire. Instead of referring to the respective institutions and their CIPACS by using the somewhat clumsy expression "this library" now the actual names of the libraries could be used in the questionnaires. Also, a new question could be added to the first part of the questionnaire, naming the respective library's CIPAC(s) and asking about its/their importance for the respondent – primarily as a means for drawing the person's attention to the right catalogue. Furthermore, it became possible to cut out several questions which were not

---

5 It had been hoped that the Bavarian State Library and/or the Zurich Central Library – these libraries offer CIPACS integrated with OPACS – would participate in the survey, but, unfortunately, neither responded to the CLQ.

6 The English version was needed for the Czech National Library.

7 This version (translated by the author) was used for all participating libraries with exception of the Moravian Library.

8 The translation into Czech by the Moravian Library is gratefully acknowledged. The Czech version was also used for the Czech National Library (alongside the English and the German versions).

9 For details see Appendix C2.

10 The helpful support by UBTUW is gratefully acknowledged.
relevant in the versions for the Freie Universität Berlin Library and the Berlin Central and Regional Library.

In order to enable transfer of the answers to each filled questionnaire into (library-specific) result files on the web-server, a corrected and amended version of a PERL script published by the American Library Association (Ward, 2000) was implemented on the UBTUW's web-server. The first questionnaire to be implemented on the server was the one for the Austrian National Library. After it had been made sure that both this questionnaire and the PERL script were fully operational, the questionnaire was pre-tested by a small group of fellow librarians and academics.\(^{11}\) As a result, several questions had to be re-written and some answer categories were amended. Also, a few errors in the underlying HTML-code were found and corrected. After the final version had been established,\(^{12}\) the welcome screens and questionnaires for the other participating libraries were completed.\(^{13}\)

In the meantime, all participating libraries had been sent the web addresses to which links on their CIPAC pages were to be implemented. Also, appropriate animated icons in three languages were designed and sent to the libraries, the majority of which actually used them on their web-pages.\(^{14}\)

### 4.2.5 Fieldwork and out-turn

Field work started on 4 February 2001 with the Moravian Library as the first to become operational. Within the following eight days, all other participating libraries had built in the links to the respective welcome screens on the UBTUW server in Vienna, so that by 13 February all questionnaires were fully operational. After the first two or three weeks, it became visible that the maximum weekly out-turn would be in the region of 40 usable questionnaires – an interesting result insofar as it had been absolutely unclear what to expect. During fieldwork, a number of regular tasks were performed: Weekly statistics of the questionnaires received per library were created and also sent to the participating libraries; empty and duplicate questionnaires were identified and removed from the result files; data were saved both on the web-server and locally. The overall

---

\(^{11}\) From the Austrian National Library, the University of Vienna and the Vienna University of Technology.

\(^{12}\) The English version of the questionnaire is reproduced as Appendix C4.

\(^{13}\) The implementation of the Czech versions was obviously difficult and the author gratefully acknowledges the fruitful co-operation with both participating libraries from the Czech Republic.

\(^{14}\) Some libraries used them as they were, some eliminated the animation, while others used textual links. For an example see Appendix C5.
impression was that users did not have problems with handling or sending the questionnaires, and that the degree of (deliberate) misuse was rather small. In order to reach the amount of 300 (or more) completed questionnaires, the period of fieldwork was extended over Easter, and finally ended by 17–19 April 2001. The final out-turn was 320 usable questionnaires.\footnote{The term "response rate" that is normally used in the survey literature refers to the proportion of returned questionnaires to those sent or given out, so that in the present context the term "out-turn" seems the more appropriate term. – A tabular summary of the total and weekly figures by library is included as Appendix C6.}

4.2.6 Data analysis

After the end of fieldwork, the library-specific result files\footnote{These were UNIX text files with a tabulator set for each variable.} were merged into one large file, with an identifier for the respective libraries as an additional variable. This file was imported into MS-Excel where several checks were performed, and, in some cases, empty cells corrected. From Excel, lists of the answers to the open-ended questions were printed which were used for analyzing and categorizing of these answers;\footnote{Appreciation is given to the colleagues from the Czech libraries who readily translated the Czech answers to the open-ended questions into English.} the new categories were then manually inserted into the data matrix.

\textit{SPSS 10.00 for Windows} was used for the computation of frequencies, means and cross-tabulations.\footnote{In the present case of a non-probability sample, tests of statistical significance are not justified and the author therefore resisted the temptation of letting the powerful SPSS compute such tests.} For the latter, both newly defined (type of CIPAC, index of CIPAC expertise) and re-categorized variables (main subject area) were used.\footnote{See section 4.3.2 below.} The resulting output files were re-imported into Excel in order to produce diagrams, or into MS-Word for the creation of tables.

4.3 Findings

4.3.1 Characteristics of the "sample"

As mentioned above, a total of 320 questionnaires was used for data analysis. However, as shown in Table 4-2 below, the coverage of the participating libraries was rather uneven. About a quarter of all questionnaires returned were concerned with the CIPACS of
the Austrian National Library, almost as many with those of the University of Vienna Library, and still a relatively large number with those of the Czech National Library. Even if factors such as where and how noticeably the links were placed on the individual libraries' CIPAC web-pages may have contributed to this result, it is certainly justified to assume the overall frequency of use as the main factor causing this response pattern. Nevertheless, in the present context these numbers are not really important, because it was not the aim of the study to collect data representative for the individual libraries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>No. of questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austrian National Library (ONB)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vienna Library (UBW)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of the Czech Republic (NKP)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg University Library (UBH)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berne City and University Library (SUB)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravian Library (MZK)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxony-Anhalt University and State Library (ULB)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library, Freie Universität Berlin (FUB)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Innsbruck Faculty of Theology Library (IHS)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin Central and Regional Library (ZLB)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna Univ. of Econ. &amp; Business Adm. Lib. (WUW)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2: Questionnaire coverage of participating libraries

One of the main characteristics of the respondents is the fact that they were, to a great extent, frequent users of CIPACS. It had been an unforeseeable risk of this survey whether or not many accidental or first-time visitors to the various CIPACS' web-pages would be inclined to fill in the questionnaire. Fortunately, this was not the case, as 63% said that they used the respective CIPAC(s) "often" or even "very frequently", whereas only 10% were first-time users. This variable will further be dealt with in a separate section (4.3.3).

Only a few questions were asked on "demographics". Variables such as age, sex, social status etc. were felt to be not relevant at the present stage, and therefore not included into the questionnaire. However, the respondent's status as a library user (or OPAC user) was ascertained by means of an appropriate question (no. 26). As shown in Figure 4-1, 35% of the respondents were students, and 31% academic teachers and/or researchers. Only 15% of the respondents were librarians, quite contrary to the original
fear that maybe the majority of people to answer the questionnaire might come from this category.

![Figure 4-1: Library user status](image1)

The overall majority of respondents came from the humanities (Figure 4-2). Although it had been expected that students/scholars from these disciplines would be more interested in CIPACs than others, a proportion as large as two thirds (67%) of all respondents had not been anticipated. The second largest sub-group came from the social and behavioural sciences (11%); all other subject areas were covered by 5% or less, respectively. *This suggests the hypothesis that CIPACs are predominantly used for literature searching in the humanities and have almost no relevance for scientific and technological study and research.*

![Figure 4-2: Main subject area](image2)

Another factor that was felt to be of interest was *where* the respondents usually performed their searching of OPACS (including CIPACS). Obviously, one of the clear advan-
tages of CIPACS is that they – unlike card catalogues – can be searched without the need of approaching the library in person. The results in Figure 4-3 indicate that in fact the majority of respondents said that they connected to online library catalogues mainly from their homes or offices (54%), whereas not as many searched OPACs primarily on workstations located in the respective libraries.

![Fig. 4-3: Preferred location for OPAC searching](image)

### 4.3.2 Total results and standard breaks

In the following sections, the results of the survey will be discussed both for the total sample and also for certain sub-groups of respondents. The percentages for all respondents (or, in the case of several questions, pre-filtered segments of the total sample) will be displayed graphically, with reference to the corresponding tables (C-1 to C-47) in Appendix C7. The results for the sub-groups, or "standard breaks", are also shown in these appended tables and will only be mentioned here when appropriate. Five variables were used as standard breaks:

- **Type of CIPAC**: This was computed according to the library a given respondent was referring to when answering the questionnaire. For this purpose, the libraries (or better, the CIPACS) represented in the survey were categorized into three groups, or "types":
  - Type A (51%): CIPACS based on binary searching (KatZoom systems; libraries: IHS, ONB, UBW, WUW);
  - Type B (27%): CIPACS with alphabetical indexes (the Swiss and German Chopin CIPACS; libraries: SUB, ZLB, FUB, ULB; plus DigiKat at UBH);
  - Type C (22%): CIPACS based on virtual drawers (the Czech CIPACS; libraries: MZK, NKP).

Each respondent was allocated to one of these categories (see Table C-1).
**Index of CIPAC expertise:** This was computed on the basis of question 1 (frequency of CIPAC use) and question 7 (self-rated familiarity with CIPACS). Three categories were formed:

- **High** (30%): Respondents who said they had used the respective CIPAC(s) "very frequently" and who considered themselves as "rather experienced users" of CIPACS;
- **Low** (20%): Respondents who neither said that they had used the respective CIPAC(s) "very frequently" nor that they considered themselves as "rather experienced users" of CIPACS;
- **Medium** (50%): All other respondents.

Each respondent was allocated to one of these categories (see Table C-2).

**Main subject area:** The original categories used in question 26 were aggregated into three groups:

- Humanities, arts (67%)
- Social sciences, economics, law (15%)
- Science and technology, medicine (11%)

The respondents who did not answer this question (8%) were not included.

**Library user status:** Only three categories (from question 25) were used for this break; the rest (19%) were not included.

- Student (35%)
- Academic (31%)
- Librarian (15%)

**OPAC searching location:** As this break was supposed to contrast users who prefer the library for OPAC searching with those who prefer other locations, only two groups (from question 27) were used; the rest (30%) were not included.

- Library (17%)
- Home, office, etc. (54%)

### 4.3.3 Frequency and purpose of CIPAC use

The intention of the very first question – supposed to apply to every respondent – was to investigate whether the respondents were frequent, infrequent or novice users of the respective CIPACS. The wording of the question ("how often ... in the last semester") was used to refer to a time-span meaningful to most respondents; there was no intention of "measuring" an exact period of time. For the ZLB which is not an academic library this wording was altered to "in the last six months". In the case of libraries offering more
than one CIPAC the question did not relate to a specific CIPAC but to "any of these catalogues".

![Frequency of CIPAC use](image)

**Fig. 4-4: Frequency of CIPAC use**

As already mentioned above, Figure 4-4 clearly shows that the majority of respondents were frequent users of the respective CIPACs, describing their behaviour as "very frequently" (32%) or "often" (31%). Only 23% selected "every now and then", and just 4% said that they "rarely" used the CIPACs. The proportion of first-time users ("novices") was only 10%. Although this pattern cannot be generalized to all users of CIPACs, the fact that amongst the CIPAC users that answered this questionnaire were so many frequent users suggests the hypothesis that CIPACs – as a rather special type of OPAC – are used more likely by groups of "regulars" than by occasional users.

Of the three types differentiated, type "A" CIPACs showed a higher frequency of use than the others, probably because of the size and contents of the respective catalogues. Respondents with a background in the humanities, and also academics, reported – not unexpectedly – a more frequent use of CIPACs than those from other subject areas or library user groups (Table C-3).

Another question (no. 4) dealt with the perceived importance of the various CIPACs. Although it was asked mainly in order to name the individual catalogues in the questionnaire and to draw the respondents' attention to them, it also produced some interesting findings, especially for the three libraries for which the largest numbers of respondents were obtained (ONB, UBW, NKP). In the case of the ONB, the respondents showed a clear preference for the two "main" CIPACs – the large author and subject catalogues for

---

21 It would certainly have been more rewarding to ask this question to representative samples for each participating library.
the 1930–1991 period (Figure 4-5). In the case of the UBW, the preferences are more evenly distributed among the six CIPACS, although the 1932–1988 author catalogue stands out from the others as the most important CIPAC, and the decentral holdings catalogue seems to be the least interesting of the three author/title catalogues offered (Figure 4-6). It should be emphasized that in both libraries the ratings for the subject CIPACS are rather high – a result that had not been foreseen as such and that corresponds with another finding reported below (question no. 2).

![Fig. 4-5: Perceived importance of CIPACS (ONB)](image)

For the NKP, Figure 4-7 shows that the three general catalogues are perceived to be much more important than the more specialized CIPACS, with the oldest collection of the library (catalogue I: 1501-1950) topping the range of preferences. Similar results, indicating a greater interest in the general catalogues compared to the specialized ones,
were obtained for the other libraries; however, the respective sub-samples are rather small (Tables C-6 to C-13).

**Fig. 4-7: Perceived importance of CIPACS (NKP)**

The general purpose of CIPAC use was covered by a question (no. 2) that explored the type of the last search performed on a card-image catalogue. Respondents were asked to differentiate between known-item and subject searches, with "works of a specific author" as a third, and "other" as a forth option. It was possible to check more than only one answer category.

**Fig. 4-8: Type of last CIPAC search**

As shown in Figure 4-8, the majority of searches reported were of the kind typically performed on author catalogues (author/title known; works of specific author). This is not surprising, because all but one of the participating libraries offer CIPACS which are author catalogues, whereas the CIPACS of several libraries do not have any features for
subject searching. In view of this, the result must be emphasized that 29% of the respondents said that their last CIPAC search was a search for a subject or a topic. It suggests the hypothesis that users are interested in CIPACs not only for the (obvious) author/title searching, but also as tools for subject searching. This aspect will be dealt with further in section 4.3.8 below. For sub-group results, see Table C-4. Questions referring to the frequency of CIPAC use were also asked in connection with
- the awareness of other CIPACs (see 4.3.7)
- the comparison of CIPACs with the original card catalogues (see 4.3.5)
- the comparison of CIPACs with "normal" OPACS (see 4.3.6)

4.3.4 Familiarity with CIPACs, perceived ease of use, users' competence

A number of questions were asked in order to investigate the respondents' levels of familiarity with CIPACs, the problems and difficulties they had perceived and/or experienced, and how they rated the CIPACs with regard to various aspects of browsing and searching.

One of these questions (no. 5) was asked to find out whether or not the respondents had instantly known how to operate the CIPAC when they used it for the first time. Figure 4-9 shows that the majority said that they "got immediately and intuitively into using it" (68%), whereas only less than a third admitted that "it took me some time to get accustomed to it" (30%).

Respondents referring to "type B CIPACs" showed even a slightly better result than the rest – hinting that at first sight this category of CIPACs may look easier than the others. More noticeable is the different answer pattern of the librarians among the respondents. However, of all standard breaks, the factor correlating most with this variable was the
"index of CIPAC expertise" – respondents with a "low" level were much more likely to report initial difficulties (52%) than those with a "high" level (21%). (Table C-14).

The respondents who said they had needed some time to get used to the system were asked to comment on the problems they had; the results of this open-ended question are shown in Table 4-3. The answers seem to indicate that the main difficulty for the users was the CIPAC interface as such – they felt uncertain how to navigate, or thought it was too cumbersome in one way or the other. All other aspects mentioned (e.g. bad legibility of the images, problems with the catalogue such as filing rules or subject headings) were obviously less important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navigation was unclear / difficult to understand</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation arduous, inconvenient, time-consuming</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface confusing, lack of overview &amp; orientation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legibility of images, badly scanned cards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing sequence, subject headings, split catalogues</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough help / personal help needed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book ordering functionality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer handling (buttons, icons, clicking, hardware)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System too slow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (respondents who needed some time to get accustomed to operating the CIPAC)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3: Problems when using CIPACs for the first time

Another question (no. 7) – it was also used for the "index of CIPAC expertise" – invited the respondents to rate themselves as "rather experienced" or "rather inexperienced" users of CIPACS. In view of the fact that the sample consisted of many frequent users who also often said that they had not had initial difficulties, it is not surprising that a high percentage (78%) rated themselves as "experienced" (Figure 4-10).

![Fig. 4-10: Self-rated familiarity with CIPACs](image-url)
The tendency of seeing oneself as an experienced user was particularly strong among respondents from the humanities (86%), a finding that fits into the picture of CIPACs as instruments predominantly used in that subject area. Of all sub-groups, the respondents talking about "type C" CIPACs were the ones with the smallest percentage of experienced users (59%; Table C-19).

In addition, there were three other questions relating to aspects connected with familiarity, ease and convenience of use, successful searching etc. One of them (no. 6) explicitly mentioned "convenience and ease of use"; the respondents were asked to rate four aspects of the CIPAC used most recently as "easy", "a bit difficult", or "rather awkward" (Figure 4-11).

The great majority of respondents (70%) considered it relatively easy to locate the right alphabetical entry points – a finding which may look surprising at first sight but obviously reflects the overall structure of the sample (rather frequent/experienced users); the data also show a positive correlation with "CIPAC expertise". Only "type C" users tended not to follow this pattern as they chose "a bit difficult" much more often (39%) than the users of other CIPACs (15–16%; Table C-13). The second navigational aspect – browsing / jumping forward and backward – was also seen as rather easy albeit by a smaller majority (53%). It is most interesting that the answer pattern differs in accordance with the three CIPAC types: While "type B" CIPACs received the best rating (68% "easy", 24% "difficult", 5% "awkward"), "type A" CIPACs were more often seen as not so easy to navigate (50% – 35% – 12%; Table C-16). The third item – understanding the filing rules (alphabetical order of cards) – was rated in a similar way to the second. Here, "type C" CIPACs were rated better than the others (only 7% "awkward", compared
to 17% in the case of "type A"), which might be indicating that the filing rules were maybe less complicated in Czech card catalogues than in their German counterparts which often used the PI (Table C-17). Somewhat surprisingly, the last item – *reading the images of the cards (esp. when handwritten)* – was given the least favourable rating of the four. This was particularly true in the case of "type A" CIPACs, where 21% of the users chose the "awkward" category (compared to only 4–5% of the other two groups), a result that obviously reflects the criticism of the UBW’s pre-1932 CIPAC (Table C-18), which was also uttered by a number of respondents elsewhere in the questionnaire (various open-ended questions).

In connexion with the type of their last CIPAC search (known-item v. subject, see above) the respondents where also asked to describe that last search by eight statements – both positive and negative ones – that could be rated each as "true" or "not true" (question no. 3). Figure 4-12 shows the proportions of the "true" categories.

![Fig. 4-12: Characteristics of last CIPAC search](image)

At first sight, the overall picture resulting from this question is again a rather favourable one. A large majority (69%) of the respondents said that carrying out that search was easy – only 23% admitted that they had some problems with browsing or navigating – and that they were pleased with the results (61%). To a great extent (44%), they even found items originally not looked for (as one would expect when browsing card catalogues). However, 23% did *not* find what they were looking for. Even if this includes the cases when the information looked for was not in the respective catalogue, the fact
that 13% said that they had broken up their search as unsuccessful does indicate the existence of a certain failure rate. This suspicion is supported further by another result – the relatively large proportion (33%) who thought that the CIPACs probably contained more relevant items than they managed to retrieve. *Maybe searching of the CIPACs was not that easy altogether!*

The analysis of the standard breaks reveals three interesting results (Table C-5):

- The level of CIPAC expertise correlated (not unexpectedly) with most statements.
- The CIPACs of "type B" received (again) the relatively best rating. In comparison with the other two types, "type B" respondents said much more likely that they were easy to use (84% v. 69% [A] and 50% [C]), and less frequently that they had problems with browsing/navigating (14% v. 26–27%) or thought that there was more in the catalogue than they had managed to find (21% v. 37%).
- Compared to academics and librarians, students had remarkably more problems with searching CIPACs, as all results for this sub-group are either above average (negative items) or below average (positive items).

The third question (no. 8) to explore convenience and ease of use of CIPACs presented six statements (positive and negative ones); the respondents were asked to express the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each item. There was a five-point answer scale that went from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree", with "neutral" as the mid-point. During data analysis, weights from 1 to 5 were assigned to these categories in order to compute for each statement the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation.22

22 This computation was made on the basis of the number of respondents who actually rated the respective item (hence the differing Ns per item).
As shown in Figure 4-13, the resulting overall picture is less favourable than in the case of the previous question. Although the respondents did not agree with the two negative statements ("browsing/navigating is difficult", "searching is not as efficient as it should be") they did not really reject them either. Furthermore, none of the positive statements was really accepted; the relatively best rating was given to "the search interface is user-friendly", the worst to "there is adequate online help available". As the table in the appendix (C-20) indicates, there was generally a certain degree of disagreement between the respondents; this variation is also expressed by standard deviation values between 1.1 and 1.25 (except .9 for the last item for which the majority chose the neutral category, i.e. "don't know").

The sub-group results (Table C-20) reveal that the "type B" CIPACs were again rated more favourably than the others (except for online help). This finding and the previously reported results suggest the hypothesis that CIPACs that offer alphabetical indexes as entry points are seen as more user-friendly and convenient than the others, and are therefore accepted better by the users. Besides, there is again a covariation of the ratings with the level of CIPAC expertise, and also a tendency that users from the humanities gave a slightly more positive rating. Finally, the results for the student sub-group are again less positive (or more negative) than those for the academics and librarians, which – together with the above-mentioned findings suggests the hypothesis that students are more likely (than other users groups) to experience CIPACs as not so easy to use and/or efficient to search.

### 4.3.5 CIPACs versus original card catalogues

Two questions dealt with CIPACs as compared to their predecessors, the original card catalogues. First, the respondents were asked which of the two they used more frequently (question no. 9; Figure 4-14).

The great majority of the respondents (50%) said that they used the present-day CIPACs more often than the former card catalogues, whereas only in 23% of the cases the opposite was reported. Whilst 5% claimed that they used both catalogue types at about the same frequency,23 16% had never used the card catalogue(s) on which the CIPAC(s) they were referring to was/were based.

---

23 This answer category was not in the questionnaire; respondents who (by their comments) claimed that they used both at the same frequency were then assigned this category. It is likely that the percentage would have been higher if the category were actually presented in the questionnaire.
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As the main reason for using CIPACs more often, their *easy and universal availability through the world-wide-web* was the reason most frequently given in the comments to this question (Table C-22). The possibility of accessing CIPACs independent of place was more often mentioned than other web-related aspects (access via the WWW is more convenient, can be done independent of time, is time-saving). Not as many respondents said that they used CIPACs more often because they were faster or easier to search than card catalogues. Interesting enough, both the speed of browsing and the ease of navigation were rather used by the other category of respondents to explain why they had formerly searched card catalogues more frequently (Table C-23). Another criterion mentioned several times was that card catalogues supposedly offered a better overview of the cards. As the main reasons for not having used the card catalogue(s) at all, residence in a different place (one had never been at the library's site) and age (one was not a student at that time) were nominated, whereas only in a few cases the searching of card catalogues was described as too arduous or cumbersome (Table C-24). Thus, it can be hypothesized that *primarily the simple fact that CIPACs are available over the web – and not their other possible benefits – has led to a better utilization of these resources* compared to the time when they were only available in one place and in paper format.

Respondents scoring high on the "index of CIPAC expertise" were much more likely to use CIPACs more frequently (65%) than those scoring low (22%), and, consequently, less likely to have used card catalogues more often (16% v. 28%). It is also interesting to note that among the respondents with a low score on this index, there was a much higher proportion who had never used the card catalogues. Another noticeable subgroup result is that among the respondents assigned to "type C" CIPACs the percentage having used the former card catalogues more often was much higher (36%) compared.
with the two other sub-groups (18–21%); however, this is probably a country-specific rather than a CIPAC-specific result. Finally, the result that home/office-based OPAC users said more often than library-based users that they searched CIPACs more frequently (56% v. 38%) matches the above-mentioned statement concerning the availability of CIPACs over the web (Table C-21).

The other question (no. 10) once again touched on the ease of use aspect, as the respondents were asked whether they thought that CIPACs or the former card catalogues were easier to use.

As shown in Figure 4-15, 42% voted for CIPACs, but a strikingly large minority (29%) thought that card catalogues were easier to use. Also, a large proportion were undecided or said that there was no difference (29%), so that in total the majority of respondents did not feel that CIPACs were easier to use. Even amongst those who scored high on the "index of CIPAC expertise" the overall vote was not in favour of the CIPACs. However, CIPACs were rated slightly more positive by home/office OPAC users as well as by students. Another interesting sub-group result is that only 37% of "type A" CIPAC users thought that the electronic catalogues were easier to use, compared to 46–47% of the "type B" and "type C" users (Table C-25).

The respondents were also asked to give the reasons for their judgements (Tables C-26, C-27). Of the reasons in favour of CIPACs, the various advantages of access via www (not really contributing to the ease of use in comparison with card catalogues) and ergonomical aspects (e.g. no need to move around between catalogue cabinets or to wait for drawers used by other people) were the most frequently mentioned ones. Other aspects (CIPACs make it possible to print out individual cards or to place orders online) were

---

24 Only those who had not claimed they had never used card catalogues (previous question).
also addressed, but not as often. Those respondents who believed that card catalogues are easier to use mentioned mainly the speed, the ease and the flexibility of browsing/navigating the cards as the primary issues. This finding again indicates that – at least to a certain proportion of CIPAC users (including experienced ones) – the electronic versions do not appear to be great improvements, as to them they appear not as fast, as comfortable and as easy to use as their predecessors.

4.3.6 CIPACs versus "normal" online catalogues

In order to compare CIPACs with "normal" online public access catalogues, two questions were asked. The intention of the first (no. 11) was to find out whether the respondents were using the CIPACs more or less frequently than their libraries' OPACs. Again, the expression "last semester" was used as the period of reference for the respondents' frequency judgements.

As shown in Figure 4-16, almost half the sample (48%) reported that they had used the "normal" OPACS more frequently than the CIPACs, and only a small minority of 6% said that the opposite was true. Even if the respondents who had not used the "normal" OPACS at all (7%) were added to the second category, it would still remain a distinct minority. However, the existence of a relatively large fourth group (32%) claiming they used both types of catalogues at about the same frequency shows that the overall picture is not that homogeneous. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that – even among users of CIPACs (i.e. the present sample) – the card-image catalogues are generally not used as frequently as the "normal" OPACS offered by the respective libraries.
Amongst the sub-groups analysed, the users of "type B" CIPACs were far above average (74%) to vote for "normal" OPACS. Although this looks as if this particular type of CIPACs would cause a lower frequency of use it seems more likely that other variables (circumstantial factors such as range of materials in the CIPACs, kind of library or university/study programme) contributed to this result. Other sub-groups that used the "normal" OPACS noticeably more often than the others are respondents with a background in the social sciences, economics or law (68%), librarians (61%) and people who preferred the library as the location for searching online catalogues (60%). Also, the respondents rating "medium" on the "index of CIPAC expertise" seem to fall into this category (57%), whereas those with a "high" score seem more likely to use the CIPACs more often than on average. Interesting enough, the respondents with a "low" score on that index are the sub-group with the highest percentage (16%) of those who did not use the "normal" OPACS at all (Table C-28).

Fig. 4-17: OPAC features missed "greatly" when using CIPACs

The second question (no. 12) listed ten options and features usually available on "normal" online catalogues\textsuperscript{25} and asked the respondents to indicate for each item if they missed it "greatly", "a bit" or "not at all" when using their library's card-image catalogue(s). It is quite obvious that CIPACs cannot be expected to offer all these features – in that case they would be full OPACS – but it was felt that this kind of question would help to reveal the main deficiencies of CIPACs as experienced by their users, and at the same

\textsuperscript{25} plus an open-ended "other" category as an eleventh item.
time help to understand which features of "normal" OPACs are appreciated most. Figure 4-17 shows the results for the "missed greatly" category only. It is clearly visible that the OPAC feature which was given the highest priority is "searching of keywords / searching of full texts of the catalogue record" (53%). This leads directly to the assumption that CIPACs that do offer this option – BerninaSpider systems (Zurich, Luzerne), HeBIS-Retro (Frankfurt), etc. – will be accepted better by their respective user communities than the (majority of) CIPACs which were created without optical character recognition of the texts on the original catalogue cards. This is supported further by the finding that users of "type A" CIPACs (i.e. those with the most limited search options) rated this feature more frequently as "greatly missing" (60%) than the users of "type B" and "type C" CIPACs (51% and 39%). Also, those with a "high" score on the "index of CIPAC expertise" nominated this feature far above average (65%). Students (62%) and respondents with a humanities background (60%) are other sub-groups showing percentages above average (Table C-29).

The second item in order of rank (42%) is also a retrieval-related one – "browsing of different indexes (authors, titles, subjects etc.)" – and also concerned with an option that most CIPACs do not offer. The indexes of every nth author or subject heading that are typical features of "type B" CIPACs are seemingly not regarded as a replacement for "real" index browsing because 46% of the respective sub-group said they would miss this feature "greatly"! Also, students (52%) and librarians (51%) voted for this item above average. However, unlike in the case of the first item here the level of CIPAC expertise seems not to play any role.

The two features following closely behind in the ranked list are "displaying the loan status (availability) of the books" (40%) and "making orders (from stacks), reservations, loan extensions" (38%). Both are not related to retrieval but to circulation – a finding that points to the importance of this aspect of online catalogues and supports the assumption that CIPACs with some sort of interface to circulation will gain better acceptance than CIPACs without such features. Subsequently, on places five to seven we find "displaying a list of short titles" (26%), "using Boolean operators (AND, OR, NOT) for searching" (25%) and "displaying the borrower status (e.g. books overdue, fees)" (25%). Of the remaining features, only "building and combining sets of search results" (17%) is of some importance for CIPAC users, whereas their interest in "choosing from several different display formats" (8%), "displaying the search history" (8%) and "other" options (3%) seems to be rather low.
4.3.7 Awareness of other CIPACS

After having dealt with "normal" OPACS, the respondents were made to think of other CIPACS they might be familiar with. First, they were asked if they knew of any card-image catalogues that other libraries offer over the web (question 13). The results of this question are shown in Figure 4-18.26

Almost half the respondents (46%) claimed they knew of some other CIPAC(s), whereas 54% said they had no such knowledge. The sub-group results in Table C-30 reveal that the awareness of other CIPACS does not only correlate with the "index of CIPAC expertise" ("high": 59%; "low": 31%) but also with the user status (academics: 59%) and the subject background (humanities: 52%). In contrast, the co-variation with "type of CIPAC" is certainly an artefact.27

The respondents who said they knew of one or several other CIPAC(s) were also asked to specify the respective libraries or institutions; their answers were coded as "correct", "wrong" or "unclear".28 As shown in Table 4-4 the vast majority of the respondents (81%) were able to name at least one correct institution; only 19% failed to do so. However, most respondents knew of only one relevant institution. The number of wrongly named or unclear libraries or institutions was relatively small. This result indicates that there is a certain level of awareness of other CIPACS, even if it cannot be assumed to be very high or sophisticated.

26 Because in the case of this question "don't know" has the same meaning as "no", those respondents who did not answer were also counted as "no".
27 The respondents of the "type A" group (57%) were more likely to answer "yes", but not because of the CIPAC type but as a result of the existence of CIPACS at two major research libraries in the same city (Vienna) that happen to be of the same software type.
28 The computation of frequencies for the individual institutions named by the respondents would only have made sense in the context of a representative and quantifiable study.
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### Table 4-4: Other CIPACs specified by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of correctly named libraries / institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of wrongly named libraries / institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. unclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (respondents who said they knew of other CIPACs)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those respondents who said they knew of other CIPACs (N=146) were subsequently asked how often they had used card-image catalogues of other libraries in the last semester (question 14). As shown in Figure 4-19, over 60 percent said they used such CIPACs at least frequently (26% "very frequently" and 35% "often") and another 21% "every now and again", whereas only relatively small proportions of the respondents used them rarely (10%) or not at all (6%). This seems to indicate that if CIPAC users know of other online catalogues of this kind, they are likely to use them quite frequently as well.

![Fig. 4-19: Frequency of use of other CIPACs](image)

The sub-group results show that there is not only considerable co-variation of this pattern with the "index of CIPAC expertise", but also with "type of CIPAC", as respondents of the "type A" group reported again – see section 4.3.3 – a higher frequency of use (70% "very frequently" or "often"), especially when compared to the "type B" group (38%). Another sub-group with an above-average value are academic teachers/re-
searchers (75%), whereas it seems that librarians who are aware of other CIPACs are not as likely to make practical use of their knowledge (Table C-31).

The following question (no. 15) asked the respondents who had said they were aware of other CIPACs to decide whether they preferred "their" CIPAC or other CIPACs with regard to six aspects. However, the overall picture in Figure 4-20 suggests that this question was beyond many respondents' level of awareness because the majority answered by choosing "neutral / don't know" or did not answer at all.

![Fig. 4-20: Comparing "this library's" CIPAC with other CIPACs](image)

Generally speaking, the distribution of the judgements seems to indicate that the CIPAC users who did actually vote were not too happy with "their" CIPACs, as they often said they preferred another library's CIPAC. This is particularly true for the two aspects, "efficiency of searching / quality of results", and "speed of searching / system performance" (both 18% v. 16%). Although the sub-group results must be interpreted with caution (because of the reduced sample size, N=146) there is one consistent result to be mentioned: In the case of all six items "type B" CIPACs received noticeably better ratings than "type A" and "type C" CIPACs (Table C-32ab).

Finally, these CIPAC users were asked if they knew of any features (e.g. for searching, navigating, displaying) of other card-image catalogues that "their" CIPACs do not offer (question 16). The results show again the limits of the respondents' awareness, as only 19% answered "yes" (Figure 4-21; Table C-33). The features actually mentioned in this
context included options for online book ordering (10), for searching or browsing (other data fields, indexes, keyword searching) (10), and navigational aspects (7).

![Graph showing awareness of additional features of other CIPACs](image)

**Fig. 4-21: Awareness of additional features of other CIPACs**

### 4.3.8 CIPACS and subject searching

In order to draw the respondents' attention to subject searching they were first asked whether "their" library's CIPAC(s) offers any options that support searching for topics rather than authors or titles (question 17).29

![Graph showing awareness of features for subject searching](image)

**Fig. 4-22: Awareness of features for subject searching**

Figure 4-22 shows that 40% of the respondents answered "yes", 15% "no", and 45% said they did not know – a somewhat ambiguous result as it cannot be validated easily.

---

29 As the only CIPAC offered by FUB is a subject headings catalogue, this question and the following one were not included in the questionnaire for that library's users.
For example, 10% of the "type C" users claimed that their CIPACS had such options (which is not correct), and only 55% of the "type A" users answered "yes" (Table C-34), although the CIPACS of ONB, UBW and WUW include subject catalogues (which was mentioned explicitly at the beginning of the respective questionnaires). The result, therefore, seems to indicate that many CIPAC users are not really aware of the search options that their catalogues actually offer.

By means of the same question those who answered "yes" (N=122) were asked to name the features for subject searching available on their CIPACS. The results in Figure 4-23 show that most respondents chose "a subject headings catalogue" (82%, in many cases correct), whereas the other options – mostly not being features of the CIPACS under discussion – were nominated only by small proportions of the respondents. The sub-group results show a great amount of variation – e.g. 97% of the "type A" group mentioned the subject headings catalogue (correct!) –, but most of these data are based on rather small numbers of respondents (Table C-35).

![Fig. 4-23: Perceived features for subject searching](image)

The same pre-filtered group of respondents (N=122) was subsequently asked about the frequency of their subject searches on CIPACS, again with "the last semester" as the period of reference (question 18). As shown in Figure 4-24, almost half of the respondents said that they had undertaken frequent subject searches (20% "very frequently, 25% "often"). Another 26% searched occasionally for topics, whereas only a minority reported rare or no subject searches at all. This seems to indicate that if CIPAC users are aware of options for subject searching they are rather inclined to make frequent use of such features. The sub-group results, although based again on only small numbers of respondents, suggest that a high level of CIPAC expertise increases the likelihood of conducting subject searches (36% "very frequently; see Table C-36).
The respondents\textsuperscript{30} were also asked to comment on positive and/or negative experiences with subject searching on CIPACS (question 19). However, from this open-ended question (which also covered various catalogues) no detailed discussion could be expected. Therefore, a high percentage of non-response was no surprise: 77\% mentioned no positive and 60\% no negative experiences (Tables C-37, C-38). The following tables (Table 4-5, Table 4-6) give an overview of the positive and negative aspects mentioned by the respondents. Obviously, a number of aspects not primarily relevant for subject searching were also mentioned in this context. However, there is at least some indication for a lack of orientation when searching for subjects on CIPACS – not enough information about the system of subject headings, uncertainty about the degree of recall when conducting a subject search, doubts about the quality of the subject headings. A further investigation of this issue would certainly require personal qualitative interviews with selected users of specific CIPAC systems.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline
Frequency & Percent \\
\hline
fast, efficient, straightforward & 11 8\% \\
unexpected hits (serendipity) & 9 7\% \\
general advantages of CIPACs & 6 4\% \\
various advant. of universal access via www & 5 4\% \\
other & 3 2\% \\
no answer & 105 77\% \\
Total & 137 100\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Positive experiences with subject searching}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{30} The same pre-filtered group as before, plus the respondents from FUB (N=137).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inadequate subject headings</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of orientation (subj. headings, recall)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cards / call nos. illegible, half-empty cards</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arduous, time-consuming navigation</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only limited search options</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incomplete coverage of catalogue</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system too slow</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-6: Negative experiences with subject searching

4.3.9 CIPACs and circulation/loan

Some of the CIPACs covered by the user survey offer an option for online book ordering, e.g. a form where users can enter the call number, their user ID and other data, whereas other CIPACs do not have any such features implemented. Therefore, a detailed discussion of these functionalities would require a CIPAC-specific study, so that in the context of the present survey which covered eleven card-image catalogues only a few general aspects could be touched. First, the respondents31 were asked if "their" CIPAC had any sort of interface to the respective library's circulation or loan system (question 20); the results are shown in Figure 4-25.

![Fig. 4-25: Awareness of interface to circulation/loan system](image)

38% of the respondents answered "yes" and 17% "no", but a large proportion (45%) said they did not know or gave no answer at all. It is not possible to validate the correctness of the yes/no-answers, but this doesn not really matter. The fact that counts is that a large proportion of CIPAC users are seemingly not aware whether their system

---

31 All respondents except those from ZLB where no circulation system was operated (N=317).
offers any such features or not. The degree of awareness varies noticeably with the level of CIPAC expertise ("high": 27% "don't know", "low": 78%) and with the CIPAC type, as users of "type B" CIPACs seem to be more knowledgeable than users of "type C" CIPACs (35% "don't know" v. 66%; see Table C-39).

The respondents who answered "yes" (N=121) were also asked to name the kind of interface their CIPAC would offer. The vast majority (71%) selected "a form for ordering books from the stacks and/or making reservations", which is indeed the most common way in which CIPACs link to circulation. The general category, "a link to the library's automated circulation system", was nominated in 27%, whereas only 7% believed that "a display of loan information (books in/out, overdues, fees, etc.) was offered. 9% mentioned "other" options, e.g. the transfer of call numbers from the CIPAC into the "normal" OPAC (Table C-40).

The same respondents were asked how often they had used these features in the last semester (question 21). The results in Figure 4-26 resemble those reported in the previous section on subject searching – if CIPAC users are aware of circulation features they tend to make frequent use of these features. About half of the respondents said they had used these features frequently (23% "very frequently" and 25% "often"), and another relatively large proportion used them occasionally (30%). Less than a quarter of the respondents used the circulation features rarely or not at all (both 11%). The sub-group results show a higher frequency of use for "type A" CIPAC users (32% "very frequently") and for respondents scoring "high" on the "index of CIPAC expertise" (44%), but they are again based upon only small sub-group numbers (Table C-41).

![Fig. 4-26: Frequency of use of features for circulation/loan](image-url)
The same respondents were further asked how they rated these features for circulation (loan) in terms of ease and convenience of use (question 22).

![Fig. 4-27: Rating of features for circulation/loan](image)

The results in Figure 4-27 show that the majority of the respondents were not complaining about the features offered although a very large proportion chose "somewhat adequate" (53%) rather than "very adequate" (23%), which means that many users were not totally happy with the circulation interface of their CIPACs. On the other hand, "only slightly adequate" was selected by only 17% and just 2% opted for condemnation ("not adequate at all"). However, the verbal comments to this question that were written down by a number respondents do not show much more than a diffuse criticism of the respective systems as being cumbersome or clumsy. The sub-group results indicate that the users with a higher level of CIPAC expertise rated the circulation features much better than those with a lower level (Table C-42).

![Fig. 4-28: Perceived importance of features for circ./loan](image)

Finally, all respondents were asked if they thought that it was important for a card-image catalogue to have features for circulation/loan like those mentioned before (ques-
tion 23). This had actually been a real question uttered by one of the participating libraries where the management was hesitant to start operating such features. The results in Figure 4-28 show that the answer is quite clear, because the vast majority of the respondents (74%) stated that such features were important. This opinion varies both with the "index of CIPAC expertise" ("high": 83% "yes", "low": 65%) and the subject areas (humanities: 81%), but not with the "type of CIPAC" user groups (Table C-43).

### 4.3.10 General/emotional evaluation of the CIPAC approach

The final CIPAC-related question (no. 24) comprised five more or less emotional statements on the respondents' local card-image catalogues which they had to rate on a five-point scale (from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree", with "neutral" as the midpoint). During data analysis, weights from 1 to 5 were assigned to these categories in order to compute for each statement the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation.32

![Fig. 4-29: Emotional rating of "this library's" CIPAC(s)](image)

As shown in Figure 4-29, the resulting values indicate that many users are rather unhappy with their CIPACs. Although the respondents did not agree with the two negative statements ("this system is rather old-fashioned", "this system should be replaced by something else") they did not really reject them either. Furthermore, none of the positive statements was really accepted (all means are between two and three on the scale); the relatively best rating was given to "this system is convenient to use", the worst to "I am totally happy with this system". As Table C-44 indicates, there was generally a certain degree of disagreement between the respondents; this variation is also expressed by

---

32 This computation was made on the basis of the number of respondents who actually rated the respective item (hence the differing Ns per item).
standard deviation values between 1.02 and 1.33. The highest degree of disagreement occurred for the statement "this system should be replaced by something else" – could this mean that some respondents feared that the replacement system could be even worse?

The sub-group results (Table C-44) show some interesting findings. First of all, the breaks show that the "type A" CIPACs received the least favourable ratings, especially in comparison with "type B". Obviously, they are the ones that users would like to see replaced by something else ("type A": ζ=2.56, "B": 3.27, "C": 3.14). Second, there is only a mild correlation between the level of CIPAC expertise and these emotional ratings. And third, librarians rated CIPACs on all five statements more favourable than the other user categories!

The last question in the questionnaire was an open-ended one, offering space for any additional comments that the respondents might wish to make. Some of these comments had nothing to do with CIPACs (but with other library services, opening hours, loan regulations etc.), others dealt with technical or network problems, quite a few were appeals to the participating libraries (mainly the ONB) for retaining the old card cabinets. Other respondents commented on the present questionnaire (both praising and criticizing it), and some others just repeated aspects of previous questions. However, there were also a number of more or less emotional comments which are worthwhile quoting here in order to round off the above picture. A few examples follow:

- *I am very grateful for this catalogue but it should be converted to Aleph 500 soon (ONB)*
- *Ordering from home is phantastic! Each time I gain a full day which I had to spend in the catalogue room otherwise. (ONB)*
- *Many thanks for the invaluable option of using the catalogues from home or office! (ONB)*
- *It gets on my nerves to be forced to use such medieval techniques in the 21st century and in a capital city! (UBW)*
- *Both catalogues are prehistoric, a drollery, a less-than-ideal-solution (UBW)*
- *These TIFF-catalogues are just better than nothing (UBW)*
- *It is nice that this catalogue is online available even if the system is old-fashioned and leaves many wishes open (IHS)*
- *One can't expect cow's milk from a goat! (FUB)*
- *A stopgap measure, a makeshift (UBH)*
- *A good interim solution but not more (ULB)*
- *It is real progress compared to the former need to search on-site! (SUB)*
- *This image-catalogue is better than nothing, at least it makes it possible to access the old catalogue from home and independent of the library's opening hours (SUB)*

---

33 Author's translation.