

## Resistance to Online Catalogs: A Comparative Study at Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore Colleges

Carol Walton, Susan Williamson, and Howard D. White

*Surveys of student and faculty attitudes toward proposed online public access catalogs were conducted in 1984 with largely identical questionnaires at two colleges. Support for the traditional card catalog was strong among both students and faculty at both colleges; only Swarthmore faculty gave majority support to the online catalog. A minority of perhaps one in six may never use the new technology. Resistance to change was proportionately highest in the humanities and lowest in the sciences, with the social sciences in between. Respondents were unused to waiting for access to the card catalog and seemed unlikely to tolerate more than brief waits for the online catalog. While unconcerned about keeping online searches private, they did not like the idea of searching as others waited. Perceptions of the online catalog were sometimes positive; many welcomed the idea of terminals in faculty offices and student dormitories. Differences between the two colleges, while not great, may result from Swarthmore's greater experience with campuswide computing.*

**T**HE LIBRARIANS OF THREE WELL-KNOWN LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES in the Philadelphia suburbs, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore, are jointly investigating the possibility of converting from traditional card catalogs to one online public access catalog (OPAC). Academic librarians now recognize the potential for improved access to collections provided by online catalogs—for example, the ability to search simultaneously on multiple fields, such as subject, date, and language of publication. However, despite the obvious benefits, the prospect of an online catalog can be daunting, in that questions persist about system reliability, number of terminals needed for adequate levels of service, and user reactions.

Given that an online catalog is viewed by library planners as a solution to a variety of problems, what remains is to reduce some of the unknowns about OPACs. While system reliability and demand for terminals are important considerations, the survey reported here is concerned with user attitudes. No system, however sophisticated, will be adequate if its intended users reject it out of hand or if they cannot use it to get desired information.

Although many of the studies of online catalog users report a high degree of satisfaction,<sup>1-11</sup> only a few studies have surveyed the nonuser

---

Carol Walton, now Assistant Professor (Processing) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries, was a member of the Bryn Mawr Library staff at the time this study was conducted. Susan G. Williamson is Social Sciences Librarian, Swarthmore College Library; and Howard D. White is Associate Professor, College of Information Studies, Drexel University.

group to identify sources of resistance to using an OPAC. Reasons for nonuse are usually a lack of instruction or a lack of time to learn the new system.<sup>12,13</sup> In a study at California State University at Chico, some "16 percent of the nonusers considered the computer catalog harder to use than the card catalog."<sup>14</sup> The identical statistic was found for nonusers in the Council of Library Resources (CLR) study.<sup>15</sup> At Ohio State University, Pease and Gouke identified a group of patrons who tried the online catalog and then returned to the card catalog because they felt a lack of confidence in their searching ability on the online system.<sup>16</sup>

None of these studies attempted, as this one does, to survey the market prior to installation of an online catalog, so as to identify both potential "resistants" and potential "receptives" to the new technology. Yet the results of interviews with library staff reported in the CLR study suggest that no library can afford to make such a major transition without first seeking to understand its clientele, particularly their misgivings. In one study, staff claimed that "users have more apprehensions about public online catalogs and request more assistance than the survey data may suggest."<sup>17</sup>

These apprehensions are a main concern in this paper. Legitimate or not, they must be taken into account in the planning and design phases if a new OPAC system is to be successful. However, we also report *positive* visions of change—views favorable to OPACs—from patrons who as yet know little about the new technology. Both negative and positive opinions, we think, are worth perusing by all library planners on whom the burden of implementing OPAC technology rests.

### HYPOTHESES

With the above considerations in mind, a survey was designed by Walton and Williamson to gather information on user reactions to proposed OPACs at Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore Colleges. Swarthmore College has an enrollment of 1,350 students and its library contains some 600,000 volumes. Bryn Mawr College has an undergraduate enrollment of approximately 1,000 and a graduate enrollment of some 800 students. The library holds approximately 750,000 volumes. Library management at Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore colleges recommended this study, which was conducted and coordinated as independent study projects at the College of Information Studies at Drexel.

Questionnaires bearing largely identical questions were administered at Bryn Mawr and at Swarthmore in late spring of 1984, under the auspices of the Tri-College Library Automation Committee at Bryn Mawr, Swarthmore, and Haverford (see appendix A). The questions were intended to bear on the following hypotheses:

1. Users are basically satisfied with the existing card catalog system.
2. Most people would be receptive to using a computerized catalog, particularly if it provided more information. Greatest resistance is expected from the faculty.
3. Users are not accustomed to waiting to access the library's collection through the card catalog and would not react well to having to wait to use a computerized catalog.
4. Important concerns for users of an online catalog are that searching be (a) private and (b) unpressured.

5. Users would welcome remote access to the library's collections from additional locations on campus and would be willing to wait longer for such access just for the added convenience.

### METHODOLOGY

An attempt was made to obtain representative samples of the campus communities, including faculty, students, and staff. Staff data were later omitted because of the small number of respondents. At Bryn Mawr, samples were taken at the main library (Canaday) and at the five branch libraries. In addition, approximately 100 questionnaires were distributed to faculty, graduate, and undergraduate mailboxes. A total of 236 were completed—189 by students and 47 by faculty. These returns represent 11 percent of the student body and 25 percent of the faculty.

The method of data collection at Swarthmore differed somewhat. Student responses were gathered by handing out questionnaires in classes, with the prearranged permission of individual faculty members. Large classes across a range of disciplines were chosen to reach a broad cross section of the student body. Faculty members received and sent back their questionnaires by college mail. Some 273 student questionnaires and 97 faculty questionnaires were completed—a total of 370. These figures represent 21 percent of the student body and 41 percent of the faculty.

The data gathering instrument was a self-administered questionnaire. In February 1984 a trial questionnaire was administered to 25 people at Bryn Mawr. Some flaws in the instrument became apparent, and it was subsequently revised. The questions were designed to avoid technical jargon and personal bias. All but one of the questions were forced choice and closed ended. The final draft was pretested on several students and after a few minor adjustments was administered during April and May 1984 at both colleges.\*

Limiting respondents to only one answer sometimes caused discomfort. Fortunately, the questions people found hard to answer with only one choice were evenly distributed throughout the questionnaire, and no single question had to be discarded because of too few responses.

After being keypunched, the data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences in version SPSS<sup>X</sup>. Missing values were not figured into the percentages for each question, so that the total N in some of our tables varies slightly.

### RESULTS

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Respondents were asked to classify themselves in terms of their status at Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore. The breakdown of responses appears in table 1. Table 2 shows the breakdown of respondents by their general

\*For those who have discovered that people are not sufficiently motivated to fill out library questionnaires, we offer this suggestion: *use an incentive*. The incentive for participating in this study at Swarthmore was a drawing for prizes—two \$10 gift certificates, one from a local cheese shop and the other from a local ice cream parlor. Both faculty members and students seemed pleased by this opportunity and gladly filled out both the questionnaire and a slip for the drawing.

fields of study. There is an overall similarity in the samples from both colleges, both in terms of status and fields of study. More faculty members are represented in the Swarthmore sample, but this is the only major difference between the two.

#### DATA ANALYSIS

Hypothesis 1. *Users are basically satisfied with the existing card catalog system.*

Respondents were asked to generalize about their rate of success in locating information with the card catalog. Table 3 shows the results, with 84 percent at Bryn Mawr and 88 percent at Swarthmore indicating successful catalog use more than half the time. Queried further about catalog effectiveness, 80 percent at Bryn Mawr and 63 percent at Swarthmore said that when they were unable to locate materials, the

TABLE 1

RESPONDENTS BY STATUS

Category	Bryn Mawr	Swarthmore
	N = 236	N = 370
Student	80%	74%
Faculty	20%	26%

TABLE 2  
RESPONDENTS BY FIELD  
OF STUDY

Field	Bryn Mawr	Swarthmore
	N = 236	N = 370
Humanities	45%	39%
Social sciences	24%	27%
Natural sciences	29%	28%
Other	2%	6%

fault did not lie with the catalog itself. Rather, they believed, as table 4 shows, that the catalog merely reflected lack of materials in the collection. A sizable proportion at both schools attributed their lack of success to their own uncertainty about alternative ways to search. (Patrons at Swarthmore appear to be either less confident or more honest in this regard.)

These results generally support the hypothesis of satisfaction with the card catalog as a means of locating information. It is an established technology that users understand reasonably well. The strongest pressure for change to OPACs is coming not from users, but from library management.

Hypothesis 2. *Most people would be receptive to using a computerized catalog, particularly if it provided more information. Greatest resistance is expected from the faculty.*

The assumption here is that people do not have an aversion to computers per se. However, when asked to choose between a card catalog and a computerized catalog, both containing identical information, 56 percent from Bryn Mawr and 49 percent from Swarthmore expressed a preference for the card catalog (see table 5).

When the results in table 5 are broken down by respondent status (table 6), we see the expected "traditionalism" of faculty. Fully two-thirds of the Bryn Mawr faculty chose the card catalog over its online counterpart. The comparable figure for Swarthmore faculty is 44 percent—a minority, but a large one. Swarthmore faculty may be relatively more

open to computerization than Bryn Mawr's because of more experience using a campuswide mainframe computer system.

Note, however, that the students at both schools have large "traditional" elements; it is not the case that youth is solidly in favor of technological change. Half of the students at Swarthmore and 53 percent of those at Bryn Mawr choose the traditional card catalog over the OPAC. In fact, the only majority the computer catalog gets is from the Swarthmore faculty, and the result there is not overwhelming.

TABLE 3  
SUCCESS WITH CARD CATALOG

Success Rate	Bryn Mawr		Swarthmore	
	N = 233	N = 358		
Seldom find information	2%		2%	
Less than half the time	14%		10%	
More than half the time	59%		62%	
Almost always find information	25%		26%	

TABLE 4  
PERCEIVED REASON FOR LACK OF CATALOG SUCCESS

Reason for Failure	Bryn Mawr		Swarthmore	
	N = 220	N = 344		
Library lacks materials	80%		63%	
Uncertain how to search	13%		31%	
Confused filing arrangement	3%		3%	
Other	4%		3%	

TABLE 5  
CHOICE OF CATALOG

System Preferred	Bryn Mawr		Swarthmore	
	N = 223	N = 333		
Card catalog	56%		49%	
Computer catalog	44%		51%	

Student feelings can be gauged from such remarks as the following. At Bryn Mawr an undergraduate wrote, "The serendipity of a card catalog is lost with computerization. I would be at a tremendous loss if the card catalog were removed." Another student preferred the card catalog "because I'd probably take forever unless I knew exactly what I was doing." Even those who opted for the computerized catalog expressed concern, such as one who warned, "We'd have to wait for terminals much longer than for drawers. It's not worth it." Or another who said, "I don't want *just* a computer catalog—as an auxiliary it would be nice, though." Yet another suggested an alternative: "What would be nice would be a [card] catalog on each floor."

TABLE 6  
CHOICE OF CATALOG BY STATUS OF RESPONDENT

System Preferred	Bryn Mawr		Swarthmore	
	Students	Faculty	Students	Faculty
	N = 180	N = 43	N = 256	N = 77
Card catalog	53%	67%	50%	44%
Computer catalog	47%	33%	50%	56%

At Swarthmore feelings about the two options also ran high. Several students wrote in "very strong preference" when checking an option. Several noted that the card catalog was always available, while computer terminals would not be. A student who had done research with an online catalog said, "Overall, the flexibility of the computer is limited and frustrating at times, not to mention frustration at lack of terminals. Yeck!" Ambivalence was common: "This idea of computerization is a good one," a student wrote, "but making it the *sole* source of sources is the height of stupidity."

One interesting question was asked only in the Bryn Mawr version of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to choose between a traditional card catalog and an online catalog that would provide information in greater depth. Some objected to this question as "too leading." Even so, 17 percent of the respondents overall still chose the card catalog. Note that this figure is similar to the 16 percent of nonusers in two precedent studies<sup>18</sup> and may represent the irreducible core of computerphobes. In the breakdown by status, 12 percent of the students and 30 percent of the faculty would be reluctant to give up the card catalog for the online intruder.

These results do not offer strong support to the main hypothesis—that people are generally receptive to an online catalog when first proposed. They confirm, moreover, our expectations of substantial faculty resistance. Some respondents, of course, refused to answer the questions, pleading too little knowledge to make an informed choice. But we were surprised by the amount of resistance from the students, who by now have been exposed to other computer systems and appear to have accepted them.

In our hypotheses we did not conjecture whether respondents would differ by field of study in their acceptance of OPACs. However, as noted in table 2, we could place all respondents broadly in the humanities, social sciences, or natural sciences, and the cross tabulations are suggestive. As one would expect, allegiance to the traditional card catalog is highest in the humanities and next highest in the social sciences (with proportionately more "traditionalists" in both at Bryn Mawr). In fact, table 7 shows clear majorities for the computer catalog only in the natural sciences at both schools. (It will be recalled that, at Bryn Mawr, 17 percent of *all* respondents preferred the card catalog to an OPAC even when the latter was presented as richer in information. Within fields,

TABLE 7  
CHOICE OF CATALOG BY FIELD OF RESPONDENT

	Bryn Mawr			Swarthmore		
	Humanities	Social Sciences	Sciences	Humanities	Social Sciences	Sciences
System Preferred	N = 103	N = 52	N = 65	N = 129	N = 91	N = 95
Card catalog	62%	61%	42%	54%	50%	41%
Computer catalog	38%	39%	57%	46%	50%	59%

those with this preference were sciences, 6 percent; social sciences, 18 percent; and humanities, 23 percent).

Hypothesis 3. *Users (a) are not accustomed to waiting to access the collection through the card catalog, and (b) would not react well to having to wait to use a computerized catalog.*

The first part of the hypothesis was tested by asking respondents about their experiences waiting to use a drawer of the card catalog. At Bryn Mawr 73 percent and at Swarthmore 77 percent stated that they had never had to wait to use the card catalog. That so many people expect "instant access" must be taken into account in orienting the community to an online system, so as to avoid false expectations of what the system can provide.

To test the second part of the hypothesis, users were asked how long they would wait to use a drawer of the card catalog, as opposed to a computer terminal. Tables 8 and 9 provide their respective answers. The percentage of users "unwilling to wait at all" or "to wait more than a minute" is considerable—about half the sample at both schools. (Student or faculty status does not matter.) Moreover, respondents at various levels of impatience are roughly the same for both the card and the online catalogs. We would infer from this that patience is not going to be more in evidence if online catalogs are installed. Serious efforts must be made to provide enough terminals to satisfy the demand for quick access.

Related to the issue of waiting is whether patrons are willing to interrupt someone else's extended search at a terminal if they need to do a quick search. At Bryn Mawr only 27 percent said they would be willing to interrupt. The reluctance of the rest—a large majority—could lead to frustration as they wait for access.

TABLE 8  
RESPONDENTS' WILLINGNESS TO WAIT FOR CARD CATALOG DRAWER

	Bryn Mawr	Swarthmore
Length of Time	N = 228	N = 362
Wouldn't wait at all or would return later	36%	24%
Wait about one minute	19%	26%
Wait 2-5 minutes	29%	35%
Wait 5-10 minutes	12%	9%
Wait as long as necessary	4%	5%

TABLE 9  
RESPONDENTS' WILLINGNESS TO WAIT FOR ONLINE CATALOG

	Bryn Mawr	Swarthmore
Length of Time	N = 230	N = 355
Wouldn't wait at all or would return later	27%	28%
Wait about one minute	22%	24%
Wait 2-5 minutes	33%	29%
Wait 5-10 minutes	14%	15%
Wait as long as necessary	4%	4%

At Swarthmore, interestingly enough, 51 percent said they would be willing to interrupt a terminal user. The presence of a large Prime computer network at Swarthmore has introduced students and faculty to competition for terminals as limited resources. This in turn may have induced a greater willingness to interrupt someone's ongoing work, rather as happens now at copying machines in many places.

Our data clearly support the hypothesis that users are not accustomed to waiting to access their library's collection. While willingness to wait varies, it also seems clear that large (sometimes majority) groups of users will not use an online catalog if they have to wait for it very long.

Hypothesis 4. *An important concern for users of an online catalog is that searching be (a) private and (b) unpressured.*

People were asked to state whether they would feel uncomfortable if someone could see what they were searching on the computer terminal. Apparently refuting the hypothesis, 83 percent at Bryn Mawr and 81 percent at Swarthmore said they would not feel uncomfortable. (Cross tabulating by status and by field of study provided no additional insights.) Some of this unconcern may be due to inexperience with online catalogs and may change when innocence is lost. Other studies indicate that privacy is an important concern to OPAC users.<sup>19</sup>

Less surprising is that 86 percent at Bryn Mawr said they would feel pressured to hurry their searches if someone were standing behind them to use the terminal. (This question was not asked at Swarthmore). Clearly, library planners should take such concerns into account when planning the number and location of terminals. A system that prevents people from completing their searches because of excessive queuing will generate annoyance and ill will. (In this, OPAC terminals are like automatic teller machines at banks.)

Hypothesis 5. *Users would welcome remote access to the library's collection from additional locations on campus and would be willing to wait longer for the added convenience of such access.*

Users were asked, "If the library's catalog were accessible through terminals all over campus, where would you prefer to look up information?" Table 10 indicates how students and faculty responded. Modally, at both Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore, students want terminals to be located in the library. However, at least a third in both schools welcome the idea of terminals in their dorms: "This I like a lot," or "That would be marvelous," or "A great idea." Faculty overwhelmingly opt for terminals in their offices. Many of the faculty at Swarthmore now have office terminals connected to a Prime computer; this experience has been positive, and probably explains why 81 percent are keen for remote access to the library holdings.

Table 11 shows willingness to wait, by status, for remote access through an OPAC. At both schools, the modal group among students and faculty would wait two to five minutes. Again, however, an interesting difference in *impatience* appears. Combining categories of those who would not wait at all or would wait only up to a minute, one sees a greater proportion of impatient students at Swarthmore than Bryn Mawr (28 percent versus 22 percent). The same holds for Swarthmore faculty, but more so (46 percent versus 33 percent). We again attribute this to the



TABLE 10  
CHOICE OF LOCATION FOR OPAC TERMINALS BY STATUS

Location	Bryn Mawr		Swarthmore	
	Students N = 181	Faculty N = 46	Students N = 268	Faculty N = 96
Library	57%	37%	60%	18%
Computer center	1%	0	3%	1%
Dormitories	33%	0	37%	0%
Faculty offices	1%	63%	0	81%
Branch libraries*	8%	0	0	0

\*Bryn Mawr option only.

TABLE 11  
WILLINGNESS TO WAIT FOR REMOTE ACCESS BY STATUS OF RESPONDENT

Length of Time	Bryn Mawr		Swarthmore	
	Students N = 182	Faculty N = 45	Students N = 265	Faculty N = 93
Wouldn't wait or would return	13%	13%	15%	26%
Wait one minute	9%	20%	13%	20%
Wait 2-5 minutes	45%	29%	38%	33%
Wait 5-10 minutes	18%	16%	24%	11%
Wait as long as necessary	15%	22%	11%	10%

greater experience with campuswide computing at Swarthmore.

It appears that if OPACs are to be installed among persons already acquainted with widespread terminal use and with typical waiting times, the percentage of those unwilling to wait long will be higher.

### CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this survey, while not startling, underscore the problems of winning acceptance for an online catalog. Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore patrons seem fairly content with the status quo and are therefore hesitant to try something new. Many are concerned that a change to an online catalog will disrupt their ability to find the information they require. Existing online catalogs have in some cases received negative publicity because of excessive downtime, queuing, or perceived difficulty. As one faculty member wrote, "A card catalog never breaks down. The . . . university library computer catalog was broken so often during my daughter's four years there that the library simply closed it down." Such concerns must be taken into account by planning committees as they make their choices.

Our respondents are not accustomed to waiting to access the collection, and few expressed willingness to wait any considerable length of time, regardless of whether the catalog is in card form or online. There must be sufficient terminals to ensure that users have access to holdings within five minutes or the majority will be dissatisfied.

The card catalog apparently is popular because of its constant availability and the immediacy of access it provides. An unpublished

Swarthmore study reveals that people use the card catalog when they have to—for an assignment, exam, or lecture. Much of this use is unpredictable as to period of day, and there is no reason to assume that online catalog use will fit into more predictable patterns. Users are understandably concerned about having any types of limitations placed on their catalog search behavior. As one student put it, “Specifying hours of use would be very limiting.”

The survey also clearly pointed out many people’s resistance to learning something new. The greatest vote of confidence the OPAC received was only 56 percent (Swarthmore faculty). Students at neither school gave it a majority, and fully two out of three Bryn Mawr faculty were skeptical. People in the humanities appear to be most likely to prefer the traditional card catalog, at least when the OPAC is still merely an idea. Perhaps one person in six will *always* prefer the card catalog to an OPAC. If libraries are going to switch, the staff must be prepared to launch a vigorous educational campaign—one that goes beyond sticking directions on the terminal—or else be resigned to a system that will lose many of the more timid or computer-hostile users.

Instruction will be necessary, furthermore, because of the nuances of the new system. Pease and Gouke found that, although most patrons came to prefer the online catalog, they were often unable to make full use of its retrieval power, compared to a skilled searcher.<sup>20</sup> Problem searches will require additional instruction or direct help.

Library planners must also anticipate users’ feelings. While our respondents did not appear concerned with someone’s being able to see what they were working on, the great majority were sensitive to the implicit pressures of others waiting to use the same equipment.

The library must be prepared to offer users some substantial improvement over a manual catalog. Given a choice between two databases, one manual and one computerized, close to half of our respondents chose the former, as we have seen. Yet if the online catalog contained additional information or if users could access it from the convenience of their offices or dorms, many would welcome the change.

The experience of libraries that have switched is that users’ expectations are raised considerably; they are no longer content with the same information that was accessible with a card catalog. They routinely want access to circulation data, to in-process files, and to areas of the collection poorly covered in card catalogs, such as periodicals and government documents.<sup>21</sup> Once users’ expectations are raised, they may not only want more, but with less delay in processing time. While an online catalog may seem a panacea to harried librarians, they will probably find that it creates an entirely new set of pressures. We would hope, however, that this paper identifies some of the problem areas, so that planners can begin efforts, through publicity and education, to forestall complaints and cultivate allies.

#### REFERENCES

1. Betsy Baker and Brian Nielsen, “Educating the Online Catalog User: Experiences and Plans at Northwestern University Library,” *Research Strategies* 1:155-66 (Fall 1983).

2. Hugo Chapa-Guzman and Marcella Stark. "Online Public Access Catalogs: Two Studies," *Reference Services Review* 11:19-49 (Winter 1983).
3. Charles R. Hildreth, *Online Public Access Catalogs: The User Interface*. (Dublin, Ohio: OCLC, 1982).
4. Neal K. Kaske and Nancy P. Sanders. *A Comprehensive Study of Online Public Access Catalogs: An Overview and Application of Findings*. Final Report to the Council on Library Resources, V.3. (Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Online Computer Library Center, 1983).
5. Karen Markey, *Online Catalog Use: Results of Surveys and Focus Group Interviews in Several Libraries*. Final Report to the Council on Library Resources, V.2. (Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Online Computer Library Center, 1983).
6. Joseph R. Matthews, *Public Access to Online Catalogs: A Planning Guide for Managers*. (Weston, Conn.: Online, Inc., 1982).
7. Joseph R. Matthews, Gary S. Lawrence, and Douglas K. Ferguson, *Using Online Catalogs: A Nationwide Survey*. (New York: Neal-Schuman, 1983).
8. Carole Weiss Moore, "User Reactions to Online Catalogs: An Exploratory Study." *College & Research Libraries* 42:295-302 (July 1981).
9. Sue Pease and Mary Noel Gouke, "Patterns of Use in an Online Catalog and a Card Catalog." *College & Research Libraries* 43:279-91 (July 1982).
10. Sarah M. Pritchard, *Scorpio: A Study of Public Users of the Library of Congress Information System*. (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1981).
11. William E. Post and Peter G. Watson, *Online Catalog: The Inside Story*. (Chico, Calif.: Ryan Research International, 1983).
12. Matthews, Lawrence, and Ferguson, *Using*, p.95.
13. Post and Watson, *Online*, p.137.
14. *Ibid.*
15. Matthews, Lawrence, and Ferguson, *Using*, p.98.
16. Pease and Gouke, "Patterns," p.285-86.
17. Davis B. McCarn, ed. *Online Catalogs: Requirements, Characteristics and Costs*. (Washington, D.C.: Council on Library Resources, 1983), p.74.
18. Matthews, Lawrence, and Ferguson, *Using*, p.95-99; Post and Watson, *Online*, p.137.
19. Kaske and Sanders, *A Comprehensive*, p.52; Matthews, *Public*, p.97.
20. Pease and Gouke, "Patterns," p.280.
21. Kaske and Sanders, *A Comprehensive*, p.51-52.

**APPENDIX A**  
**BRYN MAWR COLLEGE LIBRARY SURVEY\***

1. Category of respondent (please check one)
  - undergraduate student
  - graduate student
  - faculty
  - other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
2. How many courses are you taking this semester? specify number \_\_\_\_\_
  - not applicable
3. What is your general field of study? (please check one)
  - arts and humanities
  - social sciences
  - natural sciences and mathematics
  - other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
4. Which of the Bryn Mawr College Libraries do you use *most* often? (please check one)
  - Canaday
  - Psychology
  - Math/Physics

\*Editor's note: The questionnaire used for the Swarthmore College Library survey requested essentially the same information but was particularized for that institution. It has not been reproduced here because of space constraints.

- Chemistry/Geology  
 Biology  
 Art and Archaeology
5. If you checked Canaday or the Art and Archaeology Library for the above question, have you ever used any of the science libraries?  
 yes       no
6. If you checked Canaday or one of the science libraries for question number 4, have you ever used the Art and Archaeology Library?  
 yes       no
7. On the average for *this semester*, how often have you visited any of the Bryn Mawr College Libraries for any reason? (please check one)  
 never been to any BMC library this semester  
 less than once a month  
 once a month  
 a few times a month  
 once a week  
 about every other day  
 once a day or more
8. Do you *generally* visit the BMC Libraries: (please check one)  
 to have a quiet place to study,  
 to consult the library staff,  
 to use the card catalog,  
 to use the reference materials,  
 to use the reserve materials,  
 to use the Xerox machines, or  
 to socialize?  
 other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
9. Approximately how often *this semester* have you used the card catalog in any of the BMC Libraries? (please check one)  
 have never used  
 hardly ever  
 about every other week  
 once, maybe twice a week  
 more than twice a week
10. During the week, when do you prefer to use the card catalogs in the BMC Libraries? (please check one)  
 opening to 11 a.m.  
 11 a.m. to 2 p.m.  
 2 p.m. to 5 p.m.  
 5 p.m. to 8 p.m.  
 8 p.m. to closing  
 seldom use during the week
11. On the weekends, when do you prefer to use the card catalogs in the BMC Libraries? (please check one)  
 opening to noon on Saturday  
 Saturday noon to 5 p.m.  
 Saturday 5 p.m. to closing  
 opening to 5 p.m. on Sunday  
 Sunday 5 p.m. to closing  
 seldom use on the weekends
12. Do you use the card catalogs *more*: (please check one)  
 before the semester begins,  
 in the first month of the semester,  
 just before an exam or paper,  
 consistently throughout the semester, or  
 in the last month of the semester?
13. Do you think that you find what you're looking for in the card catalogs: (please check one)  
 seldom,  
 less than half the time,

- more often than not, or  
 almost always?
14. When you can't find what you want in the card catalogs, is it generally because:
- the library doesn't seem to have the materials you need,  
 you're not sure if there's another way to look up what you wanted, or  
 the arrangement of the cards in the catalog is confusing?  
 other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
15. When you're in the libraries, do you generally consult a library staff member:
- before you start to use the card catalog,  
 only if you haven't been able to find what you needed in the card catalog, or  
 to help clarify what you found in the catalog?  
 you never find it necessary to ask for assistance with the card catalog
16. Have you *ever* had to wait to use a specific drawer of the card catalog?
- yes                       no
17. Do you *often* have to wait to use a specific drawer of the card catalog?
- yes                       no
18. When you use the card catalog in any of the libraries, do you more often look for: (please check one)
- a specific title of a book or journal,  
 a particular person's name, or  
 a subject or topic, such as United States history?  
 no preference  
 other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
19. On the average for *this semester* how much *total* time have you spent each time that you consulted the card catalog in any of the BMC Libraries? (please check one)
- less than five minutes each time  
 5 to 10 minutes  
 10 to 20 minutes  
 over 20 minutes.
20. *Excluding* times when you must use a specific drawer of the card catalog as soon as possible, how long would you be willing to wait for a drawer before you felt inconvenienced? (please check one)
- wouldn't wait around at all  
 about a minute  
 2 to 5 minutes  
 5 to 10 minutes  
 as long as it took  
 would come back later
21. Have you ever used the OCLC terminal that sits in the area by the phone directories in Canaday Library?
- yes                       no\*

\*If you answered "No" to the above question, please proceed to question 25

22. When you used the OCLC terminal, did you:
- teach yourself from the instructions next to the terminal,  
 read the instructions and then ask someone to help you begin,  
 ask someone to show you how to use it without having read the instructions, or  
 ask for help only if the terminal didn't respond as you expected?
23. Have you ever asked someone to explain something that you found on the terminal?
- yes                       no
24. Have you ever had to wait to use the OCLC terminal?
- yes                       no
25. As far as you're aware, the OCLC system contains: (please check one)
- information about all the books that Bryn Mawr owns  
 information about some of the books that Bryn Mawr owns  
 information about some books that Bryn Mawr owns and some books that other libraries own  
 listings of books by subject  
 no idea what it contains

26. If you've never used the OCLC terminal in Canada, is it because: (please check one)
- you haven't felt it was necessary for what you wanted,
  - you aren't sure what information is available from it,
  - you would rather not use a computer terminal,
  - you didn't know it was available for general use,
  - you weren't sure how to begin,
  - you never heard of it before, or
  - you seldom visit Canada Library for any reason?
  - not applicable
27. If you were able to get the information you can currently get from the card catalogs *only* from a computer terminal, how long would you be willing to wait to use it before you felt inconvenienced? (please check one)
- wouldn't wait around at all
  - about a minute
  - 2 to 5 minutes
  - 5 to 10 minutes
  - as long as it took
  - would come back later
28. If you were given a choice between two systems that contained *identical* information, would you rather use:
- a card catalog, or
  - a computerized catalog?
29. If someone were using a drawer of the card catalog for an extended period of time and you needed to check one item in that drawer very quickly, would you feel comfortable asking to interrupt that person's search for one brief moment?
- yes                       no
30. If someone were conducting an extended search with a computerized catalog and you needed to check one citation very quickly, would you feel comfortable asking to interrupt that person's search for one brief moment?
- yes                       no
31. If you were given a choice between a card catalog and a computerized catalog that provided broader access to the same information (ability to limit searches by language, year, etc., of publication) and provided more types of information (whether book was on order, checked out, etc.), would you rather use:
- a card catalog, or
  - a computerized catalog?
32. Would you feel you had to hurry if someone were standing behind you waiting to use a computer terminal?
- yes                       no
33. Would you feel uncomfortable if someone could see what you were searching on a computer terminal?
- yes                       no
34. If the library's catalog were accessible through terminals all over campus, where would you prefer to look up information? (please check one)
- in the library
  - in the computer center
  - in the dormitories
  - in faculty offices
  - other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
35. If it were possible to dial up the catalog from outside the library but it took more time to get a response than it would in the library building itself, how long would you be willing to wait for a response?
- wouldn't wait around at all
  - about a minute
  - 2 to 5 minutes
  - 5 to 10 minutes
  - as long as it took
  - would come back later