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Abstract

In February 2013, the ULg Library launched a new portal where the new library website and Primo were closely integrated. Three months before the official launch to the public, Primo FE was shown to library colleagues to get the first professional feedback. Several training sessions were organized for the library staff to focus on the differences between discovery tools and traditional opacs and to explain how our Primo would function (local data vs PCI, pipe process, normalization rules, deduplication, FRBRization...). Then, a survey was organized among the library staff to get their feelings and perceptions about discovery tools in general, and the impacts that such tools have, according to them on the users' habits and searches. Our presentation will explain how our library colleagues (directors, service heads, cataloguers, trainers, circulation staff, e-librarians, secretaries...) felt apprehensive and/or enthusiastic about switching to a discovery tool in general (not specifically Primo).
University of Liege (ULg) Library

- **5 main libraries:**
  - Arts & Humanities Library
  - Agronomy Library
  - Law & Social Sciences Library
  - Life Sciences Library
  - Science & Technology Library

- **4 campuses:**
  - Liège Sart-Tilman (main campus)
  - Liège City centre
  - Gembloux
  - Arlon

- **Staff:** about 115 people (ca 82 FTE)
Migrating to Primo: context

- Project started in March-April 2012

- Data
  - Local data (Jan 2013)
    - **Aleph**: 1,200,000 bib records
    - **SFX**: 55,000 serials and 66,500 ebooks
    - **ORBi**: institutional repository ([http://orbi.ulg.ac.be](http://orbi.ulg.ac.be))
      - 91,000 archived references (55,500 with a full text)
  - **Primo Central Index**

- **Two-phased launch:**
  - **Internal launch** end of November 2012:
    - Only for librarians
    - To get used with Primo before the public launch
  - **Official public launch** on 20 February 2013: Life with Primo v4.1
Training sessions

• Training sessions given to library staff:
  • Dec 2012 - Jan 2013: 10 sessions for max 10-12 people
  • Feb 2013: 1 global session with additional Q&A time
    • Kind of “everything you ever wanted to know about Primo at ULg”
    • About 60 participants
  • Audience: anyone working at ULg Library:
    • Librarians
    • Directors, heads of section, managers
    • Secretaries, accountants, computer specialists...
  • Content:
    • General aspects regarding discovery tools (trends, evolution, advantages...)
    • Technical aspects: how Primo works (local data vs PCI, normalization rules, FRBR, Pnx structure...)
Survey

• About
  • Librarians’ **feelings** and **perceptions** about discovery tools in general
    • Not about our Primo at ULg!
    • Even if it was difficult to avoid in the survey
    • What **impacts** do such tools have on end-users’ habits and searches?

• How
  • 22 statements on discovery tools
    • Some of them inspired by:
        ([http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19322909.2012.651417](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19322909.2012.651417))
  • **7 questions on the profile of respondents (functions, degrees, experience...)**
  • With SurveyMonkey
  • Sent by the Primo Team to the whole Library staff

• When
  • Organized between the training sessions and the official public launch:
    • **After** colleagues have had some experience (but not too much)
    • **Before** colleagues have had contacts and exchanges with end-users.
Respondents

- Survey sent to the whole Library staff: 115
- Really concerned people: ca 100
  - < holiday, illness, sabbatical year, Primo Team...
- 72 responses ⇒ 72%: high participation rate!
  - 3 uncompleted responses (no profile information)
  - 69 full and exploitable responses
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Profile of respondents

- Degree in LS?
  - Yes: 40
  - No: 29

- Involved in information literacy?
  - Yes: 24
  - No: 45

- Involved in the Primo project at ULg?
  - Yes: 11
  - No: 58
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Profile of respondents

How many times have you been using a discovery tool within the last 12 months?

- 20% never
- 29% 1 to 5 times
- 28% 5 to 20 times
- 23% more than 20 times
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Survey statements

• **S1**: Discovery tools will one day search all of a given library’s collections.
• **S2**: Discovery tools compete with Google.
• **S3**: A single search box (without any possibility of searching through any logical base [scope]) is a plus.
• **S4**: End-users don’t need any training to use discovery tools.
• **S5**: Discovery tools are only useful for beginners and freshmen.
• **S6**: With a discovery tool, end-users will less often ask librarians for help.
• **S7**: With a discovery tool, the use of print resources is going to...
• **S8**: With a discovery tool, the number of loans is going to...
Survey statements (2/3)

• **S9**: With a discovery tool, the number of ILL outgoing requests is going to...

• **S10**: With a discovery tool, the number of ILL incoming requests is going to...

• **S11**: Catalog data (Aleph) cannot be easily identified in the ULg Library Primo.

• **S12**: The fact that Aleph records are not displayed in Marc21 format is a problem.

• **S13**: Given the high number of results, end-users will often be lost when results display.

• **S14**: Having records from Aleph, SFX and ORBi mixed with Primo Central records will be confusing for end-users.

• **S15**: It is not very interesting to allow users to find, through a single interface, additional records to those from the catalog.
Survey statements (3/3)

- **S16**: With a discovery tool, the usage of specialized databases will...
- **S17**: Specialized databases are doomed because of discovery tools.
- **S18**: Advanced Search is essential.
- **S19**: The number of Advanced Searches will be almost as high as the number of Simple Searches.
- **S20**: End-users will have difficulty to know how to get the item they want.
- **S21**: Metadata that discovery tools offer are of less good quality (compared to metadata of specialized databases) and this will lead to searches of less good quality.
- **S22**: Using now a discovery tool in the library will positively change my work.
Discovery tools will one day search all of a given library’s collections.

- Strongly agree [=14]
- Agree [=31]
- Disagree [=13]
- Strongly disagree [=6]
- I don't know [=4]
- I don't understand [=1]
• **Comments:**
  - Print resources will remain!
  - Discovery tools will never be able to make complete searches like in special databases (thesauruses...)
  - Some databases are very specific and with a very limited number of users. Their content will never interest discovery tools vendors.
Discovery tools compete with Google.

- **Strongly agree [=3]**
- **Agree [=6]**
- **Disagree [=48]**
- **Strongly disagree [=8]**
- **I don't know [=4]**
- **I don't understand [=0]**
A single search box (without any possibility of searching through any logical base [scope]) is a plus.
From the 24 involved in information literacy...

- Strongly agree: 0.0%
- Agree: 8.3%
- Disagree: 25.0%
- Strongly disagree: 45.8%
- I don't know: 20.8%

⇒ Infolit subgroup is rather apprehensive (66.6%)
End-users don’t need any training to use discovery tools.

→ 79.7% (strongly) disagree.

- Strongly agree [0]
- Agree [12]
- Disagree [37]
- Strongly disagree [18]
- I don't know [2]
- I don't understand [0]
From the 24 involved in information literacy...

→ Percentage of colleagues who disagree is lower (70.9%).

From the 20 who have never used a discovery tool...

From the 33 who have used a DT more than 5 times during the last 12 months
S4 - Comments

• Trainings are not so necessary anymore if the discovery tool correctly works.
• It depends of the end-users and of how good they can use electronic resources.
• With Google, end-users are anyway used to search without any training.
• Trainings are not necessary for a basic usage, but trainings remain useful if one wants to use discovery tools properly.
• Trainings are useful at the beginning: to unlearn the way it works with the traditional opac.
Discovery tools are only useful for beginners and freshmen.

- Strongly agree [=1]
- Agree [=1]
- Disagree [=40]
- Strongly disagree [=26]
- I don't know [=1]
- I don't understand [=0]
With a discovery tool, end-users will less often ask librarians for help.

- Strongly agree = 0%
- Agree = 13.0%
- Disagree = 44.9%
- Strongly disagree = 27.5%
- I don't know = 14.5%
- I don't understand = 0%
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From the 24 involved in information literacy...

- 50% Agree
- 21% Disagree
- 8% Strongly disagree
- 21% I don't know
With a discovery tool, the use of print resources is going to...
S7 - Comments

- Since there are some many more e-resources in the discovery tool than print resources, end-users will certainly be satisfied with e-content.
- Print resources are less visible than e-resources.
- The decrease of the use of print materials is not directly linked with discovery tools.
- Not in my discipline (French language and literature)!
- It’s very satisfactory that end-users find useful content without going physically to the library.
With a discovery tool, the number of loans is going to...

- Significantly increase [4]
- Slightly increase [18]
- Slightly decrease [22]
- Significantly decrease [4]
- I don't know [20]
- I don't understand [1]
S8 – Fact checking

Number of loans from March until end August (years 2007-2013)

Decrease?

NB: Spring 2008: huge flood on the main campus, fungal contamination in several libraries → tens of thousands of books placed in quarantine.
With a discovery tool, the number of ILL outgoing requests is going to...

- Significantly increase [8%
- Slightly increase [29%
- Slightly decrease [19%
- Significantly decrease [2%
- I don't know [8%
- I don't understand [3%]
S9 – Fact checking

ILL - Outgoing requests

2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013


2013 = extrapolation
With a discovery tool, the number of ILL incoming requests is going to...

- Significantly increase [=6]
- Slightly increase [=30]
- Slightly decrease [=11]
- Significantly decrease [=0]
- I don't know [=19]
- I don't understand [=3]
S10 – Fact checking

ILL - Incoming requests

2013 = extrapolation
S11

Catalog data (Aleph) cannot be easily identified in the ULg Library Primo.

- Strongly agree [=8]
- Agree [=28]
- Disagree [=20]
- Strongly disagree [=1]
- I don't know [=9]
- I don't understand [=3]
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Online records from PCI or SFX
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Source indicated in each record!!
The fact that Aleph records are not displayed in Marc21 format is a problem.

- Strongly agree [=6]
- Agree [=15]
- Disagree [=22]
- Strongly disagree [=5]
- I don't know [=16]
- I don't understand [=5]
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S12 – Comments

• Only librarians use them!
• Only a problem for librarians.
• It might be a problem for librarians from other institutions.
• Who cares?? Marc records are not for students or faculty staff. OPACs are not made for librarians!

Woman on Computer in Card Catalog | University of Illinois Archives
http://archives.library.illinois.edu/archon/index.php?p=digitallibrary/digitalcontent&id=6117
Given the high number of results, end-users will often be lost when results display.
From the 24 involved in information literacy...

- Strongly agree: 46%
- Agree: 25%
- Disagree: 29%
- Strongly disagree: 0%
Having records from Aleph, SFX and ORBi mixed with Primo Central records will be confusing for end-users.

- Strongly agree [=9]
- Agree [=34]
- Disagree [=19]
- Strongly disagree [=1]
- I don't know [=6]
- I don't understand [=0]
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From the 24 involved in information literacy...

- Strongly agree: 17%
- Agree: 50%
- Disagree: 25%
- Strongly disagree: 4%
- I don't know: 4%

"S14"
S14 - Comments

• Maybe at the beginning, but users will get used to it.
• End-users won’t get confused if they attend training sessions.
• That’s why training sessions remain important!
• Users don’t care about the origin of the records: they only want to access what is interesting to them.
• It is genial to have those records mixed. Finding and quickly getting access to the content is the most important. No matter where records come from!

Crowd surrounding a woman skating around a giant skillet with slabs of bacon tied to her feet, holding a giant wooden spatula, Chehalis (WA), ca. 1929-1932 | University of Washington Library
http://content.lib.washington.edu/u7/social,1442
It is not very interesting to allow users to find, through a single interface, additional records to those from the catalog.
Mixed content? Interesting & confusing

S15: Interesting?

- Yes: 59
- No: 8

S14: Confusing for users?

- Yes: 43
- No: 20
With a discovery tool, the usage of specialized databases will...
## S16 – Fact checking

### Searches from March to July

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>% 2010-2011</th>
<th>% 2011-2012</th>
<th>% 2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ebsco Academic Search Premier</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-49%</td>
<td>-43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebsco Business Source Premier</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>-54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB Abstracts</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebsco Communication &amp; Mass Media Complete</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>-54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EconLit</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>-61%</td>
<td>-49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCIS</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>-38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GeoRef</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>-65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Abstracts</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-54%</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Islamicus (*)</td>
<td>161%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (*)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>115%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA International Bibliography</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>-44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosopher's Index</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-59%</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsycINFO</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest Sociological Abstracts (*)</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>203%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) New platform for 2012

- A significant decrease already occurred in 2012.
- Impossible to deduce the impact of Primo for 2013!
Specialized databases are doomed because of discovery tools.
Advanced Search is essential.

- Strongly agree [=39]
- Agree [=25]
- Disagree [=3]
- Strongly disagree [=0]
- I don't know [=2]
- I don't understand [=0]
The number of Advanced Searches will be almost as high as the number of Simple Searches.

- Strongly agree [=4]
- Agree [=19]
- Disagree [=22]
- Strongly disagree [=8]
- I don't know [=16]
- I don't understand [=0]
S19 – Fact checking

Simple Search vs Advanced Search in our Primo
(from March 2013 until August 2013)

- 221.169; 68%
- 102.215; 32%

We know that Advanced Search is used by many colleagues!!
End-users will have difficulty to know how to get the item they want.
Metadata that discovery tools offer are of less good quality (compared to metadata of specialized databases) and this will lead to searches of less good quality.
How many times have you been using a discovery tool within the last 12 months?
S22

Using now a discovery tool in the library will positively change my work.

44.9% don’t know!
- Cause of concern or of expectation?
- Are they lost?
- Do they puzzle about the change?

44.9% don’t know!
Conclusions

- Participation rate: 72% -> representative of ULg Library
- Rather **positive reception** of DTs:
  - DTs are not strongly criticized or discredited.
  - Some perceptions are probably based on own experiences with ULg Primo.
- Sometimes **perplexity** and distrust:
  - Single search box (S3)
  - Some nostalgia for catalog data (Marc records [S12], identifying catalog records [S11])
- **Contradictions:**
  - Single search box (S3) vs « DTs are only for beginners » (S5)
  - Content: DTs are at the same time useful (S15) and confusing (S14).
- Sometimes too early to draw clear conclusions (loans [S8], ILL [S9, S10], databases usage reports [S16]...)
- No real discrepancy between the 24-infolit specialists and the rest of the group.
- According to respondents, trainings for end-users remain necessary.
- Advanced Search seems to have a future (S18, S19)... But how will it be after using Primo for 2-3 years?
- For respondents, specialized databases have a future too (S16, S17, S21).

- **What about a similar survey (in a similar context) at other libraries?**
"Where are my Marc records?" - Librarians' perception of discovery tools
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