Assessment of Cataloging Services in an Academic Library

ABSTRACT

Personnel in the Public Services Division and in the Cataloging and Metadata Services
Department were surveyed to determine how they rated the importance of various cataloging
services, and to gauge their satisfaction with these services. The two groups differed in the
importance and satisfaction scores that they assigned to certain cataloging services. The issues
raised by respondents suggested that Cataloging and Metadata Services should take a more
proactive approach to communication with Public Services, and indicated the need for further
research.

KEYWORDS

Assessment, surveys, cataloging, technical services

AUTHORS

Catherine Sassen

Cataloging and Metadata Services Department, University of North Texas Libraries

Kathryn Loafman

Cataloging and Metadata Services Department, University of North Texas Libraries

Rebecca Welch

Institutional Advancement Office, North Central Texas College

INTRODUCTION

Academic libraries are facing increasing demands to measure their worth and justify their

activities. The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) stressed the importance of

assessment in *The value of academic libraries: A comprehensive research review and report* (2010, p. 11). The authors stated that academic librarians "must demonstrate their value," and placed this trend in the context of the accountability movement in higher education. Assessment is critical in our current environment, as it "provides leaders tools for advocacy and accelerating relevance" as noted in *New roles for the road ahead: Essays commissioned for ACRL's 75th anniversary* (Wilson 2015, p. 106).

Like many other technical services librarians in academic libraries, we are concerned about assessing our work. When contemplating assessment in the Cataloging and Metadata Services (CMS) Department of the University of North Texas (UNT) Libraries, we decided to conduct a survey of our colleagues. We thought that an online survey would be the best way to reach our colleagues because they work in six different locations throughout Denton, Texas. The Cataloging and Metadata Services Department is in the Library Annex, which is located off campus. The Collection Development Department, Preservation Department, and remote storage are also located in this building. Willis Library, Eagle Commons Library, and the Media Library are located on the main campus. Another library is located on the Discovery Park campus. Finally, the Research Collections Library, a remote storage facility for special collections, is located off campus. All of these libraries serve the University of North Texas, the largest university in the Dallas-Fort Worth area with over 36,000 students.

The impetus for assessing our services stemmed from the changes that we have experienced over the past few decades. Cataloging operations were decentralized in 1993. There are now catalogers in the Eagle Commons Library (which includes the government documents collection), the Media Library, the Music Library, the Special Collections Department, and in the Cataloging and Metadata Services Department. Other changes include a

reduction in staffing levels in the Cataloging and Metadata Services Department, a proliferation of the sources from which we derive our catalog records, and an expansion in the range of utilities and application software available to catalogers. We wanted to know how our colleagues perceived our cataloging in the light of all of these changes.

Our study is based on a research project by Herrera, Cheng, Leslie, and Harry (2006). In their study, technical services librarians sought feedback from public services personnel regarding cataloging and database maintenance activities at the University of Mississippi Libraries. They administered two identical surveys, one to public services and one to technical services, to determine if there were differences of opinion. Survey results revealed the need for staff training and information sharing across departments. The results also identified various problems for catalogers to resolve. This study was the only one we could find in which researchers examined cataloging activities by asking for input from public services and technical services personnel. As such, we replicated their methodology with the intent to answer the following research questions:

(1)   How do Public Services employees rate the importance of Cataloging and Metadata Services activities?

(2)   How satisfied are Public Services employees with Cataloging and Metadata Services activities?

(3)   Is there any agreement between the two groups?

LITERATURE REVIEW

The library literature indicates that assessment is a prevailing concern in technical services. Two recent surveys point to the extent of technical services assessment studies. Wright and White (2007) conducted a survey about the assessment activities of Association of Research

Libraries (ARL) member libraries, and published the results in a SPEC kit. They received

responses from 73 libraries, most of which were academic libraries. Individuals from 67

libraries responded to a question about which library departments had conducted assessments

since 2002. Fifty-seven institutions indicated that they had assessed the online catalog, 47

reported that they had assessed cataloging, and 49 reported that they had assessed acquisitions.

Mugridge (2014) conducted a survey of Pennsylvania academic libraries, and received responses

from 63 libraries. Ninety percent of the respondents reported that they had assessed technical

services activities.

Technical services librarians have used surveys to gain information about their external and

internal users. El-Sherbini and Chen (2011) used a questionnaire to learn about the behaviors and

preferences of librarians and patrons who conducted subject searches for non-Roman script

materials. Yue and Kurt (2011) administered an internal survey followed by staff interviews to

determine staff satisfaction with periodical management practices nine years after a decision to

cease print periodical check-in.

Assessment studies have been conducted to improve technical services workflows and

increase their efficiency. Case studies of acquisitions and cataloging workflows have reported

by Chase and Krug (2007), Godbout (2007) and Loring (2007). Other workflow studies have

concerned serials and monographic ordering (Herrera, Leslie, Harry & Cheng, 2006), and

electronic resources management (Webber, 2004; Medeiros, 2007). One particular strategy used

to evaluate and improve workflows is benchmarking, as reported in a survey by Mugridge and

Poehlmann (2015).

Another goal of assessment studies has been to evaluate the cost or value of certain

processes. Time and cost factors have been examined in relation to outsourcing the physical

processing of books (Schroeder & Howland, 2011), and in relation to acquisitions processes (Stouthuysen, Swiggers, Reheul, & Roodhooft, 2010). Metadata value measurement was explored by Mitchell (2013), while metrics for the value and cost of cataloging activities were developed by the Task Force on Cost/Value Assessment of Bibliographic Control (Stalberg & Cronin, 2011).

Subscription cost increases have been a driving force in technical services assessment projects to evaluate serials and electronic resources. One of the most publicized cases in this area concerns the decision of SUNY Potsdam to cancel its subscription to the American Chemical Society online journal package (Rogers, 2012). This decision was based on a study of costs, usage statistics and user input. Recent work in this area was reported by Enoch and Harker (2015) who developed a serials and electronic resources cancellation strategy based on usage statistics, overlap analysis, and user input. In another recent study, Harker and Kizhakkethil (2015) developed a method to evaluate the overlap of journals in abstract and index databases.

Technical services assessment projects also have been conducted to determine if the usage of library materials is related to catalog record enhancements such as table of contents notes and summary notes. Several researchers investigated this issue by conducting experimental studies in which they measured circulation before and after catalog enhancement projects (Knutson, 1991; Dinkins & Kirkland, 2006; Faiks, Rademacher & Sheehan, 2007; Chercourt & Marshall, 2013). Other researchers conducted retrospective cohort studies to find if library materials with enhanced catalog records circulated more than those with unenhanced records (Morris, 2001; Madarash-Hill & Hill, 2004; Madarash-Hill & Hill, 2005; Tosaka & Weng, 2011; Kirkland, 2013, Harker & Sassen, 2015).

Finally, technical services websites and online work tools have been assessed to determine if improvements were needed. Mundle, Huie, and Bangalore (2006) examined ARL member libraries' catalog department websites to assess their functionality. Groves (2005) studied the inclusion of online work tools in the web pages of technical services departments. Although we identified many studies concerning technical services assessment, we found only one study about the end users' evaluation of cataloging services (Hererra, Cheng, Leslie, & Harry, 2006). We believe that more research is needed in this area, and this study serves to begin filling this gap.

METHODS

Survey

Although we used the survey of Herrera, Cheng, Leslie, and Harry (2006) as a model for our study, we rewrote the questions to reflect our current environment. The catalogers in Cataloging and Metadata Services identified critical activities and projects for inclusion in the survey. The University of North Texas Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved the survey instrument, which we created with Qualtrics software. (Please see the appendix of this article for the questionnaire.) The questions were presented in four paired groups. In each paired group, questions about the importance of the service appeared first, followed by questions about satisfaction with the service. Each sequence of questions concluded with an open-ended response of "Other" which gave the participants the opportunity to identify and rate an area of particular concern.

The first group of questions concerned the types of materials that we catalog:

- Purchased print books
- Gift books

- E-books

- UNT theses and dissertations

- Rush items

- Print journals

- Electronic journals

- Streaming media

- Electronic databases

The second group of questions focused on the accuracy of information:

- Resolving problems with call numbers

- Maintaining our holdings in OCLC WorldCat

- Editing information in the online catalog about lost or missing materials

- Adding information about copies or volumes to existing records in the catalog

The third group addressed four CMS Department projects:

- Cataloging French, German, Spanish and Cyrillic gift books

- Creating records for individual titles in monographic series

- Adding birth and/or death dates to personal name headings

- Updating minimal records for periodicals

The fourth group of questions was about three database maintenance activities.

- Name authority: all works by the same author (personal or corporate) are grouped together in the catalog

- Series title authority: all titles in the same series are grouped together in the catalog

- Subject authority: headings are consistently used and cross-references are provided

An open-ended question at the conclusion of the survey gave the participants the opportunity to add their own comments about the services of the CMS Department.

We decided to use a four-level scale in order to block the possibility of ambiguous data. Rea and Parker (2014, p. 79) stated that this approach is appropriate "when it is suspected that a great number of respondents will choose a middle response and the research requires that respondents choose among alternatives." The scales used in the multiple choice survey questions are displayed in Table 1. The scale for the importance questions ranged from one (no importance) to four (high importance). The scale for the satisfaction questions ranged from one (dissatisfied) to four (satisfied).

TABLE 1. Importance and Satisfaction Rating Scales

Importance scale	Satisfaction scale
1 = No importance	1 = Dissatisfied
2 = Low importance	2 = Somewhat dissatisfied
3 = Moderate importance	3 = Somewhat satisfied
4 = High importance	4 = Satisfied

Participants

The researchers administered an online survey to a non-probability, purposive sample. An invitation to participate in the survey was sent to all full-time staff (n=74) in the Public Services Division, the Special Libraries Division and the Collection Development Department. We will refer to this group collectively as Public Services (PS). Individuals from this group responded to the online survey in Qualtrics. An invitation to participate in the survey was also sent to all full-time staff in the Cataloging and Metadata Services (CMS) Department (n=8). Individuals from this group responded to a separate copy of the online survey.

The survey was open for a three-week period from October 27 to November 17, 2014. We chose this time after consulting with department heads in Public Services. They indicated that the best time for a survey would be in the middle of the fall term. We sent weekly e-mail messages to all potential participants to invite them to respond to the survey. Each individual responding to the survey remained anonymous. The survey did not request any information that would have identified individual respondents.

Data Analysis

The researchers downloaded the survey results reports from Qualtrics into Excel. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the results and generate tables.

RESULTS

Response Rate

We received responses from 48 percent (n=36) of the 74 staff members in Public Services. We also received responses from 87 percent (n=7) of the eight staff members in Cataloging and Metadata Services. Although we had hoped for more participation from Public Services, their response rate of 48 percent is well above the mean response rate for online surveys, which Shih and Fan (2008) estimated as 34 percent. The Public Services sample size represents a 90% confidence interval with a 10% margin of error. Therefore, it may not be wholly generalizable to the entire Public Services population.

Cataloging Services

Respondents were asked a series of multiple-choice questions about the cataloging of various categories of materials, such as print books, e-books, print journals and e-journals. Their responses to these questions are reported in terms of means, and are summarized in Table

2. The responses are sorted in the order of the mean importance scores assigned by Public

Services.

TABLE 2. Mean Ratings of Cataloging Services (Arranged by PS Importance Ratings)

Cataloging Services	Importance		Satisfaction	
	Mean (PS)	Mean (CMS)	Mean (PS)	Mean (CMS)
Cataloging purchased print books	3.94	4	3.74	4
Cataloging rush items	3.92	4	3.79	4
Cataloging e-books	3.78	4	3.54	3.71
Cataloging electronic journals	3.78	3.86	3.54	3.67
Cataloging electronic databases (e.g. Ebscohost)	3.61	3.57	3.59	3.5
Cataloging print journals	3.61	3.71	3.56	3.83
Cataloging streaming media (e.g. Video on Demand)	3.56	3.71	3.62	3.67
Cataloging UNT theses and dissertations	3.44	3.71	3.65	3.86
Cataloging gift books	3.22	2.86	3.65	3.71

Almost all of the importance and satisfaction scores were between three and four. Both

groups assigned the highest importance and satisfaction scores to "cataloging purchased print

books" and "cataloging rush items." The only score below three was the 2.86 assigned by

Cataloging and Metadata Services for the importance of "cataloging gift books."

Other Services

We asked respondents a series of questions about other services of the Cataloging and

Metadata Services Department, including editing cataloging records for lost or missing items,

resolving call number problems, adding copies and volumes, and maintaining OCLC holdings.

The responses to these questions are reported in terms of means, and are summarized in Table 3.

The responses are sorted in the order of the mean importance scores assigned by Public Services.

TABLE 3. Mean Ratings of Other Services (Arranged by PS Importance Ratings)

Other Services	Importance		Satisfaction	
	Mean (PS)	Mean (CMS)	Mean (PS)	Mean (CMS)
Editing records in our online catalog for lost or missing materials	3.88	3.71	3.31	3.29
Resolving problems with call numbers (such as duplicate or inaccurate call numbers)	3.76	3.43	3.74	3.86
Adding copies or volumes to existing records in the online catalog	3.59	3.43	3.49	3.71
Ensuring that OCLC WorldCat accurately represents the UNT Libraries' holdings	3.56	3.14	3.46	3.57

All of the scores were between three and four. Both groups assigned the highest

importance scores to "editing records in our online catalog for lost or missing materials" and the

lowest importance scores to "ensuring that OCLC WorldCat accurately represents the UNT

Libraries' holdings." Both groups assigned the highest satisfaction scores to "resolving

problems with call numbers," and the lowest satisfaction scores to "editing records in our online

catalog for lost or missing materials."

Projects

Respondents were asked about various projects of the Cataloging and Metadata Services

Department. The responses to these questions are reported in terms of means, and are

summarized in Table 4. The responses are sorted in the order of the mean importance scores

assigned by Public Services.

TABLE 4. Mean Ratings of Projects (Arranged by PS Importance Ratings)

Projects	Importance		Satisfaction	
	Mean (PS)	Mean (CMS)	Mean (PS)	Mean (CMS)
Creating records for individual titles in monographic series	3.47	3.14	3.39	3.67
Updating catalog records for periodicals that were migrated from the previous online catalog (VTLS) and contain minimal information	3.29	3.29	3.42	3
Cataloging Spanish language gift books	2.73	2.71	3.66	3.83
Adding birth and/or death dates to personal name headings in the online catalog	2.63	3	3.7	3.83
Cataloging French language gift books	2.62	2.57	3.66	3.83
Cataloging German language gift books	2.59	2.57	3.62	3.83
Cataloging Cyrillic script gift books	2.44	2.29	3.64	3.67

The highest importance score assigned by Public Services was a 3.47 for "creating records for individual titles in monographic series," while the highest importance score from Cataloging and Metadata Services was a 3.29 for updating minimal level periodical records.

Nine importance scores were between two and three, indicating that respondents believed certain projects to be of low importance. Both Public Services and Cataloging and Metadata Services assigned low importance scores to the cataloging of Spanish, French, German and Cyrillic gift books. However, both groups assigned satisfaction scores ranging from 3.62 to 3.83 to these various categories of foreign language gift books.

Public Services assigned a low importance score of 2.63 to the project of "adding birth and/or death dates to personal name headings in the online catalog." However, the satisfaction scores assigned by Public Services (3.7) and Cataloging and Metadata Services (3.83) for this project were higher.

Database Maintenance

We also asked respondents about various database maintenance tasks of the Cataloging and Metadata Services Department. The responses to these questions are reported in terms of means, and are summarized in Table 5. The responses are sorted in the order of the mean importance scores assigned by Public Services. All scores fell in the range of three to four.

TABLE 5. Mean Ratings of Database Maintenance Activities (Arranged by PS Importance Ratings)

Database Maintenance	Importance		Satisfaction	
	Mean (PS)	Mean (CMS)	Mean (PS)	Mean (CMS)
Subject headings are consistently used and cross references are provided.	3.85	3.71	3.15	3.17
All works by the same author (personal or corporate) are grouped together in the catalog. For example, an author's birth name, pseudonym, married name, stage name, etc. are consistently used and cross references are provided.	3.79	3.86	3.32	3.67
All titles in the same series are grouped together in the catalog.	3.62	3.43	3.26	3.5

Public Services assigned the highest importance score in this area (3.85) to "subject headings are consistently used and cross references are provided." However, both Public Services and Cataloging and Metadata Services assigned lower satisfaction scores (3.15 and 3.17 respectively) to this item. This highest importance score assigned by Cataloging and Metadata Services in this section was a 3.86 for "all works by the same author (personal or corporate) are grouped together in the catalog."

Responses to Open-Ended Question

The survey included an open-ended question, which asked for comments on the services of the Cataloging and Metadata Services Department. We received sixteen responses from Public Services to this question. The responses included eight compliments, seven concerns and one comment about the questionnaire design.

We received several succinct compliments from Public Services such as "You guys rock!" We also received lengthier notes of praise from Public Services, such as "The basis of our civilization is what our catalogers do every day. We could not function as a society if our catalogers stopped doing their work."

Public Services respondents expressed concerns covering a variety of issues. Some of the topics covered included broken links in electronic journal records, microforms cataloging quality, and online catalog display issues.

DISCUSSION

We conducted this study to determine how respondents rated the importance of cataloging services, and to gauge their satisfaction with these services. We also wanted to determine if there was any agreement between Public Services and Cataloging and Metadata Services employees on these topics.

We had hoped that the overall scores for importance would fall in the range between three (moderate importance) and four (high importance). We also had hoped that the overall scores for satisfaction would be in the range between three (somewhat satisfied) and four (satisfied). When we averaged all importance and satisfaction scores, we found that the mean scores were within the desired ranges, as displayed in Table 6.

TABLE 6. Overall Mean Ratings

	PS	CMS
Importance	3.42	3.38
Satisfaction	3.54	3.67

Highest and Lowest Scores

Respondents from both groups agreed that the most important cataloging services are cataloging purchased print books and rush items. The Cataloging and Metadata Services Department has assigned high priority to these items, and it is helpful to know that Public Services employees agree with this decision. Respondents from both groups also assigned high satisfaction scores to the cataloging of these materials.

Both groups also agreed on the low importance of cataloging foreign language gift books. However, they disagreed on the importance of gift books in general. Cataloging and Metadata Services gave gift book cataloging a mean score of 2.86, while Public Services assigned it a mean score of 3.22. The low score given by Cataloging and Metadata Services probably reflects the low priority that the CMS Department has assigned to cataloging gift books. However, the department has no backlog, and gift books are usually cataloged within three weeks of receipt.

The lowest satisfaction score assigned by Public Services was 3.15 for "subject headings are consistently used and cross references are provided." The complaints that we have heard most often about subject headings pertain to bibliographic records from one vendor for a unique

collection of materials. We are correcting this situation by enhancing our locally created

bibliographic records for this collection with Library of Congress subject headings. After we

enhance a locally created record, we delete the corresponding vendor record.

The lowest satisfaction score assigned by Cataloging and Metadata Services was a three for

updating minimal level periodical records. These records describe periodicals that were not

received through active subscriptions in 1996 when we migrated to our present online catalog.

Many of these periodicals were cataloged under the AACRI latest title entry rule. Cataloging

and Metadata Services employees probably have a lower level of satisfaction with this project

because they know how much time and effort would be required to recatalog latest title entry

records to successive title entry. This project has not been completed due to a lack of time and

staffing. Although these records are minimal level, they contain full holdings statements to

inform catalog users of the volumes available.

Areas of Greatest Disagreement

Public Services gave a low importance rating of 2.63 to the project of adding birth and/or

death dates to personal name headings in the online catalog, while Cataloging and Metadata

Services rated this as moderately important with a score of 3. However, Public Services gave a

higher score (3.79) to the database maintenance activity of grouping all works by the same

author together in the catalog. Perhaps Public Services did not understand the importance of

adding dates to name headings. If we are to group all works by the same author together in the

catalog, we need to make that author's name distinctive. One way to make an author's name

distinctive is to add dates to the name heading.

We noticed gaps in the importance and satisfaction scores between the two groups for

creating records for distinctive titles in monographic series. Public Services assigned a

satisfaction score of 3.39, while Cataloging and Metadata Services assigned a score of 3.67. The gap in satisfaction scores may be related to a legacy cataloging practice. Over forty years ago, our policy was to catalog all volumes in a monographic series with one bibliographic record. Our current policy is to catalog each distinctive title in a monographic series with a separate bibliographic record. The current practice provides more access to the author(s), title and subjects of each volume. Unfortunately, our catalog still contains some bibliographic records resulting from our previous series cataloging policy. We are in the process of recataloging older series to provide separate bibliographic records for series volumes with distinctive titles.

Public Services employees gave a higher importance score to the cataloging of distinctive titles in monographic series than did Cataloging and Metadata Services employees, although both scores were in the moderate importance range. The catalogers in the CMS Department routinely catalog distinctive titles in monographic series with separate bibliographic records. Perhaps they did not give this item a higher score because it was listed in the questionnaire as a project. The project of recataloging older series is not a priority for all cataloging staff members because it has been assigned to only one person in the CMS Department.

Another difference concerned resolving problems with call numbers. Public Services employees assigned a higher importance score to this task than did Cataloging and Metadata Services employees. Of course, the catalogers understand that the call number on the resource must match the call number in the bibliographic record if the patron is to locate the resource on the shelf. It is possible that Cataloging and Metadata Services employees did not give this a higher score because this is not on everyone's priority list. Only one person in the CMS Department has been assigned the responsibility of resolving call number problems.

Areas of Greatest Agreement

Earlier we discussed similar scores assigned by both groups for the cataloging of purchased print books, rush items and foreign language gift books. Both groups also assigned similar satisfaction scores for editing online catalog records for lost or missing materials. The mean satisfaction score assigned by Public Services to this item was 3.31, while the mean score assigned by Cataloging and Metadata Services was 3.29. Although these scores are in the "somewhat satisfied" range, there is room for improvement. The scores may reflect the fact that the online catalog includes records for some items that are not in the collection because they have not been reported yet as lost or missing. Unfortunately, we have not had the resources to conduct an inventory since the 1960s. The Circulation Department has initiated a project to suppress item records from the catalog for items that they have verified to be lost or missing.

NEXT STEPS

We identified four areas for further action. These areas concern resolving problems, increasing communication with Public Services, sharing information with Collection Development, and conducting further research.

Problem Resolution

In response to the open-ended question, a respondent from Public Services stated that sometimes the order of volumes is jumbled in the online catalog display. We trained Cataloging and Metadata Services staff to correct the problem, and asked them to resolve such display issues whenever they find them.

Increasing Communication with Public Services

One Public Services respondent asked that we monitor e-journal holdings for broken or inactive links. In response, we have reminded Public Services to report broken links to the Serials Unit. We also have informed them that a project is underway to identify and resolve broken links.

Another respondent wrote about the difficulty of searching for a particular journal title in the online catalog. We could not replicate the problem. However, we have responded by encouraging Public Services to use the "report a problem" feature of the online catalog interface when they encounter such difficulties.

A Public Services respondent expressed dissatisfaction with having to view separate records for print journals and electronic journals in the online catalog to determine which volumes are accessible. In response, we have explained that this was not due to a cataloging policy. We have limited resources for serials cataloging and are only able to manage our electronic journal holdings by loading Serials Solutions records. Serials Solutions records are constantly updated by the vendor to reflect changes in electronic journal holdings. For this reason, the print journals and electronic journals cannot be represented on the same catalog record.

Sharing Information with Collection Development

We have informed the Collection Development Department that our respondents place a low importance on the cataloging of foreign language gift books. This information may help Collection Development prioritize their processes.

Conducting Further Research

A respondent from Public Services expressed a concern about the quality of microforms catalog records. We are collecting more information from Public Services about the extent of this problem, which may lead to a special project. We also are considering the possibility of conducting focus groups to gather more information about their concerns.

LIMITATIONS

Only 48 percent of Public Services employees responded to the survey. The Public Services sample size represents a 90% confidence interval with a 10% margin of error. Therefore, it may not be wholly generalizable to the entire Public Services population. We may have received more responses if we had offered incentives to participants, such as coupons to the library café or the opportunity to win a bookstore gift card.

It is possible that some Public Services employees had a deeper understanding of cataloging than their colleagues. While Cataloging and Metadata Services staff catalog all general collection materials, other materials are cataloged by staff in the Eagle Commons Library (which includes the government documents collection), the Media Library, the Music Library and Special Collections. If any catalogers in Public Services responded to the survey, they most likely would have been more knowledgeable about cataloging issues than their colleagues.

Some of the respondents from the Cataloging and Metadata Services Department may have downplayed responsibilities that were not in their personal lists of priorities. For example, Cataloging and Metadata Services employees gave a lower score to call number problem resolution than did Public Services employees. This probably was because call number resolution has been assigned to only one person in Cataloging and Metadata Services.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATIONS

In conducting this research, the authors were able to compile a list of recommendations for individuals planning to administer this type of survey in their libraries.

(1)   Clearly explain the intent of the survey at the beginning of the project. If the survey is administered without any explanation of its purpose, some respondents may fear that it is part of a strategy for eliminating jobs or positions.

(2)   Gain support from management. Survey administrators need the backing of their managers if they are to have sufficient time to conduct the survey and analyze the results.

(3)   Seek feedback on a draft of the survey to reduce any confusion about the meaning of the questions.

(4)   Ask department heads about the best time for survey administration to increase the chances of a good response rate.

(5)   Offer incentives to encourage participation.

(6)   Individuals in an academic setting will need to follow Institutional Review Board (IRB) requirements from the inception of the project if they intend to publish or present their research findings.

CONCLUSION

The survey responses improved our understanding of our colleagues' views concerning cataloging services. Earlier we had assumed that our colleagues would contact us directly about their concerns, or notify us through the "report a problem" feature in the online catalog. However, the survey results revealed some issues that Public Services had not reported through any other channels. Now we realize the importance of requesting feedback.

We believe that we have increased the visibility of cataloging services by conducting this survey, sharing the results and addressing concerns. This assessment has allowed us to improve our services and increase our value.

REFERENCES

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2010). *The value of academic libraries: A comprehensive research review and report*. Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries. Retrieved from www.acrl.ala.org/value

Chase, A., & Krug, T. (2007). New techniques in library technical services at the Appalachian College Association. In M. Mitchell (Ed.), *Library workflow redesign: Six case studies* (8-20). Washington, DC: Council on Library and Information Resources.

Chercourt, M., & Marshall, L. (2013). Making keywords work: Connecting patrons to resources through enhanced bibliographic records. *Technical Services Quarterly, 30*(3), 285-295.

Dinkins, D., & Kirkland, L. N. (2006). It's what's inside that counts: Adding contents notes to bibliographic records and its impact on circulation. *College & Undergraduate Libraries, 13*(1), 59-71.

El-Sherbini, M., & Chen, S. (2011). An assessment of the need to provide non-Roman subject access to the library online catalog. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, 49*(6), 457–483.

Enoch, T. & Harker, K. R. (2015) Planning for the budget-ocalypse: The evolution of a serials/ER cancellation methodology. *The Serials Librarian, 68*, 282-289.

Faiks, A., Rademacher, A., & Sheehan, A. (2007). What about the book: Google-izing the catalog with tables of contents. *Library Philosophy & Practice,* paper 125, 1-12.

Godbout, M. (2007). Preparing an item for circulation while streamlining the workflow between the acquisitions and cataloging offices. *Indiana Libraries, 26*(4), 59–67.

Groves, D. (2005). Online work tools: A look at 20 academic libraries technical services Web pages. *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services, 29*(4), 395–402.

Harker, K. R. & Kizhakkethil, P. (2015) The quick and the dirty: The good, the bad, and the ugly of database overlap at the journal title level. *The Serials Librarian, 68,* 249-254.

Harker, K. R. & Sassen, C. (2015) Enhancing access to e-books. *Evidence based library and information practice, 10(*1)*, 5-19.

Herrera, G., Cheng, D. T., Leslie, J., & Harry, T. (2006). Technical services cataloging and database maintenance assessment. *Technical Services Quarterly, 23*(3), 51–72.

Herrera, G., Leslie, J., Harry, T., & Cheng, D. T. (2006). Technical services serials and monographic ordering assessment. *Technical Services Quarterly, 24*(1), 45–62.

Kirkland, L. N. (2013). The relationship of metadata to item circulation. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, 51*, 510-531.

Knutson, G. S. (1991). Subject enhancement: Report on an experiment. *College & Research Libraries,* 52 (1), 65-79.

Loring, C. B. (2007). Increasing productivity through workflow redesign at Smith College. In M. Mitchell (Ed.), Library workflow redesign: Six case studies (50-59). Washington, DC: Council on Library and Information Resources.

Madarash-Hill, C. & Hill, J. B. (2004). Enhancing access to IEEE Conference proceedings: A case study in the application of IEEE Xplore full text and table of contents enhancements. *Science & Technology Libraries, 24*(3/4), 389-399.

Madarash-Hill, C. & Hill, J. B. (2005). Electronically enriched enhancements in catalog records: A use study of books described on records with URL enhancements versus those without. *Technical Services Quarterly, 23*(2), 19-31.

Medeiros, N. (2007). Managing electronic resources in the Tri-College Consortium. In M. Mitchell (Ed.), Library workflow redesign: Six case studies (60-72). Washington, DC: Council on Library and Information Resources.

Mitchell, E. (2013). Assessing the value of metadata in information services. *Technical Services Quarterly, 30*(2), 187-200.

Morris, R. C. T. (2001). Online tables of contents for books: Effect on usage. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association, 89*(1): 29-36.

Mugridge, R. L. (2014). Technical services assessment: A survey of Pennsylvania academic libraries. *Library Resources and Technical Services, 58*(2), 100-110

Mugridge, R. L. & Poehlmann, N. M. (2015). Benchmarking as an assessment tool for cataloging. *Technical Services Quarterly, 32*(2), 141-159.

Mundle, K., Huie, H., & Bangalore, N. S. (2006). ARL library catalog department web sites: An evaluative survey. *Library Resources & Technical Services, 50*(3), 173–185.

Rea, L. M. & Parker, R.A. (2014). *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rogers, J. (2012) *Walking away from the American Chemical Society*. [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.attemptingelegance.com/?p=1765

Schroeder, R., & Howland, J. L. (2011). Shelf-ready: A cost-benefit analysis. *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services, 35*(4), 129–134.

Shih, T., & X. Fan. (2008). Comparing response rates from web and mail surveys: A meta-analysis. *Field Methods*, *20*(3), 249-271.

Stalberg, E., & Cronin, C. (2011). Assessing the cost and value of bibliographic control. *Library Resources & Technical Services, 55*(3), 124–137.

Stouthuysen, K., Swiggers, M., Reheul, A., & Roodhooft, F. (2010). Time-driven activity-based costing for a library acquisition process: A case study in a Belgian university. *Library Collections, Acquisitions & Technical Services, 34*(2), 83–91.

Tosaka, Y., & Weng, C. (2011). Reexamining content-enriched access: Its effect on usage and discovery. *College & Research Libraries, 72*(5), 412-427.

Webber, S. (2004). Applying program assessment techniques to electronic resources management. *Technical Services Quarterly, 22*(1), 9-20.

Wilson, B. (2015). An afterword on leadership for the road ahead. In Bell, S., Dempsey, L., Fister, B. (2015) *New roles for the road ahead: Essays commissioned for ACRL's 75th anniversary* (p. 103-107). Chicago, Ill.: Association of College and Research Libraries. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/publications/whitepapers/new_roles_75th.pdf

Wright, S. & White, L. S. (2007). *Library assessment*. SPEC Kit 303. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.

Yue, P. W., & Kurt, L. (2011). Nine years after implementing the unthinkable: The cessation of periodical check-in at the University of Nevada, Reno. *Serials Librarian, 61*(2), 231–252.

APPENDIX: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

See: http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc488133/m1/1/