



Moving Image Collections

Directory Field Evaluation Report (6/10/2003)

Method

Instrument

Online Survey Form

Channels for calling for the participation

- Announcement on mailing lists
- Links on MIC & MicEval Web sites
- Other

Respondent Population

- Members of Science Educators' Advisory Board (12 members ?)
- Archivists from AMIA-L mailing lists
- Members from other mailing lists (e.g. Science-education mailing list)

Responding duration

36 days (May 5th – June 10th)

Results

Channels for acknowledging the participation of the survey

The majority of respondents (57.6%) replied that they acknowledged the survey through AMIA-L mailing list, whereas only 2 persons (6.1%) were from the Science & Educator's board. 15.2 % (5 out of 33) respondents knew the survey from other mailing lists, such as MIC_ALPHA list, MIC_ANNOUNCE list, & NJSTATE_DIGLIB@RUTGERS. The respondents from MIC or MicEval Web site were 3 respectively for each. However, it should be noted that some respondents who indicated that they learnt the survey through MicEval or MIC are likely to be the member of at least one emailing list posted. None of respondents learned the survey from other science educators' mailing list and the Web sites other than MIC and MicEval.

Demographic data

There were totally 33 respondents*. Regarding the job identity, 48.5% respondents labeled them as archivists, whereas 15.2% were university librarians and 33.3% belonged to "other" categories (e.g. student, independent contractor, production company employee, restoration specialist, electronic records consultant and webmaster, Library and Information Science graduate student, independent film coordinator, & adjunct/undergrad Sci Methods Crs; administrator for K-12 Sci pgrms). Please see the attached Excel file for the raw demographic data.

Preference of further participation and confidentiality

When being asked whether or not they would accept an interview later on, the majority of them (66.7% i.e. 22 out of 33) selected positive answers. Whereas 21 out of 22 preferred email interview, only 8 would like to be interviewed via telephone. It should be noted that there were five respondents with no specific interviewing preference.

For the preference of being referenced with their institution by name as participants later on, 69.7% respondents (23 out of 33) selected the positive answer, and there were 3 missing data (i.e. three respondents selected neither yes nor no answer)

Regarding the permission of direct quotes from the survey, 36.4% respondents (12 out of 33) selected the quote only option, whereas 33.3% provided all permission. Also, there were 5 missing data.

Perceived usefulness of the directory fields

The table-1 below summarizes the descriptive statistical data of the survey results. Whereas each column (col.2 – col.6) represents one IFLA FRBR function, each row (row2 – row28) shows a specific organization directory field.

❖ Physical description fields about an organization

Unsurprisingly, the name of an organization is the most useful information according to the respondents. The majority of the respondents (on average 89.4%) rated the field as very useful or useful for the FRBR functions surveyed. Right after the organization name, country, state/regional and city location of an organization were also rated as useful or very useful, with 78.0%, 72.0% and 78.8% respondents on average. Comparatively, the respondents are unlikely to care about the parent organization and alternative or variance of organization names (with average 65.6% and 66.7% usefulness rating respectively). More respondents rated organization type as useful (42.4%) rather than as very useful (37.4%). Additionally, organization's address and URL seem to be highly needed by the respondents in terms of identifying and obtaining resources (with average 89.4% and 93.9% usefulness rating). 75.8% respondents rated usefulness for the description field of complex situations for obtaining resources.

❖ Collection description fields

It is likely that general physical formats, predominant subjects and classes of materials in a collection are more useful to the respondents, with 82.6%, 81.1%, and 81.1% average usefulness rating respectively. Comparatively, complementary resources and full-text description of collection size/subjects seem to be less useful, only with 54.5%, and 63.3% average usefulness rating respectively.

❖ Service description fields

A high proportion of respondents (93.9% on average) regarded the four service description fields useful or very useful for them to obtain resources. These fields are controlled text fields regarding whether an organization sells/loans/rents copies of resources and free-text description of policies/restrictions for obtaining. Comparatively, the service restriction information is likely to be less useful for identifying, finding and selecting. Audience of organization services and services provided were less highlighted by the respondents, with only 50.9% and 71.7% average usefulness rating respectively.

❖ Contact information fields

The fields of primary contact/email/URL for obtaining resources were highly rated by the respondents, with 97.0% usefulness rating respectively. Comparatively, the mailing address and telephone number were less needed with 93.9% usefulness rating. It is clear that the respondents regarded the primary fax number much less useful, with only 72.7% usefulness rating.

❖ IFLA FRBR

For finding a moving image organization, the organization’s physical description fields seem to be more useful than other fields (e.g. collection and service). Especially, organization name, state/region location and organization type has 93.9%, 93.9% and 90.9% usefulness rating respectively.

Similarly, for finding a moving image collection, the collection description fields were much more highly rated. For instance, general physical formats, predominant subjects and classes of materials in the collection has 90.9%, 90.9% and 87.9% usefulness rating respectively.

When trying to confirm that the record describes the organization most appropriate to users’ need, the usefulness of the majority fields of organization description, collection and service is about the same (around 78.8%). The two extremes are organization name (93.9%) and audience of organization service (45.5%).

For the identifying purpose, more useful fields in the respondents’ viewpoints are organization name (93.9%), general physical formats (87.9%), organization’s address (87.9%), and URL(93.9%). Audience of organization services still has the least usefulness rating (57.6%).

Unsurprisingly, service policy/restriction and contact information are very useful for users to obtain resources, among which primary contact, email address and URL of obtaining resources seem to have the highest usefulness rating (97.0%). Still, audience of organization services still has the lower usefulness rating (54.5%). Other lower rated fields included primary fax number (72.7%) and description of complex situations for obtaining resources (75.8%).

Table-1 Descriptive Statistical Data

	FIND (organization)	FIND (Collection)	SELECT	IDENTIFY	OBTAIN
Organization name	very useful: 28 (84.8%) useful: 3 (9.1%) neutral: 1 (3.0%) less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 21 (63.6 %) useful: 4 (12.1%) neutral: 5 (15.2%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	** very useful: 25 (75.8%) useful: 6 (18.2%) neutral: 0 less useful: 1 (3.0%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 27 (81.8%) useful: 4 (12.1%) neutral: 0 less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%) missing data: 1	
Parent organization	very useful: 9 (27.3%)	very useful: 6 (18.2%)		very useful: 10 (30.3%)	

	useful: 14 (42.4%) neutral: 5 (15.2%) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 2 (6.1%)	useful: 13 (39.4%) neutral: 7 (21.2%) less useful: 6 (18.2%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)		useful: 13 (39.4%) neutral: 4 (12.1%) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 3 (9.1%)	
Country	very useful: 20 (60.6%) useful: 6 (18.2%) neutral: 4 (12.1%) less useful: 1 (3.0%) not useful: 2 (6.1%)	very useful: 15 (45.5%) useful: 9 (27.3%) neutral: 5 (15.2%) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 17 (51.5%) useful: 10 (30.3%) neutral: 4 (12.1%) less useful: 0 not useful: 2 (6.1%)	very useful: 17 (51.5%) useful: 9 (27.3%) neutral: 4 (12.1%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	
State or region	very useful: 21 (63.6%) useful: 10 (30.3%) neutral: 1 (3.0%) less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 13 (39.4%) useful: 9 (27.3%) neutral: 5 (15.2%) less useful: 4 (12.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%) missing data: 1	very useful: 16 (48.5%) useful: 10 (30.3%) neutral: 2 (6.1%) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 2 (6.1%)	very useful: 15 (45.5%) useful: 11 (33.3%) neutral: 3 (9.1%) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	
City	very useful: 16 (48.5%) useful: 12 (36.4%) neutral: 3 (9.1%) less useful: 1 (3.0%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)		very useful: 16 (48.5%) useful: 9 (27.3%) neutral: 3 (9.1%) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 2	very useful: 13 (39.4%) useful: 12 (36.4%) neutral: 3 (9.1%) less useful: 4 (12.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	
Org type	very useful: 14 (42.4%) useful: 16 (48.5%) neutral: 1 (3.0%) less useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 9 (27.3%) useful: 15 (45.5%) neutral: 3 (9.1%) less useful: 3 (9.1%)	very useful: 14 (42.4%) useful: 11 (33.3%) neutral: 5 (15.21%) less useful: 2 (6.1%)		

	not useful: 1 (3.0%)	not useful: 1 (3.0%) missing data: 2	not useful: 0 missing data: 1		
Audience of org service	very useful: 6 (18.2%) useful: 11 (33.3%) neutral: 12 (36.4%) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 4 (12.1%) useful: 11 (33.3%) neutral: 12 (36.4%) less useful: 4 (12.1%) not useful: 2 (6.1%)	very useful: 7 (21.2%) useful: 8 (24.2%) neutral: 11 (33.3%) less useful: 6 (18.2%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	***very useful: 8 (24.2%) useful: 11 (33.3%) neutral: 7 (21.2%) less useful: 4 (12.1%) not useful: 2 (6.1%) missing data: 1	very useful: 5 (15.2%) useful: 13 (39.4%) neutral: 9 (27.3%) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 2 (6.1%) missing data: 1
Services provided	very useful: 10 (30.3%) useful: 10 (30.3%) neutral: 7 (21.2%) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 2 (6.1%) missing data: 1		very useful: 17 (51.5%) useful: 10 (30.3%) neutral: 3 (9.1%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 11 (33.3%) useful: 13 (39.4%) neutral: 5 (15.2%) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	
Classes of materials in the collection	very useful: 16 (48.5%) useful: 11 (33.3%) neutral: 3 (9.1%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 23 (69.7%) useful: 6 (18.2%) neutral: 1 (3.0%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 17 (51.5%) useful: 8 (24.2%) neutral: 6 (18.2%) less useful: 1 (3.0%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 16 (48.5%) useful: 8 (24.2%) neutral: 4 (12.12%) less useful: 4 (12.12%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	
Predominant subjects in the collection	very useful: 21 (63.6%) useful: 5 (15.2%) neutral: 5 (15.2%) less useful: 1 (3.0%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 24 (72.7%) useful: 6 (18.2%) neutral: 0 less useful: 1 (3.0%) not useful: 1 (3.0%) missing data: 1	very useful: 21 (63.6%) useful: 4 (12.12%) neutral: 5 (15.2%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 16 (48.5%) useful: 10 (30.3%) neutral: 3 (9.1%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 2 (6.1%)	

General physical formats	very useful: 17 (51.5%) useful: 9 (27.3%) neutral: 4 (12.12%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 20 (60.6%) useful: 8 (24.2%) neutral: 2 (6.1%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 18 (54.5%) useful: 8 (24.2%) neutral: 4 (12.12%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 18 (54.5%) useful: 11 (33.3%) neutral: 0 less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	
Complementary resource collection	very useful: 5 (15.2%) useful: 13 (39.4%) neutral: 9 (27.3%) less useful: 4 (12.12%) not useful: 2 (6.1%)				
Controlled text indicating whether the org. sells copies of resources		very useful: 13 (39.4%) useful: 10 (30.3%) neutral: 6 (18.2%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%) missing data: 1	very useful: 18 (54.5%) useful: 8 (24.2%) neutral: 4 (12.1%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 11 (33.3%) useful: 12 (36.4%) neutral: 6 (18.2%) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 24 (72.7%) useful: 7 (21.2%) neutral: 1 (3.0%) less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%)
Controlled text indicating whether the org. loans or rents copies of resources		very useful: 14 (42.4%) useful: 10 (30.3%) neutral: 6 (18.2%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 17 (51.5%) useful: 9 (27.3%) neutral: 4 (12.1%) less useful: 2 (6.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	very useful: 11 (33.3%) useful: 10 (30.3%) neutral: 6 (18.2%) less useful: 4 (12.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%) missing data: 1	very useful: 24 (72.7%) useful: 7 (21.2%) neutral: 1 (3.0%) less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%)
Alternative or variance of org names				very useful: 9 (27.3%) useful: 13 (39.4%)	

				neutral: 6 (18.2%) less useful: 4 (12.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	
Organization's address				very useful: 20 (60.6%) useful: 9 (27.3%) neutral: 2 (6.1%) less useful: 0 not useful: 2 (6.1%)	very useful: 25 (75.8%) useful: 5 (15.2 %) neutral: 2 (6.1%) less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%)
Organization's URL				very useful: 25 (75.8%) useful: 6 (18.2 %) neutral: 1 (3.0%) less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%)	
Free-text description of service restriction				very useful: 11 (33.3%) useful: 13 (39.4%) neutral: 6 (18.2 %) less useful: 1 (3.0%) not useful: 2 (6.1%)	
Free-text description of collection size, subjects, etc.				very useful: 9 (27.3%) useful: 12 (36.4%) neutral: 5 (15.2 %) less useful: 6 (18.2%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)	
Organization's mailing address					very useful: 26 (78.8%)

					useful: 5 (15.2 %) neutral: 0 less useful: 1 (3.0%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)
Free-text description of policies/restrictions for obtaining resources					very useful: 21 (63.6%) useful: 10 (30.3 %) neutral: 1 (3.0%) less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%)
Primary contact for obtaining resources					very useful: 29 (87.9%) useful: 3 (9.1 %) neutral: 0 less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%)
Primary telephone number for obtaining resources					very useful: 28 (84.8%) useful: 3 (9.1 %) neutral: 1 (3.0%) less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%)
Primary fax number for obtaining resources					very useful: 24 (72.7%) useful: 4 (12.1 %) neutral: 2 (6.1%) less useful: 1 (3.0%) not useful: 2 (6.1%)
Primary email address for obtaining resources					very useful: 29 (87.9%) useful: 3 (9.1 %)

					neutral: 0 less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%)
URL for obtaining resources					very useful: 28 (84.8%) useful: 4 (12.1 %) neutral: 0 less useful: 0 not useful: 1 (3.0%)
Description of complex situations for obtaining resources					very useful: 13 (39.4%) useful: 12 (36.4%) neutral: 4 (12.1 %) less useful: 3 (9.1%) not useful: 1 (3.0%)

* Among the total number of 33 respondents, one is from MicEval team. There are three reasons to include the data from the respondents in the analysis. Firstly, the respondent did not participate in the instrument design and has less acknowledgment with the purpose of the questionnaire. Secondly, the respondent is a MLS student at SCILS and has shown particular interests in digital library resource and management. Considering the expansion of our population in the later period of survey, the identity of the respondent is unlikely to be an extreme outlier. Thirdly, by looking at her data and email communication, it is surely that the respondent filled the online survey form seriously.

** It need to be noted that there is 25 missing value for the organization name field rating for “select” function according to the original data. However, by looking at the html coding for the survey, I found that the missing value is due to an error space in the name tag for very useful rating. Accordingly, I recoded the 25 missing value as “very useful”. It should be noted that there is a plausible threat of having recoded a certain of real missing value. However, by looking at the entire data set, one may find that the missing value issue is trivial.

*** There are two duplicate statement (9 and 16) in the online survey form in the IDENTIFY section. Only the answers to the 9th statement were counted. However, by looking at the descriptive statistic analysis results, one may find the two sets of results are highly replicated. The fact might serve as side evidence supporting the internal validity of the survey instrument.