National Bibliographic Knowledgebase

Community Survey: Overall Figures
Overall Objective
To inform the development of the National Bibliographic Knowledgebase with comprehensive feedback from existing and potential contributors.

Core Research Objectives
» Understand the requirements of the library community, and any difference in experience by library;
» Explore rationale for contributing and the potential benefits of the NBK;
» Understand the use of data suppliers;
» Explore approaches to data and metadata, including data sharing;
» Test the attractiveness of potential support mechanisms for the NBK.

30 minute online survey with institutional responses requested

99 responses

Survey In Field:
4th June – 19th July 2018
About your Library Management System
Which LMS do you currently use?

- Alma: 34%
- Other: 15%
- Sierra: 13%
- Symphony: 10%
- Aleph: 10%
- Alto: 9%
- Millenium: 3%
- Worldshare Management...: 2%
- Voyager: 2%
- Horizon: 1%

Which format(s) can your LMS use to store and ingest bibliographic records?

- MARC exchange: 76%
- MARCXML: 50%
- Dublin Core: 27%
- BIBFRAME: 14%
- Other: 10%
- MODS: 5%

*Other: Koha (5), Soutron (4), OLE (Open Library Environment (1), Out to tender (1), EOS Sirsidynix (1), Don’t have one (1), Heritage Cirqa (1)*
Is your library involved in any of the following support networks for your LMS?

- **User group**: 91% Yes, 7% No, 13% This doesn't exist for my LMS
- **Online forum**: 71% Yes, 18% No, 11% This doesn't exist for my LMS
- **Mailing list**: 96% Yes, 1% No, 3% This doesn't exist for my LMS

Does your LMS provide guidance on how to export large datasets to external databases?

- **Yes** 76%
- **No** 11%
- **Don't know** 13%
About your data suppliers
In the last year, how often has your library used the following services for record supply/download?

- **Vendor/Shelf ready**: 76% more than 10 times, 18% 5-10 times
- **OCLC**: 61% more than 10 times, 29% 5-10 times
- **Library of Congress**: 49% more than 10 times, 36% 5-10 times
- **LMS e.g. Alma Community Zone**: 48% more than 10 times, 49% 5-10 times
- **RLUK database**: 41% more than 10 times, 59% 5-10 times
- **Other source**: 39% more than 10 times, 57% 5-10 times
- **BNB/LDSCP**: 22% more than 10 times, 76% 5-10 times
- **SUNCAT**: 21% more than 10 times, 67% 5-10 times
- **ESTC**: 12% more than 10 times, 84% 5-10 times
- **NLS**: 8% more than 10 times, 87% 5-10 times
- **CERL**: 4% more than 10 times, 92% 5-10 times
Please tell us if you undertake any of the following activities to check the quality and accuracy of the bibliographic records?

- Cataloguer undertakes individual checks: 84
- Record update or overlay: 57
- Global editing using LMS functionality: 50
- Sample checking: 46
- Global editing using external software: 41
- Other: 6
- None: 3

Do you report back errors in the bibliographic records to suppliers?

- Yes: 49%
- No: 47%
- Don't know: 5%
Data and metadata
On average, how often does your library work on the following types of metadata?

- **Books/monographs - physical**: 86%
- **Books/monographs - electronic**: 68%
- **Continuing resources - physical**: 30%
- **Continuing resources – electronic**: 26%

[Color-coded chart showing frequency of metadata work: Daily, Weekly, Fortnightly, Monthly, Less often, N/A]
Quality of metadata – last five years

How would your library rate the quality of metadata that has been added to your catalogue in the last 5 years?

Books/monographs - physical

Continuing resources - physical

Books/monographs - electronic

Continuing resources – electronic

1 (poor)  2  3  4  5 (excellent)  N/A
How would your library rate the quality of legacy metadata (i.e. older than 5 years)

- Continuing resources - physical
- Continuing resources – electronic
- Books/monographs - physical
- Books/monographs - electronic
We do not edit our existing metadata

Other

Vendor/system data is too basic for discovery

To meet a national cataloguing standard

To apply a local cataloguing standard for consistency

To meet user expectations

For which of these reasons would you edit your existing metadata?

Does your library consider the IFLA FRBR model when creating or amending bibliographic records?

Yes

No

Don't know

N/A

38% Yes

44% No

12% Don't know

6% N/A
Cataloguing standards, authority schema

Which cataloguing standard(s) are represented in your bibliographic records?

- **AACR2**: 95
- **RDA**: 87
- **AACR**: 31
- **DCRM**: 22
- **Other**: 11
- **BIBCO**: 1

Which authority schema do you maintain in your bibliographic records?

- **LCSH**: 78
- **LC Names (NAF)**: 66
- **Other**: 22
- **MESH**: 20
- **FAST**: 13
Which of the following tools does your library use for data matching and manipulation?

- Data Manipulation tools within your LMS: 79
- MarcEdit: 72
- Excel: 59
- OpenRefine: 19
- Other: 17
- No current capability in-house: 6
Data sharing
Does your library do original cataloguing?

- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%

(If yes) Do you catalogue with sharing of records in mind?

- Yes: 56%
- No: 42%
- Don't know: 2%
What type of record/data types does your library contribute to the following shared services?

- OCLC Worldcat
  - Print book records: 34%
  - eBook records: 20%
  - Print journal records: 13%
  - eJournal records: 16%
  - Other: 10%
  - We don't contribute: 6%

- NBK
  - Print book records: 31%
  - eBook records: 18%
  - Print journal records: 16%
  - eJournal records: 15%
  - Other: 13%
  - We don't contribute: 7%

- Copac
  - Print book records: 25%
  - eBook records: 22%
  - Print journal records: 16%
  - eJournal records: 17%
  - Other: 14%
  - We don't contribute: 6%

- SUNCAT
  - Print book records: 25%
  - eBook records: 1%
  - Print journal records: 39%
  - eJournal records: 33%
  - Other: 1%
  - We don't contribute: 1%
Processes: manual or automated

Is your process manual or automated?

- **OCLC Worldcat**
  - Manual: 58%
  - Automated: 21%
  - We don't contribute: 21%

- **NBK**
  - Manual: 61%
  - Automated: 16%
  - We don't contribute: 24%

- **Copac**
  - Manual: 52%
  - Automated: 26%
  - We don't contribute: 23%

- **SUNCAT**
  - Manual: 37%
  - Automated: 31%
  - We don't contribute: 32%
Which of the following functions is your library able to perform with your current LMS and in-house expertise.

- Batch importing of files of bibliographic records: 91
- Batch exporting of selected bibliographic records: 88
- Selective matching and importing of full bibliographic records from a file: 75
- Selective matching and merging of full bibliographic records from a file: 69
- Ability to merge selected fields ONLY into matched local records from an incoming file of full bib records: 52
- Other: 9
Updating records based on automated error reports

Does your library update your bibliographic records based on automated error reports from shared services?

- Yes: 25%
- No: 66%
- Don't know: 9%

Please tell us why you do not update your bibliographic records.

- Lack of staff time: 38
- Error report are not in a useful format: 9
- Other: 32
- Lack of staff expertise: 15
- Do not contain actionable information

*The majority of ‘other’ responses fall into the theme of we don’t receive automated error reports, or we don’t contribute to shared services.
Contributing to the NBK
Q25: How important are the following drivers in the decision to contribute bibliographic records to shared services?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not so important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping researchers find and access the resources they need</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased discoverability of special collections</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A consolidated source of high quality metadata for import or export</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of collection management tools to support ILL</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating with other academic and specialist libraries across the...</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficient and better-quality resource description across the...</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a one-stop-shop for finding locations for Interlibrary Loans</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to open access collections</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for collaboration with other libraries</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to link to other data sources and services (e.g. usage...</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26: Thinking about the following future benefits of the NBK, how important are each of these to your library?
Q27: How interested would your library be in using the NBK to improve its metadata in the following ways?
Q28: Do you consider any of the following to be barriers to you contributing your data to the NBK? (Please select all that apply)?

- Lack of staff time, 52
- Quality of some catalogue records not good enough to contribute, 45
- Technical issues, 39
- Local data issues preventing export from LMS or import to NBK, 13
- Insufficient expert knowledge of extracting a subset of records from our LMS, 17
- NBK documentation didn't address all our concerns, 8
- Other, 24
- Lack of support...
Support and documentation
Q29: How useful have you found the existing NBK support mechanisms? 

- One to one interactions with NBK staff: 30% Extremely useful, 20% Useful, 8% Somewhat useful, 4% Not very useful, 4% Not at all useful, 40% I haven't used this
- Data sharing FAQ: 4% Extremely useful, 18% Useful, 11% Somewhat useful, 27% Not very useful, 64% Not at all useful, 4% I haven't used this
- Data supply workflow: 3% Extremely useful, 24% Useful, 11% Somewhat useful, 11% Not very useful, 51% Not at all useful, 3% I haven't used this
- Data supply supporting documentation: 4% Extremely useful, 27% Useful, 15% Somewhat useful, 4% Not very useful, 51% Not at all useful, 4% I haven't used this
- Potential contributor information: 6% Extremely useful, 31% Useful, 20% Somewhat useful, 11% Not very useful, 42% Not at all useful, 4% I haven't used this
Ongoing support

Q30: Please tell us how useful the following types of ongoing support would be for your library

- Clear documentation on which records to submit to the NBK
  - Extremely useful: 58%
  - Useful: 36%
  - Somewhat useful: 5%

- Guidance to support decision making on who owns MARC records
  - Extremely useful: 58%
  - Useful: 30%
  - Somewhat useful: 8%

- Vendor specific technical advice on preparation for exporting records
  - Extremely useful: 49%
  - Useful: 30%
  - Somewhat useful: 13%

- A shared online support space/forum for asking questions and seeking advice
  - Extremely useful: 40%
  - Useful: 46%
  - Somewhat useful: 13%

- Becoming part of an active NBK User Group community
  - Extremely useful: 31%
  - Useful: 43%
  - Somewhat useful: 21%

- Access to an expert advisor from Jisc
  - Extremely useful: 29%
  - Useful: 42%
  - Somewhat useful: 26%

- A dedicated mailing list for NBK contributors
  - Extremely useful: 28%
  - Useful: 51%
  - Somewhat useful: 18%

- Video tutorials demonstrating NBK workflows
  - Extremely useful: 26%
  - Useful: 47%
  - Somewhat useful: 22%

- Access to an expert advisor from a peer organisation
  - Extremely useful: 25%
  - Useful: 47%
  - Somewhat useful: 24%

- Regular updates from Jisc on product development
  - Extremely useful: 21%
  - Useful: 47%
  - Somewhat useful: 30%

- Webinars
  - Extremely useful: 20%
  - Useful: 50%
  - Somewhat useful: 27%

- Case studies from other institutions
  - Extremely useful: 14%
  - Useful: 52%
  - Somewhat useful: 29%