Evaluation of the Existing System

The existing AIISH Institutional Repository and the Online Public Access Catalogue were evaluated by conducting a questionnaire survey among the end user community. The details are explained in this chapter.

**Evaluation of the OPAC**

An eight-item questionnaire was developed for collecting the opinion of the Online Public Access Catalogue by the end users at the Institute (Appendix-1). Totally, 50 questionnaires were distributed and 30 users (60%) responded to the survey.

The respondents include 11 staff and 19 students. Among the respondents, 21 had been with the Institute for more than three years and nine joined the Institute in less than a year. The respondents were screened initially based on whether they use OPAC or not. The non-users were requested to return the questionnaire after indicating the reasons for not using the facility. Further questions were limited to those were using the OPAC.

Only two respondents (6.6%) did not use the Online Public Access Catalogue. The reasons cited for non-use include ‘I don’t know the benefit of using OPAC’ and ‘I prefer searching the books directly on the shelves’,

The questionnaire received from the remaining 28 respondents were further analysed for understanding their pattern of use, difficulties faced and suggestions for features in the new OPAC.

The respondents came to know about the OPAC facility from ‘colleagues and friends’ (32%, 9 no.), library staff (57%, 16 nos.), library website (18%, 5 nos.), teachers in the class (3 nos., 11%), and library orientation (64%, 18 nos.). Thus the majority came to know about the facility through the library orientation programme.

To a question on the functionalities of OPAC that were being used, the respondents indicated book author searching, searching (17 nos, 60%), title searching (21 nos., 75%), keyword searching (13 nos., 46%), location (26, 93%), no. of copies of books (9 nos., 32%), new arrivals (2 nos., 7%). No one used the facility for book reservation and for checking outstanding due.

Fifteen respondents (54%) used OPAC on weekly basis and the remaining 46% used it rarely.

The respondents faced difficulties in using OPAC and book circulation. These include missing the due date of book return (10 nos., 36%), lack of information on the total fine due (11 nos., 39%), unskilled in OPAC searching (2 nos., 7%), lack of information on new arrivals (7 nos., 25%), inadequacy in the no. of books issued (7 nos., 25%), and inconvenient book circulation timing (2 nos., 7%).

The respondents suggested features and functionalities for the new OPAC such as user review on books (11 nos. 39%), international database search facility ( 7 nos., 25%), common search interface for all the library resources ( 17 nos., 61%), feedback ( 4 nos., 14%), table of contents ( 20 nos., 71 %), and book suggestion facility (15 nos., 54%).

**Evaluation of the Institutional Repository**

A 16-item questionnaire was developed for collecting the feedback on existing IR from the end-user community. (Appendix-II). Totally, 50 questionnaires were distributed and 31 persons (62%) responded to the survey. 17 respondents (55%) had been with the organization for more than five years. Seven (23%) had three to five years’ experience and the remaining seven respondents (23%) joined the Institute in less than three years. Four out of 31 respondents never used the IR. The reasons include, ‘It is not relevant for my information needs’ (50%, 2 nos.), and ‘I don’t know how to use it’ (50%, 2 nos.).

The questionnaire received from the 27 respondents, who were the users of the IR, were further analysed for understanding their pattern of use, views on different aspects of Institutional repository, difficulties faced and suggestions for functionalities and features in the new OPAC.

Majority of the respondents (63%, 17 nos.) came to know about the repository through the library orientation programme. Other sources of information about the IR were, colleagues and friends (48%, 13 nos.), teachers in the classroom (30%, 8 nos.), and library website (22%, 6 nos.).

In an attempt to find out the awareness of the resources available in IR, the respondents were requested to identify the resources from among a list. The list included items which were not available in the repository. Only 37% (10 nos.) of the respondents were able to tick the correct combination of resources in the repository.

Of the four types of resources content, the PG dissertations were used frequently or very frequently by majority of respondents (59%, 16 nos.). This is followed by doctoral theses which were used frequently or very frequently by 37% (10 nos.). Only 22% (6 nos.) used the Independent Project reports very frequently or frequently. A considerable number of end-user respondents (37%, 10 nos.) never used the Independent Project reports.

Another awareness question was asked regarding the nature of accessibility to the repository. Only 19% of the respondents answered the correct combination of repository accessibility options.

Majority of the respondents (78%, 21 nos.) did not use any repository other than AIISH Institutional repository. The major reasons for not using other repositories were ‘Didn’t find any other useful repository’ (37 %, 10 nos.) and ‘Need did not arise’ (41%, 11 nos.). The respondents who reported as using other repositories (22%, 6 nos.) were asked to name them. However, the names they entered were not actually repositories.

The level of satisfaction of the respondents with regard to 12 functionalities and features of the repository was measured on a five-point scale. Of these, 52% (14 nos.) reported dissatisfaction on the content types of the repository. 22% (6 nos.) were satisfied and the remaining 26% ( 7 nos.) stood neutral.

48% (13 nos.) were satisfied with the *content quantity* whereas 22% (6 nos.) were dissatisfied. The *search and retrieval* ability of the repository was dissatisfying for 67% of the respondents. Only 11% (3 nos.) were satisfied on this aspect. A huge 85% were dissatisfied with the *navigation* facility of the repository. However, 55% (15 nos.) expressed satisfaction on the *content up-dation* of the repository. 81% expressed satisfaction on *open accessibility* of the repository content and as well as *content accuracy*. 70 % were not satisfied with the *look and feel* of the repository. A huge majority (93%) reported that the repository had useful content. 53% are satisfied with the readability of the content. Only 15% (4 nos.) were satisfied with the speed of access and 7% with the username and password-based access.

The end-users were asked a question on their knowledge of the copyright ownership of the content and answers of 67% were wrong.

To an open-ended question on additional resources, they wish to access in the repository, the respondents suggested publications and presentations.

The respondents indicated additional features like ability to download the full-text content (78%), more types of content (59%), display of most popular/ most retrieved items (56%), E-alert on new deposit (52%), feedback mechanism (48%), peer-reviewing (41%), facility for self-deposit (33%), and availability of research datasets (33%). 67% (18 nos.) reported difficulties in using the repository. These include access interruption, more downloading time, issue with the flash player, username and password based access and limited search facility.

To a question on the perceived benefits of making the research works available in IR, all the respondents reported enhancement of citation, getting protection for the work from plagiarism (93%), easy communication of research results (85%), long-term preservation (18%), easy identification of works by others (14%), making the research available with very little effort on the part of contributor (20%), making the research available faster than the traditional publishing process (41%), improve the quality of research work in the field (40%) and enhancement of quality of teaching-learning process (63%).

The major concerns of the respondents in contributing their research work to a repository are, repositories in general have low prestige(15%), repositories in general are harmful to research rather than helpful (12%), others might copy the work without my permission (48%), by depositing the work in the repository I may not be able to publish it elsewhere (60%) and there is no motivation and incentives for contributing to the repository (64%).

**Inference**

**Online Public Access Catalogue**

* The end users are not using all the features and functionalities of the existing OPAC.
* The usage rate of OPAC is fairly good. The users are facing issues related to book circulation. The major ones are the missing of due date and fine accrued due to late return.
* Though the OPAC is listing newly arrived books, the users demanded new arrivals functionality in the new OPAC. Probably, the new arrival section of the existing OPAC is not getting enough visibility.
* The major functionalities required in new OPAC are book review, link to international databses, common search interfaces for all the resources, table of contents of books, feedback system and suggestion for new books.

**Digital Repository**

* Though a minority, there are end-users who are not using the existing repository due to the lack of skills.
* The library orientation programmes played a major role in inducting skills on using the repository. Also, a considerable number of respondents learned to use IR from their colleagues.
* The End-users are not fully aware of all types of resources available with the repository.
* Post graduate dissertations are the most frequently used repository type.
* Surprisingly, only less number of end-users are aware of the fact that the repository content are fully accessible from across the world free of cost.
* All the respondents participated in the survey were using only AIISH Institutional Repository. No other IR is as useful as AIISH IR for the respondents.
* Though the respondents were not fully aware of the types of the repository content, they expressed dissatisfaction about the content types which is contradictory.
* A considerable no. of respondents was not happy with the quantity of the content also.
* The respondents required improved search/ retrieval and navigation facility for the repository. Also, they were not happy with the look and feel of the repository. However, they were satisfied with the content updating, content accuracy and open accessibility to the content. Slightly more than half of the respondents were who satisfied with the readability of the repository.
* Access speed of the repository much to be improved. Also, the respondents were not happy with the user-name and password based access to the repository.
* The end-users had little knowledge about the ownership and copyright of the repository content.
* The respondents demanded faculty publications and presentation in the repository.
* The additional functionality required for the repository include full-text downloading, additional content types, display of popular or most viewed items, e-alert, self-depositing and research data set.
* The respondents were well aware of the benefits of depositing their research materials in the repository. However, they were concerned whether they could publish their work elsewhere if they deposit them in the repository. Also, they were less motivated as there is no incentives in depositing content to the repository.