

Survey Report – MBooks

SI 622: Evaluation of Systems and Services
March 5, 2007
Assignment #5

Group members:

Kehr Bailey

Wei (Cherry) Chen

Valentina Karimova

Sarah Raux

Mary Ann Williams (mailbox #295)

Table of Contents

<i>Overview</i>	3
<i>Methods</i>	4
<i>Statistical Analysis</i>	6
Concluding Remarks about Survey Data	11
<i>Recommendations</i>	12
<i>Conclusion</i>	13
<i>Appendix A</i>	15
MBooks Survey	15
<i>Appendix B</i>	19
Survey Summary from SurveyMonkey.com	19
<i>Appendix C</i>	25
Numerical Survey Data	25

Overview

This report contains the survey analysis of MBooks, also known as the Michigan Digitization Project. This project, associated with Google, provides an online access system to the University of Michigan Library's digitized collections. MBooks utilizes a "page turner" interface allowing users to either search within the text or view the full text depending on the copyright restrictions currently in place for each individual resource. The MBooks system does not currently allow downloading of full texts, nor can its collection be browsed or searched as a distinct entity among the electronic resources at U of M.

The purpose of this survey was to receive feedback on the MBooks user experience and to compare MBooks with other electronic resources. The comparison focused on features available in other electronic resource systems and what features are lacking from the MBooks system. To obtain objective data a broad audience was reached within the UM community as well as outside the UM community.

Methods

Due in large part to the early release of our survey, we succeed in surveying 93 people from diversified fields. The participants included University of Michigan students (undergraduate, masters, and doctoral students), UM faculty, UM staff, UM librarians, and individuals from outside the UM community. It is also important to note that of the 93 respondents, 73 responses were completed in full, which comprises the main sample used for our data analysis. Participants were asked to fill out a survey, which asked questions related to both MBooks as well as other electronic resources. Using a conditional response structure, those who answered that they had used MBooks before were asked to evaluate different features of the MBooks usability and functionality. Those who had used other electronic resources, such as Google Book Search or ProQuest, were asked to rate their satisfaction with using these other electronic resources. All participants, including those who had never used these services before, were asked to choose the features they considered most important when using an electronic resource like MBooks.

Conditional questions are one of the most significant characteristics in our survey. Assuming, based on previous knowledge, that many survey participants would have used other electronic resources more frequently than the MBooks system, we considered these people to be our potential future users for MBooks. These participants' opinions about competitor services provided a useful reference point for our MBooks evaluation. Therefore, we designed our survey to accommodate the experiences of different participants who were asked to answer different questions according to their experiences with a variety of electronic resources. For example, MBooks users would be asked to evaluate the usability of MBooks after they clicked "yes" for "Have you used MBooks before?" Meanwhile, people who answered "no" to this question were asked to rate the importance of the functionality of MBooks through questions about comparative resources. Participants who had used other electronic resources before were asked to rate their experiences with these services. This method allowed us to not only collect feedback and comments from MBooks users, but also to obtain potential users' needs for MBooks as they related to similar services. The survey questions are included in Appendix A.

The survey consisted of 15 questions covering rated functionality, usability of the service, demographic questions, and two open-ended questions in which participants could write additional comments related to both the resources in the survey as well as the survey itself. Nine questions were asked in the form of a single choice in which respondents were asked to indicate their experiences using different services and their demographic information. Three questions offered opposing adjectives ("Very satisfied—Not at all satisfied"), asking respondents to rate on a five-point scale their affective reaction of the functionality and usability of the services. The order of the options that were used for rating were designed to be randomized by the survey service (Survey Monkey) in order to avoid the phenomena that people may consider the first option the most important¹. The remaining two questions were open-ended and optional for respondents. They asked for other comments that respondents might have thought to be

¹ Kuniavsky (2003) -- p. 321

important for the evaluators but were not included in the survey. We received a number of valuable comments from these questions and included some in our recommendations.

Statistical Analysis

The open source software R was used to perform analysis on the data from our survey. In all cases the rows with missing values were omitted from the analysis.

Our first task was to reach a determination of which online text delivery system was the most preferred by our users (Table 1). This relates to the data obtained in question 1B of the survey (Appendix A), asking participants to rate their experience with our 5 comparison sites on a scale of 1-5 with one being “not at all satisfied” and 5 being “very satisfied”. The comparison sites (Google, Amazon.com, ProQuest, Mirlyn, Harvard, and Open Library) were chosen during the survey design process. They were considered to be the best reference points due to their previous analysis in the comparative evaluation, conducted prior to the survey. All responses of 0, corresponding to “not applicable”, were not figured into the analysis as it was assumed that these participants had no knowledge of the product and should not influence the results provided by those that did.

Table 1: Statistical data obtained from survey question 1B

	Google Book Search	Amazon.com	ProQuest Safari Books	Mirlyn	Harvard Book Search	Open Library
Min	1	1	1	1	1	1
Max	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mean	3.52	4.351	3.444	3.291	3.143	3.3
Median	4	5	4	3	3	3.5
Standard Deviation	0.9528	0.8073	0.9218	1.0878	1.215	1.1595
Variance	0.9078	0.6517	0.8497	1.1834	1.4762	1.3444
Respondents	50	77	18	79	8	10

Respondents appeared most satisfied with the Amazon.com reader service, giving it the highest mean rating and the lowest standard deviation. Google Book Search was second in mean rating score, ProQuest Safari Books was rated third, and Mirlyn was rated fourth. For the purposes of further analyzing this data, the results for Harvard and Open Library were omitted for low numbers of respondents. The results for ProQuest indicate that it is a fairly satisfactory system for those that use it, but the Google and Amazon systems are more relevant for comparison to MBooks.

To see whether there was a significant difference between the ratings given to Google and Amazon.com among the set of all users, a t-test was performed using a .05 criterion of significance.

Table 2: Significant preferences between Google and Amazon

All users' preferences between Google and Amazon

	Google	Amazon
mean	3.52	4.351
p-value (between system's		1.87E-06

means)

--	--

It was determined that the probability that the systems' means are the same (Table 2) given our data is 1.87e-06, which is statistically significant. This indicates that users showed a clear preference for Amazon.com's system over Google's. This significance did not hold up across all groups. Those participants who *had* used MBooks (Table 3) gave both systems a lower mean rating than the entire sample, although the difference between the two systems' mean ratings was still significant. For participants who *had not* used MBooks, both systems were given higher mean ratings than those given by the whole population. Additionally, the difference between the two systems' ratings lost its significance. The differences between non-MBooks users and MBooks users' means for these two systems were not significant. This is potentially an effect of the sample size.

Table 3: MBooks usage and preferences for Google and Amazon

People who *have* used MBooks and their preferences for Google and Amazon

	Google	Amazon
mean	3.3704	4.2591
p-value (between systems)		0.0022
p-value (all users vs. MBooks users)	0.5485	0.6561

People who *haven't* used MBooks

	Google	Amazon
mean	3.8889	4.6667
p-value (between systems)		0.064*
p-value (all users vs. non-MBooks users)	0.2971	0.2386

Difference in Google and Amazon Ratings Between users and non-users of MBooks

	Google	Amazon
MBooks user mean	3.3704	4.2591
MBooks non-user mean	3.8889	4.6667
p-value (between MBooks user and non-user means)	0.1833	0.1876

Online Journal Use and its Impact on Google and Amazon Ratings

User prefers journal on paper

	Google	Amazon
mean	3.5	4.351
p-value (between whole sample and this subset)	0.9223	0.9987

User prefers journals on screen

mean	3.6	4.075
p-value (between whole sample and this subset)	0.8145	0.1856**

In comparing those respondents who preferred journals online or on paper with their responses for Google and Amazon, we found no significant change in the means of their respective ratings. However, there was a very low probability given for the t-test conducted between the mean rating for Amazon given by those preferring journals on the screen and Amazon's mean rating given by the entire sample. While not significant, it may be indicative of a certain lack of functionality provided by Amazon for those who enjoy conducting journal-based research on-screen. This may be worth further scrutiny in analysis on a larger data set.

General reader features (Table 5) were rated on the same scale of 1-5 (responses of 0 for 'not applicable' were not considered). All of these rated at above 4 ('somewhat important') except familiarity and help availability, indicating that similarity to previously used resources is not so important to users. These elements might also be affected by the advanced level of many of the survey's respondents. The most important factors were, in order, ease of use, search/browse text, speed of reaching the book and downloadable text (tied), search or browse the collection digital, zoom, help availability, and familiarity. The lowest standard deviation was found on ease of use and ability to search, indicating that the sample was most certain about the highest rated features.

When looking at the ratings given to certain general features of an online reader, we found nothing of statistical significance but did observe a few things that may be of interest for a follow-up study. Table 5 shows the mean values of the entire sample for the given features, along with the mean values of certain subsets for that particular sample. The probabilities show that the differences in mean between the whole sample and subset are significant. While nothing meeting our significance criterion existed, there were some differences in means. Each of these differences had a *relatively* low probability of naturally occurring given the distributions of the data. For instance, those that preferred to read journals online gave a mean rating of 3.818 vs. the sample mean of 4.277 for the importance of downloading full text (p-value = .2718) – a natural drop for those that commonly read articles on the screen. In another case MBooks users' mean value for the ability to search the online collection was 4.481 vs. 4.185 (p-value = .2128) for all respondents. This could be indicative of frustration over the inability to specifically search the MBooks collection separately of other electronic resources in Mirlyn. Such a theory may be further supported by the fact that non-students rated the ease of getting to the book at 4.529 vs. 4.277 (p-value = .1896) for the entire sample, which may show that less active computer users in the University of Michigan community or non-researchers may have a need for a clearer path from a record to an online book (MBooks users rated this feature at 4.444, also higher than the whole sample but only obtaining a p-value of .3434). Finally, those that preferred using journals on the screen rated ease of use at 4.818 vs. 4.569 (p-value = .1177) for the whole sample. While not significant, the low probability could serve as a future study to reveal the need for advanced research features that online sources can provide when implemented in a usable way (especially for those who use resources online without printing). This, among many other things, could increase the importance of this facet of online reader functionality.

The ratings of MBooks functionality (Table 4) showed the readability of available items emerged as the highest rated part of the system. This indicates that accessibility concerns were taken into account in the design of the system and have succeeded in creating a system with generally readable representations. However, the mean rating of 3.526 shows that progress still must be made. The ability to search within a book was also rated slightly above neutral which indicates users do not find this a detriment even though more work could also be done here. All groups of participants rated the remaining functions in MBooks below ‘neutral’ (given as a numerical rating of 3). This marks the availability of full-text, the time to locate the resource, and the downloading functionality as areas that need improvement.

Given the complete lack of non-students who responded as having used MBooks, we could not analyze this subset. It should be mentioned that this would be a useful group to sample in any further study. What did emerge as a potential area for consideration is MBooks’ search functionality and readability and how that relates to downloading.

Table 4: MBooks functionality statistics

MBooks functionality preferences

	availability of full text	time to locate resource	ability to search within book	readability	download full text
Min	1	1	1	1	1
Max	4	5	5	5	5
Mean	2.7	2.905	3.368	3.526	2.579
Standard Deviation	1.0311	1.0911	1.0651	1.2635	1.2164
Variance	1.0632	1.1905	1.1345	1.5965	1.4795

Prefers Paper Journals

mean	2.8462	2.7692	2.9167	3.1667	2.3846
p-value	0.7003	0.7157	0.2426*	0.4487	0.6022

Prefers Online Journals

mean	2.75	2.8	4.25	4	2.2
p-value	0.929	0.874	0.0304	0.5684	0.7646

Participants who preferred on-screen journal reading rated the ability to search MBooks much more highly than the whole sample, with a mean of 4.25 (p-value of difference = .0304). This significance may show that persons used to online research are just generally happier about the concept of full text-searching or that MBooks is particularly useful in this area. Although, those that preferred reading journals on paper rated this feature far lower than the whole sample’s mean, but not significantly. The same participants who preferred to read journals on paper also rated the readability of MBooks texts lower than both those that used the screen for journals and the whole sample (although not significantly). This shows that the lack of print functionality is something that is seen as a detriment by certain groups of users.

Table 5: Feature importance statistics
Importance of Online Reader Functions

	download full text	Search or browse within text	Search or browse collection	help menu/FAQ	zoom	getting to book	familiarity	ease of use
min	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
max	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
mean	4.277	4.4	4.185	3.862	4.092	4.277	3.538	4.569
standard deviation	1.0534	0.8441	1.059	0.8993	0.9474	0.9101	1.105	0.7493
variance	1.1096	0.7125	1.1216	0.8087	0.8975	0.8284	1.2211	0.5615
MBooks user mean	4.222	4.519	4.481	3.889	4.111	4.444	3.63	4.63
p-value	0.8292	0.5102	0.2128	0.8904	0.923	0.3434	0.7218	0.6742
student mean	4.3	4.3	4.05	3.775	4.15	4.225	3.675	4.55
p-value	0.9153	0.5908	0.5293	0.6443	0.7706	0.79	0.5381	0.9063
non-student mean	4.294	4.529	4.412	4	4.176	4.529	3.294	4.647
p-value	0.9404	0.487	0.3682	0.5889	0.7331	0.1896	0.4047	0.6578
prefers paper journals	4.391	4.478	4.283	3.935	4.13	4.239	3.543	4.565
p-value	0.5473	0.5846	0.6079	0.6642	0.823	0.8199	0.9807	0.9762
prefers online journals	3.818	4.182	3.818	3.636	4	4.455	3.727	4.818
p-value	0.2718	0.535	0.376	0.4148	0.7966	0.568	0.6083	0.1177

Concluding Remarks about Survey Data

Our results show that of the selected comparative resources, Amazon.com and Google have the highest user ratings. While we do not recommend copying these systems (as shown earlier, familiarity was not as highly regarded), researching their creation, development, and functionality may be useful toward improving MBooks for the research library community. It should be noted that using MBooks does seem to have an impact that lowers the ratings of these systems. While not significant (p-value about .185 for both Google and Amazon), this may be an area for continued research as this might indicate MBooks to have an interface which makes the system less impressive in some way.

It should be noted here that a few of the findings reflect issues that are currently out of the control of the MBooks developers. For example, the University of Michigan's agreement with Google forbids that they offer full pdf downloads of the books. Also, availability of full-text materials is dictated by current copyright law as well as the fact that the project won't be completed for a few more years.

The functionalities most highly rated for online readers in general were ease of use, searching within text, downloading, and the speed of reaching the book. MBooks does not provide downloads and was rated below 'neutral' in terms of speed of location on our question regarding user satisfaction of their system. Searching text was rated above neutral on that same question, and those that preferred to read journals on-screen rated this facet of MBooks even higher. MBooks users rated its download feature between 'somewhat unsatisfied' (2) and 'neutral' (3) – a mean rating of 2.579. This indicates that users are somewhat accepting of the current state, but may experience some benefit from the addition of this feature. MBooks functionality also seemed lacking in the availability of resources. This may be the result of frustration due to minimal indication of differences between 'full-text' or 'search only' until late in the search process. It is also possible that users may have a genuine need for such a resource to be more extensive.

Key areas for further focus are:

- Clarity of pathway from start of search process to an MBook resource;
- Development of alternatives to download capabilities;
- Visibility through clear existence as a separate collection, with internal searching and browsing;
- Maintaining the users' ease of use;
- High consideration for the differences between types of users.

While our survey did not provide us with all the data we would have preferred, or a breadth of significant results, we did find some important trends and potential trends that could drive more extensive research at a later time. It should be remembered that any further research on this topic should proceed in a structured way that can allow for analysis of many different user groups rather than just those within the University of Michigan. It seemed clear that there were effects

between the small subsets we tested which might indicate greater changes when working with larger samples or additional effects among untested groups.

Recommendations

Survey respondents provided us with valuable comments on improving the MBooks user experience. These comments can be summarized and grouped into several categories. Categories in this summary are denoted with bold text and any text in quotes denotes actual user comments.

MBooks **electronic book interface** would benefit if the following features were added:

- In the MBooks page turner interface, the digital image of the actual book's page should fit within the viewing portion of the screen so that users would not need to scroll down the page in order to read the text (i.e., all text falls "above the fold");
- Users would like to have a viewing option so that parts of the book can be viewed with several pages on the screen for faster and easier browsing;
- Scanned books could benefit from more quality control (i.e., some MBooks have blank pages along with pages of text).

Commenting on **search capability**, respondents indicated that providing "snippets of books that are still under copyright protection" (in the same method used by Google Books) and allowing the user to search within "multiple texts at a time" would be a useful addition to existing search options.

We received several comments on the experience of specifically **locating MBooks** and determining the MBooks **collection boundary and size** within all library resources, particularly next to other electronic resources when using Mirlyn (the University of Michigan Library Catalog). Some survey comments were:

- "Couldn't find a way to search only for MBooks",
- "Actually getting to MBooks through Mirlyn is very important (and difficult)",
- Could not see "how much you can get online",
- And additionally, users commented that the scope of the collection was difficult to determine because they could not see "what collection includes and excludes".

Respondents reported that providing the user with additional information through **guided search** with a "link to related literature/ topics" and/or a recommender system.

Finally, users considered **personalized features** to be an important additional functionality that would allow them to manage their personal records about books (i.e., "tools for note taking", "organizing items across books/journals for research").

Conclusion

The literature on electronic resources² mentions a number of features important to the success and usability of these resources. These features include:

- the ability to search for texts from the larger collection's website,
- searchability within a particular text
- browse functions within a text such as a hyperlinked table of contents
- the capacity to download full texts

These features are crucial for an electronic resource collection to be both usable and useful for its intended users. Based on our comparative analysis we devised a list of major contributors to the electronic resource community. Many of these e-resource systems employ a number of the different functions recommended for electronic collections by the leading research in online resources. By evaluating users' reactions to and satisfaction with the other e-resource providers and specifically how they have interacted with MBooks, we hoped to analyze the important functionality and usability issues lacking within the MBooks system. Our goal was to determine, not only who is using the system, but what functionality they find important, their need for electronic resources and their specific familiarity with our system.

Based on our survey results we can see that only half of our respondents were even familiar with the name, "MBooks", and of those who had heard of MBooks, only 65% of them had ever actually interacted with an MBook. This distinction is important to make. The name recognition associated with MBooks is only 50% of our population, and it is important here to note our biases in conducting this survey. We decided to take advantage of the SI 622 class' affiliation with the School of Information to ensure a higher number of people with exposure to MBooks. SI students, especially, are exposed to new technology and topics within the library field; many within SI have worked closely with Google and the University Library system to bring the MBooks project into being. We wanted to be sure that some of our respondents were familiar with the MBooks interface, and not just aware of the MBooks name, so that we could learn what users liked or did not like about the service's functionality.

Out of all our respondents 73 completed the survey. Of these 73 users 40 were masters students with the next highest group represented being staff/administrator with 12 respondents. Although these numbers of respondents do not correlate with the percentages of our target population we decided to focus mostly on graduate students in the School of Information to improve the likelihood that our respondents were familiar, not only with general electronic resources, but specifically with the MBooks system.

² Summerfield, Mary, et al. "Perspectives on scholarly online books: the Columbia University online books evaluation project." *Journal of Library Administration* v. 35 no1/2 (2001), pg. 78
Miller, Ron. "Ebooks Worm Their Way into the Reference Market." *EContent (EContent)* v. 28 no7/8 (July/August 2005) p. 30-4

As indicated above, our survey statistics gave us bountiful information not only about how our users perceive the MBooks system and interface, but also what comparative resources they prefer and the functionality they expect to see in an e-resource system. Our numbers show that all our users significantly prefer Amazon's e-resource system more than any other system available. The Amazon system employs a number of important functionality that is either not as advanced or outright missing from the MBooks system. The ability to search for a text within the greater collection, something very easily done through Amazon and a feature rated as more than somewhat important by our users, is lacking in the MBooks system. Also, Amazon provides the ability to see the full text of resources online and download that resource (with the purchase of a book). MBooks full text availability is extremely limited due to copyright restrictions, and as of now the ability to download full text volumes is not present due to the agreement with Google.

Overall, the features of the MBooks system which received user ratings close to 2 (somewhat unsatisfied) were the availability of full texts, the ability to download full texts and the time it takes to locate an MBook resource. These numbers not only raise concerns with the functionality associated with MBooks, but the overall usability of the system. If users are not able to locate resources it is likely that they will be discouraged from returning to the system for future research needs.

What we learned as a group:

We hoped, through the dissemination of our survey, to obtain a clearer understanding of the features users find most important in online resources. After thoroughly analyzing the MBooks system and other comparative systems we discovered a long list of functions that contribute to the usefulness and usability of e-resources. It was tempting to list a large number of these functions within our survey, but we struggled with a manageable number to keep our respondents interested in the survey. The process of limiting our survey's size actually aided us in determining the most important features within our system.

Time constraints played a huge role in the construction and release of our surveys. On one hand we needed to get the survey out as quickly as possible, but on the other hand we needed to test the survey for accuracy. We chose to do all our testing in the "paper prototype" stage, so we missed some errors that occurred in posting the survey online. Also, we wanted as much time as possible for our respondents to answer the survey and for our analysis of the results, so the construction of the survey was rapid to leave ample time for data analysis.

Finally, as mentioned previously, sampling our user base was difficult because we needed respondents who had actually used MBooks, while at the same time trying to grasp who out of our population were unfamiliar with the service. We chose to focus on those users most likely to have interacted with an MBook, which makes it difficult to assess how well known the service is among our wider user population.

Appendix A

MBooks Survey

Part 1: Introduction

MBooks is the University of Michigan's online access system to the Library's digitized collections, particularly volumes that have been scanned through UM's partnership arrangement with Google. (See: <http://mdp.lib.umich.edu/m/mdp/mdp-faq.htm>)

The purpose of this survey is to conduct an analysis which utilizes multiple methodologies (including this survey) to help with future development of MBooks. (See: <http://www.lib.umich.edu/usability/projects/MBooks.html>)

This survey should take you no more than 15 minutes to complete. There will be space at the end of the survey for you to leave comments in free-form if you wish. You may quit the survey at any time. This survey is anonymous and completely confidential.

If you have questions, please feel free to email the evaluation group at 622group@ctools.umich.edu.

Thank you very much for your input and time!

Part 2: General Internet Usage

1. Have you used any of the following electronic resources before taking this survey?
 - Google Book Search
 - Amazon.com
 - ProQuest Safari Books Online
 - Mirlyn
 - Harvard Book Search
 - The Open Library
 - Yes (users are led to Question 2)
 - No (users are led to Question 3)
 - Other (please specify)
2. How would you rate your general experience with the following electronic resources?

	Not at all satisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied	N/A
Google Book Search	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Amazon.com	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ProQuest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Safari books Online						
Mirlyn	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Harvard Book Search	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Open Library	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other Electronic Resource	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. For journals/serials, which do you prefer?
 - Reading a hard copy
 - Reading on a computer screen
 - No preference

4. For books, which do you prefer?
 - Reading a hard copy
 - Reading on a computer screen
 - No preference

5. Which of these are you comfortable using? (Please check all that apply.)
 - Web browser (Example: Internet Explorer, Mozilla Firefox, Safari, Netscape, etc.)
 - Search engine (Example: Yahoo, Google, Alta Vista, Dogpile, etc.)
 - Online news sources (Example: CNN, MSN, New York Times, etc.)
 - Adobe Reader
 - Email
 - IM (Example: AOL, Yahoo, Google Chat, MSN, etc.)
 - Online networking/friend communities (Example: MySpace, Facebook, Friendster, Yahoo 360, etc.)
 - Other (please specify)

6. How many hours do you spend online per day? Please include online activity at work, home, and other times of day.
Please specify

7. How often do you search for online information or other electronic resources?
 - Rarely (1 or less times per month)
 - Sometimes (2-3 times per month)
 - Frequently (4-6 times per month)
 - Often (7-10 times per month)
 - Extensively (more than 10 times per month)

Part 3: MBooks Specific Questions

This question refers specifically to MBooks. Users familiar with the University of Michigan's library catalog (Mirlyn) should be aware that MBooks resources often are displayed alongside general electronic resources listed in the catalog. General electronic resources are denoted with a lightening bolt icon, whereas MBooks are denoted with a specific MBooks logo icon. These questions will ask you about MBooks and not general electronic resources

8. Before taking this survey, were you familiar with MBooks?

- Yes (users are led to Question 9)
- No (users are led to Question 11)

9. Have you used MBooks before?

- Yes (users are led to Question 10)
- No (users are led to Question 11)

10. How would you rate your satisfaction of these activities when using MBooks?

	Not at all satisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied	N/A
Ability to download the text in full	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Readability of the text	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Availability of full-text resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Time it takes to locate a desired resource	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to search within a particular book	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. Rank the importance of the following features.

	Not at all important	Somewhat not important	Neutral	Somewhat important	Very important	N/A
Search or ease of use	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Help menu or FAQ	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
collection to find a specific text	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Search or browse within text	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Familiarity with Web	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Speed of getting to the	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Familiarity with Web page/interface design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to adjust text size (zoom)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. What other features do you think are important?
Please specify.

Part 4: Comments and Demographics

13. Feel free to give us any comments.

14. Please indicate your age group.

- Under 18
- 19 - 25
- 26 - 35
- 36 - 45
- 46 - 55
- over 55

15. Please indicate your affiliation with the University of Michigan.

- Undergraduate student
- Masters student
- Doctoral student
- Faculty
- Staff/Administrator
- Other (please specify)

Appendix B

Survey Summary from SurveyMonkey.com

1. Have you used any of the following electronic resources before taking this survey? - Google Book Search - Amazon.com - ProQuest Safari Books Online - Mirlyn - Harvard Book Search - The Open Library

	Response Percent	Response Total
Yes 	96.7%	89
No 	3.3%	3
Other (please specify)	0%	0
Total Respondents		92
(skipped this question)		1

2. How would you rate your general experience with the following electronic resources?

	Not at all satisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied	N/A	Response Average
Google Book Search	1% (1)	10% (8)	12% (10)	31% (26)	6% (5)	40% (33)	3.52
Amazon.com	1% (1)	1% (1)	8% (7)	35% (29)	47% (39)	7% (6)	4.35
ProQuest Safari Books Online	1% (1)	1% (1)	7% (6)	11% (9)	1% (1)	78% (65)	3.44
Mirlyn	7% (6)	14% (12)	27% (22)	37% (31)	10% (8)	5% (4)	3.29
Harvard Book Search	1% (1)	0% (0)	5% (4)	1% (1)	1% (1)	92% (76)	3.14
The Open Library	1% (1)	1% (1)	4% (3)	5% (4)	1% (1)	88% (73)	3.30
Other electronic resource	1% (1)	1% (1)	11% (9)	19% (16)	5% (4)	63% (52)	3.68
Total Respondents							83
(skipped this question)							10

3. For journals/serials, which do you prefer?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Reading a hard copy 	72.1%	62
Reading on a computer screen 	17.4%	15
No preference 	10.5%	9

Total Respondents 86
(skipped this question) 7

4. For books, which do you prefer?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Reading a hard copy	91.8%	78
Reading on the computer screen	1.2%	1
No preference	7.1%	6
Total Respondents		85
(skipped this question)		8

5. Which of these are you comfortable using? (Please check all that apply.)

	Response Percent	Response Total
Web browser (Example: Internet Explorer, Mozilla Firefox, Safari, Netscape, etc.)	96.5%	82
Search engine (Example: Yahoo, Google, Alta Vista, Dogpile, etc.)	94.1%	80
Online news sources (Example: CNN, MSN, New York Times, etc.)	89.4%	76
Adobe Reader	89.4%	76
Email	95.3%	81
IM (Example: AOL, Yahoo, Google Chat, MSN, etc.)	75.3%	64
Online networking/friend communities (Example: MySpace, Facebook, Friendster, Yahoo 360, etc.)	50.6%	43
Other (please specify)	4.7%	4
Total Respondents		85
(skipped this question)		8

6. How many hours do you spend online per day? Please include online activity at work, home, and other times of day.

Total Respondents 85

(skipped this question) 8

7. How often do you search for online information or other electronic resources?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Rarely (1 or less times per month)	0%	0
Sometimes (2-3 times per month)	7.1%	6
Frequently (4-6 times per month)	3.6%	3
Often (7-10 times per month)	8.3%	7
Extensively (more than 10 times per month)	81%	68
Total Respondents		84
(skipped this question)		9

8. Before taking this survey, were you familiar with MBooks?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Yes	51.2%	43
No	48.8%	41
Total Respondents		84
(skipped this question)		9

9. Have you used MBooks before?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Yes	70.5%	31
No	29.5%	13
Total Respondents		44
(skipped this question)		49

10. How would you rate your satisfaction of these activities when using MBooks?

	Not at all satisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied	N/A	Response Average
Availability of full-text resources	14% (3)	23% (5)	32% (7)	23% (5)	0% (0)	9% (2)	2.70

Time it takes to locate a desired resource	9% (2)	27% (6)	27% (6)	27% (6)	5% (1)	5% (1)	2.90
Ability to search within a particular book	5% (1)	14% (3)	23% (5)	36% (8)	9% (2)	14% (3)	3.37
Readability of the text	9% (2)	9% (2)	14% (3)	36% (8)	18% (4)	14% (3)	3.53
Ability to download the text in full	18% (4)	23% (5)	32% (7)	5% (1)	9% (2)	14% (3)	2.58
Total Respondents							22
(skipped this question)							71

11. Rank the importance of the following features.

	Not at all important	Somewhat not important	Neutral	Somewhat important	Very important	Response Average
Download full text	3% (2)	3% (2)	17% (11)	17% (11)	60% (39)	4.28
Search or browse within text	2% (1)	2% (1)	9% (6)	31% (20)	57% (37)	4.40
search or browse the entire collection to find a specific text	3% (2)	5% (3)	15% (10)	25% (16)	52% (34)	4.18
Help menu or FAQ	2% (1)	5% (3)	25% (16)	45% (29)	25% (16)	3.86
Ability to adjust text size (zoom)	2% (1)	6% (4)	12% (8)	42% (27)	38% (25)	4.09
Speed of getting to the source	2% (1)	3% (2)	12% (8)	32% (21)	51% (33)	4.28
Familiarity with Web page/interface design	6% (4)	9% (6)	29% (19)	35% (23)	20% (13)	3.54
Ease of use	2% (1)	0% (0)	6% (4)	25% (16)	68% (44)	4.57
Total Respondents						65
(skipped this question)						28

12. What other features do you think are important?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Specify here 	100%	22
Total Respondents		22
(skipped this question)		71

13. Feel free to give us any other comments

Total Respondents	18
(skipped this question)	75

14. Please indicate your age group.

	Response Percent	Response Total
Under 18	0%	0
19-25	34.2%	25
26-35	41.1%	30
36-45	11%	8
46-55	11%	8
over 55	2.7%	2
Total Respondents		73
(skipped this question)		20

15. Please indicate your affiliation with the University of Michigan.

	Response Percent	Response Total
Undergraduate student	6.8%	5
Masters student	54.8%	40
Doctoral student	4.1%	3
Faculty	9.6%	7
Staff/Administrator	16.4%	12
Other (please specify)	8.2%	6
Total Respondents		73
(skipped this question)		20

Appendix C

Numerical Survey Data

This data was formatted to remove any participants who did not complete the survey.

For yes/no responses 1 = yes and 2 = no.

For satisfaction responses:

- 0 = N/A
- 1 = Not at all satisfied
- 2 = Somewhat unsatisfied
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat satisfied
- 5 = Very satisfied

For importance responses:

- 1 = Not at all important
- 2 = Somewhat not important
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat important
- 5 = Very important

All other responses are given numerical values relating to the order in which they are presented in the survey (see Appendix A).