

Electronic Journal User Survey (Feb. 11-25, 2002)
Final Report & Findings

Background and Methodology

A user survey was conducted at Rutgers University Libraries during the spring semester of 2002, for the purpose of gathering information about the use of electronic journals available at Rutgers. A subgroup of the Libraries Assessment Committee (Ann Montanaro, Samson Soong, and Adeline Tallau,) consulted with the Collection Development Council about information that would be helpful in making decisions about e-journals or making them accessible to our users. Among other matters, the following issues were identified:

- How do our users typically locate an e-journal article?
- Are our users now reading more electronic journals than print journals?
- What other e-journals would they like us to purchase if funding were available?

The subgroup developed a questionnaire that was reviewed by the Libraries Assessment Committee. Most questions were designed for multiple choices. A few open-ended questions were also included to obtain information on what the users like or dislike most about electronic journals and their suggestions for new e-journal titles. The questionnaire was pre-tested and modified for content and language.

For delivery to e-journal users, the subgroup recommended a self-administered, web-based questionnaire. A web-based survey platform developed by Ron Jantz and SCC staff was used. There is evidence that a paper-and-pencil test results in "very minor, but significant, differences in the item means..." (1) Since the results were more for guidance than research, the need for responses of persons using electronic access, the ease of administration, the conversion of responses for analysis were considered paramount. Sam McDonald created several links from the main e-journals webpage, A-G page, H-Z page, and the main news page to the survey on the SCC server. The responses were time-stamped in a hidden field to indicate when the user responded. Information on where the user entered the survey was also obtained from the web sever log. All survey results were captured using an MS-Access database and also converted to Excel. The survey was conducted for two weeks, February 11-25, 2002, a reasonably good use period for electronic journals. In total, 141 valid responses were received during the two weeks. The Excel file of responses was used to sort, tabulate, and cross-tabulate questions and categories.

1. Perkins, Gay Helen and Yuan, Haiwang "Comparison of Web-based and Paper-and-Pencil Library Satisfaction Survey Results." College and Research Libraries 62(4): 376, July 2001.

Web Questionnaire Results

1. What is your status at Rutgers?

TABLE 1. Status of Respondents

Status	# of Responses	% of Responses
Undergraduate	24	17%
Graduate student	69	49%
Faculty	27	19%
Staff	14	10%
<u>Other*</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5%</u>
Total	141	100%

2. What campus are you affiliated with:

TABLE 2. Campus affiliation

Campus	# of Responses	% of Responses
Camden	12	9%
New Brunswick	109	77%
<u>Newark</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>14%</u>
Total	141	100%

A combination of these two answers is presented in Table 3. This table clarifies the distribution of respondents and is useful in understanding the answers to subsequent questions

*Other described as: UMD, post baccalaureate, ordinary patron, visiting scholar, Monmouth University student

TABLE 3. Status by Campus Affiliation

Status	Campus			Total
	Camden	New Brunswick	Newark	
Undergraduate	2	23	2	24
Graduate	7	47	15	69
Faculty	2	23	2	27
Staff	0	12	2	14
Other*	1	6	0	7
Total	12	103	21	141

3. What is your department/major?

Fifty three different departments were listed in response to this question. The entire list of departments appears in Appendix A. The specific departments have been grouped into 5 categories in order to make the results more useful. Table 2 makes clear that the users who chose to answer this survey were primarily from the sciences and the social sciences. Since many of the e-journals were in these two categories, these results are not surprising. Another survey, when more Arts & Humanities titles have been added will undoubtedly reflect the increase.

TABLE 4. Status by Grouped Departments

Status	Grouped Departments						Total
	Arts & Humanities	Inter-disciplinary	Science	Social Sciences	Undeclared	No Answer	
Undergraduate	4	0	11	5	4	0	24
Graduate	3	2	34	30	0	0	69
Faculty	2	0	15	10	0	0	27
Staff	0	1	7	4	0	2	14
Other*	1	0	3	2	1	0	7
Total	10	3	70	51	5	2	141

*Other described as: UMD, post baccalaureate, ordinary patron, visiting scholar, Monmouth University student

4. Where do you use electronic journals most of the time?

Increased hours of availability and ease of access are the results of electronic availability so it is not surprising that use from campus offices and home constitute 67.4% of the answers to this question. There have been problems with access from some dorms which probably accounts for the low dorm percentage.

TABLE 5. Location of E-Journal Use

Used at	# of Responses	% of Responses
Office on campus	57	40.4%
Home	38	27.0%
Library on campus	19	13.5%
Computer lab on campus	13	9.2%
Dorm on campus	6	4.3%
Other*	3	2.1%
<u>No answer</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3.5%</u>
Total	141	100%

5. How do you typically locate an e-journal article?

The E-journal list is the commonest path users take to find an electronic journal. Most are unaware that this list is derived from IRIS which is more up-to-date than the list.

TABLE 5. Locate E-Journal Via

Locate via	# of Responses	% of Responses
E-journal online list	79	56.0%
IRIS	34	24.1%
From a database	20	14.2%
Other**	4	2.8%
Personal bookmark	1	.7%
Publisher or producer web site	0	0%
<u>No answer</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2.1%</u>
Total	141	100%

*Other listed: UMD, both home and work, lab

**Other listed: Jstor, PubMed, first time user, friends tell me

6. Have you ever asked one of the following resources for help or to report a problem using electronic journals? For those you have asked, rate your level of satisfaction with the assistance you received, with 1 as the lowest score and 5 as the highest score.

Electronic journals users prefer personal assistance from library staff, friends, or the online “Ask a Librarian” service than e-journal vendor/provider when they need help or to report a problem using e-journals. Fifty four respondents reporting satisfaction or 38.29% of electronic journals users have asked library staff for assistance using electronic journals; 70.37% of them rated their level of satisfaction with the assistance they received with high score of 4 or 5. Fifty two or 36.87% of users have asked a friend or colleague; 44.23% rated the assistance with high scores. Forty two or 29.78% of users have used the online "Ask a Librarian" service; 54% rated the assistance with high scores. Twenty two or 15.6% of users have asked vendor/provider; 40.9% rated the assistance with high scores. Fourteen or 9.9% of users have asked others for assistance but many were dissatisfied with the help they received. Since each user was asked to respond to each type of help, the results cannot be totaled.

TABLE 7. Type of Help by Satisfaction

Type of Help	Satisfaction						
	Least 1	2	3	4	Most 5	did not ask	no answer
Librarians	7	6	3	21	17	75	12
Ask a Librarian	10	2	7	6	17	87	12
Friends	3	5	14	16	14	74	15
Provider	6	4	3	5	4	101	18
Other*	7	1	1	2	3	48	79

7. When using electronic journal do you a) only read the articles on the screen, b) only print the articles to read on paper, or c) both read on the screen and print articles?

The majority of electronic journal users are reading on the screen and printing paper copies of articles. One hundred and nine respondents or 77.3% of users both read articles on the screen and print paper copies. Twenty five or 17.73% of users only print paper

*Other included: anyone, professor, assistant, colleague, department

copies to read and don't read on screen. Four respondents or 2.8% of users only read articles on the screen and don't print paper copies, and 3 users did not indicate what they usually do.

TABLE 8. Read on screen versus Printing

Status	Read and Print	Print Only	Read Only	No Answer	Total
Undergraduate	19	3	1	1	24
Graduate	53	14	1	1	69
Faculty	20	5	2	0	27
Staff	12	1	0	1	14
Other*	5	2	0	0	7
Total	109	25	4	3	141

8. How often do you use electronic journals?

Many users use electronic journals at least once a week and some use them on a daily basis. Seventy two or 51.15 % of users, who reported use, use electronic journals at least once a week. Twenty five or 17.7% of users use them daily. Twenty three or 16.3% of users, who reported use, use them at least once a month. Seventeen or 12.1% of users use them occasionally (less than once a month). Only four respondents or 2.8% did not answer this question.

TABLE 9. Status by Frequency of use.

Status	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Occasion-ally	No Answer	Total
Undergraduate	3	5	4	11	1	24
Graduate	9	42	13	4	1	69
Faculty	6	18	3	0	0	27
Staff	5	4	2	1	2	14
Other*	2	3	1	1	0	7
Total	25	72	23	17	4	141

*Other described as: UMD, post baccalaureate, ordinary patron, visiting scholar, Monmouth University student

9. Are you now reading more electronic journals than print journals?

The majority of electronic journal users are reading more electronic journals than print journals. Ninety one of the users responding with their frequency of use, or 64.5% of users read more e-journals than print journals. Thirty two users or 22.69% of users read about the same amount of both. Fifteen users or 10.63% of users still read more print journals than e-journals and three or 2.1% of the respondents did not answer this question. Since Rutgers often cancelled print copies to pay for electronic, this change may not have been a matter of choice.

TABLE 10. Ratio between Reading Electronic versus Print

Status	Reading more Electronic	Reading Same	Reading more Print	No Answer	Total
Undergraduate	16	4	3	1	24
Graduate	41	20	7	1	69
Faculty	18	5	4	0	27
Staff	13	0	0	1	14
Other	3	3	1	0	7
Total	91	32	15	3	141

9. What do you like most about electronic journals?

The specific answers to the questions were categorized by the type of response. A response might include more than one category. In most instances, the word appeared in the actual answer. The following definitions were applied to text in which a specific word did not appear:

- Accessibility – Quality of state of being available,
- Availability – capable of use for the accomplishment of a purpose,
- Convenience – suited to one’s comfort or ease.
- Searchability – having the capacity for being searched.

In general the factors accessibility, availability, convenience and similar factors constitute the majority of responses. Since improving the “accessibility” of titles on all

*Other described as: UMD, post baccalaureate, ordinary patron, visiting scholar, Monmouth University student

three campuses had been one of the goals of the Library, this finding indicates that goal has been achieved.

TABLE 11. Advantages of E-Journals

Response Category	Number of Response
Accessibility	54
Convenience	45
Printing, including costs	16
Searchability	15
Availability	13
Easy to Use	10
Download for future use	7
Don't have to go to multiple locations	6
Miscellaneous	13
No answer	23

10. What do you dislike most about electronic journals?

Answers were assigned to categories based on the text of the answer. Usually the response category words appeared in the specific response. Multiple categories appeared in some responses.

The majority of dislikes were because the material was unavailable, in terms of coverage, embargos, lack of titles and problems with what was available. The miscellaneous responses are very varied: changes in what is available, the complicated process to browse articles, the system (Ingenta), changes in the system (Proquest to EBSCO), difficulties with the e-journal page, and the lack of printed copies. A number of statements indicated a preference for print by stating its preferred characteristics

TABLE 12. Disadvantages of E-Journals

Response Category	Number of Answers
Problems with Years and/or volumes available	25
Titles or subjects not included	23
Computer problems in using	15
Difficulty in locating	12
Problems with printing/downloading	11
Availability of full text, pdf, page images	6
Problems accessing e-journals	6
Difficult to use	3
Miscellaneous	24
No answer	46

11. If funding were available , what e-journal would you like us to purchase?

Sixty eight of the 141 respondents did not answer the question. However, the other respondents generated quite a list of suggestions. Eighty two specific titles were listed in this question. Table 8 lists the titles, including duplicate requests, indicates if we already have any electronic access by listing the vendor providing the title, if we have the title in paper, and if the title is available in electronic format. Ulrichs was used to determine availability. It is disturbing to note that 27of the requests for titles were for titles which were already available at that time.

In addition to the specific title requests, several categories occurred. Fourteen responses requested titles by subject. Examples are Business journals, United Nations issues, microbiology, social work journals, journals relating to tourism, major English journals, economics journals and psychology journals. Five requests were for titles by specific publishers, examples are: Kluwer journals, Blackwell-Synergy set (387 titles), Sage publications and Jstor Arts and Sciences Collection II. Five requests were for publications from societies or associations. When acronyms have been used, it's not

always possible to be sure what is being requested. For example, we have the ACM digital Library, but perhaps that's not the society represented by ACM. Journals associated with SIM, ASM, ACS, AAAS societies and the American Educational Research Association journals were also requested

There were several very positive responses: "You have most of the ones I use" and "you have a great selection." A number of other responses indicated the desire for longer runs, gave general replies, such as "all proceedings and conferences," or commented on current and previous providers: "Why isn't Ebsco easier to access?", KEEP Lexis-Nexis and the law journals it provides," and "the provider we previously(sic) used, Proquest I think, had a much better array of journals with deeper retrospection that whatever has now replaced it ---go back to it."

Table 13. List of E-Journals requested for purchase

journal title	RU-online	RU own	Avail E
Aids Care	epnet	0	yes
American Anthropologist	0	Paper	yes
		Not	
American Antiquity	0	current	yes
		Not	
Annals of Pure and Applied Logic	SD	current	yes
Biological Invasions	0	0	yes
		Not	
Biology and Philosophy	0	current	yes
Biophysical Journal	0	Paper	yes
British Journal of Political Science	CUP	Paper	yes
Bulletin of Symbolic Logic	0	Paper	yes
Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences	0	Paper	yes
Cancer Cell	0	0	yes
Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers and Prevention	0	Paper	yes
Cancer Research	0	Paper	yes
Cancer Research	0	Paper	yes
Cancer Research	0	Paper	yes
Cancer Research	0	Paper	yes
Cancer Research	0	Paper	yes
Cell	0	Paper	yes
Cell	0	Paper	yes
Cell	0	Paper	yes
Cell	0	Paper	yes
Cell	0	Paper	yes
Cell	0	Paper	yes
Cerebral Cortex	0	0	yes
Cerebral Cortex	0	0	yes
Computational Linguistics	0	Paper	yes
Developmental Cell	0	0	yes
		Not	
Drug Metabolism Reviews	0	current	yes
Ecosystems	springer	0	yes

Entomological news		Paper	yes
Environment and Planning A	0	Not current	yes
Environment and Planning B	0	Not current	yes
Environment and Planning C	0	current	yes
Environment and Planning D	0	Paper	yes
Environmental Health Perspectives	GPO	Paper	yes
European Journal of Human Genetics	0	0	yes
European Journal of Neuroscience	epnet	0	yes
Human Gene Therapy	0	Paper	yes
International Migration Review	0	Paper	yes
International Studies Quarterly	epnet	Paper	yes
JAMA	AMA	Paper	yes
Journal of Analytical Toxicology	0	Paper	yes
Journal of Archaeological Research	Ideal	Not current	yes
Journal of Conflict Resolution	epnet	Paper	yes
Journal of Mathematical Behavior	0	Paper	yes
Journal of Medical Genetics	0	Paper	yes
Journal of Neurotrauma	0	Not current	yes
Journal of Phycology	epnet	Paper	yes
Journal of Sol-Gel science and technology	0	0	yes
Journal of the Electrochemical Society	0	Paper	yes
Journal of the National Cancer Institute	0	Paper	yes
Journal of the North American Benthological Society	0	0	yes
Journal of Wildlife Management	0	Paper	yes
Journal/Northwest Educational Consortium for Men's Issues	0	0	no
Limnology and Oceanography	jstor	Paper	yes
Marine Ecology Progress Series	int.res.com	Paper	yes
Memory	epnet	0	yes
Molecular and Cellular Biology	0	Paper	yes
Molecular Cell	0	0	yes
Molecular Cell	0	0	yes
Molecular Microbiology	epnet	Paper	yes
Narrative and Life History	0	0	no
Narrative Inquiry	0	0	yes
Nature	nature	Paper	yes
Nature	nature	Paper	yes
Nature	nature	Paper	yes
Nature	nature	Paper	yes
Nature Biotechnology	0	0	yes
Nature Cell Biology	nature	Paper	yes
Nature Genetics	nature	Paper	yes
Nature Immunology	nature	0	yes
Nature Medicine	nature	Paper	yes
Nature Neuroscience	nature	Paper	yes
Nature Structural Biology	nature	Paper	yes
Netherlands Journal of Sea Research	0	0	yes

Neuron	0	Paper	yes
NeuroReport	on order	0	yes
Oncology	0	Paper	yes
Optics Letters	optics.info	Paper	yes
Oxford Journal of Legal Studies	0	0	yes
Paleobiology	bioone/jstor	Paper	yes
Pharmaceutical Research	0	Paper	yes
Pharmacogenetics	0	0	yes
Pharmacogenetics	0	0	yes
Plant Journal	epnet	Paper	yes
Progress in Brain Research	0	Paper	yes
Psychiatric Genetics	0	0	yes
Psychiatric Nursing (title not found)			
Reading Research Report (title not found)			
Science	science/jstor	Paper	yes
Science	science/jstor	Paper	yes
Science	science/jstor	Paper	yes
Social Work in Health Care	0	Paper	yes
Synthese	0	0	yes
Topics in Language Disorders	0	0	yes
Tourism Geographies	epnet	0	yes
Urban Ecosystems	0	Paper	yes
Wildlife Society Bulletin	0	Paper	yes

12. IP addresses from which the survey was answered.

The IP addresses from Campus locations account for 68% of the responses, while 32% are responding from off campus. This closely conforms to the answers to questions 7, “Where do you use electronic journals most of the time, 67 percent gave campus locations while 27 said home. There were 5.6% who said other or did not answer.

TABLE 14. Location of IP Addresses

165.230.*. (Campus)	56	40%
128.6.*. (Campus)	40	28%
192.76.178 (Campus)	0	0%
Other (Off-campus)	45	32%
Total	141	100%

Discussion

Although each electronic journal study has different questions and slightly different populations, there were a number of questions where the findings were similar to our results.

Reading versus Printing

A number of other studies have found that most people would prefer to read from paper and opt for printing when relevant articles were found. Few users reported reading the article on the computer screen. Responses “web questionnaire surveys showed that when relevant articles were found, the majority of users would print them: 45.6 % would study and then print and 42.7% would print to read it later.”(2) Thus a total of 88.3% were printing in the Eason study while 94.6% were printing in the Rutgers survey.

Frequency of Use

A study done at Ohio State University queried graduate students and faculty about the frequency of use of e-journals. (3) The data covered multiple years. Thirty six point two percent of faculty read e-journals daily, weekly or monthly in 1998. The percentage rose to 53.9% in 2000. The graduate student use was 42.6% in 1998 and 42.6% in 2000. (4) In 2002, 100% of Rutgers faculty respondents and 92,8% of the graduate students report reading daily, weekly or monthly. In a study at 13 British institutions of 49 journals which used transaction logs, only “2% used it more frequently than three sessions per month and “a small but significant minority (11%) used it every month.”(5) In a study of members of the biomedical section, chemical-physical-technical section and the humanities section at the Max Plank Institute, most responses fell between every two weeks to once a month. “However there were a sizeable number of users reporting “daily,” “several times a week,” and weekly.”(6)

2. Eason, Ken, Richardson, Sue and Yu, Liangshi “Patterns of use of electronic journals.” Journal of Documentation 56(5):488, September 2000.
3. Rogers, Sally A. “Electronic journal usage at Ohio State University.” College and Research Libraries 62(1), 25-34, January 2001.
4. Rogers, Sally A. “Electronic journal usage at Ohio State University,” College and Research Libraries 62(1): 30, January 2001.
5. Eason, Ken, Richardson, Sue and Yu, Liangshi “Patterns of use of electronic journals.” Journal of Documentation 56(5):487, September 2000.
6. Rusch-Feja, Diann, and Siebeky, Uta “Evaluation of usage and acceptance of electronic journals; results of an electronic survey of Max Planck Society researchers including usage statistics from Elsevier, Springer and Academic Press (Full Report). D-Lib Magazine 5(10) October 1999.
<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/october99/rusch-feja/10rusch-feja-full-report.html>

Advantages

A study done at Ohio State University on graduate students and faculty asked about advantages and disadvantages of electronic journals. Forty one percent of the faculty and 25% of the graduate students gave, as the primary advances the 24-hour availability and easy access. (7) The next highest advantage for 13% of the faculty and 19% of the graduate students “noted that it would be easier and less time-consuming to find needed information.” (8) A study of chemists reported that the ability to print a copy of an electronic copy was the most important advantage of electronic journals. (9) The advantages responses at the Max Plank Institute were desktop accessibility, prompt availability, currency, and downloading or printing the item.(10) Liew reported that 73.5% graduate students cited availability at all times was given as a positive reason for e-journals, and “easy/faster access” by 73.5% .(11) The findings from these studies are very similar to the results reported for Rutgers in Table 11.

Disadvantages

The Max Plank Society researchers reported concern incomplete volumes both due to absence of issues or where back volumes had not been digitized. Reading from a monitor, network dependency, loss of features in print versions, and graphic quality were considered lesser disadvantages when compared to the advantages. (11) Some of these disadvantages are also responses of the Rutgers users. “Don’t know” was the major disadvantage for 24 % of the Ohio State University faculty and 33 % of the graduate students. Eight percent of the faculty and 6% of the graduate students said there were no that other aspects of e-journal use.

7. Rogers, Sally A. “Electronic journal usage at Ohio State University,” College and Research Libraries 62(1): 25-34, January 2001.
8. Rogers, Sally A. “Electronic journal usage at Ohio State University,” College and Research Libraries 62(1): 25-34, January 2001.
9. Stewart, L. “User acceptance of electronic journals – interviews with chemists at Cornell University,” College and Research Libraries 57(4): 339-349, 1996.
10. Rusch-Feja, Diann, and Siebeky, Uta “Evaluation of usage and acceptance of electronic journals; results of an electronic survey of Max Planck Society researchers including usage statistics from Elsevier, Springer and Academic Press (Full Report). D Lib Magazine 5(10) October 1999.
<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/october99/rusch-feja/10rusch-feja-full-report.html>
11. Liew, Chern Li, Foo, Schubert and Chennupati, K.R. “A study of graduate student end-users’ use and perception of electronic journals.” Online Information Review 24(4): 305, 2000.

disadvantages. The next highest disadvantage was computer access problems. The lack of hard copy was a disadvantage for 12 % of the faculty and 13% of the graduate students. (12) It would appear that disadvantages are more location and time dependent.

12. Rogers, Sally A. "Electronic journal usage at Ohio State University." College and Research Libraries 62(1): 28-29, January 2001.

Conclusions

This survey provides a broad outline of the current status of e-journal use at Rutgers. At the time when the survey was conducted, there were more science and social science users most of whom were in New Brunswick. More use was occurring from campus IP addresses and more responses with on campus locations are being reported. Rutgers users were using e-journals more frequently than had been reported in other studies, and more reported reading more e-journals than print.

Rutgers users gave numerous advantages for e-journals. Printing of electronic articles was common and dislike of screen reading reflects similar responses in other surveys. The disadvantages provide a place to start improving the service although some disadvantages are impervious to improvement. It was disappointing to see the number of titles suggested for purchase to which we already have available. Outreach is needed to make users aware of the existing electronic titles we have and how to find out what is available.

In a year or so, it would be worth repeating this survey to determine if the patterns of use have changed. Familiarity with electronic journals, the addition or loss of titles and the changes in IRIS records should have an impact. Since the use of e-journals is a rapidly changing scene, new data should be gathered to determine if changes are reflected in user response.

Appendix A. List of Specific Departments

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Accounting	3	2.1	2.1	2.1
Accounting	3	2.1	2.1	2.1
Administration of Justice	1	.7	.7	2.8
Administration of Justice	1	.7	.7	2.8
Agricultural, Food and Resource Economics	1	.7	.7	3.5
Agricultural, Food and Resource Economics	1	.7	.7	3.5
Animal Science	1	.7	.7	4.3
Animal Science	1	.7	.7	4.3
Anthropology	4	2.8	2.8	7.1
Anthropology	4	2.8	2.8	7.1
Archaeology	1	.7	.7	7.8
Archaeology	1	.7	.7	7.8
Biochemistry	4	2.8	2.8	10.6
Biochemistry	4	2.8	2.8	10.6
Biological Sciences	4	2.8	2.8	13.5
Biological Sciences	4	2.8	2.8	13.5
Cell Biology and Neuroscience	3	2.1	2.1	15.6
Cell Biology and Neuroscience	3	2.1	2.1	15.6
Ceramics and Materials Engineering	1	.7	.7	16.3
Ceramics and Materials Engineering	1	.7	.7	16.3
Chemical Biology	1	.7	.7	17.0
Chemical Biology	1	.7	.7	17.0
Chemical Engineering	1	.7	.7	17.7
Chemical Engineering	1	.7	.7	17.7
Chemistry	2	1.4	1.4	19.1
Chemistry	2	1.4	1.4	19.1
Civil Engineering	3	2.1	2.1	21.3
Civil Engineering	3	2.1	2.1	21.3
Communication	3	2.1	2.1	23.4
Communication	3	2.1	2.1	23.4
Criminal Justice	2	1.4	1.4	24.8
Criminal Justice	2	1.4	1.4	24.8
Ecology, Evolution, and Natural Resources	7	5.0	5.0	29.8
Ecology, Evolution, and Natural Resources	7	5.0	5.0	29.8
Ecology, Evolution, and Natural Resources	7	5.0	5.0	29.8
Education	7	5.0	5.0	34.8

English	5	3.5	3.5	38.3
Entomology	1	.7	.7	39.0
Entomology	1	.7	.7	39.0
Environmental Sciences	3	2.1	2.1	41.1
Environmental Sciences	3	2.1	2.1	41.1
Geography	1	.7	.7	41.8
Geography	1	.7	.7	41.8
History	1	.7	.7	42.6
History	1	.7	.7	42.6
Human Ecology	2	1.4	1.4	44.0
Human Ecology	2	1.4	1.4	44.0
Labor and Industrial Relations	1	.7	.7	44.7
Labor and Industrial Relations	1	.7	.7	44.7
Liberal Studies	1	.7	.7	45.4
Liberal Studies	1	.7	.7	45.4
Library Studies	2	1.4	1.4	46.8
Library Studies	2	1.4	1.4	46.8
Linguistics	2	1.4	1.4	48.2
Linguistics	2	1.4	1.4	48.2
Marine and Coastal Sciences	2	1.4	1.4	49.6
Marine and Coastal Sciences	2	1.4	1.4	49.6
Mathematics	1	.7	.7	50.4
Mathematics	1	.7	.7	50.4
Molecular Biology	1	.7	.7	51.1
Molecular Biology	1	.7	.7	51.1
Neural Sciences	3	2.1	2.1	53.2
Neural Sciences	3	2.1	2.1	53.2
Neurobiology	3	2.1	2.1	55.3
Neurobiology	3	2.1	2.1	55.3
Nursing	6	4.3	4.3	59.6
Nursing	6	4.3	4.3	59.6
Oceanography	4	2.8	2.8	62.4
Oceanography	4	2.8	2.8	62.4
other	5	3.5	3.5	66.0
other	5	3.5	3.5	66.0
Pharmaceutical Science	5	3.5	3.5	69.5
Pharmaceutical Science	5	3.5	3.5	69.5
Pharmacology	1	.7	.7	70.2
Pharmacology	1	.7	.7	70.2
Philosophy	2	1.4	1.4	71.6
Philosophy	2	1.4	1.4	71.6
Plant Pathology	1	.7	.7	72.3
Plant Pathology	1	.7	.7	72.3
Plant Science	2	1.4	1.4	73.8
Plant Science	2	1.4	1.4	73.8
Political Science	6	4.3	4.3	78.0
Political Science	6	4.3	4.3	78.0
Psychology	3	2.1	2.1	80.1
Psychology	3	2.1	2.1	80.1
Public Administration	3	2.1	2.1	82.3
Public Administration	3	2.1	2.1	82.3
Public Health	1	.7	.7	83.0
Public Health	1	.7	.7	83.0
Social Work	11	7.8	7.8	90.8
Social Work	11	7.8	7.8	90.8
Sociology	1	.7	.7	91.5

Toxicology	1	.7	.7	92.2
undeclared	5	3.5	3.5	95.7
undeclared	5	3.5	3.5	95.7
Urban Planning and Policy Development	3	2.1	2.1	97.9
Urban Planning and Policy Development	3	2.1	2.1	97.9
Urban Studies	1	.7	.7	98.6
Urban Studies	1	.7	.7	98.6
Women's Studies	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
Women's Studies	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
Total	141	100.0	100.0	
Total	141	100.0	100.0	

Appendix B

Help by Satisfaction by Status (see also Table 7)

0- No Answer

1- Least Satisfied

5 - Most Satisfied

6 - Did Not Ask For Help

STATUS * help_librarians Crosstabulation
Count

		help_librarians							Total
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
STATUS	faculty		1		1	7	6	12	27
STATUS	faculty		1		1	7	6	12	27
	graduate	8	3	4		4	9	41	69
	graduate	8	3	4		4	9	41	69
	other				2	1	1	3	7
	other				2	1	1	3	7
	staff	1	1			3	1	8	14
	staff	1	1			3	1	8	14
	undergraduate	3	2	2		6		11	24
	undergraduate	3	2	2		6		11	24
Total		12	7	6	3	21	17	75	141
Total		12	7	6	3	21	17	75	141

STATUS * help_online Crosstabulation
Count

		help_online							Total
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
STATUS	faculty		1		1	4	5	14	27
STATUS	faculty		1		1	4	5	14	27

	graduate	6	4	2	4	1	8	44	69
	other						2	5	7
	other						2	5	7
	staff	1	3				1	9	14
	staff	1	3				1	9	14
	undergrad	3	2		2	1	1	15	24
	uate								
	undergrad	3	2		2	1	1	15	24
	uate								
Total		12	10	2	7	6	17	87	141
Total		12	10	2	7	6	17	87	141

STATUS * help_friend Crosstabulation
Count

		help_frien							Total
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	graduate	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	graduate	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
STATUS	faculty	2			4	2	2	17	27
STATUS	faculty	2			4	2	2	17	27
	graduate	9	2	4	5	8	7	34	69
	graduate	9	2	4	5	8	7	34	69
	other				2		2	3	7
	other				2		2	3	7
	staff	1	1		1	3		8	14
	staff	1	1		1	3		8	14
	undergrad	3		1	2	3	3	12	24
	uate								
	undergrad	3		1	2	3	3	12	24
	uate								
Total		15	3	5	14	16	14	74	141
Total		15	3	5	14	16	14	74	141

STATUS * help_provider Crosstabulation
Count

		help_provi							Total
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	graduate	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	graduate	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
STATUS	faculty	2	2			2		21	27
STATUS	faculty	2	2			2		21	27
	graduate	9	3	3	1	2	3	48	69
	graduate	9	3	3	1	2	3	48	69
	other						1	6	7
	other						1	6	7
	staff	3	1	1		1		8	14
	staff	3	1	1		1		8	14

	undergrad	4			2			18	24
	uate								
Total		18	6	4	3	5	4	101	141
Total		18	6	4	3	5	4	101	141

STATUS * help_other Crosstabulation
Count

		help_other						Total	
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
STATUS	faculty	15						12	27
STATUS	faculty	15						12	27
	graduate	39	4	1	1		2	22	69
	graduate	39	4	1	1		2	22	69
	other	3						4	7
	other	3						4	7
	staff	8	1					5	14
	staff	8	1					5	14
	undergrad	14	2			2	1	5	24
	uate								
	undergrad	14	2			2	1	5	24
	uate								
Total		79	7	1	1	2	3	48	141
Total		79	7	1	1	2	3	48	141