

## Library survey: May 2018

Only 33 responses were received for the 2018 library survey (down from 169 in 2017, and 166 in 2016). The survey was advertised on the library website, via Twitter, and by posters and leaflets in the library in the same way as in previous years. However, this year we omitted to send a notification out via the Classicists mailing list, as had been done previously. This omission has left us with a much smaller set of results, which may skew comparisons with previous years. It has also provided the useful information that the mailing list does seem to be the most effective way to engage with many of our readers.

Another effect of this was that the profile of those who responded to the survey was slightly altered. There were similar proportions of respondents from the different categories of membership, but proportionally fewer respondents who listed their academic affiliation as 'other UK', and a higher percentage of those who have classified themselves as private/other. As it is likely that the mailing list would promote the survey to a higher number of academic staff around the country who did not visit the library during the survey period, these changes make sense. Responses this year have mostly come from a group who use the library very frequently, with fewer occasional visitors represented.

A question asking about respondents' activities on their last visit to the library had some slight variation on previous years. There was a higher proportion who met with colleagues, borrowed or returned books, used the library's computers and digital resources, and a slight reduction in the percentage of people using the scanner. These results are perhaps to be expected from a sample group who are more regular users of the library.

An additional question was included this year that asked if respondents would have preferred to consult material in an electronic form, if it had been possible for them to do so. A clear preference in most respondents for print over digital was shown, with 84% answering 'no', although we did receive comments that indicated that this question was not as straightforward as it was presented, and that the answer given would vary depending on the content in question. Whole books were definitely preferred in print, but there was more willingness to use digital versions for journal articles or individual chapters, especially if it had been possible to access that content remotely.

A question asking for a rating on a scale of 1 (poor) to 4 (good) for a range of library services showed some slight variations on last year. These may be down to the slight differences in responder profile this year, rather than changes within the library. Many scores were similar, or slightly higher. Those that had dropped in comparison to last year were: the range of e-resources, scanning/printing facilities, the cost of scanning/printing, heating. Heating was the category that scored lowest in the survey, a clear indication that despite the continued monitoring of the temperature, and agreement from the University to run the heating for longer periods, readers are still not finding the temperature comfortable in the winter. One new category was included in this question for the first time this year, which was the ease of accessing e-resources. This scored second lowest, with an average score of 2.65 out of 4. Average scores were above 3 in all categories except four: ease of access to e-resources, scanning, cost of scanning, and heating.

The average score for overall satisfaction with the library was 3.78 (no significant change from 3.79 last year).

22 respondents left comments on the library. Many of these covered more than one area.

The highest number of comments fell into the category of general compliments on the library and the library staff.

The next largest number of comments were regarding the heating, with seven people commenting that the library, in particular the archaeology room, is often very cold in winter.

There were four comments on the opening hours: two that the library opens too late on weekdays, one calling for more evening opening, and one asking for 24/7 access to the library.

There were three comments on the classification system, noting that it can be confusing, or that some areas are too broad. There were also two specific recommendations for content, which will be taken into consideration for acquisitions.

Three respondents commented that the new reception desk area is not as good as the previous one.

There were some general comments on the seating facilities, one calling for more desks in or near the literature rooms, and three noting aspects of the desks that could be improved: some cabling under the desks, a few sockets that need fixing, and a few chairs that are due to be replaced.

There were three complaints about the scanner, suggesting an additional scanner in the computer room, a photocopier, or asking for free scanning.

There was one call for a common room, one for spaces in the library where parents could work with children or for group work. There was also one comment regarding the additional security at the building over the past months.

### [Update on the 2017 survey](#)

The following changes have been implemented in response to the 2017 survey:

- The completion of the long-planned reconfiguration of the lobby area has provided additional seating space and a place where people can meet.
- We have installed a slightly larger table for the scanner, to provide space for stack of books or other items to be placed nearby while using the scanner.
- We have replaced some of the library chairs that were in poor condition.

Joanna Ashe, Librarian, 2018