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The User Satisfaction Survey
Context

In 2012 the same user satisfaction survey was carried out in two Italian university libraries: Milano-Bicocca and Siena.

Both organizations are members of the GIM (Interuniversity Group for the Monitoring of Academic Libraries) but they are very different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Milano-Bicocca</th>
<th>Siena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation of University</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Northern Italy</td>
<td>Central Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculties</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Users</td>
<td>34,634</td>
<td>24,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Sites</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Staff</td>
<td>34 [30.64 FTE]</td>
<td>99 [96.45 FTE]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives

We wanted to overall analyze the perceived quality, and find out users’ behaviors and opinions.

Library attendance
- Who attends libraries, who doesn’t and why?

Library services and features
- How and how often are services used and by whom? What are the reasons behind this?
- How important and satisfying are library services and features to users? What do people think of them?

Overall perception
- What is overall perception of the library and why?
- What are users’ suggestions for improving libraries?
A Conceptual Model
Library Features

- Collections
- Services
- Communication
- Opening times
- Spaces
- Staff

Questions and features

Why?

When?

Where?

Who?

What?

How?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES</th>
<th>TIMES</th>
<th>SPACES</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>COLLECTIONS</th>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Room</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC and WiFi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL/DD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Arrivals Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Variables and useful Questions

### Closed questions:
- Level of satisfaction and importance for library features
- Level of use, satisfaction and importance for library services

### Open questions:
- Reasons for satisfaction/dissatisfaction, and little use of services
- Suggestions for improving library features and services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>SATISFACTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPENING TIMES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLECTIONS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Closed questions:**
- Level of satisfaction and importance for library features
- Level of use, satisfaction and importance for library services

**Open questions:**
- Reasons for satisfaction/dissatisfaction, and little use of services
- Suggestions for improving library features and services
Survey Process and Tool
Scheduled Activities

This was the survey schedule in both universities.

March-April 2012
- Planning
- Advertising

May-September 2012
- Data Collection
- Data Analysis

October 2012-March 2013
- Communication
- Actions
Survey Tool

We created a survey tool using open and closed questions to gather both Qualitative and Quantitative data.

We invited all institutional users to fill in the online questionnaire, through the open source application Lime Survey.
Questionnaire Sections

The questionnaire was divided into 5 sections.

- **User Profile**
  - User type (student, teacher, scholar, employee and so on)
  - Faculty and type of graduate courses

- **Attendance**
  - Attending university libraries: level, and reasons
  - Attending other libraries or not attending libraries: reasons

- **Services**
  - Using services: level (4-point scale), reasons for using/not using
  - Importance and Satisfaction level (4-point scale), opinions

- **Features**
  - Importance and Satisfaction level (4-point scale)
  - Opinions about features (opening times, spaces, collections, etc.)

- **Overall Perception**
  - Level of the overall Satisfaction (4-point scale) with the library
  - Reasons for evaluation, and suggestions for improving libraries
Partition of services

In the introduction of survey results, we used a colour code to identify the library services examined, according to their prevalent features.
Main Survey Results
Sample Composition

15% of population took part in the survey as for Milano-Bicocca, and 9% as for Siena.

The two pie charts illustrate the sample composition according to user type.

Comparing sample and population, in both cases teachers and scholars took part in the survey to a greater extent.
The two pie charts illustrate the sample composition as for what concerns library attendance.

In Siena, a university town, there are more people who attend university libraries than in Milan, a city full of commuters.

As for Milano-Bicocca, the people who don’t attend university libraries say they either don’t need them or attend public libraries, as nearer to their home.
The two pie charts show the sample composition according to the use of library services.

In Siena there are more people who use only on-site services than in Milan: 33% compared with 19%.

Among people who don’t attend university libraries, there are many users of online services: 18% out of 31% in Milan, and 9% out of 10% in Siena.
Importance of Services

In both universities the most important services are also the most used.

The most important service is Reading room together with Consultation in Siena, and Consultation in Milan. The least important one is Reference in both towns, excluding IL courses that weren’t examined in Siena.

In both cases the least important services are often unknown.
Satisfaction with Services

In both universities the least satisfactory services are the same, whereas the most satisfactory ones are different.

The least satisfactory services are PC/WiFi, Photocopying, and Website. The most satisfactory ones are Quick Reference and Consultation in Siena, ILL/DD and IL courses in Milan.

The biggest negative gap between importance and satisfaction occurs for PC/WiFi (-0,76) in Siena, and for Consultation (-0,43) in Milan.
The most and least important library features are almost the same in both universities.

In both cases among the most important library features there are Spaces, Collections, and Opening Times.

The least important library feature is Communication both in Milan and in Siena.
Satisfaction with Features

The most satisfactory library features are the same in both universities, but the least satisfactory ones are different.

Among the most satisfactory library features there are Staff and Spaces in both cases. The least satisfactory ones are Communication in Siena, Opening Times and Online Services in Milan.

The biggest negative gap between importance and satisfaction occurs for Communication (-0.91) in Siena, and for Opening Times (-0.55) in Milan.
Overall Perception

The level of overall satisfaction is average high in both universities.

The reasons for dissatisfaction and the suggestions for improving libraries were very useful to understand how to do better in both contexts.

The gap between importance and satisfaction was useful to identify priority actions about services and library features.
# Library Profiles [1]

The table below illustrates the results in Milan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Profiles</th>
<th>The most important Features</th>
<th>The most used Services</th>
<th>User Type</th>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place to study</strong></td>
<td>Opening Times, Spaces</td>
<td>Reading Room, PC and WiFi</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Average high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Point to use on-site services</strong></td>
<td>On-site Services, Collections</td>
<td>Consultation, Loan, Photocopying, OPAC, Quick Reference</td>
<td>Students, Teachers, Scholars, Graduates</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gateway to online services</strong></td>
<td>Online Services, Communication</td>
<td>Digital Library, OPAC, Website</td>
<td>Teachers, Scholars, Graduates</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediator for bibliographic research</strong></td>
<td>Staff, On-site Services</td>
<td>Reference, IL courses, ILL/DD</td>
<td>Teachers, Scholars, Graduates</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Library Profiles [2]

Users fall into two main categories.

- **Students** (63%)
- **Teachers, Scholars, Graduates, Graduands** (34%)
Qualitative Analysis by T-LAB

The diagram shows the Multi Dimensional Scaling analysis on overall perception in Milano-Bicocca [from Laura Oliva’s thesis].

**General evaluation:**
library, services, satisfying, study

**Use of spaces:**
finding, studying, seat, silence

**Specific evaluation:**
service, opening, improving, online

**Use of printed copies:**
book, loan, copy, available
Good Practices
Realized Activities

In both universities we planned and realized the following activities, which can be considered Good Practices.

- Organizing staff training courses
- Carrying out internal and external benchmarking
- Taking care of internal and external communication
- Sharing results with various stakeholders
- Gathering users’ suggestions and complaints
- Taking actions to improve libraries
To sum up, when you carry out a User Satisfaction Survey, you could follow these Good Practices.
Thanks for your attention!
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