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Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this article is to explore from a number of points of view the perceptions of mainly undergraduate students at the University of Cape Town (UCT) about the value they derive from visiting the physical library.

Design/methodology/approach: Data from different investigations were assembled to derive a composite view of undergraduates’ perceptions of the value of the library. LibQUAL+® data reflecting the “Library as Place” dimension of the survey completed in 2014 were scrutinized; data from two surveys conducted in the information commons and the 24/7 venue of the main library at UCT were compiled and data from gate counts during the past three years showed different aspects of undergraduates’ opinions and behavior.

Findings: The combination of data from difference sources provided convincing evidence that undergraduate students value the library as a physical space and that they believe their working in the library enables them to get better marks for their university work.

Originality/value: The originality of this paper lies in the combination of different datasets to focus on one particular issue, the value of the physical library.
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Introduction

The sustainability of the library as a physical space has been questioned since the dawn of the digital era. As early as 1978, Lancaster proposed that in the “paperless society” there would no longer be the need for libraries (Young, 2008:844). A number of authors predicted that, as information resources became increasingly available online and students no longer needed to visit a library to read and borrow books and journals, the demise of the physical library would be the inevitable result (Carlson, 2001:A35). In Carlson’s well-known article “The deserted library” (2001), he discussed observations that academic libraries were no longer visited by
students on a regular basis, and that reference inquiries were decreasing and circulation figures declining as more information resources became available online. He considered some of the ways in which library directors attempted to renovate and restructure their libraries to attract more students, mainly by adding coffee shops and advice or writing centres.

Carlson remained ambivalent as to whether these alterations were worthwhile: he thought the changes were very expensive and nobody was sure whether superficial modifications such as comfortable chairs and coffee shops helped students to learn, even if they did attract more of them to the library (2001: A36). Nevertheless, many agreed that colleges had to do something to attract students back to the physical structures, because the new electronic offerings were not going to go away. There is no doubt, then, that as far as its most basic function of information provision is concerned, everybody agreed that the library had become “overwhelmingly a virtual destination” (Campbell. 2006:18).

Libraries, however, consist of more than collections of information resources. In addition to housing resources, they have always been responsible for organising them and making them available to a range of different stakeholders who may have very divergent information requirements and skills. In the case of the physical library, stakeholders in the past had to come to the library to access the materials; if these materials were all available digitally, this need would fall away. But as Pomerantz & Marchionini (2007:506) pointed out, a library is more than a physical space, just as a home is more than a house. A library is also a place where people come together to work, to collaborate and to exchange ideas. These authors therefore made it clear that while the virtual library can be a substitute for the physical library as a source of information, it cannot be a substitute for the physical library “in all aspects of library functionality” (2007:205-6).

Carlson’s article produced a “passionate response” (Antell & Engel, 2006:537) and the gloomy predictions of the imminent demise of the library did not materialise as expected. In a number of subsequent papers, Lancaster (e.g.1999) revised his original vision of the paperless society, and librarians rose to the challenge of incorporating digital technologies and resources into new or remodelled libraries, so that by 2003, Albanese wrote “Deserted no more,” demonstrating that after years of decline, campus libraries were now bustling with activity, and gate counts and even circulation figures were increasing once more (2003: 34).

One of the most significant attributes of these new and bustling libraries was the shift in focus from being a “storehouse” of knowledge to becoming “an active participant in the educational process” and supporting “a curriculum concerned with the discovery of new knowledge” (Weise, 2004:9). Bennett argued that one of the most important results of the technology revolution in libraries had been the move away from “a teaching culture and toward a culture of learning” (2005:10). As libraries became less involved with information provision, their focus shifted to a need to demonstrate their role in and contributions to student learning (Kuh & Gonyea, 2003:256). Studying student experience in technologically-focused libraries, Kuh & Gonyea found that students who use the library most frequently display a stronger work ethic, and that students experience the library as a positive learning environment (2003;269-270).
Reconstructing library spaces in order to render them more welcoming to students should therefore not be regarded as artificial enticement to students who would rather be in a café or bookshop, but recognised as adding crucial value to the learning environment. Group study areas such as learning commons are created in response to constructivist learning theories that acknowledge the importance of collaborative learning (Lin, Sheng & Chang, 2010: 343). Motivated by the social learning theory of Vygotsky, who emphasizes the importance of physical interaction in learning (Pomerantz & Marchioni, 2007:524), libraries are increasingly incorporating collaborative learning spaces in order to create attractive spaces that are specifically designed to promote study and learning (Bennet, 2005:14).

**Role of the library as a learning space**

Although the threat of an imminent demise of the academic library has therefore receded, demonstrating the impact of the academic library on its stakeholders and the value that it adds to the user constituencies is an increasingly serious requirement at higher education institutions (Poll, 2012:121). Evidence of such impact has been a growing concern for librarians and library managers, who seek from all library activities indications that the library is to some extent responsible for making a difference, for example by improving the academic performance of library users, or shortening the time to graduation, or saving time and effort through teaching users new information literacy skills (Poll, 2012:125). In order to explore the value of this newly-defined space that no longer primarily focuses on information provision, it becomes necessary to explore whether libraries do indeed foster the culture of learning and the discovery of knowledge as proposed above.

When seeking evidence of impact, Poll (2012:126) was careful to note that evidence may be derived through different approaches, for example inferred from conclusions based on routinely collected data such as expenditure, stock, attendance, circulation, gate counts and seat occupancy; observed, for example by mining data of what users actually do; solicited by asking users and non-users about their experiences and opinions; and derived from unsolicited communication, such as emails, suggestion boxes or anecdotes. Quantitative outputs could then be combined with qualitative reports into narratives that demonstrate or illustrate perceived value.

Unfortunately, routinely collected statistics do not easily lend themselves to providing evidence of value or impact, so librarians need to design and use special research instruments for soliciting or observing information that would enable them to obtain evidence of the perceived value of library services. A mixed-methods approach was used for this study as library value is a complicated construct which is difficult to demonstrate in a single investigation. The new standard for assessing the impact of libraries, ISO 16439-2014, explicitly states that combining data from different studies can provide a “richer and more nuanced set of findings that may lead to better insights, understanding and identification of library impact and also greater confidence in in the conclusions” (2014:22). For these reasons, this article reports on the value that the library may be adding to students’ learning experiences at the University of Cape Town.
(UCT), by soliciting students’ perceptions of library services in different investigations and observing their behaviour in order to be able to infer whether they derive value from the physical library and its services.

**Solicited evidence: LibQUAL+®**

One instrument which has been used internationally to measure user satisfaction in mainly academic libraries since the early 2000s, has been LibQUAL+®. While user satisfaction does not necessarily signify impact or demonstrate whether the library has made an actual difference to users, it is proposed in this article that certain LibQUAL+® findings, in conjunction with additionally solicited information, may enable one to infer that users derive benefits from using library spaces, and that they perceive these spaces to be valuable.

The LibQUAL+® instrument solicits information from respondents in the three dimensions of *Information Control, Affect of Service* and *Library as Place*. Up to five additional optional questions may be added from a list, together with a demographic questions and questions about respondents’ library use. Using the technique known as gap analysis, respondents are asked to rate the library on a scale of 1 - 9 according to their minimum acceptable, desired, and perceived service levels, so that it is possible to observe not only what respondents’ perceptions are about the level of service they receive, but also how much a service is desired and therefore possibly valued.

UCT conducted a LibQUAL+® investigation for the third time in August 2014. The previous investigations had been in 2005 and 2009. The LibQUAL+® Lite version of the survey was used for the first time in 2014 and a total of 1643 responses from a total population of 24866 were received. There were 1072 undergraduate responses. For the purpose of this study, mainly the dimension of *Library as Place* will be explored, together with two of the five “local questions” which also referred to issues of library space. An image of the LibQUAL+® survey with the 22 core questions is attached to this article as Appendix A and the five local questions selected by UCT in 2014 are attached as Appendix B.

In 2004 Lippincott and Kyrillidou noted that in spite of the general availability of digital material, the physical library had not diminished in importance for undergraduate students and that their responses consistently show “much higher ratings for desired level of service in the ‘Library as Place’ dimension of service than faculty do” (2004:8). Since then, other studies have shown (e.g. Jankowska, Hertel & Young, 2006:64) that postgraduate students and academics value the *Information Control* dimension most highly, but that for undergraduates, the *Library as Place* dimension is the most important, as reflected in their most desired scores.

Research at UCT has confirmed this finding (Daniels, Darch & de Jager, 2010:120). The graph below for the 2014 iteration illustrates that in all but one of the questions of *Information Control*, the postgraduates’ desired levels of service are higher than those of the undergraduates. The exception is IC-3, “The printed library materials I need for my work.” As far as the *Library as Place* dimension is concerned, the undergraduates’ desired levels of service
are all higher than those of the postgraduates, apart from LP-2, “Quiet space for individual work”, where the postgraduates’ desired level is the highest of all in this dimension and even exceeds that of the undergraduates.

These results emphasize that while postgraduates value aspects of Information Control most highly, undergraduates’ most urgent desires are still for the library as a physical space. The two exceptions noted above do not contradict the importance of the library as physical space for both sets of users, showing that even the postgraduates value the library as a quiet place for individual work, and that undergraduates at UCT still need both the physical library and some information resources in the tangible format of print.
UCT LibQUAL 2014 - Information Control & Library as Place
Postgrad & Undergrad Comparisons
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Figure 1
The results for both undergraduate and postgraduate students for the dimension of Library as Place (LP) were scrutinized more closely. Four of the LP questions had the highest overall desired scores for undergraduates of all the 22 standard core questions. These were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Undergraduate Desired Mean</th>
<th>Postgraduate Desired Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP-4 A haven for study, learning, or research</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-2 Quiet space for individual work</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-3 A comfortable and inviting location</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-1 Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Highest overall desired scores for undergraduates

For the postgraduates, the desired means for these questions, apart from LP-2, discussed above, were considerably lower. The dimensions which were next in the order of desirability for undergraduates both came from the dimension of Information Control, although they were lower than those of the postgraduates’, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Undergraduate Desired Mean</th>
<th>Postgraduate Desired Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC-5 Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-2 A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own.</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Next in order of desirability for undergraduates

The undergraduates’ desired means for all the other core questions were below 8.00, clearly indicating that as far as undergraduates were concerned, the dimension of Library as Place was regarded as their most important aspect of overall library service.

A closer look at the LP results shows the extent of the gaps between the minimum, perceived and desired scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Minimum Mean</th>
<th>Desired Mean</th>
<th>Perceived Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP-1 Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-2 Quiet space for individual work</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-3 A comfortable and inviting location</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-4 A haven for study, learning, or research</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-5 Space for group learning and group study</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Gaps between Minimum, Desired and Perceived Means

In the case of LP-2, “quiet space for individual work”, the minimum mean (7.00) was higher than the perceived mean (6.88), showing that undergraduate students found a quiet space for individual work not only one of the most important qualities that they desired, but also that the UCT Libraries were perceived to be performing at a level lower than their minimum expectations. This is the only instance in the 2014 undergraduate results where the perceived mean is lower than the minimum mean in the 22 standard LibQUAL+® questions thus, emphasizing undergraduates’ urgent need for quiet spaces in which to work.

In 2014, two of the five optional local questions were also specifically targeted at the dimension of the Library as Place. These items are illustrated below and it is interesting to note that “A secure and safe space” was the most highly desired issue among the local questions for
undergraduates. For both of these optional place-focused questions, the perceived means were also lower than the minimum means, once more indicating that undergraduates perceive the library as providing a less-than-desired service in these areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum Mean</th>
<th>Desired Mean</th>
<th>Perceived Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A secure and safe place</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for group / individual study and research needs</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.** Local questions focusing on space

In addition to the questions, LibQUAL+® also provides space for additional free-text comments. At UCT in 2014, there were 948 comments, of which 640 were from undergraduates. Since many of the comments mentioned more than one topic, the total of 948 comments were coded into 1721 tags, which were then counted according to theme. Undergraduate responses showed that their most frequently occurring comments were positive: 119 referring to the good service or assistance they received; 82 positive comments about the atmosphere or environment in the library; 80 positive comments about the library staff; and 63 about the good work the staff did. The next most frequent comments were negative: 54 comments about the library not being open long enough; and 53 about inadequate library space. A few verbatim free text comments will serve to illustrate some of these sentiments:

- “UCT library is the best library I have ever used.”
- “I am impressed by the level of good service provided by library staff.”
- “Because of staff who are helpful and who inspire confidence, I’ve had only very good experiences and service,”
- “I love working in the UCT library.”
- “I live in and love our library.”
- “The library, in my opinion, provides a productive environment which is conducive of efficient learning and academic curiosity.”
- “The library is, and has been since first year, my favourite place on campus.”
- “I find the atmosphere of the library to be great for learning.”
- “Need more study spaces.”
- “The service is great but there isn’t enough space.”
- “Excellent service....but do need more room or desks available for students.”
- “The library is great but often too full.”

**Table 5.** Free text comments

It is suggested that these results provide substantial evidence that undergraduate students value the library as a place of learning; that they like being there and that they object to barriers that they perceive as preventing to them from spending even more time there.

**Solicited evidence: Learning Spaces**

Two investigations were conducted in the UCT Libraries at the time of the end-of-semester examinations in June 2014, when student use of the library’s information commons and of its new 24/7 study venue were particularly heavy. The first investigation concerned the
sometimes-long queues that formed in the Knowledge Commons (KC) while students were waiting to use the computer workstations. In spite of the general availability of campus-wide wi-fi and many other computer laboratories at UCT, students were willing to wait patiently in these queues for the next computer to become available for use. They had to wait as there is no booking system for the workstations; it has always been understood in KC that students are allowed to use a computer for as long as they needed it.

The queuing process was orderly and when one computer workstation was vacated, the first person in the queue went to use it. This investigation focused on the queuing students and in a brief questionnaire asked for how long they were prepared to wait for a computer to become available and what they were planning to do once their turn arrived. The student assistants (“Navigators”) in KC handed out clipboards with questionnaires, together with a piece of candy as an incentive. Questioning did not commence before a queue had formed. The survey was conducted between 10h00 – 17h00 every day for a week just before the end-of-semester examination period whenever a queue was evident. By 17h00 the queues had abated.

The questions asked about the activities in which respondents intended to engage once a computer became available, with the purpose of exploring the use made of KC and the value that students think the KC added to their academic work. In order for the questions to be anonymous, and also as short as possible, the only demographic questions related to year of study and faculty affiliation. A total of 577 responses were received.

A similar study was conducted a few days later in the new 24/7 study area in the main library, which had opened in 2012 in response to strong student demand. This facility is on the top floor of the library, with its own outside entrance, and it opens when the main library closes in the evening. Once more, only limited demographic questions were asked and the questions enquired about what respondents do in the 24/7 venue, how long they intended staying, and how much they valued working there. For security reasons this venue does not have its own computer equipment, although wi-fi is available and students bring their own devices, so students were also asked whether they make use of an electronic device such as a laptop, tablet, or smartphone. Survey forms were left on desks when the facility opened and the security guard, the only staff member present, assisted in collecting the forms during the night and over weekends, when the main library was closed. Although there were fewer respondents than for the KC study, a total of 257 responses were received during the investigation, which, like the KC investigation, lasted for one week.

Somewhat surprisingly, it seemed that the clientele at the two venues differed to some extent. Commerce students (who are very well served by their own, dedicated computer labs) are the most frequent users in both instances, but Humanities students use the KC far more than the 24/7 venue and it was somewhat unusual to encounter in both venues a sizeable number of students from Health Sciences, who work on an entirely different campus some five km away.

It was interesting to test the original assumption that mostly first and second year students use the KC and that the 24/7 venue would be popular with senior students who have more work to
do by their third year. Results, however, showed that the 24/7 space is attended by undergraduate students from first to third years, while in the KC most students were third years, followed by second then fourth years\(^1\). This finding therefore challenged an assumption that KC was mainly an undergraduate facility.

**Figure 2.** How frequently do they visit KC?

**Figure 3.** How frequently do they visit 24/7?

\(^1\) In South Africa, Bachelor’s degrees typically take a minimum of three years to complete.
These results show that in the KC, a total of 148 Respondents reported visiting every day, while a total of 229 reported visiting at least twice a week. In the 24/7 space, a total of 45 respondents visited every day and 90 visited twice a week or more often, so that 65% of the respondents in KC and 56% of the respondents in the 24/7 space had visited the respective venues at least twice a week or more often.

As with the LibQUAL+® comments, free-text questions asking about what respondents value most about working in the two venues were coded according to concepts that appeared most frequently. As the services and facilities in the two venues are different, the coding reflected this. In both cases the respondents most highly appreciated the silence; a workplace that was quiet and where respondents could work in peace for as long as they needed.

**Figure 4.** What do you value most in KC?

**Figure 5.** What do you value most in 24/7?

In the KC, the next most valued quality was the available technology: fast computers, big screens, efficient scanning and printing; followed by the clean and tidy working environment
providing a scholarly atmosphere. The ready availability of help with both technical and study issues were highly regarded and the group study rooms were appreciated.

In the 24/7 venue there are, for security reasons, no computers at all, but the entire venue receives wi-fi and students are encouraged to bring their own devices. There is no library staff assistance apart from a security guard. Here the drawcards, in addition to the quiet space, were the scholarly environment where others are also working, and staying in a safe place all night. Physical comfort in a warm, spacious and well-lit venue was noted as well. Most of the respondents used their own electronic devices, but some 12% did not use any device at all, and of those who did, 70% used laptops and the rest used tablets or smartphones in almost equal measures.

In the KC the use of social media such as Facebook is not allowed unless “for academic purposes” and the student Navigators keep an eye on this. Although there are no Navigators present in the 24/7 space to watch what students are doing, social media did not seem to play a big part in their activities and repeated comments from both venues noted approvingly that respondents were not distracted by social media. The question as to whether respondents thought that working in the respective venues enabled them to get better marks for their courses produced very clear results. In the KC 86% and in the 24/7 venue 92% of the respondents agreed that indeed they thought working there resulted in their achieving better marks.

**Observed evidence: Gate counts**

As early as 2003, Albanese had noted increasing gate counts and usage statistics in libraries that had been restructured to provide more computers and a variety of spaces to support technology-driven teaching and learning (2003:34). The UCT Library had also in recent years undergone extensive physical renovations to make it more attractive and user-friendly to students by providing more study spaces, network points, a variety of seating areas and spaces, including more group study rooms, comfortable easy chairs for relaxing, and installing a significant collection of modern South African art on the walls to create an aesthetically pleasing ambience. Records of actual library visits during the past three years according to gate counts were scrutinized. The figures below are de-duplicated, so that if someone entered the library more than once on the same day, only a single entry was recorded. These results confirm that undergraduate students use the physical library the most, and that their numbers increased each year during the past three years.
Findings such as these enable one to infer that undergraduate students in particular do indeed value working in the library; responses confirming this have been obtained in different contexts. The quiet, orderly spaces where one can concentrate for long periods without disturbance are particularly important to them and they wish to be in the library because they believe that they benefit academically from working there. Lin, Chen and Chang had noted that students study more and are more motivated to learn in environments that they regard as “warm and friendly” (2010:343). At UCT too, students acknowledge the importance of library staff who make them feel welcome and are able to assist them in their work. They value both the facilities for quiet study and reflection, as well as the opportunities for collaborative learning provided by the renovated library.

One may therefore conclude that the library is functioning as a “third place” in the UCT community. Third places are not homes or workplaces, but those places where people choose to spend much of the rest of their time (Ojala, 2009:24-35), whether to work quietly or to experience a community of other students who are also working. This impression of the library functioning as a third place is reinforced by many of the LibQUAL+® comments in Table 5. Fry and Codispoti (2010) noted additional aspects of academic libraries that function as third places: redesigned spaces for improved social interaction, “comfy couches, group seating arrangements and fine art.” The UCT Library has incorporated these features into its redesigned buildings and this study has demonstrated that by providing excellent learning opportunities in supportive and pleasing environments, students believe that they obtain better marks, thus illustrating that the library is indeed contributing to the University’s mission of providing quality educational experiences that are appreciated and valued.
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APPENDIX A

UCT results for the 22 core questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>My Minimum Service Level Is</th>
<th>My Desired Service Level Is</th>
<th>Perceived Service Performance Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Library staff who instill confidence in users</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Giving users individual attention</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Library staff who are consistently courteous</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) The printed library materials I need for my work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Quiet space for individual work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Readiness to respond to users’ enquiries</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) The electronic information resources I need</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Library staff who have the knowledge to answer user questions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) A comfortable and inviting location</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Library staff who deal with users in a caring fashion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Library staff who understand the needs of their users</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) A haven for study, learning, or research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Willingness to help users</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Making information easily accessible for independent use</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Space for group learning and group study</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Dependability in handling users’ service problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B

Local Questions at UCT in 2014:

- A secure and safe space
- Collections of online full text articles sufficient to meet my needs
- Enabling me to find information myself 24 hours a day
- Librarians providing help that both assists in finding the information needed now, and improves skills useful in future information searches
- Space for group/individual study and research needs