

## IALS Library Reader Satisfaction Survey 2021 – Full report

A survey of readers was carried out between Monday 21<sup>st</sup> and Sunday 27<sup>th</sup> June 2021 in order to find out how satisfied readers are with the library's collections and information services. The original two-page survey questionnaire created in 2003 was used, as it has been every year since, to ensure consistent quality measurements. Having introduced an additional question on ease of access to electronic resources two years ago (and we look forward to building up useful data on this question over the coming years), a one-off question was also added this year specifically soliciting feedback and ratings regarding our response to the Coronavirus pandemic. A weblink to the survey questionnaire was placed on the IALS website, inviting returns. This weblink and encouragement to complete the questionnaire was also emailed to all of our current library members. Posters advertising the survey were put up throughout the library for the whole of the survey week and survey questionnaires were continually available at the library entrance, on the Issue & Enquiry Desk and on the IALS website. A prize draw (£50 worth of vouchers) was also offered to encourage reader participation.

The survey asked readers to rate how the library generally meets their needs in terms of books, journals, electronic databases, library catalogue, access to e-resources, computers, photocopiers, printing, helpfulness of staff, training sessions, study facilities, study environment and opening and closing times. Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction on a 4-point scale. The definitions of each category were as follows:

1 = rarely satisfied

2 = sometimes satisfied

3 = often satisfied

4 = usually satisfied

In total 53 completed survey forms were returned, of which 18 were from LLM students or other postgraduate taught course students, 14 from academic and research staff and 21 from postgraduate research degree students. Respondents did not always answer every question. Despite all of the measures outlined above to encourage responses, we were not surprised to see the rate of returns fall dramatically this year – whilst the library reading rooms have been open to readers since September 2020, student numbers in London are still low, and our in-person responses were significantly lower than usual. Additionally, our electronic returns were lower than usual, probably because we had to run the survey this year during the academic vacation, so our usual cohort of academic responders may simply not have seen the email publicising the survey. We very much hope that next year we will be able to run the survey under more normal circumstances, and at a more propitious time of the year for receiving maximum returns. The satisfaction ratings below are the amount of people marking us at 3 (often satisfied) or 4 (usually satisfied) for each given question.

### Highlights of the survey:

In this very unusual year, and whilst it wasn't the highest score we received, we feel that the highlight of the survey is the satisfaction rating of **94.3%** for our response to the Coronavirus pandemic, as the IALS Library staff have been working very hard behind the scenes to provide as robust a service as possible. We have been operating a very successful virtual enquiry and reference service to support researchers during

lockdown, moving all of our training and reference appointments online, and developed a 'live chat' section on the Library pages in the IALS website. We quickly updated all our subject guides and jurisdictional guides to highlight those e-resources which were remotely accessible, identified key titles to ensure we had electronic copies and acquired e-versions where they were missing. Furthermore, we developed a web list and provided easy access to quality open access legal resources and produced a series of podcasts and videos aimed at guiding researchers through online research. As soon as the University allowed, we re-opened the physical building at 17 Russell Square in July 2020 (initially only for "Click, Collect and Return" book loans) and worked closely with the University's Health and Safety team to ensure that the building, staff offices and public areas were operating in a safe and Coronavirus-secure environment. The safety of our readers and staff has been our number one priority, so it is enormously satisfying to have received such a high satisfaction rating, and the appreciative comments attached to this question in the appendices are full of genuine thanks from our members.

The overall satisfaction rate (those who indicated they were either often or usually satisfied) was **98.1%**, a pleasing slight improvement, given the challenging circumstances, on last year's mark of 97.5% and consistent with our excellent mid-nineties score for this question virtually every year since the survey began. IALS Library is very pleased to have established a definite trend of overall reader satisfaction, particularly in light of the recent refurbishment and the impact that this has had on certain other survey questions in previous years.

The other top rating at **98.1%** was for our electronic training sessions, having received ratings of plus 90% for the previous thirteen years. This very good rating replicates the excellent feedback solicited at the end of our training events and underlines the library's central mission of research facilitation. To have received such a high mark in a year where we had to reinvent our training materials for an entirely virtual training programme and learn a variety of new skills and technologies in a very short space of time, is a credit to our staff. We continue to put a great deal of effort into the expansion and development of these training sessions and have started offering a wider range of training throughout the year as a direct result of feedback from students as to what sort of training they would like the library to provide. This result clearly shows that researchers and students continue to view our annual programme of research training skills sessions as a major value-added service.

We were extremely pleased to note that this year, for the third year in a row, ten survey questions received plus 90% ratings, showing a steady improvement across the board. Again, this is especially gratifying considering the challenging year we have all had. The impact of the new and improved library space has had a beneficial effect on overall ratings and has addressed certain issues on which we have been marked down in the past such as study facilities and availability of computers. These individual ratings will be addressed in turn below. In addition to the plus 90% ratings for the library's provision during the coronavirus pandemic, our electronic training sessions, and overall satisfaction, the other plus 90% ratings were for study facilities at **95.9%**, helpfulness of library staff at **94.4%**, range of electronic journals and databases at **94.2%**, study environment - quietness at **94%**, range of print journals at **92.5%**, range of books at **92.5%**, and study environment - heating at **92%**.

Although very slightly down on previous years, our rating for helpfulness of the staff, at **94.4%**, is still excellent and the comments section is full of praise for our friendly and helpful librarians, which gives us a great deal of pride. Many of the comments this

year specifically focus on how vital the assistance provided by IALS Library staff has been over the course of the pandemic lockdown, a vindication of the hard work put in by all staff to support our readers and researchers. We are pleased to note that this particular rating has never dropped below a plus 90% satisfaction rating in the entire history of the survey.

IALS Library was delighted to see such a high rating for study facilities at **95.9%**, surpassing even last year's rating of 95.1%. To put this in context, this question received a sub-80% rating as recently as 2016, and the comments sections of previous surveys had included complaints about the tired look of the building, and the old desks and chairs in the library. In 2019, this question received a plus 90% rating for the first time in over a decade as a result of the IALS Transformation Project being underway, and this trend of improved satisfaction now that the transformation is complete is very gratifying. This is borne out in the welcome contrast seen this year and last year in the comments section, where we received many compliments on the new furniture and comments on how comfortable and suitable they are for long periods of study.

Following on from this, we are very pleased to have received much improved ratings for study environment – heating at **92%** and for study environment – quietness at **94%**. Long-time readers of this survey will be aware that our readers have been unsatisfied with these issues since the inception of the survey. At last, it appears that we have solved our heating issues via the installation of onsite local temperature controls. To contextualise the improvement, last year we received a rating of 76.5% for Study environment - heating. IALS library staff will continue to monitor the temperatures in the reading rooms as part of their regular patrols and attempt to regulate it as best we can. We were also very encouraged to see the improved **94%** rating for study environment – quietness which has been assisted by the installation of secondary glazing on all library windows during the IALS Transformation Project.

As the national research library for law our priority is to collect and make available the national research collection of printed law books and serials, however we also endeavour to make as much material as possible available digitally to our members and are always keen to expand our range of specialist legal databases. We were therefore very pleased to see that the rating of **94.2%** for the range of electronic journals and databases has remained above 90% for the fifth year running. We feel this indicates that the library, whilst having to make difficult decisions about resource provision in these difficult economic times, has chosen prudently which resources to cut, and to no detrimental effect to our readers, and even managed where possible to add new legal electronic resources to our collection.

The library is very pleased to see that rating for range of print journals has retained a plus 90% rating for seventh consecutive years now. This **92.5%** rating, although slightly down on last year, highlights that our attempts to maintain a relevant and comprehensive collection have been successful, despite our collections budget not keeping up with average law book inflation and the ongoing problems caused by a weak pound sterling for an international collection.

The library is pleased to see that our rating for range of books has remained plus 90% for the third year running. Indeed, this year's rating of **92.5%** is a slight improvement on last year. The library remains committed to maintaining a comprehensive and up-to-date legal research collection, protecting our book purchasing budget and adding significantly to the collection. Indeed, the comments section of the survey supports this higher rating, being full of praise for our rich collection.

Ratings of **above 80%** were received for opening times (**88.2%**), ease of access to e-resources (**88%**), quality of computing facilities (**87.5%**), sufficient copies of LLM textbooks (**86.8%**), ease of use of Library catalogue (**86%**), and closing times (**82.4%**).

Our **88.2%** rating for opening times, although not continuing the improving trend first noticed two years ago (up from 83.7% in 2018 to 89% in 2019 and 89.7% last year), is still very gratifying considering the challenging circumstances of the past year, and our inability to open at all for some periods of time due to government restrictions. Indeed, the comments section of the report is full of thanks for providing a safe study space during the pandemic, and we hope that the relatively stable score for both opening and closing times demonstrates that our readers appreciated our efforts in opening as much as we were able in the circumstances. We very much hope to be able to offer a more usual service and opening hours for the coming year, so shall review this statistic with interest next year.

We decided to include the new question on ease of access to e-resources for the first time three years ago in light of negative feedback on this issue received by the School of Advanced Study (SAS) generally, as we wanted to ascertain how much of an issue this was for students at IALS in particular. We find this year's rating of **88%**, being virtually unchanged from last year's rating of 88.4%, to be reassuringly high (indeed, as with the previous three surveys, when this result is isolated to show only responses from IALS students, the result is 100%). Again, in the light of the increased need for e-resources over the past year, and the sterling efforts of all IALS Library staff to facilitate much wider e-access to our readers, this result is more gratifying still.

We were very pleased to see the rating for quality of computing facilities remain virtually unchanged at **87.5%** (88.9% last year). Our Information Systems team worked hard during the Transformation Project to ensure the smooth transition of computing infrastructure and services, which was achieved with the minimum of inconvenience to our researchers. Just before the start of the Transformation Project they had successfully migrated us to the new website, streamlined the Wi-Fi log on process, and simplified network printing.

The above point feeds on neatly to the next rating regarding sufficient copies of LLM textbooks. We were extremely pleased to see a rating of **86.8%**, an improvement on last year's rating of 83.7%. Measures such as the careful monitoring of the circulation and usage of core texts, the purchasing of additional copies of heavily used material and the placing copies of key items into the short loan collection, have already been undertaken to improve this rating. To assist matters further, prior and during the pandemic we have been meeting more teaching material requirements through an increased use of e-books, and our Information Resources team have done good work in securing improved electronic access to as many texts as possible for our LLM students. For example, we subscribed to Brill Online, the Oxford Scholarship Online service, Cambridge Core Online law eBooks and Edward Elgar eBooks among others which contain many hundreds of legal textbooks.

The rating of **86%** for ease of use of library catalogue has once again slipped below 90%, having achieved a plus 90 rating for the previous two years. As the Library catalogue has not changed in the past few years, these fluctuations in marks may be caused by the constantly changing survey pool. There may also have been issues caused by more people attempting to access electronic information via the catalogue without proper training or experience during lockdown. Following on from comments in previous surveys regarding federated searching, the Information Resources staff

have recently purchased new software which should allow us to improve the efficiency of the article level searching and cross-searching modules of the Sierra Library Management System.

Ratings of **below 80%** were received for availability of PCs at **77.8%**, availability of photocopiers at **76.1%**, availability of printers at **68.9%**, and cost of copying (the lowest mark) at **57.4%**.

The lower rating for the availability of PC's is understandable as during the pandemic the public machines were closed for health and safety reasons. Our comprehensive wireless network was still in place, however, allowing full access onsite to all IALS e-resources via users' own devices. This perhaps accounts for the relatively high rating of 77.8%. We have re-opened our public PC's during September 2021.

Our rating for availability of public photocopiers continues, puzzlingly, to remain below 90%, as anecdotal evidence from staff (and copying statistics pulled from the machines back this up) suggests that they are rarely all in use at the same time. Even though we had to reduce the number of available copiers for health and safety reasons, we have never seen a queue or received a complaint about lack of copying facilities. This year's rating of **76.1%** is expected to change next year, when we are able to provide full access to our reprographic equipment. The low rating of **68.9%** for availability of printing facilities is understandable, as for health and safety reasons we were unable to offer printing to our readers for much of the pandemic.

The lowest rating by far was received for cost of copying, scanning and printing at **57.4%**, which is broadly in line with previous marks received. What is puzzling though is that for the whole of the year copying and scanning has been completely free. The cost of photocopying at IALS Library was reduced on three separate occasions some years ago and has not been increased since then, and last year we introduced a 1p reduction in the cost of scanning to bring us in line with the rest of the central University libraries. A unit of copying or printing now stands at 5 pence per copy, and scanning at 4 pence, which compares favourably with similar libraries and is broadly in line with other University of London college libraries. IALS Library will monitor this rating following the reintroduction of charging for reprographic facilities.

Finally, given the choice, most of our respondents wanted more books available in the library (**75.5%**) rather than more lending outside the library (**24.5%**). This is up by a few percentage points on last year, and only slightly below the record breaking 75.7% of people in favour of materials in the library received in 2017. It is consistent with our results for this question every year since the survey's inception. It is gratifying to see that our primary objective of being a national legal reference library is supported by most of our users. It may also reflect the fact that because more and more of our research resources are available online offsite, users still expect the rarer printed materials to be available onsite when they visit Russell Square and not out on long loan.

## **Comments section**

The comments section of the questionnaire provided the usual mix of compliments and suggestions and can be read in Appendix A below. This year, the survey also specifically asked readers for feedback on how IALS Library responded to the Coronavirus pandemic with the comments listed in Appendix B below. We were very

pleased to see the very appreciative comments from our readers, who appear very grateful for our efforts to offer library research support services during the pandemic.

To conclude, the Library is very pleased and reassured that since its inception in 2003, we have received consistently very high ratings across almost all categories in our annual user survey, despite our regularly changing membership. In addition, we are very proud of our successful record of delivering onsite and offsite library services during the past very challenging year. We will continue to monitor the dip in some of the ratings in this survey, and all potential areas for improvement will be fully investigated.

Laura Griffiths  
Academic Services Manager  
30<sup>th</sup> August 2021

### Full results of the survey:

The following full results of the survey contain responses across all reader categories to 19 specific questions all starting with the text: “Do you feel the Library generally meets your needs in terms of...”. By ticking category 3 or category 4 on the 4-point scale we have assumed that the respondents’ needs were either often satisfied (3) or usually satisfied (4).

### Percentage and number of respondents who ticked category 3 (often satisfied) and category 4 (usually satisfied):

		2019		2020		2021	
<b>Range of books?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	88.5%	54	90%	54	94.4%	17
	Postgraduate research degree students	94.7%	18	88.9%	16	90.5%	19
	Academic / research staff	96%	24	94.1%	32	92.9%	13
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>91.9%</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>91.4%</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>92.5%</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Sufficient copies of core LLM textbooks?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	75.4%	43	78.6%	44	77.8%	14
	Postgraduate research degree students	100%	10	88.9%	8	90.9%	10
	Academic / research staff	92.3%	12	94.4%	17	100%	9
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>81.7%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>83.7%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>86.8%</b>	<b>33</b>

<b>Range of print journals?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>94.9%</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>15</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>95.2%</b>	<b>20</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>97.1%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>95.4%</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>96.6%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>92.5%</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Range of e-journals and databases?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>96.5%</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>88.9%</b>	<b>16</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>94.4%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>19</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>96%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>91.2%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>93.5%</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>94.7%</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>94.2%</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Ease of access to e-resources?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>76.7%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>15</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>94.4%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>94.7%</b>	<b>18</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>79.2%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>87.1%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>84.6%</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>81.9%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>88.4%</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>50</b>



<b>Ease of use of library catalogue?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>86.4%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>15</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>89.5%</b>	<b>17</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>100%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>96.9%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>84.6%</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>92.5%</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>91.3%</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Quality of Computing facilities?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>78.9%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>91.1%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>77.8%</b>	<b>14</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>82.4%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>76.5%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>88.9%</b>	<b>16</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>90.9%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>90.3%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>88.9%</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Availability of PCs?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>82.1%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>92.9%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>58.8%</b>	<b>10</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>100%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>82.4%</b>	<b>14</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>86.4%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>86.7%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>91.5%</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>77.8%</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Photocopiers?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>80.4%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>89.3%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>70.6%</b>	<b>12</b>

	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>87.5%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>70.6%</b>	<b>12</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>86.9%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>89.3%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>82.8%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>86.6%</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>76.1%</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Printing?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>82.1%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>89.5%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>12</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>75%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>68.8%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>64.7%</b>	<b>11</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>90.5%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>82.8%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>82.5%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>68.9%</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Cost of photocopying and printing?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>61.4%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>52.9%</b>	<b>9</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>50%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>56.3%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>58.8%</b>	<b>10</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>80%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>77.8%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>62.9%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>64.4%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>57.4%</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Helpfulness of library staff?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>98.4%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>96.7%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>88.9%</b>	<b>17</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>100%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>19</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>96%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14</b>

	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>98.2%</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>96.6%</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>94.4%</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Electronic training sessions?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>94.9%</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>94.7%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>19</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>95.8%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98.1%</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Study facilities?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>88.3%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>96.7%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>88.9%</b>	<b>16</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>94.7%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>20</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>100%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>92.6%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>95.1%</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>95.9%</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Study environment – quietness?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>75%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>15</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>89.5%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>18</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>80.6%</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>86.1%</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Study environment – heating?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>75%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>76.7%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>16</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>78.9%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>18</b>

	Academic / research staff	<b>87.5%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>78.1%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>79.6%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>76.5%</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Opening times?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>83.3%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>88.3%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>72.2%</b>	<b>13</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>94.7%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>19</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>100%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>92.3%</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>89.7%</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>88.2%</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Closing times?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>81.7%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>86.7%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>61.1%</b>	<b>11</b>
	Postgraduate research degree student	<b>100%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>19</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>95.8%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>96.9%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>92.3%</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>88.1%</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>90.4%</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>82.4%</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Overall, how satisfied?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	<b>93.4%</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>98.3%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>94.4%</b>	<b>17</b>
	Postgraduate research degree students	<b>100%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>21</b>
	Academic / research staff	<b>96%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>All reader categories (including others)</b>	<b>95.5%</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>97.5%</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>98.1%</b>	<b>52</b>

		2019			2020			2021		
<b>More materials available in the library or more lending?</b>	LLM / other taught course students	In library	62.3%	38	In library	63.3%	38	In library	72.2%	13
		More lending	37.7%	23	More lending	36.7%	22	More lending	27.8%	5
	Postgraduate research degree students	In library	73.7%	14	In library	70%	14	In library	80.9%	17
		More lending	26.3%	5	More lending	30%	6	More lending	19.1%	4
	Academic/research staff	In library	72%	18	In library	85.3%	29	In library	71.4%	10
		More lending	28%	7	More lending	14.7%	5	More lending	28.6%	4
	<b>All reader categories</b>	<b>In library</b>	<b>67.6%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>In library</b>	<b>71.2%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>In library</b>	<b>75.5%</b>	<b>40</b>

## Survey results year by year

	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Range of books?	92.5%	91.4%	91.9%	86.5%	89.7%	86.7%	89.7%	90.5%	91.9%	95.5%	93.2%	93.3%	92.2%	94.5%	94%
Sufficient copies of LLM textbooks?	86.6%	83.7%	81.7%	74.8%	75.3%	68.9%	72.4%	63.6%	79.7%	82.1%	73.1%	73.3%	87.6%	81.5%	75.7%
Range of journals?	92.5%	96.6%	95.4%	95.2%	94.2%	90.2%	92.6%	89.7%	87.2%	94.8%	93.7%	91.6%	93.3%	94.3%	91.7%
Range of electronic journals and databases?	94.2%	94.7%	93.5%	94.4%	90.4%	86.1%	91.4%	89.1%	86.9%	94.7%	91.5%	89.4%	92.4%	91.9%	90.6%
Access to e-resources	88%	88.4%	81.9%	88.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Ease of use of library catalogue?	86%	91.3%	92.5%	84.7%	81.9%	84.3%	85.9%	77.9%	86.4%	88.3%	90.1%	91.6%	87.8%	95.7%	94.2%
Quality of computing facilities?	87.5%	88.9%	83%	86.7%	90.7%	88.9%	82.5%	78.9%	88.9%	86.6%	84.2%	94.8%	91.6%	93.2%	91.1%
Availability of PCs?	77.8%	91.5%	86.7%	86.8%	87.9%	84%	79.5%	76.7%	82.7%	79.3%	72.7%	82.2%	82.8%	81.4%	74.1%
Photocopiers?	76.1%	86.6%	82.9%	84.7%	91.6%	85.6%	87.7%	83.4%	81.5%	78.1%	83.3%	86.1%	82.5%	89.3%	77.6%
Printing?	68.9%	83.9%	82.5%	79.5%	88.6%	81.3%	83.4%	76.3%	82.2%	80.1%	82.8%	82.9%	89.9%	86.8%	77.7%
Cost of photocopying / printing?	57.4%	64.4%	62.9%	58.6%	61.2%	52.9%	56.3%	54%	55.8%	55.7%	56.2%	56.4%	63.5%	53.3%	39.4%
Helpfulness of library staff?	94.4%	96.6%	98.2%	98%	97.2%	97.3%	98%	98.9%	97.7%	99.4%	98.7%	99.9%	98.3%	99.4%	96.2%
Electronic training sessions?	98.1%	98%	97%	93.9%	96%	92.1%	97.1%	92.1%	93.5%	92.8%	90.8%	90.7%	95.8%	91.7%	86.3%
Study facilities?	95.9%	95.1%	92.6%	80%	83.8%	78.6%	85.9%	76.7%	89.1%	87.6%	80.6%	88.7%	91.4%	87.1%	88.4%
Study environment – quietness?	94%	86.1%	80.6%	88.3%	90.6%	85.7%	88.2%	86.1%	85.6%	82.4%	87.2%	83.4%	86.5%	79.7%	78.8%
Study environment – heating?	92%	76.5%	79.6%	67.6%	71.7%	65.2%	70%	70.3%	64.7%	45.1%	50.9%	67.5%	74.5%	71.6%	69.7%
Opening times?	88.2%	89.7%	89%	83.7%	87.9%	84.7%	90.2%	83.9%	87.2%	92.4%	79.8%	85.4%	86.3%	89.8%	87.5%
Closing times?	82.4%	90.4%	88.1%	83.5%	83.2%	79.5%	84.3%	75.9%	85.5%	87.5%	67.7%	67.3%	76%	80.2%	71.9%
Availability vs Lending	75.5% v 24.5%	71.2% v 28.8%	67.6% v 32.4%	64% v 36%	75.7% v 24.3%	59.8% v 40.2%	67.5% v 32.5%	60.9% v 39.1%	73.41% v 26.59%	61.7% vs 38.3%	67.1% vs 32.9%	64.6% vs 35.4%	66.9% vs 33.1%	63.3% vs 36.7%	61.1% vs 38.9%
Overall, how satisfied?	98.1%	97.5%	95.5%	96%	96.3%	95.3%	94.2%	92.6%	97.1%	93.9%	95.1%	95.3%	98.3%	95.1%	96.3%

## **Appendix A - General comments and suggestions**

Space was also made available on the survey form for readers to make individual comments and suggestions:

- Wonderful library.
- Could find the materials I needed.
- Quiet, no distractions and very pleasant staff.
- Everything i needed was there and no noise.
- Although not been able to physically visit, online access is fine.
- IALS is by far my favourite library in London. It is very comfortable for studying and I can concentrate easily. It has many books and electronic resources.
- Friendly staff, good opening hours, great books.
- Came to get a book, took less than 5 minutes!
- I enjoy the environment and the resources available.
- The study environment is clean and quiet. The librarians are helpful when I seek assistance. Wide range of books, journals and e-resources. I am an IALS student, and I am proud of the library.
- I found the resources I was looking for.
- I had a very quick and efficient visit today.
- Whenever I visit, I come away satisfied and know that if a publication is not available, I will be informed when it is so.
- I always find what I seek. I am so far from a physical library that I shudder to think how I could have managed without the IALS.
- Fantastic range of materials.
- The librarians are always smiling and welcoming.
- It is the best library I have ever been to!
- I mostly find what I am looking for. Also, it is a very comfortable study space.
- So many wonderful materials.

## **Appendix B - Comments on IALS Library's response to the Coronavirus Pandemic**

- Even though study space is limited I am always accommodated. Sanitizers at every step!
- The improvements to the library have made it a useful study space.
- Because of the wide range of electronic resources.
- I am appreciative of the library offering relatively long slots upon re-opening. Very different from the BL!
- The staff are extremely helpful, and the library is an ideal place for quiet work.
- Keeping open the possibility of booking a desk has been a lifeline.
- I have used the Library as a quiet place to research online, read and write. It is a wonderful library.
- Ability to browse bookshelves and staff assistance has been very helpful. There is enough space between people which is very important.
- Still able to access materials online which I need for my research.
- Short opening hours.

- I have always found the staff very approachable if I can't find things.
- Better opening times and book limits compared to KCL. Good safety measures.
- The spacing out of reading desks is very good. The glass separators to protect readers from staff also very good, and the one-way system. Lots of sanitizer.
- Would have preferred longer opening at the weekend.
- Library is clean and tidy, and although the opening times are shorter and fewer desks available, we have everything we need. Sanitiser available everywhere. E-resources and staff help when I was distance learning was amazing. I just wish we could use the group study rooms.
- Because of great access to online resources.
- Pleased the Library has remained open as it holds all of the primary sources I need for my research. Library support is vital to research, and so far there have been no problems that the librarians could not solve. They are proactive in locating books for me, and knowledgeable enough to recommend decent alternatives. I also like the fact that fewer people are in the library because of the pandemic!
- Comprehensive, clearly explained and practical.
- IALS has saved me during the pandemic, even more so with the convenience of the use of electronic resources.
- Booking a study desk is easy, the space is quieter than ever and feels very safe.
- Very well handled.
- I really like the book a desk system. The library provides a nice, clean and safe study environment.
- Library should have reopened sooner after lockdown.
- The most quiet and organised, clean library in London!
- The library feels like a safe place to be.

Laura Griffiths  
30<sup>th</sup> August 2021