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About the Survey

Goal
To gather feedback from our primary user community, students and faculty, on how well Tulane University Libraries (TUL) support their learning, teaching, and research

Instruments
The survey consisted of the following six sections, including 21-33 questions depending on the respondents’ answers. Questions covered a range of topics including users’ frequency of library use, perceptions of TUL, use of and satisfaction with various library spaces, resources, and services, and their demographic characteristics.

- Introduction
- Demographics
- Library Spaces
- Library Resources
- Library Services
- Conclusion

Data Collection
- The survey was launched in the spring 2022, open for five weeks (Mar 7 - Apr 10, 2022)
- 608 usable responses were collected

Participants
432 Students
(3% response rate)

176 Faculty
(9% response rate)

Resource Format Preferences

Students

2022

Scholarly books
50%

Fiction books
36%

Textbooks
9%

Journal articles
9%

Musical scores
6%

Reference works
2%

2018

Scholarly books
39%

Fiction books
45%

Textbooks
12%

Journal articles
9%

Musical scores
7%

Reference works
2%

Scholarly Books:
Compared to the 2018 results, both students and faculty showed changes in format preferences in 2022 with a higher percentage of students and faculty reporting they preferred print format for scholarly books (those changes were statistically insignificant though).

The fact that a choice of “I don’t use this” was newly added to the 2022 survey may be partly attributed to this change.

Textbooks:
Compared to the 2018 results, students only showed change in format preferences in 2022 with a higher percentage of students reporting they preferred electronic format for textbooks (this change was statistically insignificant though).

An increase in online instruction due to the pandemic may lead to more use of electronic textbooks, consequently contributing to this change.

Hypothetical Allocation of $100

The survey asked users to hypothetically allocate $100 to make the most positive impact on how the Libraries support their work.

Students tended to allocate more money to improving physical spaces (e.g., new furniture and group spaces), while faculty tended to allocate more money to growing collections (e.g., journal subscriptions and print books). Also, there seemed to be little difference in allocations for both students and faculty between 2018 and 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Students Mean</th>
<th>Faculty Mean</th>
<th>Students Mean</th>
<th>Faculty Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>$19.70</td>
<td>$3.70</td>
<td>$15.86</td>
<td>$2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group spaces</td>
<td>$22.09</td>
<td>$5.75</td>
<td>$23.73</td>
<td>$6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digitize archives</td>
<td>$11.03</td>
<td>$11.48</td>
<td>$9.29</td>
<td>$12.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More journals</td>
<td>$13.01</td>
<td>$11.48</td>
<td>$12.46</td>
<td>$31.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More print books</td>
<td>$9.83</td>
<td>$23.54</td>
<td>$8.87</td>
<td>$19.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More computers</td>
<td>$4.55</td>
<td>$3.01</td>
<td>$8.31</td>
<td>$6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special computing spaces</td>
<td>$9.23</td>
<td>$5.43</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver materials</td>
<td>$4.46</td>
<td>$3.19</td>
<td>$6.07</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$5.34</td>
<td>$11.32</td>
<td>$10.58</td>
<td>$10.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No In-Person Visit to Libraries

16% (n=28) of student respondents and 6% (n=29) of faculty respondents reported they did not visit any TUL locations in person during the academic year 2021-2022.

Compared to the 2018 results, there seemed to be little difference in terms of top three reasons for no in-person visit to the Libraries except that “being online students” was on the list in 2022.
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