

The Remaking of *The Librarian: Average Customer* Review ★★☆☆☆

Peter E Sidorko¹

Abstract

In a world of rapid change, librarians often ponder their future, their shifting roles, even what they should call themselves and their libraries. This paper looks at some of these issues in the context of an academic library, the University of Hong Kong Libraries, and looks at the dilemmas facing librarians altering their traditional collection development policies through a growing emphasis on electronic resources as well as attempting to reinvent themselves to be closer aligned with their institution's teaching and learning processes. The author also draws on his previous experience where experimental integration of libraries, education support and technology services resulted in improved services for students and a variety of experiences for librarians. Through two very different surveys at the University of Hong Kong, a biennial climate survey and a smaller targeted faculty survey, the author considers the views of the University's users in the context of the changes being undertaken by librarians at his institution.

Introduction

As human beings, our greatness lies not so much in being able to remake the world... as in being able to remake ourselves. Gandhi.

Libraries have undergone transformational change in recent decades and in so doing have sought to remake or reinvent themselves. Of course, technology has been a major factor in this change. Some have feared its impact, some have relished it. Some have successfully reinvented themselves and their roles, others have disappeared from the radar. But technology is not the only factor impacting on librarians. In institutions of higher education we are facing numerous, social, technological, pedagogical and demographic impacts that compel us to realign ourselves, to re-engineer our skills and roles, and to continue to prove our worth to our stakeholders. But are our users concerned about our changing roles or are they more concerned about the uncertain path that we are taking them down in this digital age and in our quest to remain relevant?

... by any other name

The emergence of the Internet led to a flurry of debate about the future of librarianship and the changing roles of librarians. The excitement generated by this new medium was palpable as librarians found seemingly new ways of doing old things and indeed new

¹ Peter E Sidorko is Deputy Librarian at the University of Hong Kong, peters@hku.hk.

opportunities in their career paths. In turn questions of nomenclature would arise. We started to read and hear about cybrarians, internet navigators, hybrarians (hybrid librarians), knowledge managers, information specialists, information services officers, advisors, coordinators, managers, architects and so on. We found ourselves working in knowledge centers, learning centers, information resource centers, knowledge hubs, virtual libraries, cybraries and so on. Even as our roles continue to change today, the debate continues as to what we should call ourselves and our libraries, as can be witnessed from various threads of discussion lists and articles concerning the image of the librarian. Frankly, I agree with the school of thought that believes what we call ourselves is irrelevant as long as we meet the required needs of our individual institutions. And each of our institutions *does* have a certain uniqueness that compels us as librarians to seek to find the niche that best suits us and the organization. Dictating that we should be called librarians or some other derivation is largely irrelevant without first considering the tasks performed and the organizational environment and climate in which they are performed.

There is little wonder that variations will occur when we consider a librarian's skill set, of which we are all well aware, but acknowledged even by the populist MSN *Encarta* encyclopedia who declare that librarians "must have solid bibliographic and technological skills" and "strong communication and interpersonal abilities" as well as "professional skills such as database searching and competence in using the Internet and other computer networks and systems" (Microsoft Corporation, 2004). Of course we must also have excellent organizational skills, research skills, marketing skills and the obvious skills of finding, evaluating and presenting information. Going beyond this, Fourie identifies several broad areas for potential new roles for librarians including a cultural role, negotiation/lobbying on behalf of users, publishing role, project management role (Fourie, 2004, pp. 67-68).

There is also little wonder that, given this broad skill set, institutional leaders are exploiting (I mean this in a positive sense) "librarians" to perform tasks beyond what is often perceived as their traditional role and they will continue to do so into the future.

Change and higher education: no oxymoron

Universities are often chided as being glacial in their ability to change. The somewhat fatalistic view of the future of universities posed by Drucker that "thirty years from now the big university campuses will be relics, Universities won't survive. It's as large a change as when we first got the printed book" (Lenzner and Johnson, 1997) is tempered by a more balanced perspective from Coaldrake and Stedman who believe that "institutions and organisations of all shapes and sizes need to be able to adapt quickly and fundamentally, and sustain the ability to change and grow. This will require both an educated population capable of producing and using new knowledge, and organisations throughout the workforce which are able to maintain continuing and large scale change" (Coaldrake and Stedman, 1998, pp4-6).

As academic librarians working in universities well know, changes to our profession are also compounded by enormous changes facing institutions of higher education. The factors affecting higher education globally are well documented in articles, reports and

governmental higher education review reports. Common among these are: rapidly expanding developments in information and communication technologies; increased competition, both locally and, increasingly, globally; reduced funding, at least using traditional funding modes; a growing emphasis on student-centered education (Australia. Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002, pp11-16). In Hong Kong the Sutherland Report into higher education noted that the mere shift from education as “teaching” to “teaching and learning” marked a significant change (to a more student centered approach) (Sutherland, 2002, p23). The Report noted four further change factors. Broadly speaking these were changing demographics, impact on the economy, technology and changes in knowledge development. Changes such as these have affected the sector dramatically and, in turn, these have left an indelible mark on the libraries and the librarians of those very institutions.

In response to such changes, the mid 1990’s saw a small explosion of libraries, in particular academic libraries, experimenting by “integrating” with other departments within their institutions, most commonly the IT department. These mergers varied in their degree of integration from a mere administrative reporting line to a thorough re-engineering that saw professionals re-skilled to take on new tasks, services and responsibilities that were previously not familiar to them. I am the product of such an integration that took on characteristics more closely related to the latter than the former. In my previous position at The University of Newcastle in New South Wales, Australia, we identified a number of factors that were especially impacting on our institution. Most significant among these were technology that was enabling students to “undertake studies which are time and place independent; a highly competitive global knowledge economy where information technology is a strategic differentiator and where our students increasingly expect high quality, flexible information and education services without the constraints of time or distance” (O’Brien and Sidorko, 2000). With these factors in mind it was determined that new partnerships needed to be forged between library and information professionals, information and education technologists, trainers and staff developers, instructional designers and media designers and producers. The creation of the integrated Information and Education Services Division resulted. In reality such a Division could not have been created without the full support of the organization’s chief executive, the Vice-Chancellor, who in fact had created the momentum for this change by expressing his interest in converged services.

In this previous position, I was known as the Program Manager for Client Services within the Information and Education Services Division, which was an amalgam of the Library, the IT Division, the Centre for the Advancement of University Teaching and a few other smaller units. As a manager within this integrated Division I held responsibility for a range of library and IT services and I was charged to specifically exploit the collaborative opportunities (my staff tired of the use of the word synergies) between the two. In this role I was responsible for services such as library reference services across three libraries on two campuses, faculty librarian/liaison services, central computer laboratory management, help desks, IT desktop support through Service Level Agreements, software sales and site license management and student training in IT and information literacy. While many staff were challenged by being part of such a partnership, others welcomed the new opportunities that arose (Pilarski and Picasso, 2002).

In my present position as Deputy Librarian at the University of Hong Kong Libraries (HKUL), we have seen significant changes in recent years and we have sought to capitalize on these changes through re-engineering and repositioning ourselves as key campus players in the teaching and learning process. The current University Librarian has been appointed as the Interim Director for IT in Learning, in addition to his existing responsibilities. In this role he chairs the University-wide Knowledge Team. This Team brings together key players involved in IT in Learning from the Libraries, the Computer Centre, the Centre for the Advancement of University Teaching and other key strategic players with an interest in this field. Library staff have, in recent times, taken on a number of what could only be deemed non-traditional library tasks including the role of principal supervisor for a learning objects project aimed at facilitating the sharing of learning and teaching resources across the 8 universities in Hong Kong; the campus wide implementation of Turnitin, a plagiarism detection software package; and the negotiation for the University's laptop tendering exercise. In many ways we have sought to reinvent ourselves.

What do our users want?

I raise these examples in the context of the changing roles of librarians and pose the question "but what do our users want?" Certainly our repositioning at the University of Hong Kong has been undertaken with the interests of our users firmly in the forefront of our motivation to change. Not unusual for a profession with an unparalleled service ethic. But do users care that librarians often enjoy a valuable skill set that enables them to undertake a range of roles that are not traditionally library-oriented? In most cases they have no such interest. In the case of The University of Newcastle, the integrated approach led to better planning and collaboration among university support services, and this ultimately led to better services for students. The University's Composite Student Questionnaire (CSQ), an annual survey of students measuring the degree of satisfaction with the overall university experience, saw marked increases in student satisfaction with services provided through the Division. Most notable among these improvements were IT services for students.

But how rapidly are our users' needs changing? How might we respond to these changing needs? How do we know what they want? In 2004 we conducted two important surveys at the University of Hong Kong Libraries. The first of these was our biennial user climate survey, where we decided to create a new survey instrument that would assist us to better understand our users' needs, to assess how well we were meeting these needs and to provide us with evidence to better plan library services into the future. The second survey was a more targeted survey that was implemented in response to the creation of three new positions at the Libraries. I will now look at our experience in these surveys, highlighting what we learnt from the responses and implications for our future. All of this will be discussed in the context of an ever evolving definition of an academic librarian.

Biennial user survey

Motivation and methodology

One of the University of Hong Kong Libraries' nine Strategic Directions is to *communicate more effectively internally and externally with the University, Hong Kong, Asian and international communities* and one of the methods we have chosen to do this is through our biennial survey. It is albeit a one way communication mechanism but one that solicits a wealth of feedback to assist in our policy, planning and budgetary ruminations.

Broadly, seven goals were identified for the 2003/04 survey:

1. To provide an opportunity for users to evaluate our performance;
2. To identify performance gaps and make improvements on the problem areas with large gaps;
3. To identify information needs, services and library resources that are most and least important to users;
4. To study user preferences for print and electronic materials;
5. To study different information needs of users from different library locations;
6. To study different information needs from different patron types;
7. To use the collected data as a management tool for strategic planning.

We decided to revise our pre-existing survey that had been in use for several years² and we established a library wide task force to do so³. We also strived for the highest response rate that led to the requirement that the survey only be available in an online format⁴. We arrived at a final survey instrument following two pilot tests among Libraries' staff and a total of 23 iterations. There were in fact 7 variations of the instrument to account for minor differences between our Main Library and our six branches. A forthcoming article by the Task Force Leader, Helen Woo (Woo, 2005), explores our methodology in detail.

² This survey had two fundamental faults: firstly it took far too long to complete – creating an imposition on our users and a greater likelihood of abandonment as well as creating far too much data for proper analysis and action, and; secondly, the survey did not provide any gap analysis between users' expectation and our performance, providing only an assessment of our performance making the data less useful than it might be for proper review, planning and ultimately resource allocation.

³ This task force was directed to research alternate survey styles and designs, to review the existing categories of questions in our previous survey instrument and to report their findings to our Quality Assurance Team (QAT). The first draft saw five categories for review: Service Quality; Facilities, Equipment and Physical Environment; Resources; Electronic Resources; and New Services Implemented by the Libraries Since 2001, since these had been considerable in number and to date untested. The QAT advised the Task Force that the instrument was too lengthy leading to the subsequent removal of two categories: Facilities, Equipment and Physical Environment; and, New Services Implemented by the Libraries Since 2001.

⁴ This requirement was subsequently relaxed in extreme cases only. A total of 2,564 responses were received, of which only 81 were print. This high rate represents an increase of over 42% over the previous survey of 2001/02 (1805) and an increase of 77% over the 2000/01 survey (1450). An incentive of a small notepad, compliments of a database vendor, was offered to every respondent. Only 706 of these were collected.

Survey results: gap analysis⁵

A significant aspect of the survey was to identify areas where respondents consider that our performance does not match the importance they place on the range of services provided, in particular where our performance is ranked *lower* than importance. To do this we asked respondents to first rate on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being most important) the importance of particular services. We then asked respondents to rate the Libraries performance in the same area once again on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being best possible performance). We then scored the overall mean importance and performance of each service and determined the gap between these two scores. The full listing arranged by gap size can be found in Appendix 1.

The three areas with the most significant gaps between the importance placed on the service and how well we performed were:

1. Books in your discipline (0.84);
2. Electronic resources are accessible from my home/office (0.76); and
3. Ease of use (of electronic resources) (0.71).

The significance of the figures in the 2nd and 3rd categories highlights our users demands for accessing information anywhere, anytime but also emphasizes their growing frustrations at the complexity of using these resources due no doubt to the growing number of them and the different interfaces and search methods adopted by them. These sentiments were certainly reinforced in the freeform comments (see below).

The three areas with the smallest gaps between the importance placed on the service and how well we performed were:

1. Library user education (courses/workshops/orientation) (-0.22);
2. Being alerted to new electronic resources by bulk email, Focus (HKUL newsletter), etc. (-0.21); and
3. Library orientation/courses/workshops meet my needs (-0.16).

In fact, these negative figures indicate that we outperformed respondents' expectations in these three areas.

I believe there are three key observations to be drawn from these results. Firstly, the 1st and 3rd areas of best performance (both dealing with training in library resources) seem at odds with the 3rd lowest performance (ease of use of electronic resources). In other words while library users perceptions of our performance in training matters far exceeded their expectations, they still found the ease of use of these resources as their third major concern. I would discern from this that while the quality of our training and information literacy campaigns is very high, we still have some ground to cover to reach a wider audience. Secondly, while users want anywhere, anytime access to voluminous electronic resources, our second lowest performance lay in providing this accessibility. I believe that this low performance may be due, at least in part, to our authentication requirements and the limitation of this access by certain vendors to particular user groups such as alumni. Finally, the Libraries lowest performance area lay in the provision of "books in your discipline." Our users still want physical access to books.

⁵ The full results, analysis and Libraries' response can be found at <<http://lib.hku.hk/survey2004/>>.

Survey results: print v electronic

Like most large academic libraries, the University of Hong Kong Libraries has invested in electronic resources for all the right, well-documented reasons. This investment has been regulated by our Electronic Resources Collection Development Policy (University of Hong Kong Libraries, 2004a). Our increasing investment is dramatically evident when we compare acquisition expenditure from 1998/99 to 2003/04:

	1998/99	2003/04	Change
Electronic Resources	8%	32%	+24%
Books	46%	26%	-20%
Journals	46%	37%	-9%
Others	0	5%	+5%

While it had always been our intention to survey our users' preferences for print and electronic materials in the current survey, we were pre-empted with the publication of an article written by staff from the Department of Linguistics at the University of Hong Kong. In this article, a survey of 35 University of Hong Kong undergraduate students was taken to assess their preference for print materials over digital resources. The article also refers to a user survey undertaken at the University of Texas at Austin (University of Texas Libraries, 2001) where "of the 788 respondents, 627 (80%) preferred e-journal access, while only 162 (20%) preferred print" (Bodomo, et al, 2003, p37). The authors next refer to a "similar survey" carried out at the California State University (California State University, 2002) where the NetLibrary System was under review. They find it interesting to note that "of the 211 library users who responded, 57% preferred print book version if they had used both the print and e-book version of a book" (Bodomo, et al, 2003, p37). The authors' own survey of University of Hong Kong undergraduates, found that "27 of the 35 respondents (approximately 77%) preferred print materials, while only 3 had a preference for digital resources" (Bodomo, et al, 2003, p41). With these results in mind we were determined to obtain the highest possible response rate to our survey. We were also conscious to draw a clear distinction between books and journals as these utilize quite different technologies that will affect users' preferences. Both factors erroneously overlooked by the authors.

We were not surprised by the response to our question "If both printed and electronic versions are available, which format do you prefer to use?" As the table below shows there is an overwhelming difference for electronic versions according to the material type being accessed, with journals being highly favored in electronic format while books are favored in the print version. These results emulate other similar studies including those quoted by Bodomo, et al as well as anecdotal and observational evidence that we had discerned locally.

	Online	% Online	Print	% Print	Total No. of Respondents
Journals	1764	68.8	800	31.2	2564
Books	724	28.2	1840	71.8	2564

Survey results: freeform comments

In addition to ranking questions we also encouraged written comments. Almost 90 pages of these were received and subsequently classified into a number of recurring themes. The top 10 recurring themes for the Main Library were:

1. Extend Opening Hours
2. Shelving/books missing on the shelves/tracing missing materials
3. More e-resources
4. Library staff - improvement needed
5. Alumni - access to electronic resources
6. User Education – timetables and online versions
7. Acquiring multiple copies of heavily demanded books (equal 7th)
7. HKUL Resources homepage - Improvements needed (equal 7th)
8. E-resources interface not user-friendly
9. Expand the depth of the collection
10. Borrow/return of Library materials (inter-branch loans) (equal 10th)
10. Mobile phones/Noise (equal 10th).

I believe that there is great interest in reviewing these comments. While we as a profession remain deeply concerned about new roles and redirections, our users, certainly at the University of Hong Kong, ask us for more routine, even mundane improvements. Ironically with our substantial investment in electronic resources, the number one request is for longer hours so they can spend more time in the physical library building. Equally mundane are other top ten comments such as shelving and finding missing books (number 2), acquiring multiple copies (equal 7), mobile phones and noise (equal 10).

While these are by no means trivial, they are also hardly revolutionary and might be found in responses to any library user survey. Furthermore, they hardly conjure grand visions of librarians as having moved from anything but a traditional role. Nonetheless they are issues so fundamental to our users that they must be addressed. Needless to say we have done so as best as possible within our existing means. We believe our next survey will return results that reflect marked improvements in these areas.

Faculty needs survey

Motivation and methodology

In July 2003, following a significant restructure of the HKU Libraries, we established three new Subject Librarians positions that were assigned to perform collection development and faculty liaison⁶.

⁶ These were established for the 6 faculties for which the Libraries did not have a branch library but who were largely serviced through our Main Library. Each Subject Librarian was assigned responsibility for two faculties being Arts/Architecture, Business & Economics/Social Sciences, and Science/Engineering. We wanted these positions to emulate as best as possible the high quality and personalized services offered by our Branch Librarians to their given Faculties. There was a problem. Our Branch structure was long and well established. Faculty knew the branch library as a physical place and they knew the librarian as their point of access into the library system.

We wanted these librarians to play a larger role in teaching and assisting faculty to better integrate library resources into teaching and learning processes. Despite numerous attempts at promoting the new Subject Librarians we were decidedly underwhelmed by Faculty enthusiasm. With the limited response it became increasingly difficult for the Subject Librarians to develop tailored faculty based action plans focused on the individual needs of their particular faculties.

A simple survey was developed to help solicit faculty's views on their priorities related to the six main areas of duties assigned to the Subject Librarians that are geared towards better supporting their teaching and research needs. We asked faculty to assign an importance ranking of 1 to 5 (1 being "Most important" and 5 being "Less important") to each of these six areas based upon their own personal needs. These six areas were:

1. Collection building
2. Research consultation
3. Instruction on subject-specific library materials
4. Integrating library materials into teaching & learning resources for specific courses/programs
5. Promote library services
6. Foster closer collaboration with faculty.

We consciously decided to ask for faculty details to enable specific one-to-one follow-up. This proved particularly useful as we were able to do just that in many instances including this one "Also great if there are more dialogues between librarian (Collection Development Dept.) and self-funded programmers like ours." However not all faculty agreed as one noted "This survey would have received more honest responses had it been anonymous!"

Survey results: rankings

We received 143 returns from 457, representing a 31% response rate. Not as large as was hoped, but enough to provide our Subject Librarians with useful data to enable them to prioritize their activities and develop action plans according to their faculties' needs. Overall results from the 143 responses ranked the six activities in order of importance (with 1 the most important and 6 the least) as:

1. Collection building
2. Research consultation
3. Integrating library materials into teaching & learning resources for specific courses/programs
4. Promote library services
5. Instruction on subject-specific library materials
6. Foster closer collaboration with faculty.

We also ranked the 6 activities according to each Faculty, thereby providing each Subject Librarian with their faculties' unique profiles enabling them to better tailor their services and develop more meaningful action plans. These faculty based rankings can be found in Appendix 2.

As the highest ranking activity, it is reassuring to note that Faculty still prize librarians for their collection building skills, an area that busy faculty are finding less time for as they take on more teaching, research and increasingly, administration. The second highest ranking activity is also noteworthy. As a recently introduced service, our one to one (tailored) research consultations have taken off slowly but are now gaining momentum and this result reflects the growing importance that faculty place on this service. Interestingly, more formal “instruction” is less valued by faculty for the understandable reasons of well, formality and their necessarily generic nature. As an entirely new direction for us and one where we have had only limited success, we are pleased that “Integrating library materials into teaching & learning resources for specific courses/programs” ranked third. This new direction, however, is not without its critics (see Freeform Comments below).

Survey results: freeform comments

In addition to assigning priorities to the six activities, faculty members were also encouraged to provide freeform comments. It is these comments that are perhaps the most revealing. While there were several negative comments of a more general nature:

All of the six areas mentioned are equally important for teaching and research purposes. It doesn't make sense to rank-order the six areas.

Totally useless for [my department]. (Research consultation)

Most teachers are professionals in their particular area and do not require this type of assistance. (Instruction on subject-specific library materials)

The Library is clearly trying to reinvent itself and its role after decades of inactivity.

there was greater concern that librarians were somehow becoming involved in matters surrounding curriculum development as highlighted in item 4 *Integrating library materials into teaching & learning resources for specific courses/programs*. These comments reflect some of the concerns:

Your staff have no professional training in ... areas of curriculum design and should not try [to] interfere in our teaching methods. (Integrating library materials into teaching & learning resources for specific courses/programs)

Instead of trying to pry into curriculum development at the faculty level, it would be better to wait until asked by colleagues. It is the teachers who are employed to develop curriculum, not librarians.

I think academics are in a far better position to undertake most of these aims than the “subject librarian”.

Our intent is obviously not to usurp, undermine or in any way diminish the role played by faculty in curriculum design. Rather, it has been to work with them to develop guides to relevant library resources, to assist in enabling electronic access to course-reading materials via the use of electronic-reserve and to assist them to identify the appropriate library materials to be integrated in course management software, such as WebCT, to enable students to quickly link from course material to relevant databases, articles and other electronic resources. Clearly we need to be conscious of, and sensitive to, these types of concerns as we attempt to position ourselves in a role that brings us more closely aligned with direct teaching and learning support at our University. Subject Librarians have now developed action plans for their faculties. They are also in the process of clarifying misconceptions at an individual level and assuring faculty that we are trying to support their teaching efforts and not design curriculum on their behalf.

Conclusion

From our own perspective at the University of Hong Kong Libraries we have learnt a number of things in our drive for change. Our users' responses to our rapid growth in electronic resources and our drive to change our existing roles, or at least partially change these roles, has demonstrated to us that there is no single formula that will appease everybody. Notwithstanding this we have learnt a great deal from the two surveys administered in 2004. We have learnt:

- that having access to books in their discipline is the number one area of current concern to our users;
- to better understand our users' preferences for print and electronic (most prefer books in print than electronically, while most prefer journals electronically rather than print).
- that our users want more electronic resources even though they have difficulty (because of the large number) identifying the right ones that meet their needs;
- that the variety of interfaces for electronic resources is a source of frustration for our users and they are becoming increasingly difficult to use;
- that the quality of our training programs is high, yet they still need help with all of the new resources;
- that seemingly mundane or traditional things like opening hours, correct shelving and noise are still very important to our users, in some instances more important;
- that faculty need librarians to help build collections;
- that faculty want tailored training in resources that meet their needs at a place and time that suit them; and

- that faculty are mixed in their responses to our attempts to involve ourselves more closely with teaching and learning processes. While some are sensitive to this apparent incursion into their domain, others welcome the initiative.

These lessons provide us with the opportunity to take stock of what we do and why we do them. No doubt our next survey will provide us with different lessons that will be reflective of whatever our position is when that is undertaken. These lessons have taught us that our changing role does not singularly affect us. It has a profound effect on our users as well, some of whom are not too comfortable with the directions we are moving, be it in our drive towards greater electronic resources or in our attempts to position ourselves as key players in teaching and learning initiatives. As librarians, we need to be conscious of issues such as these and, depending on our own unique circumstances, change our ways or use the knowledge to enlighten those who need it. In doing this we must provide reassurance that the past, that remains relevant today, will continue to be there for those who want it.

As we strive towards new, ever evolving roles we need to maintain sight of this past and not forget or ignore the seemingly trivial items that remain significant to our users, no matter how mundane they may appear to us as we participate in roles that we believe to be of higher institutional value. In these complex times in which we operate we need to juggle a number of roles that can be deemed to be both traditional and non-traditional, in ratios that are different for each of us but which are determined by our own institutional requirements, our users' needs and our own individual drive for change. In this dynamic environment we must listen and respond to our users and stakeholders. But we must also lead. We must lead by demonstrating our true worth and the value we bring to our organizations through, a myriad of innovative ways, all of which contribute to the high quality outcomes so desired of our organizations today.

APPENDIX 1 Mean gaps between importance and performance

Question	Mean Importance	Rank Importance	Mean Performance	Rank Performance	Mean Gap	Rank Gap
Books in your discipline	4.55	1	3.72	12	0.84	1
Electronic resources are accessible from my home/office	4.49	3	3.74	11	0.76	2
Ease of use	4.36	5	3.67	17	0.710	3
Ease of locating electronic resources	4.34	6	3.66	18	0.706	4
Prompt action is taken regarding missing books & journals	3.96	20	3.31	30	0.673	5
Recommended materials are purchased and processed rapidly for inclusion in the collection	4.11	17	3.46	27	0.667	6
Extensiveness of databases	4.29	7	3.66	19	0.66	7
Scores	3.95	21	3.33	29	0.63	8
Journals in your discipline	4.26	8	3.68	14	0.59	9
Dragon, HKUL Catalogue provides clear and useful information	4.54	2	3.99	3	0.56	10
Electronic Databases	4.23	11	3.68	15	0.551	11
Books & journals are reshelved quickly	4.15	14	3.62	22	0.546	12
Well organized Fung Ping Shan Library homepage	4.21	12	3.68	16	0.54	13
Opening hours meet my needs	4.37	4	3.85	7	0.53	14
Well organized Law Library homepage	4.09	18	3.78	10	0.33	15
InterLibrary Loans (ILL) requests are followed through	3.94	23	3.64	21	0.324	16
Well organized HKUL homepage	4.18	13	3.87	6	0.319	17
Library staff are knowledgeable and answer enquiries accurately and clearly	4.23	10	3.99	4	0.253	18
Well organized Music Library homepage	3.94	22	3.71	13	0.25	19
Well organized Medical Library homepage	4.13	16	3.89	5	0.24	20
Well organized Education Library homepage	4.02	19	3.80	8	0.23	21
Library staff are readily available to provide assistance and respond in a timely manner	4.24	9	4.04	2	0.209	22
Well organized Dental Library homepage	3.76	25	3.57	24	0.206	23
Assistance from librarians	3.92	24	3.80	9	0.13	24
Library staff are polite and friendly	4.14	15	4.06	1	0.084	25
Audio-visual materials	3.42	28	3.37	28	0.075	26
Library printed/online guides	3.54	26	3.49	26	0.073	27
Library orientation/ courses/ workshops meet my needs	3.40	29	3.57	25	-0.16	28
Being alerted to new electronic resources by bulk email, Focus (HKUL newsletter), etc.	3.43	27	3.65	20	-0.21	29
Library user education (courses/workshops/orientation)	3.34	30	3.58823529	23	-0.22	30

APPENDIX 2

The University of Hong Kong Libraries' Faculty Needs Survey Results According to Faculty

Faculty	Collection Building	Research Consultation	Instruction on Subject-Specific Library Materials	Integrating Library Materials into Teaching & Learning Resources for Specific	Promote Library Services	Foster Closer Collaboration With Faculty
	** Ranking in descending order (1 is most important)					
Architecture	2	2	3	1	3	4
Arts	1	2	5	4	3	6
Business and Economics	2	4	2	5	1	3
Engineering	1	2	6	3	4	5
Science	1	3	5	4	2	6
Social Sciences	1	5	4	2	3	6
Unknown	3	1	4	5	2	3
OVERALL TOTAL :	1	2	5	3	4	6

References

- Australia. Department of Education, Science and Training. *Higher Education at the Crossroads: an Overview Paper* (Canberra: The Dept., 2002) available at <<http://www.backingaustraliasfuture.gov.au/publications/crossroads/pdf/crossroads.pdf>>.
- Bodomo, Adams, et al. "Some students still read books in the 21st Century: a study of user preferences for print and electronic libraries." *The Reading Matrix* 3(3) (November 2003): pp34-49 available at <http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/bodomo_lam_lee/article.pdf> .
- California State University, Council of Library Directors, Electronic Access to Information Resources Committee. *CSU E-book Pilot Project: Final Report*. CSU, 2002 <<http://seir.calstate.edu/ebook/index.shtml>>.
- Coaldrake, Peter & Lawrence Stedman. *On the Brink: Australia's Universities Confronting their Future* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1998).
- Fourie, Ina. "Librarians and the claiming of new roles: how can we try to make a difference?" *Aslib Proceedings: new information perspectives* 56(1) (2004): 62-74.
- Lenzner, Robert and Stephen Johnson. "Seeing things as they really are [interview with Peter Drucker]," *Forbes*, 10 March 1997, available at <<http://www.forbes.com/forbes/97/0310/5905122a.htm#DRUC>>.
- Microsoft Corporation. *MSN Encarta: Library (institution)* (Microsoft, 2004) available at <[http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761564555_6/Library_\(institution\).html#s54](http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761564555_6/Library_(institution).html#s54)>.
- O'Brien, Linda and Peter Sidorko. "Integrating information, education and technology services" (paper presented at the annual Educause Conference, Nashville, USA, October 10-13, 2000) available at <<http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/EDU0027.pdf>>.
- Pilarski, Carla and Vicki Picasso. "Morphing the technician: moving the line in the sand." *Australian Library Journal*, 51(2) (2002): 850-54 also available at <<http://conferences.alia.org.au/libtec2001/papers/pilarski.picasso.html>>.
- Sutherland, Stewart. *Higher education in Hong Kong: report of the University Grants Committee / commissioned by the Secretary for Education and Manpower, [Hong Kong: University Grants Committee, 2002]* available at <http://www.ugc.edu.hk/english/documents/UGCpubs/her_e.html>.
- University of Hong Kong Libraries. *Collection Development Policy* (Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Libraries, 2004) available at <<http://lib.hku.hk/cd/policies/cdp.html>>.

University of Hong Kong Libraries. *Electronic Resources Collection Development Policy* (Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Libraries, 2004a) available at <http://lib.hku.hk/cd/policies/erp.html>.

University of Texas Libraries. *Informal Survey: Paper or E-Journal?* (University of Texas Libraries, 2001) available at <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/admin/cird/surveyresponse.html>.

Woo, Helen. "The 2004 User Survey at the University of Hong Kong Libraries" to appear in *College and Research Libraries*, March or June (2005).