

**EVALUATING USER'S LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE CHINESE STUDIES  
COLLECTION HELD AT AN ACADEMIC LIBRARY**

**Chia Yip Ping<sup>1</sup> and N.N. Edzan<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman

P.O. Box 11384, 50774 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

<sup>2</sup>Library, University of Malaya

50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

e-mail: chiayp@mail.utar.edu.my ; edzan@um.edu.my

**ABSTRACT**

A user assessment study was conducted to evaluate the users' level of satisfaction with the Chinese studies collection at the University of Malaya Library. The respondents were library professionals, faculty members, undergraduate and postgraduate students at the Department of Chinese Studies, University of Malaya. A total of 135 responses were received with a response rate of 77.5%. The results indicated that the undergraduates of years 2 and 3 and the postgraduates were less satisfied with the collection and services compared with the undergraduates of year 1, faculty members and library professionals. Results showed that there is no significant gap between the performance evaluation by library professionals and library users' expectations in the level of satisfaction with the information sources available between the library professionals and the respondents from the Department of Chinese Studies at the university.

**Keywords:** User evaluation; User satisfaction; User study; Gap analysis; Special collection; Collection development; University of Malaya Library; Academic library

**USER EVALUATION OF LIBRARY COLLECTION AND RESOURCES**

Evans (1995) defines collection development as "a process of identifying the strengths and weaknesses of a library's materials collection in terms of patron needs and community resources, and attempting to correct existing weaknesses, if any". He (Evans and Saponaro 2005) later revised the collection development definition to include both libraries and information centres, as "a process of meeting the information needs of the people (a service population) in a timely and economical manner using information resources locally held, as well as from other organisations". In general, collection development involves planning, selection, acquisition, maintenance, preservation and evaluation of library collections. Another approach to the collection development process proposed by Sanchez (2005) consists of formulation of policies; study of user needs; evaluation of collection; evaluation of information resources; planning and evaluation of information sources; decision making and acquisition. Both approaches by Evans (2005) and Sanchez (2005) though expressed in different terms but emphasise on

*Chia, Y.P. & Edzan, N.N.*

the need for users to assess and evaluate the collection in meeting their information needs.

Over the years, different measures have been used to assess library performance and user satisfaction. The measures include measurement of collection size (Hernon and McClure 1990); measurement of technical services such as cataloguing and weeding (Lancaster 1993); measurement of reference service performance (Aluri 1993); and measurement of library processes using the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award's (MBNQA) criteria and ISO9000 standards, There are also instruments which measure the perceived quality of service. Oliver (1996) noted that it is difficult to measure satisfaction using a standard or instrument. As a result, quality of service can only be reflected by the gap which exists between the services desired by the users and the perceived actual service received. SERVQUEL (Nitecki and Hernon 2000) measures performance in the service industry and LibQUAL (Cook and Health 2001) measures the users' perception of service quality in libraries. Roslah and Zainab (2007) carried out a case study using SERVPERF (Cronin and Taylor 1994) which is a modified version of SERVQUEL to measure the users' satisfaction with the services provided by the library at Universiti Tenaga Nasional, a private university in Malaysia. The services are grouped as frontline, core and peripheral. Frontline services comprise client-centred services which include OPAC, library website and user education programmes. The core services included adequacy, availability and accessibility of collection, staff, facilities and reference services. The peripheral services include physical environment factors such as signage, library opening hours and space. Respondents included undergraduate and postgraduate students who rated 59 service attributes from the three service groups. The results showed that two attributes were rated as excellent, 20 good, 31 average and four poor. A total of 16 services which were rated below 50% were identified to be on the list of the library's proposed action plan. The good and excellent services were encouraged to maintain their performance.

Shaheen, Mumtaz and Tamara (2001) carried out a study in five major agricultural libraries in Malaysia to investigate factors that contribute positively to the users' perception of the library's effectiveness. They found that there is a positive relationship between adequacy of library collections, services and facilities as well as users' perception of a library's effectiveness. They also emphasised on the importance of the library meeting users' expectations and that any library effectiveness studies have to be associated with user satisfaction and meet user expectations. They discovered that a common problem found in most libraries in developing countries is inadequate, irrelevant and outdated collections which fail to fulfill the information needs of their users which in turn led to their reluctance to go to the library.

In 2005, Agee examined the elements of collection evaluation in a collection development process. He recommended three collection evaluation models to encourage library professionals to be informed of the value of collection evaluation, namely the user-centred evaluation model, physical assessment or collection-centred model and specific subject support model. The user-centred evaluation model determines how well the library's collections meet the needs of the users who seek information. The physical assessment model involves a subject specialist to manually pull monographs from shelves to determine whether the item should remain in the collection. Lastly, the specific subject support model compares the core curriculum or course syllabus reading list with the current library collections. All these models allow the library professionals to know what resources are already available and what else may be needed so that future collection development may be met more effectively with print or electronic resources. The evaluation models described by Agee have also been discussed in the *Conspectus Model for Collection Evaluation* (IFLA 2001). Besides the quantitative and qualitative measures listed by Agee (2005), the collection depth indicators or levels are also used to describe a library collection (Nicholson 1999). The indicators are defined in 6 levels, namely:

- i. Level 0: out of scope: the Library does not collect in this area.
- ii. Level 1: minimal: a collection for which only few selections are made beyond introductory/very basic material
- iii. Level 2: basic information: a collection of up-to-date materials which serves to introduce and define a subject; a basic information collection can support general enquiries, school and some undergraduate instruction, but is not sufficient to support advanced undergraduate courses.
- iv. Level 3: intermediate: a collection containing a broad range of resources adequate to support undergraduate instruction and work at less than research intensity.
- v. Level 4: research: a collection containing current and retrospective resources which can support postgraduate and independent academic research; the collection will provide materials in all appropriate formats and languages.
- vi. Level 5: comprehensive: a collection which includes, as far as is reasonably possible, all significant works of recorded knowledge in all applicable languages for a defined and limited field; the aim, if not the achievement, is comprehensiveness.

The research by Gee and Tan (2003) listed Chinese collections from six top East Asian libraries in the United States of America. The focus of the research was to gather information from each library in the aspects of historical background; overview of the development; subject strengths; special collections; and Internet

*Chia, Y.P. & Edzan, N.N.*

resources. The libraries listed in the study were the C.V. Starr East Asian Library of Columbia University; Wason Collection on China and the Chinese of Cornell University; Harvard-Yenching Library; The Chinese Collection of Library of Congress; East Asian Library and the Gest Collection of Princeton University; and the East Asia Library of Yale University. These libraries set a benchmark for the type of Chinese materials collected by reputable East Asian libraries.

Fan (2003) examined an electronic resources development model of Chinese studies that were collected in 26 East Asian academic libraries in North America. The emphasis was on self-service by offering automated systems for library users. However, the utilisation of library electronic resources on Chinese studies was not fully exploited due to cost and time constraints; lack of technical support; lack of training and incompatibilities of Chinese and English computer operating systems; classifications of electronic resources among Chinese studies resources; and accessibility issues. He recommended that the East Asian libraries need to focus on how the respective libraries can develop multi-functional websites with their own unique features to ensure that the users have as much access as possible to quality information from electronic resources.

Within the literature, not much has been written about collection development of Malaysia's special collections such as Chinese studies, Malay studies and Indian studies. Subsequently, very little is known about the users' expectations of the Chinese studies collection and the criteria for evaluating Chinese studies collection in Malaysia. The one study that is identifiable is by Pong (2006) which seeks to identify the needs and information seeking pattern of the users of the Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies (CMCS) Library. The study recommended the provision of electronic resources to increase the quality and quantity of Chinese studies collection. The traditional method of measuring the number of books, serials and titles purchased is no longer valid. There are other factors that positively contribute to the users' views about the effectiveness of a library collection which includes library promotion, users' involvement in selection of materials, user education programmes and availability of assistance to the users in the use of facilities and services of the library which help to shape the users' perception of the effectiveness of a library collection (Shaheen, Mumtaz and Tamara 2001).

## **METHODOLOGY**

The University of Malaya Library has a network consisting of the Main Library, three branch libraries and 13 special libraries of which one of it is the East Asian Studies Library (EASL). The Library initially started out as the Chinese Studies collection with a small volume of 8,000 items. With the Malaysian government's launch of the Look

### *Evaluating User's Level of Satisfaction with the Chinese Studies Collection*

East Policy in 1982, the Library began collecting materials in the Japanese and Korean languages. Items in these languages are transliterated using the Pinyin and Hepburn as well as the Korean pronunciation systems. There are approximately about 70,000 volumes of items in the Chinese, Japanese and Korean languages. The collection consists of items about classical and modern Chinese literature; Chinese language and linguistics; history; and philosophy. The Library also has a special collection on Malaysiana materials and subscribes to two popular Chinese dailies namely the *Sin Chew Daily* and *Nanyang Siang Pau*. The University of Malaya's Main Library holds Chinese studies collection items written in the English language whereas the Chinese studies items written in the Chinese language are housed in EASL. The users of the Library consist of undergraduates, postgraduates and academics from the Department of Chinese Studies, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences; and researchers as well as academics from the Institute of China Studies. With a staff of three, the Library is opened Mondays to Fridays from 8.30 am to 5.30 pm. Users are allowed to borrow the items based on their eligibility.

This study attempts to identify the usage pattern of the Chinese studies collection and services provided by the University of Malaya Library. It also aims to evaluate the satisfaction level of the respondents with the collection as well as the services and facilities provided. A questionnaire was used to collect data. It was deemed appropriate since it is less time-consuming, more economical and suitable for assessing user satisfaction. The questionnaire consists of 29 questions divided into four parts. Part 1 consists of four questions designed to obtain demographic information about the respondents and the library used most often by them. Part 2 has six questions which allow respondents to assess the quality of the Chinese studies collection. Part 3 has 9 open-ended questions and Part 4 has ten questions which seek to solicit views and recommendations from the respondents. The questionnaire was pre-tested and subsequently distributed to the Chief Librarian, Reference Librarian and the Chinese Studies Librarian as well as academics from the Department of Chinese Studies. The questionnaires were distributed to the students during their respective classes. A total of 178 questionnaires were distributed and 135 responses were returned giving a response rate of 77.5%.

## **RESULTS**

### **Library Usage**

Only 12 (8.9%) respondents used only the Main Library and 123 (91.1%) respondents used only EASL. Out of the 123 respondents who used EASL, 50 (37.0%) have also used the Main Library. Besides using the Main Library and EASL, a small number of respondents (8) have also used other academic libraries, and information or resource centres. The undergraduates used the UM's Perpustakaan Zaaba (1), Perpustakaan Bahasa (1) and the Chinese Studies Resource Centre (3). The library

professionals and faculty members used the Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman (UTAR) Library (2) and Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies Library (1). The high level of respondents using the Library can be used as an indication that the Library is able to fulfil the needs of the users.

### Frequency

From Table 1, one can see that the University of Malaya’s EASL was more frequently used (91.1%) by the respondents compared to the University of Malaya Main Library (8.9%). The results show that the library was used on an average of one to two times per week.

Table 1: Frequency of Use (n=135)

Frequency	Usage of University of Malaya Library				Total Count
	Main Library		East Asian Studies Library		
	No.	%	No.	%	
Never	1	20.0	4	80.0	5
1-2 times per week	10	9.6	94	90.4	104
3-4 times per week	1	5.0	19	95.0	20
5-6 times per week	0	0.0	3	100.0	3
7 or more per week	0	0.0	3	100.0	3
Total	12	8.9	123	91.1	135 (100%)

The usage of EASL was more frequent because the courses offered in the Department of Chinese Studies were conducted in the Chinese language. Hence, the respondents prefer to use the Chinese materials found in EASL compared to the Main Library which housed related materials but written in English and Bahasa Malaysia. The high frequency of usage of EASL when compared to the Main Library shows that it is able to meet the information needs of the users. The collection within the Library itself is specific to the needs of the users who are academics and students from the Department of Chinese Studies.

### Inter-library Loan

About 43.0% of the respondents never used the inter-library loan service, 53.4% used it sometimes and 4.0% used it often (Table 2). About 70.0% of the undergraduates of year 1 never had the need to use the inter-library loan service with about 30.0% using it sometimes. This indicates that the Chinese studies collection in the University of Malaya Library is sufficient enough to meet the needs of undergraduates especially those in their first year. There may also be a possibility that the respondents were unaware of the inter-library loan services provided by

*Evaluating User's Level of Satisfaction with the Chinese Studies Collection*

the Library. Or, it could also be brought about by the feeling of dissatisfaction with the inter-library loan service provided by the University of Malaya Library that resulted in the respondents not using the service.

Table 2: Inter-Library Loan (n=133)

Respondent	Inter Library Loan						Total Count
	Never		Sometimes		Often		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Librarian	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	3
Faculty – Associate Professor	0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	3
Faculty – Lecturer	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	3
Undergraduate – Year 1	16	69.6	7	30.4	0	0.0	23
Undergraduate – Year 2	17	48.6	16	45.7	2	5.7	35
Undergraduate – Year 3	21	34.4	37	60.7	3	4.9	61
Postgraduate - Master's	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0	5
	57	42.9	71	53.4	5	3.8	133 (100%)

For those respondents who used the inter-library loan services, the libraries used by the students were UM's Perpustakaan Zaaba (1); UM's Perpustakaan Bahasa & Linguistik (1); New Era College Library (14); Southern College Library (10); and UM's Perpustakaan Pusat Asasi Sains (1). The libraries mainly used by the library professionals for inter-library loan services were the UTAR Library (1), National University of Singapore Library (1) and New Era Library (1). The faculty members prefer to use the Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies Library (1) and the UTAR Library (1). The New Era College Library is the most commonly used library amongst all the respondents especially the undergraduates (13). The College offers associate degree courses in Chinese language and literature which prepares the students to be transferred as third year students at partner universities in China and Taiwan (New Era College, Malaysia Centre for Ethnic Studies 2006). It is possible that the New Era College Library's Chinese studies collection meets the needs of students from the University of Malaya. The popularity of the college's inter-library loan services is inevitable.

Non-usage of the inter-library loan services is highest amongst the year 1 undergraduates which could be an indication that what is available within the Library is sufficient for them. For the lecturers, postgraduates, years 2 and 3 undergraduates, their usage of the inter-library services is high and this can be

attributed to the unavailability of information sources pertinent to their research interest.

#### **Level of Satisfaction with the Chinese Studies Collection**

The level of satisfaction with the Chinese studies collection is measured based on a total of 18 statements. The statements were divided into four categories:

- a) Adequacy of Chinese studies printed books,
- b) Adequacy of Chinese studies printed journals,
- c) Adequacy of Chinese studies electronic resources, and
- d) Overall strengths and weaknesses of books, print journals and electronic resources.

Each category was further divided into five statements which included adequacy of the collection to meet the needs of the undergraduates, postgraduates, for teaching, research and general reading purposes. A 5-point scale was used for each statement and responses were grouped as 1 (Poor), 2 (Below Average), 3 (Satisfactory), 4 (Above Average) and 5 (Excellent).

Table 3 shows the level of satisfaction with respect to the mean scores based on the count for ratings 4 (above average) and 5 (excellent) only. The percentage of the total respondents who rated 4 and 5 are also listed next to the count. It indicates that the respondents gave a satisfactory rating on the adequacy of print books from the Chinese studies collection for general reading purposes with a mean score of 3.42 and undergraduate students' needs with a mean score of 3.17. Similarly, the respondents were satisfied with the adequacy of print journals for general reading purposes with a mean score of 3.07. The overall strengths and weaknesses of print books received a mean score of 3.18 compared to print journals and electronic resources which received a mean score of 2.71 and 2.65 (below average) respectively.

For other categories, the level of satisfaction received average mean scores of between 2.72 and 2.93 for print books; between 2.48 and 2.81 for print journals and between 2.50 and 2.85 for electronic resources. None of the categories of collection was rated as 'excellent', 'above average' or 'poor'. The responses showed that there are fairly sufficient resources to meet the needs of general reading and the needs of undergraduates, but did not adequately meet the postgraduates' teaching and research needs.



**Table 3: Level of Satisfaction with the Chinese Studies Collection (n=135)**

Collection	Count*	%	Mean
<b>Adequacy of Chinese Studies print books</b>			
General reading purposes	61	45.2	3.42
Undergraduate students' needs	47	34.8	3.17
Teaching needs	25	18.5	2.93
Postgraduate students' needs	19	14.1	2.78
Research needs	21	15.5	2.72
<b>Adequacy of Chinese Studies print journals</b>			
General reading purposes	38	28.1	3.07
Undergraduate students' needs	28	20.7	2.81
Teaching needs	15	11.1	2.60
Postgraduate students' needs	16	11.8	2.56
Research needs	14	10.4	2.48
<b>Adequacy of Chinese Studies electronic resources</b>			
General reading purposes	26	19.3	2.85
Undergraduate students' needs	27	20.0	2.81
Postgraduate students' needs	14	10.4	2.59
Teaching needs	16	11.8	2.58
Research needs	14	10.3	2.50
<b>Overall strengths and weaknesses</b>			
Print books	48	35.6	3.18
Print journals	22	16.3	2.71
Electronic resources	20	14.8	2.65

*\*Count - For ratings 4 and 5 on a 5-point scale*

The overall mean level of satisfaction with the Chinese studies collection and the mean score of the individual respondent groups which make up the overall mean is shown in Table 4. The respondents were generally satisfied with the Chinese studies printed books which adequately met the needs of general reading purpose and undergraduates with a mean score of 3.0 and above. However, when the undergraduates move on to year 2 and 3, they seem to be less satisfied with the printed books collection.

**Table 4: Comparison of Level of Satisfaction of Chinese Studies Collection (n=135)**

Collection	Count*	Overall Mean (n=135)	Librarian Mean (n=3)	Faculty Member Mean (n=6)	Under graduate Year 1 Mean (n=23)	Under graduate Year 2 Mean (n=37)	Under graduate Year 3 Mean (n=61)	Post graduate Mean (n=5)
<b>Adequacy of Chinese Studies print books</b>								
General reading purposes	61	3.42	3.67	3.83	4.00	3.33	3.23	3.20
Undergraduate students' needs	47	3.17	4.00	3.50	3.39	3.27	2.95	3.20
Postgraduate students' needs	25	2.93	4.00	2.83	3.46	2.88	2.73	3.00
Teaching needs	19	2.78	3.33	2.83	3.33	2.79	2.57	2.60
Research needs	21	2.72	2.67	2.83	3.25	2.76	2.57	2.60
<b>Adequacy of Chinese Studies print journals</b>								
General reading purposes	38	3.07	3.33	2.33	3.63	3.21	2.72	3.20
Undergraduate students' needs	28	2.81	3.00	3.17	3.10	3.09	2.46	3.00
Postgraduate students' needs	15	2.60	2.67	2.33	3.31	2.75	2.31	2.67
Teaching needs	16	2.56	2.00	2.50	3.08	2.88	2.31	2.40
Research needs	14	2.48	1.67	2.33	3.17	2.71	2.24	2.60
<b>Adequacy of Chinese Studies electronic resources</b>								
General reading purposes	26	2.85	2.00	2.83	3.44	3.12	2.54	2.40
Undergraduate students' needs	27	2.81	1.50	2.67	3.23	3.14	2.53	2.33
Postgraduate students' needs	14	2.59	1.50	2.50	3.42	2.89	2.25	2.60
Teaching needs	16	2.58	1.50	2.33	3.31	2.87	2.24	2.67
Research needs	14	2.50	1.50	2.33	3.25	2.83	2.17	2.80
<b>Overall strengths and weaknesses</b>								
Books	48	3.18	4.00	3.50	3.61	3.24	2.93	2.80
Print journals	22	2.71	2.67	2.17	3.00	3.06	2.45	2.80
Electronic resources	20	2.65	1.50	2.50	3.30	2.88	2.34	2.60

\*Count - for ratings 4 and 5 on a 5-point scale

### *Evaluating User's Level of Satisfaction with the Chinese Studies Collection*

Similarly, the postgraduates were fairly satisfied (mean score = 3.0) with the print books collection for their teaching and research needs. The other respondent groups also gave the same response for print journals and electronic resources. The library professionals themselves were dissatisfied (mean score = 1.5) with the electronic resources provided to the users. Currently, there are very little electronic resources available in the library due to budget constraints but there is a need to provide electronic resources to the users. However, the results also indicated that the undergraduates of years 1 and 2 were generally more satisfied with the electronic resources provided with a mean score of above 3.0 compared to the undergraduates of year 3, postgraduates and faculty members with a mean score of between 2.17 and 2.80.

A gap analysis was carried out for the level of satisfaction as perceived by the library professionals and the other respondent groups with the purpose of assessing the association between two variables at a time. For the general reading purpose category for adequacy of books, there is a gap score of -0.16 between library professionals (3.67) and faculty members (3.83); a gap score of -0.33 between library professionals and undergraduates year 1; a gap score of 0.50 between library professionals and undergraduates year 2; a gap score of 0.44 between library professional and undergraduates year 3; and a gap score of 0.47 between library professionals and postgraduate students.

According to the Rodski Behaviour Research Group (Woo 2005), gaps larger than or equal to 2.00 are considered significant with a rating scale of 1-7 and gap scores of larger or equal to 1.33 are considered significant with a rating scale of 1 to 5. Using this as a basis for comparison, it can be concluded that there is no significant gap in the level of satisfaction between library professionals and other respondent groups (Table 5). A negative gap score shows that the satisfaction level of some of the respondent groups were above the level of satisfaction of the library professionals. However, Zaiton, Carole and Wan (1998) do agree that the low percentage of level of satisfaction with special libraries is understandable since the clientele of special libraries have specialised information needs that may not be easily met by the librarians. This definitely holds true for the Chinese Studies collection.

**Table 5: Gap Score of Chinese Studies Collection**

Collection	Librarian Mean (n=3) <b>A</b>	Faculty Member Mean (n=6) <b>B</b>	Mean Gap <b>A-B</b>	Under graduate Year 1 Mean (n=23) <b>C</b>	Mean Gap <b>A-C</b>	Under graduate Year 2 Mean (n=37) <b>D</b>	Mean Gap <b>A-D</b>	Under graduate Year 3 Mean (n=61) <b>E</b>	Mean Gap <b>A-E</b>	Post graduate Mean (n=5) <b>F</b>	Mean Gap <b>A-F</b>
<b>Adequacy of Chinese Studies print books</b>											
General reading purposes	3.67	3.83	-0.16	4.00	-0.33	3.33	0.50	3.23	0.44	3.20	0.47
Undergraduate students' needs	4.00	3.50	0.50	3.39	0.61	3.27	0.23	2.95	1.05	3.20	0.80
Teaching needs	4.00	2.83	1.17	3.46	0.54	2.88	-0.05	2.73	1.27	3.00	1.00
Postgraduate students' needs	3.33	2.83	0.50	3.33	0.00	2.79	0.04	2.57	0.76	2.60	0.73
Research needs	2.67	2.83	-0.16	3.25	-0.58	2.76	0.07	2.57	0.10	2.60	0.07
<b>Adequacy of Chinese Studies print journals</b>											
General reading purposes	3.33	2.33	1.00	3.63	-0.30	3.21	-0.88	2.72	0.61	3.20	0.13
Undergraduate students' needs	3.00	3.17	-0.17	3.10	-0.10	3.09	0.08	2.46	0.54	3.00	0.00
Teaching needs	2.67	2.33	0.34	3.31	-0.64	2.75	-0.42	2.31	0.36	2.67	0.00
Postgraduate students' needs	2.00	2.50	-0.50	3.08	-1.08	2.88	-0.38	2.31	-0.31	2.40	-0.40
Research needs	1.67	2.33	-0.66	3.17	-1.50	2.71	-0.38	2.24	-0.57	2.60	-0.93
<b>Adequacy of Chinese Studies electronic resources</b>											
General reading purposes	2.00	2.83	-0.83	3.44	-1.44	3.12	-0.29	2.54	-0.54	2.40	-0.40
Undergraduate students' needs	1.50	2.67	-1.17	3.23	-1.73	3.14	-0.47	2.53	-1.03	2.33	-0.83
Postgraduate students' needs	1.50	2.50	-1.00	3.42	-1.92	2.89	-0.39	2.25	-0.75	2.60	-1.10
Teaching needs	1.50	2.33	-0.83	3.31	-1.81	2.87	-0.54	2.24	-0.74	2.67	-1.17
Research needs	1.50	2.33	-0.83	3.25	-1.75	2.83	-0.50	2.17	-0.67	2.80	-1.30
<b>Overall strengths and weaknesses</b>											
Print books	4.00	3.50	0.50	3.61	0.39	3.24	0.26	2.93	1.07	2.80	1.20
Print journals	2.67	2.17	0.50	3.00	-0.33	3.06	-0.89	2.45	0.22	2.80	-0.13
Electronic resources	1.50	2.50	-1.00	3.30	-1.80	2.88	-0.38	2.34	-0.84	2.60	-1.10

### **Level of Satisfaction with Library Services and Facilities**

The range of services and facilities provided by the University of Malaya Library is listed in Table 6. It also lists the overall mean level of satisfaction and the mean score of the individual respondent groups which makes up the overall mean. The respondents were generally satisfied with most of the library services and facilities with a mean score of 2.50 and above. However, the areas which require improvement are those responses which received a rating of 2.50 and below. For example, the library professionals were less satisfied with their participation in material selection with a score of 2.00. In this instance, the materials selection policy of the library is such that acquisition of materials is based on recommendations from the lecturers or based on their reading lists. The library professionals cannot recommend books that meet the needs of the community, hence, the dissatisfaction. But this should be further investigated since Mohd Zain and Siti Hawa (2004) stressed that the coordination and completion of the selection process in collection development is the responsibility of the librarians and not the faculty members.

The undergraduates of year 3 are also less satisfied with the inter-library loan services with a score of 2.50. About 43% of the respondents never used the inter-library loan services listed previously. Information seeking skills sessions are important to the postgraduates who expressed dissatisfaction with service and giving it a score of 2.40. The most frequently used services are the general reference service; library guides about the collection or the OPAC system; and the short-term and long-term loan facilities. However, there were some areas of dissatisfaction which require the management of the University of Malaya Library to look into.

### **Use of Resources**

Based on the responses, the respondents prefer print books (118, 88%) compared to print journals (14, 10.4%) and electronic resources (2, 1.5%). This may be caused by the absence of relevant or insufficient print journals and electronic resources available for usage in the University of Malaya Library. This also reinforces the fact that Chinese is a text based society which prefers books rather than electronic resources (Woo 2005). An on-line survey was carried out by Woo (2005) in 2004 at the University of Hong Kong libraries to evaluate the performance of the main library and six branch libraries. The libraries were the Main Library, Education Library, Dental Library, Law Library, Medical Library, Music Library and the Fung Peng Shan Library. In her study, she found that among the seven libraries studied, there was a difference in the preference for print books between the libraries. Of the users of the Education Library, 66.2% preferred to access print books compared to 82.9% of the users of the Fung Ping Chan Library, which housed the Chinese, Japanese and Koreans collection.

Table 6: Level of Satisfaction with Library Services and Facilities (n=135)

Library Service	Count *	Overall Mean (n=135)	Librarian Mean (n=3)	Faculty Member Mean (n=6)	Undergraduate Year 1 Mean (n=23)	Undergraduate Year 2 Mean (n=37)	Undergraduate Year 3 Mean (n=61)	Post graduate Mean (n=5)
Access library resources within campus	49	3.36	4.00	3.50	3.76	3.59	3.05	3.00
General reference service	45	3.32	2.67	3.80	3.45	3.55	3.13	3.20
Short term loan service	40	3.20	4.00	4.00	2.90	3.58	2.98	3.00
Long term loan service	39	3.19	0.00	4.00	3.53	3.20	2.98	3.20
Individualised reference/research services	30	3.10	2.37	4.00	3.18	3.45	2.86	2.60
Library guides about the collection	32	3.03	3.00	3.80	3.00	3.10	2.94	2.80
Inter-library loan service	19	2.89	3.00	3.20	3.31	3.23	2.50	3.00
List of newly acquired materials	21	2.88	2.67	3.60	2.94	2.90	2.83	2.40
Participation in materials selection	14	2.85	2.00	3.20	2.83	3.04	2.76	2.60
Information seeking skills sessions	15	2.82	2.67	3.00	2.88	3.04	2.72	2.40
Information about collection policies	11	2.74	3.00	2.80	3.60	2.86	2.56	2.80
Access library resources outside campus	12	2.66	2.50	3.75	2.69	2.83	2.44	3.00

\* Count - for ratings 4 and 5 on a 5-point scale

### CONCLUSION

From this study, one can conclude that most of the respondents use EASL and most of them go to the Library at least one to two times per week. The majority also use the inter-library loan services sometimes whilst another group has never used this service. The findings also indicate that undergraduates of year 1, faculty members and library professionals are satisfied with the collection and services of the Chinese studies collection. But, the undergraduates of years 2 and 3 and the postgraduates are less satisfied. However, the level of satisfaction in this instance is at the lower level of satisfaction, that is, between 2.5 to 3.5.

### *Evaluating User's Level of Satisfaction with the Chinese Studies Collection*

Subsequently, a gap analysis was carried out to compare the level of satisfaction between the library professionals and the respondent groups of the Department of Chinese Studies. Results showed that there is no significant gap between the performance evaluation by library professionals and library users' expectations in any particular area. Thus, it can be concluded that at this point in time, the collection and services of EASL fairly satisfy the users' needs. This study can in turn be further extended into a more comprehensive user needs assessment study of the Chinese studies collection.

User needs analysis is one of the components in any collection development model such as the Evans' model (1995). Further studies of the University of Malaya Library based on the elements of the Evans' model should be considered. Apart from that, comparative studies can be carried out on other Chinese studies collections which are available in other libraries or information centres in Malaysia or overseas.

Findings from this study could be utilised by managers or librarians of special collection in various ways. The study has shown the need to:

- a. Provide adequate reference service to support the academic needs of the university students and faculty in the area of Chinese studies at undergraduate and postgraduate levels.
- b. Encourage intensive research at undergraduate and postgraduate levels to propel the university to be a resource centre and research institute of excellence in Malaysia for Chinese studies. The study has enabled us to understand how users use the Chinese studies collection as a teaching, learning and research resource.
- c. Support library policies to achieve the maximum use of library resources in an academic library.
- d. The findings will be useful for the University of Malaya Library to review their library resources, services and facilities to effectively meet the needs of the users.

## REFERENCES

- Agee, J. 2005. Collection evaluation: a foundation for collection development. *Collection Building*, Vol. 24, no. 3: 92-95.
- Aluri, R. 1993. Improving reference service: the case for using a continuous quality improvement method. *ItQ*, Vol. 22: 220-221, 232.
- Cook, C. and F. Health. 2001. Users' perceptions of library service quality: libQUAL+ quality study. *Library Trends*, Vol. 9, no. 4: 54-584
- Cronin, J.J. and Taylor, S.A. 1994. SERVPERF versus SERVQUAL: reconciling performance-based and perceptions-minus-expectations measurement of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58, no. 1:125-131.
- Evans, G. E. 1995. *Developing library and information centre collections*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Englewood Colo: Libraries Unlimited.
- Evans, G. E., and Saponaro, M. Z. 2005. *Developing library and information center collections*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Fan, K. W. 2003. Electronic resources for Chinese studies and East Asian libraries. *New Library World*, Vol. 104, no. 10: 408-414.
- Gee, K.C., and Tan, W. 2003. Chinese Collections of Top East Asian Libraries on the East Coast of the United States. *Journal of Educational Media & Sciences*, Vol. 42, no. 2: 139-162.
- Hernon, P. and Charles R. McClure. 1990. *Evaluation and library decision making*. New Jersey, Ablex.
- International Federation of Library Association and Institutions [IFLA]. 2001. *Guidelines for a collection development policy using the Conspectus Model: section on acquisition and collection development*. Available at: <http://www.ifla.org/VII/s14/nd1/gcdp-e.pdf>
- Lancaster, F.W. 1993. *The measurement and evaluation of library services*. Washington: Information Resource Press.
- Mohd. Zain Abd. Rahman and Siti Hawa Darus. 2004. Faculty awareness on the collection development of the International Islamic University Library. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, Vol. 9, no. 2: 17-34.
- New Era College. 2006. *Malaysian Centre for Ethnic Studies*. Available at: [http://www.newera.edu.my/academic/index\\_e.php](http://www.newera.edu.my/academic/index_e.php)
- Nicholson, D. 1999. *Collection level description: a review of existing practice, an e-library support study*. Available at: <http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/metadata/cld/study/collection/conspectus/>
- Nitecki, Danuta A and Peter Hernon. 2000. Measuring service at Yale University's libraries, *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 26, no. 4: 259-273
- Oliver, R.L. 1996. *Satisfaction: a behavioural perspective on the consumer*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pong, Y.T. 2006. *A user study of the Centre for Malaysian Chinese Studies Library* (MLIS diss., University of Malaya)



*Evaluating User's Level of Satisfaction with the Chinese Studies Collection*

- Roslah, J. and Zainab, A.N. 2007. Identifying what services need to be improved by measuring the library's performance. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, Vol. 12, no. 1: 35-53.
- Sanchez Vignau, B.S. 2005. Collection development policies in university libraries: a space for reflection. *Collection Building*, Vol. 24, no. 1: 35-43.
- Shaheen. M., Mumtaz, A. A., and Tamara, S. E. 2001. User perceptions of library effectiveness in Malaysian agricultural libraries. *Library Review*, Vol. 50, no. 4: 176-186.
- Woo, H. 2005. The 2004 user survey at the University of Hong Kong Libraries. *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 66, no. 2: 115-35.
- Ye, Y. S. 2004. *A non-specialist guide to building Chinese studies collections for small college libraries, Macalester College, St Olaf College and Carleton College*. Available at: <http://www.macalester.edu/library/resources/eastasia/documents/guidetochinesestudiescollection.doc>.
- Zaiton, O. Carole, A.G and Wan H.W.A. 1998. Quality services: policies and practices in Malaysia. *Library Management*, Vol. 19, no. 7: 426-433.