emerald PUBLISHING

Library Manag

Does Size Matter? In-library study of two Canadian public library branches

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Does Size Matter? User study of two branches

1. Introduction

During its 2019 – 2023 strategic planning process, Richmond Public Libraries commissioned a user study of its Brighouse and Steveston branches. The management team was particularly interested in how residents used its Steveston facility, a community branch judged as a priority for renovation.

Richmond is a city of 200,000 people located on several islands at the mouth of the Fraser River on Canada's west coast. A suburb of Vancouver, the city has the highest proportion of immigrants in Canada: 60% according to the 2016 Canada Census. Richmond Public Library system has a large central branch, three smaller community facilities, and Saturday library service in a community centre. The article begins with short descriptions of the two public library branches studied.

2. Branch Profiles

The 49,352 square foot Brighouse branch is adjacent to the city's main commercial centre and transportation routes. It is part of a cultural-sports complex that includes an art gallery, museum, seniors' centre, skating arena, swimming pool, and sports fields. Richmond's central branch provides a range of public reading areas, multipurpose and small study rooms. The children's area is separated from public spaces to reduce ambient sound. Brighouse offers 3-D printers, digitization stations, green and media walls, large English and Chinese collections, reference materials, and programming in both English and Chinese. The central facility has over a dozen times the floor area and five times the gate count of the Steveston branch.

The Steveston branch is situated in the southwest corner of the island near a historic fishing village. The surrounding community park contains sports fields, an outdoor swimming

pool, and Japanese cultural facilities. The branch is a single room of 3,919 square feet in the

community centre. Public access computers are located near the entrance and the children's area

is not separated from public spaces. The collection, computer stations, reference, and circulation

desks occupy a central position in the branch. Steveston offers children's programming in

English.

Insert Table 1 - Richmond Public Library 2017 Annual Branch Statistics

3. Literature Review

This section surveys the research methods used to explore user in-branch behaviours, their use in

library studies, and the perceived user benefits from public library use.

3.1 Unobtrusive and participant observation

Unobtrusive observation techniques include seating sweeps, wayfinding, and pedestrian choice.

Seating sweep studies record the behaviours and locations of patrons on floor plans (Leckie and

Hopkins, 2002; Given and Leckie, 2003; May, 2010; Bryant et al, 2009; Macrae et al., 2013).

Wayfinding studies explore how people navigate through public (Mandel, 2010) and academic

libraries (Li and Klippel, 2012). Pedestrian choice studies shadow patrons as they walk

throughout a facility (van Beynen et al, 2010).

Unobtrusive observation has its limitations. People who stay longer in a branch are more

likely to be observed during a seating sweep (Høivik, 2008). Observing people's behaviours

without asking the reasons behind those behaviours provides an incomplete picture. As a result,

multiple data collection techniques are often used (Leckie and Hopkins, 2002; Koontz et al.,

2005). Alternatively, participation observation techniques can be used to both record people's

behaviours and the reasons behind their behaviours. As in ethnographic studies, researchers

interact with the people being observed (Prigoda et al., 2007).

Despite their usefulness in studying human behaviour, observational techniques are not widely used in library studies. Khoo *et al*. (2012, p. 83) remarked that "ethnography is a complex method." Unobtrusive and participation observation studies are labour intensive and researchers often lack experience in these methodologies.

3.2 Interviews and surveys

One-to-one interviews, focus groups, and surveys are commonly used in library studies. Interviewers can probe patrons in depth (May, 2011) and explore issues unanticipated prior to the study. The downside of the technique is the time needed to interview, transcribe, and analyze data, resulting in smaller sample sizes. Consistency during data collection is an issue.

Surveys enable larger sample sizes and extrapolation to the underlying populations. However, questionnaires are hard to design, provide less detail, and only explore issues anticipated in advance. Surveys are subject to non-response error and unrepresentative sampling (Bookstein, 1985). Respondents may misunderstand questions, lack memories of past events, or respond with what they think are socially acceptable answers. Surveys overestimate the frequency of library visits as such studies are more likely to question frequent library users (Smith, 1999). The current study used an exit questionnaire for reasons of cost and the involvement of undergraduate student researchers.

3.3 In-Library user studies

Canadian studies have investigated in-library use of public libraries. One study explored the use of the central branches of the Vancouver and Toronto Public Libraries (Leckie and Hopkins, 2002; Given and Leckie, 2003). Across the border, use of new Seattle main branch was documented (Fisher *et al*., 2007).

May and Black (2010) replicated the Vancouver methodology during their study of six

Nova Scotia public library branches. Use of a Halifax branche was again documented by Macrae

et al. (2013). Farther west, surveys measured in-library use of the Edmonton (Wortman, 2012)

and Prince George Public Libraries (Shepherd *et al*., 2015).

Studies have explored patron social behaviour within public libraries. Norwegians

researched public libraries as social meeting places (Aabø *et al*., 2010; Audunson *et al*., 2011).

Hillenbrand (2005) undertook a social audit of an Australian community library. In addition to

general user studies, research has investigated library use by immigrants (Audunson *et al*., 2011;

Shepherd *et al*., 2018) and by a knitting group (Prigoda *et al*., 2007.

The pattern of in-branch use reflects local demographics. Koontz *et al*. (2005) stressed

the need to go beyond regular statistics to measure library use in majority-minority

neighbourhoods. The residents of majority-minority neighbourhoods use library branches in

ways that are poorly captured by library statistics.

3.4 Perceived benefit studies from library use

Another way of understanding public library use is to explore the benefits that users receive from

visiting a library. American library impact studies (McClure and Bertot, 1998; Lance *et al.,*

2001) included such questions in their user surveys. The perceived benefits that people obtain

from library use has been studied in Finland (Vakkari and Serola, 2012), the U.S.A. (Sin and

Vakkari, 2015), and other countries (Vakkari *et al.*, 2016).

3.5 Use of public libraries as study space

D'Elia (1980) identified two patterns of library use. Type 1 use is associated with visit frequency

and the use of collections and services. Type 2 use is associated with visit duration and weakly

associated with visit frequency and the use of services. Type 2 users are often younger, use

libraries for educational reasons, and often lack library cards. This study explores Type 2

behaviour as one of the reasons for the Steveston branch renovation was the perceived need for

more study space.

According to Leckie and Hopkins (2002), half of the people in the main branches were 18

to 34 years of age and one-quarter selected "student" as their occupation. Similarly, Shoham

(2001) explored student use of Israeli public library reading rooms.

Post-secondary students often study in public libraries. Antell (2004) studied U.S. college

student use of public libraries. Behr and LaDell-Thomas (2014) explored U.S. public library use

by distance graduate students.

3.6 Characteristics of good public library spaces

Cohen and Cohen (1979) stressed the need to consider human behaviour when designing library

spaces. The authors described how people interact with library furniture, seating, and public

spaces.

As people interact with places and furniture in predictable ways, academic library

research into student study behaviour may be relevant to public libraries. Cha and Kim (2015)

identified the criteria used by students when they select study places. Applegate (2009) and Xia

(2005) observed student preferences for study furniture. Seating sweeps (Linn, 2013; McKay and

Buchanan, 2014) provided insight into student group sizes, the different types of groups, and

how they interacted with furniture.

4. Design, Methodology and Approach

The exit questionnaire was based on a survey instrument used to study in-library use in Surrey

Libraries by Canadian newcomers (Shepherd *et al.*, 2018). The principal investigator worked

with library staff to adapt the previous questionnaire to meet the information needs of Richmond Public Library's strategic planning process.

The population surveyed were library users, 15 years of age or older, who visited the Steveston or Brighouse branches on Thursday, February 8, or Saturday, February 10, 2018. Student researchers administered the paper questionnaires under the supervision of Dr. Petrillo as a class project.

During library hours of operation, on Thursday and Saturday, student researchers approached library users at branch exits. After each questionnaire, they were instructed to contact the next person exiting the building. Students could assist library users as necessary. No incentives were offered to participate in the survey.

Over two days, 437 people completed the survey, approximately 2% to 14% of daily branch gate count. Eighty percent of all Brighouse respondents completed their questionnaires on Thursday, compared to 59% at the Steveston branch. Given the skewed response rates, the weighting for Thursday Brighouse responses was adjusted downwards to 59%.

To reduce memory recall errors, respondents were asked what they did during their current visit. According to Vakkari and Serola (2012), the longer the time delay between an event occurring and the administration of a survey, the less reliable are people's memories. Questionnaire responses were keyed into a spreadsheet and double checked for errors.

After the survey, library managers asked for reports on how patrons used the two branches, how people of different age groups used the library branches, and whether Chinese readers used branches in the same way as English readers. One of these reports led to this journal article.

Each branch was later visited to document the number and type of study rooms, public

computer stations, public spaces, furniture, and seating. Furniture tally sheets were supplemented

with library records and photographs of public spaces. Library staff supplied branch statistics for

the year 2017 and for the dates of the study.

Working with the technical librarians, branch circulation statistics were extracted for

patrons with the nearest postal code, V7E, for the period January 1, 2018, to December 14, 2018.

The circulation statistics for postal code V7C users were used as a comparison. In Canada, the

first three characters of the postal code are used by the postal service to define geographic areas.

Postal codes were selected using postal code boundary maps.

Library statistics were supplemented by data from Statistics Canada and the Canadian

Urban Library Council. The 2016 Canada Census data were downloaded for the City of

Richmond and for postal codes V7E and V7C. The Canadian Urban Library Council's 2017

urban branch statistics report (Marriott, 2017) contained statistics for over 300 Canadian public

library branches.

5. Study Results

5.1 Frequency and duration of branch visits

While the users at each branch self-reported a similar frequency of library visits, patrons

stayed longer in the Brighouse branch during their current visit. While 53% percent of Steveston

respondents left after 30 minutes or less, 43% of Brighouse users visited for one or more hours.

Insert Table 2 – Please estimate how long you were in the library today

5.2 Group behaviour of library users

One half of the respondents at each branch arrived with companions; however, the people who

accompanied them were different. Among Steveston users, 27% visited with one companion and

22% with two or more people. Among Steveston users who arrived with other people, 86% came

with family and 7% with friends. In contrast, Brighouse users visited with a wider range of

companions: family (68%), friends (21%), or other students (7%).

When users were asked how important it was to have a place to meet, talk, or work

together with other people in the library, 71% of Steveston and 85% of Brighouse users selected

either "very important" or "somewhat important".

5.3 User activities during their current branch visit

Respondents were given a list of 20 library activities and asked to select all the activities they did

during their current visit. Of these activities, users most frequently selected looking for library

materials, returning or borrowing library materials for themselves, reading, using the Wi-Fi

service, or relaxing in the branch.

Brighouse respondents engaged in more activities during their visit than Steveston users.

Higher percentages of Brighouse users reported a range of in-library activities such as studying,

reading, relaxing, doing personal projects, and using Wi-Fi services than their community branch

counterparts.

Insert Table 3 – At the Library today, I did the following (top 14 listed activities)

5.4 Circulation-related activities

The most common user activities, in both branches, were looking, borrowing, or

returning library materials. A higher proportion of Steveston users either borrowed or returned

materials during their current visit. As 53% of Steveston respondents stayed in the branch for no

more than 30 minutes, dropping off or picking up items from the collection was likely a primary

reason for many of their visits.

Heavy use of the children's collections occurred in both facilities. Slightly more than half of the materials lent came from children's collections. In comparison, one-third of U.S. public library circulation came from the children's collection (Joo and Cahill, 2017). Fifty-six percent of Steveston's collection was classified as children's materials, suggesting that the branch focuses on that age group.

The annual circulation statistics for the two branches were comparable when annual lending activity was divided by gate count. Users borrowed an average of 1.5 items per visit. When the circulation per square foot of floor space of the two branches were compared to the ratios for other Canadian library branches, Steveston scored in the top 2% and Brighouse in the top 15% (Marriott, 2017).

The borrowing behaviour for cardholders with the same postal code as the Steveston branch, V7E, was analyzed. Over the first 11.5 months of 2018, people within this postal code borrowed 49% of their materials from Steveston, 41% from Brighouse, and 8% from the Ironwood branch. Brighouse is located 7.3 kilometers northeast of the Steveston branch and Ironwood is situated a large shopping centre, 7.4 kilometers east of the branch.

In contrast, a different pattern of branch circulation was noted among borrowers from postal code V7C, north of the Steveston branch and west of the Brighouse branch. Among these users, 68% of materials borrowed came from Brighouse, 24% from Steveston, and 7% from Ironwood.

5.5 Attendance in library programming

Children's programming was a major focus of the Steveston branch. Among the respondents, 16% of Brighouse and 14% of Steveston users attended a library program during

their visit. Among Steveston respondents who attended branch programming, 83% participated

in children's programming compared to 46% of Brighouse attendees.

According to 2017 branch statistics, 99% of Steveston and 64% of Brighouse attendees

were enrolled in children's programming. In comparison, 71% of people enrolled in U.S. public

library programs attended children's programming (Joo and Cahill, 2017).

5.6 Use of computer workstations

Steveston users matched their Brighouse counterparts in their use of computer workstations.

Within both branches, one-quarter of respondents used library computers during their current

visit. In comparison, May and Black (2010) reported that 32% of Nova Scotian library patrons

were observed using public service computers.

These percentages were higher than those estimated based on 2017 branch statistics.

When the number of computer sessions were divided by branch gate count, 9% of Brighouse and

7% of Steveston patrons used public computers per visit.

5.7 Study behaviour

People who studied in Richmond library branches stayed longer than other users. Over one-third

of people who studied in the branches remained for over two hours. People who studied were

more likely to arrive with a companion, either a friend or a family member. Sixty percent of this

group reported doing personal work, 68% used the Wi-Fi service, and 24% met with friends. A

bimodal distribution was noted among those who studied: 41% were 15 to 24 years of age and

46% were 30 to 49 years of age. Brighouse users were three times more likely to study in the

facility than were Steveston users.

5.8 User benefits received from library use

Another question explored the benefits that library users received from the library. Twelve

benefit statements were prepared based on the literature. Users were asked to select all the

statements that applied to them.

Insert Table 4 –Benefits received from Richmond Public Library Use

Similar proportions of patrons selected the same benefits at each branch. The most

commonly selected benefits were "an affordable place to read", "safe and welcoming place", and

"feel connected to my community". Higher percentages of Brighouse users selected the library as

a "place to study", "meet people and make friends", "learn a new language", "build confidence"

and "contact distant friends and family". A higher proportion of Steveston users selected, "feel

connected to my community", and "help my child do well in school".

These results are consistent with the literature. Reading of fiction and non-fiction and

self-education were top benefits of using a U.S. public library (Sin and Vakkari, 2015). They

identified three benefit clusters: everyday activities and interests, reading and self-education, and

work and formal education. A library was also valued by its users as a safe, relaxing, and

peaceful place (Hillenbrand, 2005).

5.9 User demographics

User demographics were different at each branch. According to survey responses, a higher

percentage of Steveston respondents were either 15 to 18- years, or over 50 years of age. When

2016 Canada Census profiles were used to compare the age cohorts of Stevenson postal code

residents to that of Richmond, modestly higher percentages of Steveston's population were

children, teenagers, or 65 years or older.

Among Brighouse respondents, a higher proportion were 19 to 29 years of age, a figure

consistent with Richmond's census profile. A lower percentage of Steveston's population were

in the 20- to 39-year-old age group. In most age groups, 40 to 64 years of age, both Steveston

and Richmond had similar profiles.

Over 97% of respondents at both branches stated that they normally read in English.

Written Chinese was selected by 36% of Brighouse and 23% of Steveston respondents.

According to the Census profiles, 32% of Steveston and 45% of City of Richmond residents

reported one or more Chinese languages as their mother tongue.

6. Discussion

6.1 Branch selection decisions by users

As noted above, only half of the items lent to Steveston three-digit postal code users were

borrowed from the nearest branch so household distance from the library branch was not the only

factor influencing borrowing behaviour. As the questionnaire didn't ask for the respondents'

postal codes, the relationship between branch distance and other types of library use is

undeterminable.

This observation is interesting as a household's distance, actual or perceived, from the

nearest branch has long been associated with the likelihood of library use (D'Elia, 1980; Sin and

Kim, 2008). However, Jae Park (2012) identified travel time as more significant than physical

distance. In a City of Regina study (Allen, 2019), the travel time of each neighbourhood to the

nearest library branch was mapped, by time of day and type of transportation.

The proximity of each library branch to other amenities is another factor. A U.S. study

concluded that 80% of users made multiple stops while travelling to a public library (Jae Park,

2012).

Branch location may help explain to the heavy use of each faculty. Brighouse is near

recreation facilities, a regional shopping mall, a commuter train station, and numerous bus

routes. Steveston is along the same street as several bus routes and a short walk from a historic

retail and restaurant district. Each branch is less than 800 meters from a large secondary school.

May and Black (2010) described each Nova Scotian public library as different in its

internal layout, the communities it served, and in its user behaviours. While the physical

locations of branches are fixed, the users of public library branches are mobile. Users likely

juggle factors such as distance, library services, and nearby amenities when selecting a library

branch.

6.2 Duration of branch visits

As outlined above, Brighouse users stayed longer in the central branch than Steveston

users. The visit duration pattern for the Steveston facility is easier to explain. A significant

percentage of user visits of under 30 minutes have been reported in other Canadian studies (May

and Black, 2010; Wortman, 2012; Shepherd *et al.*, 2015).

Longer visits to the Brighouse branch is harder to explain. In some ways, the visitation

pattern more resembles that of the central branch for large metropolitan library. For example,

Leckie and Hopkins (2002) reported that 57% of Vancouver central branch users stayed for over

an hour.

According to the authors, patrons used the central branch as a "public workspace and not

as a recreation space" (Leckie and Hopkins, 2002, p. 354). Users valued the breadth and depth of

its collections. In comparison, Brighouse lacks the depth of collections in Vancouver's central

branch and serves both a place of study and of recreation. Possible explanations for the duration

of stays in the Brighouse branch are explored below.

6.3 Social behaviour at library branches

It is unlikely that patron social behaviour explains the duration of visits to the Brighouse branch. According to the exit survey, the respondents from each branch were equally likely to arrive with one or more companions, though the type of companion differed.

Public libraries are public places but are not particularly social places. Aabø and Audunson (2012) described libraries as public spaces where many of the individual users and groups are focused on private projects.

Canadian studies suggest that user social behaviour differ between branches. May and Black (2010) observed that 8% to 74% of Nova Scotian users were alone in the libraries. Wortman (2012) reported that 58% of Edmonton users were unaccompanied.

In contrast, 75% of Vancouver (Leckie and Hopkins, 2002) and Seattle Public Library (Fisher *et al.*, 2007) central branch users arrived alone. If people used Brighouse in the same way as people use Vancouver's central branch, solitary activities would be the norm.

6.4 Majority-Minority neighbourhoods

The 2016 Census profiles for two postal codes, V7E and VYC, were used to compare the demographics of neighbourhoods surrounding the two branches. The residents of the V7C postal code reside in the northwest quadrant of Richmond's main island, immediately to the west of the Brighouse branch.

Significant differences exist between the two areas. Among the residents of the Steveston postal code, 43% had a European ethnic background, 63% mainly speak English at home, and over half were born in Canada. In contrast, two-thirds of postal code V7C residents are immigrants, three-quarters have an Asian ethnic ancestry, and 43% mainly speak English at home. Twenty percent of VYC residents immigrated in Canada between 2006 and 2016, and nearly 60% are of Chinese ancestry.

Consequently, the area to the west of Brighouse likely encompasses "majority-minority neighbourhoods" and pockets of recent immigrants. The public libraries that serve majority-minority neighbourhoods (Koontz *et al*., 2005) and recent immigrants (Shepherd *et al*., 2018) often exhibit different patterns of library use.

6.5 Differences in facilities, collections, and services

Differences in branch facilities could explain the longer visits to the Brighouse branch. The facility offers a range of public reading areas and multi-purpose rooms. Branch furniture includes study carrels, and rectangular and circular tables. Patrons can sit on stools, benches, curved modular seating, regular or padded chairs, lounge chairs, or sofas. This diversity fulfils the recommendations of Cohen and Cohen (1979) for a mixture of public spaces, furniture, and seating types in public libraries.

In contrast, Steveston has limited floor space relative to gate count. Tables and seating arrangements are limited in number and variety. When patrons were asked what would encourage them to make more use of the branch, they commented on its limited seating and study space, sound issues, and hours of operation.

Steveston's 2017 gate count per square foot of floor space placed it in the top 2% of Canadian urban public library facilities (Marriott, 2017). Unsurprisingly, over half of Steveston visits were for 30 minutes or less. Macrae *et al*. (2013) commented on the impact of the Halifax Spring Garden Memorial Library on user behaviour. User visits of under five minutes to the facility were attributed to crowding and limited seating.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The current study suggests that an exit survey, when combined with other data sources, can provide useful insight into in-library use of branch facilities.

Both facilities have a high gate count partially due to their proximity to a range of community services, shopping, and public transit. Differences in the duration of user visits to the central and community branches can be explained by factors such as floor space, the diversity of public spaces and seating arrangements, branch services and collections, and neighbourhood demographics.

Exit surveys provide a cost-effective way of performing in-library use surveys for branches or public library systems when observational studies are not feasible. As in any exploratory study, methodological improvements are desirable. Online exit questionnaires administered with mobile devices would simplify data collection. Online questionnaires are scalable and can collect responses in multiple languages.

Data collection on a weekday and a Saturday is not ideal if the objective is to extrapolate to the underlying user population. Hours of branch operations could be divided into time periods and time blocks could be selected randomly as was done by Shepherd *et al*. (2015).

This study identified areas for future research. The analysis of circulation data by residential postal code yielded interesting results. The exit questionnaire is easily modified to collect residential the residential postal code and the reasons behind the current branch visit. Using postal code data to map branch boundaries was suggested by Koontz (1995). The reasons why patrons select specific branches is incompletely understood and worthy of further research. More research into the personal benefits that people receive from library use should lead to a better understanding of library users and support the development of impact measures.

References

Aabø, S., Audunson, R. and Vårheim, A. (2010), "How do public libraries function as meeting places?", Library *& Information Science Research*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp.16-26.

Aabø, S. and Audunson, R. (2012), "Use of library space and the library as place", *Library & Information Science Research*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 138-149.

Allen, J. (2019), "Mapping differences in access to public libraries by travel mode and time of day", Library *& Information Science Research*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 11-18.

Antell, K. (2004), "Why Do College Students Use Public Libraries? A Phenomenological Study", *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 227-236.

Applegate, R. (2009), "The Library Is for Studying: Student Preferences for Study Space", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 341-346.

Audunson, R., Essmat, S. and Aabø, S. (2011), "Public libraries: A meeting place for immigrant women?", *Library & Information Science Research*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 220-227.

Behr, M. and LaDell-Thomas, J. (2014), "What Do They Have that We Don't Have? Local Libraries and Distance Students: Why Do Students Stray and Can We Get Them Back?", *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, Vol. 8 No. 3-4, pp. 137-167.

Bookstein, A. (1985), "Questionnaire Research in a Library Setting", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 24-28.

Bryant, J., Matthews, G. and Walton, G. (2009), "Academic libraries and social and learning space: A case study of Loughborough University Library, UK", *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 7-18.

Cha, S.H. and Kim, T.W. (2015), "What matters for students' use of physical library space?", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 274-279.

Cohen, A. and Cohen, E. (1979), *Designing and Space Planning for Libraries: A Behavioral Guide*, R.R. Bowker Co, New York, NY.

D'Elia, G. (1980), "The development and testing of a conceptual model of public library user behavior", *The Library Quarterly*, Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 410-430.

Fisher, K.E., Saxton, M.L., Edwards, P.M., and Mai, J.E. (2007), 'Seattle Public Library as place: Reconceptualizing space, community, and information at the central library' in Buschman, J.E. & Leckie G.J. (Eds.), *The Library as Place: History, Community and Culture*, Libraries Unlimited, Westport, CT, pp. 135-160.

Given, L.M. and Leckie, G.J. (2003), "`Sweeping' the library: Mapping the social activity space of the public library", *Library & Information Science Research*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 365-385.

Hillenbrand, C. (2005), "A place for all: social capital at the Mount Barker Community Library, South Australia", *Australasian public libraries and information services*, Vol. 18 No. 2, p. 41-58.

Høivik, T. (2008), "Count the traffic", paper presented at the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutes (IFLA) Conference, 10 – 14 August, Quebec, Canada, available at: http://mogadorebranch.akronlibrary.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/19/files/2011/07/Count-the-traffic.pdf (accessed 13 December 2018).

Joo, S. and Cahill, M. (2017), "The relationships between the expenditures and resources of public libraries and children's and young adults' use: An exploratory analysis of Institute of Museum and Library Services public library statistics data", *Journal of Librarianship*

and Information Science, available at https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000617709057 (accessed

10 December 2018).

Khoo, M., Rozaklis, L. and Hall, C. (2012), "A survey of the use of ethnographic methods in the

study of libraries and library users", *Library & Information Science Research*, Vol. 34

No. 2, pp. 82-91.

Koontz, C. M. (1995), "Using geographic information systems for estimating and profiling

geographic library market areas", in L. C. Smith & M. Gluck (Eds.), *Geographic*

information systems and libraries: patrons, maps, and spatial information, University of

Illinois Press, Champaign, IL., pp. 182-193

Koontz, C.M., Jue, D.K. and Lance, K.C. (2005), "Neighborhood-based in-library use

performance measures for public libraries: A nationwide study of majority–minority and

majority white/low income markets using personal digital data collectors", *Library &*

Information Science Research, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 28-50.

Lance, K.C., Steffen, N.O., Logan, R., Rodney, M.J., Kaller, S., Koontz, C.M., and Jue, D.K.

(2001), "Counting on results: new tools for outcome-based evaluation of public

libraries", available at: www.lrs.org/documents/cor/CoR_FullFinalReport.pdf (accessed

26 July 2019).

Leckie, G.J. and Hopkins, J. (2002), "The Public Place of Central Libraries: Findings from

Toronto and Vancouver", *The Library Quarterly*, Vol. 72 No. 3, pp. 326-372.

Li, R. and Klippel, A. (2012), "Wayfinding in Libraries: Can Problems be Predicted?", *Journal*

of Map & Geography Libraries, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 21-38.

Linn, M. (2013), "Seating Sweeps: An Innovative Research Method to Learn About How Our

Patrons Use the Library", paper presented at the Association of College & Research

Libraries (ACRL) Conference, Indianapolis, 10-13 April, available at:

http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/conferences/confsandpreconfs/201

3/papers/Linn_Seating.pdf (accessed 13 December 2018).

Macrae, E., van de Vooren, S., and Witherbee, S. (2013), "More Than Just Shelves: Patron

Perceptions of a Downtown Halifax Library", *Journal for Undergraduate*

Ethnography, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 32–43.

Mandel, L.H. (2010), "Toward an understanding of library patron wayfinding: Observing

patrons' entry routes in a public library", *Library & Information Science Research*, Vol.

32 No. 2, pp.116-130.

Marriott, J. "2017 Canadian Public Library Statistics, Branch-Level Data", Canadian

Urban Libraries Council, available at:

http://www.culc.ca/cms_lib/2017%20CULC%20KPI%20Branch-Level%20Data.pdf

(accessed March 19, 2019).

May, F. and Black, F. (2010), "The Life of the Space: Evidence from Nova Scotia Public

Libraries", *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 5-34.

May, F. (2011), "Methods for Studying the Use of Public Spaces in Libraries/Les méthodes

d'étude de l'utilisation des espaces publics dans les bibliothèques. *Canadian Journal of*

Information and Library Science, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 354-366.

McClure, C.R. and Bertot, J.C. (1998), "Public Library Use in Pennsylvania: Identifying Uses,

Benefits, and Impacts", available at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED419548.pdf

(accessed 26 July 2019).

McKay, D. and Buchanan, G. (2014), "On the other side from you: how library design facilitates

and hinders group work", paper presented at the 26th Australian Computer-Human

Interaction Conference on Designing Futures: The Future of Design, 2-5 December, Sydney, Australia, available at http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/5003/1/ozchispace2014cr2-refsin-final.pdf (accessed February 27, 2019).

Jae Park, S. (2012), "Measuring travel time and distance in library use", *Library Hi Tech*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 151-169.

Prigoda, E. and McKenzie, P.J. (2007), "Purls of wisdom: A collectivist study of human information behaviour in a public library knitting group", *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 63 No. 1, pp. 90-114.

Shepherd, J., Vardy, K. and Wilson, A. (2015), "Quantifying patron time-use of a public library", *Library Management*, Vol. 36 No. 6/7, pp.448-461.

Shepherd, J., Petrillo, L. and Wilson, A. (2018), "Settling in: how newcomers use a public library", *Library Management*, Vol. 39 No. 8/9, pp.583-596.

Shoham, S. (2001), "Users and Uses of the Public Library Reading Rooms", *Public Library Quarterly*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 31-46.

Sin, S.C.J. and Kim, K.S. (2008), "Use and non-use of public libraries in the information age: A logistic regression analysis of household characteristics and library services variables", *Library & information science research*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 207-215.

Sin, S.C.J. and Vakkari, P. (2015), "Perceived outcomes of public libraries in the US", *Library & Information Science Research*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 209-29.

Smith, I.M. (1999), "What do we know about public library use?", *Aslib Proceedings*, Vol. 51, No. 9, pp. 302-314.

Vakkari, P. and Serola, S. (2012), "Perceived outcomes of public libraries", *Library & Information Science Research*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 37-44.

Vakkari, P., Aabø, S., Audunson, R., Huysmans, F., Kwon, N., Oomes, M. and Sin, S.C.J.

(2016), "Patterns of perceived public library outcomes in five countries", *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 72 No. 2, pp. 342-361.

van Beynen, K., Pettijohn, P. and Carrel, M. (2010), "Using Pedestrian Choice Research to

Facilitate Resource Engagement in a Midsized Academic Library", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 36 No. 5, pp. 412-419.

Wortman, B. (2012), "What Are They Doing and What Do They Want: The Library Spaces

Customer Survey at Edmonton Public Library", *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 1-22.

Xia, J. (2005), "Visualizing occupancy of library study space with GIS maps", *New Library*

World, Vol. 106 No. 5/6, pp. 219-233.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Richmond Public Library 2017 Annual Branch Statistics

Branch Statistics	Brighouse	Steveston
Floor area	49,352 sq. ft.	3,919 sq. ft.
Annual gate count	978,103	197,934
Annual physical circulation	1,527,267	303,627
% of collection circulated	80.95%	89.63%
Number of programs	2,222	500
Program attendees	63,348	15,201
Inquiries to staff	88,192	16,246
Public computers	58	7
Public seating	522	32
Study rooms	8	0

Table 2 – Please estimate how long you were in the library today

Duration of visit	Brighouse Branch % of Responses	Steveston Branch % of Responses
30 minutes or less	27	53
30 minutes to 1 hour	30	34
1 to 2 hours	26	9
Over 2 hours	17	4
No response	0	1

Table 3. At the Library today, I did the following (top 14 listed activities)

Type of Activity	Brighouse Branch % of Responses	Steveston Branch % of Responses
Looked for books, videos, etc.	48	59
Returned or borrowed books, videos, etc. for myself	44	46
Read	42	35
Used Wi-Fi	36	20
Relaxed	33	27
Used a library computer	25	24
Personal work	25	12
Asked for help from library staff	24	18
Studied	20	6
Returned or borrowed books, videos, for someone else	17	21
Attended a children's library program	10	14
Met friends	8	6
Attended an adult library program or community event	8	1
Other activities	7	9
No response	5	4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 4. Benefits received from Richmond Public Library Use

Public Library User Benefits	Brighouse % of Responses	Steveston % of Responses
Provided me with an affordable place to read books, magazines, etc.	87	86
Provided me with a safe and welcoming place to relax	78	76
Helped me feel connected to my community	56	63
Provided a place to study or do school assignments	45	35
Provided a place to meet people and make friends	42	32
Helped me learn new skills	31	25
Helped my child do well in school	27	33
Helped me learn about Canada or other subjects	27	25
Helped me search for jobs, housing, etc.	21	17
Helped me learn a language	20	9
Helped me build confidence and to give back to the community	16	8
Helped me contact distant friends and family	14	9
Other	8	11
No response	2	2

Hello, I am a Kwantlen Polytechnic University student researcher conducting a survey on behalf of Richmond Public Library's public consultation. We want to hear from you to ensure the library reflects the changing needs of the community. With this survey, we are asking about how you use the library and what services are the most important to you. Your answers to this survey will be entered anonymously. The survey will take about 10 minutes to complete.

Your feedback will be compiled to assist the 2019 – 2021 Strategic Plan which will be published on the library's website in the fall of 2018.

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE STUDENT RESEARCHER

1. In which branch is the survey being completed? (Check ✓a box)

☐ Brighouse branch ☐ Steveston branch

2. Day of the survey (Check ✓a box)

☐ Weekday ☐ Saturday

3. Time of the survey (Check ✓a box)

☐ Morning (until noon)
☐ Afternoon (noon to 5 pm)
☐ Evening (after 5 pm)

MY LIBRARY ACTIVITY (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LIBRARY USER)

4. During today's visit, I was in the library for (Check ✓a box)

☐ Under 30 minutes
☐ 30 minutes to 1 hour
☐ 1 hour to 2 hours
☐ Over 2 hours

5. I visit Richmond Public Library (Check ✓a box)

☐ Daily ☐ Several times a year
☐ Weekly ☐ Rarely
☐ Monthly

6. I came to the library today (Check ✓a box)

☐ Alone
☐ With one person
☐ With two or more people

The people who came with me to the library today are (Check ✓ all that apply)

☐ Friends ☐ Family ☐ Students ☐ Co-workers ☐ Other

7. How important is it for me to have a place in the library to meet, talk, or work together with other people? (Check ✓a box)

☐ Very Important   ☐ Somewhat important   ☐ Not important

8. Today I met with a tutor in the library. (Check ✓a box)

☐ Yes   ☐ No

9. I was tutored in: (Check ✓a box)

☐ Learning a language   ☐ School homework or studying for an exam

10. At the library today, I did the following: (✓Check all boxes that apply)

☐ Asked for help from library staff
☐ Returned or borrowed library books, videos, etc. for myself
☐ Returned or borrowed library books, videos, etc. for someone else
☐ Looked for books, videos etc.
☐ Attended an adult library program or community event
☐ Attended a children's library program
☐ Attended a teen library program
☐ Attended a Chinese library program
☐ Volunteered
☐ Read
☐ Relaxed
☐ Personal work
☐ Job search
☐ Studying
☐ Tutored a student
☐ Used a library computer
☐ Used Launchpad services (3D printer, digitization station, photo scanner)
☐ Used photocopiers/printers/scanner
☐ Used Wi-Fi
☐ Met friends
☐   Other: Please describe _____

11. Overall, I would rate the services at Richmond Public Library as:

Excellent   ☐   Good   ☐   Fair   ☐   Poor   ☐

12. Richmond Public Library has … **(**Check (✓) all the boxes that apply).

☐   Provided me with an affordable place to read books, magazines, etc.
☐   Provided me with a safe and welcoming place to relax
☐   Helped me feel connected to my community
☐   Provided a place to meet people and make friends
☐   Provided a place to study or do school assignments
☐   Helped me search for jobs, housing, etc.

2

☐   Helped my child do well in school

☐   Helped me learn new skills

☐   Helped me contact distant friends and family

☐   Helped me learn a language

☐   Helped me learn about Canada or other subjects

☐   Helped me build confidence and to give back to the community through volunteering

☐   Other _____

ABOUT YOU

13. I normally **READ** in the following language (in alphabetical order, check ✓ all that apply)

☐ Cantonese   ☐ Mandarin

☐ English   ☐ Other Chinese language

☐ French   ☐ Punjabi

☐ Hindi   ☐ Spanish

☐ Japanese   ☐ Tagalog (Pilipino, Filipino)

☐ Other language _____

16. My age is: (Check ✓ only one box)

☐ 15 to 18 years

☐ 19 to 24 years   ☐ 50 to 54 years

☐ 25 to 29 years   ☐ 55 to 59 years

☐ 30 to 34 years   ☐ 60 to 64 years

☐ 35 to 39 years   ☐ 65 to 69 years

☐ 40 to 44 years   ☐ 70 to 74 years

☐ 45 to 49 years   ☐ 75 years or more

16. I would use the library more if:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you very much for completing this survey!

3