

# *What do you like to read?*

An Evaluation Report

**Briony Train**



Centre for the Public Library  
In the Information Society  
Department of Information Studies  
The University of Sheffield

*East Midlands Libraries working together  
to promote books and reading  
supported by Arts Council East Midlands.*

September 2003

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Project background</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Introduction	4
1.2	Black Bytes	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Methodology</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Reading habit survey: <i>What do you like to read?</i>	5
2.1.1	The respondents	6
2.1.2	Analysis of reading habits survey	6
2.2	Interviews with library users	7
2.3	Anticipated evaluation outcomes	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Survey findings: <i>What do you like to read?</i></b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Gender and age	8
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Question One</b>	<b>10</b>
3.2.1	Analysis	10
3.2.2	Frequency Tables: Question One	10
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Question Two</b>	<b>17</b>
3.3.1	Analysis	17
3.3.2	Gender	17
3.3.3	Frequency Tables: Question Two	18
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Question Three</b>	<b>21</b>
3.4.1	Analysis	21
3.4.2	Gender	21
3.4.3	Correlations (using a Pearson's test)	24
3.4.4	Black British fiction readers	28
3.4.5	Black British fiction readers: <i>Where did you look for these books?</i>	29
3.4.6	Black British fiction readers: <i>What factors influence you in your choice of library books?</i>	31
3.4.7	Black British fiction readers and Asian fiction readers	32
3.4.8	Frequency Tables: Question 3	33
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Question Four</b>	<b>40</b>
3.5.1	Analysis	40
3.5.2	Gender	41
3.5.3	Correlations: Asian fiction and Black British fiction	42
3.5.4	Correlations: gay/lesbian and Black British fiction	43
3.5.5	Frequency Tables: Question 4	44
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Question Five</b>	<b>51</b>
3.6.1	Analysis	51
3.6.2	Gender	52
3.6.3	Frequency Tables: Question Five	53
<b>4</b>	<b>Comparison of control and non-control libraries: a longitudinal investigation of the impact of the Black Bytes promotion</b>	<b>58</b>
4.1	Context	58

4.2	Analysis	58
4.3	Further analysis	59
4.4	Table to show the percentage of change between the 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> questionnaires	59
<b>5</b>	<b>Comparison of libraries of different types</b>	<b>61</b>
5.1	Nature of community	61
5.1.1	Context	61
5.1.2	Analysis	61
5.1.3	Table to show survey responses by community type	62
5.2	Ethnicity	64
5.2.1	Context	64
5.2.2	Analysis	64
5.2.3	Table to show survey responses by ethnicity	65
5.3	Class	67
5.3.1	Context	67
5.3.2	Analysis	67
5.3.3	Table to show survey responses by class	68
<b>6</b>	<b>Comparison of survey responses by gender</b>	<b>70</b>
6.1	Context	70
6.2	Analysis	70
6.3	Table to show the responses of male and female respondents	71
<b>7</b>	<b>Analysis of interviews with library users</b>	<b>73</b>
7.1	Book displays	73
7.2	Reasons for choosing not to read particular types of book	75
7.3	Factors influencing choice of library books	76
7.4	Response to the Black Bytes promotion	77
<b>8</b>	<b>Response to research findings and recommendations to public library staff</b>	<b>79</b>
8.1	Context	79
8.2	Methodology	79
8.3	Preferred location for selecting books	80
8.4	Respondents' reading choices	81
8.5	Categories that respondents would not consider reading	83
8.6	Factors affecting choice of library books	83
8.7	Comparison of libraries of different types	84
8.8	Response to the Black Bytes promotion	84
8.9	In conclusion	85

## Appendices

# 1. Project background

## 1.1 Introduction

This report presents the findings of research conducted by the Centre for the Public Library in the Information Society, a research centre within the Information Studies department of the University of Sheffield. This work formed part of the EMERALD [East Midlands Reader and Library Development] initiative, funded by each of the East Midlands public library authorities and the Arts Council East Midlands<sup>1</sup> (as a result of a successful Regional Arts Lottery Programme bid), and managed by Opening the Book<sup>2</sup>. The nine East Midlands public library authorities are as follows:

1. Derby City Council
2. Derbyshire County Council
3. Leicester City Council
4. Leicestershire County Council
5. Lincolnshire County Council
6. Northamptonshire County Council
7. Nottingham City Council
8. Nottinghamshire County Council
9. Rutland County Council.

## 1.2 Black Bytes

Black Bytes is a Black British fiction promotion that was developed by one of the EMERALD specialist project groups, and in 2003 was in place in many public libraries throughout the East Midlands region.

The original focus of the research was on the impact of the Black Bytes promotion on the reader. However, in order to avoid both giving leading questions and obtaining biased responses, it was decided that the evaluation should have a more general focus, investigating people's reading choices, and factors that may affect these choices.

The resulting piece of work gives a detailed picture of the reading, browsing and borrowing habits of 1,047 people in the East Midlands. This is a sufficiently large sample size to enable the collection of statistically significant data, and to provide a rare opportunity to obtain a picture of reading activity across the East Midlands region.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.artscouncil.org.uk/aboutus/contact\\_eastmidlands.html](http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/aboutus/contact_eastmidlands.html)

<sup>2</sup> [www.openingthebook.com](http://www.openingthebook.com)

## 2. Methodology

The findings presented in this report are a reflection of data collected from public libraries within each of the nine local authorities participating in the EMERALD initiative (as listed above). It would be inappropriate to make generalisations as to the universal value and impact of the promotion of Black British fiction based on the data.

However, the following data could be regarded as an indicator that a project with a similar methodology, conducted under similar conditions, would produce comparable results.

### 2.1 Reading habit survey: *What do you like to read?*

The main element of the methodology was to devise, pilot and analyse a brief reading habit survey to be distributed at issue points in a total of 16 libraries in the nine participating authorities before, and a time after, the installation of the *Black Bytes* promotion. This survey would only require respondents to provide their names and contact details if they were happy to be contacted over the phone at a later stage. Distribution of the survey took place in February and May 2003.

In addition, the survey was distributed twice to 5 **control libraries**, libraries that did not participate in the promotion, each in a different EMERALD authority. The aim of this was to avoid any anomalies in the findings of the evaluation, for example it could have been that other factors had influenced respondents' answers, factors that bore no relation to the *Black Bytes* promotion.

The questionnaire consisted of 5 simple questions:

1. During your visit to the library TODAY, what type(s) of book were you looking for?
2. Where did you look for these books?
3. What type of books would you USUALLY borrow from the library?
4. (In the following list), are there any types of book that you would NOT consider reading?
5. What factors usually influence you in your choice of library books?

Following each question there was a series of options, and respondents were asked to tick as many as were relevant to them. For questions 1, 3 and 4, thirteen categories (excluding 'Other') were listed. These were the result of a series of discussions between the researcher and the project group, and were agreed to represent a wide range of the stock available in a typical library in the East Midlands:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Science fiction/fantasy                                 | 8. Crime fiction   |
| 2. Gay/lesbian fiction                                     | 9. 'Chick Lit' e.g. Lisa Jewell,<br>Jane Green, Marian Keyes |
| 3. Black British fiction                                   | 10. Asian fiction in English                                 |
| 4. Family sagas  | 11. Audio books (books on<br>tape/CD)                        |
| 5. Non-fiction   | 12. Literary fiction   |
| 6. Romance fiction   | 13. War/spy/adventure  |
| 7. 'Lad Lit' e.g. Nick Hornby,<br>Irvine Welsh, Mike Gayle |  |

On the survey itself, categories were listed randomly in order to emphasise that all reading choices were equally significant, and that no judgment of the respondent was implicit in the survey.

In addition to the optional anonymity of the respondent, the survey appears to have been very successful in eliciting frank responses, particularly to Question 4 (see 3.5).

### 2.1.1 The respondents

Overall, a total of 1,047 respondents completed the questionnaire, of whom:

- 277 (26.4%) were male
- 572 (54.6%) were female
- 198 (18.9%) chose not to state their gender.

There was a fairly similar number of respondents in each of the age groups over 30 (slightly more in the 70+ group), and considerably less for the 16-19 and 20-29. However, it was encouraging that there were 162 (15.5%) 30-39 year olds (i.e. people who would not normally be regarded as frequent library users).

### 2.1.2 Analysis of reading habits survey

The survey data were interpreted using SPSS, a statistical computer software package for the analysis of quantitative data. Basic frequency tables were produced in order to present the simpler data, and statistical (Pearson's) tests were conducted in order to reveal the more detailed findings that were thought to be of greater practical use to the library staff participating in the EMERALD project.

## 2.2 Interviews with library users

The final element of the methodology was to interview a sample of library users to obtain further information concerning their reading habits and preferences. These interviews were conducted in June-July 2003.

The final element of the evaluation methodology was to interview a sample of library users to obtain further information concerning their reading habits and preferences.

The project group requested that in selecting the sample group, the researcher concentrate on 16-39 year old respondents (i.e. the age group thought to be the least frequent library users), and to give roughly equal weighting to male and female respondents.

Interviewees were selected by cross-tabulating (combining) the following variables:

- Gender
- Age
- If the respondent said that (s)he was happy to be interviewed
- Predominant class of community local to library
- Type of local community (rural/suburban/urban).

This resulted in a total of 16 male and 68 female respondents, from which interviewees were randomly selected. A total of 21 respondents were interviewed in June-July 2003, of which:

- All were aged 16-39
- 8 were male
- 13 were female
- All used libraries that had displayed the Black Bytes promotion.

The group also included respondents from middle, working and mixed class communities, and from rural, suburban and urban areas.

The sample was therefore representative of the overall group of respondents.

## 2.3 Anticipated evaluation outcomes

Using the above methods, the evaluation focused on the following two areas:

1. The impact over time of the promotion on library users, changes in the impact on reading habits and reading confidence, impact on library use. This included the impact on male and female readers.
2. A comparison of the impact of the promotion in different types of libraries, for example of rural, suburban and urban areas, of different ethnic communities, of different class communities.

### 3. Survey findings: *What do you like to read?*

This section presents the findings of the 1,047 questionnaires collected for this project. Table headings described as '(1)' refer to the 551 questionnaires collected in February 2003, those described as '(2)' refer to the 496 collected in May 2003. In order to help the reader, the 'combined valid percentage', given after each pair of data tables, refers to the overall group of 1,047 respondents.

#### 3.1 Gender and Age

- 277 (26.4%) male respondents
- 572 (54.6%) female respondents
- 198 (18.9%) respondents chose not to state their gender.

As the number of male and female respondents varied considerably, this should be taken into account when looking at the overall findings.

There was a fairly similar number of respondents in each of the age groups over 30 (slightly more in the 70+ group, particularly for the second questionnaire), and considerably less for 20-29, and in particular, 16-19. However, it was encouraging that there were 162 (15.5%) 30-39 year olds (i.e. people who would not normally be regarded as frequent library users).

**gender (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	male	155	26.6	28.1	28.1
	female	308	52.9	55.9	84.0
	blank	88	15.1	16.0	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**gender (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	male	122	21.0	24.6	24.6
	female	264	45.4	53.2	77.8
	blank	110	18.9	22.2	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

**your age (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	16-19	28	4.8	5.1	5.1
	20-29	52	8.9	9.4	14.5
	30-39	86	14.8	15.6	30.1
	40-49	79	13.6	14.3	44.5
	50-59	91	15.6	16.5	61.0
	60-69	88	15.1	16.0	77.0
	70+	93	16.0	16.9	93.8
	blank	34	5.8	6.2	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**your age (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	16-19	18	3.1	3.6	3.6
	20-29	51	8.8	10.3	13.9
	30-39	76	13.1	15.4	29.3
	40-49	70	12.0	14.1	43.4
	50-59	79	13.6	16.0	59.4
	60-69	71	12.2	14.3	73.7
	70+	101	17.4	20.4	94.1
	blank	29	5.0	5.9	100.0
	Total	495	85.1	100.0	
Missing	System	87	14.9		
Total		582	100.0		

**3.2 Question One: *During your visit to the library TODAY, what type(s) of book were you looking for?***

**3.2.1 Analysis**

Questions 1 and 3 - *During your visit to the library TODAY, what type(s) of book were you looking for?* and *What type of books would you USUALLY borrow from the library?* - should provide information concerning today’s visit and a typical visit. If just one of these questions had been asked, the resulting data would not necessarily be accurate information regarding reading habits. Presenting two possible cases in this way should guide the respondents to think differently about the books that they have in their hand on that day, and those that they might usually choose. It rules out the ‘one-off’, the atypical example that may skew the results in some way.

For the purposes of the analysis, this means that the findings of Question 3 (Section 3.5) are more useful to the reader.

**3.2.2 Frequency Tables: Question One**

**science fiction/fantasy (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	83	14.3	15.1	15.1
	no	461	79.2	83.7	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**science fiction/fantasy (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	86	14.8	17.3	17.3
	no	407	69.9	82.1	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 16.2%

**gay/lesbian fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	2	.3	.4	.4
	no	542	93.1	98.4	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**gay/lesbian fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	3	.5	.6	.6
	no	490	84.2	98.8	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 0.5%

**black british fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	12	2.1	2.2	2.2
	no	532	91.4	96.6	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**black british fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	20	3.4	4.0	4.0
	no	473	81.3	95.4	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 3.1%

**family sagas (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	132	22.7	24.0	24.0
	no	412	70.8	74.8	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**family sagas (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	142	24.4	28.6	28.6
	no	351	60.3	70.8	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 26.3%

**non-fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	278	47.8	50.5	50.5
	no	266	45.7	48.3	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**non-fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	219	37.6	44.2	44.2
	no	273	46.9	55.2	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	495	85.1	100.0	
Missing	System	87	14.9		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 47.4%

**romance fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	98	16.8	17.8	17.8
	no	446	76.6	80.9	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**romance fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	117	20.1	23.7	23.7
	no	374	64.3	75.7	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	494	84.9	100.0	
Missing	System	88	15.1		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 20.8%

**lad lit (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	12	2.1	2.2	2.2
	no	532	91.4	96.6	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**lad lit (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	20	3.4	4.0	4.0
	no	472	81.1	95.4	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	495	85.1	100.0	
Missing	System	87	14.9		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 3.1%

**crime fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	210	36.1	38.1	38.1
	no	334	57.4	60.6	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**crime fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	186	32.0	37.5	37.5
	no	307	52.7	61.9	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 37.8%

**chick lit (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	30	5.2	5.4	5.4
	no	514	88.3	93.3	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**chick lit (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	40	6.9	8.1	8.1
	no	452	77.7	91.3	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	495	85.1	100.0	
Missing	System	87	14.9		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 6.8%

**asian fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	12	2.1	2.2	2.2
	no	532	91.4	96.6	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**asian fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	10	1.7	2.0	2.0
	no	483	83.0	97.4	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 2.1%

**audio books (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	45	7.7	8.2	8.2
	no	499	85.7	90.6	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**audio books (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	35	6.0	7.1	7.1
	no	458	78.7	92.3	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 7.7%

**literary fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	101	17.4	18.3	18.3
	no	443	76.1	80.4	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**literary fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	114	19.6	23.0	23.0
	no	379	65.1	76.4	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 20.7%

**war/spy/adventure (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	108	18.6	19.6	19.6
	no	436	74.9	79.1	98.7
	blank	7	1.2	1.3	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**war/spy/adventure (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	108	18.6	21.8	21.8
	no	385	66.2	77.6	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 20.7%

### 3.3 Question Two: *Where did you look for these books?*

#### 3.3.1 Analysis

By far the most popular location for choosing books was - perhaps unsurprisingly - the library shelves (74.1% of respondents selected this category). The returns trolley was predictably popular (44.4%), yet even more popular were the displays of new books (48.8%). Perhaps strangely, 'other displays or promotions' received a far lower percentage (16.8%), with the library catalogue the least popular choice (15.7%).

It would therefore appear that people are more interested in new books than in themed displays. However, it should be taken into account that respondents could have interpreted the question in different ways. For example, there could be some confusion between 'new' books that have recently been published, and 'new' books that are simply new (often paperback) copies of previously unpublished books. If a display and display materials have been recently installed in a library, they could be regarded as 'new' books.

#### 3.3.2 Gender

If responses to Q.2 are divided by gender, there were very few noticeable differences between the responses of male and female respondents, as the table (below) illustrates. The data suggest that overall women tend to look at displays and the returns trolley more, and the library catalogue less, than men.

**Table to show the percentage of respondents who answered 'yes' to question 2 'Where did you look for these books?'**

N.B. 1 = 1<sup>st</sup> questionnaire, 2 = 2<sup>nd</sup> questionnaire.

	Male 1 (%)	Female 1 (%)	Male 2 (%)	Female 2 (%)
Displays of new books	49.0	45.8	45.9	52.7
The returns trolley	43.2	43.2	35.2	45.1
The library catalogue	18.1	14.6	22.1	15.2
Other displays or promotions	14.2	19.6	18.0	19.3
On the shelf	80.6	72.5	75.4	72.0

### 3.3.3 Frequency Tables: Question Two

**displays of new books (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	263	45.2	47.7	47.7
	no	283	48.6	51.4	99.1
	blank	5	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**displays of new books (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	247	42.4	49.8	49.8
	no	245	42.1	49.4	99.2
	blank	4	.7	.8	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 48.8%

**returns trolley (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	243	41.8	44.1	44.1
	no	303	52.1	55.0	99.1
	blank	5	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**returns trolley (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	221	38.0	44.6	44.6
	no	271	46.6	54.6	99.2
	blank	4	.7	.8	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 44.4%

**library catalogue (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	80	13.7	14.5	14.5
	no	466	80.1	84.6	99.1
	blank	5	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**library catalogue (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	84	14.4	16.9	16.9
	no	408	70.1	82.3	99.2
	blank	4	.7	.8	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 15.7%

**other displays or promotions (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	87	14.9	15.8	15.8
	no	459	78.9	83.3	99.1
	blank	5	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**other displays or promotions (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	88	15.1	17.7	17.7
	no	404	69.4	81.5	99.2
	blank	4	.7	.8	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 16.8%

**on the shelf (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	419	72.0	76.0	76.0
	no	127	21.8	23.0	99.1
	blank	5	.9	.9	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**on the shelf (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	358	61.5	72.2	72.2
	no	134	23.0	27.0	99.2
	blank	4	.7	.8	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 74.1%

### 3.4 Question Three: *What type of books would you USUALLY borrow from the library?*

#### 3.4.1 Analysis

Responses to this question are considered here in more detail than those to Q.1, as they are more likely to accurately represent respondents' reading choices in general, not only those choices they may have made on one particular visit to the library.

The most popular choices were again non-fiction (52.4%) and crime fiction (43.2% of responses). 1.0% of responses were for gay/lesbian fiction as a usual reading preference, 3.5% for Black British fiction and 2.8% for Asian fiction. The percentage of respondents who usually read 'lad lit' and 'chick lit' was slightly higher for this question (4.2% and 8.6% respectively) than for Q.1 (3.1% and 6.8%).

Family sagas, romance fiction, war/spy/adventure and literary fiction were similarly popular, with a relatively small margin of 24.1% - 29.6%.

#### 3.4.2 Gender

If responses to Question 3 are divided by gender (see tables below), again there is reasonably little difference between the responses of male and female respondents. Apart from genuine coincidence, there could be two possible explanations for this:

- That respondents were choosing books for someone else
- That respondents have noted down what they felt that they *should* be reading.

With both male and female readers, non-fiction and crime fiction were the most popular choices, and Asian, gay/lesbian and Black British fiction the least popular.

Table to show the percentage of male respondents who answered 'yes' to question 3 'What type of books would you USUALLY borrow from the library?' Categories in descending order of popularity.

### FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE

		Male (%)
1	Non-fiction	57.4
2	Crime fiction	48.4
3	War/spy/adventure	36.8
4	Literary fiction	26.5
5	Science fiction/fantasy	23.9
6	Audio books	13.5
7	Family sagas	10.3
8	Romance fiction	5.8
9	'Lad lit'	5.2
10	Black British fiction	3.2
11=	'Chick lit'	0.6
11=	Asian fiction	0.6
13	Gay/lesbian fiction	0.0

### SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE

		Male (%)
1	Non-fiction	51.1
2	Crime fiction	41.6
3	Family sagas	29.9
4	Romance fiction	25.5
5	Literary fiction	24.8
6	War/spy/adventure	23.4
7	Science fiction/fantasy	17.5
8	'Chick lit'	13.1
9	Audio books	8.0
10	'Lad lit'	5.8
11=	Black British fiction	2.9
11=	Gay/lesbian fiction	2.9
13	Asian fiction	2.2

Table to show the percentage of female respondents who answered 'yes' to question 3 'What type of books would you USUALLY borrow from the library?' Categories in descending order of popularity.

### FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE

		Female (%)
1	Non-fiction	51.9
2	Crime fiction	42.2
3	Family sagas	33.4
4	Romance fiction	32.1
5	Literary fiction	24.4
6	Science fiction/fantasy	14.6
7	War/spy/adventure	13.3
8	'Chick lit'	11.4
9	Audio books	10.1
10	Asian fiction	3.9
11	'Lad lit'	3.6
12	Black British fiction	1.6
13	Gay/lesbian fiction	0.6

### SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE

		Female (%)
1	Non-fiction	47.9
2	Crime fiction	43.7
3	Family sagas	33.0
4 =	War/spy/adventure	28.7
4 =	Romance fiction	28.7
6	Literary fiction	28.0
7	Science fiction/fantasy	21.8
8	Audio books	10.3
9	'Chick lit'	8.0
10	Black British fiction	6.9
11	'Lad lit'	5.7
12	Asian fiction	3.4
13	Gay/lesbian fiction	1.5

### 3.4.3 Correlations (using a Pearson’s test)

It would be interesting to know if there was a direct correlation between two variables: for example, is there a link between those respondents who will read Black British fiction but will not read Asian fiction?

Statistical tests were carried out for each of the five possible answers to Question 2, with each of the possible answers to Question 3, in order to determine whether there is a link between respondents’ choice of book and method of searching for books. The results are presented below.

N.B. Each correlation listed in the following tables is of potential interest and value to library staff. In addition, elements thought by the researcher to be particularly noticeable or relevant have been highlighted.

#### Explanation of terms used in tables below:

- ‘**Not significant**’ denotes that there is no particular significant relationship between the 2 variables, e.g. in **table a.** below, if a person usually reads *science fiction/fantasy*, it is unlikely that he/she would look for these books in the *displays of new books*.
- ‘**Significant**’ denotes that the relationship between the 2 variables is significant, e.g. in **table a.** below, if a person usually reads *literary fiction*, it is likely that he/she would look for these books in the *displays of new books*.
- ‘**Highly significant**’ denotes that the relationship between the 2 variables is highly significant, e.g. in **table a.** below, if a person usually reads *gay/lesbian fiction*, it is highly likely that he/she would look for these books in the *displays of new books*.

#### FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE

##### a. Displays of new books

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
Science fiction/fantasy Chick Lit Asian Crime	Literary	Gay/lesbian Black British Family Non-fiction Romance Lad lit Crime War/spy/adventure

**b. The returns trolley**

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
<b>Science fiction/fantasy</b> Non-fiction Romance Lad lit Chick lit Asian Audio	Gay/lesbian Black British War/spy/adventure	Family sagas Crime Literary

**c. The library catalogue**

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
Family sagas Non-fiction Romance Crime Asian Literary War/spy/adventure		<b>Science fiction/fantasy</b> Gay/lesbian Black British Lad lit Chick lit Audio

**d. Other displays or promotions**

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
<b>Science fiction/fantasy</b> Romance Asian	Non-fiction Crime Audio	Gay/lesbian Black British Family sagas Lad lit Chick lit Literary War/spy/adventure

**e. On the shelf**

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
<b>Science fiction/fantasy</b> Family sagas Non-fiction <b>Romance</b> Asian Audio	Chick lit War/spy/adventure	Gay/lesbian Black British Lad lit Crime fiction Literary

## SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE

### a. Displays of new books

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
Science fiction/fantasy Romance Chick lit	Gay/lesbian Non-fiction Crime Asian	Black British Family sagas Lad lit Audio Literary War/spy/adventure

### b. The returns trolley

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
Science fiction/fantasy Gay/lesbian Black British Non-fiction Lad lit Chick lit Asian Audio		Family sagas Romance Crime Literary War/spy/adventure

### c. The library catalogue

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
Black British Family sagas Romance Crime Chick lit Audio War/spy/adventure	Literary	Science fiction/fantasy Gay/lesbian Non-fiction Lad lit Asian

### d. Other displays or promotions

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
Science fiction/fantasy Family sagas Romance Asian	Gay/lesbian Black British Chick Lit	Non-fiction Lad lit Crime Audio Literary War/spy/adventure

e. On the shelf

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
<p>Science fiction/fantasy                      Family sagas                      Romance                      Crime                      Chick Lit</p>	<p>Non-fiction                      Lad Lit</p>	<p>Gay/lesbian                      Black British                      Asian                      Audio                      Crime                      Literary                      War/spy/adventure</p>

### 3.4.4 Black British Fiction readers

Statistical tests were also conducted on the data collected from these respondents only, in order to provide detailed information about the reading choices of this user group.

#### Gender

35 respondents noted that they ‘usually’ read Black British fiction when selecting books from the public library:

- 12 male
- 19 female
- 4 chose not to state their gender.

#### Age

While acknowledging the relatively small size of the sample group, the findings suggest that no particular age group favours Black British fiction more than another (see cross-tabulation tables below).

**black british fiction (1) \* your age \* gender Crosstabulation**

Count		your age							Total	
		16-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+		blank
male	black britis yes				1	1	2	1		5
	fiction (1) no	4	17	16	17	30	33	32	1	150
	Total	4	17	16	18	31	35	33	1	155
female	black britis yes	3			1	1				5
	fiction (1) no	17	29	59	59	52	40	40	3	299
	blank		1	2				1		4
Total		20	30	61	60	53	40	41	3	308
blank	black britis no	4	5	9	1	7	13	19	28	86
	fiction (1) blank								2	2
	Total	4	5	9	1	7	13	19	30	88

**black british fiction (2) \* your age \* gender Crosstabulation**

Count

gender		your age							Total	
		16-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+		blank
male	black british yes			1	2		1	3		7
	fiction (2) no	2	11	20	15	18	18	23	6	113
	blank					1				1
	Total	2	11	21	17	19	19	26	6	121
female	black british yes	1	4	2	5		1	1		14
	fiction (2) no	13	26	45	40	45	29	45	6	249
	blank					1				1
	Total	14	30	47	45	46	30	46	6	264
blank	black british yes		1				2	1		4
	fiction (2) no	2	9	8	8	14	20	27	17	105
	blank							1		1
	Total	2	10	8	8	14	22	29	17	110

**3.4.5 Black British fiction readers: *Where did you look for these books?***

The following tables present the results further statistical tests that were conducted in order to investigate the relationship between choosing to borrow Black British Fiction (question 3) and where to look for books (question 2).

To explain this more fully, the test was used to find out if from the data it is possible to infer that if a person reads Black British fiction, then he or she is also likely/highly likely to look for these books in x location (where x = one of the five possible variables: displays of new books, the returns trolley, the library catalogue, other displays or promotions, on the shelf).

- ‘**Not significant**’ denotes that there is no particular significant relationship between the 2 variables, e.g. in the second table below, if a person usually reads *Black British fiction*, it is unlikely that he/she would look for these books on the *returns trolley*.
- ‘**Significant**’ denotes that the relationship between the 2 variables is significant, e.g. in the first table below, if a person usually reads *Black British fiction*, it is likely that he/she would look for these books on the *returns trolley*.
- ‘**Highly significant**’ denotes that the relationship between the 2 variables is highly significant, e.g. in the first table below, if a person usually reads *Black British fiction*, it is highly likely that he/she would look for these books in the *displays of new books*.

N.B. It is important always to bear in mind the relatively small size of the sample group.

**FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE**

<b>Not Significant</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Highly Significant</b>
	Returns trolley	Displays of new books Library catalogue Other displays and promotions On the shelf

**SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE**

<b>Not Significant</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Highly Significant</b>
Returns trolley Library catalogue	Other displays and promotions	Displays of new books On the shelf

As the findings varied from the first to the second questionnaire, the only significant point to make here is that Black British fiction should be promoted to this and similar groups using a wide range of display methods, as its readers do not seem to particularly favour one method over another.

### 3.4.6 Black British fiction readers: *What factors influence you in your choice of library books?*

Pearson’s tests (as explained above) were conducted to investigate the statistical relationship between choosing to borrow Black British Fiction (question 3) and factors influencing choice of library books (question 5).

- ‘**Not significant**’ denotes that there is no particular significant relationship between the 2 variables, e.g. in the first table below, if a person usually reads *Black British fiction*, it is unlikely that he/she would look for these books from *displays in the library*.
- ‘**Significant**’ denotes that the relationship between the 2 variables is significant, e.g. in the first table below, if a person usually reads *Black British fiction*, it is likely that he/she would look for these books on the *returns trolley*.
- ‘**Highly significant**’ denotes that the relationship between the 2 variables is highly significant, e.g. in the first table below, if a person usually reads *Black British fiction*, it is highly likely that he/she would look for these books on the *Internet*.

#### FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
Display in the library	Returns trolley Media review Friends Prize winners	Internet Bookshop Library Staff Current events

#### SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE

Not Significant	Significant	Highly Significant
Returns trolley Internet Media review Bookshop Library staff Friends Current events	Prize winners	Display in the library

A similar conclusion can be drawn here as for 3.4.5, that Black British fiction readers do not appear to be more influenced by one particular factor than another when choosing their library books.

### 3.4.7 Black British fiction readers and Asian fiction readers

There is a highly significant statistical relationship between the ‘Black British’ and ‘Asian’ fiction variables for question 3. Where it is indicated in the tables (below) that ‘correlation is significant at the 0.01 level’, this means that if a person usually reads Black British fiction, it is highly likely that he or she would also usually read Asian fiction. This statement is valid for both the first and second questionnaires.

#### FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE

##### Correlations

		black british fiction (1)	asian fiction (1)
black british fiction (1)	Pearson Correlation	1	.515**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	551	551
asian fiction (1)	Pearson Correlation	.515**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	551	551

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

#### SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE

##### Correlations

		black british fiction (2)	asian fiction (2)
black british fiction (2)	Pearson Correlation	1	.324**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	496	496
asian fiction (2)	Pearson Correlation	.324**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	496	496

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

This information could be of value to library staff promoting Black British and Asian fiction, as it would appear that the two should be promoted similarly - and could reasonably be promoted together.

### 3.4.8 Frequency Tables: Question Three

**science fiction/fantasy (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	97	16.7	17.6	17.6
	no	448	77.0	81.3	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**science fiction/fantasy (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	101	17.4	20.4	20.4
	no	392	67.4	79.0	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 19.0%

**gay/lesbian fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	2	.3	.4	.4
	no	543	93.3	98.5	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**gay/lesbian fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	8	1.4	1.6	1.6
	no	485	83.3	97.8	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 1.0%

**black british fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	10	1.7	1.8	1.8
	no	535	91.9	97.1	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**black british fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	26	4.5	5.2	5.2
	no	467	80.2	94.2	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 3.5%

**family sagas (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	151	25.9	27.4	27.4
	no	394	67.7	71.5	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**family sagas (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	157	27.0	31.7	31.7
	no	336	57.7	67.7	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 29.6%

**non-fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	302	51.9	54.8	54.8
	no	243	41.8	44.1	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**non-fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	248	42.6	50.0	50.0
	no	245	42.1	49.4	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 52.4%.

**romance fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	128	22.0	23.2	23.2
	no	417	71.6	75.7	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**romance fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	136	23.4	27.4	27.4
	no	357	61.3	72.0	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 25.3%

**lad lit (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	20	3.4	3.6	3.6
	no	525	90.2	95.3	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**lad lit (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	24	4.1	4.8	4.8
	no	469	80.6	94.6	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 4.2%

**crime fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	235	40.4	42.6	42.6
	no	310	53.3	56.3	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**crime fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	217	37.3	43.8	43.8
	no	275	47.3	55.6	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	495	85.1	100.0	
Missing	System	87	14.9		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 43.2%

**chick lit (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	43	7.4	7.8	7.8
	no	502	86.3	91.1	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**chick lit (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	46	7.9	9.3	9.3
	no	447	76.8	90.1	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 8.6%

**asian fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	13	2.2	2.4	2.4
	no	532	91.4	96.6	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**asian fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	16	2.7	3.2	3.2
	no	477	82.0	96.2	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 2.8%

**audio books (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	59	10.1	10.7	10.7
	no	486	83.5	88.2	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**audio books (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	47	8.1	9.5	9.5
	no	446	76.6	89.9	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 10.1%

**literary fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	140	24.1	25.4	25.4
	no	405	69.6	73.5	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**literary fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	136	23.4	27.4	27.4
	no	357	61.3	72.0	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 26.4%

**war/spy/adventure (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	115	19.8	20.9	20.9
	no	430	73.9	78.0	98.9
	blank	6	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**war/spy/adventure (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	135	23.2	27.2	27.2
	no	358	61.5	72.2	99.4
	blank	3	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 24.1%

### 3.5 Question Four: *...are there any types of book that you would NOT consider reading?*

#### 3.5.1 Analysis

Although for the previous question there was little difference in the number of respondents who usually read Black British or Asian fiction (3.5%/2.8% respectively), it is notable that this is not the case here (32.2%/44.6% respectively). There therefore appears to be less reluctance to read Black British fiction than Asian fiction.

Non-fiction and literary fiction were the least unpopular reading choices: just 4.3% of respondents noted that they would not be prepared to read the former, and 12.8% that they would not read the latter. Gay and lesbian fiction was the least popular reading choice, as 63.4% of respondents were not prepared to read books in this category.

Black British fiction was 4.3% less unpopular with respondents to the second questionnaire, which could suggest that the Black Bytes promotion had affected their response<sup>3</sup>. Similarly, Asian fiction was 5.7% less unpopular in the second questionnaire.

---

<sup>3</sup> For further information concerning the overall impact of the Black Bytes promotion, see Section 4, 'Comparison of control and non-control libraries: a longitudinal investigation of the impact of the Black Bytes promotion'.

### 3.5.2 Gender

The following tables list categories in ascending order of popularity for male and female respondents.

Combined valid percentage (for both questionnaires) of MALE respondents who answered 'yes' to question 4 'In the following list, are there any types of book that you would NOT consider reading?' Table begins with least popular type of book.

		Male (%)
1	Gay/lesbian fiction	73.6
2	Romance fiction	62.0
3	'Chick lit'	54.5
4	Asian fiction	53.8
5	Black British fiction	37.8
6	Audio books	34.9
7	Family sagas	34.6
8	Science fiction/fantasy	32.9
9	'Lad lit'	31.9
10	Crime fiction	13.9
11	Literary fiction	13.0
12	War/spy/adventure	9.9
13	Non-fiction	2.7

Combined valid percentage (for both questionnaires) of FEMALE respondents who answered 'yes' to question 4 'In the following list, are there any types of book that you would NOT consider reading?' Table begins with least popular type of book.

		Female (%)
1	Gay/lesbian fiction	61.8
2	Science fiction/fantasy	47.0
3	Asian fiction	43.5
4	War/spy/adventure	31.1
5	Black British fiction	30.3
6	'Lad lit'	30.1
7	'Chick lit'	27.3
8	Romance fiction	25.2
9	Audio books	24.2
10	Crime fiction	15.6
11	Literary fiction	13.6
12	Family sagas	9.8
13	Non-fiction	4.6

Both male and female respondents would be less prepared to read gay/lesbian fiction, and more prepared to read non-fiction, than any other category. Romance fiction was unpopular with male respondents, and science fiction/fantasy with female respondents. Literary fiction and crime fiction were similarly popular. A higher percentage of male than female readers would not read Asian or Black British fiction.

### 3.5.3 Correlations: Asian fiction and Black British fiction

There is a definite correlation (or link) between those respondents who would not read Asian fiction and would not read Black British fiction. Where it is indicated in the tables (below) that ‘correlation is significant at the 0.01 level’, this means that if a person would not read Asian fiction, it is also highly likely that he or she would not read Black British fiction. This statement is valid for both the first and second questionnaires:

#### First questionnaire

**Correlations**

		asian fiction	black british fiction
asian fiction	Pearson Correlation	1	.689**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	551	551
black british fiction	Pearson Correlation	.689**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	551	551

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

#### Second questionnaire

**Correlations**

		black british fiction (2)	asian fiction (2)
black british fiction (2)	Pearson Correlation	1	.603**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	496	496
asian fiction (2)	Pearson Correlation	.603**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	496	496

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Explanation of tables: We know that there is a strong link if the significance is less than 0.5. In this case, the figure is absolute zero (0.000), which means that those respondents who would not read Asian fiction would also not read Black British fiction.

### 3.5.4 Correlations: gay/lesbian fiction and Black British fiction

Again, there is a definite correlation between respondents who would not read gay/lesbian fiction and would not read Black British fiction. Where correlation is significant, this means that if a person would not read gay/lesbian fiction, it is also highly likely that he or she would not read Black British fiction (valid for both questionnaires).

#### First questionnaire

**Correlations**

		gay/lesbian fiction	black british fiction
gay/lesbian fiction	Pearson Correlation	1	.645**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	551	551
black british fiction	Pearson Correlation	.645**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	551	551

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

#### Second questionnaire

**Correlations**

		black british fiction (2)	gay/lesbian fiction (2)
black british fiction (2)	Pearson Correlation	1	.549**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	496	496
gay/lesbian fiction (2)	Pearson Correlation	.549**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	496	496

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### 3.5.5 Frequency Tables: Question Four

**N.B. 'Yes' = would not consider reading.**

**science fiction/fantasy (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	247	42.4	44.8	44.8
	no	272	46.7	49.4	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**science fiction/fantasy (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	191	32.8	38.5	38.5
	no	292	50.2	58.9	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 41.7%

**gay/lesbian fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	353	60.7	64.1	64.1
	no	166	28.5	30.1	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**gay/lesbian fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	313	53.8	63.1	63.1
	no	170	29.2	34.3	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 63.4%

**black british fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	189	32.5	34.3	34.3
	no	330	56.7	59.9	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**black british fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	149	25.6	30.0	30.0
	no	334	57.4	67.3	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 32.2%

**family sagas (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	98	16.8	17.8	17.8
	no	421	72.3	76.4	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**family sagas (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	81	13.9	16.3	16.3
	no	402	69.1	81.0	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 17.1%

**non-fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	26	4.5	4.7	4.7
	no	493	84.7	89.5	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**non-fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	19	3.3	3.8	3.8
	no	464	79.7	93.5	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 4.3%

**romance fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	207	35.6	37.6	37.6
	no	312	53.6	56.6	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**romance fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	166	28.5	33.5	33.5
	no	317	54.5	63.9	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 35.6%

**lad lit (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	180	30.9	32.7	32.7
	no	339	58.2	61.5	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**lad lit (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	136	23.4	27.5	27.5
	no	346	59.5	69.9	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	495	85.1	100.0	
Missing	System	87	14.9		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 30.1%

**crime fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	82	14.1	14.9	14.9
	no	437	75.1	79.3	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**crime fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	69	11.9	13.9	13.9
	no	414	71.1	83.5	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 14.4%

**chick lit (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	211	36.3	38.3	38.3
	no	308	52.9	55.9	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**chick lit (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	158	27.1	31.9	31.9
	no	324	55.7	65.5	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	495	85.1	100.0	
Missing	System	87	14.9		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 35.1%

**asian fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	261	44.8	47.4	47.4
	no	258	44.3	46.8	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**asian fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	207	35.6	41.7	41.7
	no	276	47.4	55.6	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 44.6%

**audio books (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	156	26.8	28.3	28.3
	no	363	62.4	65.9	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**audio books (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	128	22.0	25.8	25.8
	no	355	61.0	71.6	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 27.1%

**literary fiction (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	72	12.4	13.1	13.1
	no	447	76.8	81.1	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**literary fiction (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	62	10.7	12.5	12.5
	no	421	72.3	84.9	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 12.8%

**war/spy/adventure (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	128	22.0	23.2	23.2
	no	391	67.2	71.0	94.2
	blank	32	5.5	5.8	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**war/spy/adventure (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	106	18.2	21.4	21.4
	no	377	64.8	76.0	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

N.B. Combined valid percentage (yes): 22.3%

### **3.6 What factors usually influence you in your choice of library books?**

#### **3.6.1 Analysis**

The factor that most affected choice of library books was the 'display in the library' (57.6%). Friends' recommendations and, perhaps less predictably, newspaper/magazine/TV review, received very similar levels of response (46.2% and 44.3% respectively).

The returns trolley and books seen in a bookshop were also common influences, with 38.5% and 38.8% respectively.

The help given by library staff was considerably less popular, with only 20.6% of respondents ticking this category.

Least popular overall were 'current events', 'prize winners' and the Internet (16.4%, 17.3%, 7.9%).

The clear message to emerge from the frequency tables (3.6.3) and the division of responses by gender (3.6.2) is that the effectiveness of promotion is enhanced if the power of display, and of reader to reader recommendation, is not overlooked.

### 3.6.2 Gender

Combined valid percentage of MALE respondents who answered ‘yes’ to question 5 ‘What factors usually influence you in your choice of library books?’ Categories in descending order of popularity.

		Male (%)
1	Display in the library	63.2
2	Newspaper/magazine/TV review	45.6
3	Friends’ recommendation	35.7
4=	Returns trolley	34.8
4=	Bookshop	34.8
6	Current events	18.0
7	Library staff recommendation	16.8
8	‘Prize winners’	13.9
9	Internet	10.2

Combined valid percentage of FEMALE respondents who answered ‘yes’ to question 5 ‘What factors usually influence you in your choice of library books?’ Categories in descending order of popularity.

		Female (%)
1	Display in the library	59.9
2	Friends’ recommendation	54.6
3	Newspaper/magazine/TV review	47.3
4	Bookshop	44.3
5	Returns trolley	40.4
6	Library staff recommendation	23.3
7	‘Prize winners’	21.7
8	Current events	17.4
9	Internet	7.6

### 3.6.3 Frequency Tables: Question Five

**display in the library (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	320	55.0	58.1	58.1
	no	200	34.4	36.3	94.4
	blank	31	5.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**display in the library (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	282	48.5	57.0	57.0
	no	200	34.4	40.4	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	495	85.1	100.0	
Missing	System	87	14.9		
Total		582	100.0		

Combined valid percentage (yes): 57.6%

**I saw it on the returns trolley (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	209	35.9	37.9	37.9
	no	311	53.4	56.4	94.4
	blank	31	5.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**I saw it on the returns trolley (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	194	33.3	39.1	39.1
	no	288	49.5	58.1	97.2
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	99.8
	21.00	1	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

Combined valid percentage (yes): 38.5%

**internet (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	43	7.4	7.8	7.8
	no	477	82.0	86.6	94.4
	blank	31	5.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**internet (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	39	6.7	7.9	7.9
	no	444	76.3	89.5	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

Combined valid percentage (yes): 7.9%

**newspaper/magazine/TV review (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	254	43.6	46.1	46.1
	no	266	45.7	48.3	94.4
	blank	31	5.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**newspaper/magazine/TV review (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	211	36.3	42.5	42.5
	no	272	46.7	54.8	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

Combined valid percentage (yes): 44.3%

**I saw it in a bookshop (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	224	38.5	40.7	40.7
	no	296	50.9	53.7	94.4
	blank	31	5.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**I saw it in a bookshop (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	183	31.4	36.9	36.9
	no	300	51.5	60.5	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

Combined valid percentage (yes): 38.8%

**library staff recommendation (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	107	18.4	19.4	19.4
	no	413	71.0	75.0	94.4
	blank	31	5.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**library staff recommendation (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	108	18.6	21.8	21.8
	no	374	64.3	75.6	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	495	85.1	100.0	
Missing	System	87	14.9		
Total		582	100.0		

Combined valid percentage (yes): 20.6%

**friends' recommendation (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	252	43.3	45.7	45.7
	no	268	46.0	48.6	94.4
	blank	31	5.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**friends' recommendation (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	231	39.7	46.6	46.6
	no	252	43.3	50.8	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

Combined valid percentage (yes): 46.2%

**current events (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	91	15.6	16.5	16.5
	no	429	73.7	77.9	94.4
	blank	31	5.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**current events (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	81	13.9	16.3	16.3
	no	402	69.1	81.0	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

Combined valid percentage (yes): 16.4%

**prizewinners (1)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	92	15.8	16.7	16.7
	no	428	73.5	77.7	94.4
	blank	31	5.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	551	94.7	100.0	
Missing	System	31	5.3		
Total		582	100.0		

**prizewinners (2)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	89	15.3	17.9	17.9
	no	394	67.7	79.4	97.4
	blank	13	2.2	2.6	100.0
	Total	496	85.2	100.0	
Missing	System	86	14.8		
Total		582	100.0		

Combined valid percentage (yes): 17.3%

## 4. Comparison of control and non-control libraries: a longitudinal investigation of the impact of the Black Bytes promotion

### 4.1 Context

A key element of the evaluation methodology was the creation of five ‘control’ libraries, i.e. libraries in which the Black Bytes promotion would not be installed. 25 questionnaires were given to one library in each of five of the nine participating authorities, i.e. Derby City, Derbyshire, Leicester City, Northamptonshire and Nottingham City. The control questionnaires were distributed twice, at the same time as the 16 libraries with the Black Bytes promotion.

This enabled an investigation as to whether the Black Bytes promotion had a noticeable impact on the fiction borrowing habits of the library user. The results of the investigation are presented in the table below. For full results for each individual question, see previous analysis for questions 1-5 (sections 3.2 to 3.6 inclusive).

### 4.2 Analysis

The table (below) shows the percentage of change (positive or negative) between the data in the first and second questionnaires, for the control and non-control libraries in the evaluation.

If the Black Bytes promotion had a positive effect on reading choices, this would mean that more people chose to read Black British fiction, and fewer people chose not to read Black British fiction. The expected results for this category would therefore be:

- Question 1: A positive figure in Column C
- Question 3: A positive figure in Column C
- Question 4: A negative figure in Column C.

The higher the number (either positive or negative), the greater the impact.

The results are as follows:

- Question 1: +1.7% (18 respondents)
- Question 3: +3.9% (41 respondents)
- Question 4: -6.2% (65 respondents).

Questions 1 and 3: Looking at the books that respondents either chose ‘today’ or would ‘usually’ choose, there was an increase of 1.7% and 3.9% (18 and 41 respondents respectively) in the number of people reading Black British fiction.

Question 4: Whereas the number of respondents from control libraries (libraries without the promotion) that would not read Black British fiction has increased slightly (1.7% or 18 respondents), there was a 6.2% reduction in the number of

people from non-control libraries who would not read this genre. This equates to 65 respondents.

### 4.3 Further analysis

Other interesting conclusions to draw from the above table are as follows:

- Questions 2 and 5: respondents' response to book displays or promotions remained relatively unchanged throughout the period of the evaluation.
- Question 3: *Asian fiction* appears to have grown in popularity in those libraries that had the Black Bytes promotion.
- Question 4: *literary fiction* is the only genre that respondents (from libraries with the promotion) to the second questionnaire would be less likely to consider reading than those who responded to the first questionnaire.

### 4.4 Table to show the percentage of change between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> questionnaires

N.B. Where figures are highlighted, this indicates a change in respondents' reading habits and choices that could be attributed in part to the Black Bytes promotion.

COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C	COLUMN D
Question no.	Categories	% change (+/-) LIBRARIES WITH BLACK BYTES	% change (+/-) LIBRARIES WITHOUT BLACK BYTES
1. During your visit to the library TODAY, what type(s) of books were you looking for?	Science fiction/fantasy	+2.6	+1.0
	Gay/lesbian fiction	+0.8	-1.6
	Black British fiction	+1.7	+2.6
	Family sagas	+2.7	+10.8
	Non-fiction	-6.2	-5.8
	Romance fiction	+6.9	+2.0
	Lad Lit	+1.4	+3.4
	Crime fiction	-0.3	-1.5
	Chick Lit	+2.0	+4.5
	Asian fiction	+1.0	-4.0
	Audio books	-2.5	+3.6
	Literary fiction	+3.4	+9.1
	War/spy/adventure	-0.2	+10.1

<b>2. Where did you look for these books?</b>	Displays of new books	-0.1	+6.4
	The returns trolley	-1.5	+7.1
	The library catalogue	+1.6	+5.0
	Other displays or promotions	+0.5	+6.6
	On the shelf	-2.3	-8.8
<b>3. What type of books would you USUALLY borrow from the library?</b>	Science fiction/fantasy	+2.0	+5.2
	Gay/lesbian fiction	+1.9	-0.8
	Black British fiction	+3.9	+1.8
	Family sagas	+3.7	+5.8
	Non-fiction	-3.7	-8.2
	Romance fiction	+4.7	+2.4
	Lad Lit	+1.2	+1.1
	Crime fiction	+1.2	+1.2
	Chick Lit	+0.8	+3.8
	Asian fiction	+1.8	-2.3
	Audio books	-1.7	+0.4
	Literary fiction	+1.4	+4.4
	War/spy/adventure	+6.3	+6.9
<b>4. In the following list, are there any types of book that you would NOT consider reading?</b>	Science fiction/fantasy	-9.5	+4.5
	Gay/lesbian fiction	-1.2	-0.1
	Black British fiction	-6.2	+1.7
	Family sagas	-1.2	-2.4
	Non-fiction	-0.2	-3.1
	Romance fiction	-4.1	-4.0
	Lad Lit	-7.8	+3.2
	Crime fiction	-2.0	+2.4
	Chick Lit	-6.6	-5.6
	Asian fiction	-5.4	-6.7
	Audio books	-2.5	-2.7
	Literary fiction	+1.7	-18.3
	War/spy/adventure	-3.4	+3.0
<b>5. What factors usually influence you in your choice of library books?</b>	Display in the library	-1.5	+0.3
	I saw it on the returns trolley	-1.6	+10.9
	Internet	+0.4	-1.2
	Newspaper/magazine/TV review	-5.5	+3.4
	I saw it in a bookshop	-4.8	-
	Library staff recommendation	+2.1	+3.5
	Friends' recommendation	+0.3	+2.3
	Current events	-0.8	+1.8
	'Prize winners'	-	+5.6

## 5. Comparison of libraries of different types

This section presents the results of a series of comparisons of the data collected from libraries of different types. A project representative from each of the 21 libraries participating in this evaluation was asked to define his/her library in the following ways:

- Is the library in a rural/urban/suburban community?
- Is the library in a predominantly white/Black/mixed/Asian community?
- Is the library in a predominantly middle/working/mixed class community?

The findings of these comparisons are presented in the following three sections.

### 5.1 Nature of community

#### 5.1.1 Context

Number of respondents in each type of community:

- Rural: 192
  - Urban: 458
  - Suburban: 397
- Total = 1,047.

#### 5.1.2 Analysis

There are minimal apparent differences between the reading choices of respondents using libraries in rural, urban or suburban areas. However, observations such as the following can be made:

- Questions 1 and 3: more respondents from suburban areas ‘today’ and ‘usually’ read *crime* fiction than those in rural or urban areas.
- Questions 1 and 3: fewer respondents in suburban areas ‘today’ or ‘usually’ read *war/spy/adventure* books than those in rural or urban areas.
- Question 3: *Crime* fiction reading is more popular with suburban respondents.
- Question 3: more respondents read *Black British* and *Asian* fiction in urban areas than in rural or suburban areas.
- Question 4: perhaps conversely, a higher number of respondents from urban areas than from rural or suburban areas would not consider reading *Black British* fiction.

- Question 4: *Science fiction/fantasy* is noticeably less unpopular with urban than with rural or suburban respondents.
- Question 5: considerably more urban respondents considered themselves to be influenced by the Internet than rural respondents.

More respondents from urban communities than from either suburban or rural communities stated that they would ‘usually’ read Black British fiction.

However, the figures collected for Question 4 do not suggest any greater willingness to read Black British fiction on the part of respondents from urban communities.

### 5.1.3 Table to show survey responses by community type

N.B. Points of particular interest are highlighted in the table.

Question no.	Categories	Combined valid %		
		Rural	Urban	Suburb.
1. During your visit to the library TODAY, what type(s) of books were you looking for?	Science fiction/fantasy	13.2	18.7	15.1
	Gay/lesbian fiction	0.0	0.9	0.3
	Black British fiction	1.0	3.4	3.5
	Family sagas	26.5	23.5	29.4
	Non-fiction	52.9	46.0	46.5
	Romance fiction	20.8	20.7	20.8
	Lad Lit	1.6	3.9	3.1
	Crime fiction	35.5	35.4	41.1
	Chick Lit	5.3	7.4	6.9
	Asian fiction	0.6	3.3	1.6
	Audio books	6.9	9.6	5.8
	Literary fiction	20.9	19.5	22.0
	War/spy/adventure	20.9	17.8	14.1
2. Where did you look for these books?	Displays of new books	46.6	48.6	50.4
	The returns trolley	49.5	38.3	48.8
	The library catalogue	13.7	18.8	13.5
	Other displays or promotions	17.9	13.6	20.2
	On the shelf	73.7	73.7	75.1
3. What type of books would you USUALLY borrow from the library?	Science fiction/fantasy	16.8	21.1	17.9
	Gay/lesbian fiction	0.5	1.8	0.3
	Black British fiction	2.6	5.4	1.9
	Family sagas	29.4	27.4	31.8
	Non-fiction	58.0	52.6	49.6

	Romance fiction	24.6	25.8	25.3
	Lad Lit	1.1	5.9	4.0
	Crime fiction	40.7	41.1	47.2
	Chick Lit	6.9	9.7	8.1
	Asian fiction	1.6	4.7	1.3
	Audio books	11.0	12.6	6.8
	Literary fiction	27.1	25.9	26.8
	War/spy/adventure	24.9	21.8	26.3
4. In the following list, are there any types of book that you would NOT consider reading?	Science fiction/fantasy	45.4	36.6	45.6
	Gay/lesbian fiction	69.2	63.5	60.9
	Black British fiction	33.9	32.7	30.6
	Family sagas	17.2	19.2	14.5
	Non-fiction	4.7	4.5	3.8
	Romance fiction	34.9	36.5	34.6
	Lad Lit	33.0	27.4	31.9
	Crime fiction	14.0	14.7	14.2
	Chick Lit	37.1	38.3	30.5
	Asian fiction	46.4	44.6	43.5
	Audio books	26.5	25.6	28.9
	Literary fiction	12.5	14.7	10.7
	War/spy/adventure	18.9	13.2	23.1
5. What factors usually influence you in your choice of library books?	Display in the library	62.0	56.7	56.5
	I saw it on the returns trolley	45.8	33.6	40.7
	Internet	4.3	11.0	6.2
	Newspaper/magazine/TV review	40.2	44.5	46.1
	I saw it in a bookshop	40.4	37.4	39.8
	Library staff recommendation	16.3	23.6	19.4
	Friends' recommendation	37.2	48.6	47.9
	Current events	14.1	17.8	16.0
	'Prize winners'	15.1	18.2	17.4

## 5.2 Ethnicity

### 5.2.1 Context

Although library staff were given four choices of ethnicity (a community that was 'predominantly white', 'predominantly Black', 'mixed' or 'predominantly Asian', they only selected either 'predominantly white' or 'mixed'.

Number of respondents in each type of community:

- Predominantly white: 811
- Mixed: 236  
Total = 1,047.

### 5.2.2 Analysis

- Questions 1 and 3: the majority of respondents who 'today' and 'usually' read *Black British* and *Asian* fiction were from libraries in 'mixed' communities. 6.5% of respondents who 'usually' read Black British fiction were from 'mixed' communities, whereas just 2.7% of respondents from 'white' communities 'usually' selected this type of book. 7.3% of respondents who 'usually' read *Asian* fiction were from 'mixed' communities, whereas only 1.5% of respondents from 'white' communities 'usually' selected this type of book.
- Question 4: fewer respondents from 'mixed' communities 'would not' read *Black British* or *Asian* fiction than those in 'white' communities.

Respondents from 'mixed' communities were therefore more likely to read Black British and Asian fiction than those from predominantly white communities.

- Question 2: considerably fewer respondents from 'mixed' communities said that they looked for their books from the *returns trolley* than those from 'white' communities.
- Question 5: the *returns trolley* was considerably less popular, and the Internet more popular, with respondents from 'mixed' communities than with those from 'white' communities.

### 5.2.3 Table to show survey responses by (community) ethnicity

N.B. Points of particular interest are highlighted in the table.

Question no.	Categories	Combined valid %			
		White	Black	Mixed	Asian
1. During your visit to the library TODAY, what type(s) of books were you looking for?	Science fiction/fantasy	14.6		21.7	
	Gay/lesbian fiction	0.4		0.9	
	Black British fiction	2.8		4.3	
	Family sagas	28.3		19.9	
	Non-fiction	48.7		43.1	
	Romance fiction	21.5		18.3	
	Lad Lit	2.8		4.3	
	Crime fiction	39.1		33.5	
	Chick Lit	6.6		7.3	
	Asian fiction	1.2		5.1	
	Audio books	7.1		9.3	
	Literary fiction	20.7		20.4	
	War/spy/adventure	22.0		16.2	
2. Where did you look for these books?	Displays of new books	49.9		44.9	
	The returns trolley	47.9		32.2	
	The library catalogue	15.6		16.2	
	Other displays or promotions	18.4		11.5	
	On the shelf	75.3		70.0	
3. What type of books would you USUALLY borrow from the library?	Science fiction/fantasy	17.8		23.0	
	Gay/lesbian fiction	0.6		2.2	
	Black British fiction	2.7		6.5	
	Family sagas	31.1		24.5	
	Non-fiction	53.0		50.4	
	Romance fiction	26.5		21.3	
	Lad Lit	3.6		6.4	
	Crime fiction	44.0		40.7	
	Chick Lit	8.3		9.4	
	Asian fiction	1.5		7.3	
	Audio books	9.7		11.4	
	Literary fiction	26.5		26.3	
War/spy/adventure	25.5		32.3		
4. In the	Science fiction/fantasy	45.1		30.0	

<b>following list, are there any types of book that you would NOT consider reading?</b>	Gay/lesbian fiction	64.7		59.8	
	Black British fiction	33.5		27.9	
	Family sagas	15.9		21.2	
	Non-fiction	4.0		5.5	
	Romance fiction	34.8		38.0	
	Lad Lit	32.0		23.6	
	Crime fiction	14.0		16.0	
	Chick Lit	34.8		36.4	
	Asian fiction	46.4		38.5	
	Audio books	28.0		24.1	
	Literary fiction	12.5		14.0	
	War/spy/adventure	22.6		21.5	
<b>5. What factors usually influence you in your choice of library books?</b>	Display in the library	58.5		54.2	
	I saw it on the returns trolley	41.8		27.6	
	Internet	6.0		14.1	
	Newspaper/magazine/TV review	43.1		48.4	
	I saw it in a bookshop	38.3		40.3	
	Library staff recommendation	21.1		19.1	
	Friends' recommendation	45.1		49.6	
	Current events	14.4		48.2	
	'Prize winners'	16.2		21.2	

## 5.3 Class

### 5.3.1 Context

Number of respondents in each type of community:

- Middle class: 259
  - Working class: 309
  - Mixed: 479
- Total = 1,047.

### 5.3.2 Analysis

- Questions 1 & 3: respondents from working class areas read more *Asian* fiction than those from other areas.
- Questions 1 & 3: respondents from working class areas read more *Black British* fiction than those from other areas.
- Question 2: there appears to be little difference in preferred location for books between the three types of community.
- Questions 1 & 3: respondents from working class areas read less *literary* fiction than those from other areas.
- Question 4: similarly, more respondents from working class areas would not read *literary* fiction than those from other areas.
- Question 5: reading choices made by respondents from working class areas appear to be less influenced by books seen in bookshops, and more by library staff recommendation, than those from other areas.

### 5.3.3 Table to show survey responses by (community) class

N.B. Points of particular interest are highlighted in the table.

Question no.	Categories	Combined valid %		
		Middle	Working	Mixed
1. During your visit to the library TODAY, what type(s) of books were you looking for?	Science fiction/fantasy	13.6	16.9	17.3
	Gay/lesbian fiction	0.4	0.7	0.4
	Black British fiction	3.2	5.3	1.7
	Family sagas	25.2	29.1	25.1
	Non-fiction	48.7	43.3	49.3
	Romance fiction	19.7	21.7	20.9
	Lad Lit	3.4	4.1	2.3
	Crime fiction	41.4	38.0	35.7
	Chick Lit	6.0	5.8	7.8
	Asian fiction	1.6	4.8	0.6
	Audio books	5.4	9.1	7.9
	Literary fiction	18.9	14.3	25.5
	War/spy/adventure	23.6	20.4	19.2
2. Where did you look for these books?	Displays of new books	46.0	54.3	46.6
	The returns trolley	44.1	41.2	46.6
	The library catalogue	12.9	15.5	17.4
	Other displays or promotions	19.3	14.9	16.7
	On the shelf	77.7	70.6	74.4
3. What type of books would you USUALLY borrow from the library?	Science fiction/fantasy	16.9	19.3	20.1
	Gay/lesbian fiction	0.4	1.4	1.1
	Black British fiction	2.5	6.7	2.1
	Family sagas	28.6	32.0	28.6
	Non-fiction	55.1	47.5	54.1
	Romance fiction	22.7	27.9	25.3
	Lad Lit	4.1	5.9	3.2
	Crime fiction	48.6	43.0	40.5
	Chick Lit	7.2	6.4	10.7
	Asian fiction	1.6	6.5	1.1
	Audio books	7.9	12.2	10.0
	Literary fiction	23.5	21.6	30.9
	War/spy/adventure	27.3	22.0	23.4
4. In the following list, are there any types of book that you would	Science fiction/fantasy	45.1	37.9	42.2
	Gay/lesbian fiction	62.2	68.2	61.4
	Black British fiction	30.8	33.2	32.4
	Family sagas	13.5	15.9	19.8

<b>NOT consider reading?</b>	Non-fiction	5.2	4.9	3.4
	Romance fiction	33.4	34.3	37.6
	Lad Lit	31.1	20.7	34.9
	Crime fiction	13.1	12.4	16.5
	Chick Lit	30.2	33.5	38.6
	Asian fiction	41.9	39.8	49.1
	Audio books	28.3	25.7	27.2
	Literary fiction	11.6	18.2	12.3
	War/spy/adventure	22.2	22.6	22.1
<b>5. What factors usually influence you in your choice of library books?</b>	Display in the library	59.6	59.5	55.4
	I saw it on the returns trolley	39.3	38.7	37.9
	Internet	4.3	7.7	9.8
	Newspaper/magazine/TV review	42.6	40.7	47.4
	I saw it in a bookshop	40.7	32.5	41.6
	Library staff recommendation	18.9	25.4	18.6
	Friends' recommendation	46.5	46.6	45.7
	Current events	13.9	15.8	18.0
'Prize winners'	18.0	14.6	18.8	

## 6. Comparison of survey responses by gender

### 6.1 Context

As 198 respondents chose not to state their gender when completing the questionnaire, the following analysis is based on the response of 849 respondents, of whom:

- 277 (26.4%) were male, and
- 572 (54.6%) were female.

### 6.2 Analysis

- Questions 1 & 3: more male than female respondents ‘today’ and ‘usually’ read *science fiction/fantasy*, *war/spy/adventure* and *non-fiction*.
- Questions 1 & 3: more female than male respondents ‘today’ and ‘usually’ read *family sagas* and *romance* fiction.
- Questions 1 & 3: equal numbers of male and female respondents ‘today’ and ‘usually’ read *gay/lesbian* and *crime* fiction.
- Question 2: slightly more female than male respondents looked at *displays of new books or other displays and promotions* when choosing their books.
- Question 4: more male than female respondents would not read *Black British* or *Asian* fiction.
- Question 5: male and female respondents were relatively equally influenced in their choice of library books, although more female respondents than male respondents were influenced by *books they had seen in a bookshop* and by their *friends’ recommendations*.

### 6.3 Table to show the responses of male and female respondents

N.B. Points of particular interest are highlighted in the table.

Question no.	Categories	Combined valid %	
		Male	Female
1. During your visit to the library TODAY, what type(s) of books were you looking for?	Science fiction/fantasy	20.0	14.5
	Gay/lesbian fiction	0.7	0.7
	Black British fiction	3.7	3.1
	Family sagas	16.2	28.3
	Non-fiction	52.4	43.7
	Romance fiction	12.4	24.3
	Lad Lit	4.4	3.0
	Crime fiction	39.8	17.7
	Chick Lit	4.1	7.7
	Asian fiction	1.6	2.2
	Audio books	8.6	7.1
	Literary fiction	20.1	20.0
	War/spy/adventure	26.5	18.3
2. Where did you look for these books?	Displays of new books	47.0	48.7
	The returns trolley	42.3	45.0
	The library catalogue	16.6	16.0
	Other displays or promotions	15.6	18.4
	On the shelf	76.5	72.5
3. What type of books would you USUALLY borrow from the library?	Science fiction/fantasy	22.4	17.1
	Gay/lesbian fiction	1.3	1.2
	Black British fiction	3.7	3.9
	Family sagas	18.6	32.3
	Non-fiction	54.0	50.1
	Romance fiction	15.6	29.2
	Lad Lit	5.4	4.5
	Crime fiction	43.2	43.2
	Chick Lit	5.4	10.0
	Asian fiction	2.0	3.1
	Audio books	10.7	10.2
	Literary fiction	25.8	26.4
	War/spy/adventure	31.0	21.7
4. In the following list, are there any types of book that you would NOT consider reading?	Science fiction/fantasy	37.5	44.5
	Gay/lesbian fiction	67.9	62.9
	Black British fiction	37.8	31.1
	Family sagas	26.2	13.4
	Non-fiction	3.0	4.6

	Romance fiction	50.0	30.8
	Lad Lit	30.2	29.5
	Crime fiction	14.4	14.8
	Chick Lit	45.4	32.7
	Asian fiction	49.1	44.2
	Audio books	31.0	27.4
	Literary fiction	15.3	12.8
	War/spy/adventure	17.6	24.8
<b>5. What factors usually influence you in your choice of library books?</b>	Display in the library	60.2	58.2
	I saw it on the returns trolley	37.8	39.6
	Internet	8.4	8.2
	Newspaper/magazine/TV review	43.2	45.4
	I saw it in a bookshop	34.6	40.0
	Library staff recommendation	18.6	22.3
	Friends' recommendation	40.5	50.7
	Current events	16.3	16.2
	'Prize winners'	15.7	19.0

## 7. Analysis of interviews with library users

When both sets of questionnaires had been collected, a sample of respondents was selected for interview (see 2.2). The following section presents the findings of these interviews, with comments made divided into four areas:

1. Book displays
2. Reasons for choosing not to read particular types of book
3. Factors influencing choice of library books
4. Response to the Black Bytes promotion.

### 7.1 Book displays

Some of the most interesting information to emerge from the interviews pertained to people's views of book displays.

For some respondents, a display would be a starting point, a way in which to obtain ideas for book choices, before moving to the shelves. For others, the displays were consulted after the initial browsing among the shelves.

'I would probably use the library catalogue to locate books that I specifically wanted...and then I would look at displays of new books, and promotions, for further ideas.'

'I would normally [just go straight to the shelves], and browse through authors that I recognise or anything new that jumps out at me.'

'I think displays, probably I would see these first...then it would be more on the shelf that I would go.'

A number of interviewees commented on their browsing habits when in a library. For example, did they enter the library having made a decision as to the books they were going to borrow?

'I tend to go to the library with an agenda, or a particular idea in mind, based on newspaper reviews and friends' recommendations, and consequently I don't feel the need to ask staff when I'm there, because library staff don't necessarily know me, whereas friends do, and I've made my own decisions based on newspapers and internet sites and so on.'

'When I come through the door, I haven't really got a set idea of what I'm going to take out, not always.'

'It's pretty much seeing what's there, really, although I might have it in the back of my head about authors I've been told about, really. So it's very much dependent on what I see.'

'You know, I do have an idea of some things that I like, but if I come across something that's different, that looks interesting, even if I don't know anything about it, I'll just go for it.'

Interviewees were asked to comment on any displays they had seen in their local library, or more generally on the value of book displays. On the whole, people liked to see books displayed thematically, taken out of the usual a-z sequence on the shelves:

'I'd prefer them to be displayed by type, thematically...if they're [only] in alphabetical order of the authors, you've got to read the blurb of each one to find out what type of book it is!'

'...I think they had a stand in the library not so long back for wartime, 40s, 50s books, fiction during the war, and I thought that was really good because I went there and I think I got about 3 or 4 books out at one go, because it was a subject rather than an author. I do like wartime books but to be honest with you sometimes I can't be bothered to look through all the shelves looking for books that are about wartime...'

'...I would rather see them done in that way [books set aside in a thematic display], I must admit, I don't like a-z! I've got four children, so I haven't always got time to spend hours in there.'

Considering the quality of displays they had seen, interviewees underlined the importance of:

- striking the right balance between displaying and not displaying books
- ensuring that the display is relevant to the local library, and that the stock is regularly maintained
- ensuring that the theme of each display is clearly signposted.

'I think that sometimes when there's too many displays it can be off-putting...'

'I have seen some displays, they didn't seem adequately connected to the books...there seemed to be lots of posters for a particular subject area...so yes, it wasn't adequately connected to the stock in the library...it just seemed to be something that wasn't integrated, because it seems to me that if you have a display it should integrate with the local collection strongly. It's tremendously frustrating if something inspires you to go and read it, and then you find that the library doesn't have it, or that there's a tremendously long waiting list.'

'...for example the wartime one, it was very obvious as you walked in and went past it what it was, that it was something I was going to be interested in, so then I looked at all the books and took 2 or 3 off...[it's important,]the way it's displayed. I can look at one in science fiction/fantasy, and you instantly know what it is by the way it's displayed, and I think 'I'm not going to waste my time on that, because I know I'm not interested', basically!'

A primary reported benefit of library displays was their potential to increase reading choices, the primary objective of any reader development activity:

‘If that display [Black Bytes] wasn’t there, I would never have known of those authors, I would never have known of those books.’

‘...if they [library staff] displayed something different, it might make people read things that they wouldn’t normally go and physically look for...to sort of evolve, as it were.’

‘They [displays] should draw your attention more to the different areas of books...different genres.’

‘And if the library gets it right...then yes I’m quite happy to borrow from displays, and I like seeing them. I like the way in which they open up new avenues for reading books I wouldn’t necessarily have gone in to choose, that weren’t on reviewed lists, or friends’ recommendations, I think that’s interesting and good.’

## 7.2 Reasons for choosing not to read particular types of book

Four interviewees had listed no category that they would not read when they had completed the questionnaire. Their comments included the following:

‘I would try any book at all.’

‘Well, I think it’s like anything, if you see a paragraph on the front of the book that interests you, or it’s something different, then yes, you might pick it up.’

The remaining interviewees were asked to explain why they would choose not to read particular types of book. Each of the people who had listed at least one category that they would not read cited a lack of interest as the primary reason:

‘I have tried them, and I just don’t find them very interesting.’

‘That’s just the books that I wouldn’t specifically go and look for...they don’t really interest me.’

‘I don’t really find them interesting, I cannot get into them.’

‘They’re not topics that I would be interested in, so I haven’t bothered to even go there.’

Interestingly, a number of respondents felt compelled to qualify their lack of interest, to assure the interviewer that their reason was not due to any particular prejudice. In almost all cases, the types of book that they were discussing were gay/lesbian, Asian or Black British fiction:

‘It’s not that I’m against reading them, if I picked one up and it looked interesting, I might, but it’s not something that I’d go and specifically look for to read.’ [Asian and Black British fiction]

‘[I don’t read] romance and gay/lesbian, not because I’m homophobic or anything, just because really it’s something that doesn’t interest me in the slightest.’

‘I just haven’t even been interested in it [science fiction/fantasy, gay/lesbian, lad lit, war/spy/adventure], I haven’t ever experienced anything in these books. They’re not topics that I would be interested in, so I haven’t bothered to even go there.’

‘Science fiction I don’t like full stop, I don’t like it on telly, I don’t like it in books: you either do or you don’t!’

‘I don’t try to take anything too heavy or too deep, because I haven’t got the time to focus on that, of course!’ [Interviewee had three young children]

### 7.3 Factors influencing choice of library books

The findings of the questionnaire revealed that 20.6% of respondents felt that library staff recommendation was a particularly influential factor in their choice of library books. Given that five of the nine possible categories had a higher response rate, this was a relatively low result. Asked to discuss their answers to this question in more detail, just two interviewees cited library staff as an influential factor:

‘...if a librarian recommended one to me, if she knew what kind I liked, I would take her opinion.’

‘...the staff are absolutely spot-on, they’re really friendly, it’s the personal touch...’

The most frequently cited influence was the friend (or family member)’s recommendation, particularly by the female interviewees:

‘Friends’ recommendations...because some of my friends haven’t got children, they have more time to read, so they’ve had the opportunity to say that’s something you could pick up on, [name of interviewee], and then I’d have a look.’

‘I would [be affected] by friends’ recommendations. I know that me, my mum and my sister tend to swap books around, and we all like the same sort of thing.’

Many interviewees stated that serendipity played as important a role in their search for reading material as any other factor:

‘It’s pretty much seeing what’s there, really...’

‘It’s probably equal between friends, and just going to have a look myself, and seeing what I fancy.’

#### 7.4 Response to the Black Bytes promotion

One third of the interviewees had seen the Black Bytes promotion in their local library. This is a relatively low figure, for which there could be two possible reasons:

- That respondents had not visited the library during the promotional period
- That the promotion had not been prominently displayed.

Nevertheless, the response to the promotion was largely positive, in some cases extremely so.

‘I recently had some books from there [my local library] to do with Black culture, which was excellent, because I kept thinking it’s hard to find stuff related to my culture, and that was brilliant. But time just whizzes by so quickly, I didn’t get time to read them all through, so I might have to go back and find them all again, actually.’

‘...it was fantastic, I really got into it...it was excellent, the books were fabulous. If I’d had more time, I would have read them all. But I just didn’t have time - that’s my problem, I just don’t have the time. But it’s stuff that when you pick it up and start reading, you don’t want to put it down, but obviously I have to feed people!...it was really something that I could have gotten in to.’

‘...it was a good idea to have the cards inside; the little postcards to write your own review...’

‘...I saw the Black Bytes poster, but I didn’t particularly want to look at the books.’

‘Yes, I think the last time I went in there was a section on Black writers...there was a good diversity, they did have some African writers coming under the umbrella of ‘British’ if they’re residing in the UK...I was interested in the books it was promoting, I did flick through, I didn’t borrow but I had a look.’

N.B. 2 of the above responses were from the same library.

A major priority of the Black Bytes promotion was that it should have general appeal, should not have a target group of Black readers. To this end it appears to have been successful, as respondents were asked to state whether they felt that the promotion had a specific target audience:

'I think the idea would be for a more general appeal, because it probably just highlights, shows that there are talented Black writers, and this is what they've got to offer, so it wouldn't just be for Ethnic.''

'Oh, no, it [had] a general appeal, because I think that everybody needs to be made aware of how Black culture is influenced by English culture in this country. It is a multicultural society, and I really think that people need to be made aware of how we feel within that culture, of how that has affected us.'

'...I think that anybody, once they had picked up a book [from the Black Bytes promotion] and started to read it, they would probably find it really interesting.'

One interviewee felt that other library users would, like her, be interested in seeing future displays of books written by authors from different cultures. When asked if she would like to see more displays like Black Bytes, she said:

'Oh yes, and from all different cultures, not just from Black culture, but from Asian culture, or Polish culture, or whatever. Because in Northampton, especially, there's a huge Polish community, but there doesn't seem to be that much about how they perceive being in this multicultural society, or how it has affected them...that would be good, if there were any authors that have done anything like that.'

## **8. Response to research findings and recommendations to public library staff**

The following is a summary of key findings of the longitudinal research project conducted by Sheffield University, as part of the EMERALD initiative (for further details see section 1 of research report). It could be removed from the research report and regarded as an **executive summary** of the overall project.

### **8.1 Context**

The original focus of the research was on the impact on the reader of the Black Bytes Black British fiction promotion, although it was subsequently decided that the work would more usefully have a wider focus on people's general reading choices.

### **8.2 Methodology**

The research focused on the following two areas:

1. The impact over time of the promotion on library users, changes in the impact on reading habits and reading confidence, impact on library use. This included the impact on male and female readers.
2. A comparison of the impact of the promotion in different types of libraries, for example of rural, suburban and urban areas, of different ethnic communities, of different class communities.

A brief reading habit survey was devised and distributed at issue points in a total of 16 libraries in the nine participating authorities before, and a time after, the installation of the Black Bytes promotion. In addition, the survey was distributed twice to five control libraries (libraries that did not participate in the promotion), each in a different EMERALD local authority.

The questionnaire consisted of 5 simple questions:

6. During your visit to the library TODAY, what type(s) of book were you looking for?
7. Where did you look for these books?
8. What type of books would you USUALLY borrow from the library?
9. (In the following list), are there any types of book that you would NOT consider reading?
10. What factors usually influence you in your choice of library books?

Following each question there was a series of options, and respondents were asked to tick as many as were relevant to them. For Questions 1, 3 and 4, thirteen categories (excluding 'Other') were listed. These were the result of a series of

discussions between the researcher and the project group, and were agreed to represent a wide range of the stock available in a typical library in the East Midlands:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 14. Science fiction/fantasy                                 | 21. Crime fiction   |
| 15. Gay/lesbian fiction                                     | 22. 'Chick Lit' e.g. Lisa Jewell,<br>Jane Green, Marian Keyes |
| 16. Black British fiction                                   | 23. Asian fiction in English                                  |
| 17. Family sagas  | 24. Audio books (books on<br>tape/CD)                         |
| 18. Non-fiction   | 25. Literary fiction  |
| 19. Romance fiction   | 26. War/spy/adventure   |
| 20. 'Lad Lit' e.g. Nick Hornby,<br>Irvine Welsh, Mike Gayle |   |

Overall, 1,047 respondents completed the questionnaire, of whom 277 (26.4%) said that they were male, 572 (54.6%) said that they were female, and 198 (18.9%) chose not to state their gender.

The final element of the methodology was to interview a sample of library users to obtain further information concerning their reading habits and preferences. 21 interviews were conducted with respondents from middle, working and mixed class communities, and from rural, suburban and urban areas.

### 8.3 Preferred location for selecting books

The data collected regarding respondents' preferred location in the library for selecting books showed that three-quarters of people looked on the library shelves, in other words in the traditional a-z sequence. At first glance this seems to be a discouraging finding in terms of promotion planning: if library users prefer to go directly to the shelves, why should library staff make the effort to devise specific promotional displays? The key thing to bear in mind here is that respondents were asked to tick as many options as were relevant to them, that in many cases the library shelves were just one of a number of locations they selected. Although three-quarters ticked 'on the shelf', approximately half ticked 'displays of new books' and 'the returns trolley'.

In other words, library staff should be encouraged by these data: promotion and display were important to half of the survey respondents, and it is reasonable to suggest that they would be equally important to library users across the East Midlands region.

During the interviews conducted with a sample of questionnaire respondents, interviewees were asked to comment on any displays they had seen in their local library, or more generally on the value of book displays. On the whole, people liked to see books displayed thematically, taken out of the usual a-z sequence on the shelves.

Considering the quality of displays they had seen, interviewees underlined the importance of library staff:

- striking the right balance between displaying and not displaying books
- ensuring that the display is relevant to the local library, and that the stock is regularly maintained
- ensuring that the theme of each display is clearly signposted.

#### 8.4 Respondents’ reading choices

Popularity	Genre	Percentage
1	Non-fiction	52.4
2	Crime fiction	43.2
3	Family sagas	29.6
4	Literary fiction	26.4
5	Romance fiction	25.3
6	War/spy/adventure	24.1
7	Science fiction/fantasy	19.0
8	Audio books	10.1
9	Chick Lit	8.6
10	Lad Lit	4.2
11	Black British fiction	3.5
12	Asian fiction	2.8
13	Gay/lesbian fiction	1.0

As the above table illustrates, the most popular reading choice was non-fiction. It is interesting that more than half of respondents selected this option, as national CIPFA data indicate that far more fiction is borrowed from public libraries than non-fiction. However, it could simply be that people had failed to think of books that they would specifically borrow from the library, and were including any non-fiction material including, for example, reference material, magazines and newspapers.

Nonetheless, for promotional purposes it would be useful for library staff to bear in mind the popularity of non-fiction material, and to include it in future stock promotions. In recent years, for example, the genre ‘narrative non-fiction’ has become increasingly popular, and titles from this category are frequently featured in lists of best-selling books. Anne Downes of *Opening the Book* defined this relatively new publishing trend as follows:

‘This type of writing takes a different approach to non-fiction than the simply informational...The authors are attempting to make a contract with their readers in the way that fiction authors do - to engage the interest, seduce

the intellect, shock the sensibility and demand that the reader participates as an equal in the adventure of a good read.’<sup>4</sup>

The potential danger of presenting data as in the above table is that they are open to interpretation, and can be considered out of context. For example, if the reader is looking for evidence to support the argument that public libraries should not stock gay/lesbian fiction, then the fact that just 1% of questionnaire respondents stated that they ‘usually’ read this type of book could be regarded as such evidence. However, library staff could more usefully interpret the data as evidence that gay/lesbian fiction is not sufficiently well promoted. Perhaps it is the case that just 1% of respondents usually read gay/lesbian fiction because libraries stock insufficient titles in this category? Certainly, given the data for Question 4, we know that 63.4% of respondents would not be prepared to read gay/lesbian fiction, whereas 36.6% of respondents who stated that they would.

Would it not then be reasonable to suggest that public libraries in the East Midlands should bear in mind this openness on the part of more than one third of questionnaire respondents when planning stock promotions, and interpret it as a willingness to try new types of books? Reader development is offered to people as a means of widening reading choices, and a promotion or display that included the less commonly read materials would be a means of doing this.

A series of statistical tests was conducted in order to determine whether there was a link between respondents’ choice of book and method of searching for these books. These revealed that the less ‘popular’ reading choices - gay/lesbian, Black British and Asian fiction - were not likely to be looked for on the returns trolley, but that respondents would instead appear to go directly to the shelves for these titles. This information could simply be used to underline the unpopularity of these titles, but a more feasible interpretation would be that library users are not expecting these titles to be in frequent circulation, as they are less strongly promoted, and less widely available.

When those people who ‘usually’ read Black British fiction were taken as a separate group, the findings revealed that respondents did not appear to favour one particular location over another when choosing their books. This would seem to suggest that readers of these books look in a wide range of locations, as fewer titles are available than for the more ‘popular’ categories, such as crime fiction. Black British fiction should therefore be promoted using a wide range of display methods.

The research also found that there was a highly significant statistical relationship between the Black British and Asian fiction variables for Question 3, in other words that if a person usually reads the former category, it is also highly likely that he or she would usually read the latter. This information could be of value to library staff promoting Black British and Asian fiction, as it would appear that the two should be promoted similarly - and could reasonably be promoted together.

---

<sup>4</sup> Downes, A. (2001) ‘Making non-fiction seductive’, *The Library Association Record*, vol. 103 (3), 160-61.

## 8.5 Categories that respondents would not consider reading

It is extremely rare that a research question will focus on negative reading choices. The danger of asking people what they would *not* consider reading is that they may feel obliged to give the more politically correct response. However, the findings strongly indicate that there is a high level of honesty in the responses given, with neither shame nor political correctness expressed.

Gay/lesbian fiction was the least popular reading choice with both male and female readers, and Black British and Asian fiction were similarly unpopular. The questionnaires alone give no further information concerning the reasons made for not selecting the three, yet genres such as these vary enormously in subject matter. It would therefore appear that large numbers of respondents are choosing not to read these books not because of their content, but because of the cultures or lifestyles that they represent.

Interestingly, a number of respondents felt compelled to qualify their lack of interest, to assure the interviewer that their reason was not due to any particular prejudice. In almost all cases, the types of book that they were discussing were gay/lesbian, Asian or Black British fiction:

‘It’s not that I’m against reading them, if I picked one up and it looked interesting, I might, but it’s not something that I’d go and specifically look for to read.’ [Asian and Black British fiction]

‘[I don’t read] romance and gay/lesbian, not because I’m homophobic or anything, just because really it’s something that doesn’t interest me in the slightest.’

‘I just haven’t even been interested in it [science fiction/fantasy, gay/lesbian, lad lit, war/spy/adventure], I haven’t ever experienced anything in these books. They’re not topics that I would be interested in, so I haven’t bothered to even go there.’

It is notable that there appeared to be less reluctance to read Black British than Asian fiction. Nonetheless, statistical tests were conducted that revealed that if a person stated that they would not read Asian fiction, it is also highly likely that he or she would not read Black British fiction.

Encouragingly, Black British fiction was 4.3% more popular with respondents to the second questionnaire, a significant increase that could suggest that the *Black Bytes* promotion had affected their response.

## 8.6 Factors affecting choice of library books

The clear message to emerge from the responses to Question 5 is that the effectiveness of stock promotion is enhanced if the power of display, and of reader

to reader recommendation, is not overlooked. More than half of respondents said that their choice of reading materials was affected by the 'display in the library'. In other words, the presentation of books in the library building itself is as important (if not more so) than any external factor.

## **8.7 Comparison of libraries of different types**

Section 5 of the report presents the results of a series of comparisons of the data collected from libraries of different types. A project representative from each of the 21 libraries participating in the Black Bytes evaluation was asked to define his/her library in the following way:

- Is the library in a rural/urban/suburban community?
- Is the library in a predominantly white/Black/mixed/Asian community?
- Is the library in a predominantly middle/working/mixed class community?

More respondents from urban communities than from either suburban or rural communities stated that they would 'usually' read Black British fiction. Further investigation of data collected from libraries in rural, urban and suburban communities (for Question 4) did not, however, suggest any greater willingness to read Black British fiction on the part of respondents from urban communities.

Respondents from 'mixed ethnicity' and 'working class' communities were more likely to read Black British and Asian fiction than those from predominantly white communities. A simple interpretation of this by library staff would be a decision to stock - and promote - these types of books to mixed ethnicity, working class communities.

In terms of equal access, however, such an action would exclude people living in other communities who may wish to extend their reading choices. There is also an underlying assumption that books written by, for example, Black British authors, would only be of interest to Black British readers, which is clearly nonsensical.

Black British fiction should therefore be equally widely promoted in libraries in all communities, and equally available to all people.

## **8.8 Response to the Black Bytes promotion**

The interviews conducted with a sample of questionnaire respondents revealed that one third of the interviewees had seen the Black Bytes promotion in their local library. This is a relatively low figure, for which there could be two possible reasons:

- That respondents had not visited the library during the promotional period
- That the promotion had not been prominently displayed.

Nevertheless, the response to the promotion was largely positive, in some cases extremely so.

A major priority of the Black Bytes promotion was that it should have general appeal, should not have a target group of Black readers. To this end it appears to have been successful, as interviewees clearly felt that the promotion did not have a specific target audience.

## **8.9 In conclusion**

Although many survey respondents stated that they would go to the library shelves in their search for a book, the fact that they were also frequently influenced by displays suggests that there is a reader development opportunity waiting to be taken. In order to encourage people to find the elusive 'good read', the effective use of themed promotion and display can be used to remove fears and prejudices in an entirely unobtrusive way, to present wider reading choices to all library users.