JIPI (Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan dan Informasi) Vol. 11 No. 2 Tahun 2026
ISSN (online): 2528-021X
Page: 558-571

USER PREFERENCES FOR FACILITIES AT THE JUSUF KALLA LIBRARY OF UNIVERSITAS ISLAM INTERNASIONAL INDONESIA

Nazwa Arraudhah Phalos
Program Studi Ilmu Perpustakaan dan Informasi Islam, Fakultas Adab, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung
Email : nazwaphalos@gmail.com*

Eni Amaliah
Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia

Irva Yunita
Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia

Receive : 09 Oct 2026
Accepted : 28 Oct 2026
Published : 05 Nov 2026
DOI 10.30829/jipi.v10i2.32163

Abstract
The transformation of academic libraries into third places has contributed to a substantial increase in visits by external users, as observed at the Jusuf Kalla Library of Universitas Islam Internasional Indonesia (UIII). This study aims to map external visitors' preferences across four categories of physical facilities: reading areas (V1), study and work areas (V2), technology facilities (V3), and supporting and general facilities (V4). Employing a descriptive quantitative survey design, the study defined its population based on the peak month of external visits in April 2026 (12,065 visitors). A sample of 388 respondents was determined using Slovin's formula with a 5% margin of error and recruited through accidental sampling. Data were collected using a validated and reliable four-point Likert-scale questionnaire administered through Google Forms. Descriptive statistics and interval analysis revealed that study and work areas (V2) received the highest preference score, with a mean of 3.43 per item (very high category; 69.1% of respondents). Reading areas (V1) and supporting/general facilities (V4) were both classified as high, with respective means of 2.85 (55.2%) and 2.65 (55.7%). In contrast, technology facilities (V3) received the lowest score, with a mean of 2.46 (low category; 50.3% of respondents). These findings suggest that adaptable physical spaces supporting individual and collaborative activities, including single and group working spaces, are a major attraction for external visitors, whereas technology facilities warrant further evaluation and improvements in management.

Keywords: Academic Library; External Visitors; Facility Preferences; Jusuf Kalla Library, UII

INTRODUCTION

University libraries are undergoing a substantial paradigm shift from repositories of printed collections or reading centers toward collaborative and interactive learning commons (Gu and Tanoue, 2022). This transformation is driven by advances in information technology and changing learning practices, which require flexible physical environments that support the three pillars of higher education (Utami, 2023). In response, libraries are expected to fulfill their educational role in society (Mustofa et al., 2021) and provide information services that facilitate learning (Amaliah, Iqbal, and Sholeha, 2022). The provision of adequate physical facilities and information systems is also essential for supporting users' academic activities (Yunita and Parangu, 2022) (Yunita & Parangu, 2022). Such adaptable spaces have evolved into learning commons that accommodate group discussions (M Zikra and Primadesi, 2024), foster interactive learning environments for digitally oriented generations (Utami, 2023), and strengthen the functions of institutional repositories and library information services (Amaliah et al., 2025).

Theoretically, interactions between users and contemporary library spaces can be understood through the concept of the third place. This concept positions the library as a neutral public space beyond the home (first place) and the workplace or classroom (second place). Changing user lifestyles have encouraged libraries to become flexible third places responsive to users' needs, directly affecting their comfort, productivity, and learning-space choices (Saputra and Riady, 2024). In this capacity, modern libraries adopt a user-oriented spatial design, dividing their premises into functional zones such as main reading rooms, learning commons, computer equipment rooms, locker areas, lounges, and other shared facilities (Gu and Tanoue, 2022).

The use of these varied physical facilities depends substantially on user preferences, defined as individuals' tendencies or choices regarding facilities that best meet their needs (Sutikno and Khoirunisa, 2025). These preferences are shaped by internal factors, including coursework, learning styles, and habits, and external factors, including facility availability, comfort, quietness, and internet access (Ashidiqi and Nabila, 2023). Library users actively select physical environments that best support their activities (Risparyanto, 2022). Consequently, providing adaptable physical facilities (Utami, 2023) is crucial to establishing an optimal learning environment and promoting users' psychological well-being (Saputra and Riady, 2024).

In Indonesia, the provision of physical library facilities is explicitly regulated by National Library of the Republic of Indonesia Regulation No. 2 of 2024 concerning National Library Standards. Under this regulation, academic libraries must provide adequate, safe, comfortable, and inclusive infrastructure and facilities. These requirements encompass diverse functional areas, including individual or main reading rooms, group discussion rooms, information technology and computer facilities, and lockers, as well as physical environmental standards relating to lighting, ventilation, acoustics, places of worship, and safety provisions such as evacuation routes (Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia, 2024).

This development is clearly reflected at the Jusuf Kalla Library of Universitas Islam Internasional Indonesia (UIII), which offers a wide range of physical facilities. Preliminary observations conducted on February 2–5, 2026, identified reading rooms distributed across floors 1–6, including the Tribunes (second floor), a flexible tiered reading area; the Great Reading Hall (third floor), the main reading room; carrel-style Single Working Spaces (third floor), designed for focused individual study; cubicle-style Group Working Spaces (second and

third floors), intended for group discussions; and a Casual Reading Area (sixth floor). Additional facilities include a locker room (first floor), with complimentary tote bags for carrying personal belongings; computer areas (second and third floors); Small Common Rooms (floors 2–6), where users can eat and drink; and a prayer room (sixth floor). These facilities are intended to create a flexible learning environment for independent study, discussion, and working from home (WFH). Notably, official visitor records for September–November 2025 reported 34,025 visits, including 30,654 general/external visitors, considerably exceeding the 2,788 visits by UIII students. The large proportion of external visitors suggests that the library's diverse physical facilities make it an attractive setting for members of the wider public to study, work, and engage in discussion.

Although libraries as public spaces and workplaces have received considerable scholarly attention, the existing literature has several limitations. Lestari, A. N., Nurdiani, N., & Katarina (2021) evaluated satisfaction with and preferences for general library facilities among internal campus users. Akhmadi, Laksitarini, and Nabila (2020) specifically examined Generation Z students' preferences for learning spaces at three Indonesian public universities (ITB, ITS, and UNPAD). Meanwhile, Sari, M. P., and Kurniawan (2023) examined libraries as public spaces within regional or municipal public library settings. Other studies, including S Mawardah, N Nurdiani (2021) and Nichols and Philbin (2022), have addressed the adaptation of coworking spaces but have not mapped external public preferences at a newly established international university offering specialized postgraduate (master's and doctoral) programs, such as UIII. This empirical and contextual gap demonstrates the need to examine how external visitors select and evaluate physical facilities in an international academic library.

To address this gap, the present study investigates a single variable (univariate analysis): external visitors' preferences for physical facilities at the Jusuf Kalla Library, UIII. Rather than testing relationships or effects between independent and dependent variables (X and Y), the study aims to identify the most favored or frequently utilized spaces, such as the Tribunes, Great Reading Hall, carrels, cubicles, and Small Common Rooms, and the purposes for which visitors use them, including studying, discussing, and working remotely. Preferences are assessed across four facility categories and four perspectives of measurement: reading areas (V1), study and work areas (V2), technology facilities (V3), and supporting/general facilities (V4). The study's novelty lies in positioning external visitors as the principal evaluators of facilities at a postgraduate academic library, quantitatively mapping preferences across specific facility categories, and offering new insights into the dual spatial role of an international academic library that also functions as a third place for the wider community. Its findings are expected to contribute theoretically to library and public-space studies while offering evidence-based practical recommendations for UIII library management.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a descriptive quantitative approach using a survey method to profile and systematically describe a particular social phenomenon through respondent questionnaires (Abdullah et al., 2022). The approach was designed to describe users' preferences for the library's physical facilities without testing hypotheses regarding relationships or causal effects between variables (Sudaryono, 2023). Because the principal analysis involved descriptive indicators and response frequency distributions, including percentages and means, this purely descriptive study neither accepted nor rejected inferential hypotheses. Accordingly, neither a

null hypothesis (H_0: $\mu = 0$) nor an alternative hypothesis (H_a: $\mu \neq 0$) was formulated (Sugiyono, 2023).

The questionnaire distributed on August 13, 2026, formed part of a pilot test involving 30 participants excluded from the main sample to assess item validity and reliability. The main data collection took place over one month, from August 18 to September 17, 2026, at the Jusuf Kalla Library of Universitas Islam Internasional Indonesia (UIII), Depok, West Java. The study population consisted of general or external visitors to the library. According to official visitor records for January–July 2026, obtained through email correspondence with library administrators, April 2026 had the highest number of external visits, totaling 12,065. April was selected as the population reference period on the assumption that a peak-visit period could capture a broader diversity of external users and provide a more comprehensive basis for describing their preferences regarding physical library facilities. Following Sugiyono (2023), the sample size was calculated using Slovin's formula with a 5% error tolerance. This formula was used to estimate the minimum sample required to represent the study population, as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{[1+N(e)^2]}$$

$$n = \frac{12.065}{[1+12.065(0.05)^2]}$$

$$n = \frac{12.065}{[1+12.065(0,0025)]}$$

$$n = \frac{12.065}{1+30,1625}$$

$$n = \frac{12.065}{31,1625}$$

$$n = 387,16 \approx 388\ responden$$

Where:

- n = Minimum sample size.
- NN = Population size (12,065 general visitors).
- e^2e = Margin of error (5% or 0.05).

The calculation yielded a sample size of 387.16 respondents, which was rounded up to 388 to meet the minimum sample requirement. Respondents were recruited using accidental sampling, whereby questionnaires were administered to general visitors encountered while using physical facilities at the Jusuf Kalla Library, UIII (Sudaryono, 2023). Primary data were collected using a closed-ended questionnaire distributed via Google Forms and through direct observation (Sugiyono, 2023). Secondary data were obtained from documentation and library visitor records. Preferences were measured using a four-point Likert scale designed to encourage definite choices (Syamsuddin et al., 2022). The scale scores and assessment criteria are presented in the following table:

Measurement Criteria Based on a Likert Scale

Score	Abbreviation	Description
1	STS	Strongly Disagree
2	TS	Disagree
3	S	Agree
4	SS	Strongly Agree

An interval scale ranks objects according to specified attributes with equal distances between categories (Sugiyono, 2023). To interpret descriptive mean scores for respondents' preference levels, results were classified into four interval categories. Interval width was calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Panjang Interval } (i) = \frac{\text{Skor Maksimal} - \text{Skor Minimal}}{\text{Jumlah Kategori}} = \frac{4-1}{4} = 0{,}75$$

Based on an interval width of 0.75, the classification of mean preference scores is presented in the following table:

Interval-Scale Categories for User Preferences

Mean Score	Preference Level (Category)
1,00 – 1,75	Very Low
1,176 – 2,50	Low
2,51 – 3,25	High
3,26 – 4,00	Very High

Instrument Validity and Reliability Testing

Before the questionnaire was used for the main survey, each statement item was tested using Pearson correlation between its score and the total score of its respective facility category. For the 30 pilot respondents, the critical correlation value at the 5% significance level was 0.361. Reliability was subsequently assessed using Cronbach's alpha to determine internal consistency across items within each measurement category (Sugiyono, 2023). The instrument-testing results are summarized below:$r_{\text{tabel}}(\alpha)$

Table 3. Results of Instrument Validity and Reliability Testing

Facility category	Items	Calculated r range	Critical r	Cronbach's alpha	Decision
V1 – Reading Areas	P1–P8	0,669–0,899	0,361	0,917	Valid and reliable
V2 – Study/Work Areas	P9–P16	0,694–0,896	0,361	0,919	Valid and reliable
V3 – Technology Facilities	P17–P24	0,726–0,867	0,361	0,916	Valid and reliable
V4 – Supporting/General Facilities	P25–P33	0,532–0,828	0,361	0,885	Valid and reliable

Source: Primary data processed using SPSS, 2026.

All item–total correlation coefficients exceeded 0.361. The lowest coefficient, 0.532, occurred in the supporting and general facilities category, while the highest, 0.899, was observed for reading areas. These findings indicate that all 33 statement items were positively aligned with their respective category scores and could therefore be retained for the main survey. Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.885 to 0.919. Study and work areas demonstrated the strongest internal consistency (0.919), followed by reading areas (0.917) and technology facilities (0.916). Supporting and general facilities also exhibited strong consistency (0.885). These pilot-test findings support the use of a consistent measurement instrument across all indicators for the analysis of preferences among the 388 main respondents.$r_{\text{tabel}}(\alpha)$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results cover instrument quality testing, respondent characteristics, and a mapping of external visitors' preferences across four facility categories at the Jusuf Kalla Library, UIII. The instrument was pilot-tested with 30 respondents outside the main sample, while the descriptive analysis involved 388 participants. The four categories were reading areas (V1), study and work areas (V2), technology facilities (V3), and supporting and general facilities (V4). This classification was used to identify users' assessments of comfort, use, needs, and satisfaction for each facility category.

Respondent Characteristics

Respondent characteristics were examined to describe the backgrounds of users evaluating the library's facilities. All respondents were external visitors who consented to participate and had visited and used the Jusuf Kalla Library facilities more than twice. This criterion was important because evaluations were therefore provided by individuals with firsthand experience of the available facilities. The distribution of respondent characteristics is presented below:

Table 4. Characteristics of Study Respondents

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	186	47,9
	Female	202	52,1
Age	16–18 years	44	11,3
	19–24 years	169	43,6
	25–34 years	136	35,1
	35–44 years	31	8,0
	>45 years	8	2,1
Visitor category	Lecturers/Researchers/Academics outside UIII	40	10,3
	Students from outside UIII	178	45,9
	General public	54	13,9
	Employees/Professionals/Freelancers	74	19,1
	Senior high/vocational school students	42	10,8
Visit frequency	More than twice	388	100,0

Source: Primary data processed using SPSS, 2026. The 19–24 age category combines two identical labels in the output data.

By gender, the sample comprised 202 women (52.1%) and 186 men (47.9%), indicating a relatively balanced distribution. Participants aged 19–24 formed the largest group (169 respondents; 43.6%), followed by those aged 25–34 (136; 35.1%). Together, these two groups accounted for most of the sample, demonstrating the predominance of young adult visitors.

By visitor category, students from institutions other than UIII constituted the largest group (178; 45.9%), followed by employees, professionals, and freelancers (74; 19.1%). Other respondents included members of the general public, school students, and lecturers, researchers, and academics from outside UIII. This composition demonstrates that the library serves external visitors from varied backgrounds, potentially associated with different purposes, including studying, completing assignments, reading, conducting research, and working. However, the study did not directly test relationships between respondent characteristics and facility preferences; therefore, these characteristics cannot establish the causes of differences in evaluations.

This visitor diversity is consistent with the changing role of academic libraries, which now support learning and collaboration in addition to providing information resources. Similar discussions of evolving library spaces and user needs appear in M Zikra and Primadesi (2024) and Saputra and Riady (2024). In the present context, these perspectives highlight the importance of evaluating facilities according to their different functions and how these functions support visitors' activities. Nevertheless, each facility category must be assessed on the basis of survey results rather than assumptions about the needs of particular demographic groups.

User Preferences Across Facility Categories

Descriptive analysis was performed for four facility categories. Total scores were converted into per-item means to enable comparisons, as V1, V2, and V3 each contained eight items, whereas V4 contained nine. The results appear in Table 5.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of User Preferences Across Facility Categories

Facility category	Minimum	Maximum	Total mean	Mean per item	Standard deviation	Category
V1 – Reading Areas	13	32	22,83	2,85	3,757	High
V2 – Study/Work Areas	17	32	27,47	3,43	3,018	Very High
V3 – Technology Facilities	9	29	19,68	2,46	3,576	Low
V4 – Supporting/General Facilities	13	34	23,88	2,65	3,981	High

Source: Primary data processed using SPSS, 2026.

Table 5 indicates that study and work areas received the highest preference score, whereas technology facilities received the lowest. This variation suggests that external visitors do not evaluate all library facilities equally. Spaces directly supporting studying and working appear to receive more favorable evaluations than technology facilities considered as a separate category. However, these descriptive findings reflect response patterns and do not establish statistically significant differences.

The strong preference for study and work areas may be related to the availability of two distinct spatial arrangements: carrel-style Single Working Spaces for individual activities and

cubicle-style Group Working Spaces for discussion and collaborative work. These spaces offer alternatives for users with different requirements, ranging from concentration-intensive activities to collaborative tasks. Their functional flexibility may help explain the stronger evaluations of study and work areas. However, since the reasons underlying spatial choices were not measured directly, this explanation remains an interpretation of facility functions rather than a demonstrated causal relationship.

This finding can be considered in relation to Gu and Tanoue's (2022) discussion of user-oriented library spaces that flexibly support learning. In the present study, facilities directly associated with academic activities were particularly important to external visitors' preferences. Nevertheless, such a comparison does not imply that the spatial characteristics investigated in the two studies were identical. Differences in library context, user characteristics, and measurement indicators must be considered before broader similarities are inferred.

Reading areas also received a high preference rating. This category includes the Tribunes, Great Reading Hall, and Casual Reading Area, which offer different reading environments. Their lower position relative to study and work areas does not mean that reading spaces are unnecessary. Rather, the results indicate different levels of preference across facility groups. Because visitors use libraries for varied purposes, their need for reading spaces may vary according to their activities. This observation is relevant to Gu and Tanoue's (2022) emphasis on incorporating multiple spatial functions into library design.

Supporting and general facilities—including lockers, dining and refreshment rooms, prayer rooms, toilets, and evacuation-route signage—also received a high preference rating. This suggests that amenities supporting comfort and basic needs remain integral to visitors' library experience. Their function nevertheless differs from that of study and reading spaces because some are used only when a particular need arises, rather than continuously throughout a visit. Consequently, the aggregate score cannot be assumed to represent every individual facility equally. Risparyanto (2022) and the National Library Standards issued by the National Library of the Republic of Indonesia (2024) provide a basis for discussing supporting facilities in relation to service management and user needs. Preference ratings should therefore be considered alongside service functions, facility conditions, and safety requirements.

Unlike the other three categories, technology facilities—including library computers, the digital catalog or online public access catalog (OPAC), and Wi-Fi—received a low preference rating. This finding requires careful interpretation: a low preference score does not demonstrate that the facilities are technically inadequate or unnecessary. One possibility is that visitors primarily value the availability of space for their activities, with technology serving a supporting function. The use of personal devices may also influence demand for library computers, although the present study collected no data capable of confirming this explanation.

The contrast between study and work areas and technology facilities has implications for library development. Study and work areas provide environments in which activities take place, whereas computers, OPAC, and Wi-Fi facilitate access to information and support those activities. Lower preferences for technology should therefore prompt an assessment of users' needs for each service rather than a reduction in the role of technology. Such assessment could address OPAC usability, computer availability, and visitors' experiences accessing the internet. This approach would enable managers to identify necessary improvements on the basis of evidence rather than assumptions. Comparisons with Gu and Tanoue (2022) should likewise

focus on facility functions and user needs, not be interpreted as proof that physical space is invariably more important than technology.

Item-level analysis revealed differences obscured by aggregate category scores. Within V1, P2 had the highest mean (2.98), while P3 had the lowest (2.70). Within V2, P14 had the highest mean (3.53), compared with 3.22 for P9. Within V3, P22 had the highest mean (2.65) and P19 the lowest (2.23). Within V4, P33 had the highest mean (2.87) and P32 the lowest (2.47). Across all 33 items, P14 had the highest and P19 the lowest mean. These patterns are consistent with the aggregate finding that the strongest evaluations concern an aspect of study and work areas, while the weakest concern an aspect of technology facilities. However, each item must first be matched to the original questionnaire statement before any individual facility can be identified as the most preferred.

Overall, external visitors' preferences were strongest for study and work areas, followed by reading areas and supporting/general facilities, whereas technology facilities received relatively lower ratings. These results extend earlier discussions of the importance of adapting library spaces and services to user needs (M Zikra and Primadesi, 2024). The study's principal contribution, however, is a descriptive mapping of preferences across four facility categories among external visitors to the Jusuf Kalla Library, UIII. It does not establish the determinants of preferences or relationships between respondent characteristics and facility evaluations. Facility development should therefore take these findings into account alongside actual usage records, facility condition assessments, and direct feedback from users.

Distribution of User Preference Levels

In addition to mean scores, categorical distributions were examined to describe the proportion of respondents at each preference level within each facility category. The classifications were very low (1.00–1.75), low (1.76–2.50), high (2.51–3.25), and very high (3.26–4.00). These distributions provide a more detailed picture of the number of respondents at each preference level.

Table 6. Distribution of User Preference Categories

Facility category	Very Low n (%)	Low n (%)	High n (%)	Very High n (%)
V1 – Reading Areas	6 (1,5%)	102 (26,3%)	214 (55,2%)	66 (17,0%)
V2 – Study/Work Areas	0 (0,0%)	12 (3,1%)	108 (27,8%)	268 (69,1%)
V3 – Technology Facilities	36 (9,3%)	195 (50,3%)	147 (37,9%)	10 (2,6%)
V4 – Supporting/General Facilities	9 (2,3%)	135 (34,8%)	216 (55,7%)	28 (7,2%)

Source: Primary data processed using SPSS, 2026.

Table 6 demonstrates distinct preference distributions across the four facility categories. Study and work areas (V2) accounted for the largest proportion of very high ratings, whereas technology facilities (V3) were predominantly rated low. Reading areas (V1) and supporting/general facilities (V4) most frequently received high ratings. Thus, the distributions reinforce the earlier finding that the strongest preferences concern study and work areas, while technology facilities warrant further attention.

For V2, 96.9% of respondents reported high or very high preference levels, indicating relatively consistent acceptance of study and work areas. This category includes Single Working Spaces for individual tasks and Group Working Spaces for collaborative activities, enabling the library to accommodate different study and work needs. Because the figures represent an aggregate category score, however, they do not establish which of the two space types is individually preferred. Additional item- or space-level analysis is required. The finding also highlights the importance of aligning library spaces with user activities, as discussed by Gu and Tanoue (2022).

For V1, 72.2% of respondents reported high or very high preferences. Reading areas therefore remained positively evaluated, although the distribution was less favorable than for V2. The proportion reporting low or very low preferences was 27.8%, indicating variation in evaluations. Such differences may reflect visitors' diverse needs: some prioritize reading, whereas others visit to complete assignments, work, or collaborate. Thus, the results do not necessarily indicate inadequate reading facilities; rather, preferences may differ according to visit purposes. Variation in users' needs and experiences is also relevant to discussions of facility preferences (Sutikno and Khoirunisa, 2025).

For V4, 62.9% of respondents gave high or very high ratings, while 37.1% rated the facilities low or very low. Supporting and general amenities were therefore assessed positively by a majority, although evaluations were not uniform. This category includes facilities with distinct functions, such as lockers, dining and refreshment rooms, prayer rooms, toilets, and evacuation signage. As needs may vary with visit duration and purpose, aggregate scores do not identify which facilities contribute most to the category's rating. Evaluating each facility separately is therefore necessary when establishing development priorities. Assessments of library services and facilities should also consider their contributions to users' comfort and needs (Risparyanto, 2022).

In contrast to the other categories, V3 was dominated by low and very low ratings, with a combined share of 59.6%. Only 40.5% of respondents gave high or very high ratings; the reported percentages sum to 100.1% due to rounding. These results indicate comparatively lower preferences for technology facilities. They do not, however, demonstrate that computers, OPAC, or Wi-Fi are malfunctioning or of poor service quality. Lower ratings provide grounds for closer examination of accessibility, network reliability, catalog usability, device conditions, and alignment with visitor needs. Facility-specific evaluation is essential before determining appropriate improvements. The importance of aligning library services with users' needs and experiences is also addressed by Gu and Tanoue (2022).

Overall, preference distributions differed across facility categories. Study and work areas received the strongest evaluations; reading and supporting/general facilities tended to receive high ratings; and technology facilities attracted a larger share of low ratings. This pattern suggests that library development should preserve well-received facilities while investigating those with comparatively less favorable evaluations. The findings offer an initial basis for management priorities, but development decisions should also incorporate individual facility evaluations, visitor needs, and actual utilization data. Such an approach would generate recommendations responsive to specific needs rather than relying solely on aggregate trends.

Item-Level Preference Analysis

Item-level analysis was conducted to identify the highest- and lowest-rated aspects within each facility category. Unlike aggregate category means, item-level scores provide more

specific evaluations of individual facility aspects. For reading areas (V1), item P2 had the highest mean (2.98), whereas P3 had the lowest (2.70). For study and work areas (V2), P14 had the highest mean (3.53), while P9 had the lowest (3.22). For technology facilities (V3), P22 had the highest mean (2.65) and P19 the lowest (2.23). For supporting and general facilities (V4), P33 had the highest mean (2.87) and P32 the lowest (2.47).

Table 7. Comparison of the Highest and Lowest Item Scores in Each Facility Category

Facility category	Highest item	Mean	Lowest item	Mean
V1 – Reading Areas	P2	2,98	P3	2,70
V2 – Study/Work Areas	P14	3,53	P9	3,22
V3 – Technology Facilities	P22	2,65	P19	2,23
V4 – Supporting/General Facilities	P33	2,87	P32	2,47

Source: Primary data processed using SPSS, 2026.

Across all items, P14 had the highest mean score (3.53), falling within the very high category, while P19 had the lowest (2.23), falling within the low category. This difference demonstrates that preferences vary not only between facility categories but also among items within the same category. However, facility names corresponding to the item codes must be verified against the questionnaire statements. Preference scores should not be interpreted directly as frequencies of facility use.

Implications for the Development of Library Facilities

The results show that study and work areas attracted the highest preferences, while technology facilities had a relatively larger proportion of low ratings. One possible interpretation is that study and work areas directly provide environments for individual and collaborative activities, whereas demand for technology depends on visitors' personal devices and use of digital services. This interpretation requires further investigation and should not be presented as a causal relationship established by the present study.

These findings suggest that library managers should maintain the quality of study and work areas while evaluating technology facilities, particularly access to computers, OPAC, and Wi-Fi. Each facility should also be assessed individually so that improvement decisions do not rely solely on category means. This recommendation is consistent with the emphasis on matching library facilities to user needs in Gu and Tanoue (2022). Future research could combine preference ratings with actual usage frequencies and interviews to explain the factors associated with facility choices.

CONCLUSION

A survey of 388 external visitors to the Jusuf Kalla Library, UIII, found that study and work areas were the most preferred facility category (mean = 3.43; very high). Reading areas (mean = 2.85) and supporting/general facilities (mean = 2.65) were both rated high. Technology facilities, by contrast, received a low rating (mean = 2.46). These results demonstrate that spaces supporting independent and collaborative learning are a particularly valued feature of the library among external visitors. They also advance understanding of preferences in academic libraries by highlighting differences between evaluations of study spaces and technology facilities.

The study has limitations associated with its descriptive design: the findings describe respondents' preferences but do not explain why evaluations differ. The sampling method must also be taken into account when extending the results beyond the surveyed participants. Moreover, facility-category scores cannot identify which individual facilities are used most frequently. Future studies could recruit more diverse visitors and combine questionnaires with interviews or facility-use records to develop a deeper understanding.

For academic library managers, these findings provide a basis for preserving the quality of study and work areas while reassessing technology facilities to better meet visitor needs. Facility development should consider not only the provision of additional infrastructure but also comfort, accessibility, and the benefits of each facility for users' activities. Understanding highly and poorly rated facilities can help managers establish improvement priorities informed by visitor needs.

SUGGESTION

Based on the findings, the management of the Jusuf Kalla Library, UIII, is advised to: (1) maintain the quality and capacity of study and work areas, the highest-rated category, including ensuring that collaborative Group Working Spaces and individual workspaces remain sufficient for visitor patterns; (2) prioritize evaluations of technology facilities, including Wi-Fi stability, OPAC usability, computer conditions, and equitable network coverage throughout the library; (3) maintain the comfort of reading areas and the quality of supporting facilities through appropriate cleaning and maintenance of spatial layouts, lockers, dining and refreshment rooms, prayer rooms, toilets, and safety information; and (4) in future research, measure use frequencies for each facility separately to identify the most frequently selected individual spaces, including Group Working Spaces, Single Working Spaces, the Great Reading Hall, the Tribunes, and other facilities.

THANK YOU NOTE

The authors express their sincere gratitude to the Director of the Central Library and all staff of the Jusuf Kalla Library, Universitas Islam Internasional Indonesia (UIII), for granting research permission and assisting with data provision throughout the study. The authors also thank all general visitors who volunteered as respondents and took the time to complete the questionnaire, as well as their academic supervisors and colleagues for their continuing guidance and support during the preparation of this article.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Karimuddin, Misbahul Jannah, Ummul Aiman, Suryadin Hasda, Zahara Fadilla, Taqwin, Masita Ketut Ngurah Ardiawan, and Meilida Eka Sari. 2022. *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Edited by Nanda Saputra. Sigli: Yayasan Penerbit Muhammad Zaini.

Akhmadi, Niken Laksitarini, and Ganesha Puspa Nabila. 2020. "Preferensi Pengunjung Mahasiswa Generasi Z Masa Kini Terhadap Atribut Learning Space Di Perpustakaan Akademik." *Arsitektura: Jurnal Ilmiah Arsitektur Dan Lingkungan Binaan* 18 (1): 109–18. https://doi.org/https://www.google.com/search?q=https://doi.org/10.20961/arst.v18i1.40967.

Amalia, L & Syam, AM. (2026). STRATEGI PERPUSTAKAAN DALAM MENINGKAT BRANDING PERPUSTAKAAN SEKOLAH SMA NEGERI 1 MEDAN. Bibliotika: Jurnal Kajian Perpustakaan dan Informasi 10 (1), 471-484

Amaliah, Eni, Rahmat Iqbal, and Nadya Amalia Sholeha. 2022. "Strategi Perpustakaan Dalam

Mendukung Pembelajaran Secara Daring Di Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung." *Pustabiblia: Journal of Library and Information Science* 6 (23): 203–19. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/pustabiblia.v6i2.203-219.

Amaliah, Eni, Rahmat Iqbal, Irva Yunita, and Hildawati Almah. 2025. "The Role of the Repository for the Preservation of Management Information and Digital Services in the Library of the Raden Intan Islamic University." *Insaniyat: Journal of Islam and Humanities* 10 (1): 01–96. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15408/insaniyat.v10i1.42413.

Ashidiqi, Muhammad Ibra, and Jeihan Nabila. 2023. "Persepsi Pemanfaatan Perpustakaan Terhadap Motivasi Penulisan Skripsi Mahasiswa Perpustakaan Dan Ilmu Informasi Universitas Negeri Padang." *Journal of Scinary – Science of Information and Library* 01 (04): 132–36. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24036/scinary.v1i4.47.

Cikani, S & Syam, AM. (2026). Analysis of the Transformation of Medan City Students' Reading Preferences from Gramedia to Kedebox in Meeting Their Reading Needs. Jurnal IPTEK Bagi Masyarakat 6 (2), 616-624

Gu, Binli, and Kenichi Tanoue. 2022. "A Research on Library Space Layout and Intelligent Optimization Oriented to Readers' Needs." *Hindawi Mathematical Problems in Engineering* 2022:1–12. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/4426091.

Lestari, A. N, N Nurdiani, and W. Katarina. 2021. "A Study of User's Preferences of Public Library in Jakarta, Indonesia." *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 794 (1). https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/794/1/012162.

M Zikra, Ramdhana, and Yona Primadesi. 2024. "Library As Learning Commons: Studi Kasus Di Dinas Perpustakaan Dan Arsip Daerah D.I.Yogyakarta." *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai,* 8 (2): 27637–42.

Masrek , M. N. ., Baharuddin , M. F. ., & Syam , A. M. . (2025). Determinants of Behavioral Intention to Use Generative AI: The Role of Trust, Personal Innovativeness, and UTAUT II Factors. International Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 14(4), 378-390. https://doi.org/10.14419/44tk8615

Mawardah, S, N Nurdiani, and W Katarina. 2021. "A Study of the Application of Behavioral Architecture in Public Libraries in Jakarta , Indonesia A Study of the Application of Behavioral Architecture in Public Libraries in Jakarta , Indonesia." *IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 794. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/794/1/012161.

Mustofa, Muhamad Bisri, Mezan El Khaeri Kesuma, Irva Yunita, Eni Amaliah, and Indri Rahmawati. 2021. "Pemanfataan Media Pustaka Digital Dalam Membangun Perpustakaan Desa Berbasis Inklusi Sosial Di Masa Pandemi." *JIPKA (Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan Dan Kearsipan)* 1 (1): 1–13.

Nichols, Aaron F, and Paul P Philbin. 2022. "Library Usage Study, the How and What: A Survey of Space Usage at a Mid-Sized Research Library." *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 17 (4): 122–38. https://doi.org/10.18438/eblip30103.

Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia. 2024. "Peraturan Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 2 Tahun 2024 Tentang Standar Nasional Perpustakaan." Jakarta.

Risparyanto, Anton. 2022. "Pengaruh Kualitas Layanan Perpustakaan Dan Aktivitas Kegiatan Pustakawan Terhadap Kepuasan Pengguna Perpustakaan Di Era 4 . 0." *UNILIB: Jurnal Perpustakaan* 13 (2): 89–100. https://doi.org/10.20885/unilib.Vol13.iss2.art4.

Ritonga, A. R., Education, I. R., Zein, A., Syam, A. M., & Ohorella, N. R. (2023). Misconceptions of Jihad: A Constructivist Review of the Meaning of Struggle in Islam in the Modern Era: Analysis of the verses al-Amwaal wa al-Nafs.

Rusdi, M., Sebayang, V.A., Kholil, S., & Syam, A.M. (2024). Islam and the Ethics of War: Deconstructing Jihad through the Principle of Humanism in Theological Discourses

Saraan, M. I. K., Rambe, R. F. A. K., Syam, A. M., Suhendar, A., Dalimunthe, M. A., & Sinaga, R. P. K. (2024, May). The application of fertilizer subsidies in the context of coffee plantations in Pollung Sub-District, Humbang Hasundutan District, North Sumatra Province. In IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science (Vol. 1352, No. 1, p. 012012). IOP Publishing.

Saputra, Uji, and Yasir Riady. 2024. "Optimizing University Libraries in Palangkaraya City as a Supporting Facility for Independent Campuses." *LADU: Journal of Languages and Education* 4 (1): 11–19. https://doi.org/10.56724/ladu.v4i1.264.

Sari, M. P., & Kurniawan, A. 2023. "Analisis Preferensi Pengguna Terhadap Fasilitas Perpustakaan Modern Di Lingkungan Akademik." *Jurnal Kajian Informasi Dan Perpustakaan* 11 (2): 120–132. https://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/jkip/article/view/45678.

Sayekti, R., Batubara, A. K., Aditya, M., Purwaningtyas, F., & Syam, A. M. (2021). When the" Library as Place" Matters: A Case Study of an Academic Library. Library Philosophy & Practice.

Sudaryono. 2023. *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, Dan Mix Method*. Edisi 2. Depok: Rajawali Pers.

Sugiyono. 2023. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, Dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sutikno, and Amelia Khoirunisa. 2025. "Infrastruktur Perpustakaan Digital Dan Preferensi Mahasiswa Dalam Mengembangkan Budaya Literasi Di Perguruan Tinggi : Studi Kasus Di Universitas Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya Tahun 2023-2024." *Jurnal Pustaka Ilmiah* 11 (1): 1–14. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.20961/jpi.v11i1.98472.

Syamsuddin, Naidin, Rizki Dewantara, Ida Bagus Benny Surya Adi Pramana, Desma Erica Maryati M., Mery Sulianty H. Sitanggang, Hommy Dorthy Ellyany Sinaga, Siska Amelia Maldin, Lili Dahliani, Fatmawati, and Yulvitriyani Br Sebayang. 2022. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Edited by Sanabil.

Tinendung, EF & Syam, AM. (2026). Implementation of Librarian Knowledge Management in a Developing Regional Library: A Wiig Model-Based Analysis at Pakpak Bharat Regional Library. Jurnal IPTEK Bagi Masyarakat 6 (1), 136-145

Utami, N.P. Pramita. 2023. "Learning Commons:Upaya Perpustakaan Undiksha Menciptakan Lingkungan Belajar Bagi Pemustaka Generasi Digital." *MSIP: Media Informasi Dan Perpustakaan* 3 (1): 67–76. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23887/msip.v3i1.2349.

Yunita, Irva, and Reza Nawafella Alya Parangu. 2022. "Layanan Readers' Advisory Dalam Mewujudkan Layanan Referensi Yang Prima Pada Perpustakaan." *Info Bibliotheca: Jurnal Perpustakaan Dan Ilmu Informasi* 4 (1): 71–86. https://doi.org/10.24036/ib.v4i1.362.