Summary of MLF User Questionnaire 2018

February 8th, 2019   J-PARC Center
Overview of MLF User Questionnaire

- Implementation method
  Google Forms is adopted

- Implementation period
  January 4th, 2019 15:00 to February 1st, 2019 15:00

- Survey Respondent (2018年1月から12月までのMLF利用者）
  1581people (last year:1345people)

- Number of respondents
  Japanese:350people, English:149people total:499people
  (last year Japanese:321people, English:106people total:427people)

- Response rate
  31.6% (last year:31.7%)
Number of respondents by job title

- Faculty: 32.9%
- Graduate Student: 19.4%
- Postdoctoral Researcher: 8.2%
- Staff Scientist: 7.6%
- Other: 19.4%

Other Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Researcher, Industrial</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad student, Undergraduate student</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher at National Institute</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator for Support of Neutron Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest Incorporated Foundation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General foundational juridical person</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibaraki Prefecture Government</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIST Senior Researcher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of respondents by research field

- Materials Science and Engineering: 46.7%
- Soft Matter, Biomaterials and Liquids: 17.4%
- Magnetism and Strongly Correlated Electron Systems: 14.2%
- Fundamental Physics, Nuclear Science and Instrument R&D: 8.6%
- Industrial Applications: 6.8%
- Energy Science: 2.6%
- Hydrogen in Matter & General Applications: 1.6%
- Electronic Properties of Matter: 1.2%
- New User Promotion: 0.8%
Number of respondents by beamline
Number of responses by question items

Comparison graph of items by number of respondents.
1. Proposal process

1-1) Ease of proposal process
1-2) Efficiency of scheduling time
1-3) Fairness of proposal process
2. Safety Education

- 2-1) Effectiveness of computer based training
- 2-2) Appropriateness of the contents regarding safety education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2-1</th>
<th>2-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Support Facilities

3-1) User laboratory facilities
3-2) Tools and supplies in user labs
3-3) Computers/network access for visitors
3-4) User Rooms
3-5) Break/snack room
3-6) Accommodation
3-7) MLF operation status information
4. Sample environments

4-1) Variety of sample environments
4-2) Support from sample environment personnel
4-3) Quality and reliability of the equipment
5. Instrument performance

- 5-1) Support from J-PARC Staff
- 5-2) Hardware reliability and performance
- 5-3) Data acquisition/instrument control software
6. Software (Data Analysis Software)

- **6-1) Quality of Software**
- **6-2) Range of capabilities**
- **6-3) Assistance from J-PARC staff**
- **6-4) Remote access to software**

![Bar chart showing the distribution of ratings for different categories of software.](chart_image)
Comparison graph of respondents in both this and the preceding year

Comparison graph of items in both this and the preceding year.
### 1-1) Ease of proposal process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1-2) Efficiency of scheduling time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1-3) Fairness of proposal process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2-1) Effectiveness of computer based training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-2) Appropriateness of the contents regarding safety education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4-1) Variety of sample environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4-2) Support from sample environment personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4-3) Quality and reliability of the equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5-1) Support from J-PARC Staff

2016
- 0.6% POOR
- 35.9% FAIR
- 28.4% GOOD
- 32.9% VERY GOOD
- 0.2% EXCELLENT

2017
- 2.1% POOR
- 14.8% FAIR
- 25.5% GOOD
- 58.3% VERY GOOD
- 0.5% EXCELLENT

2018
- 10.0% POOR
- 26.3% FAIR
- 62.5% GOOD
- 0.2% VERY GOOD
- 1.0% EXCELLENT

5-3) Data acquisition/instrument control software

2016
- 7.2% POOR
- 55.1% FAIR
- 22.2% GOOD
- 12.9% VERY GOOD
- 0.4% EXCELLENT

2017
- 5.7% POOR
- 3.5% FAIR
- 25.8% GOOD
- 40.0% VERY GOOD
- 2.9% EXCELLENT

2018
- 3.2% POOR
- 23.8% FAIR
- 36.3% GOOD
- 35.9% VERY GOOD
- 0.8% EXCELLENT
### 6-1) Quality of Software

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6-2) Range of capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6-3) Assistance from J-PARC staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6-4) Remote access to software

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison graph of respondents in both Japanese and English

Comparison graph of items by respondents answered in Japanese and English.
1-1) Ease of proposal process

1-2) Efficiency of scheduling time

1-3) Fairness of proposal process
2-1) Effectiveness of computer based training

2-2) Appropriateness of the contents regarding safety education

POOR | FAIR | GOOD | VERY GOOD | EXCELLENT
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Japanese | 3 | 12 | 131 | 127 | 80 | 77 | 64
English | 0 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 2

Japanese | 2 | 1 | 126 | 116 | 92 | 78
English | 0 | 2 | 52 | 52 | 78
3-1) User laboratory facilities

Japanese

3-2) Tools and supplies in user labs

Japanese

3-3) Computers/network access for visitors

Japanese

3-4) User Rooms

Japanese
4-1) Variety of sample environments

4-2) Support from sample environment personnel

4-3) Quality and reliability of the equipment
6-1) Quality of Software

Japanese

POOR: 3 0 17 2 125
FAIR: 3 0 17 2 125
GOOD: 24 56 67 67
VERY GOOD: 138 67 67
EXCELLENT: 6 6

English

POOR: 0 0 0 0 0
FAIR: 0 0 0 0 0
GOOD: 0 0 0 0 0
VERY GOOD: 0 0 0 0 0
EXCELLENT: 0 0

6-2) Range of capabilities

Japanese

POOR: 3 0 17 3 130
FAIR: 3 0 17 3 130
GOOD: 29 60 61 67
VERY GOOD: 139 60 61 67
EXCELLENT: 6 6

English

POOR: 0 0 0 0 0
FAIR: 0 0 0 0 0
GOOD: 0 0 0 0 0
VERY GOOD: 0 0 0 0 0
EXCELLENT: 0 0

6-3) Assistance from J-PARC staff

Japanese

POOR: 1 0 4 1 67
FAIR: 16 19 118
GOOD: 0 0 0
VERY GOOD: 0 0 0
EXCELLENT: 0 0

English

POOR: 0 0 0 0 0
FAIR: 0 0 0 0 0
GOOD: 0 0 0 0 0
VERY GOOD: 0 0 0 0 0
EXCELLENT: 0 0

6-4) Remote access to software

Japanese

POOR: 15 4 34 6 168
FAIR: 35 44 53 60
GOOD: 0 0 0 0
VERY GOOD: 0 0 0 0
EXCELLENT: 0 0

English

POOR: 0 0 0 0 0
FAIR: 0 0 0 0 0
GOOD: 0 0 0 0 0
VERY GOOD: 0 0 0 0 0
EXCELLENT: 0 0