How Are We Doing?

UNCG Libraries Conducts LibQual+™ Survey

The University Libraries conducted the LibQual+™ survey in the Fall of 2008 to solicit student, faculty and staff perceptions about the UNCG Libraries (Jackson and Music Libraries). LibQual+™ is a standardized measurement developed by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL Libraries) in 2000. Since then it has been completed by over 1 million people from over 1000 libraries worldwide. It measures what service is desired by clients and the service they perceive they are receiving. LibQual+™ also asks what is the minimum level of service with which they would be satisfied.

The Libraries were delighted with the response rate. More than 1900 University students, faculty and staff completed the survey and provided over 700 narrative comments. Libraries’ staff also participated. The highest response came from graduate students (730 or 37%) who also provided the highest number of comments (427). The disciplines of Business and Health Sciences represented the most respondents from all categories of users. Incentives for taking the survey included a grand prize of an IPOD along with other prizes including gas cards and UNCG Bookstore gift certificates.

The survey includes 22 core questions on:
- Affect of Service (services)
- Information Control (collections and resources)
- Library as Place (library buildings)

Eleven additional questions ask about general satisfaction with the library and how often they use the library, both in-person and online. There is also space for narrative comments. The University Libraries last administered LibQual+™ in 2003.

The specific questions that received the highest ratings were “willingness to help users,” (7.73) “modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information” (7.73) and “employees who are consistently courteous.” (7.71). Rankings among specific user groups varied somewhat with faculty rating Affect of Service as highest and both graduate and undergraduate student choosing Information Control.

LibQual+™ also provides feedback on what is most important (desired) to our users. For all user groups Information Control ranked as the most desired service we provide. Specific needs include electronic resources, remote access to these resources and a web...
page that lets users access information on their own. Both faculty and graduate students ranked Affect of Service as the 2nd most important service while undergraduates ranked Library as Place as 2nd.

Conducting LibQual+™ provides the Libraries with the opportunity to address services or resources that need improvement. The difference between perceived service and desired service is calculated to form an “adequacy gap.” Interestingly, even though Information Control was rated the highest across all groups, because it is the most important dimension it is also the area all user groups feel needs the most improvement. The 2nd and 3rd priorities for improvement also followed the overall rankings with Affect of Service (2nd) and Library as Place (3rd). Specific concerns in these areas included lack of quiet comfortable space for study and difficulty finding an open computer.

The narrative comments also provide a very rich source of feedback from our users. Through the comments, we noted that many graduate students value quiet study space over group areas, while the opposite is true for undergraduates. We were also pleased to see that many of the comments included thanks and praise for specific libraries’ staff members. These and other comments have been coded with a qualitative analysis software tool and distributed to the appropriate Libraries’ units.

The Libraries continue to follow up on the data gathered from LibQual+™. During the Spring semester 2009, student focus groups were conducted to probe further about how the Jackson Library building addresses their academic needs. Because collections and resources were identified as the most important dimension, additional focus groups will be held to gain more information on how to make improvements. In addition, a survey to University staff will be administered to further ascertain their information needs.

In the meantime, in response to the survey the University Libraries have already taken action to more clearly delineate the quiet floors from the group study floors and to increase awareness of services, such as document delivery for graduate students and faculty, that our users were unaware of. The LibQual+™ survey will be conducted again in a few years and benchmarked against the 2008 data.

Comments:

“I have been around UNCG since 1974 — the library has become an amazing resource for linking technology to bibliographic information and making it easily accessible to users.”  (faculty)

“It is the best university library I have ever been associated with. I use the library as a selling point for potential new faculty.”  (faculty)

“I am also impressed by the knowledgeable staff, and how easy they are to access. You can IM them, email them, or call. I really like that flexibility.”  (graduate student)

“I appreciate the balance of print and electronic resources as well as the ability to access both online reference service and in-person help. As a distance ed student I rely on the virtual library services. But, much as I like online resources, the print and in-person services remain essential so I am glad that Jackson continues to provide solid physical and virtual information support in tandem. I’m glad I can come in to Jackson to get more in-depth resources and help. Thanks, Jackson library staff!”  (graduate student)

“When someone asks me one thing that I like best about UNCG, I always tell them that we have an excellent library here. ” (undergraduate student)

“The Library was my second home when I had nowhere else to go and I am very thankful for that. It was great for concentrating on getting my work done, and I don't know what I would have done without it there! Thank you so much!”  (undergraduate student)
What is LibQual+?

- Developed and administered by Association of Research Libraries (ARL)
- Implemented in 2000
- Has been completed by over 1 million users at over 1000 libraries in US and abroad
What is LibQual+? cont.

- Based on ServQual
- Developed to measure service in banking industry
- Measures what service clients expect and what they perceive they are receiving
What is LibQual+? cont.

- Users asked for judgment on:
  - Desired (expected) level of service
  - Minimum level of service they would be satisfied with
  - Perceived level they actually receive

- 22 core questions in 3 areas:
  - Affect of Service
  - Information Control
  - Library as Place

- 11 additional questions
- Qualitative comments box
LibQual 2008 at UNCG

- Administered for 3 weeks in October and November 2008
- 1,986 total responses
- 18% response rate
- (328 responses in 2003)
Respondents by user group

- 37% staff
- 30% faculty
- 16% graduate students
- 14% undergraduate students
- 3% library staff
Respondents by discipline

- Business: 17%
- Health Sciences: 17%
- Social Sciences/Psychology: 12%
- Education: 11%
- Performing & Fine Arts: 13%
- Math: 6%
- Humanities: 9%
- Other: 6%
Respondents by gender

Respondents by Gender

- Women: 30%
- Men: 70%

UNCG Gender Distribution

- Women: 33%
- Men: 67%
Overall results

- **Affect of Service**
- **Information Control**
- **Library as Place**

desired Mean
perceived Mean
Comparison to 2003

- Affect of Service
- Information Control
- Library as Place

Perceived Mean 2003
Perceived Mean 2008

All (excluding Library staff)
Comparison to Library staff

- Affect of Service
- Information Control
- Library as Place
Comparison to other state university

- Affect of Service
- Information Control
- Library as Place

- UNCG
- Other State University
Top 3 overall perceived mean

1. Willingness to help users  
   *Category: “Affect of Service”*

2. Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information  
   *Category: “Information Control”*

3. Employees who are consistently courteous  
   *Category: “Affect of Service”*
Top 3 desired

1. The electronic information resources I need
   *Category: “Information Control”*

2. Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office
   *Category: “Information Control”*

3. A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own
   *Category: “Information Control”*
Top three opportunities

1. Giving users individual attention  
   *Category: “Affect of Service”*

2. Employees who instill confidence in users  
   *Category: “Affect of Service”*

3. Library space that inspires study and learning  
   *Category: “Library as Place”*
Narrative comments

- Over 700 responses
- Numerous positive comments reflecting staff
- Division of opinion between graduate and undergraduate students on quiet/study space
- Analysis of comments using Atlas.ti Qualitative Data Analysis Software
- Separate analysis document is forthcoming
Selected quotes

“The Library was my second home when I had nowhere else to go and I am very thankful for that. It was great for concentrating on getting my work done, and I don't know what I would have done without it there! Thank you so much!”

-- an undergraduate patron.
“I personally like the library but the bathrooms could be better. I can get a lot of studying accomplished there. I never really check books out, I just use the space to write papers on my laptop because it is a great study environment.”

-- a Social Sciences graduate patron
“My main complaint about the library is the noise level from other students. I think there should be some effort made to require students to show a bit more restraint.”

-- a Health Sciences undergraduate patron
Selected quotes (cont.)

“We need more quiet spaces ... and more group study areas.”

-- a Health Sciences undergraduate patron
Some highlights

- Information Control most important expected service across all user groups
- For Library staff, Affect of Service most important
- Journal collections an issue for faculty
- Quiet study space an issue for graduate students
What’s next?

- Look at expectations vs. perceived service for each user group and evaluate the gaps.
- Compare expectations of users with Libraries’ staff.
- Conduct focus groups with each user group to probe further.
- Address needs.
Actions take after 2003 survey

- New ILS
- Usability lab
- Federated searching
- Improvements to Journal Finder
- Desktop Delivery of articles
- Opening library at 7:30
- Pay per View/ILL analysis
- Increase in e-resources
- 24/5
Analysis of LibQual+™ Survey Results (2008)

University of North Carolina at Greensboro, University Libraries

Quantitative Survey Results by User Group and User Role
Background

In the fall of 2008, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro University Libraries conducted the “LibQual+®” survey across a selection of staff, faculty, Library staff, undergraduate and all graduate students. Over 11,000 survey invitations were sent out with 1986 responses received, which is an 18% return rate. Data captured included both quantitative through a rating of each question and qualitative data, in the form of written comments.

Although results showed a statistically significant representation of each user group, only the quantitative data in the Faculty, Graduate and Undergraduate survey responses are analyzed in this analysis, as these groups represent the highest volume of Library patron resource needs.

Intent of Analysis

The specific intent of this analysis is to ask the following questions:

- **“What are we doing that is right?”**
  
  o Put another way, “Where are we delivering the best service based on patron expectations?”

  o Considers metrics for the top three Perceived Service Level scores and the top three Superiority Gaps (“Perceived” minus “Desired”)

- **“What are we doing that is wrong?”**
  
  o Put another way, “Where are we delivering service that is close to or below the minimum requirements of our patrons?”

  o Considers metrics for the bottom three Perceived Service Level scores and the bottom three Adequacy Gaps (“Perceived” minus “Minimum”)

- **“What should our priorities be?”**
  
  o Put another way, “What the points where we should start working to improve that would affect the most improvements?”

  o Considers the ranking orders for each of the three main dimensions (‘Affect of Service’, ‘Information Control’ and ‘Library as Place’) with metrics for Perceived Service Level, Desired Service Level and Adequacy Gaps.
Notes on Dimensions and Metrics

The LibQUAL+® survey is divided up into the three main dimensions of ‘Affect of Service’, ‘Information Control’ and ‘Library as Place’ using metrics from 22 core questions. The breakdown of the core metrics from the 22 questions is:

- **Affect of Service** – 9 Questions
  - “Dependability in handling users’ service problems.”
  - “Employees who understand the needs of their users.”
  - “Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions.”
  - “Readiness to respond to users’ questions.”
  - “Willingness to help users.”
  - “Employees who are consistently courteous.”
  - “Giving users individual attention.”
  - “Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion.”
  - “Employees who install confidence in users.”

- **Information Control** – 8 Questions
  - “Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work.”
  - “A library web site enabling me to locate information on my own.”
  - “The electronic information resources I need.”
  - “Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information.”
  - “Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own.”
  - “The printed materials I need for my work.”
  - “Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office.”
  - “Making information easily accessible for independent use.”

- **Library as Place** – 5 Questions
  - “Library space that inspires study and learning.”
- “A comfortable and inviting location.”
- “Quiet space for individual activities.”
- “A getaway for study, learning or research.”
- “Community space for group learning and group study.”

From the LibQUAL+® results document, “Service Superiority is an indicator of the extent to which you are exceeding the desired expectation of your users. A positive service superiority gap score indicates that your users’ perceived level of service quality is above their desired level or service quality.”

The calculation for ‘Superiority Gap’ is:

$$\text{Superiority Gap} = \text{“Perceived” service level} - \text{“Desired” service level}$$

Also from the LibQUAL+® results document, “Service adequacy is an indicator of the extent to which you are meeting the minimum expectation of your users. A negative service adequacy gap score indicates that your users’ perceived level of service quality is below their minimum level of service quality.”

The calculation for ‘Adequacy Gap’ is:

$$\text{Adequacy Gap} = \text{“Perceived” service level} - \text{“Minimum” service level}$$
Top Three Scoring Core Questions

“What are we doing that is right?”

Examining the top three scoring core questions answers the question “What are we doing that is right?”, or put another way, “Where are we delivering the best service based on patron expectations?”

The core question top three scores for ‘Perceived Mean’ are included mostly as a reference point, as they do not consider what the patron’s have indicated as their ‘Desired’ service levels which represent their highest expectations.

See the bottom three ‘Superiority Gaps’ to see the core questions that most accurately answer the question “What are we doing that is right?”, as those scores do consider what the patrons have indicated as their ‘Desired’ service levels which represent their highest expectations.

Top Three Perceived Service Level Core Question Scores

These metrics are the highest individual core question scores for the top-three values over the 22 core question scores, for each of the user groups.

Faculty

1. “Employees who are consistently courteous.” (7.91 – Affect of Service)
2. “Willingness to help users.” (7.83 – Affect of Service)
3. “Readiness to respond to users’ questions.” (7.82 – Affect of Service)

Undergraduate

1. “Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information.” (7.82 – Information Control)
2. “Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office.” (7.68 – Information Control)
3. “Making information easily accessible for independent use.” (7.68 – Information Control)

Graduate

1. “Willingness to help users.” (7.76 – Affect of Service)
2. “Employees who are consistently courteous.” (7.76 – Affect of Service)
3. “Readiness to respond to users' questions.” (7.71 – Affect of Service)
Top Three Superiority Gaps for each User Group

The calculation for ‘Superiority Gap’ is:

Superiority Gap = “Perceived” service level - "Desired” service level

Faculty

1. “Community space for group learning and group study.” (0.19 – Library as Place)
2. “A getaway for study, learning or research.” (-0.26 – Library as Place)
3. “Quiet space for individual activities.” (-0.29 – Library as Place)

Undergraduate

1. “Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information.” (-0.36 – Information Control)
2. “Community space for group learning and group study.” (-0.36 – Library as Place)
3. “Willingness to help users.” (-0.44 – Affect of Service)

Graduate

1. “Community space for group learning and group study.” (-0.05 – Library as Place)
2. “Giving users individual attention.” (-0.37 Affect of Service)
3. “Readiness to respond to users' questions.” (-0.48 – Affect of Service)
Bottom Three Scoring Core Questions

“What are we doing that is wrong?”

Examining the bottom three scoring core questions answers the question “What are we doing that is wrong?”, or put another way, “Where are we delivering service that is close to or below the minimum requirements of our patrons?”

The two metrics that address the area where improvement should be made are the lowest scoring ‘Perceived Mean’ and lowest scoring ‘Adequacy Gaps’ for each user group. The lowest ‘Perceived Mean’ scores indicate the core questions that have the lowest service level the patrons are receiving and the lowest ‘Adequacy Gaps’ scores indicate the degree that the Library is meeting the minimum needs of the patrons in those core questions.

The core question bottom three scores for ‘Perceived Mean’ are included mostly as a reference point, as they do not consider what the patron’s have indicated as their ‘Minimum’ service level that they require to get their work done.

See the bottom three ‘Adequacy Gaps’ to see the core questions that most accurately answer the question “What are we doing that is wrong?”, as those scores do consider what the patrons have indicated as their ‘Minimum’ service level that they require to get their work done.

**Bottom Three Perceived Mean for each User Group**

**Faculty**

1. “Community space for group learning and group study.” (6.66 – Library as Place)
2. “Library space that inspires study and learning.” (6.74 – Library as Place)
3. “Quiet space for individual activities.” (6.94 – Library as Place)

**Undergraduate**

1. “Giving users individual attention.” (6.81 – Affect of Service)
2. “Employees who install confidence in users.” (6.98 – Affect of Service)
3. “Library space that inspires study and learning.” (7.25 – Library as Place)

**Graduate**

1. “Library space that inspires study and learning.” (6.66 – Library as Place)
2. “Employees who install confidence in users.” (6.67 – Affect of Service)
3. “Quiet space for individual activities.” (7.03 – Library as Place)

**Bottom Three Adequacy Gaps for each User Group**

The calculation for ‘Adequacy Gap’ is:

Adequacy Gap = “Perceived” service level – “Minimum” service level

**Faculty**
1. “Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work.” (-0.21 – Information Control)
2. “A library web site enabling me to locate information on my own.” (-0.03 – Information Control)
3. “The electronic information resources I need.” (0.10 – Information Control)

**Undergraduate**
1. “Employees who are consistently courteous.” (0.59 – Affect of Service)
2. “Quiet space for individual activities.” (0.64 – Library as Place)
3. “The electronic information resources I need.” (0.66 – Information Control)

**Graduate**
1. “Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work.” (0.01 – Information Control)
2. “The electronic information resources I need.” (0.15 – Information Control)
3. “Library space that inspires study and learning.” (0.19 – Library as Place)
**Prioritizing Target Areas for Improvement**

In order to assist with prioritizing where the University Libraries should focus attention on making changes to improve service levels and patron satisfaction, the measures of ‘Perceived Service Level’, ‘Desired Service Level’ and ‘Adequacy Gaps’ provide the best direction.

The ranking of ‘**Perceived Service Level**’ gives an indicator how well in general the University Library is doing in that dimension, but does not consider the minimum or desired service levels for the dimensions. This metric is ranked from highest to lowest with the inference that the dimension with the lowest score should be addressed first.

The ranking of ‘**Desired Service Level**’ provides a hierarchy of how the user groups believe the University Library should be providing service. It does not take into account what service level is being currently provided nor does it consider what minimum service level is required for patrons to do their work. This metric is ranked from lowest to highest with the inference that the dimension with highest desired service level should be addressed first.

The ranking of ‘**Adequacy Gaps**’ shows the gaps between the minimum service levels that are required for patrons to do their work and the service level that is currently being provided. The dimension where the gap between Minimum and Perceived is smallest is where attention should be focused first. This metric is ranking from highest to lowest with the inference that the dimension with the smallest gap between ‘Perceived’ and ‘Minimum’ should be addressed first.

In order to come up with an aggregate prioritization list based on these three metrics, a simple formula assigns ‘1’, ‘2’ or ‘3’ to each of the ranked dimension for each metric and then the sum provides the final ranking values. For example, in the Faculty user group:

*Perceived*:

1. Affect of Service (7.63)
2. Information Control (7.59)
3. Library as Place (6.99)

*Desired*:

1. Library as Place (7.30)
2. Affect of Service (8.11)
3. Information Control (8.41)

*Adequacy Gap*:
1. Library as Place (0.71)
2. Affect of Service (0.51)
3. Information Control (0.10)

In this example, for the Perceived metric, 1 point is assigned to ‘Affect of Service’, 2 points to ‘Information Control’ and 3 points to ‘Library as Place’. The same is done for the Desired and Adequacy Gaps metrics. The final score is the ranking for prioritization.

**Perceived Service Level Ranking by User Group**

The ‘Perceived’ service level for each dimension is what the user groups feel that the Library is currently providing for each dimension.

**Faculty**

1. Affect of Service (7.63)
2. Information Control (7.59)
3. Library as Place (6.99)

**Undergraduate**

1. Information Control (7.60)
2. Library as Place (7.43)
3. Affect of Service (7.39)

**Graduate**

1. Information Control (7.59)
2. Affect of Service (7.48)
3. Library as Place (6.67)

**Desired Service Level Ranking By User Group (Dimension)**
The ‘Desired’ service level for each dimension can be perceived as being equivalent to what the user groups ‘expect’ the Library to provide for each dimension. In other words, the ‘desired’ service level is our target service level to provide complete satisfaction for our patrons.

**Faculty**

1. Library as Place (7.30)
2. Affect of Service (8.11)
3. Information Control (8.41)

**Undergraduate**

1. Affect of Service (7.89)
2. Library as Place (8.02)
3. Information Control (8.12)

**Graduate**

1. Library as Place (7.77)
2. Affect of Service (8.06)
3. Information Control (8.41)

**Ranked Adequacy Gaps by Dimension for each User Group (“Perceived” minus “Minimum”):**

The calculation for ‘Adequacy Gap’ is:

\[
\text{Adequacy Gap} = \text{“Perceived” service level} - \text{“Minimum” service level}
\]

**Faculty**

1. Library as Place (0.71)
2. Affect of Service (0.51)
3. Information Control (0.10)

**Undergraduate**

1. Library as Place (0.76)
2. Affect of Service (0.75)
3. Information Control (0.75)

**Graduate**

1. Affect of Service (0.64)
2. Library as Place (0.44)
3. Information Control (0.28)

**Prioritization Rank by User Group**

Based on the sums of each dimension across each user group above, the following list is the prioritization list for each user group.

**Faculty**

1. Information Control
2. Affect of Service
3. Library as Place

**Undergraduate**

1. Information Control
2. Affect of Service
3. Library as Place

**Graduate**

1. Information Control
2. Library as Place
3. Affect of Service

**Overall Prioritization Rank**

This rank is simply an average of the ranking across all user groups and provides an aggregate list of priorities across all user groups.
1. Information Control

2. Affect of Service

3. Library as Place

From these results, we see that the most important dimension for all user groups is ‘Information Control’, which is the dimension pertains specifically to resource management and resource accessibility, should be the first or primary focus of attention for improvement.

Looking at the other dimensions as they pertain to the user groups, we see that ‘Library as Place’ has a higher average desired service level to the Undergraduate user group than it does to the Faculty and Graduate user groups. This indicates that the physical presence of the Library building itself (space, furnishings, and ambiance) means more to the Undergraduate user group than to the Faculty and Graduate user groups.

However, once the scores for the user groups are considered the overall ranking of the dimensions places ‘Affect of Service’ ahead of ‘Library as Place’. This means that to the majority of people who responded to the survey, the Library staff’s knowledge and willingness to help patrons is more important than the Libraries physical presence.