

Performance Measurement and Metrics

*The International Journal for Library and Information
Services*

Equating scores on “Lite” and long library user survey forms: the LibQUAL + ® Lite randomized control trials

Bruce Thompson

Texas A&M University and Baylor College of Medicine, College Station, Texas, USA

Martha Kyrillidou

Association of Research Libraries, Washington, DC, USA

Colleen Cook

Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA



Performance Measurement and Metrics: The international journal for library and information services addresses the issues of metrics, quantitative approaches to measurement across the spectrum as well as the qualitative aspects of the provision of library and information services.

EDITOR

Steve Thornton
Formerly Departmental Programmes
Co-ordinator for Knowledge Services,
Defence Science and Technology Laboratory,
Ministry of Defence, UK

PUBLISHER

Lizzie Scott

ISSN 1467-8047

© 2009 Emerald Group Publishing Limited

Performance Measurement and Metrics: The international journal for library and information services is published in association with Aslib, The Association for Information Management.



Awarded in recognition of Emerald's production department's adherence to quality systems and processes when preparing scholarly journals for print



Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Howard House, Environmental Management System has been certified by ISOQAR to ISO 14001:2004 standards

Performance Measurement and Metrics:
The international journal for library and information services
is indexed and abstracted in:
Academic Search Alumni Edition
Academic Search Complete
Academic Search Premier
Academic Science Complete
Academic Science Premier
Current Abstracts
Current Awareness Abstracts
Emerald Management Reviews
INSPEC
Library, Information Science and Technology Abstracts
(LISTA)
ProQuest Research Library
TOC Premier
retoc

This journal is also available online at

Journal Information

www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm

Table of contents

www.emeraldinsight.com/1467-8047.htm

Online journal content available worldwide at www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald Group Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane,
Bingley BD16 1WA, United Kingdom
Tel +44 (0) 1174 777700
Fax +44 (0) 1174 782400
E-mail emerald@emeraldinsight.com



EMERALD BY PEOPLE

Regional offices

For America

Emerald Group Publishing Inc., One NITFS Place, 119 West Auburn Street,
Suite 100, Harvard Square, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA
Tel +1 617 326 5781
E-mail america@emeraldinsight.com

For Asia Pacific

Emerald, 7-1, 7th Floor, Malacca Gate, Tanjong Pagar Road,
47100 Pasir Ris, Singapore, Malaysia
Tel +65 3 8214 4499; Fax +65 3 8216 6007
E-mail asia@emeraldinsight.com

For Australia

Emerald, PO Box 1045, Marley North, VIC 3048, Australia
Tel/Fax +61 80 3 9078 1200; Mobile +61 80 420 26424
E-mail australia@emeraldinsight.com

For China

Emerald, Room 201, Tower A, North Ring Center, 10th Yan'an Road,
Zhangjiagang District, Beijing, China
Tel +86 10 120 4428
E-mail china@emeraldinsight.com.cn

For India

Emerald, 301 + 303, 3rd Floor, Ring Road Mall, Plot No. 11, Mangalore Place,
Dhyanu Centre, Sector 19, Gurgaon, New Delhi 122015, India
Tel +91 98103 14423
E-mail india@emeraldinsight.com

For Japan

Emerald, 30-3 Nakagawa, Aza 1-10, Yokocho 2-1-034, Japan
Tel/Fax +81 45 367 1114
E-mail japan@emeraldinsight.com

For African enquiries

E-mail afrika@emeraldinsight.com

For European enquiries

E-mail europa@emeraldinsight.com

For Middle Eastern enquiries

E-mail mideast@emeraldinsight.com

Customer helpdesk:

Tel +44 (0) 1174 777700; Fax +44 (0) 1174 782400
E-mail helpdesk@emeraldinsight.com
Web www.emeraldinsight.com/customercenter

Orders, subscriptions and mailing claims enquiries:

E-mail subscriptions@emeraldinsight.com
Tel +44 (0) 1174 777700; Fax +44 (0) 1174 782400

Mailing claim enquiries will be fulfilled if claimed within six months of date of dispatch. Maximum of one claim per issue.

Hard copy print backsets, back volumes and back issues of volumes prior to the current and previous years can be ordered from Periodical Service Company. Tel +1 518 537 4200; E-mail psr@periodicals.com for further information go to www.periodicals.com/emerald.html

Reprints and permission service

For reprint and permission options please see the abstract page of the specific article in question on the Emerald web site (www.emeraldinsight.com), and then call on the "Reprints and permission" link. Or contact:
Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, USA
Tel +1 877 879 5111 (toll free) or 978 750 8400
E-mail custserv@copyright.com
Web www.copyright.com

No part of this journal may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without written permission from the publisher or its agents. Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. An responsibility is accepted for the accuracy of information contained in the text, illustrations or advertisements. The opinions expressed in the articles are not necessarily those of the author or publisher.

Emerald is a trading name of Emerald Group Publishing Limited
Printed by TYP Digital, Luton House, Middleton Industrial Estate,
Middleton Road, Guildford GU1 5XP



Equating scores on "Lite" and long library user survey forms

The LibQUAL + ® Lite randomized control trials

Bruce Thompson

Texas A&M University and Baylor College of Medicine, College Station, Texas, USA

Martha Kyrillidou

Association of Research Libraries, Washington, DC, USA, and

Colleen Cook

Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

Abstract

Purpose – In 2009, in *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, the authors reported results of LibQUAL + ® experiments at four universities in which the use of the LibQUAL + ® Lite protocol was investigated. The purpose of this article is to briefly report related results for the first use of LibQUAL + ® in Hebrew. The authors also take the opportunity to propose another method for equating scores across the LibQUAL + ® Lite and the traditional LibQUAL + ® protocols.

Design/methodology/approach – Matrix sampling is a survey method which can be used to collect data on all survey items without requiring every participant to react to every survey question. Here, the authors investigate the features of data from one such survey, the LibQUAL + ® Lite protocol, exploring the participation rates, completion times, and result comparisons across the two administration protocols – the traditional LibQUAL + ® protocol and the LibQUAL + ® Lite protocol – at an Israeli University and for the first time, in Hebrew.

Findings – This experimental approach confirms the previous work which showed that greater completion rates were realized with the LibQUAL + ® Lite protocol. The data from the Lite protocol might be the most accurate representation of the views of all the library users in a given community.

Originality/value – This is the first time LibQUAL + ® has been used in Hebrew.

Keywords Consumer satisfaction, Library users, Information services, Quality management, Israel

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Librarians have increasingly come to recognize the importance of listening to their users. Librarians have come to realize the wisdom of the words of French philosopher and moralist François de La Rochefoucauld, "Il est plus nécessaire d'étudier les hommes que les livres." (de La Rochefoucauld). In the words of Bruce Thompson, "We only care about the things we measure" (Thompson, 2006), so we do not seriously care about service quality unless we listen to library users in various systematic ways. Within a service quality orientation, "only customers judge quality; all other judgments are essentially irrelevant" (Zeithaml *et al.*, 1990).



PMM
10,3

214

- (11) French Polynesia;
- (12) Hong Kong;
- (13) Ireland;
- (14) Japan;
- (15) Mexico;
- (16) The Netherlands;
- (17) New Zealand;
- (18) Norway;
- (19) Singapore;
- (20) South Africa;
- (21) Sweden;
- (22) Switzerland;
- (23) The United Arab Emirates;
- (24) The United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales);
- (25) The United States; and most recently
- (26) Israel.

Currently, the system supports 18 languages: Afrikaans, American English, British English, Chinese (Traditional), Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French (Belgian), French (Canadian), French (French), Hebrew, German, Japanese, Norwegian, Spanish, Swedish, Welsh, and most recently, Hebrew. The development and use of LibQUAL + ® has been documented in a host of academic outlets (Cook *et al.*, 2001; Thompson *et al.*, 2001; Cook *et al.*, 2003; Heath *et al.*, 2002; Cook *et al.*, 2002; Cook and Heath, 2001; Cook *et al.*, 2001; Thompson *et al.*, 2005; Thompson *et al.*, 2007a; Thompson *et al.*, 2008).

Purposes of the present article

Various experiments have been conducted during the development of LibQUAL + ® to insure that the protocol yields reliable and valid scores and is useful in guiding library service quality improvement. For example, an early LibQUAL + ® experiment assigned users either a radio button or a slider survey response format, so that we could empirically determine which format worked best (Cook *et al.*, 2001).

In 2009, in Performance Measurement and Metrics, we reported results of LibQUAL + ® randomized controlled trial (RCT) experiments at four universities in which we investigated the use of "matrix sampling" methods to collect ratings on the LibQUAL + ® Lite protocol

As we explained in more detail in that report (Thompson *et al.*, 2009):

LibQUAL + ® Lite is a survey methodology in which (a) all users answer a few, selected survey questions (i.e. 3 core items), but (b) the remaining survey questions are answered ONLY by a randomly selected subsample of the users. Thus, (a) data are collected on all questions, but (b) each user answers fewer questions, thus shortening the required response time.

LibQUAL + ®

One service quality assessment tool that has been widely used to listen to library users around the world is LibQUAL + ®. As noted elsewhere, LibQUAL + ® has three primary components.

First, LibQUAL + ® consists of 22 core items measuring perceived service quality with respect to:

- service affect;
- library as place; and
- information control.

Each item is rated with respect to:

- minimally-acceptable service expectations;
- desired service expectations; and
- perceived level of actual service quality.

Second, the LibQUAL + ® protocol solicits open-ended comments from users regarding library service quality. These comments are crucial, because here the participants elaborate upon perceived strengths and weaknesses, and sometimes offer suggestions for specific actions to improve service. Third, libraries using LibQUAL + ® have the option of selecting five additional items from a supplementary pool of 100 + items to augment the 22 core items to focus on issues of local interest. (Thomson *et al.*, 2007)

LibQUAL + ® data can be evaluated using any or all of three interpretation frameworks:

- location of perceptions within the “zones of tolerance” defined by minimally-acceptable and desired expectations;
- benchmarking against peer institutions; and
- comparing changes in a given institution’s data longitudinally over time.

In the ten years since its inception in 2000 (Thomson, 2007), LibQUAL + ® has been used to collect data from more than 1.15 million library users from more than 1,000 institutions! LibQUAL + ® now has been used in 26 different countries:

- (1) Australia;
- (2) Bahamas;
- (3) Belgium;
- (4) Canada;
- (5) China;
- (6) Cyprus;
- (7) Denmark;
- (8) Egypt;
- (9) Finland;
- (10) France;

PMM
10,3

214

- (11) French Polynesia;
- (12) Hong Kong;
- (13) Ireland;
- (14) Japan;
- (15) Mexico;
- (16) The Netherlands;
- (17) New Zealand;
- (18) Norway;
- (19) Singapore;
- (20) South Africa;
- (21) Sweden;
- (22) Switzerland;
- (23) The United Arab Emirates;
- (24) The United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales);
- (25) The United States; and most recently
- (26) Israel.

Currently, the system supports 18 languages: Afrikaans, American English, British English, Chinese (Traditional), Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French (Belgian), French (Canadian), French (French), Hebrew, German, Japanese, Norwegian, Spanish, Swedish, Welsh, and most recently, Hebrew. The development and use of LibQUAL + ® has been documented in a host of academic outlets (Cook *et al.*, 2001; Thompson *et al.*, 2001; Cook *et al.*, 2003; Heath *et al.*, 2002; Cook *et al.*, 2002; Cook and Heath, 2001; Cook *et al.*, 2001; Thompson *et al.*, 2005; Thompson *et al.*, 2007a; Thompson *et al.*, 2008).

Purposes of the present article

Various experiments have been conducted during the development of LibQUAL + ® to insure that the protocol yields reliable and valid scores and is useful in guiding library service quality improvement. For example, an early LibQUAL + ® experiment assigned users either a radio button or a slider survey response format, so that we could empirically determine which format worked best (Cook *et al.*, 2001).

In 2009, in Performance Measurement and Metrics, we reported results of LibQUAL + ® randomized controlled trial (RCT) experiments at four universities in which we investigated the use of "matrix sampling" methods to collect ratings on the LibQUAL + ® Lite protocol

As we explained in more detail in that report (Thompson *et al.*, 2009):

LibQUAL + ® Lite is a survey methodology in which (a) all users answer a few, selected survey questions (i.e. 3 core items), but (b) the remaining survey questions are answered ONLY by a randomly selected subsample of the users. Thus, (a) data are collected on all questions, but (b) each user answers fewer questions, thus shortening the required response time.

Here, we briefly report related results for the first use of LibQUAL + \oplus in Hebrew. We also take the opportunity to propose another method for equating scores across the LibQUAL + \oplus Lite and the traditional LibQUAL + \oplus protocols. In the traditional protocol, all users complete all the 22 core items of the LibQUAL + \oplus survey, while on the Lite form, each participant completes only 8 of the 22 questions.

Results

Method

At the participating university in Israel, randomly 50 percent of the users invited to complete the LibQUAL + \oplus survey were asked to complete all the 22 core items of the LibQUAL + \oplus survey. The remaining 50 percent of the users invited to complete the LibQUAL + \oplus survey were asked to complete the LibQUAL + \oplus Lite protocol in which only 8 of the 22 core items are presented, but different users receive different item combinations (with 3 "linking" items being completed by every Lite respondent). Thus, the present study was a randomized controlled trial (RCT).

Results

As in our previous RCT comparing the Lite versus the long LibQUAL + \oplus protocol, a higher percentage of the persons asked to rate library services completed the protocol when they received the Lite form. Of the 1,908 participants who met our inclusion criteria (i.e. not too many "not applicable" responses, and not too many "inversions" in which on an item minimum-acceptable ratings are illogically higher than desired ratings), we received 1,089 responses from Lite participants, but only 819 responses from long form participants. Thus, the percentages of our data from Lite versus long forms (i.e. 57.1 percent versus 42.9 percent), because they deviate from our random 50 percent/50 percent presentation of the two protocols, reflect the greater tendency for Lite-form participants to complete the survey.

As noted previously, participants receiving the long protocol responded to all 22 LibQUAL + \oplus core items. Participants receiving to the Lite form responded to eight of the 22 core items. Five of these eight items were randomly selected for each individual participant. The remaining three items were completed by all respondents. These three items, one per LibQUAL + \oplus scale (i.e. Affect of Service, Information Control, and Library as Place) were items AS13 (i.e. the 13th of the 22 core items, which is an item from the Affect of Service scale), IC10, and LP03. These items were selected as "linking" items that could be used to equate scores on the Lite and long forms because scores on these items were most highly correlated with their respective scales.

Table I presents the means (and standard deviations) across the "Lite" and long forms on the five LibQUAL + \oplus scores on each of the three LibQUAL + \oplus items AS13, IC10, and LP03. Theoretically, because participants were randomly assigned one of the two administration protocols, and all participants in both groups responded to these three items, means (and standard deviations) should be equal or very similar, unless sample compositions of the persons electing to complete the survey differ in their views across the shorter and the more time-consuming protocols.

Equating method

As noted in our previous report (Thompson, Kyrillidou and Cook, 2009), there are various ways that linking items can be used to equate scores across alternative test

PMM
10,3

216

Table I.
Means (and standard deviations) across "Lite" and long forms on five LibQUAL + @ scores on each of the three LibQUAL + @ scales

	Form/difference	Affect of service		Scale Information control		Library as a place	
Perceived	Lite	7.51	(1.55)	6.76	(1.69)	6.15	(1.08)
	Long	7.52	(1.46)	7.16	(1.44)	6.22	(1.99)
	<i>Difference</i>	<i>0.01</i>	<i>0.03</i>	<i>0.48</i>	<i>0.07</i>	<i>0.21</i>	<i>0.11</i>
Minimum	Lite	7.21	(1.60)	6.81	(1.61)	6.73	(1.75)
	Long	7.22	(1.63)	7.29	(1.54)	6.94	(1.64)
	<i>Difference</i>	<i>0.01</i>	<i>0.03</i>	<i>0.48</i>	<i>0.07</i>	<i>0.21</i>	<i>0.11</i>
Desired	Lite	8.41	(0.95)	8.32	(1.02)	8.15	(1.26)
	Long	8.35	(0.97)	8.44	(0.93)	8.33	(1.08)
	<i>Difference</i>	<i>0.06</i>	<i>0.02</i>	<i>0.12</i>	<i>0.09</i>	<i>0.18</i>	<i>0.18</i>
Adequacy gap	Lite	0.30	(1.82)	0.06	(2.11)	0.58	(2.49)
	Long	0.30	(1.76)	0.13	(1.88)	0.72	(2.33)
	<i>Difference</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.05</i>	<i>0.08</i>	<i>0.23</i>	<i>0.14</i>	<i>0.15</i>
Superiority gap	Lite	0.91	(1.55)	1.55	(1.83)	2.00	(2.27)
	Long	0.84	(1.43)	1.28	(1.58)	2.11	(2.15)
	<i>Difference</i>	<i>0.07</i>	<i>0.13</i>	<i>0.27</i>	<i>0.26</i>	<i>0.11</i>	<i>0.12</i>

Note: nLITE = 1,089; nLONG = 819; standard deviations are presented in parentheses; the differences (Lite minus Long) in statistics are presented in italics

forms. The alternatives vary in their tradeoffs of simplicity against precision, and with respect to what statistical assumptions one wants to make. Here, we use the Israel data to illustrate yet another choice.

To convert a score on the j th item on the long form for a given subscale to the j th item score on the Lite form, we can use the formula:

$$LITEX_{ij} = [(LONGX_{ij} \cdot LONGM_j) / LONGSD_j] \cdot$$

$$(LONGSD_j \cdot [LITESDL / LONGSDL]) + [LONGM_j \cdot (LONGML - LITEML)]$$

where:

$LONGX_{ij}$ = the score (e.g., 6.00, 7.00) of a given i th person, on any one given j th item (e.g., IC02, IC05, IC07), from a given subscale (e.g., Information Control, Library as Place), on the long protocol.

$LONGM_j$ = the mean on the long form on the j th item;

$LONGSD_j$ = the standard deviation on the long form on the j th item;

$LITESDL$ = the standard deviation on the Lite form on the linking item for a given subscale;

$LONGSDL$ = the standard deviation on the long form on the linking item for a given subscale;

$LONGML$ = the mean on the long form on the linking item for a given subscale;

$LITEML$ = the mean on the Lite form on the linking item for a given subscale.

For example, for these data for the perception score on the linking item for the Information Control scale, IC10 (i.e. the 10th of the 22 core items, which is an item from the Information Control scale), as reported in Table I:

LONGML = 7.16;
LONGSDL = 1.44;
LITESDL = 1.69;
LITEML = 6.76.

If a particular participant, i = Martha, had a score of 6.00 on the long form on item j = IC02 (i.e. an Information Control item), for which for these data LONGMIC02 = 6.93 and LONGSDIC02 = 1.80, Martha's equated score on the Lite form would equal:

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\text{LONGX}_{ij} - \text{LONGM}_j) / \text{LONGSD}_j) * \\ & (\text{LONGSD}_j * [\text{LITESDL} / \text{LONGSDL}]) + [\text{LONGM}_j - (\text{LONGML} - \text{LITEML})] \\ & [(6.00 - 6.93) / 1.80] * (1.80 * [1.69 / 1.44]) + [6.93 - (7.16 - 6.76)] \\ & [(6.00 - 6.93) / 1.80] * (1.80 * [1.69 / 1.44]) + [6.93 - 0.40] \\ & [(6.00 - 6.93) / 1.80] * (1.80 * [1.69 / 1.44]) + 6.53 \\ & [(6.00 - 6.93) / 1.80] * (1.80 * 1.17) + 6.53 \\ & [(6.00 - 6.93) / 1.80] * 2.11 + 6.53 \\ & [(-0.93 / 1.80) * 2.11] + 6.53 \\ & [0.52 * 2.11] + 6.53 \\ & 1.09 + 6.53 = 5.44 \end{aligned}$$

Conversely, if we wanted to equate a score 5.00 of i = Colleen on the Lite protocol, also on item j = IC02, with a score on the long protocol, we could use the formula:

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\text{LITEX}_{ij} - \text{LITEM}_j) / \text{LITESD}_j) * \\ & (\text{LITESD}_j * [\text{LONGSDL} / \text{LITESDL}]) + [\text{LITEM}_j - (\text{LITEML} - \text{LONGML})] \\ & [(5.00 - 6.88) / 1.80] * (1.80 * [1.44 / 1.69]) + [6.88 - (6.76 - 7.16)] \\ & [(5.00 - 6.88) / 1.80] * (1.80 * [1.44 / 1.69]) + [6.88 - -0.40] \\ & [(5.00 - 6.88) / 1.80] * (1.80 * [1.44 / 1.69]) + 7.28 \\ & [(5.00 - 6.88) / 1.80] * (1.80 * 0.85) + 7.28 \\ & [(5.00 - 6.88) / 1.80] * 1.53 + 7.28 \\ & [(-1.88 / 1.80) * 1.53] + 7.28 \\ & [1.04 * 1.53] + 7.28 \\ & 1.60 + 7.28 = 5.68 \end{aligned}$$

More detail on various test equating methods that can be used in the presence of "linking" items completed by all participants on all alternative test forms is provided in chapter 20 of the text by Crocker and Algina (1986). However, the topic is complex, and

even greater detail is available for the masochist in the book-length treatment by Kolen and Brennan (2004).

A key point to remember is that all score equating methods are only approximate. Also, high-stakes equating efforts (e.g., equating scores on the myriad forms of the Graduate Record Exam, or the Scholastic Aptitude Test) use more linking items, so that equating can be done with scores that are more reliable. Nevertheless, even approximate equating may be useful, as long as the researcher bears in mind the inherent limits of equating procedures, all of which are approximate.

Discussion

In our previous report (Thompson *et al.*, 2009) of a LibQUAL + @ Lite randomized controlled trial (RCT) conducted at four universities using an English version of the protocol, our major findings included higher completion rates for participants randomly assigned the Lite protocol, but that scale scores for persons completing the Lite protocol tended to be somewhat lower, at least on the Information Control and Library as Place scales. Thus, the Lite form seemingly yielded expected benefits. Our results here again confirm higher completion rates when using the LibQUAL + @ Lite protocol.

Even more importantly, we must always bear in mind the totals costs of the library satisfaction survey data we collect. The number of person hours invested in collecting the Lite data is about half that of the data collected using the long form. When a library is collecting data from thousands, or even tens of thousands of library users, these savings in the time invested by users in responding to our requests for feedback are hugely important.

In the present study, the noteworthy differences in means across the two protocols on the Information Control scale occurred once again. And the finding of virtually no difference in means across the two protocols on the Affect of Service scale was replicated. However, the previous differences in means across protocols on the Library as Place scale were not manifested in these new data.

Overall, as we collect more information about the performance of the LibQUAL + @ Lite protocol, the benefits of the protocol are confirmed. However, the comparability "apples to apples" of scores from the two protocols remains a question that requires additional study from more than five universities, and across more than only two language variations.

References

- Cook, C. and Heath, F. (2001), "Users' perceptions of library service quality: a LibQUAL+™ qualitative study", *Library Trends*, Vol. 49, pp. 548-84.
- Cook, C., Heath, F. and Thompson, B. (2002), "Score norms for improving library service quality: a LibQUAL+™ study", *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 13-26.
- Cook, C., Heath, F. and Thompson, B. (2003), "Zones of tolerance' in perceptions of library service quality: a LibQUAL+™ study", *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 113-23.
- Cook, C., Heath, F., Kyriellidou, M., Thompson, B. and Thompson, R.L. (2001), "The search for new measures: the ARL LibQUAL+™ study - a preliminary report", *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 103-12.
- Crocker, L. and Algina, J. (1986), *Introduction to Classical & Modern Test Theory*, CBS College Publishing, New York, NY.

- Heath, F., Cook, C., Kyrillidou, M. and Thompson, B. (2002), "ARL Index and other validity correlates of LibQUAL+™ scores", *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 27-42.
- Kolen, M.J. and Brennan, R.L. (2004), *Test Equating, Scaling, and Linking: Methods and Practices*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York, NY.
- Thompson, B. (2006), "Measuring user perceptions of library service quality: an introduction to LibQUAL+™", *Proceedings of the Czech and Slovakian Library Information Network (CASLIN) Conference, Prague, Czech Republic, June 2006*.
- Thompson, B. (2007), *The Origins/Birth of LibQUAL+®*, available at www.coe.tamu.edu/~bthompson/libbirth.htm (accessed 3 October, 2009).
- Thompson, B., Cook, C. and Heath, F. (2001), "How many dimensions does it take to measure users' perceptions of libraries? A LibQUAL+™ study", *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 103-12.
- Thompson, B., Cook, C. and Kyrillidou, M. (2005), "Concurrent validity of LibQUAL+™ scores: what do LibQUAL+™ scores measure?", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 31, pp. 517-22.
- Thompson, B., Kyrillidou, M. and Cook, C. (2007), "On-premises library versus Google™-like information gateway usage patterns: a LibQUAL+™ study", *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 463-80.
- Thompson, B., Kyrillidou, M. and Cook, C. (2008), "Library users' service desires: a LibQUAL+™ study", *Library Quarterly*, Vol. 1, pp. 1-18.
- Thompson, B., Kyrillidou, M. and Cook, C. (2009), "Item sampling in service quality assessment surveys to improve response rates and reduce respondent burden", *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 6-16.
- Zeithaml, V.A., Parasuraman, A. and Berry, L.L. (1990), *Delivering Quality Service: Balancing Customer Perceptions and Expectations*, Free Press, New York, NY.

Further reading

- Cook, C., Heath, F. and Thompson, R.L. (2000), "A meta-analysis of response rates in web- or internet-based surveys", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 61, pp. 821-36.
- Cook, C., Heath, F. and Thompson, B. (2001), "Users' hierarchical perspectives on library service quality: a LibQUAL+™ study", *College and Research Libraries*, Vol. 62, pp. 147-53.
- Cook, C., Heath, F., Thompson, R.L. and Thompson, B. (2001), "Score reliability in web- or internet-based surveys: unnumbered graphic rating scales versus Likert-type Scales", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 61 pp. 697-706.
- Cullen, R.J. (2001), "Perspectives on user satisfaction surveys", *Library Trends*, Vol. 49 No. 4, pp. 662-86.
- de La Rochefoucauld, F. (1613), "It is more necessary to study men than books", *Maximes*, Maxim 550 (G.E.F).

Corresponding authors

Bruce Thompson can be contacted at bruce-thompson@tamu.edu