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Overview

• Survey
  • background
  • design
• Analysis
  • Quantitative
  • Qualitative
• Summaries & Conclusions
• What next? Libraries’ focus
LibQual Survey

HISTORY

• ARL & Texas A&M developed from SERVQUAL instrument in 2000
• Standardized National Assessment tool for libraries
• More than 1,000 libraries have conducted LibQual Survey in over 17 countries
LibQual Survey

Instrument

• 3 dimensions
  1) Affect of Service (9 questions)
  2) Information Control (8 questions)
  3) Library as Place (5 questions)

• Five additional questions we selected

• 3 Overall general satisfaction questions on
  • Use of libraries
  • web browsers questions

• 5 Information Literacy questions
LibQual Survey

• Respondents were asked to provide three ratings for each Question
• Ratings range from 1 (low) to 9 (high)
  • Minimum (where should this service level start)
  • Desired (where should this service level be)
  • Perceived (where is this service level now)
• Measuring the Gaps
  • Adequacy Mean (Perceived – Minimum)
  • Superiority Mean (Perceived – Desired)
2011 LibQual

- LibQual Lite, a shorter version of the survey with core and rotating questions
- ARL provides a Results Notebook (summaries) of survey responses and demographics
- K-State Libraries conducted full version of LibQual in 2007
Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>54.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>24.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>13.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Staff</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library that you use most often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hale Library</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>76.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture Library</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Library</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Physics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medical Library</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina Library</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For all analysis, we filtered out Library Staff.
- Undergrads were underrepresented (74.92% of campus population)
- Majority of respondents were users of Hale Library
- “Other” library could be labs or library-like space on campus
Analysis Overview

• Data Analysis – Using averages
  • Standard Deviation
  • Central Tendency: Mean, Median and Mode
  • Graphs: frequency histogram, radar charts
• Reliability
  • Cronbach's Alpha
• Validity
  • Representativeness
Analysis Tools

• Graphs
  • Frequency graphs – shape of the data
  • Histograms – Is it normal?
  • Radar – how did we do (viewing all 3 dimensions)

• Reliability
  • Cronbach’s Alpha – measures internal consistency. Helps to answer the question of ‘Should I trust the average?’

• Validity
  • Representative – Need to be careful to making generalizations about Undergraduates, Business and Science/Math Disciplines
Ratings & Gaps

• **Adequacy** Means ratings measure the gap between the Perceived and Minimum ratings
• **Superiority** Means ratings measure the gap between the Perceived and the Desired ratings
• Large negative gaps could indicate problem areas
• Higher Desired ratings indicate areas that are important to users
Analyzing Our Results

• Results analyzed by
  • Dimension (Service, Library as Place, Info Control)
  • User Group (Undergrad, Grad, Faculty, Staff)
• Comments
  • Comments supplement and help to understand the ratings
• Other data sets used to triangulate or explore other questions or hypotheses about user perception on library resources, environment & services
• Blue bands are the Adequacy Gaps (shows where the service level starts)
• Yellow bands are Superiority Gaps. We want to close this gap.
• Green bands are where we exceeded the desired level
• Red bands are where we’re not meeting the minimum level
Overall Results

**Perceived Above or Equal to Desired** – where we we exceeded customer’s desired level

- LP05: Community space for group learning and group study (0.23)

**Top 3 Desired (Desired Mean)** – what customers identified they want the most

- IC-02: A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own (8.06)
- IC-01: Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office (8.05)
- IC-05: Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information (8.01)

**Largest Gaps Between Perceived and Desired (Superiority Gap)** – areas identified by customers to improve

- IC-02: A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own (-0.99)
- IC-01: Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office (-0.78)
- IC-08: Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work (-0.73)

**Top 3 Perceived (Perceived Mean)** – customers identified we’re doing well

- AS-03: Employees who are consistently courteous (7.80)
- AS-08: Willingness to help users (7.71)
- AS-06: Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion (7.67)
Analysis of DIMENSIONS

Largest Superiority gaps are for Information Control and Library as Place

FACULTY AND GRADS
- IC-2 A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own -1.68/-1.10
- IC-8 Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work -1.63/-1.20

UNDERGRADS
- LP-02 Quiet space for individual activities -0.80
- LP-01 Library space that inspire study and learning -0.80
Analysis of DIMENSIONS

What are we doing well?

• Overall Lowest Superiority Gaps are for Affect of Service
  • LP-5  Community space for group learning & group study (0.23)
  • AS-2  Giving users individual attention (-0.08)
  • AS-8  Willingness to help users (-0.09)
  • AS-4  Readiness to respond to users’ questions (-0.13)
Analysis of DIMENSIONS

Not meeting Users’ Minimums – 2 areas

• Faculty have high Desired level re: Library Resources. 2 Information Control questions are not meeting Faculty minimum levels
  • IC-8 Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work (Fac) -0.63
  • IC-2 A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own (Fac) -0.26
Finding a balance

What does all of it mean?

• We exceed users’ perception re: group space
• Need to work on noise/quiet for individuals
• Continue to provide high level of service/resources/environment
• Improve areas identified for improvement
• Overall, we’re very close to users’ desired level of service
Analysis For Undergraduates

What are we doing well?

• LP-5 Community space for group learning & group study (0.11 - exceeding desired level)
• AS-4 Readiness to respond to users’ questions (0.01 – exceeding desired level)

What needs attention?

• LP-2 Quiet space for individual activities (-0.85)
• LP-1 Library space that inspires study and learning (-.80)

What are we doing (Library’s Plan of Action)?

• Power (strips) needs in Great Room
• More quiet space
• Power/outlet/strips needs for laptops in Hale Library
Analysis For Graduate Students

What are we doing well?

• LP-5  Community space for group learning and group study (0.12 – exceeding desired level)
• AS-3  Employees who are consistently courteous (-0.06)

What needs attention?

• IC-8  Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work (-1.20)
• IC-2  A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own (-1.10)

What are we doing (Library’s Plan of Action)?

• Create a Graduate Student Study space
• We redesigning the library website
Analysis For Faculty

What are we doing well?

- LP-5 Community space for group learning and group study (0.95 – exceeding desired level)
- LP-2 Quiet space for individual activities (0.70 – exceeding desired level)

What needs attention?

- IC-2 A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own (-1.68)
- IC-8 Print and/or electronic journal collections I require to my work (-1.63)

What are we doing (Library’s Plan of Action)?

- Meet with faculty/departments to find out what resources we don’t own that they need for their research
2007-2011 Overall Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Year</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Desired</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Adequacy Gap</th>
<th>Superiority Gap</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>2194</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Overall, Users’ minimum and desired levels have decreased while their perceived level has increased.
- We improved by .37 to achieving their desired level
- Increase in survey respondents and comments
• Superiority Gap shows our progress to Desired (0.00)
  • Affect of Service .44
  • Information Control .39
  • Library as Place .24

• Adequacy Gap shows progress from minimum
  • Affect of Service .26
  • Information Control .38
  • Library as Place .23
LibQual Comments

- Comments are sorted by categories
- Single largest category was Staff&Service, then General-Satisfied.
- Facilities-Noise/Quiet is a big issue, mostly negative. This is also an issue in the quantitative part of the survey.
- Comments will be further analyzed and coded for dimensions
  - Tone (positive, negative, neutral)
  - Causal or intervening conditions
- Comments were used to supplement and clarify quantitative results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LibQual Comments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Resources</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Catalog</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>344</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Hours</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>445</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Library Services</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff&amp;Service</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/Circulation</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>466</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of User-Distance</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total comments</strong></td>
<td><strong>1455</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer Institutions Comparison

- The blue line of Superiority Gap chart is our target. The closer we are, the better.
- The black line is the ARL average.
- The Adequacy Gap measures how far we are from customer’s minimum level of service.
- We’re well above the customer’s minimum level. Our overall average is better than the ARL average.
- Some of these peer institutions were mentioned in K-State 2025
- Colorado State, Iowa State and Oregon State are our closest peers. NCSU has never conducted LibQual Survey. Oklahoma State was not included as it is their policy not to disseminate LibQual data.
- Years are included also because not all institutions conduct LibQual Survey annually.
Next Steps

• Share findings/conclusions: Participants, LibQual Results Website & Summit (coming in Spring 2012)

• What is actionable? Which areas do we address? What’s the priority?

• QUESTIONS?