

ASSESSING

SERVICE

Quality

THIRD EDITION



SATISFYING THE EXPECTATIONS
OF LIBRARY CUSTOMERS

PETER HERNON | ELLEN ALTMAN | ROBERT E. DUGAN

An imprint of the American Library Association
Chicago 2015



© 2015 by the American Library Association

Extensive effort has gone into ensuring the reliability of the information in this book; however, the publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

ISBNs

978-0-8389-1308-6 (paper)

978-0-8389-1309-3 (PDF)

978-0-8389-1310-9 (ePub)

978-0-8389-1311-6 (Kindle)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hernon, Peter.

Assessing service quality : satisfying the expectations of library customers / Peter Hernon, Ellen Altman, and Robert E. Dugan. — Third edition.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8389-1308-6 (print : alk. paper)

1. Public services (Libraries)—Evaluation. 2. Public services (Libraries)—United States—Evaluation.

I. Altman, Ellen. II. Dugan, Robert E., 1952- III. Title.

Z711.H45 2015

025.5—dc23

2014042718

Cover design by Kimberly Thornton. Images © Shutterstock, Inc.

Composition by Alejandra Diaz in the Interstate, Adelle and Adobe Caslon Pro typefaces.

Select illustrations by Alexander Smith Design.

© This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

Printed in the United States of America

19 18 17 16 15 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

List of Figures.....	vii
Preface.....	xi
ONE UNDERSTANDING ENDS AND MEANS	1
TWO A LOOK IN THE LIBRARY MIRROR	13
THREE “YOUR MISSION, SHOULD YOU CHOOSE TO ACCEPT IT . . .”	21
FOUR MEASURING AND EVALUATING THE COMPONENTS OF HIGH-QUALITY SERVICE	35
FIVE WHAT CAN GO WRONG WITH NUMBERS?	61
SIX DIFFERENT WAYS OF LISTENING TO CUSTOMERS	67
SEVEN MANAGING THE THREE Cs (COMMENTS, COMPLAINTS, AND COMPLIMENTS)	81
EIGHT LISTENING THROUGH SURVEYS	101
NINE LISTENING THROUGH FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS	117
TEN CUSTOMER-RELATED METRICS AND REQUIREMENTS	127
ELEVEN SATISFACTION AND SERVICE QUALITY: SEPARATE BUT INTERTWINED	143
TWELVE INTERPRETING FINDINGS TO IMPROVE CUSTOMER SERVICE	167
THIRTEEN EMBRACING CHANGE—CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	187
About the Authors.....	207
Index	209

Figures

1.1	DIFFERENCES IN QUALITY DIMENSIONS	7
3.1	MISSION STATEMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE URBAN LIBRARIES COUNCIL	22
3.2	CORE VALUES (ROCHESTER, MINNESOTA, PUBLIC LIBRARY)	27
3.3	STRATEGIC PLAN COMPASS (UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA LIBRARIES)	29
4.1	SELECTED METRICS OF FINANCIAL VALUES: HOW VALUABLE?	45
4.2	SAMPLE ACADEMIC LIBRARY INSTITUTIONAL ROI SPREADSHEET	46
4.3	COMPONENTS OF THE “HOW . . . ?” QUESTIONS: THE LIBRARY AND CUSTOMER PERSPECTIVES	49
4.4	EXAMPLE METRICS OF INTEREST	50
4.5	STAKEHOLDER INTEREST IN CERTAIN “HOW . . . ?” QUESTIONS ABOUT THE LIBRARY	51
4.6	RELATING <i>WHAT</i> TO MEASURE WITH <i>HOW</i> TO MEASURE	52-53
4.7	FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION	53
4.8	NINE STEPS IN BENCHMARKING	56
4.9	COUNTABLES AND EVALUATEABLES	58
4.10	CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR METRICS RELATING TO LIBRARY SERVICE	59

6.1	VARIOUS WAYS TO LISTEN	68-72
6.2	SUMMARIZING CONTENT FOUND ON SOCIAL MEDIA	75
6.3	METHODS FOR LISTENING TO CUSTOMERS	78
7.1	COMPLAINT FORM	85
7.2	PROBLEM REPORT FORM (FOR STAFF USE)	86
7.3	COMPLIMENT FORM	87
7.4	DISCUSSION QUESTIONS FOR LIBRARY STAFF	89
7.5	SAMPLE CATEGORIES FOR A COMPLIMENT AND COMPLAINT TRACKING SYSTEM	91-93
7.6	PROBLEM RESOLUTION TRACKING DATABASE	94
7.7	FRAMEWORK FOR MAXIMIZING CUSTOMER SATISFACTION AND LOYALTY	95
7.8	HOW DOES THE LIBRARY MEASURE UP?	95
7.9	SUGGESTION BOX ON LIBRARY HOME PAGE	96
7.10	SELECTED ACTIONS TAKEN FROM LISTENING TO CUSTOMER COMMENTS	97-99
8.1	CUSTOMER SERVICE INVENTORY (TO BE COMPLETED BY STAFF)	102-103
8.2	REASONS AND REMEDIES FOR CUSTOMER DISSATISFACTION (TO BE COMPLETED BY STAFF)	104
8.3	LIBRARY CUSTOMER SURVEY	105
8.4	CUSTOMER-DRIVEN SERVICE	106
8.5	LEARNING COMMONS SURVEY: SAMPLE QUESTIONS	112-113
8.6	KEY STEPS FOR CONDUCTING SURVEY RESEARCH (SERVICE QUALITY AND SATISFACTION)	114-116
9.1	STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW	118
9.2	INSTANCE SELECTION IN CASE STUDIES	119
9.3	SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR LOST AND NEVER-GAINED CUSTOMERS	122
9.4	SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR INTERNAL CUSTOMERS	123

9.5	FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS	124-125
10.1	COMPONENTS OF CUSTOMER LOYALTY	128
10.2	LIBRARY USE	131
10.3	PROPORTION OF POPULATION REGISTERED AS BORROWERS	132
10.4	LOYALTY METRICS: DISTRIBUTION OF CUSTOMERS BY YEARS OF CONTINUOUS REGISTRATION AND ACTIVITY	133
11.1	GAPS MODEL OF EXPECTATIONS	144
11.2	CONSTRUCT INDICATORS FOR SERVICE ENCOUNTER SATISFACTION AND OVERALL SERVICE SATISFACTION	146
11.3	SATISFACTION: A POOL OF QUESTIONS	147
11.4	CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY: SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY	151-153
11.5	CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY: UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA LIBRARIES	154-155
11.6	SAMPLE STATEMENTS (SERVICE QUALITY)	157
11.7	SERVICE STATEMENTS THAT MIGHT BE CONVERTED INTO METRICS	160
11.8	CUSTOMER-RELATED METRICS	163
12.1	FRAMEWORK FOR QUADRANT ANALYSIS	171
12.2	SERVICE RATING: MATCHING CUSTOMERS TO SERVICES	176
12.3	THE RADAR CHART	181
12.4	OPPORTUNITY INDEX	182
12.5	QUADRANT CHART (COUNTING OPINIONS™)	183
12.6	COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC LIBRARY RESPONDENTS	184-185
13.1	CRITICAL ISSUES FACING PUBLIC LIBRARIES	188
13.2	SAMPLE CUSTOMER-RELATED METRICS (BY ATTRIBUTE)	190-191
13.3	AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF OUTCOMES RELATED TO ACADEMIC LIBRARIES	193

13.4	AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF OUTCOMES RELATED TO PUBLIC LIBRARIES	194
13.5	METRICS OF ENGAGEMENT	196-197
13.6	SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED CUSTOMERS	198
13.7	SAMPLE CASE STUDY STATEMENTS FOR STAFF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT	199-201

Preface

The first edition of *Assessing Service Quality* premiered in 1998 and was the recipient of the Highsmith Library Literature Award the following year. In 2010, we revised the work and now (five years later), with all of the new developments and trends in academic and public libraries, as well as some new perspectives on evaluation and assessment, the American Library Association asked us to update the content. To increase the relevance and value of the content, we added a third author, Robert E. Dugan, who has been a coauthor with Peter Hernon on a number of books and articles.

Academic and public libraries are continuing to transform as the information landscape changes and their parent organizations or institutions expand their missions and as libraries envision a future that leads to new service roles and improved organizational performance and accountability. Change in libraries is not limited to the United States, as other countries also see rapid advances in information technology, changing patterns of scholarly publication, disruptions to the economics of information production and use, new models for teaching and learning in higher education, and radical changes in the expectations held by faculty, students, members of the public, and users for all types of libraries. The way people search for information—print and digital—is changing, as is the way in which they use the information they find. The demands they make on library collections, facilities, and services are also changing. In essence, change characterizes the nature of library collections and services, the information needs and expectations of library customers, and the competitive environment within which libraries function. The hope of all of us is that libraries transition into organizations that can thrive in conditions dramatically different from those of today.

Libraries today seek to enrich people's lives and help them be better informed and more productive members of society. Academic libraries seek a bigger role in educating students and guiding learning. They seek to inspire critical thinking, advance knowledge, and foster curiosity for graduates to become lifelong learners. These aspirations are not dissimilar for public libraries, which also seek to advance literacy and a love for reading and learning. The new roles that libraries are assum-

ing are intended to help them contribute more proactively to the lives of those they serve—namely, actual customers—while converting more members of the public into frequent and *loyal* customers. As *Assessing Service Quality*, as well as the vast literature on customer service, points out, all customers evaluate the services they receive—regardless of the service organizations they visit—and decide if they will seek further interactions with those organizations. In this context, it is important for libraries to demonstrate their value while simultaneously *delighting* customers with the service they receive. Service quality and satisfaction are not incidental matters to customers who become repeat users.

Behaviors and attitudes toward libraries over time influence both customer perceptions about the library and the views of stakeholders who make decisions affecting the library's funding. Many businesses—hotels and restaurants, for instance—no longer feel that it is enough to leave a questionnaire in the guests' rooms or on a table and hope for a response. They proactively seek customer feedback and realize that customers readily turn to social media and Internet blogs and review sites to air their reactions to their stays or dining experiences. As a result, these and other businesses view customer satisfaction as vital to their success and even survival. *Survival* may be too strong a word for many academic and public librarians; perhaps "making a profound impact on their community" might be better. However, remember that privatized public libraries exist, and some people want to see the number increase.

Customers are more than a source for data collection; they are the reason for the existence of libraries. It is important (if not essential) to listen to, and learn from, them and to use the insights gained to improve services. For this reason, we stress the importance of listening to customers and creating an ongoing dialogue with them. If libraries do not act on what customers say, what message do they convey? When libraries survey their customers and the response rate is low, have they really created a culture of listening to their customers and valuing what they say, while maintaining that ongoing dialogue?

A number of libraries have ignored customers because they perceive them as a captive audience. This book—and the literature on customer service—dispels that notion as it acknowledges that there are many competitors poised to challenge the library's perceived monopoly on information and knowledge provision. Librarians need new ways of thinking and alternatives for applying a customer-centered approach to service quality and customer satisfaction. The approach presented here recognizes that holistic evaluation involves the use of qualitative and quantitative data collection, as each type complements the other. The approach presented here is too large and too complex for any single library to undertake at one time. Rather, our intention is to present some ways to think about service quality and customer satisfaction, along with some other methods for evaluating and improving service. Libraries can select, from among the methods discussed, those most appropriate to their particular situation and implement them at a pace that suits their needs.

Libraries are service organizations that function in a competitive environment, and librarians must create and perfect services that better match the information needs, information-seeking behaviors, and expectations of those they intend to serve.

Finally, we should note that, regardless of the edition, the purposes of *Assessing Service Quality* are to

- suggest new ways to think about the evaluation and assessment of library services
- present different ways for libraries to become more customer-centric
- explain service quality and customer satisfaction and their theoretical bases as well as clarify the differences between them
- identify procedures for measuring both service quality and satisfaction
- challenge conventional thinking about the utility of input, output, and performance metrics
- suggest possible customer-related metrics that provide insights useful for library planning and decision making

- encourage libraries to take action—action leading to improved service and accountability.

Although this book focuses on academic and public libraries, the basic principles, strategies, and data-collecting procedures presented apply in other settings. If academic and public libraries do not try to be truly service-centered, what are they willing to commit to? What is the source of their service inspiration? What service reputation do they generate, and are they aware of their reputation? The answers to such questions have a definite impact on the extent to which customers are loyal to the library and on the number of customers who are delighted or completely satisfied—not merely appeased. We could re-characterize the previous sentence by emphasizing the net promoter score, which is discussed in this book: are most customers promoters and not passives or detractors? If they are detractors, to what extent do they shape the perceptions of others?

Most people who become librarians do so from a desire to connect people to information and thereby transform their lives—a concept that is the cornerstone of service quality and customer satisfaction. But, somehow, along the way, the profession has gotten caught up in bean counting—how many of this and how much of that—as though the items counted exist in a universe totally unto themselves. It is our hope that the ideas presented here will encourage librarians to remember the ideals that attracted them to the profession and to abandon such misperceptions as “customers cannot judge quality,” “customers do not know what they want,” and “professional hegemony will be undermined by kowtowing to customers.” Perhaps another misperception is that “libraries need not be accountable and be involved in data collection—after all, we did not go to library school to become social scientists and data collectors, having to justify ourselves and our organizational mission!” To this we merely point out that times have changed. *Accountability is not something that is bad, but it can be carried out badly.*

It is important to focus on the customers of individual libraries and to realize that comparisons

to other libraries (and the use of mostly generic data-collection instruments, which have little relevance to a particular library) assume that customer expectations do not vary from community to community and from individual to individual. We caution against accepting this assumption. At the same time, do not forget that libraries have, as do other service organizations, internal customers who have a direct link to the external customers and the quality of service they receive. We believe that both sets of customers should be addressed. How can libraries best serve external customers if the internal customers are dissatisfied? What is discussed in this book applies to both audiences.

1

Understanding Ends and Means

Historically, the quality of a library has been measured by the size of its collection. The acquisition of the millionth volume was cause for celebration, and press releases flooded local and national news media. The millionth volume or a million-dollar “book” budget gave bragging rights to the library’s director. For decades, library directors, upon retirement, wanted to be known for the number of titles added during their tenure.

As collections grew, space became a problem, so library directors pressed for bigger buildings to house the increased number of volumes. Bigger collections meant the need for more staff and furnishings, especially shelving. Several other factors influenced collection building, especially after World War II. The expansion of colleges and universities in response to the GI Bill meant more faculty had to be hired, and they were expected to “publish or perish” to receive tenure. Of course, authors wanted the library to purchase their published works. Several publishing companies were launched to translate and reprint works held by major European university libraries that had been damaged during the war. The new faculty expected the library to resemble the one from which they received their doctoral degree—having similar-sized collections and holdings.

By the 1970s, many university administrators regarded academic libraries as bottomless pits because of constant entreaties for more money to keep up with the publishing output. In the 1980s and 1990s, the pleas for more money centered on the large annual increases in the prices of scholarly and professional journal subscriptions and the need for electronically delivered resources and their requisite infrastructure. The biggest impact of the first decade of the twenty-first century was the recession of 2007–2009 and how libraries and their institution or parent organization coped.

More recently, academic libraries have expanded their involvement with consortia and partnerships as they assumed new roles: these libraries are

- “often negotiating and licensing content and software collectively”;
- “aggressive intermediaries and aggregators of information, and, as publishers, are creating new innovative modes of scholarly communication”;

- “partnering with faculty to expand their educational involvement beyond the traditional bibliographic instruction, and to advance operational investigations as research-and-development organizations”;
- “more entrepreneurial organizations, more concerned with innovation, business planning, competition and risk, leveraging assets through new partnerships to produce new financial resources.”¹

They also seek more electronic resources while focusing on their customers’ information needs and information-seeking preferences and on the affordability of resources to meet those needs. Libraries also provide access to their digitized collections of archival materials as an essential component of their mission, and they engage in preservation activities to prevent the loss of vital cultural, historical, and scholarly resources. Further, more library directors mention innovation and how it is supposed to guide future planning.

Because the cost of a college education continues to increase, the Obama administration maintains that graduation rates, loan defaults, and the percentage of low-income students enrolled are useful indicators of which institutions best serve their students. Many state governors and legislators add that increasing productivity in higher education depends, in part, on building strong accountability systems that rely on performance-based outcomes linked to such metrics as graduation rate and the extent to which graduates receive high-paying jobs in that state. Revamping states’ higher education accountability systems tends to focus on increasing the use of performance and outcome metrics and then using those metrics to make and evaluate policy decisions, particularly in areas such as budgeting, funding, and regulation. Added to this new focus is one on the affordability of obtaining a college degree. Students often assume high debts as they complete their degrees, but colleges and universities may also have acquired sizable debts. Perhaps the biggest reason for surging tuition in the last few years is not increased spending on the part

of institutions but, rather, the steep decline in state and local government support in the wake of the recent recession and its aftermath. And just as the recession varied in severity across the country, tuition rose unevenly. As institutional budgets shrink and get realigned, so do those of libraries. Libraries have increased their involvement with consortia to centralize negotiations with information providers and realize economies of scale in strategic efforts to maintain and possibly expand their collections, especially through database holdings. Additionally, they have embraced partnerships and innovation.

Some critics note the fallacy of equating collection size with quality—not all libraries count items in the same way, while others keep outdated and unwanted books to boost their volume count. Obviously, the sheer number of volumes does not necessarily mean that the library collection matches readers’ interests, and many titles go unused—they have not circulated even once. Today, volume counts are of lesser interest as more libraries decrease the size of their print collections but increase the size of digital ones. Further, public libraries may get e-books from Amazon.com and, like academic libraries, receive scholarly journals electronically from bundlers. They do not own these copies. In the age of widespread access to digital resources, volume and title counts become less important, unless the institution is seeking to comply with prescriptive accreditation standards that set expectations for collection size.

PATRONS, USERS, CLIENTS, OR CUSTOMERS?

Organizations refer to the people they serve by many different terms, such as *clients*, *patrons*, *students*, *readers*, *visitors*, and *guests*. Such terms make these individuals seem like something other than customers. Librarians often prefer the terms *patron* and *user*, perhaps to avoid the implication of an exchange occurring between the library and the people using the services. Yet, both words have negative connotations, as Darlene E. Weingand points out:

The word *patron* is associated with the act of giving support and protection, such as occurred in the Renaissance between royalty and artists. The impression here is one of unequal status, of the powerful protecting the less powerful. This is not the type of relationship that puts libraries on an equal level of partnership with their communities. Further, while *user* accurately describes someone who uses the library, the term is quite unspecific and is widely associated with the drug culture.²

Special librarians and subject specialists in university libraries probably come closest to treating their users as clients. In the case of subject specialists, faculty and doctoral students who are repeat users become clients. These librarians know their clientele personally and have insights into their research and related interests. Yet, being a client does not preclude one from being treated like a customer.

Public libraries have different types of customers with different types of interests. These *users* range from the preschooler who attends story hour to the homeless person who wants to read the newspaper to the unemployed person who attends workshops on résumé writing and job seeking to the businessperson who needs tax regulation guidelines. All have different interests, but most want materials, information, or a place to sit and use library resources—perhaps the technologies. A *customer* is the recipient of any product or service provided by the organization. That recipient might be internal, such as a coworker in the same or another unit, or external, someone in the community.

Still, some object to the word *customer* because

- “The word ‘customer’ in an academic setting feels wrong to me, meaning that I feel we don’t want to become too corporate in culture. ‘Patron or member’ gives more of the feel and tradition of academic pursuits, which are often inherently NON-corporate in nature. Plus, it keeps a bit of ‘soul’ in using ‘patron or member.’”
- “My own preference is ‘community member.’ I like it because I think of our library as serving the community-at-large, in addition to our own students and faculty, but those from other institutions, the general public and [whoever] may be in need of our services. They are all members of the community we serve. Admittedly, when in conversation with colleagues at my institution, I may simply use patrons as a convenient way to discuss them and their needs. It is a terminology with which librarians are comfortable.
- “The one term we intentionally avoid using to describe those we serve is ‘customer.’ For many librarians ‘customer’ suggests or implies that we are engaged in a for-profit business activity as opposed to providing a community service. Despite the practical implications of thinking of those who use our services as our customers, it just feels wrong.”³

However, within higher education today, there is an emphasis on running the institution as a business enterprise, and a number of library directors adopt some business terminology when they focus on innovation and risk taking. Weingand notes,

The word *customer*, which implies payment for a product or service, is a better reflection of what actually transpires between the library and people in the community. With this term the mythology of the “free” library is dispelled, and a more accurate metaphor for service is substituted.⁴

Customers make demands—expecting “high-quality facilities, resources, and services. They want a library that is focused on their needs, and they have no intention of going out of the way to meet the library’s needs or expectations.”⁵ Joseph R. Matthews argues that “library customers are the ‘ultimate’ customers because they have already paid for the service through their taxes.” He adds, “How

library staff members refer to their customers is . . . an important issue that deserves much discussion in every library.”⁶

Some academic librarians argue that students cannot and should not be regarded as customers. Yet students surely are potential customers when they select a school to attend. During high school, they are bombarded with advertising from colleges eager to enroll them. They are customers in the bookstore and food courts on campus and when they purchase tickets to college sporting and entertainment events.

Some librarians dislike library service being equated with customers and commodities. They perceive libraries and their activities to be on a higher plane than their retail or commercial counterparts and decry the evaluation of rather basic processes, functions, and services as pedestrian and unsuitable. They might equate customers with the adage, “The customer is always right.” Customers are not always right, but they have the right to express their opinions and to learn about the library’s service parameters. They also have the right to choose not to associate with the library (or even any library). However, whether the term *customer* is used to describe the individuals whom libraries serve, the people who interact with any library service are the *reason* for the organization’s existence. Therefore, their needs and desires should *drive* the service.

As Arnold Hirshon notes, the concept of customer service dates to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and to practices found in retail trade and hotel management.⁷ Customer service is all about getting people to return and sending them away feeling positive about their experience. The goal, succinctly explained, is to generate repeat customers and lessen the likelihood they will seek the services of a competitor.

Unless the library infrastructure (collections and services, facilities, staff, and technology) and customers come together in a way that is both interesting and meaningful to customers, the library is nothing more than an expensive warehouse. Hard work, much of it pedestrian, must be performed before this coming together can occur—even in the Magic Kingdom. “As Walt Disney once said, ‘[T] here is no magic to magic. It’s in the details.’”⁸

With the onslaught of the Internet, the development of new technologies, and the economic recession, academic administrators as well as state and city officials have questioned the worth of the library. Some of them think the Internet replaces libraries, and others think libraries offer little value. As a result of the recent economic recession, a number of libraries or their branches have closed, and some staff have received unpaid furloughs or lost their jobs, or they have seen reductions in spending on library materials as well as the number of hours open to the public. As the operating costs for a college or university continue to soar, with state legislatures decreasing funding to public institutions, academic libraries are grappling with the “new normal”—coping with budget reductions. The new normal also applies to public libraries at a time when they are experiencing a significant increase in the number of people visiting them.

Libraries have responded, in part, by placing greater attention on demonstrating their value. As discussed in chapter 4, they emphasize the public’s return on investment by encouraging those interested to use a monetary calculator (provided on the libraries’ home pages) to determine the return on investment received from minimal library use. The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) commissioned *Value of Academic Libraries* not only to demonstrate the contribution of academic libraries to their institutions but also to offer a framework for viewing value.⁹ At the same time, many public libraries are demonstrating their worth in terms of dollars and cents. Likewise, they are using a traditional business measure—return on investment—to put a value on library service. Adding value is vital to the continued well-being of academic and public libraries, and so is documenting value as part of a library’s accountability.

Libraries can evaluate and improve customer satisfaction, enhance service quality, and add value in ways meaningful to their sponsoring organizations. Librarians manage organizations and information resources in ways that serve their communities effectively and efficiently. More and more, managers fully understand they are accountable and must meet the expectations and demands of those

to whom they report. Accountability is about the effective and efficient expenditure of money and the meeting of promises specified in strategic plans. In doing so, the customer should neither be forgotten nor considered secondary.

SERVICE QUALITY

Every organization's service has a quality dimension—ranging from wonderful to awful. Service and quality cannot be disconnected. *Quality* is the manner in which the service is delivered or, in some cases, not delivered. For a library, *service quality* encompasses the interactive relationship between the library and the people whom it is supposed to serve. A library that adheres to all the professionally approved rules and procedures for acquiring, organizing, managing, and preserving material but has no customers cannot claim quality because a major component is missing: satisfying people's needs, requests, and desires for information. Maurice B. Line defined librarianship as “managing information resources for people.”¹⁰ How the library sees and interacts with those people—customers—clearly affects the quality and nature of the service rendered. As Françoise Hébert noted, “When library and customer measures of quality are not congruent, the library may be meeting its intended internal standards of performance but may not be performing well in the eyes of its customers.”¹¹

Service quality is multidimensional. Two critical dimensions are content and context. *Content* refers to obtaining what prompted the visit (physically or virtually)—such as particular materials or information, study space, technology, or an acceptable substitute. *Context* covers the experience itself: examples are interactions with staff, ease or difficulty of navigating the system, and the comfort of the physical environment.

Customers who come into the library as well as those who visit virtually experience both the content and context of the service. From these interactions, customers form opinions and attitudes about the library. Customer expectations can influence satisfaction with both content and context. These

expectations may or may not match what librarians think appropriate, but nevertheless *they represent reality for the customer*.

Expectations change according to what customers want and how urgently they want it. Sometimes they are seeking a quiet place to read, sometimes just a book for enjoyment, sometimes access to technology to play video games, and sometimes a vital bit of information. Importance and urgency, though seldom considered, are likely to have a strong influence on customers' satisfaction with a service. The prevailing custom has been to treat all searches or inquiries with equal priority, except those from people of special importance to the library such as an administrator in the sponsoring organization. The concept of equal treatment should be reconsidered because of its impact on consequences to the customer. If the level of service for all is high, exceptions become detrimental, costly, distracting, and unnecessary.

Service quality is a complex concept. It has several dimensions beyond the content/context and the gap between performance and customer expectations. Service quality is both personal to individuals and collective among many customers. In a number of instances, impressions of service quality can be changed: perceptions move up with positive experiences and down as a result of negative ones.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CUSTOMER SATISFACTION AND SERVICE QUALITY

The terms *satisfaction* and *service quality* are frequently used interchangeably; this mistake has led to confusion and to mislabeling (or misrepresentation) of study findings. Satisfaction is an emotional reaction—the degree of contentment or discontentment. Satisfaction may or may not be directly related to the performance of the library on a specific occasion. A customer can receive an answer to a query but be unsatisfied because of an upsetting or angry encounter. Conversely, although the query might remain unanswered, another customer might feel satisfied because the encounter was pleasant and the helper interested and polite.

Service quality, as used in this book, is a global judgment relating to the superiority of a service as viewed in the context of specific statements that the library is willing to act on *if* customers find them of great value. The implication is that a number of transactions or encounters that an individual experiences with a particular organization fuse to form a positive *impression* of service quality for that person. The collective experiences of many people create an organization's reputation for service quality.

OTHER DIMENSIONS OF SERVICE QUALITY

Marketing consultant George E. Kroon offers other ways to look at service quality: conformance, expectation, market perception, and strategic.¹² (Because the last of these measures applies only to commercial establishments, we will not consider it here.)

Conformance requires that standards for quality be set for many processes and functions. The intent is to reduce mistakes (e.g., shelving errors), streamline workflow (e.g., cut backlogs), and establish required behaviors on the part of staff (e.g., ask if the customer got what was desired). Setting standards for service quality, as opposed to targets for work productivity in technical services or restrictions on the time allowed to answer reference questions, is rather a novel idea for libraries, but one whose time has come. The library has considerable control over quality as conformance to standards that it can use to improve service in many areas.

The idea of conformance standards leads to consideration of three kinds of situations that might negatively affect service quality: predictable, foreseeable, and unpredictable. *Predictable* situations are those over which the library has considerable control and thus can take action to prevent or at least minimize. *Foreseeable* situations are those that are likely to happen, but the time frame between occurrences is longer and incidences are fewer than for the predictable ones. To some extent, it is possible to plan for even *unpredictable* and unlikely situations. For example, staff trained to respond to certain disasters or crises, such as fires, bomb threats, and tornadoes, can greatly ameliorate the situation. Following are examples of each type of library situation.

- predictable situations
 - equipment failures
 - network crashes
 - no paper in photocopiers and printers
 - staff absences
 - patron ignorance
- foreseeable situations
 - power failures
 - weather problems
 - budget cuts and rescissions
- unpredictable situations
 - natural disasters
 - fire
 - psychopaths

The downside of concentrating solely on conformance quality is that the focus is internal and may not match customer expectations or preferences. Although conformance standards are desirable, they should not be used in isolation.

The second dimension is customer *expectations*. Expectations are influenced by factors outside the control of management, such as customers' prior experience, word of mouth, and competitor behavior. Performance that repeatedly, or in some particular way, fails to meet customers' expectations is a clear signal to management that improvement is needed. Such improvement can be facilitated by training, technology, or conformance standards. Sometimes, however, customers have erroneous or unrealistic ideas about the service. In these cases, customers should be told why their expectations cannot be met.

The third dimension of service quality is *market perception*—evaluation against competitors. Libraries realize they have competitors beyond just other libraries. These competitors include, for instance, bookstores where customers can read without buying and enjoy food and drink; Redbox, Netflix, and iTunes for movies; iTunes, Blip.fm, Last.fm, and Pandora for music; and search engines such as Google for information and for creating the impression that the Internet offers everything. Amazon.com is also a competitor because of its vast offerings and ability to fill many orders promptly. This dimension

forces libraries to ask the following questions: Why don't more people use us? What do we do better than other service organizations (including other libraries)? How do we alert customers to this? Do their patterns of use realign and tip in our favor? The key is not just to ask these questions but to develop innovative ways to answer them—persuading customers to make greater use of libraries. Figure 1.1, adapted from one presented by Kroon, depicts the differences in quality dimensions.

WHY INVESTIGATE QUALITY?

There are multiple ways to view quality and report on the extent to which organizations provide quality programming and services. Stakeholders are

interested in quality and define it differently and at times narrowly. “The quality of education is the ‘elephant in the room’ in most discussions of college and university performance.”¹³ Quality might simply be defined in terms of the number of students graduated. Clearly, academic institutions and others must be able to provide different perspectives on quality while better defining what it is and is not; more important, they must persuade stakeholders that their definition and related metrics are the important ones to track. To date, however, they have not been successful.

Libraries have gathered and reported statistics about their collections, funds, and staff for decades. These statistics have, however, concentrated primarily on finances, the resources purchased with those finances, and workloads. As a result, an infor-

FIGURE 1.1

Differences in Quality Dimensions

	DIMENSION		
	CONFORMANCE	EXPECTATION	MARKET PERCEPTION
VIEWPOINT	• Internal	• External	• Peers and competitors
KEY TERMS	• Service quality	• Expectations • Performance gap	• Peer performance
FOCUS OF EFFORT	• Processes • Functions • Services	• Service • Customer	• Peer comparisons
WHAT TO EVALUATE	• Context • Performance • Transactions	• Customer expectations versus performance and versus importance	• Rankings/ratios with peer data
SUPERIOR QUALITY RESULTS IN	• Stakeholder satisfaction	• Performance exceeding expectations • Loyalty	• Good reputation
INFERIOR QUALITY RESULTS IN	• Errors • Delays • Higher costs • Lost customers	• Bad word-of-mouth • Dissatisfaction	• Unfavorable – reputation – compared to peers

Source: Adapted from George E. Kroon, “Improving Quality in Service Marketing,” *Journal of Customer Service in Marketing and Management* 1, no. 2 (1995): 13–28. Reproduced with permission.

mation gap remains. These traditional statistics lack relevance. Most of the traditional statistics do not measure the library's performance in terms of elements important to customers. They do not really describe performance or indicate whether service quality and satisfaction are good, indifferent, or bad. Even worse, they do not indicate any action that the administration or a team can or should take to improve performance.

Libraries need to evaluate quality on a much broader scale than resources held, resources acquired, and activities completed. They also need to view their institution or broader organizational role in a context much bigger than such yardsticks. A variety of companies in the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors have developed a series of customer-based metrics that they label "service quality indicators"; some collect the data quarterly. Examples include successful complaint resolution and call success rate.¹⁴ As Robert E. Dugan, Peter Herson, and Danuta A. Nitecki show, a variety of metrics could be tailored to capture the customer perspective for academic and public libraries.¹⁵

THE PAYOFF FOR THE LIBRARY

Everybody is bombarded with messages and stimuli. Therefore, *attention* and *time* are two of the most valuable assets that individuals have. Those who choose to spend these assets in the library or using library resources should be regarded as precious customers. Recognizing the value of *repeat customers*, as previously noted, is important for the success of most organizations. Repeat customers, especially the more frequent ones, tend to be loyal. The library's repeat customers already have demonstrated their interest in reading, seeking information, or making other uses of the library. Loyalty means that the customers return repeatedly; they recommend the library to their friends and colleagues and may be more forgiving when the system makes a mistake. Some of them will actively campaign for library bond issues or protest library budget cuts.

The collective experience of customers creates a reputation for the library. A reputation will become known to the administrators who fund the library and to the library community—students, faculty, the public, taxpayers, and so on. What kind of reputation does a library have? How well does that reputation match the one that library staff desire or think the library has? If the library wants a better reputation, what is it doing to improve its reputation? These questions need serious consideration. Librarians need to consider how to better describe the benefits of their service to the administrators who fund them.

Complementary to reputation is brand image—a strong one sets the organization apart from (and above) its competitors. When staff think about the brand of the library, they should be thinking about the entire customer experience—everything from the website to social media experiences to the way they answer the phone to the way customers experience the staff. A library's brand, therefore, is the way its customers perceive the organization. Building a brand is just like building a reputation in that the organization needs to prove itself repeatedly in order for people to put their trust in the organization and to become loyal customers. At the same time, to gain community support, libraries need to tell the community about the various services that are available and to do so in a way in which the public will listen and respond positively.¹⁶

NATIONAL AWARDS

Each year, the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award recognizes outstanding U.S. companies and education, health-care, service, and nonprofit organizations that apply and are judged to be outstanding in seven areas of performance excellence: leadership; strategic planning; customer engagement; measurement, analysis, and knowledge management; workforce focus; process management; and results. The first three areas represent the leadership triad and provide the context for evaluating where the organization is heading and how important effective lead-

ership is to strategic planning focused on customers. The customer engagement component, which examines how the organization engages its customers to achieve its mission, underscores the investment that customers make in the organization or their commitment to the organization, its education program, and service offerings. Engaged customers refer to their retention and loyalty, their willingness to use the organization (become a customer of it), and their willingness to be an advocate of the organization and recommend it to others. Applicants are asked to explain their data collection plan and how that plan addresses the determination of market requirements, the support provided to customers, the use of data collected to improve education programs and services, relationship building with others, and complaint management.¹⁷ It is important to note that past application forms—prior to the 2014 version—used the term *customer focus*, not *customer engagement*. *Engagement* is a stronger, more proactive term that requires direct input from customers—creating a relationship with them.

Winners of this award, given since 1987, have enjoyed considerable success. Steve George, who has written about the award and worked with some of the winners, lists several characteristics common among them:

- a genuine concern for all people using or working in the organization or its community
- a strong desire to improve in every way
- a commitment to learning from other organizations and individuals
- use of data to measure and improve an alignment of strategies, processes, and activities with the mission of the organization¹⁸

Within academic librarianship, since 2000, YBP Library Services has provided ACRL with annual funding for an Excellence in Academic Libraries Award Program to recognize an outstanding community college, college, and university library. This award honors the accomplishments of librarians and other library staff as they work together in sup-

port of the mission of their institution. Recipients, as reflected in the applications we examined, have focused on what they do and not on criteria such as those of the Baldrige Award; customer satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not emphasized, and leadership appears to be equated with accomplishments.

The Public Library Association (PLA) does not have an award similar to the one for academic libraries. The EBSCO Excellence in Small and/or Rural Public Library Service Award honors a public library that demonstrates excellence in service to a community of no more than ten thousand people. The Allie Beth Martin Award, sponsored by Baker and Taylor, recognizes a public librarian for demonstrating a range and depth of knowledge about books and other library materials and a distinguished ability to share that knowledge. The Polaris Innovation in Technology John Iliff Award recognizes a librarian or a library for the use of technology and innovation to improve services.

Each year, the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), in coordination with the White House, awards a national medal to five libraries and five museums that make a long-term commitment to public service through innovative programs and community partnerships.¹⁹

A MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

Many businesses have adopted the concept of the balanced scorecard to evaluate the performance of the organization from the perspective of each of its stakeholders. The scorecard transforms an organization's strategic plan into an action plan to guide the organization daily. It offers a framework that not only provides performance measurements but helps planners identify what should be done and measured.²⁰ Few libraries, however, have created a scorecard and, when they have, they have not always linked it to strategic planning and collected data continuously. Furthermore, many libraries do not have a management information system of any sort. Others compile and manage local information (e.g., inputs and outputs) using spreadsheets. An alterna-

tive means that is not time-consuming to maintain is provided as a service from Counting Opinions of Toronto, Canada. Through an agreement with the American Library Association, Counting Opinions provides libraries with a platform to include and access data from either *ACRLMetrics* or *PLAMetrics*, which collectively provide data from libraries completing surveys for ACRL, the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Integrated Post-secondary Education Data System (IPEDS), PLA, and IMLS. Through both data services libraries have access to data (inputs and outputs) that they and many other libraries provide. They can use the data to create benchmarks, engage in best practices, and monitor trends and competition.²¹ They can also insert other data sets into the system and thereby add other perspectives, such as that of the customer. Clearly, local libraries could insert the data collected elsewhere—such as those that represent the customer's perspective (see chapter 11)—into the system and use the ongoing data set for decision making, planning, and accountability.

A FINAL WORD

The time has come to stop confusing means—processes and functions related to the collection or to technology—with ends (i.e., purpose) and to manage information resources for people. People are the reason for having a library; without them there is no need for a library. Service is basic to the customer's satisfaction or delight with the library. Studies carried out by some companies have found very high levels of customer satisfaction. This result is not surprising because these companies emphasize market research and marketing as the tools to find out what customers want. Knowing what customers want makes it possible to tailor service provision to pleasing them. Customers are not always right, but they are our customers! They are the lifeline of any organization, and it is important to keep them by avoiding or minimizing customer dissatisfaction. If good customers are worth having, they are worth the effort to keep them coming back.

The quality of service from the customer perspective is a complex phenomenon that is composed

of the content of the service itself and the context in which the service is rendered. It is also affected by the quality of the information supplied and used and by the expectations that customers have for the service. All managers should want to avoid situations in which library performance is perceived as poor and customer expectations are low but customers appear indifferent or merely satisfied. Service quality is both individual and collective; the collective determination of service quality and satisfaction creates the library's reputation in the community and for the administrators who fund the library. Customer satisfaction effects loyalty and helps to gain acceptance for brand image (see chapter 10).

Traditional library performance metrics do not reflect the quality of service from the perspective of customers. The focus of such metrics is primarily on expenditures for resources and the amount of use generated rather than on delivery of service and how customers perceive it. For these and other reasons, library managers must look for better ways to measure and describe the quality of the services provided and, in effect, demonstrate that the organization deserves the type of recognition bestowed on Baldrige Award winners.

NOTES

1. See James G. Neal, "Advancing from Kumbaya to Radical Collaboration: Redefining the Future Research Library," *Journal of Library Administration* 51, no. 1 (2011): 67.
2. Darlene E. Weingand, *Customer Service Excellence: A Guide for Librarians* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1997), 2.
3. See *Designing Better Libraries*, "Reader. Patron. User. Member. Why Not Customer?," <http://dbl.lishost.org/blog/2012/12/03/reader-patron-user-member-why-not-customer/#.U5dpjHJdVik>.
4. Weingand, *Customer Service Excellence*, 2.
5. Jeannette Woodward, *Creating the Customer-Driven Academic Library* (Chicago: American Library Association, 2009), 178.
6. Joseph R. Matthews, *The Customer-Focused Library: Re-Inventing the Public Library from the Outside-In* (Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2009), 12.
7. Arnold Hirshon, "Running with the Red Queen: Breaking New Habits to Survive in the Virtual World," in *Advances in Librarianship*, vol. 20, ed. Irene Godden (San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1996), 5–6.
8. Laura A. Liswood, *Serving Them Right: Innovation and Powerful Customer Retention Strategies* (New York: Harper Business, 1990), 17.

9. Association of College and Research Libraries, *Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report*, researched by Megan Oakleaf (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010), www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/value/val_report.pdf.
10. Maurice B. Line, "What Do People Need of Libraries, and How Can We Find Out?," *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 27, no. 2 (June 1996): 77.
11. Françoise Hébert, "Service Quality: An Unobtrusive Investigation of Interlibrary Loan in Large Public Libraries in Canada," *Library & Information Science Research* 16, no. 1 (1994): 20.
12. George E. Kroon, "Improving Quality in Service Marketing," *Journal of Customer Service in Marketing and Management* 1, no. 2 (1995): 13–28.
13. William F. Massy, "Metrics for Efficiency and Effectiveness in Higher Education: Completing the Completion Agenda," 7, <http://archive.shero.org/annualmeeting/Metrics%20for%20Efficiency%20and%20Effectiveness%20in%20Higher%20Education.pdf>.
14. Examples include FortisBC, "Service Quality Indicators," www.fortisbc.com/ABOUT/OURCOMMITMENTS/GASUTILITY/NATGASSERVICEQUALITY/Pages/default.aspx; Greenergy, "Exceeding Our Customers' Expectations," www.greenergy.com/service_quality_indicators/index.html; and OECD, "Quality of Service Indicators," www.oecd.org/sti/broadband/2366923.pdf.
15. Robert E. Dugan, Peter Herson, and Danuta A. Nitecki, *Viewing Library Metrics from Different Perspectives: Inputs, Outputs, and Outcomes* (Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2009), 279–82.
16. See, for instance, Urban Libraries Council, "Positioning the Library," www.urbanlibraries.org/positioning-the-library-pages-174.php.
17. Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology, *The Malcolm Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence* (2014), 14, www.nist.gov/baldrige/publications/upload/2013-2014_Education_Criteria_Free-Sample.pdf.
18. Steve George, *Baldrige.com*, www.baldrige.com.
19. An interesting way to find out about other awards is to look at the websites of some major libraries. Under the heading "about the library" they might list the awards received. For example, see Orange County Library System, "Press Room: Awards & Recognition" (Orlando, Florida), www.ocls.info/About/OnlinePress/awardsRecognition.asp.
20. See Joseph R. Matthews, *Scorecards for Results: A Guide for Developing a Library Balanced Scorecard* (Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2008).
21. See Peter Herson, Robert E. Dugan, and Joseph R. Matthews, *Managing with Data: Using ACRL Metrics and PLAMetrics* (Chicago: American Library Association, 2015). This work explains how to perform different functions (e.g., prepare a return on investment) and provides access to a subset of the data available through these services.

About the Authors

Ellen Altman, now retired, was visiting professor in the Department of Library and Information Studies, Victoria University of Wellington (New Zealand), 1996–1997. She had been a faculty member at the Universities of Kentucky and Toronto and at Indiana University, professor and director of the Graduate Library School at the University of Arizona, and feature editor of *Public Libraries*, the official publication of the Public Library Association. Altman was coeditor of “The JAL Guide to the Professional Literature” in the *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, a member of the editorial board of *Library Quarterly*, and a coauthor of *Performance Measures for Public Libraries*. She received the Distinguished Alumni Award from Rutgers School of Communication, Information and Library Studies, in 1983.

Robert E. Dugan is the dean of libraries at the University of West Florida (Pensacola). Prior to assuming this position, he had been at Suffolk University, Boston; Wesley College, Dover, Delaware; and Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. He has also worked in state and public libraries during his forty-year career. He is the coauthor of thirteen books, including the award-winning *Viewing Library Metrics from Different Perspectives* (2009).

Peter Hernon is a professor emeritus at Simmons College, Boston, and was the principal (and founding) faculty member for the doctoral program, Managerial Leadership in the Information Professions. He received his PhD degree from Indiana University, Bloomington, and was the 2008 recipient of the Association of College and Research Libraries’ award for Academic/Research Librarian of the Year, the founding editor of *Government Information Quarterly*, and past editor-in-chief of *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. He is the coeditor of *Library & Information Science Research* and has taught, conducted workshops, and delivered addresses in eleven countries outside the United States. He is the author or coauthor of fifty-seven books, including the award-winning *Federal Information Policies in the 1980s* (1985), *Assessing Service Quality* (1998), and *Viewing Library Metrics from Different Perspectives* (2009).

Index

A

- academic libraries
 - access/assistance mission of, 24–25
 - assessment, purpose of, 40
 - assessment librarian, role of, 31
 - communication with stakeholders, 179–180
 - consequences, measures of, 58
 - critical issues for, 187
 - customer loyalty data, 178
 - customer preferences, interpretation of, 178–179
 - customer requirements for, 138–140
 - customer satisfaction, polling of, 145
 - customer-related metrics, 136–138
 - dashboards, 173
 - learning commons survey, 111–113
 - library as learning enterprise, 203
 - mission statements of, 22, 23
 - new roles of, 1–2
 - outcomes related to, areas for development of, 192–193
 - sample institutional ROI spreadsheet, 47
 - student return on investment, 44
 - survey, target audience for, 107
 - survey questions, formulating, 109
 - terms for people library serves, 2–5
- Academic Library Trends and Statistics Survey (ACRL), 63–64
- acceptability, of physical facility, 138
- access
 - library mission for, 24–25
 - shift to access development, 127
- accountability
 - for higher education, 2
 - of libraries, 187
 - metric of engagement, 197
 - requirements of, 201
- accreditation organizations, 40
- accuracy
 - as customer requirement, 139
 - “How accurate?” question, 42
- ACRL
 - See Association of College and Research Libraries
 - ACRL*Metrics*, 10
- actions
 - for customer satisfaction, 85, 87
 - Selected Actions Taken from Listening to Customer Comments, 97–99
- active data collection
 - comparison with other methods, 73
 - for listening to customers, 67
- activities
 - of library, unequal, 63
 - of library services, 62
- actual service, 171
- actual value, 42, 43
- Adams, Scott, 23
- Addict-o-matic, 74
- adequacy gap, 180
- affect of service
 - LibQUAL+ for measurement of customer satisfaction, 158, 159
 - in radar chart, 180
- affordability, 197
- ALA
 - See American Library Association
- Allie Beth Martin Award, 9
- alternative cost, 43
- Amazon.com, 6
- American Community Survey, 134
- American Library Association (ALA)
 - ACRL/IPEDS surveys, 63–64
 - on core values, 27
 - for library use calculator, 44
- amount/continuity ratio, 129
- anxiety, library, 15–16
- ARL
 - See Association of Research Libraries
 - Arlington (Texas) Public Library, 76–77
- assessment
 - framework for evaluation/assessment in higher education, 53
 - outcomes assessment, 48
 - purposes of, 40
- assessment librarian
 - administration of surveys by, 141
 - role of, 31
- asset maps, 173–174
- assistance, library mission for, 24–25
- Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL)
 - Academic Library Trends and Statistics Survey, 63–64
 - on library in competitive environment, 203–204
 - Value of Academic Libraries* commissioned by, 4, 46
- Association of Research Libraries (ARL)
 - LibQUAL+, 158, 159
 - LibQUAL+/MINES for Libraries, 141
 - report of survey results, 167–168
 - Values, Outcomes, and Return on Investment of Academic Libraries (LibValue)*, 46
- assurance, 156
- attention, 8
- attitude
 - for customer satisfaction, 85, 87
 - of organization towards customer service, 128
- attribute, customer-related metrics by, 190, 191
- attribute satisfaction, 146
- Auburn University Libraries, 98–99
- Auchter, Dorothy, 31–32
- availability, of library items, 82
- averages
 - presenting, 169–170
 - in quadrant analysis, 171–172

B

BackType, Twitter, 74
 balance, 56
 balanced scorecard, 9
 behavioral loyalty, 128
 bell-shaped curve, 168–169
 benchmarking
 areas of, 55–56
 questions to address with, 54
 benefits, of library services, 39
 best practices
 intent of, 56
 for service improvements, 202
 Bitner, Mary Jo, 146
 Black & Decker, 38
 blogs
 comments on library blog, 189
 library blogs for listening to customers, 71
 books, 131
 See also collections
 borrowers
 customer loyalty metrics, 135–136
 customer loyalty to library, interpretation of findings, 177–178
 privacy issues of customer-related metrics, 129–130
 proportion of population registered as borrowers, 132
 registrants, public library metrics for, 134
 See also customers
 Bowen, David E., 30
 brand image, 8
 brand penetration, 177
 budget, 188–189
 See also funding

C

cafés, in libraries, 179
 Calvert, Philip
 customization of SERVQUAL, 160
 sample statements (service quality), 157
 SERVQUAL for measurement of service quality, 156, 158
 cardholders
 customer loyalty metrics, 135–136
 customer loyalty to library, 177–178
 See also borrowers; customers
 Carlile, Heather, 16
 case studies, 118–120
 Cetinã, Iuliana, 128
 change
 competitive environment, 203–204
 critical issues for academic libraries, 187
 critical issues for public libraries, 187–189
 customer-related metrics by attribute, 190, 191
 library as learning enterprise, 203
 library websites, 189
 metrics, going beyond “How Much?,” 192–195
 metrics of engagement, 195–197

outcomes related to academic libraries,
 areas for development of, 193
 outcomes related to public libraries, areas
 for development of, 194
 quality, dimensions of, 189–191
 satisfied/dissatisfied customers chart, 198
 service, 201–203
 staff development and training, 197–201
 time for action, not excuses, 204–205
 value scorecard, 191–192
 Charlotte (North Carolina) Mecklenburg
 Library, 28
 Childers, Thomas A., 35, 36
 circulation records
 for library use statistics, 132
 metrics for information about customer
 preferences, 136
 Cisco Systems Inc., 107
 cleanliness, of library, 138
 clients, 3
 collections
 customer preferences, interpretation of,
 178–179
 library use, viewing, 130–132
 metrics for information about customer
 preferences, 136
 Selected Actions Taken from Listening to
 Customer Comments, 97
 shift to access development, 127
 size of, as measure of library quality, 1, 2
 college education, 2
 College Student Experiences Questionnaire,
 17–18
 comment cards, 72
 comments
 characteristics of, 81–82
 of customers via social media, 74–75
 on library website, 189
 from public library respondents, 184, 185
 comments, complaints, and compliments
 attitude/actions for customer satisfaction,
 85, 87
 in building/on library’s home page, 96, 98–99
 comment, characteristics of, 81–82
 complaint form, 85
 complaints, characteristics of, 82
 compliment and complaint tracking
 system, establishing, 87–88
 compliment and complaint tracking
 system, making it available, 94
 compliment and complaint tracking
 system, sample categories for, 91–93
 compliment and complaint tracking
 system, using, 90–91, 94
 compliment form, 88
 continuous improvement, 94–95, 96
 discussion questions for library staff, 88–90
 Framework for Maximizing Customer
 Satisfaction and Loyalty, 95
 importance of, 81
 Problem Report Form (For Staff Use), 86

Problem Resolution Tracking Database, 94
 process/procedure for management of, 90
 reasons customers do not complain, 82–85
 Selected Actions Taken from Listening to
 Customer Comments, 97–99
 Suggestion Box on Library Home Page, 96
 summary about, 99–100
 communication
 as high priority, 64
 with stakeholders about findings, 179–180
 community
 goodwill, as metric of engagement, 197
 library access/assistance for, 24
 library communication with, 179–180
 library’s role in community building, 187
 market penetration metrics for public
 libraries, 132–133
 measurement of, 38
 public library outcomes, 193–194
 community member, 3
 comparative benchmarking, 55
 comparison
 benchmarking, 54–56
 definitions for/standard procedure for,
 63–64
 of numbers, 54
 compass
 on library’s home page, 28
 Strategic Plan Compass (University of
 West Florida Libraries), 29
 competence, 140
 competitive benchmarking, 55
 competitive environment, 203–204
 complaint form
 availability of, 84
 sample form, 85
 complaints
 characteristics of, 82
 complaint form, 85
 How Does the Library Measure Up? 95
 objectives of complaint handling, 99–100
 reasons customers do not complain, 82–85
 spontaneous registration of, 67
 suggestion box in building/on home page,
 96, 98–99
 See also comments, complaints, and
 compliments
 compliment and complaint tracking system
 discussion questions for library staff, 88–90
 establishing, 87–88
 for listening to customers, 78–79
 making it available, 94
 process/procedure for management of, 90
 sample categories for, 91–93
 using, 90–91, 94
 compliments
 compliment form, 85, 87
 suggestion box in building/on home page,
 96, 98–99
 See also comments, complaints, and
 compliments

- conformance
 differences in quality dimensions, 7
 as dimension of service quality, 6
 quality, 189
- consequences, 39, 58
- content, 5
- content-mining engines, 189
- context, 5
- continuous improvement
 application to library processes, 127
 compliment and complaint tracking system, 94–96
 framework for maximizing customer satisfaction/loyalty, 95
See also change
- convenience
 case study instance selection, 118–119
 of library, as customer requirement, 139
- Cook, Colleen, 158
- coproduction, 14–15
- core values, 27–28
- correlation coefficients, 170
- correlations
 factor analysis and, 170–171
 quadrant analysis, 171–172
- cost
 “How much?” question for measurement of, 41
 measurement of value and, 42, 43, 44
- countables, 58, 192
- COUNTER, 135
- Counting Opinions (CO)
 ACRL/PLA data reporting tools, 64
 library data services, 10
 LibSat data presentation, 182–184
 report of survey results, 167–168
 services of, 149–150
 survey questions, formulating, 109
- courtesy
 of library staff, 140
 measurement of, 46
- critical incidents, 73–74
- Cross, Kevin F., 64
- Curry, Ann, 84
- customer, library use of term, 2–5
- customer engagement, 9
- customer expectations
 complaint indicates service does not meet, 82
 compliment and complaint tracking system and, 90
 customer satisfaction related to, 145–146
 differences in quality dimensions, 7
 as dimension of service quality, 6–7
 for evaluation of, 57
 Gaps Model of Expectations, 141–142
 influences on, 5
 LibQUAL+ data presentation, 180
 meeting or exceeding, 192
 quadrant analysis of, 171–172
 in quadrant chart, 182–183
- quality in terms of, 190
 SERVQUAL’s measurement of, 156
 survey of expectations, 175–176
- customer loyalty
 attitude/actions for customer satisfaction, 85, 87
 components of, 128
 Framework for Maximizing Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty, 95
 interpretation of findings, 177–178
 of library customers, 8
 library use, viewing, 130–132
 Loyalty Metrics: Distribution of Customers by Years of Continuous Registration and Activity, 133
 metrics for, 135–136
 metrics for academic libraries, 137–138
 net promoter score, 174–175
 objectives of complaint handling, 99
- customer perspective, 43–44
- customer preferences
 interpretation of, 178–179
 metrics for information about, 136
- customer report card, 174
- customer satisfaction
 attitude/actions for, 85, 87
 construct indicators for service encounter/overall service satisfaction, 146
 Counting Opinions for surveys, 149–150
 customer loyalty and, 128–129
 Customer Satisfaction Survey: San Francisco Public Library, 151–153
 Customer Satisfaction Survey: University of West Florida Libraries, 154–155
 customer-related metrics, 129, 161–164
 data collection for evaluation of, 64
 definition of, 145–146
 Framework for Maximizing Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty, 95
 How Does the Library Measure Up? 95
 important question for, 16
 library options for investigation of, 161
 measurement of, 46, 48
 methods for polling, 144–145
 monitoring, use of results from, 165
 opportunity index, 175
 questions for evaluation of, 148–149
 Reasons and Remedies for Customer Dissatisfaction (To Be Completed by Staff), 104
 Satisfaction: A Pool of Questions, 147
 satisfied/dissatisfied customers chart, 198
 service quality *vs.*, 5–6
 survey, 113–114
 ways to measure, 147–148
- customer satisfaction surveys
 LibQUAL+, 158–159
 LibQUAL+ Lite, 160
- customer service
 attitude/actions for customer satisfaction, 85, 87
- customer complaints/comments for
 continuous improvement, 94–95
 customer satisfaction *vs.* service quality, 5–6
- customer-driven service chart, 106
- “dumb” questions, reduction of, 17–18
- exemplary, 202–203
- failure, reasons for, 13
- first time customers at library, 14
- Framework for Maximizing Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty, 95
- image of library, changing, 15
- improving, 201–202
- of library, importance of, 4–5
- library anxiety/frustration, 15–16
- library customer satisfaction with, 10
- measurement of, 38–39, 42–44, 46, 48
- poor customer experience, 81
- questions for customer feedback about, 164–165
- review of prior to survey, 101, 104–105, 106
- seamless service, 30
- self-sufficiency of customers, 14–15
- service quality, 5
- signage, 17
- staff, 17
- staff training and development programs, 196–201
- status quo, not accepting, 18–19
- strategy, 31–32
- survey of expectations, 175–176
- time for action, not excuses, 204–205
See also comments, complaints, and compliments
- Customer Service Inventory (To Be Completed by Staff), 102–103
- customer service plans
 examples of platitudes, 31
 overview of, 30
- customer-related metrics
 for academic libraries, 136–138
 by attribute, 190, 191
 customer loyalty, components of, 128
 customer requirements for academic/public libraries, 138–140
 customer satisfaction, 129, 161–164
 insights with, 60
 library use, viewing, 130–132
 Loyalty Metrics: Distribution of Customers by Years of Continuous Registration and Activity, 133
 need for, 127–128
 privacy issues, 129–130
 proportion of population registered as borrowers, 132
 for public libraries, 132–136
 summary about, 140–141
 tracking trends, 130
- customers
 access/assistance mission of libraries, 24–25
 comments *vs.* complaints, 81–82

- customers (*continued*)
- complaints, reasons for not voicing, 82–85
 - consequences, measurement of, 39
 - decision making by, 48–50
 - “dumb” questions, reduction of, 17–18
 - evaluation, range of options for, 48
 - focus group interview, customer groups for, 117
 - library anxiety/frustration, 15–16
 - Library Customer Survey, 105
 - library goals/objectives and, 26
 - library knowledge of, 204–205
 - library reputation and, 8
 - market penetration of library, 176–177
 - measurement, questions for, 41–44, 46, 48
 - measurement of, 38, 41
 - number of customers to survey, 109
 - questionnaires/surveys, 68–69
 - questions answered by librarians, 17
 - recording comments of, 57
 - requirements for academic/public libraries, 138–140
 - self-sufficiency of, 14–15
 - signage for, 17
 - survey, target audience for, 106–108
 - See also* comments, complaints, and compliments; focus group interviews; listening to customers; surveys
-
- D**
- dashboards
 - for communication with stakeholders, 179
 - overview of, 172–173
 - for survey results, 169
 - dashed lines, 172
 - data analysis, 168–169
 - See also* interpretation of findings
 - data collection
 - active/passive, for listening to customers, 67
 - certainty about, 64
 - continuous, 79
 - for customer survey, 101, 104, 106
 - data analysis after, 167–168
 - focus group interview for, 120
 - library choice of methods for, 192
 - by library staff, 73
 - library surveys for, 63–64
 - with mystery shopping, 76–77
 - by students, 77–78
 - sweeping study for, 77
 - data presentation
 - with LibQUAL+, 180–181
 - with LibSat, 182–184
 - decision making
 - stakeholder interest in “How.?” questions
 - about library, 51
 - who decides what is important, 48–50
 - Del izzy, 74
 - Department of Veterans Affairs, 40
 - dependability, 139–140
 - detractors, 114, 174
 - Digg, 74
 - digital environment
 - metaphor for libraries in, 15
 - shift to, 187
 - See also* electronic resources
 - Digital Public Library of America, 187
 - Diigo, 74
 - disabilities
 - library services for students with, 62
 - students with, SERVQUAL customized for, 160
 - Disend, Jeffrey E., 142
 - Disney, Walt, 4
 - distribution
 - shape of, 168–169
 - of survey, 110–111
 - variability of, 170
 - downloads
 - metrics for information about customer preferences, 136
 - number of downloads metric, 132
 - tracking number of, 178
 - Dugan, Robert E., 195
 - Dumitrescu, Luigi, 128
-
- E**
- e-books
 - customer frustration with, 16
 - customer preferences, interpretation of, 179
 - EBSCO Excellence in Small and/or Rural Public Library Service Award, 9
 - economic recession
 - impact on libraries, 4
 - increase in public library use during, 177
 - effectiveness
 - evaluation of, 35
 - of library staff, case study on, 120
 - service rating: matching customers to services, 176
 - of teams/groups, 37
 - efficiency, 41
 - 80/20 rule, 135, 177
 - electronic resources
 - of academic libraries, 2
 - customer preferences, interpretation of, 178–179
 - e-metrics and, 127
 - e-mail, 69
 - emotional loyalty, 128
 - empathy, 156
 - ends and means
 - customer satisfaction *vs.* service quality, 5–6
 - library reputation, 8
 - management information system, 9–10
 - national awards, 8–9
 - new roles of libraries, 1–2
 - quality, reasons to investigate, 7–8
 - service quality, dimensions of, 6–7
 - summary about, 10
 - terms for people library serves, 2–5
 - engagement, metrics of, 195–197
 - Enterprise Rent-A-Car, 13, 113
 - errors, 111
 - evaluateables, 58
 - evaluation
 - customer comments, complaints, compliments for, 81
 - parts of, 35–36
 - range of options for, 48
 - See also* measurement/evaluation
 - Evans, G. Edward, 24, 37
 - excellence
 - as dimension of quality, 190–191
 - expectation of, 26
 - Excellence in Academic Libraries Award Program, 9
 - exemplary service, 202–203
 - exit interviews, 69
 - expectations
 - See* customer expectations
 - external customers
 - as customer group for focus group interview, 117
 - target audience for survey, 106–107
-
- F**
- Facebook, 84
 - facilities, 99
 - factor analysis, 170–171
 - faculty, 137, 138
 - feedback
 - active/passive data collection from customers, 67
 - in general systems model, 29, 30
 - financial values, 42–44, 45
 - findings
 - See* interpretation of findings
 - Fleet, Connie Van, 195
 - Fletcher, Jane, 18
 - focus group interviews
 - advantages/disadvantages of, 70
 - case studies, 118–120
 - conclusion about, 123–125
 - for customer loyalty, 135
 - for customer perspective, 17
 - internal customers, 123
 - interview, 120–121
 - lost/never-gained customers, 121–123
 - online, 121
 - overview of, 117–118
 - strengths/weaknesses of, 118
 - summary of, 124, 125
 - follow-up, 123
 - foreseeable situations, 6
 - forms, for listening to customers, 72
 - Four Seasons Hotel, 18
 - Framework for Maximizing Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty, 95
 - frequency distributions, 168–169
 - frustration
 - complaints, reasons customers do not voice, 83, 84

of library customer, 16
 functional benchmarking, 55
 functions, measurement of, 37
 funding
 library address of, 187
 reductions in operating budgets, 188–189
 fund-raising, 51

G

Gabridge, Tracy, 77
 Gadskeell, Millicent, 77
 Gaps Model of Expectations, 143–144
 general systems model, 29–30
 George, Steve, 9
 Georgia Tech University, Library, 173
 Giesecke, Joan, 15
 goals, 25–26
 goodness, 36, 141
 Google Analytics, 137
 Google Blog Search, 74, 189
 Google Forms, 110
 government documents, 131
 graphs
 Pareto diagram, 169
 quadrant chart, 182–183
 radar chart, 159
 groups, 37
 “Guidelines for Behavioral Performance of Reference and Information Service Providers” (Reference and User Services Association), 140

H

Hackman, J. Richard, 37, 120
 Hawken, Paul, 100
 health, of organization, 28–29
 Heath, Fred, 158
 Hébert, Françoise, 5
 Hedge, Alan, 17
 Heft, Sandra M., 24, 37
 “Help Zone,” 18
 Hernon, Peter
 customization of SERVQUAL, 160
 on information, 61
 on perspectives of library metrics, 195
 sample statements (service quality), 157
 SERVQUAL for measurement of service quality, 156, 158
 higher education
 framework for evaluation and assessment in, 53
 metrics for academic libraries, 192–193
 Hillman Library at the University of Pittsburgh, 17
 Hirshon, Arnold
 on customer expectations, 192
 on customer service, 4
 on customer service strategy, 31–32
 histogram, 168–169
 “How accurate?” question, 42
 “How courteous?” question, 46

“How economical?” question, 41
 “How many?” question, 41
 “How much?” question, 41, 192–195
 “How prompt?” question, 41–42
 “How.?” questions
 “How . . . ?” Questions: The Library and Customer Perspectives, 49
 stakeholder interest in certain “How.?” questions about library, 51
 “How reliable?” question, 46
 “How responsive?” question, 42
 “How satisfied?” question, 46, 48
 “How valuable?” question, 42–44, 45, 46
 “How well?” question, 42, 48
 HowSociable, 74
 Hubbert, Amy R., 146

I

ideal expectation, 171
 IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations), 46
 image
 customer loyalty component, 128
 customer satisfaction and, 129
 IMLS (Institute of Museum and Library Services), 9, 64
 impact
 importance of, 57
 measurement of, 39–40
 metrics of library services, 59
 Indiana University–Purdue University
 Indianapolis, University Library, 173
 information, as tool for power, 61
 information control
 LibQUAL+ for measurement of customer satisfaction, 158, 159
 in radar chart, 180
 in-person interviews, 70
 in-person visitors, 134
 input metrics
 caution about, 61
 for comparisons, 53
 counting same items twice, 63
 inputs
 conceptual framework for metrics relating to library services, 59
 in general systems model, 29–30
 of library services, 60
 instance selection, 118
 Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), 9, 64
 institutional return on investment
 measurement of, 44, 46
 sample academic library institutional ROI spreadsheet, 47
 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), 64
 internal benchmarking
 for baseline for service performance, 56
 description of, 55

internal customers
 case study instance selection, 119–120
 as customer group for focus group interview, 117
 focus group interviews for, 123
 target audience for survey, 106
 International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), 46
 Internet
 customer complaints on, 83–84
 electronic data statistics, measurement of, 61
 library in competitive environment, 203, 204
 online focus group interview, 121
 interpretation of findings
 asset maps, 173–174
 averages, 169–170
 comments from public library respondents, 184, 185
 communicating with stakeholders, 179–180
 customer preferences, 178–179
 customer report card, 174
 dashboards, 172–173
 data analysis methods, considerations that influence, 168–169
 factor analysis, 170–171
 frequencies/percentages, 169
 LibQUAL+ data presentation, 180
 LibQUAL+ Radar Chart, 181
 LIBSAT data presentation, 182–184
 loyalty/intensity, 177–178
 market penetration, 176–177
 need for, 167
 net promoter score, 174–175
 opportunity index, 175, 182
 Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, 170
 quadrant analysis, 171–172
 Quadrant Chart (Counting Opinions), 183
 service rating: matching customers to services, 176
 summary about, 184–185
 survey of expectations, 175–176
 variability, 170
 interval data, 168
 interval scale, 168
 interviews
 critical incidents, 73–74
 exit interviews, 69
 focus group interviews, 70
 in-person or telephone interviews, 70
 See also focus group interviews
 IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System), 64

J

John C. Pace Library at the University of West Florida, 138
 Jones, Thomas O., 129
 Jones-Grant, Tracey, 173–174

journals, 130
judgment, 36

K

Kerr, George, 135
Key Steps for Conducting Survey Research
(Service Quality and Satisfaction),
114–116
knowledge
of customers, 140–141
knowledgeability of staff, 140
Kotter, John P., 22
Kroon, George E., 6

L

L. L. Bean, 30
lapsed borrowers, 135
leadership, 8–9
learning commons survey
example questionnaire for, 111, 113
Learning Commons Survey: Sample
Questions, 112–113
learning enterprise, library as, 203
learning opportunities, 196
LibQUAL+
administration of by assessment librarian,
141
data presentation, 180
for measurement of service quality,
158–159
Radar Chart, 181
service quality measure in, 64
LibQUAL+ Lite, 160
librarians
communication with stakeholders,
179–180
complaints, reasons customers do not voice,
82–85
“dumb” questions, reduction of, 17–18
exemplary service of, 202–203
focus group interviews for data collection,
123–124
library anxiety/frustration and, 14, 15–16
questions answered by, 17
librarianship, 5
library
access/assistance, 24–25
blogs/wikis, 71
customer service, data collection on, 17
first time customers at, 14
functions, measurement of, 37
goals/objectives for actualization of
mission, 25–26
image of, changing, 15
as learning enterprise, 203
library anxiety/frustration, 15–16
measurement of physical environment, 37
measurement of, questions for, 41–44,
46, 48
mission statement *vs.* vision statement,
22–24

mission statements of, 21–22
mystery shopping at, 76–77
philosophy/values of, 26–28
proportion of population registered as
borrowers, 132
quality, measurement of, 1–2
quality, reasons to investigate, 7–8
reputation of, 8
Selected Actions Taken from Listening to
Customer Comments, 97
self-sufficiency of customers, 14–15
service, measurement of, 38–39
signage, 17
suggestion box in building/on home page,
96, 98–99
as system, 28–30
system, customer frustration with, 83, 84
terms for people library serves, 2–5
use, customer-related metrics, 130–132
library and information science (LIS), 35
library anxiety, 14, 15–16
library as place
LibQUAL+ for measurement of customer
satisfaction, 158
in radar chart, 180
Library Customer Survey, 105
library spaces
comfortable/inviting, 179
for meeting/study, 202
Selected Actions Taken from Listening to
Customer Comments, 98
student designs of ideal, 77
library staff
case study instance selection, 119–120
change, embracing, 189
communication with customers, 64
complaints, reasons customers do not voice,
82–85
compliment and complaint tracking
system, discussion questions for, 88–90
compliment and complaint tracking
system, establishing, 87–88
compliment and complaint tracking
system, making it available, 94
customer data collection by, 73
customer requirements for academic/public
libraries, 140
Customer Service Inventory (To Be
Completed by Staff), 102–103
customer service review before survey, 101,
104, 106
decision making by, 48–50
development program, 62
“dumb” questions, reduction of, 17–18
focus group interview, 120–121, 123
loyalty of, 177
Problem Report Form (For Staff Use), 86
Reasons and Remedies for Customer
Dissatisfaction (To Be Completed by
Staff), 104
rewards for, 88

self-examination by, 19
staff development and training, 187, 197–199
staff training and development, sample
case study statements for, 199–201
library website
comments on, compilation of, 189
complaint form on, 84
customer satisfaction survey on, 150
Selected Actions Taken from Listening to
Customer Comments, 99
suggestion box on library's home page, 96,
98–99
survey embedded in, 110
LibSat, 182–184
LibValue Toolkit (ARL), 46
Line, Maurice B., 5, 16
listening, ways for
customer questionnaires/surveys, 68–69
interviews, 69–70
library blogs/wikis, 71
social networks, 71
suggestion boxes, forms, comment cards, 72
toll-free or special telephone numbers, 72
listening to customers
active/passive data collection, 67
complaint tracking systems, 78–79
critical incidents, 73–74
library staff, data collection by, 73
methods for listening to customers, 79
mystery shopping, 76–77
social media, 74–75
students, data collection by, 77–78
summary about, 79
sweeping study, 77
usability testing, 78
ways to listen, 68–72
See also focus group interviews; surveys
LJ Index, 62–63
lost customer
case study instance selection, 119
focus group interviews for, 117, 121–123
target audience for survey, 107
loyalty
See customer loyalty
Lynch, Richard L., 64
Lyons, Ray, 177

M

maintenance ratio, 129
Maki, Peggy L., 203
Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award,
8–9
Malhotra, Arvind, 161
management
information system, 9–10
measurement of, 37
metrics reflecting management of library,
192
managers
customer complaints, dealing with, 83
customer service, insulation from, 13

- mapping diaries, 77
- Marco, Guy A., 25
- market penetration
- customer-related metrics for academic libraries, 137
 - customer-related metrics for public libraries, 132–133
 - interpretation of findings, 176–177
 - library use, viewing, 130
 - measurement of, 41
- market perceived quality, 190
- market perception, 6–7
- Matthews, Joseph R.
- on library customers, 3–4
 - on library loss of customers, 177
 - on net promoter score, 175
 - on service quality, 156
- McClure, Charles, 61
- mean
- calculation of, 170
 - in quadrant analysis, 171–172
 - in survey of expectations, 175
- measure, how to
- definition of measurement, 40
 - “How accurate?” question, 42
 - “How courteous?” question, 46
 - “How economical?” question, 41
 - “How many?” question, 41
 - “How much?” question, 41
 - “How prompt?” question, 41–42
 - “How reliable?” question, 46
 - “How responsive?” question, 42
 - “How satisfied?” question, 46, 48
 - “How valuable?” question, 42–44, 46
 - “How well?” question, 42
 - metrics of financial values, 45
 - relating with what to measure, 52–53
 - sample academic library institutional ROI spreadsheet, 47
 - in steps of evaluation, 36
- measure, what to
- community, 38
 - consequences, 39
 - customers, 38
 - external perspective, 53
 - functions, 37
 - impact, 39–40
 - physical environment, 37
 - processes, 37–38
 - relating with how to measure, 52–53
 - resources, 36
 - service, 38–39
 - in steps of evaluation, 36
 - teams/groups, 37
 - use, 38
- measure of central tendency, 169–170
- measurement
- of customer satisfaction, 147–148
 - level of measurement for variable studied, 168
 - of service quality, 156–161
- measurement/evaluation
- assessment, 40
 - benchmarking, 54–56
 - comparison of numbers, 54
 - comparisons, standard procedure for, 63–64
 - conceptual framework for metrics relating to library services, 59
 - consequences, measures of, 58
 - countables and evaluateables, 58
 - counting same items twice, 63
 - for customer service improvements, 167
 - effectiveness, 35
 - evaluation, parts of, 36
 - evaluation, range of options for, 48
 - framework for evaluation and assessment in higher education, 53
 - “How . . . ?” Questions: The Library and Customer Perspectives, 49
 - how to measure, 40–44, 46, 48
 - judgment of performance, 57
 - metrics, meaningful/realistic, 40
 - metrics of financial values, 45
 - metrics of interest, examples of, 50
 - outcomes assessment, 48
 - qualitative analysis, 56–57
 - quantity/quality, 50–52
 - relating what to measure with how to measure, 52–53
 - resources, service quality and, 62–63
 - sample academic library institutional ROI spreadsheet, 47
 - stakeholder interest in certain “How.?” questions about library, 51
 - statistics as double-edged swords, 63
 - summary about, 58–60
 - what is important, who decides, 48–50
 - what to measure, 36–40
 - See also* interpretation of findings
- Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services (MINES) for Libraries, 46, 141
- median, 170, 175
- Meltwater Ice Rocket, 189
- META Project, 46
- metaphors, 15
- metrics
- caution about, 61
 - conceptual framework for metrics relating to library services, 59
 - counting same items twice, 63
 - customer-related metrics, 60
 - customer-related metrics by attribute, 190, 191
 - of engagement, 195–197
 - of financial values, 45
 - going beyond “How Much?,” 192–195
 - of interest, examples of, 50
 - performance metrics, purpose of, 64
 - service statements that might be converted into metrics, 160
 - use of meaningful/realistic metrics, 40
 - use of term, 35
 - who decides what is important, 48–50
 - See also* customer-related metrics; interpretation of findings; measurement/evaluation
- Metropolitan Library System (Burr Ridge, Illinois), 202
- Microsoft Excel, 169, 170
- Microsoft Office, 169
- Miller, Rush, 189
- Minnesota State Colleges & Universities
- Board of Trustees Accountability Dashboard, 172
- mission
- goals/objectives for actualization of, 25–26
 - library access/assistance, 24–25
 - philosophy/values and, 26–28
 - plans for accomplishment of, 25
- Mission Impossible* (television show), 21
- mission statement
- of academic libraries, 22
 - library access/assistance, 24–25
 - mission fulfillment and, 21
 - Urban Libraries Council’s word cloud image of, 21–22
 - vision statement *vs.*, 22–24
- mode, 169
- moderator, 120–121, 122
- multimethod research, 120
- mystery shopping, 58, 76–77
-
- N**
- national awards, 8–9
- National Performance Review, 101
- Neal, James G., 1–2
- Nestor-Harper, Mary, 83
- net promoter score (NPS), 114, 174–175
- never-gained customers, 121–123
- newspapers, 131
- Nielson BlogPulse, 189
- Nitecki, Danuta A.
- adaptation of SERVQUAL, 156, 158
 - on perspectives of library metrics, 195
- noise, 138
- nominal variables, 168
- noncustomer
- case study instance selection, 119
 - as customer group for focus group interview, 117
 - focus group interviews for, 121–123
 - target audience for survey, 107
- nonprobability sampling, 108
- Nordstrom, 26, 27
- numbers, in library report, 179
-
- O**
- Obama, Barack, 40
- objectives, 25–26, 62
- Oliver, Richard L., 145
- online focus group interviews, 121

online survey, 110
 opportunity index (OI), 175, 182–183
 Orange County Library System (Orlando, Florida), 22
 ordinal variables, 168
 organizational culture, 27
 outcomes
 metrics for, 192–195
 student outcomes assessment, 48
 output metrics, 61
 outputs
 conceptual framework for metrics relating to library services, 59
 of library services, 60
 overall service satisfaction, 146, 147

P

Parasuraman, A., 161
 Pareto diagram, 169
 partnerships, library, 1–2
 passive data collection, 67
 passives, 114, 174
 patron, 2–3
 patron-driven acquisition, 16
 Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, 170
 Pearson's r , 170, 175
 Pentescu, Alma, 128
 percentages, 169
 performance
 benchmarking, 54–56
 judgment of, 57
 measurement of, 204
 performance metrics
 caution about, 61
 for customer service improvements, 167
 to improve library services, 64
 periods covered, 132–133
 philosophy, of organization, 26–28
 photographs, of library by students, 77
 physical environment
 acceptable, as customer requirement, 138
 measurement of, 37
 See also library spaces
 PLA (Public Library Association), 9, 63–64
 PLAMetrics, 10
 Polaris Innovation in Technology John Iliff Award, 9
 policies
 for compliment and complaint tracking system, 90
 for dealing with complaints, 83
 population, 134
 potential value (PV), 42–43
 predictable situations, 6
 print collection, 1, 2
 privacy issues, 129–130
 probability sampling
 case study instance selection, 118–119
 description of, 108
 study design used to produce data from, 169

Problem Report Form (For Staff Use)
 data from, 94
 description of, 84
 sample form, 86
 Problem Resolution Tracking Database, 94
 process metrics, 138
 processes
 measurement of, 37–38
 necessary for service, 38–39
 productivity, 138
 professionalism, 140
 Project SAILS, 141
 promoters, 114, 174
 public libraries
 access/assistance mission of, 24–25
 areas for development of outcomes related to, 193–195
 assessment, purpose of, 40
 awards for, 9
 critical issues for, 187–189
 customer loyalty data, 178
 customer requirements for, 138–140
 customer-related metrics for, 132–136
 dashboards, 173
 image of, changing, 15
 library as learning enterprise, 203
 resources, service quality and, 62–63
 survey questions, formulating, 109
 Public Libraries Survey (IMLS), 64
 Public Library Association (PLA), 9, 63–64
 purchase or exchange value, 43
 purposive sampling, 118–119

Q

quadrant analysis
 framework for, 171
 overview of, 171–172
 in survey of expectations, 175
 quadrant chart, 182–183
 qualitative analysis, 56–57
 qualitative data collection, 195
 qualitative frameworks, 195
 qualitative results, 73
 quality
 definition of, 5
 dimensions of, 189–191
 measurement of, 50–52
 See also service quality
 quantifiable benefits, 39
 quantitative results, 73
 quantity, measurement of, 50–52
 questionnaires
 learning commons survey, 111–113
 for listening to customers, 68–69
 survey questions, formulating, 109–110
 See also surveys
 questions
 about target audience for survey, 107
 answered by librarians, data collection on, 17
 for best practices, 56

compliment and complaint tracking
 system, discussion questions for library staff, 88–90
 for customer feedback about customer service, 164–165
 for customer satisfaction measurement, 147
 “dumb” questions, reduction of, 17–18
 for effectiveness evaluation, 35
 for focus group interviews, 122, 123
 for hows of measurement, 41–44, 46, 48
 Learning Commons Survey: Sample Questions, 112–113
 scenarios for addressing, 23–24
 survey questions, formulating, 109–110

R

race/ethnicity, 133
 radar chart
 description of, 159
 example of, 181
 with LibQUAL+, 180
 random sampling, 108
 ratio variable, 168
 reality, 29
 Reasons and Remedies for Customer Dissatisfaction (To Be Completed by Staff), 104
 recording, of focus group interview, 122
 Reference and User Services Association, 140
 reference services
 data collection on, 17
 “dumb” questions, reduction of, 17–18
 value of, measurement of, 42
 registrants, 134
 Reichheld, Frederick F., 174
 reliability
 of library, as customer requirement, 139–140
 measurement of, 46
 SERVQUAL's measurement of customer expectations, 156
 repeat customers, 4, 8
 report
 communication with stakeholders, 179–180
 customer report card, 174
 LibQUAL+ data presentation, 180
 See also interpretation of findings
 representativeness, of survey, 108
 reputation
 customer loyalty component, 128
 of library, 8
 sources of comments about, 129
 Research Planning and Review Committee of the ACRL, 203–204
 resident satisfaction survey, 144–145
 resources
 asset maps, 173–174
 in general systems model, 29–30
 “*How much?*” question for measurement of, 41

lack of, 204, 205
 measurement of, 36
 quality of service and, 62–63
 response rate, 110–111
 responsiveness, 42, 156
 retention ratio, 129
 return on investment (ROI)
 from library use, 4
 measurement of value with, 43, 44, 46
 sample academic library institutional ROI
 spreadsheet, 47
 rewards, 88, 107
 Rice University Fondren Library, 28
 Robinson, Charlie, 136
 Rochester, Minnesota, Public Library, 27
 Rogers, Curtis R., 17
 rotation, 171
 Rust, Roland T., 145

S

safety, 138
 Salt Lake City (Utah) Public Library, 173
 sampling
 for focus group interview, 122
 for surveys, 108
 Sampson, Scott E., 64
 San Antonio (Texas) Public Library, 28
 San Francisco Public Library, Customer
 Satisfaction Survey, 151–153
 San José (California) public and academic
 library, 24–25, 28
 Sanders, Betsy, 23, 26
 Sasser, W. Earl, Jr., 129
 satisfaction
 definition of, 5
 item, 73–74
 measurement of, 46, 48
 See also customer satisfaction
 scenarios, 23–24
 Schneider, Benjamin, 30
 seamless service, 30
 search
 customer comments/complaints and, 82
 on social media for customer feedback,
 74–75
 Selected Actions Taken from Listening to
 Customer Comments, 97–99
 self-assessment
 Customer Service Inventory (To Be
 Completed by Staff), 102–103
 by library before customer survey, 101
 Reasons and Remedies for Customer
 Dissatisfaction (To Be Completed by
 Staff), 104
 self-improvement, 36
 self-service
 customer comments/complaints and, 82
 popularity of, 58–59
 self-sufficiency, of customers, 14–15
 service
 development, 187–188
 exemplary, 202–203
 improving, 201–202
 measurement of, 38–39
 vision for, 201
 See also customer service
 service encounter satisfaction, 146, 147
 service models, 187–188
 service points, 18
 service quality
 amount of resources and, 62–63
 components of, 156
 content/context, 5
 creating your own instrument, 160–161
 from customer perspective, 10
 customer satisfaction and, 141
 customer satisfaction *vs.*, 5–6
 customer-related metrics, 162–163
 customer-related metrics and, 141
 dimensions of, 6–7
 factor analysis, 170–171
 focus on expectations, 165
 LibQUAL+, 158–159
 LibQUAL+ Lite, 160
 library options for investigation of, 161
 quality, reasons to investigate, 7–8
 sample statements (service quality), 157
 service statements that might be converted
 into metrics, 160
 SERVQUAL, 156, 158
 service rating, 176
 SERVQUAL
 customization of, 160–161
 for measurement of service quality, 156,
 158
 signage, 17
 60/40 rule, 135
 size, 117
 Snow, Dennis, 13
 snowball sampling, 122
 social media
 customer complaints voiced on, 84
 L. L. Bean's use of, 30
 listening to customers via, 74–75
 poor customer experience comments on, 81
 social networks for listening to customers,
 71
 summarizing content found on, 75
 Socialmention, 74
 solid lines, 172
 Southwest Airlines, 30
 speed, 41–42
 SPSS, 169
 SROI (student return on investment), 44
 staff
 See library staff
 staff training and development programs
 (STDPs)
 overview of, 196–199
 sample case study statements for staff
 training and development, 199–201
 stakeholders
 communication of findings to, 179–180
 interest in “How.?” questions about library,
 51
 quantity/quality, measurement of, 50–52
 who decides what is important, 48–50
 standard deviation
 calculation of, 170
 in survey of expectations, 175, 176
 standards
 conformance standards for service quality, 6
 for library performance, 57
 Starbucks, 177
 State Library of North Carolina, 173
 statistics, 63
 See also customer-related metrics;
 interpretation of findings; metrics
 status quo, 18
 Stein, Joan, 156
 Stout, Amy, 77
 strategic plan
 compass for, 28–29
 library objectives/activities, 62
 strategic quality, 190
 student return on investment (SROI), 44
 students
 as academic library customers, 4
 customer-related metrics for academic
 libraries, 136–138
 data collection by, 77–78
 digital library resources, use of, 82
 with disabilities, library services for, 62
 with disabilities, SERVQUAL customized
 for, 160
 “dumb” questions, reduction of, 17–18
 library anxiety among, 15–16
 library as learning enterprise, 203
 student learning outcomes, measurement
 of, 39
 student outcomes assessment, 48
 survey, target audience for, 107
 success, 62
 suggestion boxes
 in building/on library's home page, 96, 98–99
 for listening to customers, 72
 superiority gap, 180
 support for services provided, 196
 survey of expectations, 175–176
 SurveyGizmo, 110
 SurveyMonkey, 110
 surveys
 ACRL/IPEDS, 63–64
 Counting Opinions for, 149–150
 customer satisfaction surveys, 129, 144–145
 customer satisfaction surveys, choices for,
 147
 customer satisfaction surveys, questions for,
 147–149
 Customer Service Inventory (To Be
 Completed by Staff), 102–103
 customer-based service, review of, 101,
 104–105, 106

surveys (*continued*)

- customer-driven service chart, 106
- customer-related metrics for customer satisfaction, 161–164
- distribution of survey, 110–111
- focus group interview responses for development of, 117
- Key Steps for Conducting Survey Research (Service Quality and Satisfaction), 114–116
- learning commons survey, 111, 113
- Learning Commons Survey: Sample Questions, 112–113
- LibQUAL+, 158–159
- LibQUAL+ data presentation, 180–181
- LibQUAL+/MINES for Libraries, 141
- Library Customer Survey, 105
- LibSat data presentation, 182–184
- for listening to customers, 68–69
- number of customers to survey, 109
- Reasons and Remedies for Customer Dissatisfaction (To Be Completed by Staff), 104
- report of survey results, 167–168
- representativeness, 108
- summary about, 113, 114
- survey of expectations, 175–176
- survey questions, formulating, 109–110
- target audience, 106–108
- See also* interpretation of findings
- sweeping study, 77

T

- tangibles, 156
- target audience
 - for survey, 106–108
 - survey questions, formulating, 110
- targets, for customer satisfaction, 162
- teams, 37
- technology, 97–98
- Technorati Blog Search, 189
- telephone
 - for complaints, 84
 - interviews, 70
 - for listening to customers, 72
- ten-point scale, 148, 150
- testing, usability, 78
- Texas A&M University, 158
- Thompson, Bruce, 158
- time
 - amount of time spent in library, 63
 - conformance quality, 189
 - convenience as saving time, 139
 - customer-related metrics for time spent waiting, 162–163
 - “How prompt?” question for measurement of speed, 41–42

- spent at library by customers, 202
- as valuable asset, 8
- toll-free telephone number, 72
- tracking, 130
- training
 - sample case study statements for staff training and development, 199–201
 - staff training and development programs, 196–199
- Traverse Area District Library, 173
- TweetDeck, 74
- Twitter, 74, 84

U

- Ulwick, Anthony, 175
- unavailable items, 82
- Undercover Boss* (television show), 13
- Underhill, Paco, 124–125
- unit of analysis, 168
- United Airlines, 15
- University of North Carolina, Greensboro, University Libraries, 173
- University of North Carolina, Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 173
- University of Pittsburgh's University Library System, 38
- University of Richmond (Virginia), Boatwright Memorial Library, 173
- University of Rochester Libraries, 77–78
- University of West Florida Libraries
 - Customer Satisfaction Survey, 150, 154–155
 - faculty repeat users of library's IL instruction, 137
 - Strategic Plan Compass, 29
- unpredictable situations, 6
- Urban Libraries Council, 21–22
- urgency, 5
- usability testing, 78
- use
 - longevity of, 129
 - market penetration in terms of, 177
 - measurement of, 38
 - value of, measurement of, 43–44
 - viewing library use, 130–132
- user, 2–3

V

- value
 - demonstration of by libraries, 4
 - “How valuable?” question for measurement of, 42–44
 - as market penetration component, 177
 - metrics of financial values, 45
 - quality, measurement of, 51
 - of repeat library customers, 8
 - sample academic library institutional ROI spreadsheet, 47

- scorecard, 191–192
- of services used, 43
- values
 - core values of libraries, 27–28
 - of organization, 26–27
- Values, Outcomes, and Return on Investment of Academic Libraries (LibValue)* (ARL), 46
- Van House, Nancy A., 35, 36
- variability, 169, 170
- vicious circle complaints, 99
- Viewing Library Metrics from Different Perspectives* (Dugan, Hernon, & Nitecki), 49–50, 192
- vision, 201
- vision statement, 22–24
- visitors
 - market penetration of library, 177
 - public library metrics for, 134–135

W

- Wallace, Danny P., 195
- Walton, Richard E., 37, 120
- web-based surveys, 68
- webcam, 121
- websites
 - for social media searches, 74
 - usability testing, 78
 - See also* library website
- Wehmeyer, Susan, 31–32
- Weingand, Darlene E., 2–3, 18
- Weiss, Carol H., 36
- Why We Buy* (Underhill), 124–125
- wikis, 71
- Williment, Kenneth, 173–174
- wobble theory, 183
- workload, 41

X

- Xerox Company, 129

Y

- YBP Library Services, 9
- Yelp, 74, 84
- “you do not care about me” viewpoint, 83–84
- Yuhl, Kimberly, 179

Z

- Zeithaml, Valarie A., 161
- Zuniga, Norma, 76–77