



LibQUAL⁺
2025 Survey

University of Central Oklahoma

Association of Research Libraries

1025 Connecticut Ave, NW Suite 1200

Washington, DC 20036

Phone 202-296-2296

Fax 202-872-0884

<http://www.libqual.org>

© 2025 Association of Research Libraries

1 Introduction

1.1 LibQUAL: Defining and Promoting Library Service Quality

This notebook contains information from the 2024 administration of the LibQUAL protocol and provides background information in addition to suggestions for interpreting the data.

LibQUAL is a tool that libraries use to solicit, track, understand, and act upon users' opinions of service quality. These services are offered to the library community by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The protocol is a rigorously tested web-based survey that helps libraries assess and improve library services, change organizational culture, and market the library. The survey instrument measures library users' minimum, perceived, and desired service levels of service quality across three dimensions: Affect of Service, Information Control, and Library as Place. The goals of LibQUAL are to:

- Foster a culture of excellence in providing library service
- Help libraries better understand user perceptions of library service quality
- Collect and interpret library user feedback systematically over time
- Provide comparable assessment information from peer institutions
- Identify best practices in library service
- Enhance library staff members' analytical skills for interpreting and acting on data

LibQUAL was initiated in 2000 as an experimental project for benchmarking perceptions of library service quality across 13 Association of Research Libraries member institutions under the leadership of Fred Heath and Colleen Cook, then both at Texas A&M University Libraries, and Martha Kyrillidou, former senior director of statistics and service quality programs at ARL. This effort was supported in part by a three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE).

Since 2000, more than 1,350 libraries have participated in LibQUAL, including college and university libraries, community college libraries, health sciences libraries, academic law libraries, and public libraries—some through various consortia, others as independent participants. Through 2024, there have been 3,429 institutional surveys implemented across 1,353 institutions in 37 countries, 20 language translations, and over 3 million respondents. About 38% of the users who respond to the survey provide rich comments about the ways they use their libraries. The growing LibQUAL community of participants and its extensive dataset are rich resources for improving library services.

1.2 Web Access to Data

Data summaries from the 2025 iteration of the LibQUAL survey will be available to project participants online in the Data Repository via the LibQUAL survey management site:

<<http://www.libqual.org/repository>>

1.3 Interpreting Your Data

Means

The mean of a collection of numbers is their arithmetic average, computed by adding them up and dividing by their total number.

In this notebook, means are provided for users' minimum, desired, and perceived levels of service quality for each item on the LibQUAL survey. Means are also provided for the general satisfaction and information literacy outcomes questions.

Standard Deviation

Standard deviation (SD) is a measure of the spread of data around their mean. The standard deviation depends on calculating the average distance of each score from the mean. If all users rated an item identically, the SD would be zero. Larger SDs indicate more disparate opinions of the users about library service quality.

Service Adequacy

The service adequacy gap score is calculated by subtracting the minimum score from the perceived score on any given question, for each user. Both means and standard deviations are provided for service adequacy gap scores on each item of the survey, as well as for each of the three dimensions of library service quality. In general, service adequacy is an indicator of the extent to which you are meeting the minimum expectations of your users. A negative service adequacy gap score indicates that your users' perceived level of service quality is below their minimum level of service quality and is printed in red.

Service Superiority

The service superiority gap score is calculated by subtracting the desired score from the perceived score on any given question, for each user. Both means and standard deviations are provided for service superiority gap scores on each item of the survey, as well as for each of the three dimensions of library service quality. In general, service superiority is an indicator of the extent to which you are exceeding the desired expectations of your users. A positive service superiority gap score indicates that your users' perceived level of service quality is above their desired level of service quality and is printed in green.

Radar Charts

Radar charts are commonly used throughout the following pages to display both aggregate results and results from individual institutions. Radar charts are useful when you want to look at several different factors all related to one item. Sometimes called "spider charts" or "polar charts," radar charts feature multiple axes or spokes along which data can be plotted. Variations in the data are shown by distance from the center of the chart. Lines connect the data points for each series, forming a spiral around the center.

In the case of the LibQUAL survey results, each axis represents a different survey question. Questions are identified by a code at the end of each axis. The three dimensions measured by the survey are grouped together on the radar charts, and each dimension is labeled: Affect of Service (AS), Information Control (IC), and Library as Place (LP).

Radar charts are used in this notebook to present the item summaries (the results from the 22 core survey questions).

How to read a radar chart

Radar charts are an effective way to show strengths and weaknesses graphically by enabling you to observe symmetry or uniformity of data. Points close to the center indicate a low value, while points near the edge indicate a high value. When interpreting a radar chart, it is important to check each individual axis as well as the chart's overall shape in order to gain a complete understanding of its meaning. You can see how much data fluctuates by observing whether the spiral is smooth or has spikes of variability.

Respondents' minimum, desired, and perceived levels of service quality are plotted on each axis of your LibQUAL radar charts. The resulting gaps between the three levels are shaded in blue, yellow, green, and red. Generally, a radar graph shaded blue and yellow indicates that users' perceptions of service fall within the "zone of tolerance"; the distance between minimum expectations and perceptions of service quality is shaded in blue, and the distance between their desired and perceived levels of service quality is shown in yellow. When users' perceptions fall outside the "zone of tolerance," the graph will include areas of red and green shading. If the distance between users' minimum expectations and perceptions of service delivery is represented in red, that indicates a negative service adequacy gap score. If the distance between the desired level of service and perceptions of service delivery is represented in green, that indicates a positive service superiority gap score.

Note: Sections with charts and tables are omitted from the following pages when there are three or fewer individuals in a specific group.

Data Screening

In compiling the summary data reported here, several criteria were used to determine which responses to include in the analyses.

1. **Complete Data.** In order to submit the survey successfully, users must provide a rating of (a) minimally-acceptable service, (b) desired service, and (c) perceived service or rate the item "not applicable" ("N/A"). If these conditions are not met, when the user attempts to submit the questionnaire, the software shows the user where missing data are located and requests complete data. The user may of course abandon the survey without completing all the items. *Only records with complete data on the presented core items and where respondents chose a user group were retained in summary statistics.*
2. **"N/A" Responses.** Because some institutions provide incentive prizes for completing the survey, some users might select "N/A" choices for all or most of the items rather than reporting their actual perceptions. Or, some users may have views on such a narrow range of quality issues that their data are not very informative. *Records of the long version of the survey containing more than 11 "N/A" responses and records of the Lite version containing more than 4 "N/A" responses are eliminated from the summary statistics.*
3. **Inconsistent Responses.** One appealing feature of a gap measurement model is that the rating format provides a check for inconsistencies (i.e., score inversions) in the response data (Thompson, Cook & Heath, 2000). Logically, on a given item the "minimum" rating should not be higher than the "desired" rating on the same item. *Records of the long version of the survey containing more than 9 logical inconsistencies and records of the Lite version containing more than 3 logical inconsistencies were eliminated from the summary statistics.*

LibQUAL Analytics

LibQUAL Analytics is a tool that permits participants to dynamically create institution-specific tables and charts for different subgroups and across years. Participants can refine the data by selecting specific years, user groups, and disciplines; view and save the selection in various tables and charts; and download their datasets for further manipulation in their preferred software. As a benefit of registration, libraries have access to their own data in LibQUAL Analytics, as well as to the data for other institutions participating in the same year. Expanded access to LibQUAL data, encompassing all libraries in all years from 2000 to the present, is available for an additional fee through a LibQUAL membership subscription.

LibQUAL Norms

LibQUAL norms are available in the following conference paper:

<http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/106442/1/08.Bruce_Thompson_pp52-60_.pdf>

Selected Bibliography

- Begay, Wendy, Daniel R. Lee, Jim Martin, and Michael Ray. "Quantifying Qualitative Data: Using LibQUAL+(TM) Comments for Library-Wide Planning Activities at the University of Arizona." *Journal of Library Administration* 40, no. 3/4 (2004): 111–120.
- Berry, L.L. *On Great Service: A Framework For Action*. New York: The Free Press, 1995.
- Bradford, Dennis W. and Tim Bower. "Using Content Analysis Software to Analyze Survey Comments." *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 8, no. 4 (2008): 423–437.
- Cabrerizo, Francisco J., Ignacio J. Pérez, Javier López-Gijón, Enrique Herrera-Viedma, An Extended LibQUAL+ Model Based on Fuzzy Linguistic Information. *Modeling Decisions for Artificial Intelligence Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 2012: 90–101.
- Calvert, Philip, J. *Assessing the Effectiveness and Quality of Libraries*. Ph.D. Thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 2008.
- Cook, Colleen C., Fred Heath, and Bruce Thompson. "LibQUAL+™ from the UK Perspective." *5th Northumbria International Conference Proceedings*, Durham, UK, July, 2003.
- Cook, Colleen C. (Guest Ed.). "Library Decision-Makers Speak to Their Uses of Their LibQUAL+™ Data: Some LibQUAL+™ Case Studies." *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, 3 (2002b).
- Cook, Colleen C. "A Mixed-Methods Approach to the Identification and Measurement of Academic Library Service Quality Constructs: LibQUAL+™." (PhD diss., Texas A&M University, 2001) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62 (2002A): 2295A (University Microfilms No. AAT3020024).
- Cook, Colleen C., and Fred Heath. "Users' Perceptions of Library Service Quality: A 'LibQUAL+™' Qualitative Study." *Library Trends*, 49 (2001): 548–84.
- Cook, Colleen C., Fred Heath, and Bruce Thompson. "'Zones of tolerance' in Perceptions of Library Service Quality: A LibQUAL+™ Study." *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 3 (2003): 113–123.
- Cook, Colleen C., Fred Heath and Bruce Thompson. "Score Norms for Improving Library Service Quality: A LibQUAL+™ Study." *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 2 (2002): 13–26.
- Cook, Colleen C., Fred Heath, and Russell L. Thompson. "A Meta-Analysis of Response Rates in Web- or Internet-based Surveys." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60 (2000): 821–36.
- Cook, Colleen C., and Bruce Thompson. "Psychometric Properties of Scores from the Web-based LibQUAL+™ Study of Perceptions of Library Service Quality." *Library Trends*, 49 (2001): 585–604.
- Cook, C., Bruce Thompson, and Martha Kyrrilidou. (2010, May). Does using item sampling methods in library service quality assessment affect score norms?: A LibQUAL+® Lite study. <http://libqual.org/documents/LibQual/publications/lq_gr_3.pdf>. Paper presented at the 2nd Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries (QQML 2010) International Conference, Chania (Crete), Greece, May 27, 2010.
- Cullen, Rowena. "Perspectives on User Satisfaction Surveys." *Library Trends*, 49 (2002): 662–86.
- Detlor, Brian and Kathy Ball. "Getting more value from the LibQUAL+ survey: The merits of qualitative analysis and importance-satisfaction matrices in assessing library patron comments." *College and Research Libraries*, 76 (2015): 796–810.
- Fagan, Jodi Condit. "The dimensions of library service quality: A confirmatory factor analysis of the LibQUAL+ model."

Library & Information Science Research 36, no. 1 (2014): 36–48.

Greenwood, Judy T., Alex P. Watson, and Melissa Dennis. “Ten Years of LibQual: A Study of Qualitative and Quantitative Survey Results at the University of Mississippi 2001–2010.” *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 37, no. 4 (2011): 312–318.

Guidry, Julie Anna. “LibQUAL+(TM) spring 2001 comments: a qualitative analysis using Atlas.ti .” *Performance Measurement and Metrics* 3, no. 2 (2002): 100–107.

Heath, F., Martha Kyrillidou. and Consuella A. Askew (Guest Eds.). “Libraries Report on Their LibQUAL+® Findings: From Data to Action.” *Journal of Library Administration* 40 (3/4) (2004).

Heath, F., Colleen C. Cook, Martha Kyrillidou, and Bruce Thompson. “ARL Index and Other Validity Correlates of LibQUAL+™ Scores.” *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 2 (2002): 27–42.

Jones, Sherri and Kayongo, Jessica. “Identifying Student and Faculty Needs through LibQUAL+™: An Analysis of Qualitative Survey Comments.” *College & Research Libraries* 69, no. 6 (2008): 493–509.

Kieftenbeld, Vincent and Prathiba Natesan. “Examining the measurement and structural invariance of LibQUAL+® across user groups.” *Library & Information Science Research* 35, no. 2 (2013): 143–150.

Kyrillidou, M. The Globalization of Library Assessment and the Role of LibQUAL+®. From Library Science to Information Science: Studies in Honor of G. Kakouri (Athens, Greece: Tipothito-Giorgos Dardanos, 2005). [In Greek]

Kyrillidou, Martha. “Library Assessment As A Collaborative Enterprise.” *Resource Sharing and Information Networks*, 18 ½ (2005–2006): 73–87.

Kyrillidou, Martha. (2006). “Measuring Library Service Quality: A Perceived Outcome for Libraries. This chapter appears in *Revisiting Outcomes Assessment in Higher Education*. Edited by Peter Hernon, Robert E. Dugan, and Candy Schwartz (Westport, CT: Library Unlimited, 2006): 351–66.

Kyrillidou, Martha. (Guest Ed.). “LibQUAL+® and Beyond: Library assessment with a focus on library improvement.” *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, 9 (3) (2008).

Kyrillidou, M. “Item Sampling in Service Quality Assessment Surveys to Improve Response Rates and Reduce Respondent Burden: The “LibQUAL+® Lite” Randomized Control Trial (RCT)” (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2009). <https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/14570/Kyrillidou_Martha.pdf?sequence=3>

Kyrillidou, Martha and Colleen C. Cook. “The evolution of measurement and evaluation of libraries: a perspective from the Association of Research Libraries.” *Library Trends* 56 (4) (Spring 2008): 888–909.

Kyrillidou, Martha and Colleen C. Cook and S. Shyam Sunder Rao. “Measuring the Quality of Library Service through LibQUAL+®.” In *Academic Library Research: Perspectives and Current Trends*. Edited by Marie L. Radford and Pamela Snelson (Chicago, IL: ACRL/ALA, 2008): 253–301.

Kyrillidou, M., Terry Olshen, Fred Heath, Claude Bonnelly, and Jean-Pierre Côte. “Cross-Cultural Implementation of LibQUAL+™: the French Language Experience.” *5th Northumbria International Conference Proceedings* (Durham, UK, 2003): 193–99.

Kyrillidou, M., Colleen Cook. and Bruce Thompson. (2010, May). Does using item sampling methods in library service quality assessment affect zone of tolerance boundaries?: A LibQUAL+® Lite study <http://libqual.org/documents/LibQual/publications/lq_gr_2.pdf>. Paper presented at the 2nd Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries (QQML 2010) International Conference, Chania (Crete), Greece, May 27, 2010.

- Kyrillidou, M. and Mark Young. *ARL Statistics 2003–04*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2005.
- Lane, Forrest C., Baaska Anderson, Hector F. Ponce and Prathiba Natesan. “Factorial Invariance of LibQUAL+® as a Measure of Library Service Quality Over Time.” *Library & Information Science Research* 34, no. 1 (2012): 22–30.
- Miller, Kathleen. *Service Quality in Academic Libraries: An Analysis of LibQUAL+™ Scores and Institutional Characteristics*. Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Central Florida, 2008.
- Nitecki, D.A. “Changing the Concept and Measure of Service Quality in Academic Libraries.” *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 22 (1996): 181–90.
- Parasuraman, A., Leonard Berry, and Valerie Zeithaml. “Refinement and Reassessment of the SERVQUAL Scale” *Journal of Retailing*, 67 (1991): 420–50.
- Thompson, B. “Representativeness Versus Response Rate: It Ain't the Response Rate!” Paper presented at the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Measuring Service Quality Symposium on the New Culture of Assessment: Measuring Service Quality, Washington, DC, October 2002.
- Thompson, B., Colleen C. Cook, and Fred Heath. “The LibQUAL+™ Gap Measurement Model: The Bad, the Ugly, and the Good of Gap Measurement.” *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, 1 (2002): 165–78.
- Thompson, B., Colleen C. Cook, and Fred Heath. “Structure of Perceptions of Service Quality in Libraries: A LibQUAL+™ Study.” *Structural Equation Modeling*, 10 (2003): 456–464.
- Thompson, B., Colleen C. Cook, and Russell L. Thompson. “Reliability and Structure of LibQUAL+™ Scores: Measuring Perceived Library Service Quality.” *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 2 (2002): 3–12.
- Thompson, B., Colleen C. Cook, and Martha Kyrillidou. (2005). “Concurrent validity of LibQUAL+® scores: What do LibQUAL+® scores measure?” *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 31: 517–22.
- Thompson, B., Colleen C. Cook, and Martha Kyrillidou. “Using Localized Survey Items to Augment Standardized Benchmarking Measures: A LibQUAL+® Study.” *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 6(2) (2006): 219–30.
- Thompson, B., Colleen C. Cook, and Martha Kyrillidou. “Stability of Library Service Quality Benchmarking Norms Across Time and Cohorts: A LibQUAL+® Study.” Paper presented at the Asia-Pacific Conference of Library and Information Education and Practice (A-LIEP), Singapore, April 3–4, 2006.
- Thompson, B., Colleen C. Cook, and Martha Kyrillidou. “How Can You Evaluate the Integrity of Your Library Assessment Data: Intercontinental LibQUAL+® Analysis Used as Concrete Heuristic Examples.” Paper presented at the Library Assessment Conference: Building Effective, Sustainable, and Practical Assessment, Charlottesville, VA, August 4–6, 2006.
- Thompson, B., Colleen C. Cook, and Martha Kyrillidou. “On-premises Library versus Google™-Like Information Gateway Usage Patterns: A LibQUAL+® Study.” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 7 (4) (Oct 2007a): 463–480.
- Thompson, B., Colleen C. Cook, and Martha Kyrillidou. “User library service expectations in health science vs. other settings: a LibQUAL+® Study.” *Health Information and Libraries Journal* 24 (8) Supplement 1, (Dec 2007b): 38–45.
- Thompson, B., Colleen C. C ook, and Martha Kyrillidou. “Library Users Service Desires: a LibQUAL+® Study.” *Library Quarterly* 78 (1) (Jan 2008): 1–18.
- Thompson, B., Martha Kyrillidou, and Colleen Cook. “Item sampling in service quality assessment surveys to improve response rates and reduce respondent burden: The ‘LibQUAL+® Lite’ example.” *Performance Measurement & Metrics*, 10 (1) (2009): 6–16.

- Thompson, B., Martha Kyrillidou, and Colleen Cook. "Equating scores on Lite and long library user survey forms: The LibQUAL+® Lite randomized control trials." *Performance Measurement & Metrics*, 10 (3) (2009): 212–219.
- Thompson, B., Martha Kyrillidou, and Colleen Cook. (2010, May). "Does using item sampling methods in library service quality assessment compromise data integrity?: A LibQUAL+® Lite study." <http://libqual.org/documents/LibQual/publications/lq_gr_1.pdf>. Paper presented at the 2nd Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries (QQML 2010) International Conference, Chania (Crete), Greece, May 27, 2010.
- Thompson, B., Martha Kyrillidou, and Colleen Cook. "Does using item sampling methods in library service quality assessment compromise data integrity or zone of tolerance interpretation?: A LibQUAL+® Lite Study." 2010 Library Assessment Conference: Building Effective, Sustainable, Practical Assessment. Baltimore MD, October 25–27, 2010. (Washington DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2011).
- Town, S., and Martha Kyrillidou. "Developing a Values Scorecard." *Performance Measurement and Metrics* 14 (1) (2013): 1–16.
- Voorbij, H.. "The use of LibQUAL+ by European research libraries," *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, Vol. 13 Iss: 3 (2012): 154–168.
- Zeithaml, Valerie, A. Parasuraman, and Leonard L. Berry. *Delivering Quality Service: Balancing Customer Perceptions and Expectations*. New York: Free Press, 1990.

1.4 Library Statistics for University of Central Oklahoma

The statistical data below were provided by the participating institution in the online Representativeness* section. Definitions for these items can be found in the *ARL Statistics*: <<http://www.arl.org/stats/>>.

Note: Participating institutions were not required to complete the Representativeness section. When statistical data is missing or incomplete, it is because this data was not provided.

Total library expenditures (in U.S. \$):	\$4,085,833
Personnel - professional staff, FTE:	19
Personnel - support staff, FTE:	20
Total library materials expenditures (in U.S. \$):	1,994,754
Total salaries and wages for professional staff (in U.S. \$):	1,812,455

1.5 Contact Information for University of Central Oklahoma

The person below served as the institution's primary LibQUAL liaison during this survey implementation.

Name:	Nicole Sump-Crethar
Title:	
Address:	100 N University Dr, Box 192 UCO Max Chambers Library Edmond, OKLAHOMA 73034 United States of America
Phone:	4059742883
Email:	acrethar@uco.edu

1.6 Survey Protocol and Language for University of Central Oklahoma

The data below indicate the number of valid surveys collected by language and long/Lite breakdowns.

		Lite	Total (by Language)
English (American)	Count	352	352
	% of Protocol	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Language	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total Cases	100.00	100.00
Total (by Survey Protocol)	Count	352	352
	% of Protocol	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Language	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total Cases	100.00	100.00

2 Demographic Summary for University of Central Oklahoma

2.1 Respondents by User Group

User Group	Respondent n	Respondent %
Undergraduate		
First year	45	12.78%
Second year	34	9.66%
Third year	55	15.63%
Fourth year	45	12.78%
Fifth year and above	25	7.10%
Non-degree	4	1.14%
Sub Total:	208	59.09%
Graduate		
Masters	60	17.05%
Doctoral	3	0.85%
Non-degree or Undecided	1	0.28%
Sub Total:	64	18.18%
Faculty		
Professor	23	6.53%
Associate Professor	7	1.99%
Assistant Professor	9	2.56%
Lecturer	2	0.57%
Adjunct Faculty	2	0.57%
Other Academic Status	2	0.57%
Sub Total:	45	12.78%
Library Staff		
Administrator	5	1.42%
Manager, Head of Unit	1	0.28%
Public Services	3	0.85%
Systems	1	0.28%
Technical Services	5	1.42%
Other	5	1.42%
Sub Total:	20	5.68%
Staff		
Research Staff	0	0.00%
Other Staff Positions	15	4.26%
Sub Total:	15	4.26%
Total:	352	100.00%


Language: English (American)
Institution Type: College or University
Consortium: None
User Group: All

2.2 Population and Respondents by User Sub-Group

The chart and table below show a breakdown of survey respondents by sub-group (e.g. First year, Masters, Professor), based on user responses to the demographic questions at the end of the survey instrument and the demographic data provided by institutions in the online Representativeness section*.

The chart maps the percentage of respondents for each user subgroup in red. Population percentages for each user subgroup are mapped in blue. The table shows the number and percentage for each user sub-group for the general population (N) and for survey respondents (n).

**Note: Participating institutions were not required to complete the Representativeness section. When population data is missing or incomplete, it is because this data was not provided.*




User Sub-Group	Population N	Population %	Respondents n	Respondents %	%N - %n
First year (Undergraduate)	2,384	19.44	45	14.20	5.24
Second year (Undergraduate)	1,802	14.69	34	10.73	3.97
Third year (Undergraduate)	2,167	17.67	55	17.35	0.32
Fourth year (Undergraduate)	3,317	27.05	45	14.20	12.85
Fifth year and above (Undergraduate)	85	0.69	25	7.89	-7.19
Non-degree (Undergraduate)	0	0.00	4	1.26	-1.26
Masters (Graduate)	1,642	13.39	60	18.93	-5.54
Doctoral (Graduate)	0	0.00	3	0.95	-0.95
Non-degree or Undecided (Graduate)	0	0.00	1	0.32	-0.32
Professor (Faculty)	186	1.52	23	7.26	-5.74
Associate Professor (Faculty)	84	0.68	7	2.21	-1.52
Assistant Professor (Faculty)	103	0.84	9	2.84	-2.00
Lecturer (Faculty)	76	0.62	2	0.63	-0.01
Adjunct Faculty (Faculty)	413	3.37	2	0.63	2.74
Other Academic Status (Faculty)	5	0.04	2	0.63	-0.59
Total:	12,264	100.00	317	100.00	0.00

2.3 Population and Respondents by Standard Discipline

The chart and table below show a breakdown of survey respondents by discipline, based on user responses to the demographic questions and the demographic data provided by institutions in the online Representativeness section.*

This section shows survey respondents broken down based on the LibQUAL standard discipline categories. The chart maps percentage of respondents for each discipline in red. Population percentages for each discipline are mapped in blue. The table shows the number and percentage for each discipline, for the general population (N) and for survey respondents (n).

**Note: Participating institutions were not required to complete the Representativeness section. When population data is missing or incomplete, it is because this data was not provided.*




Discipline	Population N	Population %	Respondents n	Respondents %	%N - %n
Agriculture / Environmental Studies	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Architecture	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Business	570	20.66	38	11.99	8.67
Communications / Journalism	112	4.06	9	2.84	1.22
Education	871	31.57	57	17.98	13.59
Engineering / Computer Science	27	0.98	26	8.20	-7.22
General Studies	209	7.58	2	0.63	6.94
Health Sciences	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Humanities	110	3.99	16	5.05	-1.06
Law	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Military / Naval Science	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Other	0	0.00	28	8.83	-8.83
Performing & Fine Arts	291	10.55	30	9.46	1.08
Science / Math	357	12.94	84	26.50	-13.56
Social Sciences / Psychology	212	7.68	25	7.89	-0.20
Undecided	0	0.00	2	0.63	-0.63
Total:	2,759	100.00	317	100.00	0.00

2.4 Population and Respondents by Customized Discipline

The chart and table below show a breakdown of survey respondents by discipline, based on user responses to the demographic questions and the demographic data provided by institutions in the online Representativeness section.*

This section shows survey respondents broken down based on the customized discipline categories supplied by the participating library. The chart maps percentage of respondents for each discipline in red. Population percentages for each discipline are mapped in blue. The table shows the number and percentage for each discipline, for the general population (N) and for survey respondents (n).

**Note: Participating institutions were not required to complete the Representativeness section. When population data is missing or incomplete, it is because this data was not provided.*



Discipline	Population N	Population %	Respondents n	Respondents %	%N - %n
1-Not Applicable	0	0.00	7	2.21	-2.21
Accounting	58	2.10	11	3.47	-1.37
Adult Ed and Safety	85	3.08	4	1.26	1.82
Adv Prof and Spec Serv	193	7.00	2	0.63	6.36
Art	32	1.16	6	1.89	-0.73
Biology	133	4.82	21	6.62	-1.80
Chemistry	13	0.47	7	2.21	-1.74
Computer Science	9	0.33	20	6.31	-5.98
Criminal Justice	59	2.14	2	0.63	1.51
Curriculum and Instruction	134	4.86	2	0.63	4.23
Dance	26	0.94	0	0.00	0.94
Design	39	1.41	6	1.89	-0.48
Economics	30	1.09	5	1.58	-0.49
Educ Sci,Found, Research	13	0.47	6	1.89	-1.42
Engineering / Physics	18	0.65	6	1.89	-1.24
English	66	2.39	9	2.84	-0.45
Finance	126	4.57	5	1.58	2.99
Forensic Science Institute	154	5.58	14	4.42	1.17
Funeral Service	5	0.18	3	0.95	-0.77
General Studies	209	7.58	2	0.63	6.94
History / Geography	69	2.50	11	3.47	-0.97
Human Environmental Sciences	128	4.64	8	2.52	2.12
Humanities / Philosophy	28	1.01	6	1.89	-0.88
Info Sys Oper Manag	92	3.33	3	0.95	2.39
Kinesiology / Health	137	4.97	8	2.52	2.44
Management	168	6.09	10	3.15	2.93
Marketing	96	3.48	4	1.26	2.22
Mass Communications	112	4.06	9	2.84	1.22
Mathematics / Statistics	29	1.05	8	2.52	-1.47
Military Science	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Modern Languages	16	0.58	1	0.32	0.26
Music	171	6.20	13	4.10	2.10
Nursing	23	0.83	31	9.78	-8.95
Other	0	0.00	21	6.62	-6.62
Political Science	76	2.75	10	3.15	-0.40
Psychology	181	6.56	18	5.68	0.88

Language: English (American)
Institution Type: College or University
Consortium: None
User Group: All (Excluding Library Staff, Staff)

Sociology	8	0.29	2	0.63	-0.34
Teacher Education	0	0.00	9	2.84	-2.84
Theatre Arts	23	0.83	5	1.58	-0.74
Undecided	0	0.00	2	0.63	-0.63
Total:	2,759	100.00	317	100.00	0.00

2.5 Respondent Profile by Age:

This table shows a breakdown of survey respondents by age; both the number of respondents (n) and the percentage of the total number of respondents represented by each age group are displayed.

Age:	Respondents n	Respondents %
18 - 22	149	44.88
23 - 30	76	22.89
31 - 45	55	16.57
46 - 65	42	12.65
Over 65	10	3.01
Under 18	0	0.00
Total:	332	100.00

2.6 Respondent Profile by Full or part-time student?

Full or part-time student?	Respondents n	Respondents %
Does not apply / NA	66	20.00
Full-time	231	70.00
Part-time	33	10.00
Total:	330	100.00


3. Survey Item Summary for University of Central Oklahoma

3.1 Core Questions Summary

This radar chart shows the aggregate results for the core survey questions. Each axis represents one question. A code to identify each question is displayed at the outer point of each axis. While questions for each dimension of library service quality are scattered randomly throughout the survey, on this chart they are grouped into sections: Affect of Service, Information Control, and Library as Place.

On each axis, respondents' minimum, desired, and perceived levels of service quality are plotted, and the resulting "gaps" between the three levels (representing service adequacy or service superiority) are shaded in blue, yellow, green, and red.

The following two tables show mean scores and standard deviations for each question, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular question. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.)



ID	Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	7.02	8.00	7.55	0.54	-0.45	56
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	6.40	7.56	7.44	1.04	-0.12	75
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	7.26	8.15	8.22	0.97	0.08	89
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	7.33	8.14	7.91	0.59	-0.23	80
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	7.00	7.91	7.57	0.57	-0.34	86
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	7.04	8.00	7.83	0.79	-0.18	322
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	6.88	7.86	7.37	0.49	-0.49	86
AS-8	Willingness to help users	7.21	7.98	7.71	0.50	-0.26	84
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	6.92	7.80	7.42	0.49	-0.38	65
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	6.89	8.13	7.60	0.72	-0.53	53
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	7.27	8.24	7.81	0.54	-0.44	94
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	6.58	7.90	7.14	0.57	-0.76	90
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	6.49	7.68	7.20	0.71	-0.48	315
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	6.87	8.03	7.58	0.71	-0.45	98
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	6.63	7.96	7.11	0.49	-0.85	105
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	7.05	8.08	7.36	0.31	-0.71	105
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	6.65	7.36	7.22	0.57	-0.15	74
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	6.76	8.03	7.45	0.69	-0.57	317
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	7.26	8.40	7.77	0.51	-0.63	70
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	6.97	8.05	7.62	0.65	-0.44	94
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	6.97	8.12	7.53	0.56	-0.59	73
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	6.89	7.83	7.79	0.90	-0.04	82
Overall:		6.87	7.95	7.54	0.67	-0.42	332

Language: English (American)
Institution Type: College or University
Consortium: None
User Group: All (Excluding Library Staff)

ID	Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	2.01	1.55	1.97	1.41	1.28	56
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	2.54	1.98	1.93	2.26	2.34	75
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	2.16	1.60	1.43	2.11	1.65	89
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	1.62	1.21	1.49	1.61	1.42	80
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	1.92	1.52	1.94	2.08	1.90	86
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	1.98	1.39	1.67	1.96	1.63	322
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	1.83	1.47	1.65	1.65	1.34	86
AS-8	Willingness to help users	1.82	1.33	1.59	1.73	1.55	84
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	2.07	1.47	2.05	2.04	2.02	65
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	2.39	1.39	1.94	1.79	1.77	53
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	1.90	1.19	1.46	1.66	1.33	94
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	2.12	1.58	2.07	2.33	2.16	90
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	2.03	1.71	1.90	2.24	2.17	315
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	1.96	1.51	1.71	2.33	2.01	98
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	1.92	1.41	1.94	1.90	1.93	105
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	1.86	1.31	1.74	1.56	1.63	105
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	2.47	2.30	2.06	2.25	2.26	74
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	2.06	1.40	1.75	2.03	1.90	317
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	1.83	0.97	1.82	1.82	1.75	70
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	1.95	1.49	1.70	2.18	1.81	94
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	1.72	1.36	1.71	1.79	1.63	73
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	2.02	1.46	1.62	1.88	1.73	82
Overall:		1.60	1.09	1.40	1.55	1.38	332

Language: English (American)


Institution Type: College or University

Consortium: None

User Group: All (Excluding Library Staff)

3.2 Core Question Dimensions Summary

On the chart below, scores for each dimension of library service quality have been plotted graphically. The exterior bars represent the range of minimum to desired mean scores for each dimension. The interior bars represent the range of minimum to perceived mean scores (the service adequacy gap) for each dimension of library service quality.



The following table displays mean scores for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where n is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service	6.99	7.93	7.71	0.73	-0.22	330
Information Control	6.73	7.88	7.33	0.61	-0.55	331
Library as Place	6.88	8.05	7.57	0.69	-0.48	324
Overall	6.87	7.95	7.54	0.67	-0.42	332

The following table displays standard deviation for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where n is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service	1.83	1.30	1.55	1.72	1.50	330
Information Control	1.79	1.33	1.62	1.80	1.70	331
Library as Place	1.80	1.25	1.56	1.80	1.65	324
Overall	1.60	1.09	1.40	1.55	1.38	332

Language: English (American)

Institution Type: College or University

Consortium: None

User Group: All (Excluding Library Staff)

3.3 Local Question Summary

This table shows mean scores of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	7.08	8.23	7.77	0.69	-0.46	61
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	6.75	7.94	7.06	0.31	-0.88	51
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)	7.03	8.03	7.48	0.45	-0.55	64
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills	7.08	7.59	7.67	0.59	0.08	61
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	6.70	7.78	7.33	0.63	-0.44	54

This table shows the standard deviations for each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	1.98	1.10	1.48	1.69	1.50	61
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	2.15	1.69	2.36	2.51	2.37	51
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)	2.02	1.45	1.69	1.74	1.58	64
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills	1.93	2.09	1.77	1.87	2.28	61
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	2.02	1.46	1.79	2.01	1.69	54

3.4 General Satisfaction Questions Summary

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the general satisfaction questions: Satisfaction with Treatment, Satisfaction with Support, and Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Service, where n is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the general satisfaction questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9.

Satisfaction Question	Mean	SD	n
In general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library.	8.17	1.34	170
In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.	7.59	1.68	162
How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?	7.77	1.45	332

3.5 Information Literacy Outcomes Questions Summary

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the information literacy outcomes questions, where n is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the information literacy outcomes questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9 with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 9 representing "strongly agree."

Information Literacy Outcomes Questions	Mean	SD	n
The library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s) of interest.	6.54	2.30	114
The library aids my advancement in my academic discipline or work.	7.55	1.63	169
The library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits or work.	7.79	1.52	139
The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information.	7.27	1.79	153
The library provides me with the information skills I need in my work or study.	7.25	1.85	88

Language: English (American)


Institution Type: College or University

Consortium: None

User Group: All (Excluding Library Staff)

3.6 Library Use Summary

This chart shows a graphic representation of library use (both on the premises and electronically), as well as use of non-library information gateways such as Yahoo and Google. Bars represent the frequency with which respondents report using these resources: Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Quarterly, or Never. The table below the chart displays the number and percentage of respondents who selected each option.



Frequency

How often do you use resources on library premises?

How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?

How often do you use YahooTM, GoogleTM, or non-library gateways for information?

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Never	n/%
How often do you use resources on library premises?	57 17.17%	122 36.75%	75 22.59%	58 17.47%	20 6.02%	332 100.00%
How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?	50 15.06%	121 36.45%	77 23.19%	52 15.66%	32 9.64%	332 100.00%
How often do you use YahooTM, GoogleTM, or non-library gateways for information?	229 68.98%	54 16.27%	15 4.52%	19 5.72%	15 4.52%	332 100.00%

Language: English (American)
Institution Type: College or University
Consortium: None
User Group: All (Excluding Library Staff)


4 Undergraduate Summary for University of Central Oklahoma

4.1 Demographic Summary for Undergraduate

4.1.1 Population and Respondent Profiles for Undergraduate by Standard Discipline

The chart and table below show a breakdown of survey respondents by discipline, based on user responses to the demographic questions and the demographic data provided by institutions in the online Representativeness section.

This section shows survey respondents broken down based on the LibQUAL standard discipline categories. The chart maps percentage of respondents for each discipline in red. Population percentages for each discipline are mapped in blue. The table shows the number and percentage for each discipline, for the general population (N) and for survey respondents (n).




Discipline	Population N	Population %	Respondents n	Respondents %	%N - %n
Agriculture / Environmental Studies	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Architecture	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Business	401	22.46	28	13.46	9.00
Communications / Journalism	97	5.43	7	3.37	2.07
Education	461	25.83	33	15.87	9.96
Engineering / Computer Science	0	0.00	11	5.29	-5.29
General Studies	209	11.71	2	0.96	10.75
Health Sciences	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Humanities	56	3.14	5	2.40	0.73
Law	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Military / Naval Science	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Other	0	0.00	15	7.21	-7.21
Performing & Fine Arts	208	11.65	23	11.06	0.59
Science / Math	232	13.00	71	34.13	-21.14
Social Sciences / Psychology	121	6.78	12	5.77	1.01
Undecided	0	0.00	1	0.48	-0.48
Total:	1,785	100.00	208	100.00	0.00

4.1.2 Population and Respondent Profiles for Undergraduate by Customized Discipline

The chart and table below show a breakdown of survey respondents by discipline, based on user responses to the demographic questions and the demographic data provided by institutions in the online Representativeness section.

This section shows survey respondents broken down based on the customized discipline categories supplied by the participating library. The chart maps percentage of respondents for each discipline in red. Population percentages for each discipline are mapped in blue. The table shows the number and percentage for each discipline, for the general population (N) and for survey respondents (n).



Discipline	Population N	Population %	Respondents n	Respondents %	%N - %n
1-Not Applicable	0	0.00	4	1.92	-1.92
Accounting	48	2.69	10	4.81	-2.12
Adult Ed and Safety	57	3.19	0	0.00	3.19
Adv Prof and Spec Serv	44	2.46	0	0.00	2.46
Art	24	1.34	5	2.40	-1.06
Biology	102	5.71	17	8.17	-2.46
Chemistry	0	0.00	5	2.40	-2.40
Computer Science	0	0.00	6	2.88	-2.88
Criminal Justice	45	2.52	1	0.48	2.04
Curriculum and Instruction	81	4.54	0	0.00	4.54
Dance	21	1.18	0	0.00	1.18
Design	28	1.57	6	2.88	-1.32
Economics	22	1.23	3	1.44	-0.21
Educ Sci,Found, Research	0	0.00	1	0.48	-0.48
Engineering / Physics	0	0.00	5	2.40	-2.40
English	40	2.24	2	0.96	1.28
Finance	114	6.39	2	0.96	5.43
Forensic Science Institute	130	7.28	14	6.73	0.55
Funeral Service	0	0.00	3	1.44	-1.44
General Studies	209	11.71	2	0.96	10.75
History / Geography	47	2.63	6	2.88	-0.25
Human Environmental Sciences	45	2.52	3	1.44	1.08
Humanities / Philosophy	10	0.56	3	1.44	-0.88
Info Sys Oper Manag	47	2.63	2	0.96	1.67
Kinesiology / Health	98	5.49	6	2.88	2.61
Management	86	4.82	7	3.37	1.45
Marketing	84	4.71	4	1.92	2.78
Mass Communications	97	5.43	7	3.37	2.07
Mathematics / Statistics	0	0.00	3	1.44	-1.44
Military Science	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Modern Languages	6	0.34	0	0.00	0.34
Music	119	6.67	9	4.33	2.34
Nursing	0	0.00	29	13.94	-13.94
Other	0	0.00	11	5.29	-5.29
Political Science	29	1.62	3	1.44	0.18

Language: English (American)
Institution Type: College or University
Consortium: None
User Group: Undergraduate

Psychology	136	7.62	14	6.73	0.89
Sociology	0	0.00	2	0.96	-0.96
Teacher Education	0	0.00	9	4.33	-4.33
Theatre Arts	16	0.90	3	1.44	-0.55
Undecided	0	0.00	1	0.48	-0.48
Total:	1,785	100.00	208	100.00	0.00

4.1.3 Respondent Profile by Age:

This table shows a breakdown of survey respondents by age; both the number of respondents (n) and the percentage of the total number of respondents represented by each age group are displayed.

Age:	Respondents n	Respondents %
18 - 22	143	68.75
23 - 30	38	18.27
31 - 45	18	8.65
46 - 65	8	3.85
Over 65	1	0.48
Under 18	0	0.00
Total:	208	100.00

4.1.4 Respondent Profile by Full or part-time student?


Full or part-time student?	Respondents n	Respondents %
Does not apply / NA	4	1.93
Full-time	177	85.51
Part-time	26	12.56
Total:	207	100.00

4.2 Core Questions Summary for Undergraduate

This radar chart shows the aggregate results for the core survey questions. Each axis represents one question. A code to identify each question is displayed at the outer point of each axis. While questions for each dimension of library service quality are scattered randomly throughout the survey, on this chart they are grouped into sections: Affect of Service, Information Control, and Library as Place.

On each axis, respondents' minimum, desired, and perceived levels of service quality are plotted, and the resulting "gaps" between the three levels (representing service adequacy or service superiority) are shaded in blue, yellow, green, and red.

The following two tables show mean scores and standard deviations for each question, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular question. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.)



ID	Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	6.89	7.74	7.11	0.23	-0.63	35
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	5.76	7.11	7.24	1.48	0.13	46
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	6.69	7.79	8.12	1.42	0.33	52
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	7.10	8.02	7.94	0.84	-0.08	50
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	6.57	7.60	7.51	0.94	-0.09	53
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	6.77	7.78	7.62	0.85	-0.16	202
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	6.73	7.79	7.14	0.41	-0.64	56
AS-8	Willingness to help users	7.18	7.94	7.65	0.47	-0.29	51
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	6.80	7.53	6.95	0.15	-0.58	40
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	6.58	7.92	7.50	0.92	-0.42	36
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	6.72	8.02	7.64	0.91	-0.38	58
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	6.12	7.87	6.98	0.87	-0.88	52
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	6.15	7.38	7.11	0.96	-0.27	195
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	6.83	7.97	7.60	0.78	-0.36	58
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	6.35	7.79	6.90	0.55	-0.89	71
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	7.10	8.06	7.41	0.30	-0.65	69
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	6.33	6.98	7.12	0.79	0.14	43
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	6.63	7.99	7.27	0.64	-0.72	207
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	6.88	8.26	7.64	0.76	-0.62	42
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	6.70	7.92	7.57	0.87	-0.35	63
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	6.87	8.20	7.47	0.60	-0.73	45
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	6.98	7.91	7.87	0.89	-0.04	54
Overall:		6.61	7.78	7.40	0.79	-0.39	208

Language: English (American)
Institution Type: College or University
Consortium: None
User Group: Undergraduate

ID	Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	2.27	1.85	2.29	1.33	1.52	35
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	2.66	2.17	1.89	2.02	2.24	46
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	2.49	1.93	1.46	2.44	1.80	52
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	1.78	1.32	1.53	1.77	1.41	50
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	2.06	1.63	1.91	1.97	1.94	53
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	2.07	1.52	1.75	2.05	1.81	202
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	1.93	1.59	1.80	1.90	1.38	56
AS-8	Willingness to help users	1.81	1.33	1.67	1.84	1.79	51
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	2.19	1.60	2.24	2.11	2.31	40
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	2.42	1.48	1.84	1.73	1.78	36
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	2.10	1.30	1.50	1.74	1.34	58
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	2.18	1.57	2.10	2.66	2.50	52
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	2.09	1.86	1.82	2.15	2.23	195
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	1.99	1.60	1.65	1.96	1.77	58
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	1.94	1.50	1.99	1.81	2.12	71
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	1.66	1.16	1.69	1.53	1.42	69
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	2.66	2.55	2.21	2.01	2.11	43
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	2.01	1.37	1.84	1.88	1.99	207
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	1.92	1.11	1.91	1.97	1.91	42
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	2.04	1.62	1.78	2.28	1.90	63
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	1.60	1.20	1.77	1.62	1.63	45
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	2.00	1.36	1.48	1.82	1.66	54
Overall:		1.65	1.16	1.44	1.58	1.49	208

Language: English (American)


Institution Type: College or University

Consortium: None

User Group: Undergraduate

4.3 Core Question Dimensions Summary for Undergraduate

On the chart below, scores for each dimension of library service quality have been plotted graphically. The exterior bars represent the range of minimum to desired mean scores for each dimension. The interior bars represent the range of minimum to perceived mean scores (the service adequacy gap) for each dimension of library service quality.



The following table displays mean scores for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service	6.68	7.70	7.52	0.84	-0.18	207
Information Control	6.45	7.69	7.23	0.78	-0.46	208
Library as Place	6.73	8.01	7.46	0.73	-0.55	207
Overall	6.61	7.78	7.40	0.79	-0.39	208

The following table displays standard deviation for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service	1.96	1.43	1.66	1.86	1.67	207
Information Control	1.83	1.38	1.64	1.75	1.77	208
Library as Place	1.78	1.26	1.64	1.74	1.74	207
Overall	1.65	1.16	1.44	1.58	1.49	208

4.4 Local Question Summary for Undergraduate

This table shows mean scores of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	7.12	8.19	7.69	0.57	-0.50	42
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	6.77	7.97	6.86	0.09	-1.11	35
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)	7.02	8.21	7.55	0.52	-0.67	42
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills	6.67	7.30	7.73	1.07	0.43	30
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	6.31	7.45	7.21	0.90	-0.24	29

This table displays the standard deviations of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	1.90	1.23	1.54	1.25	1.66	42
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	2.20	1.52	2.33	2.70	2.48	35
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)	1.91	1.24	1.67	1.77	1.60	42
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills	1.88	2.04	1.76	1.60	1.65	30
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	2.25	1.68	2.02	2.21	1.90	29

Language: English (American)
 Institution Type: College or University
 Consortium: None
 User Group: Undergraduate

4.5 General Satisfaction Questions Summary for Undergraduate

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the general satisfaction questions: Satisfaction with Treatment, Satisfaction with Support, and Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Service, where *n* is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the general satisfaction questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9.

Satisfaction Question	Mean	SD	n
In general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library.	8.20	1.32	118
In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.	7.38	1.71	90
How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?	7.68	1.46	208


4.6 Information Literacy Outcomes Questions Summary for Undergraduate

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the information literacy outcomes questions, where *n* is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the information literacy outcomes questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9 with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 9 representing "strongly agree."

Information Literacy Outcomes Questions	Mean	SD	n
The library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s) of interest.	6.49	2.26	82
The library aids my advancement in my academic discipline or work.	7.52	1.58	103
The library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits or work.	7.89	1.39	75
The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information.	7.03	1.82	94
The library provides me with the information skills I need in my work or study.	7.03	1.89	62

4.7 Library Use Summary for Undergraduate

This chart shows a graphic representation of library use (both on the premises and electronically), as well as use of non-library information gateways such as Yahoo and Google. Bars represent the frequency with which respondents report using these resources: Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Quarterly, or Never. The table below the chart displays the number and percentage of respondents who selected each option.



	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Never	n/%
How often do you use resources on library premises?	41 19.71%	89 42.79%	44 21.15%	26 12.50%	8 3.85%	208 100.00%
How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?	25 12.02%	69 33.17%	53 25.48%	38 18.27%	23 11.06%	208 100.00%
How often do you use YahooTM, GoogleTM, or non-library gateways for information?	151 72.60%	30 14.42%	9 4.33%	11 5.29%	7 3.37%	208 100.00%


5 Graduate Summary for University of Central Oklahoma

5.1 Demographic Summary for Graduate

5.1.1 Population and Respondent Profiles for Graduate by Standard Discipline

The chart and table below show a breakdown of survey respondents by discipline, based on user responses to the demographic questions and the demographic data provided by institutions in the online Representativeness section.

This section shows survey respondents broken down based on the LibQUAL standard discipline categories. The chart maps percentage of respondents for each discipline in red. Population percentages for each discipline are mapped in blue. The table shows the number and percentage for each discipline, for the general population (N) and for survey respondents (n).



- Respondent Profile by Discipline
- Population Profile by Discipline

Language: English (American)

Institution Type: College or University

Consortium: None


User Group: Graduate

Discipline	Population N	Population %	Respondents n	Respondents %	%N - %n
Agriculture / Environmental Studies	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Architecture	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Business	103	20.20	4	6.25	13.95
Communications / Journalism	3	0.59	1	1.56	-0.97
Education	311	60.98	16	25.00	35.98
Engineering / Computer Science	0	0.00	15	23.44	-23.44
General Studies	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Health Sciences	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Humanities	7	1.37	5	7.81	-6.44
Law	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Military / Naval Science	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Other	0	0.00	10	15.63	-15.63
Performing & Fine Arts	19	3.73	1	1.56	2.16
Science / Math	19	3.73	8	12.50	-8.77
Social Sciences / Psychology	48	9.41	4	6.25	3.16
Undecided	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Total:	510	100.00	64	100.00	0.00

5.1.2 Population and Respondent Profiles for Graduate by Customized Discipline

The chart and table below show a breakdown of survey respondents by discipline, based on user responses to the demographic questions and the demographic data provided by institutions in the online Representativeness section.

This section shows survey respondents broken down based on the customized discipline categories supplied by the participating library. The chart maps percentage of respondents for each discipline in red. Population percentages for each discipline are mapped in blue. The table shows the number and percentage for each discipline, for the general population (N) and for survey respondents (n).



Discipline	Population N	Population %	Respondents n	Respondents %	%N - %n
1-Not Applicable	0	0.00	2	3.13	-3.13
Accounting	0	0.00	1	1.56	-1.56
Adult Ed and Safety	17	3.33	2	3.13	0.21
Adv Prof and Spec Serv	136	26.67	1	1.56	25.10
Art	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Biology	6	1.18	1	1.56	-0.39
Chemistry	0	0.00	2	3.13	-3.13
Computer Science	0	0.00	14	21.88	-21.88
Criminal Justice	5	0.98	0	0.00	0.98
Curriculum and Instruction	41	8.04	2	3.13	4.91
Dance	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Design	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Economics	0	0.00	1	1.56	-1.56
Educ Sci,Found, Research	4	0.78	3	4.69	-3.90
Engineering / Physics	0	0.00	1	1.56	-1.56
English	5	0.98	4	6.25	-5.27
Finance	0	0.00	1	1.56	-1.56
Forensic Science Institute	13	2.55	0	0.00	2.55
Funeral Service	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
General Studies	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
History / Geography	7	1.37	2	3.13	-1.75
Human Environmental Sciences	74	14.51	4	6.25	8.26
Humanities / Philosophy	2	0.39	1	1.56	-1.17
Info Sys Oper Manag	34	6.67	1	1.56	5.10
Kinesiology / Health	15	2.94	1	1.56	1.38
Management	69	13.53	0	0.00	13.53
Marketing	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Mass Communications	3	0.59	1	1.56	-0.97
Mathematics / Statistics	0	0.00	4	6.25	-6.25
Military Science	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Modern Languages	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Music	19	3.73	1	1.56	2.16
Nursing	0	0.00	1	1.56	-1.56
Other	0	0.00	8	12.50	-12.50
Political Science	36	7.06	2	3.13	3.93

Language: English (American)
Institution Type: College or University
Consortium: None
User Group: Graduate

Psychology	24	4.71	3	4.69	0.02
Sociology	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Teacher Education	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Theatre Arts	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Undecided	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Total:	510	100.00	64	100.00	0.00

5.1.3 Respondent Profile by Age:

This table shows a breakdown of survey respondents by age; both the number of respondents (n) and the percentage of the total number of respondents represented by each age group are displayed.

Age:	Respondents n	Respondents %
18 - 22	4	6.25
23 - 30	38	59.38
31 - 45	17	26.56
46 - 65	4	6.25
Over 65	1	1.56
Under 18	0	0.00
Total:	64	100.00

5.1.4 Respondent Profile by Full or part-time student?


Full or part-time student?	Respondents n	Respondents %
Does not apply / NA	8	12.50
Full-time	49	76.56
Part-time	7	10.94
Total:	64	100.00

5.2 Core Questions Summary for Graduate

This radar chart shows the aggregate results for the core survey questions. Each axis represents one question. A code to identify each question is displayed at the outer point of each axis. While questions for each dimension of library service quality are scattered randomly throughout the survey, on this chart they are grouped into sections: Affect of Service, Information Control, and Library as Place.

On each axis, respondents' minimum, desired, and perceived levels of service quality are plotted, and the resulting "gaps" between the three levels (representing service adequacy or service superiority) are shaded in blue, yellow, green, and red.

The following two tables show mean scores and standard deviations for each question, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular question. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.)




ID	Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	7.27	8.36	8.27	1.00	-0.09	11
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	7.39	8.17	7.28	-0.11	-0.89	18
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	8.19	8.76	8.19	0.00	-0.57	21
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	7.93	8.79	7.71	-0.21	-1.07	14
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	8.13	8.44	7.69	-0.44	-0.75	16
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	7.61	8.35	8.03	0.42	-0.32	62
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	7.44	7.88	7.88	0.44	0.00	16
AS-8	Willingness to help users	7.47	8.00	7.80	0.33	-0.20	15
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	7.36	8.18	8.09	0.73	-0.09	11
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	6.71	8.14	6.14	-0.57	-2.00	7
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	8.14	8.52	7.76	-0.38	-0.76	21
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	7.78	8.22	7.74	-0.04	-0.48	23
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	7.32	8.06	7.31	-0.02	-0.76	62
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	7.32	8.26	7.37	0.05	-0.89	19
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	7.00	8.06	7.75	0.75	-0.31	16
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	6.88	8.12	7.12	0.24	-1.00	17
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	7.56	8.22	7.67	0.11	-0.56	18
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	7.30	8.16	7.85	0.56	-0.31	61
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	7.95	8.68	7.84	-0.11	-0.84	19
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	8.19	8.75	7.81	-0.38	-0.94	16
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	7.47	8.27	7.67	0.20	-0.60	15
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	7.17	7.92	7.08	-0.08	-0.83	12
Overall:		7.54	8.28	7.71	0.17	-0.57	64

ID	Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	1.79	0.67	1.01	1.84	0.54	11
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	2.28	1.69	2.24	2.74	2.97	18
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	1.29	0.54	1.69	1.34	1.66	21
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	1.14	0.43	1.68	1.25	1.73	14
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	1.26	1.15	1.92	1.79	1.81	16
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	1.82	1.09	1.55	1.65	1.26	62
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	1.21	1.02	1.09	0.81	1.15	16
AS-8	Willingness to help users	1.81	1.31	1.52	1.80	1.26	15
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	2.25	1.08	1.58	2.28	1.51	11
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	3.09	1.57	2.67	2.30	2.31	7
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	1.20	1.03	1.61	1.53	1.58	21
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	1.95	1.76	1.91	0.93	0.99	23
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	1.78	1.45	2.05	2.29	1.88	62
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	1.77	1.48	2.14	2.95	2.87	19
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	2.00	1.24	1.44	1.77	1.20	16
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	2.06	1.22	2.18	1.39	2.24	17
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	1.98	1.11	1.85	2.54	1.98	18
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	2.22	1.28	1.48	2.31	1.50	61
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	1.72	0.75	1.74	1.24	1.46	19
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	1.11	0.58	1.76	1.93	1.77	16
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	1.51	1.28	1.80	1.86	1.30	15
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	1.59	1.38	2.23	1.98	2.25	12
Overall:		1.41	0.88	1.32	1.36	1.22	64

5.3 Core Question Dimensions Summary for Graduate

On the chart below, scores for each dimension of library service quality have been plotted graphically. The exterior bars represent the range of minimum to desired mean scores for each dimension. The interior bars represent the range of minimum to perceived mean scores (the service adequacy gap) for each dimension of library service quality.



The following table displays mean scores for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service	7.67	8.33	7.92	0.26	-0.41	64
Information Control	7.43	8.21	7.46	0.03	-0.75	64
Library as Place	7.50	8.30	7.78	0.28	-0.52	63
Overall	7.54	8.28	7.71	0.17	-0.57	64

The following table displays standard deviation for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service	1.48	0.88	1.33	1.37	1.27	64
Information Control	1.56	1.15	1.65	1.59	1.44	64
Library as Place	1.72	0.99	1.40	1.83	1.35	63
Overall	1.41	0.88	1.32	1.36	1.22	64

5.4 Local Question Summary for Graduate

This table shows mean scores of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	7.00	8.45	8.00	1.00	-0.45	11
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	6.86	7.43	7.29	0.43	-0.14	7
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)	7.58	7.92	7.58	0	-0.33	12
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills	8.00	8.16	7.37	-0.63	-0.79	19
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	7.18	7.91	7.18	0	-0.73	11

This table displays the standard deviations of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	2.79	0.69	1.41	2.90	0.82	11
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	2.85	2.94	2.93	0.79	1.21	7
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)	1.62	1.44	1.51	1.48	1.44	12
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills	1.25	1.95	2.09	1.71	3.12	19
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	1.78	1.22	1.78	1.95	1.10	11

5.5 General Satisfaction Questions Summary for Graduate

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the general satisfaction questions: Satisfaction with Treatment, Satisfaction with Support, and Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Service, where *n* is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the general satisfaction questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9.

Satisfaction Question	Mean	SD	n
In general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library.	7.96	1.54	25
In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.	8.18	1.19	39
How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?	8.02	1.39	64


5.6 Information Literacy Outcomes Questions Summary for Graduate

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the information literacy outcomes questions, where *n* is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the information literacy outcomes questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9 with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 9 representing "strongly agree."

Information Literacy Outcomes Questions	Mean	SD	n
The library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s) of interest.	7.21	2.57	19
The library aids my advancement in my academic discipline or work.	7.67	1.65	33
The library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits or work.	8.12	1.17	33
The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information.	7.71	1.57	31
The library provides me with the information skills I need in my work or study.	7.73	1.19	11

5.7 Library Use Summary for Graduate

This chart shows a graphic representation of library use (both on the premises and electronically), as well as use of non-library information gateways such as Yahoo and Google. Bars represent the frequency with which respondents report using these resources: Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Quarterly, or Never. The table below the chart displays the number and percentage of respondents who selected each option.



	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Never	n/%
How often do you use resources on library premises?	13 20.31%	25 39.06%	12 18.75%	9 14.06%	5 7.81%	64 100.00%
How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?	16 25.00%	28 43.75%	10 15.63%	4 6.25%	6 9.38%	64 100.00%
How often do you use YahooTM, GoogleTM, or non-library gateways for information?	40 62.50%	10 15.63%	4 6.25%	5 7.81%	5 7.81%	64 100.00%


6 Faculty Summary for University of Central Oklahoma

6.1 Demographic Summary for Faculty

6.1.1 Population and Respondent Profiles for Faculty by Standard Discipline

The chart and table below show a breakdown of survey respondents by discipline, based on user responses to the demographic questions and the demographic data provided by institutions in the online Representativeness section.

This section shows survey respondents broken down based on the LibQUAL standard discipline categories. The chart maps percentage of respondents for each discipline in red. Population percentages for each discipline are mapped in blue. The table shows the number and percentage for each discipline, for the general population (N) and for survey respondents (n).



- Respondent Profile by Discipline
- Population Profile by Discipline

Language: English (American)

Institution Type: College or University

Consortium: None


User Group: Faculty

Discipline	Population N	Population %	Respondents n	Respondents %	%N - %n
Agriculture / Environmental Studies	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Architecture	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Business	66	14.22	6	13.33	0.89
Communications / Journalism	12	2.59	1	2.22	0.36
Education	99	21.34	8	17.78	3.56
Engineering / Computer Science	27	5.82	0	0.00	5.82
General Studies	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Health Sciences	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Humanities	47	10.13	6	13.33	-3.20
Law	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Military / Naval Science	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Other	0	0.00	3	6.67	-6.67
Performing & Fine Arts	64	13.79	6	13.33	0.46
Science / Math	106	22.84	5	11.11	11.73
Social Sciences / Psychology	43	9.27	9	20.00	-10.73
Undecided	0	0.00	1	2.22	-2.22
Total:	464	100.00	45	100.00	0.00

6.1.2 Population and Respondent Profiles for Faculty by Customized Discipline

The chart and table below show a breakdown of survey respondents by discipline, based on user responses to the demographic questions and the demographic data provided by institutions in the online Representativeness section.

This section shows survey respondents broken down based on the customized discipline categories supplied by the participating library. The chart maps percentage of respondents for each discipline in red. Population percentages for each discipline are mapped in blue. The table shows the number and percentage for each discipline, for the general population (N) and for survey respondents (n).



Discipline	Population N	Population %	Respondents n	Respondents %	%N - %n
1-Not Applicable	0	0.00	1	2.22	-2.22
Accounting	10	2.16	0	0.00	2.16
Adult Ed and Safety	11	2.37	2	4.44	-2.07
Adv Prof and Spec Serv	13	2.80	1	2.22	0.58
Art	8	1.72	1	2.22	-0.50
Biology	25	5.39	3	6.67	-1.28
Chemistry	13	2.80	0	0.00	2.80
Computer Science	9	1.94	0	0.00	1.94
Criminal Justice	9	1.94	1	2.22	-0.28
Curriculum and Instruction	12	2.59	0	0.00	2.59
Dance	5	1.08	0	0.00	1.08
Design	11	2.37	0	0.00	2.37
Economics	8	1.72	1	2.22	-0.50
Educ Sci,Found, Research	9	1.94	2	4.44	-2.50
Engineering / Physics	18	3.88	0	0.00	3.88
English	21	4.53	3	6.67	-2.14
Finance	12	2.59	2	4.44	-1.86
Forensic Science Institute	11	2.37	0	0.00	2.37
Funeral Service	5	1.08	0	0.00	1.08
General Studies	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
History / Geography	15	3.23	3	6.67	-3.43
Human Environmental Sciences	9	1.94	1	2.22	-0.28
Humanities / Philosophy	16	3.45	2	4.44	-1.00
Info Sys Oper Manag	11	2.37	0	0.00	2.37
Kinesiology / Health	24	5.17	1	2.22	2.95
Management	13	2.80	3	6.67	-3.86
Marketing	12	2.59	0	0.00	2.59
Mass Communications	12	2.59	1	2.22	0.36
Mathematics / Statistics	29	6.25	1	2.22	4.03
Military Science	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Modern Languages	10	2.16	1	2.22	-0.07
Music	33	7.11	3	6.67	0.45
Nursing	23	4.96	1	2.22	2.73
Other	0	0.00	2	4.44	-4.44
Political Science	11	2.37	5	11.11	-8.74

Language: English (American)
Institution Type: College or University
Consortium: None
User Group: Faculty

Psychology	21	4.53	1	2.22	2.30
Sociology	8	1.72	0	0.00	1.72
Teacher Education	0	0.00	0	0.00	0.00
Theatre Arts	7	1.51	2	4.44	-2.94
Undecided	0	0.00	1	2.22	-2.22
Total:	464	100.00	45	100.00	0.00

6.1.3 Respondent Profile by Age:

This table shows a breakdown of survey respondents by age; both the number of respondents (n) and the percentage of the total number of respondents represented by each age group are displayed.

Age:	Respondents n	Respondents %
18 - 22	2	4.44
23 - 30	0	0.00
31 - 45	14	31.11
46 - 65	22	48.89
Over 65	7	15.56
Under 18	0	0.00
Total:	45	100.00

6.1.4 Respondent Profile by Full or part-time student?


Full or part-time student?	Respondents n	Respondents %
Does not apply / NA	40	90.91
Full-time	4	9.09
Part-time	0	0.00
Total:	44	100.00

6.2 Core Questions Summary for Faculty

This radar chart shows the aggregate results for the core survey questions. Each axis represents one question. A code to identify each question is displayed at the outer point of each axis. While questions for each dimension of library service quality are scattered randomly throughout the survey, on this chart they are grouped into sections: Affect of Service, Information Control, and Library as Place.

On each axis, respondents' minimum, desired, and perceived levels of service quality are plotted, and the resulting "gaps" between the three levels (representing service adequacy or service superiority) are shaded in blue, yellow, green, and red.

The following two tables show mean scores and standard deviations for each question, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular question. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.)




ID	Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	7.25	8.50	8.38	1.13	-0.13	8
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	7.44	8.44	8.56	1.11	0.11	9
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	7.77	8.46	8.77	1.00	0.31	13
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	7.82	8.27	8.27	0.45	0.00	11
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	7.90	8.70	8.30	0.40	-0.40	10
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	7.42	8.42	8.56	1.14	0.14	43
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	7.22	7.78	8.00	0.78	0.22	9
AS-8	Willingness to help users	6.93	8.13	7.73	0.80	-0.40	15
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	6.91	8.27	8.18	1.27	-0.09	11
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	8.22	8.89	9.00	0.78	0.11	9
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	8.25	8.75	8.58	0.33	-0.17	12
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	6.36	8.00	6.91	0.55	-1.09	11
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	6.93	8.32	7.48	0.55	-0.84	44
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	7.21	8.29	8.21	1.00	-0.07	14
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	7.91	8.55	7.73	-0.18	-0.82	11
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	6.81	8.00	7.19	0.38	-0.81	16
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	7.00	8.00	6.50	-0.50	-1.50	10
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	6.63	7.89	7.77	1.14	-0.11	35
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	7.33	8.33	8.17	0.83	-0.17	6
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	7.00	8.15	7.77	0.77	-0.38	13
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	7.13	7.25	7.38	0.25	0.13	8
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	6.27	7.55	8.18	1.91	0.64	11
Overall:		7.23	8.26	7.94	0.71	-0.31	45

Language: English (American)
Institution Type: College or University
Consortium: None
User Group: Faculty

ID	Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	1.39	0.76	0.92	0.83	0.83	8
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	1.59	0.73	1.33	1.96	1.36	9
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	1.30	0.97	0.83	1.22	0.63	13
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	1.08	0.90	1.01	1.13	1.00	11
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	0.99	0.67	1.34	1.51	0.97	10
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	1.59	0.93	0.98	1.47	0.83	43
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	2.28	1.72	1.41	1.39	0.67	9
AS-8	Willingness to help users	1.98	1.41	1.62	1.42	0.83	15
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	1.70	1.27	1.54	1.49	1.64	11
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	1.39	0.33	0	1.39	0.33	9
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	0.87	0.62	0.90	0.78	0.94	12
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	1.50	0.89	2.43	2.98	2.55	11
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	1.82	1.16	2.13	2.30	2.31	44
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	1.37	0.99	0.80	1.47	1.07	14
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	1.30	1.21	1.85	1.33	1.47	11
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	2.56	2.03	1.60	2.00	1.91	16
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	1.83	1.63	1.84	1.35	1.72	10
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	2.12	1.88	1.61	2.30	2.07	35
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	1.37	0.52	2.04	2.32	1.94	6
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	1.96	1.28	1.24	1.88	1.45	13
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	2.42	2.31	1.85	2.31	2.30	8
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	2.72	2.16	1.66	1.81	1.50	11
Overall:		1.39	0.88	1.20	1.40	1.12	45

6.3 Core Question Dimensions Summary for Faculty

On the chart below, scores for each dimension of library service quality have been plotted graphically. The exterior bars represent the range of minimum to desired mean scores for each dimension. The interior bars represent the range of minimum to perceived mean scores (the service adequacy gap) for each dimension of library service quality.



The following table displays mean scores for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service	7.42	8.36	8.37	0.95	0.01	44
Information Control	7.22	8.33	7.63	0.41	-0.70	44
Library as Place	6.78	7.87	7.78	1.00	-0.09	39
Overall	7.23	8.26	7.94	0.71	-0.31	45

The following table displays standard deviation for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service	1.46	0.94	1.08	1.21	0.78	44
Information Control	1.47	0.92	1.45	1.61	1.44	44
Library as Place	1.93	1.59	1.49	1.99	1.76	39
Overall	1.39	0.88	1.20	1.40	1.12	45

6.4 Local Question Summary for Faculty

This table shows mean scores of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	7.00	8.00	7.50	0.50	-0.50	6
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	7.17	8.00	8.50	1.33	0.50	6
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)	6.33	7.33	7.00	0.67	-0.33	9
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills	6.67	7.44	8.33	1.67	0.89	9
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	7.22	8.67	7.44	0.22	-1.22	9

This table displays the standard deviations of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	1.26	0.89	1.38	1.87	1.64	6
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	1.17	1.26	0.55	1.03	1.22	6
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)	2.96	2.24	2.18	2.06	1.87	9
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills	2.87	2.65	0.87	2.12	2.03	9
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	1.39	0.50	1.33	1.48	1.64	9

6.5 General Satisfaction Questions Summary for Faculty

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the general satisfaction questions: Satisfaction with Treatment, Satisfaction with Support, and Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Service, where n is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the general satisfaction questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9.

Satisfaction Question	Mean	SD	n
In general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library.	8.30	1.17	20
In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.	7.48	2.04	25
How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?	7.80	1.55	45


6.6 Information Literacy Outcomes Questions Summary for Faculty

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the information literacy outcomes questions, where n is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the information literacy outcomes questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9 with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 9 representing "strongly agree."

Information Literacy Outcomes Questions	Mean	SD	n
The library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s) of interest.	5.50	2.22	10
The library aids my advancement in my academic discipline or work.	7.69	1.87	26
The library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits or work.	7.32	2.15	22
The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information.	7.52	1.86	23
The library provides me with the information skills I need in my work or study.	7.78	2.28	9

6.7 Library Use Summary for Faculty

This chart shows a graphic representation of library use (both on the premises and electronically), as well as use of non-library information gateways such as Yahoo and Google. Bars represent the frequency with which respondents report using these resources: Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Quarterly, or Never. The table below the chart displays the number and percentage of respondents who selected each option.



	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Never	n/%
How often do you use resources on library premises?	2 4.44%	6 13.33%	16 35.56%	15 33.33%	6 13.33%	45 100.00%
How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?	9 20.00%	21 46.67%	11 24.44%	3 6.67%	1 2.22%	45 100.00%
How often do you use Yahoo™, Google™, or non-library gateways for information?	28 62.22%	12 26.67%	1 2.22%	2 4.44%	2 4.44%	45 100.00%

7 Library Staff Summary for University of Central Oklahoma

7.1 Demographic Summary for Library Staff

7.1.1 Respondent Profile by Age:

This table shows a breakdown of survey respondents by age; both the number of respondents (n) and the percentage of the total number of respondents represented by each age group are displayed.

Age:	Respondents n	Respondents %
18 - 22	1	5.00
23 - 30	2	10.00
31 - 45	8	40.00
46 - 65	8	40.00
Over 65	1	5.00
Under 18	0	0.00
Total:	20	100.00

7.1.2 Respondent Profile by Full or part-time student?


Full or part-time student?	Respondents n	Respondents %
Does not apply / NA	20	100.00
Full-time	0	0.00
Part-time	0	0.00
Total:	20	100.00

7.2 Core Questions Summary for Library Staff

This radar chart shows the aggregate results for the core survey questions. Each axis represents one question. A code to identify each question is displayed at the outer point of each axis. While questions for each dimension of library service quality are scattered randomly throughout the survey, on this chart they are grouped into sections: Affect of Service, Information Control, and Library as Place.

On each axis, respondents' minimum, desired, and perceived levels of service quality are plotted, and the resulting "gaps" between the three levels (representing service adequacy or service superiority) are shaded in blue, yellow, green, and red.

The following two tables show mean scores and standard deviations for each question, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular question. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.)




ID	Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	7.67	7.33	7.00	-0.67	-0.33	3
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	6.40	8.40	7.80	1.40	-0.60	5
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	6.50	8.75	7.50	1.00	-1.25	4
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	7.25	9.00	8.25	1.00	-0.75	4
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	7.20	8.40	8.40	1.20	0.00	5
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	7.40	8.40	8.45	1.05	0.05	20
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	7.83	8.33	8.17	0.33	-0.17	6
AS-8	Willingness to help users	8.38	8.88	8.38	0.00	-0.50	8
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	8.00	8.33	8.33	0.33	0.00	3
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	7.00	7.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	4
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	6.70	8.30	7.20	0.50	-1.10	10
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	5.17	8.00	7.33	2.17	-0.67	6
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	6.44	8.17	7.94	1.50	-0.22	18
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	6.25	7.50	8.25	2.00	0.75	4
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	6.75	8.00	7.75	1.00	-0.25	4
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	7.40	8.60	8.80	1.40	0.20	5
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	8.67	8.67	8.67	0.00	0.00	3
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	6.20	7.85	7.30	1.10	-0.55	20
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	7.00	8.67	5.67	-1.33	-3.00	6
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	6.50	8.25	7.75	1.25	-0.50	4
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	6.80	8.20	7.80	1.00	-0.40	5
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	7.60	8.80	8.80	1.20	0.00	5
Overall:		6.95	8.24	7.80	0.86	-0.44	20

ID	Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	1.53	2.08	1.00	2.08	2.52	3
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	3.29	0.89	0.84	3.51	1.52	5
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	0.58	0.50	1.29	1.15	1.50	4
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	1.26	0	0.96	1.15	0.96	4
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	1.10	0.55	0.89	1.10	0.71	5
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	1.93	1.79	0.69	2.01	1.99	20
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	0.98	0.52	0.75	0.52	0.41	6
AS-8	Willingness to help users	0.92	0.35	0.74	1.07	0.53	8
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	1.00	0.58	0.58	0.58	0	3
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	2.31	2.31	2.31	0	0	4
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	1.49	0.82	1.23	2.32	1.52	10
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	1.94	1.10	1.51	1.17	1.03	6
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	1.98	1.20	1.26	1.82	1.00	18
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	1.71	1.29	0.50	1.83	0.96	4
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	1.50	0.82	0.50	1.41	0.50	4
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	1.52	0.55	0.45	1.34	0.84	5
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	0.58	0.58	0.58	0	0	3
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	1.77	1.31	1.78	1.97	1.54	20
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	1.90	0.52	3.08	3.44	3.10	6
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	1.91	0.96	1.26	0.96	0.58	4
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	1.10	0.84	0.84	1.58	0.55	5
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	1.67	0.45	0.45	1.79	0	5
Overall:		1.46	0.91	0.92	1.39	0.84	20

Language: English (American)
Institution Type: College or University
Consortium: None
User Group: Library Staff

7.3 Core Question Dimensions Summary for Library Staff

On the chart below, scores for each dimension of library service quality have been plotted graphically. The exterior bars represent the range of minimum to desired mean scores for each dimension. The interior bars represent the range of minimum to perceived mean scores (the service adequacy gap) for each dimension of library service quality.



The following table displays mean scores for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service	7.38	8.37	8.17	0.79	-0.19	20
Information Control	6.61	8.09	7.80	1.19	-0.30	18
Library as Place	6.60	8.18	7.35	0.75	-0.83	20
Overall	6.95	8.24	7.80	0.86	-0.44	20

The following table displays standard deviation for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service	1.49	1.32	0.71	1.53	1.45	20
Information Control	1.71	1.00	0.94	1.54	0.85	18
Library as Place	1.59	0.88	1.57	1.87	1.43	20
Overall	1.46	0.91	0.92	1.39	0.84	20

7.4 Local Question Summary for Library Staff

This table shows mean scores of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	7.67	9.00	8.00	0.33	-1.00	3
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	5.83	7.33	7.33	1.50	0	6
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)	7.75	8.00	8.25	0.50	0.25	4
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills	6.00	9.00	8.00	2.00	-1.00	1
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	7.67	8.17	8.17	0.50	0	6

This table displays the standard deviations of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	2.31	0	1.00	1.53	1.00	3
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	3.13	1.63	1.75	4.46	3.10	6
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)	0.50	0.82	0.50	0.58	0.96	4
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills						1
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	0.82	0.75	0.75	0.84	0.63	6

Language: English (American)

Institution Type: College or University

Consortium: None

User Group: Library Staff

7.5 General Satisfaction Questions Summary for Library Staff

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the general satisfaction questions: Satisfaction with Treatment, Satisfaction with Support, and Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Service, where *n* is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the general satisfaction questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9.

Satisfaction Question	Mean	SD	n
In general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library.	8.00	1.55	6
In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.	8.07	0.92	14
How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?	8.20	0.77	20


7.6 Information Literacy Outcomes Questions Summary for Library Staff

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the information literacy outcomes questions, where *n* is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the information literacy outcomes questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9 with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 9 representing "strongly agree."

Information Literacy Outcomes Questions	Mean	SD	n
The library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s) of interest.	7.75	1.89	4
The library aids my advancement in my academic discipline or work.	7.83	0.98	6
The library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits or work.	7.57	0.79	7
The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information.	7.60	1.76	15
The library provides me with the information skills I need in my work or study.	8.50	0.76	8

7.7 Library Use Summary for Library Staff

This chart shows a graphic representation of library use (both on the premises and electronically), as well as use of non-library information gateways such as Yahoo and Google. Bars represent the frequency with which respondents report using these resources: Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Quarterly, or Never. The table below the chart displays the number and percentage of respondents who selected each option.



	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Never	n/%
How often do you use resources on library premises?	12 60.00%	6 30.00%	0 0 %	1 5.00%	1 5.00%	20 100.00%
How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?	12 60.00%	4 20.00%	1 5.00%	1 5.00%	2 10.00%	20 100.00%
How often do you use Yahoo™, Google™, or non-library gateways for information?	15 75.00%	4 20.00%	0 0 %	0 0 %	1 5.00%	20 100.00%

8 Staff Summary for University of Central Oklahoma

8.1 Demographic Summary for Staff

8.1.1 Respondent Profile by Age:

This table shows a breakdown of survey respondents by age; both the number of respondents (n) and the percentage of the total number of respondents represented by each age group are displayed.

Age:	Respondents n	Respondents %
18 - 22	0	0.00
23 - 30	0	0.00
31 - 45	6	40.00
46 - 65	8	53.33
Over 65	1	6.67
Under 18	0	0.00
Total:	15	100.00

8.1.2 Respondent Profile by Full or part-time student?


Full or part-time student?	Respondents n	Respondents %
Does not apply / NA	14	93.33
Full-time	1	6.67
Part-time	0	0.00
Total:	15	100.00

8.2 Core Questions Summary for Staff

This radar chart shows the aggregate results for the core survey questions. Each axis represents one question. A code to identify each question is displayed at the outer point of each axis. While questions for each dimension of library service quality are scattered randomly throughout the survey, on this chart they are grouped into sections: Affect of Service, Information Control, and Library as Place.

On each axis, respondents' minimum, desired, and perceived levels of service quality are plotted, and the resulting "gaps" between the three levels (representing service adequacy or service superiority) are shaded in blue, yellow, green, and red.

The following two tables show mean scores and standard deviations for each question, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular question. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.)




ID	Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	7.00	8.50	8.00	1.00	-0.50	2
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	7.50	8.50	8.50	1.00	0.00	2
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	8.33	8.67	8.00	-0.33	-0.67	3
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	6.80	7.20	7.40	0.60	0.20	5
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	6.43	7.86	6.71	0.29	-1.14	7
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	7.20	8.33	7.60	0.40	-0.73	15
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	6.20	8.80	7.20	1.00	-1.60	5
AS-8	Willingness to help users	8.00	7.67	8.33	0.33	0.67	3
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	7.00	8.33	8.33	1.33	0.00	3
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	7.00	9.00	9.00	2.00	0.00	1
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	7.67	8.67	8.33	0.67	-0.33	3
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	6.25	6.25	6.50	0.25	0.25	4
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	6.07	8.07	7.00	0.93	-1.07	14
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	5.29	7.43	6.71	1.43	-0.71	7
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	6.57	8.57	6.86	0.29	-1.71	7
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	8.00	8.67	8.67	0.67	0.00	3
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	4.67	5.67	8.33	3.67	2.67	3
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	6.71	8.29	7.64	0.93	-0.64	14
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	8.00	8.67	8.33	0.33	-0.33	3
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	5.50	6.00	6.50	1.00	0.50	2
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	6.20	8.40	8.00	1.80	-0.40	5
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	6.60	7.40	7.80	1.20	0.40	5
Overall:		6.62	7.99	7.51	0.90	-0.48	15

Language: English (American)
Institution Type: College or University
Consortium: None
User Group: Staff

ID	Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service							
AS-1	Employees who instill confidence in users	0	0.71	1.41	1.41	0.71	2
AS-2	Giving users individual attention	0.71	0.71	0.71	1.41	0	2
AS-3	Employees who are consistently courteous	0.58	0.58	0	0.58	0.58	3
AS-4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	1.79	1.48	1.52	1.34	0.45	5
AS-5	Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions	1.81	1.68	2.87	3.50	2.67	7
AS-6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	1.82	1.18	1.96	2.85	2.05	15
AS-7	Employees who understand the needs of their users	1.30	0.45	1.48	1.22	1.52	5
AS-8	Willingness to help users	1.73	1.53	0.58	1.53	1.15	3
AS-9	Dependability in handling users' service problems	1.73	1.15	1.15	1.53	0	3
Information Control							
IC-1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office						1
IC-2	A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own	0.58	0.58	0.58	1.15	0.58	3
IC-3	The printed library materials I need for my work	1.26	1.50	1.29	0.50	0.50	4
IC-4	The electronic information resources I need	1.77	1.21	1.71	2.53	1.86	14
IC-5	Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information	2.63	1.72	2.06	4.28	2.63	7
IC-6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	1.72	0.79	2.34	3.50	1.80	7
IC-7	Making information easily accessible for independent use	1.00	0.58	0.58	1.53	1.00	3
IC-8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	3.21	4.16	1.15	3.79	4.62	3
Library as Place							
LP-1	Library space that inspires study and learning	1.73	1.14	1.45	2.09	1.39	14
LP-2	Quiet space for individual activities	1.00	0.58	0.58	1.53	0.58	3
LP-3	A comfortable and inviting location	0.71	1.41	2.12	1.41	0.71	2
LP-4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	2.28	0.89	0.71	2.17	1.52	5
LP-5	Community space for group learning and group study	1.82	1.14	1.10	1.64	1.14	5
Overall:		1.34	1.13	1.35	2.02	1.31	15

8.3 Core Question Dimensions Summary for Staff

On the chart below, scores for each dimension of library service quality have been plotted graphically. The exterior bars represent the range of minimum to desired mean scores for each dimension. The interior bars represent the range of minimum to perceived mean scores (the service adequacy gap) for each dimension of library service quality.



The following table displays mean scores for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
Affect of Service	7.04	8.18	7.58	0.53	-0.60	15
Information Control	6.07	7.71	7.31	1.24	-0.40	15
Library as Place	6.63	8.00	7.73	1.10	-0.27	15
Overall	6.62	7.99	7.51	0.90	-0.48	15

The following table displays standard deviation for each dimension of library service quality measured by the LibQUAL survey, where *n* is the number of respondents for each particular dimension. (For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the Introduction to this notebook.) A complete listing of the survey questions and their dimensions can be found in Appendix A.

Dimension	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
Affect of Service	1.50	1.18	1.58	2.03	1.37	15
Information Control	2.02	1.75	1.72	2.97	2.32	15
Library as Place	1.72	1.12	1.13	1.81	1.15	15
Overall	1.34	1.13	1.35	2.02	1.31	15

8.4 Local Question Summary for Staff

This table shows mean scores of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum Mean	Desired Mean	Perceived Mean	Adequacy Mean	Superiority Mean	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	7.00	8.50	9.00	2.00	0.50	2
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	5.33	8.67	6.00	0.67	-2.67	3
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)	7.00	8.00	8.00	1.00	0	1
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills	6.67	7.33	7.00	0.33	-0.33	3
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	7.00	7.80	8.20	1.20	0.40	5

This table displays the standard deviations of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where n is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

Question Text	Minimum SD	Desired SD	Perceived SD	Adequacy SD	Superiority SD	n
A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information	0	0.71	0	0	0.71	2
Access to equipment that is not readily available in my department, for example: scanners, microphones, 3D printers, cameras, etc.	1.53	0.58	3.46	4.93	3.79	3
Access to library materials using electronic mobile devices (e.g., cell phones, tablets, and laptops)						1
Availability of assistance to improve my research and writing skills	1.53	2.08	1.73	0.58	0.58	3
Library collections that represent a range of voices, viewpoints, and perspectives	2.00	1.30	1.10	1.79	1.14	5

8.5 General Satisfaction Questions Summary for Staff

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the general satisfaction questions: Satisfaction with Treatment, Satisfaction with Support, and Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Service, where n is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the general satisfaction questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9.

Satisfaction Question	Mean	SD	n
In general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library.	8.00	1.53	7
In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.	7.38	1.85	8
How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?	7.93	1.22	15

8.6 Information Literacy Outcomes Questions Summary for Staff

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the information literacy outcomes questions, where n is the number of respondents for each question. These scores are calculated from responses to the information literacy outcomes questions on the LibQUAL survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 9 with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 9 representing "strongly agree."

Information Literacy Outcomes Questions	Mean	SD	n
The library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s) of interest.	7.33	0.58	3
The library aids my advancement in my academic discipline or work.	6.86	1.57	7
The library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits or work.	6.89	1.54	9
The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information.	8.00	1.73	5
The library provides me with the information skills I need in my work or study.	7.83	1.60	6

Language: English (American)


Institution Type: College or University

Consortium: None

User Group: Staff

8.7 Library Use Summary for Staff

This chart shows a graphic representation of library use (both on the premises and electronically), as well as use of non-library information gateways such as Yahoo and Google. Bars represent the frequency with which respondents report using these resources: Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Quarterly, or Never. The table below the chart displays the number and percentage of respondents who selected each option.



	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Never	n/%
How often do you use resources on library premises?	1 6.67%	2 13.33%	3 20.00%	8 53.33%	1 6.67%	15 100.00%
How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?	0 0 %	3 20.00%	3 20.00%	7 46.67%	2 13.33%	15 100.00%
How often do you use Yahoo™, Google™, or non-library gateways for information?	10 66.67%	2 13.33%	1 6.67%	1 6.67%	1 6.67%	15 100.00%

Appendix A: LibQUAL Dimensions

LibQUAL measures dimensions of perceived library quality—that is, each survey question is part of a broader category (a dimension), and scores within those categories are analyzed in order to derive more general information about library users' perceptions of service. These dimensions were first based on the original SERVQUAL survey instrument (the framework for the LibQUAL survey tool; for more information on the origins of LibQUAL, go to [<http://www.libqual.org/Publications/>](http://www.libqual.org/Publications/)). The LibQUAL survey dimensions have evolved with each iteration, becoming more refined and focused for application to the library context. Dimensions for each iteration of the LibQUAL survey are outlined below.

LibQUAL 2000 Dimensions

The 2000 iteration of the LibQUAL survey, which had 41 questions, measured eight separate dimensions:

- Assurance (the knowledge and courtesy of employees, and their ability to convey trust and confidence)
- Empathy (caring, individual attention)
- Library as Place (library as a sanctuary/haven or site for learning and contemplation)
- Reliability (ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately)
- Responsiveness (willingness to help customers and provide prompt service)
- Tangibles (appearance of physical facilities, equipment, personnel and communications materials)
- Instructions/Custom Items
- Self-Reliance

LibQUAL 2001 Dimensions

After careful analysis of the results from the 2000 survey, the dimensions were further refined to re-ground the SERVQUAL items in the library context. Four sub-dimensions resulted for the 2001 iteration:

- Service Affect (nine items, such as “willingness to help users”)
- Library as Place (five items, such as “a haven for quiet and solitude”)
- Personal Control (six items, such as “website enabling me to locate information on my own”), and
- Information Access (five items, such as “comprehensive print collections” and “convenient business hours”)

LibQUAL 2002 and 2003 Dimensions

For the 2002 iteration of the LibQUAL survey, the dimensions were once again refined based on analysis of the previous year's results. While the four dimensions were retained, their titles were changed slightly to more clearly represent the questions and data. The same four dimensions were also used on the 2003 survey:

- Access to Information
- Affect of Service
- Library as Place
- Personal Control

LibQUAL 2004 to Present Dimensions

After the 2003 survey was completed, factor and reliability analyses on the resulting data revealed that two of the

dimensions measured by the survey-Access to Information and Personal Control-had collapsed into one. The following three dimensions have been measured since then: Affect of Service, Information Control, and Library as Place. In addition, three core items were eliminated from the 2003 version of the survey, leaving 22 core items on the final survey instrument.

The list below displays the dimensions used to present the results in the 2012 notebooks, along with the questions that relate to each dimension. *(Note: The questions below are those used in the College and University implementation of the survey, American English version.)*

Affect of Service

- [AS-1] Employees who instill confidence in users
- [AS-2] Giving users individual attention
- [AS-3] Employees who are consistently courteous
- [AS-4] Readiness to respond to users' questions
- [AS-5] Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions
- [AS-6] Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion
- [AS-7] Employees who understand the needs of their users
- [AS-8] Willingness to help users
- [AS-9] Dependability in handling users' service problems

Information Control

- [IC-1] Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office
- [IC-2] A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own
- [IC-3] The printed library materials I need for my work
- [IC-4] The electronic information resources I need
- [IC-5] Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information
- [IC-6] Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own
- [IC-7] Making information easily accessible for independent use
- [IC-8] Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work

Library as Place

- [LP-1] Library space that inspires study and learning
- [LP-2] Quiet space for individual activities
- [LP-3] A comfortable and inviting location
- [LP-4] A getaway for study, learning or research
- [LP-5] Community space for group learning and group study



**1025 Connecticut Ave, NW Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20036
Phone 202-296-2296
Fax 202-872-0884
<http://www.libqual.org>**

© Association of Research Libraries

