

Coding Practices for LibQUAL+[®] Comments: Survey Findings

Library Assessment Conference
Baltimore, MD
Oct 24-27, 2010

Purpose of the Study

To better understand libraries' current practices in analyzing and using LibQUAL+[®] comments

Methodology

- Survey population:
 - LibQUAL+® participants from 2003 to Spring 2009
 - 110 ARL members
 - 531 non-ARL members
- October 27, 2009 to November 30, 2009
- Survey instrument: question types, administration

Survey Respondents

- 154 total respondents
- Overall response rate = 24.0%
 - 54.3% from doctorate-granting universities
 - 36.4% from master's colleges and universities
 - 9.3% from baccalaureate colleges
- 35.1% were ARL members
- 85.1% from US
- 86.9% perform qualitative analysis of the open-ended comments

Coding Methods

- Excel: 73.7%
- Atlas.ti: 18.4%
- MS Word: 10.5%
- Other: 9.2%
- NVivo: 7.9%
- SPSS: 1.3%

Coding Criteria

- Emergent keywords/concepts: 91.9%
- Expressed a “positive” or “negative” perspective or experience: 67.6%
- LibQUAL dimensions: 55.0%
- Distinct topic(s) in a single comment: 46.8%
- Pre-set list of keywords or concepts: 41.4%
- LibQUAL+® &/or local questions: 27.0%
- Other: 10.8%

Using the Comments

- For internal library improvements: 92.7%
- Administrative reports to university: 75.5%
- Outreach communications to university: 60.9%
- Communications with professional community: 25.5%
- Outreach communications to external audiences:
22.7%
- Other: 3.6%

Open Ended Comment Results:

Top Five Benefits

- Identify action items for improvement: 33 coded comments
- Better understand users: 32 coded comments
- Examples to communicate to external audience: 24 coded comments
- Identify specific user needs/issues: 21 coded comments
- Analyze specific user needs/issues: 21 coded comments

Open Ended Comment Results: Top Four Challenges

- Time intensive: 44 coded comments
- Developing categories and groupings: 18 coded comments
- Lack of appropriate software: 11 coded comments
- Lack of people/staff: 10 coded comments

Literature Review

- Eleven published studies that discussed coding comments.
 - The detail provided was inconsistent and at times sparse.
- In general, the findings paralleled the survey's findings.
 - Surprisingly little was said about the challenges.
 - Very few mentioned any plan to use the results beyond “communicating with the profession.”

Questions?

Eric Ackermann, McConnell Library, Radford University
egackerma@radford.edu

Karen Neurohr, Oklahoma State University Library
karen.neurohr@okstate.edu

Daniel P. O'Mahony, Brown University Library
[Daniel O'Mahony@brown.edu](mailto:Daniel_O'Mahony@brown.edu)

Lynda S. White, University of Virginia Library
lsw6y@virginia.edu

<http://www.library.okstate.edu/dean/neurohr/CodingSurvey10-26-09.pdf>