Measuring the quality, value and impact of academic libraries: the role of external standards

Judith Broady-Preston
Department of Information Studies, Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, UK

Alison Lobo
Library & Information Services, Aston University, Birmingham, UK

Abstract Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to explore the role and relevance of external standards in demonstrating the value and impact of academic library services to their stakeholders.

Design/methodology/approach – Two UK standards, Charter Mark and Customer Service Excellence, are evaluated via an exploratory case study, employing multiple data collection techniques. Methods and results of phases 1-2 of a three phase research project are outlined.

Findings – Despite some limitations, standards may assist the manager in demonstrating the value, impact and quality of academic libraries in a recessional environment. Active engagement and partnership with customers is imperative if academic libraries are to be viewed as vital to their parent organisations and thus survive.

Originality/value – This paper provides a systematic evaluation of the role of external accreditation standards in measuring academic library service value and impact.

Keywords Value, Impact, Quality, Customer service excellence, Charter mark, Academic libraries, Services marketing

Introduction

In March 2008 the then UK Minister for Transformational Government, Tom Watson launched a new quality standard for the public sector in the UK, the Customer Service Excellence standard. Replacing the previous Charter Mark, this is designed to be a practical tool to support and drive public services, requiring them to be more responsive to people's needs, placing the customer at the heart of service development. The aim of the Customer Service Excellence award is: [. . .] to encourage, enable and reward organisations that are delivering services based on a genuine understanding of the needs and preferences of their customers and communities (UK Government Cabinet Office, 2010).

The Customer Service Excellence Standard is a formal measure that tests in depth areas of service provision which prior research indicated are customer priorities, namely delivery, timeliness, information, professionalism and staff attitude. Both this Standard and its predecessor, Charter Mark, are awards which result in formal accreditation to a recognised standard, based on self-evaluation and continuous improvement. Designed to measure customer satisfaction rigorously, these awards

are intended to be used by organisations to provide information to underpin action plans for future improvement of services. Despite the change of Government in the UK in May 2010, the original plans for Charter Mark to be phased out by 2011 and replaced entirely by the Customer Service Excellence award are seemingly still valid.

A critical assessment of the extent to which such standards enable university libraries to demonstrate value to their stakeholders is presented in this paper. The results of a case study analysis of the impact of such standards on both the internal customer base and peer group perception of quality in academic libraries are given below. The organisation chosen as the case study is a University Library Service which attained Charter Mark and subsequently, Customer Service Excellence status.

Scope It is beyond the scope of this paper to review in depth all possible approaches to demonstrating value, service impact, and customer satisfaction in libraries. However, as Hernon and Altman (2010, p. viii) observe:

> [. . .] it is time to develop new ways to look at service [. . .] and address the perspectives of stakeholders interested in libraries and their institutional context [. . .] Librarians need new ways of thinking and alternatives for applying a customer-centered model of service quality.

This need to communicate the values of the organisation to a complex network of stakeholders, both internally and externally, is one which is receiving increased recognition and awareness (see Balmer and Greyser, 2006; Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010). Some commentators extend this argument yet further, suggesting that demonstrating the value of the service to a range of stakeholders such as employees, government agencies and so forth, may take precedence over communicating value to customer groups (see for example, Palmer, 2008, pp. 485-6). Oakleaf argues that stakeholders may hold potentially conflicting definitions and interpretations of "impacts" in relation to value, dividing primarily into those who value economic measures of impact and those placing higher value on social indicators (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010, pp. 22-27). This dichotomy of expectations is also reflected in a 2010 review of value and impact in relation to the cultural sector in the UK within the context of school and public libraries (Stanziola, 2010).

As indicated above, the award of external standards is one such approach to demonstrating comparative value in academic libraries, based on the customer perspective. Therefore, arguably, an evaluation of the role and significance of such awards in improving service delivery and customer perceptions of service quality is a contribution to the ongoing debate with regard to identifying suitable mechanisms for measuring and demonstrating the worth of libraries. While the standards evaluated here are UK based, nonetheless, as they focus on developing customer insight, understanding the user's experience, and robust measurement of service satisfaction, the analysis of their relevance has global implications for service design and delivery in a volatile and rapidly-changing environment.

Context and background

Globally, academic libraries are facing a period of retrenchment to a greater or lesser degree. In June 2010, the International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC) reissued and reinforced their original January 2009 statement of the impact of the global economic crisis on library budgets, namely:

ICOLC did not overestimate the severity of cuts to library and library consortia funding levels in its original Statement. Furthermore, we believe the worst may still be before us, as US state governments suffer the loss of stimulus funds and continued weak regional economies. All parts of the world are facing negative economic repercussions from the European debt crisis (International Coalition of Library Consortia, 2010).

In relation to academic libraries, as outlined in the March 2010 UK Research Information Network (RIN) and SCONUL report:

> [. . .] after a decade of growth in budgets and services, academic librarians now expect a sustained period of cuts over the next three to five years (Research Information Network and SCONUL, 2010, p. 4).

This prediction is not confined to UK libraries alone; the research reported in this paper derives from focus groups held in the second half of 2009 in the UK and internationally. Moreover, in a section devoted to demonstrating the value of libraries, the researchers conclude that:

> [. . .] libraries [. . .] need to be more proactive in [. . .] rigorously analysing and demonstrating the value of their activities [. . .] The focus of performance indicators up to now has tended to be on inputs and outputs that are relatively straightforward to measure, rather than addressing the much harder issues relating to impact and value (Research Information Network and SCONUL, 2010, p. 17).

Customer Service Excellence, together with its predecessor, is one such attempt to measure impact, and as such, merits detailed evaluation.

Charter Mark and Customer Service Excellence

Customer Service Excellence is both a self-assessment tool and a standard to which organisations may seek formal accreditation. It operates on three levels:

> (1) as a driver for continuous improvement;

> (2) developing skills; and

> (3) on a formal level, demonstrating competence via accreditation to the standard (UK Government Cabinet Office, 2010).

Similarly, its predecessor, the Charter Mark award, was a UK Government national standard for customer service, applicable to public sector services, independently evaluated and assessed, using six broad criteria. Despite initial concerns as to its applicability to library services per se, there are several documented instances of academic libraries in the UK successfully applying for firstly Charter Mark and subsequently Customer Service Excellence status. Aston University Library service, for example, obtained Charter Mark status in 2007 (Matheson et al., 2008) and the Customer Service Excellence Standard in March 2010 (Broady-Preston and Lobo, 2010). Huddersfield University Computing and Library Services is believed to be the first academic library to achieve Customer Service Excellence standard in July 2008 (University of Huddersfield, 2008), and the National Library of Wales, the first national library, in August 2010 (National Library of Wales, 2010).

Quality, value and customers: concepts and methodologies

Quality assessment is by no means a new phenomenon; libraries are still searching for mechanisms which accurately describe their effectiveness. Unless there is a "planned approach to service delivery and the measurement of quality" (Broady-Preston and Preston, 1999, p. 129) it will be difficult for such services to justify and maintain their existence in the current economic climate. As Balague and Saarti (2009) note, there are numerous standards against which academic libraries may benchmark their services. However "the basic principles behind the present QM [Quality Management] systems [. . .] are actually rather similar. They all emphasise the continuing improvement of services [. . .] [and] all adopt a customer oriented focus" (Balague and Saarti, 2009, pp. 227-8).

This emphasis on the customer is reflected in the rise in contemporary measures and methodologies for demonstrating service quality and value which are customer focused and customer driven, including the Balanced Scorecard (Broady-Preston and Preston, 1999; Broady-Preston, 2005; Chim, 2007), customer value discovery (CVD) (McKnight, 2009), and customer relationship management (CRM) (Broady-Preston et al., 2006), among others. What methodologies such as CVD and CRM in particular have in common, is that they facilitate an understanding of value from the customer perspective, going beyond a mere determination of satisfaction. Such a customer derived perception of value is categorised by Zeithaml et al. (2009, p. 524) as "perceived value"; a concept which they further subdivide into four differing customer definitions of value. Gronroos (2007, p. 155) offers the following definition:

> Value is perceived by customers [. . .] in their interactions with [. . .] service providers when consuming, making use of services, goods, information, personal contacts, recovery and other elements of ongoing relationships.

The inherent difficulties for service providers in deriving a full understanding of perceived value in relation to service quality are acknowledged by a range of commentators (see for example, Gronroos, 2007; Palmer, 2008; Gera, 2011). As Zeithaml et al. (2009, p. 524) remark:

This is not a simple task. When consumers discuss value, they use the term in many different ways and talk about myriad attributes or components. What constitutes value, even in a single service category, appears to be highly personal and idiosyncratic.

Gronroos (2007, p. 155) acknowledges that:

> Value [is] a complicated concept to understand and manage. However, it is a concept that cannot be ignored.

Moreover, all customer focused methodologies require active participation by and partnership with customers as co-creators of service value and quality, thereby helping to determine the future direction and shape of service provision (Broady-Preston et al., 2006; Palmer, 2008; Zeithaml et al., 2009).

In a library context, Oakleaf categorises service impact on customers as the "fourth definition of value" (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010, p. 21), and there is a discernable move towards linking library value to services rather than to resources or collections (see, for example, Kaufman, 2009).

The above discussion also reflects the increasing synergy between the conceptual models underpinning services marketing and those of performance measurement research. Contemporary services marketing theory places the customer at the centre of an organisation's processes, policies and procedures, including service design, delivery, and evaluation mechanisms (see for example, Gronroos, 2007; Lusch and Vargo, 2006; Zeithaml et al., 2009). Hernon and Altman (2010, p. 3) seemingly support this view, stating that:

> [. . .] the people who interact with any library service are the reason for the organization's existence. Therefore their needs and desires should drive the service. As outlined earlier, the concept of customers or users being more than active recipients of service value and entering into partnership with service providers to become co-creators of value derives originally from services marketing theory. Tools and techniques such as LibQualþ , were developed from more generic services marketing models, such as the GAPS model, which underpins Parasuraman et al.'s SERVQUAL model (Palmer, 2008). Moreover, with Customer Service Excellence everything hangs on the successful identification of your customers. . .describe[d]. . .as customer segmentation (Barrett, 2008, pp. 11-12).

Segmentation is, again, a technique originating in marketing.

Methodology This research project is divided into three phases and is ongoing currently (February 2011). Phase one conducted in 2008/2009 analysed the impact of the 2007 award on the standing of the service within the case study university, including the impact on library staff morale, and perception of the value and impact of the service by its customers. Phase two, conducted April 2010, is an evaluation of the perceptions of senior managers who led preparations for the Charter Mark and Customer Service Excellence formal submissions, with the aim of capturing the immediate aftermath of the 2010 award, together with an interim comparative assessment of the two awards. Final completion of the project is envisaged as taking place in 2011/2012, with a detailed evaluation, using the timeframe and methodology developed for the 2008/2009 review.

An exploratory case study approach was adopted by the researchers for several reasons. First, as the research is examining contemporary eventswhich are still evolving, behaviour cannot be manipulated and hence such an approach enables investigation of a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (Yin, 2003, p. 13). Moreover, given the aims of the project outlined above, our concern is not with generalising from results, but in facilitating the transferability of findings based on contextual applicability (Pickard, 2007, p. 93).

Triangulating data ensures external, construct and internal validity (Yin, 2003) and is achieved here by employing multiple data collection techniques and sources of evidence (Pickard, 2007). Data were collected via documentary evidence, semi-structured interviews, and customer online questionnaires using survey monkey. For all phases of the project to date, interview and questionnaire designs have been piloted and pre-tested to ensure rigour and consistency (Patton, 2002). Aberystwyth University research ethics guidelines were used throughout, and consent obtained from all participants, who were ensured confidentiality and anonymity. Data analysis identified issues and themes, which were coded, checked and cross-checked for validity (Patton, 2002).

For Phase One, non-probability purposive sampling was employed with case study staff and students in the 2008/2009 survey as this is extremely useful when you want to describe a phenomenon or develop something about which only a little is known (Kumar, 2005, p. 162).

As indicated earlier, in Phase Two, the focus was on effecting an interim assessment of the comparative worth of the awards, immediately following receipt of the second. The timing of Phase Two was brought forward following the announcement of the UK General Election in April 2010, with the concomitant uncertainty surrounding the long-term continuation of these awards, thus bringing into question the viability of a more longitudinal study. To date (February 2011), the current coalition Government in the UK has not withdrawn or significantly amended the Customer Service Excellence award, nor announced any future intention to do so. However, this could not have been foreseen or predicted in late April 2010.

Therefore, as a result of this set of circumstances, a differing approach to data collection was adopted in Phase Two. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with "information-rich critical cases" (Patton, 2002), namely with the two senior academic library managers responsible for leading the successful Charter Mark and Customer Service Excellence teams in the case study organisation, and one with the then Director of the first academic library service to achieve the award.

Following a critique of relevant concepts and methodologies, results from both phases of the data collection, together with an analysis of relevant literature are presented below, using inductive thematic analysis (Dey, 1993; Braun and Clarke, 2006). While thematic analysis is a qualitative

analytic method originally developed within psychology, as Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 97) suggest, it is a flexible approach that can be used across a range of epistemologies and research questions. Moreover, it militates against unnecessary repetition of themes originally identified in the literature review by requiring that the final report or "write-up" not only provides a coherent account of the data, but does more than just provide data. Extracts need to be embedded within an analytic narrative that compellingly illustrates the story you are telling about your data (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 93).

Interview and questionnaire data from Phase One respondents are coded as "Librarian" in alphabetical sequence, and Phase Two interview data coded "Manager" also with a unique alphabetical suffix, i.e. "Librarian A", "Manager A" and so forth. Given the constraints identified above, in the interest of maintaining comparability and achieving consistency, only interview data obtained from staff respondents are presented in the analysis.

Four themes were identified from the data obtained thus far, namely the impact attaining one or both awards was perceived to have in relation to:

> (1) service reputation and status;

> (2) service delivery and standards;

> (3) staff morale; and

> (4) the customer experience.

Impact, reputation and status

From an academic library service perspective, measuring the impact of services is difficult to achieve as it moves us from traditional views of service quality, based on such things as statistics and satisfaction surveys, to looking at the deeper issues associated with our contribution to learning, teaching and research (Poll and Payne, 2006, p. 560).

Rowley (2005) advocates consideration being given to the impact of library quality management processes on the wider organisation. Similarly, in her report of the 7th Northumbria Performance Measurement Conference, Creaser (2008) notes a range of key themes emerging in library and information services based research, including the necessity for a more holistic approach to performance measurement, with measures being tailored to differing institutional styles, becoming stakeholder driven, and incorporating elements of self-evaluation.

Such views are reinforced in 2010 reports in both the UK and the USA (Research Information Network and SCONUL, 2010; Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010). As observed in the latter:

Direct measurement of impact is challenging, and librarians may avoid examining impact, despite a long professional tradition of measurement (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010, p. 21).

Even more challengingly, Koltay and Li (2010) assert that impact assessment appears to be in its infancy for research libraries. Furthermore paradoxically, the current hunger for demonstrating library impact might be slowing our libraries' progress by creating too much pressure to produce results that are compellingly supportive of our case (Koltay and Li, 2010, p. 11).

In summary, there is seemingly widespread agreement that impacts [. . .] are extremely difficult to measure (Hernon and Altman, 2010, p. 50). A news snippet in the February 2011 volume of CILIP Update with Gazette extends the argument further, asserting that:

[. . .] the methods of proving value that the library community has urged for years (and even sometimes used) are of little use (CILIP Update with Gazette, 2011, p. 10). Difficulties associated with demonstrating the true impact of library service in an increasingly complex landscape is reflected in the views of respondents in their assessment of the success or otherwise of Charter Mark in raising the profile and standing of the library among their stakeholder community. Peer recognition is viewed as one significant benefit of obtaining an externally validated standard:

[. . .] we looked at who had gained Charter Mark status and saw it as a mark of respect (Librarian D).

Similarly:

[we] get recognition from other university libraries who want to know how we did it, to share practices (Librarian A).

The views of staff from the 2008/2009 survey are echoed in the 2010 survey of senior managers, namely:

It is a way of demonstrating the credibility of a service to the parent organisation (Manager A).

And:

[. . .] the thinking process that goes into preparing the evidence for these awards is more important in terms of impact than the result itself. However [. . .] the result can [. . .] also be used to raise the profile and shape the reputation of the library within the institution (Manager B).

Arguably therefore, the Charter Mark and Customer Service Excellence process requires staff to be "reflective practitioners", developing an evidence-based approach to service design. Such ideas were developed in greater depth by more than one respondent, namely:

[the award] helped staff to give more thought to services and the underlying processes, and how these could be improved. That should and did happen anyway, but I think the discussion over the application [. . .] encouraged and challenged ideas and actions (Manager A).

Moreover:

[it] encourage[s] you to look critically at processes and think things through (Manager B). However, not all staff perceived the process positively; as one remarked, the impact was:

[. . .] not significant. Although there has been recognition, particularly from within the Business School [. . .] this appears one event amongst many (Librarian E). The necessity to publicise the outcome and achievement more widely was a view shared by others:

I feel there should be more on the web pages of the university [. . .] I feel it is pointless that we have got it if we don't advertise it (Librarian C).

Huddersfield University have links to the news items publicising their Customer Service Excellence award on their service web pages, viewing it as a positive marketing tool (University of Huddersfield, 2008; Barrett, 2008).

Service delivery and standards

Customer service should "drive library and information policy and planning . . . as it is a fundamental enabler" (Corrall, 2002, p. 27).

Furthermore "employees are the critical factor in determining the success of the service exchange and customer satisfaction within organisations" (Broady-Preston and Steel, 2002, p. 294).

As Zeithaml et al. (2009, p. 377) observe:

Often employees are the service and in all cases they represent the organization in the customers' eyes. They affect service quality perceptions to a large degree [. . .] It is essential to match what the customer wants and needs with service employees' ability to deliver.

From the managers' perspective, one benefit of Customer Service Excellence was that it:

[. . .] remind[ed] front line staff that their role is crucial to how the service is perceived (Manager B).

Similarly:

[. . .] it provides a strong foundation for the provision of high quality services to our users – which should be the principal motivation for any university service department (Manager C).

Both Charter Mark and Customer Service Excellence require service organisations to set standards and monitor progress towards achieving these. Staff recognised the importance of this; as one remarked:

[. . .] customer services need some mechanism for measuring [their success], otherwise you might be just guessing that you are doing it right (Librarian D).

Similarly, another stated it:

[. . .] made us more aware that services and standards need to be regularly addressed (Librarian B).

A further benefit noted by staff were improvements in service delivery resulting from a more focused and structured approach to customer communication, making them "more aware of the [. . .] heightened need and importance of increased customer consultation" (Librarian E) and that "customer service is a two-way process [. . .]" (Librarian A).

Moreover, there was evidence that achieving these awards had wider applicability, namely that it demonstrated:

[. . .] to [other] external accrediting bodies that what we do is of a good quality. These would include QAA [Quality Assurance Agency], Ofsted, and other organisations that underpin HE [Higher Education] quality structures (Manager C).

The above observation echoes and reinforces recommendations by the Association of College and Research Libraries (2010, p. 16) that librarians should "record library contributions to overall institutional reputation and prestige . . . [and] engage in higher education accreditation processes".

Staff morale

Bevan and Dolphin (2001) and Matheson et al. (2008) report significant improvements in staff morale as a result of achieving Charter Mark status. The managers surveyed held similar views:

> [. . .] it can help staff to feel a pride in their service [. . .] they saw it as a verification of what they were trying to achieve (Manager A).

It also:

> [. . .] foster[s] good self esteem amongst staff (Manager B).

Staff responses were more equivocal namely:

> [. . .] staff get to hear of praise in general terms, but I feel we are not aware of particular details of comments, complaints or praise (Librarian B).

Nonetheless:

> [. . .] there is a feeling that we are doing a good job (Librarian E).

One possible drawback to such awards is that they:

> [. . .] require not insignificant staff resources which may be more problematic in a time of financial constraint, [but]in reality, this should not be a drawback as the maintenance of good quality services is even more important when financial resources are limited (Manager C). Thus, failure to demonstrate quality may become a greater cost to library services than the time and resource costs entailed in achieving external compliance with pre-set standards.

Furthermore, for implementation to be successful:

> [. . .] it must have buy in from the top to make it worthwhile. . .it must involve people if you are to achieve something; if not, then staff will just become cynical (Manager A).

Barrett (2008, p. 11) endorses these views:

> [. . .] the support of senior management [is essential]. The real benefits of the award will only be felt and will only be achievable, if all members of the service buy into the concept as opposed to regarding it as a tick-box exercise.

Customer experience

There is a subtle difference in the way we look at customers now [we are] aware now that it is not one size fits all or this is our service, take it or leave it. We are now more responsive, which is especially important in a public service which does not make money (Librarian A).

This view is echoed by Matheson et al. (2008, p. 71):

> [. . .] engaging directly with our customers and their requirements and acting upon their needs. . .allows scope to make changes that are specific to our customers, not generic changes.

These findings reflect those of earlier research into the role and relevance of internal marketing strategies in library services, which indicated that:

> [. . .] at the strategic level, internal marketing should create an environment that fosters customer consciousness amongst employees [it] is concerned with challenging the attitudes and behaviour of employees to make them more "customer conscious" (Broady-Preston and Steel, 2002, p. 296).

Arguably therefore, accreditation to externally validated standards may be viewed as a form of internal marketing, and moreover one which reinforces consciousness of and concern with, the customer experience. Standards encourage:

[. . .] staff to look at things from the perspective of the customer [. . .] the emphasis on feeding back to customers and ensuring that they are satisfied with the outcome of a complaint can lead to an over-emphasis on a problem that is only of relevance to one person/a small number (Manager B).

Conversely, the view echoed by staff generally, was that generic standards were self-defeating: standards needed to be flexible enough to cope with individual need or demand. As one remarked:

[. . .] whilst customer services need to have an element of standards [they] also need to be able to look at customers as individuals. You cannot have general standards that are too inflexible; a better service should be flexible enough to cope with customers' [requirements] (Librarian D).

Nonetheless, as Barrett (2008, p. 12) cautions, with too many specified customer service standards, the outcome was that staff became "bored with them, our customers probably never bothered to read them, and [. . .] staff were fed up with collecting and collating data. . .[therefore]we now select between 10 and 20 qualitative standards that [are] far more meaningful to our users".

Overall, the verdict on Charter Mark and Customer Service Excellence vis-a` -vis improving the customer experience is positive; summarised neatly by one member of staff as:

[. . .] we have improved [. . .] customers can identify with individuals' responsibilities (Librarian D).

Thus reinforcing not only a change in emphasis in service value perceptions, from the library to the librarian (Webster and Flowers, 2009), but to customer service which recognises not merely individual staff expertise, but expertise delivering value as perceived by the customer (Saracevic and Kantor, 1997).

It may be argued that customer satisfaction surveys would provide evidence of an improved customer experience. The 2008/2009 results showed that 68 per cent of staff and 64 per cent of students had no complaints about library services, showing a marginal improvement on 2007/2008 results of 62 per cent for both categories, but the difference is not statistically significant. Moreover, this may serve to demonstrate a fundamental flaw inherent in satisfaction surveys, namely that "it is all too easy to assume that a satisfactory level of satisfaction indicates that all is well" (Brophy, 2006, p.52).

Therefore, as Customer Service Excellence focuses on continuous improvement and customer journey mapping (Barrett, 2008) it is moot whether the journey itself is the key to demonstrating the customer experience meaningfully, as opposed to the goal of arriving at the final destination of customer satisfaction.

Conclusion

Understanding and measuring concepts of value and impact in a service environment are challenging and problematic for service providers as a whole, especially when attempting such assessments from a customer or stakeholder perspective. Such challenges apply equally to academic library services as to any other service, especially when set within the context of a global economic recession. Seeking accreditation to external standards such as Charter Mark and Customer Service Excellence is by no means the sole answer to this conundrum. Such a conclusion would be far too simplistic.

However, arguably the role for such standards is in reinforcing existing relationships and partnerships with customers, communicating the value of the service to external and internal stakeholders, and serving as a tool for improving service quality and the customer experience. One fundamental benefit is that: Customer Service Excellence sends a subliminal message to service staff that excellence in the provision of our services should always be in the forefront of our minds (Manager C). Implicit in the findings

outlined in the joint Research Information Network and SCONUL (2010) report, and explicit in earlier research (Broady-Preston et al., 2006), active engagement and partnership with customers is imperative if academic library services are to become not only valued, but vital to their parent organisations. Recognising the increasing symbiotic relationship with models and methodologies derived from services marketing, and employing these in measuring and demonstrating the complex constructs of value and impact in a library service environment may serve to strengthen performance measurement and evaluation in academic libraries.

References

Association of College and Research Libraries (2010), The Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report, Megan Oakleaf, Chicago, IL, available at: www.acrl.ala.org/value

Balague, N. and Saarti, J. (2009), "Benchmarking quality systems in two European academic libraries", Library Management, Vol. 30 Nos 4/5, pp. 227-39.

Balmer, J.M.T. and Greyser, S.A. (2006), "Corporate marketing: integrating corporate identity, corporate branding, corporate communications, corporate image and corporate reputation", European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 40 Nos 7/8, pp. 730-41.

Barrett, L. (2008), "Charter Mark is dead. Long live CSE!", SCONUL Focus, Vol. 44, pp. 11-13.

Bevan, N. and Dolphin, P. (2001), "Birkbeck is up to the mark", SCONUL Focus, Vol. 23, pp. 35-40.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006), "Using thematic analysis in psychology", Qualitative Research in Psychology, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 77-101.

Broady-Preston, J. (2005), "The Balanced Scorecard, strategy, information and intellectual capital", in Maceviciute, E. and Wilson, T.D. (Eds), Introducing Information Management: An Information Research Reader, Facet, London, pp. 123-36.

Broady-Preston, J. and Lobo, A. (2010), "Customer Service Excellence (CSE), Charter Mark (CM) and the quality of university library services in the UK: a case study of Aston University", in Katsirikou, A. and Skiadas, C.H. (Eds), Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries: Theory and Applications, Proceedings of the 2nd Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries International Conference (QQML2010) 25-28 May2010 Chania, Crete. World Scientific Pub. Co. Inc..

Broady-Preston, J. and Preston, H. (1999), "Demonstrating quality in academic libraries", New Library World, Vol. 100 No. 1148, pp. 124-9.

Broady-Preston, J. and Steel, L. (2002), "Internal marketing strategies in LIS: a strategic management perspective", Library Management, Vol. 23 Nos 6/7, pp. 294-301.

Broady-Preston, J., Felice, J. and Marshall, S. (2006), "Building better customer relationships: case studies from Malta and the UK", Library Management, Vol. 27 Nos 6/7, pp. 430-45.

Brophy, P. (2006), Measuring Library Performance: Principles and Techniques, 2nd ed., Facet, London.

Chim, W. (2007), "The quest for excellence: one library's experience", Library Management, Vol. 28 Nos 6/7, pp. 323-36.

CILIP Update with Gazette (2011), "Impact is 'not best proof'", CILIP Update with Gazette, February, p. 10.

Corrall, S. (2002), "Planning and policy making", in Melling, M. and Little, J. (Eds), Building a Successful Customer-service Culture: A Guide for Library and Information Managers, Facet, London.

Creaser, C. (2008), "Performance measurement: a more holistic view", Library þ Information Update, Vol. 7 Nos 1-2, pp. 30-1.

Dey, I. (1993), Qualitative Data Analysis: A User- friendly Guide for Social Scientists, Routledge, London.

Gera, R. (2011), "A path analysis of perceived service quality, customer satisfaction, perceived value, and behavioural intentions in Indian retail banking", International Journal of Financial Services Management, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 83-105.

Gronroos, C. (2007), Service Management and Marketing: A Customer Relationship Management Approach, 3rd ed., John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.

Hernon, P. and Altman, E. (2010), Assessing Service Quality: Satisfying the Expectations of Library Customers, 2nd ed., ALA Editions, Chicago, IL.

International Coalition Of Library Consortia (ICOLC) (2010), Statement on the Global Economic Crisis and Its Impact on Consortial Licenses, June 14, available online: www.library.yale. edu/consortia/icolc-econcrisis-0610.htm

Kaufman, P. (2009), "Carpe diem: transforming services in academic libraries", unpublished conference paper, available at: www.ideals.illinois.edu/handle/2142/12032

Koltay, Z. and Li, X. (2010), Impact Measures in Research Libraries, SPEC Kit 318, The Association of Research Libraries (ARL), Chicago, IL, table of contents and executive summary available at: www.arl.org/bm ، doc/spec-318-web.pdf

Kumar, R. (2005), Research Methodology: A Step-by-step Guide for Beginners, 2nd ed., Sage, London.

Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (2006), "Service-dominant logic: reactions, reflections and refinements", Marketing Theory, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 281-8.

McKnight, S. (2009), "Bridging the gap between service provision and customer expectations", Performance Measurement and Metrics, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 79-93.

Matheson, L., Cawood, A. and Lobo, A. (2008), "Charter Mark – to apply or not to apply?", SCONUL Focus, Vol. 43, Spring, pp. 69-71.

National Library of Wales (2010), "News: 'User satisfaction high' at NLW", available at: www. llgc.org.uk/index.php?id¼1514&no_cache¼1&tx_ttnews[tt_news]¼3674&cHash¼ aaf311b50e4f0a1ef4c6d45bb89a2124

Palmer, A. (2008), Principles of Services Marketing, 5th ed., McGraw-Hill, Maidenhead. Patton, M.Q. (2002), Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods, 3rd ed., Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Pickard, A.J. (2007), Research Methods in Information, Facet, London.

Poll, R. and Payne, P. (2006), "Impact measures for libraries and information services", Library Hi Tech, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 547-62.

Research Information Network and SCONUL (2010), Challenges for Academic Libraries in Difficult Economic Times: A Guide for Senior Institutional Managers and Policy Makers, Research Information Network in association with SCONUL, London, available at: www. rin.ac.uk/challenges-for-libraries

Rowley, J. (2005), "Making sense of the quality maze: perspectives for public and academic libraries", Library Management, Vol. 26 Nos 8/9, pp. 508-18.

Saracevic, T. and Kantor, P.B. (1997), "Studying the value of library and information services. Part I. Establishing a theoretical framework", Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, Vol. 48 No. 6, pp. 527-42.

Stanziola, J. (2010), "Numbers and pictures: capturing the impact of public libraries", Library & Information Update, December, pp. 44-6.

University of Huddersfield (2008), "News: Huddersfield celebrates 'Excellence' with a Government award in customer services", available at: www.hud.ac.uk/news/hudd-lines/ news_stories/08_07_stories/customer_service_award.html

UK Government Cabinet Office (2010), Customer Service Excellence: The Government Standard, available at: www.cse.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/homeCSE.do

Webster, D. and Flowers, B.S. (2009), "Community forum: research libraries in the digital age", Journal of Library Administration, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 303-10.

Yin, R.K. (2003), Case Study Research: Methods and Design, 3rd ed., Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA. Zeithaml, V.A., Bitner, M.J. and Gremler, D.D. (2009), Services Marketing, 5th ed., McGraw Hill, Boston, MA.