



Qualitative methods for engaging students in performance measurement

Journal:	<i>Information and Learning Science</i>
Manuscript ID	ILS-09-2017-0093
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	qualitative methods, academic libraries, focus groups, User Experience, ethnography, student engagement

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Qualitative methods for engaging students in performance measurement

Background and introduction

This article will look at how libraries can engage with students in their performance measurement activities. In the modern 'student focused' university setting, quality assurance and continual service improvement have become increasingly important in the delivery of academic library services. Working in partnership with their students, academic libraries can enable meaningful engagement, through qualitative methods which allow individual students to contribute to service development. Student engagement within universities is not a new phenomenon, but clarity as to what makes a strong student partnership has become more and more important as students and their institutions seek to define what sort of "collaborations" they are involved in together (Streeting and Wise, 2009). Working together on 'quality' is one such area and this manifests itself in libraries through engagement in performance measurement. The 2011 white paper "*Higher Education: Students at the Heart of the System*" set out a clear strategy for making the higher education system in the UK more accountable to students and to put them into a stronger position to influence the sector (Department for Business, Innovation, and Skills, 2011), and more recently this has been further validated through the 2016 white paper "*Success as a Knowledge Economy: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice*" which stresses the importance of quality in higher education and student involvement in defining and shaping this (Department for Business, Innovation, and Skills, 2016).

Method

Through a review of relevant UK and US literature sources, discussion around the emergent themes and some case study examples, this paper will illustrate how effective student engagement through qualitative methods can contribute to the quality assurance, performance measurement and ultimate service improvement of academic libraries. A wide range of literature has been consulted including papers from both library and information science and educational studies disciplines. Much of the discussion from the literature is triangulated through referenced examples of student engagement in academic libraries and these are used throughout the paper. Many of the student engagement examples used are around the development of academic library space and a significant case study is used in order to illustrate some of the qualitative methods under discussion.

Objectives

1
2
3 The main aim of the paper is to present, in a cohesive manner, a variety of qualitative
4 methods used to engage students in order to measure performance in academic libraries.
5 Where theory is discussed, real life examples are used to link this to practice and specific
6 objectives of the paper include: establishing 'partnership' at the heart of student engagement
7 and in doing so providing a framework for discussing particular student engagement
8 practices; breaking down different approaches to student engagement in academic libraries
9 and using 'space planning' as a real-life activity in which students are often engaged;
10 discussing the application of specific qualitative methods of academic library student
11 engagement including focus groups, reflective activities, and the ethnographic and
12 anthropological techniques afforded from a User Experience methodology.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Performance measurement in academic libraries

20
21 In discussing the theme of assessing the value and impact of academic library services it is
22 necessary to review the literature available about quality and performance measurement in
23 libraries.
24
25

26 "Performance measurement is central to library management, since without a firm grasp on
27 what is actually being achieved it is impossible to move forward to improved service, or even
28 to maintain the status quo" (Brophy, 2006, p.1)
29
30

31 Academic librarians have measured the quality, performance and the impact of their services
32 for a long time in order to inform how they operate in the present and how they might
33 operate in the future. That is to say the present measure of performance, and the judgement
34 made on how well the library is performing provides the benchmark as to how the library
35 should be performing in the future. Essentially, performance measurement and evaluation is
36 used in order to make comparative assessments against standards and targets
37
38
39

40
41 With this in mind, academic libraries have always attempted to measure their performance in
42 order to justify themselves through demonstrating value and impact, and to make business
43 cases for resources and developments. Such measurements previously focused on usage of
44 libraries and resources and metrics around quantities (e.g. number of visits, number of
45 loans, number of downloads). Being able to generate quantitative data about library usage
46 provides evidence as to how libraries are being used, how busy they are and how usage
47 compares over time. In addition there are examples of many academic libraries use metrics
48 and learner analytics to demonstrate impact on outcomes such as retention and
49 achievement by students in their respective institutions. The JISC Library Impact Data
50 Project is such an example, in that it demonstrates a quantitative method of assessing library
51 impact which goes beyond standard usage metrics and attempts to demonstrate a causal
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 relationship between library use and academic achievement (Stone, Patten and Ramsden,
4 2012)
5

6
7 However, alongside the use of quantitative methods, library managers are increasingly
8 turning to qualitative methods in order to further enhance and strengthen their performance
9 measurement activities. Qualitative and quantitative research methods are often dealt with
10 separately and along with this division there is, according to Berg (2009, p.2) an unwritten
11 hierarchy in research circles that quantitative research is considered to be more rigorous,
12 more reliable and more precise. Traditionally, librarians, wishing to demonstrate rigour in
13 their measures tended to favour the quantitative approaches as favoured by other social
14 scientists. However with emergence of the importance of the 'library user' methods needed
15 to be deployed which "attempt to understand behaviour and institutions by getting to know
16 the persons involved and their values, rituals, symbols, beliefs, and emotions" (Nachmias
17 and Worth-Nachmias, 2008, p.257). In other words the measures that today's academic
18 librarian requires need to be meaningful and need to be able to describe the value and the
19 impact that the library has on individual students.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 "Quantitative methodology assumes the objective reality of social facts, where qualitative
28 assumes social constructions of reality" (Gorman and Clayton, 2005 ; 24) This suggests that
29 where quantitative data obtained through survey questions and statistical returns presents
30 us with definitive factual information (i.e. x number of book issues, x% of satisfied users,
31 etc.), qualitative methods will help to validate those facts through 'real life' examples.
32 Qualitative methods for performance measurement in library and information services are
33 often more revealing when they are based on direct contact with library users. Indeed, such
34 direct contact can help to validate quantitative findings. Qualitative methods encourage
35 observation, discussion and reflection and can help librarians to identify issues and problems
36 and get to the details of such situations, or conversely can help to demonstrate the impact
37 and value that a library service has on its users.
38
39
40
41
42

43 Partnership and student engagement in Higher Education

44
45 Historically, student engagement has been around for some time and in recent years has
46 become a catch all term for involving students in collective problem solving in higher
47 education institutions (Owen, 2013). In most higher education institutions student
48 engagement is used effectively as a tool to enhance learning and teaching (Trowler, 2010),
49 and indeed, until recently, student representation and student feedback into teaching and
50 learning activities was the accepted means of achieving such engagement (Little *et al.*
51 2009). Engagement occurs when there is a strong partnership between the student and the
52 area of the university in which they are working or dealing with. An effective partnership, in a
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 university setting requires a relationship with the students which enables dialogues or
4 activities which are mutually beneficial. The whole concept of a partnership is that there are
5 multiple “partners” involved (e.g. academics, libraries, service departments, students, etc.),
6 all of whom need to be proactive in the relationship.
7
8
9

10 A piece of research by Carey (2013a) into student participation and engagement in their
11 curriculum development demonstrated that partnership is not a one off exchange but should
12 be an ongoing process that should characterise the whole student experience. The case
13 study actively engages students at all stages of the curriculum development cycle and the
14 subsequent research provides an opportunity to explore engagement procedures that extend
15 beyond the reliance on performance and evaluation data (e.g. from post module surveys,
16 etc.) which are often a proxy for an authentic student voice (Coates, 2005)
17
18
19
20
21

22 At this point it is worthwhile looking at the concept of “students as customers” or the
23 ‘consumer model’ of higher education in the UK. This notion brings with it much discussion
24 with many commentators suggesting that a consumer culture within higher education in the
25 UK is detrimental to the pedagogical aspects of the university experience in that the
26 educational experience becomes viewed as a commodity and the actual value of that
27 experience is lost (Molesworth *et al.* 2009). However, it can also be argued that the concept
28 of ‘the student voice’ has come directly from this consumerist model. Subsequently, higher
29 education has sought many ways in which to engage the student as ‘customers’ and the
30 notion of the student as such has been widely embraced by universities (Little *et al.* 2009).
31 The “consumer” model has also brought with it many positive “student engagement” and
32 “student experience” initiatives and universities are now increasingly concerned about
33 meeting students’ needs and demands and ensuring that students have a “voice” where
34 decisions about the student experience are made (Maringe, 2010). It is important to note,
35 that whilst some scholars accept that a ‘consumer model’ of higher education exists and
36 might be the cause of an increase in student engagement activity, there is an equal amount
37 of research which questions the notion of this model entirely and concludes that students
38 themselves do not see themselves as customers or consumers of higher education and
39 don’t display consumerist behaviours in their engagement with their studies (Saunders,
40 2015; Tomlinson, 2017)
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Regardless of its origins, student engagement is now seen as a means by which universities
52 can get to understand and enhance the student experience and this is often now achieved
53 by having student representation on decision making bodies (Trowler, 2010). Carey (2013b)
54 suggests that student engagement has become increasingly part of higher education rhetoric
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and is seen as a means for universities to understand and enhance the student experience.
4 This has resulted from a growing consumerism in higher education and a drive for
5 universities to form partnerships with students.
6
7

8 9 Student engagement in libraries

10 This drive to provide excellent student experiences have had a profound effect on how
11 academic libraries engage with users, in order to seek feedback, work in partnership and to
12 continually improve and develop services in a responsive manner. There are many example
13 of progressive and proactive student engagement methods in academic libraries in general
14 over recent years.
15
16
17

18
19 Everitt (2015) talks about how at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) library, a
20 range of tools are used to engage students in order to understand their needs and
21 requirements. This includes techniques such as process mapping, web surveys, exit surveys
22 and observational techniques, as well as suggestion and course feedback forms.
23

24 As well as developing library services, student engagement can also assist in performance
25 measurement and provides key evidence to the impact and value that the modern academic
26 library needs to continually demonstrate. Tilley (2013) suggests that being able to
27 personalise library services, through a range of engagement activities, allows her to
28 demonstrate the impact that her [personalised] library services have on her students.
29 Another example of engagement demonstrating impact can be found in 'Customer Value
30 Discovery' approach deployed at Nottingham Trent University, which asks the basic and
31 fundamental question: what was it about the library service that helped you [the student],
32 achieve success (McKnight and Berrington, 2008). In both these examples having a clear
33 customer focus and an embedded approach to service evaluation is important in developing
34 and demonstrating 'valued' academic library services.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 As well as 'capturing the student voice' through methods such as those illustrated above,
44 student engagement lends itself to more discursive techniques, which would fall naturally
45 into the 'qualitative' side of research methods. Whether intentionally operating within a
46 consumerist model, or driven by external kite-marks such as Customer Service Excellence,
47 more and more academic libraries are engaging their students in dialogue in order to affirm
48 their partnerships, measure their performance and ultimately improve services. What is
49 interesting about this is the willingness of most, if not all, academic libraries (certainly in the
50 UK) to adapt to this 'new managerialism' has led to lots of creativity and innovation when it
51 comes to qualitative methods of engaging with students. A selection of such examples
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 include: the 'Are students at the heart of our processes' initiative at the University of
4 Leicester library, in which students and library staff work in partnership reflecting on library
5 processes (Aitkens *et al*, 2015); library critical friends and focussed discussion forums at
6 Liverpool John Moores University (Appleton and Abernethy, 2013); and customer journey
7 mapping in order to see how students interact with services and facilities at Birmingham City
8 University (Andrews and Eade, 2013)
9
10
11
12

13 Student engagement in library space planning

14 Students can be engaged in all kinds of planning for academic library services and some of
15 the above examples feature engagement initiatives in which students are consulted about
16 the resources and facilities available to them in their libraries, as well service models and
17 staff support activity. Qualitative methods can be applied in all of these areas, but one of the
18 main areas of provision in which qualitative methods can be used to best effect is in the
19 planning and design of library space. Students have opinions and thoughts about all aspects
20 of library provision. With regard to the selection and availability of learning resources for
21 examples (e.g.: texts, monographs, journal, e-journals, etc.) librarians will often react to
22 comments such as 'I can never find the books I need', 'there aren't enough psychology
23 books' or 'not enough copies of reading list items' when they appear in surveys. Such
24 reactive behaviour is almost expected within quality assurance and performance
25 measurement frameworks in academic libraries, in that the library needs to be responsive
26 and being able to acquire additional titles or copies of books is regarded as positive and
27 responsive action. However, it is the area of library design and space planning, where
28 students can truly have a 'voice' and effect decision making and continuous improvement,
29 especially where qualitative techniques have been used in a proactive manner. There are
30 some excellent examples in existence of this in academic libraries. It is also not a new
31 concept as there is evidence of engaging students and users in academic library space
32 design spanning the last twenty years. For example, in 2006, Bennett discusses the notion
33 of asking key questions and setting objectives when designing higher education learning
34 spaces and identifies student engagement through questioning them about their learning
35 needs and behaviours as being a fundamental part of this (Bennett, 2006). Andrews, Wright
36 and Raskin (2015) examine the various qualitative student engagement they have deployed
37 at Cornell University over a period of eight years (2007 – 2015). Their longitudinal reflection
38 includes techniques such as interviews, usability testing and anticipatory design exercises,
39 all of which have helped to redesign the collaborative study spaces at their university
40 library. A similar study from Victoria University of Wellington discusses different qualitative
41 customer engagement techniques and illustrates this with some interesting case studies
42 around how users were engaged in library space planning across a number of different
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 initiatives. This included interactive feedback boards for a new build project and focus
4 groups aimed at specifically engaging Maori students in planning the spaces in which to
5 house library material with significant Maori content (Esson *et al.*, 2012)
6
7

8 9 Engagement through focus groups

10 “Focus group interviews typically have five characteristics or features: (1) people,
11 who (2) possess certain characteristics, (3) provide qualitative data (4) in a focused
12 discussion (5) to help understand the topic of interest.” (Krueger & Casey, 2009)
13
14
15

16 Focus groups had originally been popular in the commercial world amongst market
17 researchers, but have since become an acceptable method for academic research.
18 Once this was the case, the focus became less about consumer products and more
19 about issues such as community, education, social issues and public policy (Morgan,
20 1997). Focus groups encourage discussion and reflection and well-constructed
21 questioning can reveal deep and focused data, which is why this has become a
22 standard method for data capture in social science research (Bloor *et al.*, 2002)
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The focus group is now a well-established qualitative method used in the social
31 sciences and is used to generate broad discussion amongst participants which then
32 narrows down to focus on particular key issues. The role of the facilitator in these
33 situations is very important in encouraging positive discussion without actually
34 directing or controlling the flow of the discussion.
35
36
37
38

39 Where this lends itself to academic libraries as a performance measurement method
40 is in the discussion and reflection that it affords amongst student users. Students can
41 often go into far more detail of a current issue or situation based on their own
42 observations and experiences and their focused discussions can help to validate or
43 triangulate data obtained through other quantitative methods such as surveys or
44 observations.
45
46
47
48

49 Used in isolation and without any objectives, focus groups can sometimes become
50 ‘moaning sessions’ for those participating. For this reason, it is important that the
51 facilitator is skilled and focused and is able to lead the discussion effectively. Focus
52 groups are one of the more common qualitative methods used by academic libraries
53 and there is no shortage of examples of their effective use. Conrad and Alvarez
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 (2016) provide a very informative discussion of why academic libraries should use
4 focus groups and concentrate specifically on using focus groups to discuss library
5 Web interfaces and platforms with students. In their discussions they suggest that
6 focus groups can be an effective starting point, and whilst often don't lead to any
7 immediate significant service improvements they do in fact provide lots of relevant
8 data for larger decisions and often validate findings and data from elsewhere (i.e.
9 library surveys)

10
11
12
13
14
15 Similarly, current examples of where focus groups have been used effectively in
16 library space planning and design include an initiative at Newcastle University where
17 a deliberate and systematic approach to student engagement was used to inform the
18 refurbishment of two floors of the main university library. As part of a mixed method
19 approach students were employed to take part in a number of engagement initiatives
20 including observations and conducting exit polls as well as conducting focus
21 groups (Oddy, 2015). This is quite typical of academic libraries, in that those that are
22 able to engage students, make use of focus groups as part of a wider mixed method.
23 Often multiple sources of data are useful for triangulating and validating findings.
24 Another useful example of this is the piece of work conducted at Liverpool John
25 Moores University in which focus groups were used to initially surface student
26 thoughts and feedback on their library and learning spaces, before being invited to
27 complete reflective diaries in order to explore more deeply what students felt and
28 thought about the spaces in which they learnt (Appleton, 2014)

39 40 Engagement through reflective activities

41 Reflective logs and diaries are also useful for confirming and validating data
42 retrieved from other methods. That is they can provide anecdotal evidence of the
43 findings of surveys or usage statistics, or further discussion to add to the findings of
44 a focus group. As both a research method and a performance measure reflective
45 diaries and logs come in for quite a lot of criticism. Slater (1990) regards them as
46 recorded self-observations and as such suggests that they are too subjective to be
47 effective as performance measurement. However, in her book "Research methods in
48 information" Pickard suggest that they are unfortunately, largely overlooked and
49 argues that they can be of use by offering insight into the behaviour, feelings and
50 thoughts of those taking part (Pickard, 2006, p. 211).

1
2
3 The above example from Liverpool John Moores University illustrates how reflective
4 logs can be used alongside other methods such as focus groups and after first using
5 reflective logs for engaging students in library space planning a further initiative was
6 carried out where students were invited to the focus was on accessibility of electronic
7 library services. Sykes (2015) discusses how the method has been effective, but its
8 limits can be improved upon through some minor revisions (e.g. timing of reflective
9 logs, encouraging students to discuss 'feelings', etc.) and there are plans to continue
10 using reflective logs to engage students in future space planning and design
11 projects.
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 A similar technique has been very successfully deployed in the library at Edge Hill
19 University, who adopted a student diary mapping approach having discovered the
20 success of the ERIAL¹ project and the Library Study² at Fresno State University
21 (Delcore *et al.*, 2009). Students were asked to complete real time diaries in which
22 they recorded all their activities related to learning, including thoughts, feelings and
23 barriers. The diaries included illustrative maps and photographs and students were
24 then asked to reflect, through discussion with library staff, on their diary findings. The
25 method has allowed for a unique insight into how library spaces are used by
26 students and this will help to inform continual service improvements (Ramsden &
27 Carey, 2014)
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Engagement through User Experience (UX)

37
38 The above mentioned focus group and reflective methods have become increasingly popular
39 performance measurement methods utilised in academic libraries. This leads neatly into the
40 final qualitative area that this paper will discuss, as both aforementioned methods fall under
41 the User Experience umbrella. UX has become very popular as a qualitative research
42 method in academic libraries over recent years. Priestner and Borg (2016) suggest that this
43 is a response to the fact that the traditional quantitative metrics and measures used by
44 academic libraries (e.g. statistics on footfall, holdings, loans, renewals, database use,
45 downloads, views, social media followers, etc.) don't reveal anything about the success or
46 quality of the interaction experienced by the library user and ultimately the value or impact
47 that this has on the user, and that increasingly this is what academic libraries are asked to
48 evidence. They suggest that the focus in UK higher education on 'student experience' has
49 led library managers to look at how and why library users use libraries in the way that they
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 do (as opposed to the ways in which librarians think that they use them) in order to better
4 understand what users want from libraries. (Priestner & Borg, 2016)
5
6

7 UX for libraries involves a suite of techniques based around first understanding and then
8 improving the experience that users have when using libraries. One of the fundamental
9 principles of UX is that it uses ethnographic methods to achieve this. Ethnography is “a way
10 of studying cultures through observation, participation and other qualitative techniques with a
11 view to better understanding the subject’s point of view an experience of the world”.
12 (Priestner, 2015). Until recently UX was largely applied by libraries to the design and
13 usability of websites and systems interfaces, but academic libraries have now shown
14 willingness to interpret UX in a broader approach and now increasingly use ethnographic
15 methods when exploring the UX experience in the design of their physical spaces (Bryant,
16 Matthews & Walton, 2009). The notion of ‘design’ is a key one within UX. The delivery of
17 high quality, high performing library services is the aim of every library manager and
18 effective services need to be ‘designed’. Schmidt (2010) suggests librarians are quite often
19 unknowingly involved in design, in as much as every operational management decision (e.g.
20 about loan periods, where to house a collection, how to create access to a collection,
21 introducing new services, etc.) are all decisions about the design of the library service. What
22 UX does is ensure that the users’ behaviours, use and expectation of the library service are
23 behind any such decisions.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Ethnography and anthropology 35

36 UX in academic libraries makes use of a suite of techniques based around first
37 understanding and then improving the experience that students have when using libraries.
38 One of the fundamental principles of UX is that it uses ethnographic methods to achieve this.
39 Ethnography in libraries has been around for some time and there exists a wealth of
40 excellent and interesting case studies of successful ethnographic and anthropological library
41 studies (Foster and Gibbons, 2007; Suarez, 2007; Delcore *et al.*, 2009; White, 2009; Duke &
42 Asher, 2012). Similarly, there are well documented examples of library user engagement
43 and involvement in academic library service deign (Trischler & Kelly, 2016). In all these
44 examples ethnographic techniques are used to observe and then further inform
45 developments in many different aspects of library and information services and activity (e.g.
46 collection management, resource discovery, information seeking behaviour, library
47 instruction, space planning, etc.)
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In a similar way to the qualitative methods which have already been discussed, UX is
4 particularly useful for engaging students in library space planning and design. UX effectively
5 makes use of ethnographic approaches in order to see how library users actually use the
6 resources, services and spaces provided by the library, which in turn can contribute to
7 service improvement and development.
8
9

10 11 UX methods

12 Examples of UX methods include: observation of user movement in the library (to see where
13 users naturally physically travel to within their library spaces as opposed to where the
14 librarians think they travel to); observation of activity within given spaces (to see how users
15 naturally behave in demarked spaces and environments); walking through library spaces with
16 users to observe and discuss how they use the library; focused discussion with library users
17 about what works for them and what doesn't; diaries and reflective exercises about users'
18 experience of the library; observation of alternative library spaces; directed storytelling;
19 unstructured interviews; photo studies; cognitive mapping, etc.

20 By engaging students using one or more of these methods, library managers are able to
21 generate significant quantities of data which then needs to be analysed. Ramsden (2016)
22 discusses how data from UX projects needs to be effectively collected and analysed, and
23 that there needs to be a coding process and a critical standpoint needs to be assumed.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 UAL UX case study

33 A good example of the use of UX as a means to engage students in the planning and design
34 of library spaces is that of the University of the Arts London (UAL) (Appleton *et al.*, 2016).
35 During 2015, the university announced several estates and new build projects, all of which
36 had huge implications for the university's Library Services. Being involved in new build
37 projects allowed Library Services the opportunity to consider how best to engage and
38 consult students in the development of their physical library spaces. In seeking a method for
39 such student engagement it was necessary to take into account some particular
40 circumstances:
41
42
43
44
45
46

- 47 • The long term nature of some of the new build projects (5 years for London College
48 of Communication and London College of Fashion) means that any students involved
49 now, are unlikely to still be students when the new builds are completed.
- 50 • Ascertaining learning space needs and requirements in the future
- 51 • Engagement current students in order to have an impact on both the long term and
52 the short term? (i.e. whilst they are still students)
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

1
2
3 UAL Library Service therefore embarked upon a substantive UX project, which was designed
4 in order to engage students in the design and planning of the new library spaces, but also in
5 the performance measurement of the existing library spaces. This was regarded as a key
6 objective of the project in that students would potentially see the benefits of any
7 developments themselves in the short term. The UX project at UAL allowed Library Services
8 to explore current student learning behaviours in order to effectively develop library and
9 learning spaces both presently and in the future. The UAL Library Services UX project used
10 specific specific observational and qualitative methods for gathering intelligence within the
11 overall methodology:
12
13
14
15

- 16
17 • Observation of student movements within library spaces – this is achieved through
18 placing observers at vantage points throughout the libraries and Learning Zones, and
19 at specific times of the day to observe and map how students move through given
20 learning spaces. This is a popular way to see if signposting works, or whether
21 students use particular preferred routes through the library and of there are particular
22 physical paths of least resistance within spaces. It is also a good method to see
23 where the popular or unpopular destinations are.
24
25
- 26
27 • Observation of static spaces – this technique places observers at particular vantage
28 points (i.e. communal areas, silent zones, photocopy areas) to see how the area or
29 space is naturally used. This achieves some of the objectives of the space
30 observations, but also allows the observer to see which natural behaviours occur
31 within given areas.
32
33
- 34
35 • Touchstone tours – Touchstone tours involve walking around the Library or Learning
36 Zone with the user being observed in order to question and discuss the user's regular
37 experience of the space. This allows for individuals to present their subjective views.
38 Obtaining a critical mass of these within a given learning space can help to establish
39 well used and underused areas of the space as well as common likes and dislikes. It
40 is also a useful channel for getting suggestions for service improvements from users.
41
42
43
44
45

46 One of the unique elements of the UAL UX project, and why it can be used as a good
47 example of how to engage students, is the way in which current students were deployed in
48 order to complete the anthropological field work. As well as needing to observe students and
49 engage them in touchstone tours, students were also engaged in facilitating the project, and
50 a team of 12 current UAL students, representative of the university's six colleges, was
51 recruited and deployed to spend two weeks carrying out the observations in all of the college
52 Libraries and Learning Zones. The team was trained in the observational techniques and
53 their time was split evenly amongst the three observational methods described above. Once
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 the observation phase had been completed the student observers took part in a 'debrief'
4 day, where their insight into what they had observed was surfaced as well as engaging in a
5 discussion about the actual observation methods, in order to find out what worked well, and
6 what could be refined in the methods, if the UX approach was to be used again in the future.
7 One of the outputs from the 'debrief' day was the headline themes which had come from the
8 observations. These were then used in a series of focus group, held at each college in order
9 to research the students' experiences of their library spaces more deeply. More students
10 were then engaged in participating in the focus groups and in completing reflective journals
11 about their use of learning spaces.
12
13
14
15

16
17 Student representatives were then further engaged during the data analysis period in the
18 summer of 2015, as some of the original observation team were then employed to perform
19 the data analysis on all the individual element of the UX project (i.e. observations, focus
20 groups, reflective logs) for the final reporting and recommendations for both short and long
21 term library space design and planning.
22
23
24
25
26

27 Conclusion

28
29 The UAL UX project has provided a useful example of using a mixed qualitative method
30 approach for engaging students in library space planning. Being able to adopt such a
31 methodology as a formal channel of student engagement and as an instrument for
32 consultative service improvement has proved invaluable for UAL Library Services in this
33 instance. Throughout the paper other examples have been provided which have aimed to
34 illustrate how a range of qualitative method can be used in order engage students in
35 performance measurement of libraries. The examples have focused largely on focus groups,
36 reflective journals and UX and all have been applied to student engagement in the planning
37 and design of library space, a an easily accessible area for students to be engaged in.
38 Through placing the user at the heart of the method. The qualitative methods discussed
39 really harness the concept of the student as the customer and really focuses on the quality
40 of their experience. The methods seek to identify how the library has a positive impact on the
41 user by finding out exactly how the user interacts and uses the library's services, facilities
42 and resources. In particular, UX is proving to be an invaluable method in providing deep
43 insights into what the student values about their library and similarly what they don't.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 References

54
55 Aitkins, J., Baines, H., Donohue, N., Hannis, J. and Patel, D. (2015) "Digging deeper:
56 developing our capability to understand our users." SCOUNL Focus No. 64, pp. 18 –
57

1
2
3 21. Available at: https://www.sconul.ac.uk/sites/default/files/documents/6_15.pdf
4 (accessed 30 April, 2017)

5
6 Andrews, C., Wright, S. E. and Raskin, H. (2016) "Library learning spaces:
7 investigating libraries and investing in student feedback" *Journal of Library*
8 *Administration*, Vol. 56 no. 6, pp. 647 - 672. DOI: 10.1080/01930826.2015.1105556

9
10 Andrews, J. and Eade, E. (2013) "Listening to students: customer journey mapping
11 at Birmingham City University Library and Learning Resources" *New Review of*
12 *Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 161 – 177

13
14 Appleton, L. (2014), 'Tell us what you think: engaging with students in library space planning'
15 [online] #UKAnthrolib Blog Available at: [https://ukanthrolib.wordpress.com/2014/08/19/tell-](https://ukanthrolib.wordpress.com/2014/08/19/tell-us-what-you-think-engaging-with-students-in-library-space-planning/)
16 [us-what-you-think-engaging-with-students-in-library-space-planning/](https://ukanthrolib.wordpress.com/2014/08/19/tell-us-what-you-think-engaging-with-students-in-library-space-planning/)
17 (Accessed 30 April 2017)

18
19
20 Appleton, L. and Abernethy, P. (2013) "We said...we did!: a partnership approach to
21 developing library and student support services." *New Review of Academic*
22 *Librarianship*, Vol. 19 no. 2, pp. 208 - 220

23
24 Appleton, L, Batch, J, Olsson, T. and Reed, S., (2016) Engaging students through
25 user experience at the University of the Arts, London. *SCONUL Focus*, Vol. 57. pp. 59
26 – 67. Available at: https://www.sconul.ac.uk/sites/default/files/documents/14_20.pdf
27 (accessed 30 April, 2017)

28
29 Bennett, S. (2006) "First questions for designing higher education learning spaces"
30 *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 14 - 26

31
32 Berg, B. (2009) *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, 7th ed.
33 Boston, MA : Allyn and Bacon

34
35 Bloor, M, Frankland, J., Thomas, M. and Robson, K., (2002), *Focus Groups in Social*
36 *Research*, London : Sage.

37
38 Brophy, P. (2006) *Measuring Library Performance: Principles and Techniques*.
39 London : Facet Publishing.

40
41 Bryant, J., Matthews, G. & Walton, G. (2009) 'Academic libraries and social learning
42 space: a case study of Loughborough University Library, UK' *Journal of Librarianship*
43 *and Information Science*, Vol. 41 no. 1, pp. 7 – 18.

44
45
46 Carey, P. (2013a) "Representation and student engagement in higher education: a reflection
47 on the views and experiences of course representatives." *Journal of Further and Higher*
48 *Education*, Vol. 37 no. 1, pp. 71-88.

49
50 Carey, P. (2013b) "Student as co-producer in a marketised higher education system: a case
51 study of students' experience of participation in curriculum design." *Innovations in Education*
52 *and Teaching International*, Vol. 50 no. 3, pp. 250-260.

53
54 Coates, H. (2005) "The value of student engagement for higher education quality
55 assurance", *Quality Assurance in Higher Education*, Vol. 11 no. 1, pp. 25-36

1
2
3 Conrad, S. and Alvarez, N. (2016) "Conversations with Web site users: using focus groups
4 to open discussion and improve user experience. *Journal of web Librarianship* Vol. 10 no. 2,
5 pp. 53 – 82 DOI: 10.1080/19322909.2016.1161572

6
7 Delcore, H. D., Mullooly, J., Scroggins, M., Arnold, K., Franco, E., & Gaspar, J. (2009). *The*
8 *Library Study at Fresno State*. Available at:
9 <http://www.fresnostate.edu/socialsciences/anthropology/ipa/thelibrarystudy.html> (accessed
10 30 April, 2017)

11
12 Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, (2011). *Higher Education: Students at the*
13 *Heart of the System*. London, Dept. for Business, Innovation and Skills

14
15 Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, (2016). *Success as a Knowledge Economy:*
16 *Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice*. London, Dept. for Business,
17 Innovation and Skills

18
19 Duke, L. M., & Asher, A. D. (Eds.). (2012). *College Libraries and Student Culture: What We*
20 *Now Know*. Chicago: American Library Association.

21
22
23 Esson, R., Stevenson, A., Gildea, M. and Roberts, S. (2012) "Library services for the future:
24 engaging with our customers to determine wants and needs" *Library Management*, Vol. 33
25 no. 8/9, pp. 469 - 478

26
27 Everitt, R. (2015) "Stop over-thinking: basic tools for understanding stakeholder
28 needs", *SCONUL Focus*, Vol. 64, pp. 27 – 30. Available at:
29 https://www.sconul.ac.uk/sites/default/files/documents/8_17.pdf (accessed 30 April,
30 2017)

31
32 Foster, N. F. and Gibbons, S. (2007). *Studying Students : The Undergraduate Research*
33 *Project at the University of Rochester*. Chicago: Association of College and Research
34 Libraries. Available at:
35 [http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org/acrl/files/content/publications/booksanddigitalresources/](http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org/acrl/files/content/publications/booksanddigitalresources/digital/Foster-Gibbons_cmpd.pdf)
36 [digital/Foster-Gibbons_cmpd.pdf](http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org/acrl/files/content/publications/booksanddigitalresources/digital/Foster-Gibbons_cmpd.pdf) (accessed 30 April, 2017)

37
38
39 Gorman, G. E. and Clayton, P. (2005) *Qualitative Research for the Information*
40 *Professional: a Practical Handbook*, 2nd ed. London ; Facet Publishing

41
42 Krueger, R. and Casey, M.-A. (2009), *Focus Groups: a practical guide for applied*
43 *research*, 4th ed. Los Angeles, Sage.

44
45 Little, B., Locke, W., Scesa, A. and Williams, R. (2009), *Report to HEFCE on Student*
46 *Engagement*, Bristol: HEFCE

47
48 Maringe, F. (2010), "The student as consumer: affordances and constraints in a transforming
49 higher education environment", in Molesworth, M., Scullion, R. and Nixon, E. (Eds) *The*
50 *Marketisation of Higher Education and The Student as Consumer*, London: Routledge, pp.
51 142-154.

52
53 McKnight, S. and Berrington, M. (2008) "Improving customer satisfaction: changes as a
54 result of customer value discovery". *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, Vol. 3
55 no. 1, pp. 33 - 52

1
2
3 Molesworth, M., Nixon, E. and Scullion, R. (2009) "Having, being and higher education: the
4 marketisation of the university and the transformation of the student into consumer.
5 *Teaching in Higher Education*, Vol. 14 no. 3, pp. 277–87.

6
7 Morgan, D. (1997) *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, Sage.

8
9 Nachmias, D. and Worth-Nachmias, C. (2008) *Research Methods in the Social
10 Sciences*, 7th ed. New York : Worth Publishers

11
12 Oddy, E. (2015) "Embracing the student voice", *SCONUL Focus* Vol. 64. pp. 31 - 33
13 Available at: http://www.sconul.ac.uk/sites/default/files/documents/10_14.pdf (Accessed 30
14 April 2016)

15
16 Owen, D. (2013) "Haven't we seen it all before?: historical themes in student
17 engagement", in Dunne, E. & Derfel, O. (Eds), *The Student Engagement handbook:
18 Practice in Higher Education*, Bingley: Emerald, pp. 5 – 21.

19
20 Pickard, A. (2006), *Research Methods in Information*, London : Facet

21
22 Priestner, A. (2015) 'UXLibs: a new breed of conference' *Cilip Update* (May 2015), pp. 31 –
23 33

24
25 Priestner, A. and Borg, M. (2016) "Uncovering Complexity and Detail : the UX Proposition" in
26 A. Priestner & M. Borg (eds) *User Experience in Libraries: Applying Ethnography and
27 Human-Centred Design*. London : Routledge, pp. 1 - 8

28
29
30 Ramsden, B. (2016) "Using Ethnographic Methods to Study Library Use" in A. Priestner & M.
31 Borg (eds) *User Experience in Libraries: Applying Ethnography and Human-Centred Design*.
32 London : Routledge, pp. 9 - 20

33
34
35 Ramsden, M. and Carey, C. (2014) "Spaces for learning?: student diary mapping at Edge
36 Hill University" *SCONUL Focus* Vol. 62, pp. 7 - 10 Available at:
37 http://www.sconul.ac.uk/sites/default/files/documents/3_13.pdf (Accessed 30 April 2017)

38
39 Saunders, D. B. (2015) "They do not buy it: exploring the extent to which entering first-year
40 students view themselves as customers" *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* Vol. 25
41 no. 1, pp. 5 - 28

42
43 Schmidt, A. (2010) "New column launch: the user experience. *Library Journal*, January 2015.
44 Available at: [http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2010/01/opinion/aaron-schmidt/new-column-launch-
45 the-user-experience/](http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2010/01/opinion/aaron-schmidt/new-column-launch-the-user-experience/) (accessed 30 April, 2017)

46
47 Slater, M. (1990), *Research Methods in Library and Information Studies*. London :
48 Library Association

49
50 Stone, G, Pattern, D. and Ramsden, B. (2012), "The Library Impact Data Project: hit,
51 miss or maybe." in Hall, I., Thornton, S. and Town, S. (eds) *Proving value in
52 challenging times: proceedings of the 9th Northumbria International Conference on
53 Performance Measurement in Libraries and Information Services*. University of York
54 Press, York, pp. 385 – 390.

1
2
3 Streeting, W. and Wise, G. (2009) *Rethinking the Values of Higher Education: Consumption, Partnership, Community?*, Gloucester: Quality Assurance Agency for
4 Higher Education.
5

6
7 Sykes, E. (2015) "Gathering user insight on a shoestring" *SCONUL Focus* Vol. 64,
8 pp. 68 - 71 Available at:
9 https://www.sconul.ac.uk/sites/default/files/documents/18_12.pdf (accessed 30 April,
10 2017)
11

12 Suarez, D. (2007). "What students do when they study in the library: using ethnographic
13 methods to observe student behavior." *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special*
14 *Librarianship*, Vol. 8 no. 3, pp. 1–19. Available at:
15 http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v08n03/suarez_d01.html (accessed 30 April,
16 2017)
17

18
19 Trischler, J. and Kelly, K. (2016) "User involvement in the design of new library services;
20 learning from the application of Codesign on library service design projects. In Atkinson, J.
21 (ed.) *Quality and the Academic Library: Reviewing, Assessing and Enhancing Service*
22 *Provision*. Cambridge (MA): Chandos. pp. 111 – 120.
23

24 Tilley, E. (2013) "Personalised boutique services: critical to academic library success?" *New*
25 *Review of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 19 no. 1, pp. 78 - 97
26

27 Tomlinson, M. (2017) "Student perceptions of themselves and 'consumers' of higher
28 education" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 34 no. 4, pp. 450 - 467
29

30 Trowler, V. (2010) *Student Engagement Literature Review*, York: Higher Education
31 Academy.
32

33 White, C. T. (2009). *Studying Students: The Ethnographic Research Project at Rutgers (part*
34 *2)*. Available at:
35 http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/staff/groups/ethnography/reports/ERP_FinalReport_Phase_2.pdf
36 (accessed 30 April, 2017)
37

38 39 Notes

- 40
41 1. <http://www.erialproject.org/>
42
43 2. <http://www.fresnostate.edu/socialsciences/anthropology/ipa/thelibrarystudy.html>
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60