

Library Management

Decision Letter (LM-06-2020-0090)

From: ocosteve@gmail.com

To: dyah.srirahayu@vokasi.unair.ac.id

CC:

Subject: Library Management - Decision on Manuscript ID LM-06-2020-0090

Body: 13-Nov-2020

Dear Dr. Srirahayu:

Manuscript ID LM-06-2020-0090 entitled "Influence of Satisfaction and Loyalty on Net Promoter Score (NPS) in Academic Libraries in Indonesia" which you submitted to the Library Management, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript. A major revision requires a substantial revision. The paper will be reviewed again and unless it is up to standard it will fail. Work hard on the paper .

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/lm> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Library Management, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

To help support you on your publishing journey we have partnered with Editage, a leading global science communication platform, to offer expert editorial support including language editing and translation.

If your article has been rejected or revisions have been requested, you may benefit from Editage's services. For a full list of services, visit: authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/ Please note that there is no obligation to use Editage and using this service does not guarantee publication.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Library Management and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve O'Connor
Editor, Library Management
ocosteve@gmail.com

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:
Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:
Congratulations on the idea that underlies this research. It has strong conceptual and practical

potential. In addition, data from academic libraries in Indonesia will add to our understanding of the value of NPS across a range of sectors and countries.

Nonetheless, you can see from the comments I make against each criterion, that some revision is required. Your revised manuscript should (a) clearly and explicitly define the concepts you are studying; (b) justify the hypotheses you test; (c) adopt an analytical model and technique that clearly demonstrates the relationships between user satisfaction, loyalty and NPS after accounting for common variance at the library level (and, potentially, other sources of variance such as gender and field of study); (d) simplify and accurately interpret your results - do not repeat data that can be read in the tables and figures, but interpret for your reader; (e) discuss your own results relative to other studies described in the literature review and the limitations of your study; and (f) draw conclusions that consider implications of your results for library managers and stakeholders, users, and researchers in library management. More detail is provided with each numbered comment in my review.

Here, I add only some considerations about data analysis. I recommend you use a technique other than partial least squares modelling with PLS software. Why? Partial least squares modelling is a technique that combines principal components analysis (the outer or measurement model) with ordinary least squares (OLS) estimation of the path (inner or structural) model. OLS is the same estimation method used in regression analysis. PLS software has the advantage of efficiency over separate estimation of measures followed by hierarchical regression analysis, as you point out - but your conceptual model is so simple that these advantages are outweighed by the disadvantages. Furthermore, your justification for use of PLS software samples have been superseded both by developments in covariance-based modelling software and better understanding of the limitations of PLS (Baggio, R., & Klobas, J. (2017). *Quantitative Methods in Tourism: A Handbook* (2nd ed.). Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications; Henseler, J., Hubona, G., & Ray, P. A. (2016). Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: Updated guidelines. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 116(1), 2-20. doi:10.1108/IMDS-09-2015-0382).

The data suggest to me that multiple regression would serve your purposes better. This would allow you to build a single model that includes the higher level effect of library systems (using dummy variables) and the interaction of your two independent variables (user satisfaction and loyalty) as well as their direct effects. Alternatively, you might include gender and field of study (major), but you do not have enough data in all categories from each library to incorporate both library system and gender+major in the same model. If you continue with PLS, you will need to accurately estimate and interpret indirect / mediation effects.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes - subject to recommended corrections and revision. The paper tests the proposition that net provider score (NPS) in academic libraries is influenced by user satisfaction and loyalty. The results indicate the user satisfaction affects NPS indirectly, through loyalty. This is a very interesting result, which provides further evidence that NPS has the potential to be a single, low cost indicator of user behaviours associated with library performance.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The review of use of NPS in the library management literature is appropriate and up-to-date. However, a deeper discussion of NPS, and the concepts of loyalty and user satisfaction, is needed to justify the hypotheses. In particular, a definition of loyalty and its relationship with NPS is required (e.g., p. 4, lines 4-5 defines NPS, not incorrectly, as a measure of loyalty). There is no discussion of how NPS as an indicator of loyalty can differ from loyalty as a stand-alone concept.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Conceptual basis
Following on from the above comment, Reichheld's (2003) paper on the rationale behind NPS (cited in the manuscript) could be used in more depth to establish distinct definitions of the three concepts in the conceptual model (Figure 2). In any case, the three concepts need to be defined. Discussion of NPS should *explain* in specific terms why you propose NPS is valuable for academic libraries when the concept was developed for for-profit firms. Then, an explicit argument must be provided to explain each of the hypothesised relationships. At present, justification of the hypotheses is based on the discussion of word of mouth (WOM) on p. 5 (immediately below Figure 2, although WOM is first used at lines 44-45 on p. 3). However, this introduces a fourth concept (WOM) which is not discussed in the literature review. This is problematic because NPS (would you recommend ...) is almost synonymous with WOM. Again, more complete use of Reichheld (2003) would help with describing this relationship.

Methods employed

(1) The sampling approach is satisfactory, however, the approach should be described as quota sampling (50 usable cases from each of four libraries) and the method used to obtain the sample should be described.

(2) More detail of measurement is required: what items were used to measure user satisfaction and loyalty, and why are four loyalty items reported in Table 8 when there are only two in Table 5? Why is one of the items in Table 5 almost identical to NPS, and what might that mean for interpretation of your results?

(3) The idea of using path analysis to test the hypotheses has merit. However, the data present some difficulties that cannot be addressed with PLS. In particular, the data are collected at two

different levels: (a) the library and (b) the user. Variance between the four libraries needs to be extracted before hypotheses at the user level (i.e., with $N = 200$ users) can be tested validly. One way to do this is to treat each library as a grouping variable (a group in covariance-based SEM or a dummy variable in OLS regression). One risk of not accounting for the library difference is Simpson's paradox, when the relationships between the variables within libraries differ from the relationships when data is pooled across libraries. I cannot test if this is the case with your data, but if you look at the NPS line in the plot included with this review, there appears to be some systematic and unaccounted for variance in prediction of NPS (UNESA and UPN lower than the mean; UNAIR and ITS higher than the mean).

(4) Selection and justification of analytical technique. There are errors in description and justification of PLS. Other techniques are likely to provide results that are more easily understood and conveyed to readers for this simple model given the multi-level data (and evidence of individual differences by gender and field of study). See my Comments to the Author for discussion of alternative approaches.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Sufficient information is provided to allow the reader to evaluate and interpret the findings. Fewer descriptive results could provide space for more thorough consideration of findings relative to the hypotheses. A number of errors in interpretation must be repaired.

Most of your results compare individual, named libraries. While this approach is suited to a report to stakeholders in a specific library system, it is of little value to the readers of an international journal. Indeed, you could simplify the paper by removing the detailed library by library comparisons and reporting summary statistics (for total satisfaction, loyalty and NPS) only. This would allow you to draw attention to the wide range of NPS values and concentrate on understanding why such variation exists. Your primary focus, however, given the purpose of the paper is consideration of the relationship between library user satisfaction, loyalty and NPS, is to test and accurately interpret the results of your tests.

There are inaccuracies, particularly on p. 10, in interpretation of NPS and the combination of NPS and other concepts. Lines 13-16 state that detractors have had a bad experience, this is not necessarily the case, but something to be tested. Lines 24-27 attempt to combine NPS with loyalty (reported in Table 5, not Table 4), but this is incorrect. While UNAIR is recommended (just to friends, or also to colleagues?) more than the other libraries, UPN users are *unlikely* to recommend the library to their friends (more detractors than promoters, $NPS = -38$) and a neutral loyalty score is not unbiased. Lines 52- 56 (and continuation over the page) exaggerate low positive values of NPS and fail to interpret the negative values. Interpretation of these values as saying science majors are "more satisfied" is not demonstrated by the reported data. See Reichheld and others for interpretation of NPS values.

On p. 12, you interpret coefficients as standardized coefficients. Specify that you are reporting standardized coefficients to avoid confusion. Interpret the coefficients as you would regression coefficients, e.g., loyalty has an effect of .35 *all other things being equal*. Furthermore, because you have a path model, your interpretation of the effect of the endogenous variable, user satisfaction, is incorrect. You report a total effect of .16 on p.13 (line 18), but it looks to me nearer to .26 (.35*.75). In any case, it is the total effect on NPS of .07 (direct) and .16/.26 (indirect), so .23/.33. Note that the final paragraph of your conclusion (p. 15, lines 14-20) is also incorrect, both because it states that user satisfaction has no effect (the effect is largely indirect), and that *loyalty* must be increased to increase user satisfaction when it is the other way around (this order is correct on p.13).

The discussion at the top of p. 13, headed R Square Value Analysis incorrectly confuses R-square with Q-square, which you do not report. Omit reference to Q-square for this audience. Correct your interpretation of R-square in this paragraph: effects are measured by coefficients, while R-square is an estimate of the ability of your model to explain each variable of interest. So, user satisfaction "explains" 56% of loyalty (the square of the effect size, i.e., $.75 * .75$). Interpretation of the R-square for NPS is incorrect; both user satisfaction and loyalty together explain 16% of NPS (approx. square root of $.35+.07$) in your PLS model. Here, we can see the problem with use of PLS -- it has not taken the indirect effect of user satisfaction through loyalty into account. PLS users adopt different methods to deal with this and many resort to the PROCESS macro (<http://processmacro.org>) which can be run as a regression analysis in SPSS, to evaluate and estimate mediation.

Tables: Table 8 records female NPS as 18, while subtraction suggests it is 17; a note should be added to the table if this is due to rounding. The second line of NPS calculation in Table 6 (59-42) needs correction to refer to the percentage difference (the final line, 9, is correct). Table 10 is inaccurately titled and adds little to the paper; remove it and provide the relevant statistics in the text (see the APA style guide for further discussion, if needed).

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: No. These matters are not considered in the paper. Instead, the Discussion section provides a new review of literature, without demonstrating its relevance to the paper. The Conclusion does not consider implications beyond the university system within which the data were gathered. These two sections need to be re-written (1) to discuss the findings reported in this research in light of

relevant literature already reviewed in the Literature Review (i.e., without introducing new literature in the Discussion), the context of this study (what have we learnt from studying NPS in Indonesian, academic libraries), and the methods used, and (3) to consider the implications for the practice of library management, library users and future research.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Overall expression is good. There is some confusion, however, in description of technical matters, including interpretation of the findings of Laitenen (2019) (p. 4, lines 14-16), methodology and the results of the current research. Re-writing is required to ensure that concepts, methodological techniques and results are clearly and accurately presented. Much of what is required is separation of these logical components of research writing.

Use of Figure 1, which appears to be drawn from Laitenen (2019), is likely to require copyright clearance. In any case, it contains a typographic error. Just replace it with the NPS category portion of Figure 6. Include a reference to Riechheld (2003) as the source of the scale.

Provide a reference or URL for Wrap PLS.

Rather than copying and pasting tables and charts from statistical software (technical output), prepare informative tables and charts specifically for the readers of your article.


If you retain the distinction between the four libraries, I recommend they be given an alias (Library A, B, etc.) to provide anonymity and avoid distracting readers.

Please proofread and correct typographical errors (e.g., Hence on p. 5; reference to 4 dimensions, but numbering only 3) before resubmission.

Date Sent: 13-Nov-2020

Files attached

[LM-06-2020-0090_chart.pdf](#)

 Close Window

Library Management

Decision Letter (LM-06-2020-0090.R1)

From: ocosteve@gmail.com

To: dyah.srirahayu@vokasi.unair.ac.id, estiputri48@gmail.com, khoirotunlayyinah25@gmail.com

CC:

Subject: Library Management - Decision on Manuscript ID LM-06-2020-0090.R1

Body: 16-Jan-2021

Dear Srirahayu, Dyah; Anugrah, Esti; layyinah, khoirotun

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript LM-06-2020-0090.R1, entitled "Influence of Satisfaction and Loyalty on Net Promoter Score (NPS) in Academic Libraries in Indonesia" in its current form for publication in Library Management. Please note, no further changes can be made to your manuscript.

Congratulations.

Please go to your Author Centre at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/lm> (Manuscripts with Decisions for the submitting author or Manuscripts I have co-authored for all listed co-authors) to complete the Copyright Transfer Agreement form (CTA). We cannot publish your paper without this.

All authors are requested to complete the form and to input their full contact details. If any of the contact information is incorrect you can update it by clicking on your name at the top right of the screen. Please note that this must be done prior to you submitting your CTA.

If you have an ORCID please check your account details to ensure that your ORCID is validated.


By publishing in this journal your work will benefit from Emerald EarlyCite. As soon as your CTA is completed your manuscript will pass to Emerald's Content Management department and be processed for EarlyCite publication. EarlyCite is the author proofed, typeset version of record, fully citable by DOI. The EarlyCite article sits outside of a journal issue and is paginated in isolation. The EarlyCite article will be collated into a journal issue according to the journals' publication schedule.

FOR OPEN ACCESS AUTHORS: Please note if you have indicated that you would like to publish your article as Open Access via Emerald's Gold Open Access route, you are required to complete a Creative Commons Attribution Licence - CCBY 4.0 (in place of the standard copyright assignment form referenced above). You will receive a follow up email within the next 30 days with a link to the CCBY licence and information regarding payment of the Article Processing Charge. If you have indicated that you might be eligible for a prepaid APC voucher, you will also be informed at this point if a voucher is available to you (for more information on APC vouchers please see <http://www.emeraldpublishing.com/oapartnerships>)

Thank you for your contribution. On behalf of the Editors of Library Management, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve O'Connor
Editor, Library Management
ocosteve@gmail.com

Date Sent: 16-Jan-2021

 Close Window

© Clarivate | © ScholarOne, Inc., 2022. All Rights Reserved.