

HYPOTHESIS

THE JOURNAL OF THE RESEARCH SECTION OF MLA

Contents

HYPOTHESIS:
The Journal of the Research
Section of MLA
VOLUME 17, Number 2
Summer 2003

MLA Papers and Posters Win Awards.....1

Officers and Executive Committee.....2

Chapter Research Committees Report:
 Reports from Seven Chapters.....3

L/ISTEN Up: Research News from the
 Groves of Academe:
*An Interview with Catherine Arnott
 Smith, PhD*.....7

Literature Review9

Message from the Chair.....12

MLA Papers and Posters Win Awards

--Submitted by *Carole Gilbert, Awards Committee Chair*

At MLA in San Diego, the Awards Committee and volunteer judges reviewed over 200 papers and posters for quality of research. Three papers and two posters were selected for quality of research presented.

Prior to MLA, the volunteers read poster and paper abstracts posted on MLANET and agreed on those with the strongest research components which would receive the greatest attention. At MLA, the judges met and divided up the presentations, attempting to cover as many as possible. The judges used a standard evaluation form for scoring the presentations. After the annual meeting was over, score sheets were compiled and the judges made their final determination of winners by email.

Thanks to the following volunteer judges: Catherine Arnott Smith, Cathy Boss, Cathy Wolfson, Claire Twose, Claudia Lascar, Elizabeth Wood, Gale Oren, Kathy Kerdolff, Priscilla Stephenson, Susan Klimley, Susan Seuss, Dixie Jones, and from the home front, Molly Harris and Bob Wood.

A prize of \$100 was given for each Research Award; the Honorable Mention winner received \$50. In addition, each of the authors was sent a certificate commemorating the award.

(Continued on page 5)

May 21-26, 2004 • Washington, DC

**SEIZE THE
 POWER**



MLA'04
 MEDICAL LIBRARY
 ASSOCIATION

www.mlanet.org

HYPOTHESIS. The Journal of the Research Section of MLA

<http://gain.mercer.edu/mla/research/hypothesis.html>

HYPOTHESIS (ISSN 1093-5665) is the official journal of the Research Section of MLA. It is published three times a year by the Section: Spring (March), Summer (July/August), and Fall (November). It is also available at: <http://gain.mercer.edu/mla/research/hypothesis.html>

Items to be included should be sent to the Editor by the 15th of the preceding month (i.e., February 15th for Spring, June 15th for Summer, October 15th for Fall). Copy is preferred by e-mail, but will be accepted in other formats.

HYPOTHESIS is selectively indexed in the *Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature* and the *CINAHL* database. Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

Andrea L. Ball, Editor
Legacy Good Samaritan Hospital
Medical Library
VOICE: (503)413-7458
E-MAIL: ABALL@lhs.org

Ellen Detlefsen, PhD
University of Pittsburgh
School of Information Sciences
VOICE: (412) 624-9444
E-MAIL: ellen@mail.sis.pitt.edu

Ruth E. Fenske, PhD, AHIP
Grasselli Library
John Carroll University
VOICE: (216) 397-4523
E-MAIL: rfenske@jcu.edu

Editorial Board

Kristine M. Alpi, MPH, AHIP
Public Health Library, NYC Dept. of
Health & Mental Hygiene
VOICE: (212) 447-8237
E-MAIL: kalpi@att.net

Martha F. Earl
Preston Medical Library
UT Medical Center at Knoxville
VOICE: (865) 544-6616
E-MAIL: Mearl@mc.utmkc.edu

Elizabeth (Beth) Schneider, AHIP
Treadwell Library
Massachusetts General Hospital
VOICE: (617) 724-2791
E-MAIL: eschneider1@partners.org

Anne Brice
Health Care Libraries Unit
University of Oxford
VOICE: IHS (01865) 226688
E-MAIL: anne.brice@ihs.ox.ac.uk

Jon Eldredge, PhD, AHIP
Health Sciences Center Library
The University of New Mexico
VOICE: (505) 272-0654
E-MAIL: jeldredge@salud.unm.edu

Ann C. Weller, AHIP
Library of the Health Sciences
University of Illinois at Chicago
VOICE: (312) 996-8974
E-MAIL: acw@uic.edu

**Officers & Executive Committee
2003-2004**

Chair

Alice Hadley (03-04)
ahadley@gam10.med.navy.mil

Chair-Elect

Elizabeth Wood
ewood@coh.org

Immediate Past Chair

Jon Eldredge (03-04)
jeldredge@salud.unm.edu

Section Council Representative

Dixie Jones (00-03)
djones@lsuhc.edu

Secretary/Treasurer

Jo Dorsch (01-03)
jod@uic.edu

Hypothesis Editor

Andrea Ball (02-04)
aball@facstaff.wisc.edu

Web Site Editor

Allan R Barclay (02-04)
abarclay@library.wisc.edu

Awards Committee Chair

Carol Gilbert (02-04)
Cgilbert@providence-hospital.org

Bylaws Committee Chair

Peggy Mullaly-Quijas (02-04)
Mullaly-quiiasm@umkc.edu

Continuing Education Committee Chair

Kristine Alpi (02-04)
kma2002@med.cornell.edu

*Evidence-Based Librarianship
Implementation Committee Chair*

Jon Eldredge (02-04)
jeldredge@salud.unm.edu

Governmental Relations Liaison

Gary Byrd (02-04)
gbyrd@buffalo.edu

*International Research Collaboration
Committee Chair*

-Open-

Membership Committee Chair

Elizabeth Connor (02-04)
Econnor@rossmed.edu.dm

Nominating Committee Chair

Elizabeth Schneider
eschneider1@partners.org

*Practice Guidelines Advisory Committee
Chair*

Molly Harris (02-04)
Mharris@verdict.uthscsa.edu

Program Chair

See Chair-Elect

Research Resources Committee Chair

Leslie Behm (02-04)
Behm@pilot.msu.edu

*Research Results Dissemination
Committee Chair*

Liz Bayley (02-04)
Bayleyl@mcmaster.ca

Section Nominee to the MLA

Nominating Committee

Ann Weller
acw@uic.edu

For additional contact information, see
MLA Directory or Research Section Home
Page (<http://research.mlanet.org/>)

Chapter Research Committees Report

— submitted by Martha Earl

MLA Chapter Research Committees continue to provide opportunities and encouragement to researchers. Of the fourteen chapters, seven have Research Committees. Chapters without committees may provide opportunities to present project outcomes at chapter conferences.

Medical Library Group of Southern California and Arizona

The Chair of the Research Committee for 2002-03 is Mary Aldous. This chapter provides a research award with an emphasis on projects practical in nature. In addition to original research proposals, demonstration or replicated research proposals are considered acceptable. \$500 is the maximum amount per award with three awards possible per year. Winners must publish the results of the award project within a year of completion. Applicants must be chapter members and include a sponsoring librarian or library school faculty member. Awards can be used for equipment, software, computer time, photocopying, telephone/fax costs, consulting services, literature searching, travel related to research, and postage. A budget and timetable must be included in the proposal. More information can be found <http://www.mlgscsca.mlanet.org/awards.htm#research>.

Mid-Atlantic

Although the Mid-Atlantic Chapter does not have a Research Committee, strategic plan objectives include promotion of research in health information sciences through the formation of a Research Committee, development of educational programs to support research, and promotion of presentation and publication of research results of MAC members. http://www.cbil.vcu.edu/mac/about/strategic_plan.html

Midcontinental

The Chair of the Research Committee is Diane Johnson. The Research Committee has six members. Ros Dudden serves as the Resource Person. Other members include Ann Marie Corry, Cindy Schmidt, Michelle Beattie, Betsy Kelly, and Jeanne Le Ber. The Midcontinental Chapter maintains a site <http://www.kumc.edu/mcmla/MCMLARes.html>.

New York New Jersey

This Chapter does not have a Research Committee, but strategic plan objectives include the following goals: to encourage research by allocating funds yearly towards a grant or grants in health sciences or information sciences librarianship research, to advertise the grant via Chapter publications, to provide online access to the application forms, to evaluate applications and make formal recommendations to the Executive Board, and to submit Chapter funded research reports to Chapter publications. More

information on the grant can be found <http://www.nynjmla.org/ny-njresearchgrant.html>. This Chapter won the 2003 Majors/MLA Chapter Project of the Year for "Mini-Medical School for Librarians."

Northern California and Nevada

The Research Task Force, chaired by Terry Henner, is exploring a research agenda, including possible opportunities for collaboration on projects by members.

Philadelphia Regional

This chapter does not have a Research Committee, but their strategic plan includes the following goals to recognize the practice of research as essential for assuring the critical role of health sciences library and information professionals: focusing on evidence-based health care, providing opportunities for learning through courses and programs on research and publication skills, providing opportunities for highlighting methods and skills in forums such as Research Days through which members would share ideas and disseminate key research-based information about library/information science practices, particularly as they relate to outcomes, and considering a Chapter Research Project. They have also discussed formation of an Ad Hoc Research Committee. http://www.mlaphil.org/strategic_plan.html

South Central

The Chair of the Research Committee is Molly Harris. Other members include Ana Cleveland, Jon Eldredge, Mary Jackson, Sally Kasalko, Kathryn Kerdolff, Felicia Little, and Millie Moore. This Chapter provides a research mentoring service and database, an annual research grant, and a web site link highlighting ongoing research in the South Central area maintained by the Louisiana State University School of Library and Information Science <http://www.sccmla.org/research.html>.

In addition, they review annual presented papers and posters at their conference for research quality and give awards to winners. Members of the SCC Research Committee joined with members of the SCC Awards and Scholarship Committee to judge a total of 36 entries (18 contributed papers and 18 posters) in the Research Awards competition, which was held at the SCC/MLA Annual Meeting on October 12-16 in San Antonio TX. Award certificates in each division were presented at the Business Meeting to the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place winners, as well as 2 Honorable Mentions. As of this year forward, SCAMEL will be presenting cash awards to the 1st -3rd place winners in each category in the following amounts: Papers: 1st place: \$300; 2nd place: \$200; 3rd place: \$100. Posters: 1st place: \$200; 2nd place: \$100; 3rd place:

(Continued on page 4)

(Chapter Research Award Winners — Continued from page 2)

\$50.00. Here are the results of the competition:

Contributed Papers

1st Place:

Determinants of Effective Library-Faculty Communications. A Randomized Controlled Trial.

Jonathan Eldredge, Coordinator of Academic and Clinical Services and Ingrid Hendrix, Nursing Librarian, Health Sciences Center Library and Informatics Center, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.

2nd Place:

Systematic Training for Patient Support Groups.

Margaret Anderson, Graduate Student, University of North Texas School of Library & Information Science, Denton, TX, and Will Olmstadt, Education Librarian, University of Texas/Southwestern Medical Center Library, Dallas, TX.

3rd Place:

Linked Out or Left Out - How Do Your Users Fare?

Greg Pratt, Education and Reference Librarian and Wes Browning, Assistant Director for Information Systems, Research Medical Library, The University of Texas, M. D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX.

Honorable Mention:

One Journal, Many Versions.

Judith Wilkerson, Associate Professor, Head of Serials Services, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK and Beverly Dowdy, Serials and Acquisitions Librarian, University of Central Oklahoma, Edmond, OK

Honorable Mention:

Med High Peer Tutors Project - High School students teaching Medline and MedlinePlus.

Debra Warner, RAHC Library Director and Assistant Library Director for Valley Services, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, Harlingen TX

Posters

1st Place:

Health Information Use by Physicians.

Virginia M. Bowden, Jonquil Feldman, Debra Warner, Evelyn Olivier, Cynthia Olney, Mary Jo Dwyer, Graciela Reyna, Andrew Lombardo, University of Texas Health

Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX.

2nd Place:

Gathering Customer Input Prior to Home Page Re-design: An Ontological Study.

Katherine Alexander, Education Librarian; Karen Harker, Web Developer; Mori Lou Higa-Moore, Chief Futurist and Strategist; Shelley McKibbin, Research and Clinical Librarian; Helen Mayo, Outreach Manager; Laura Wilder, Research and Clinical Librarian; UT Southwestern Medical Center Library, Dallas, TX.

3rd Place:

Comparing the self-described searching knowledge of first year medical and dental students before and after a MEDLINE class.

Janna Lawrence, Reference and Instructional Services Coordinator, and Linda Levy, Database Services Coordinator, Briscoe Library, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX.

Honorable Mention:

PowerPoint Instruction Pearls and Pitfalls.

Beth Wagner, Librarian, Division of Diagnostic Imaging, The University of Texas, M. D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX.

Honorable Mention:

Woman2Woman: A Community Health Information Outreach Project. [Funded in part by National Library of Medicine Grant No. 1 G07 LM07259-01]

Jeffrey T. Huber, PhD, Associate Professor, School of Library and Information Studies, Texas Woman's University and Associate Director for Research, Houston Academy of Medicine-Texas Medical Center Library, Houston, TX.

Abstracts can be found at http://www.sccmla.org/research_awards2002.html.

Southern Chapter

This Committee includes Priscilla Stephenson, Chair; Jennifer Lyon, Steven MacCall, Robert Poyer, Cathy Schell, Rita Smith, and AddaJane Wallace. Cheryl Dee and Jocelyn Rankin are ex-officio members. The Southern Chapter awards a Research Award of up to \$1000 per year; this year's award went to John Orriola for "Strategic competency-based incremental literature searching instruction for the medical student." The Southern Chapter also keeps a database of research mentors. The Committee regularly highlights the work of a regional research in the "Research Spotlight" column of

(Continued on page 11)

*(MLA '03 Research Award Winners — Continued from page 1)***Research Award recipients****Evaluating the Effectiveness of
Clinical Medical Librarian Programs:
a systematic review**

Gary D. Byrd, Ph.D., AHIP, director, Health Sciences Library, University at Buffalo (SUNY), Buffalo, NY, and Kay C. Wagner, AHIP, director, Wegner Health Science Information Center, University of South Dakota School of Medicine – Sioux Falls

Purpose: This research is being undertaken to determine if a systematic review of the cumulative, thirty-year evidence from evaluative studies of clinical medical librarian (CML) programs can help provide a more definitive determination of the effectiveness of this model of health sciences library outreach service. The authors have hypothesized that the published literature will provide very little hard evidence that CML services actually improve patient care or the performance of health professionals in clinical health care settings.

Methods: Comprehensive searches of the library and health sciences literature were conducted to identify all publications dealing with CML services and the full text of any paper likely to contain any evaluative research methodology was reviewed by the authors. The review criteria for inclusion in the systematic review included a problem or hypothesis statement, a description of the study population or sample of CML service users or providers, a description of the data collection methodology, and/or some analysis of the study results. The paper will also include a brief descriptive review of the remaining CML literature to describe where and how often these services have been implemented. This review will also include more general studies indicating how information services can affect education and patient care in clinical health care settings and more recent articles suggesting how health sciences librarians can play a significant role in evidence-based medicine and knowledge management or take on more highly specialized clinical informationist responsibilities.

Results: To date, thirty-one CML evaluative studies published between 1975 and 2001 have been identified from this systematic review. These studies are being analyzed and compared in tables and graphs describing the characteristics of the CML service populations studied, the evaluative research methods used, and the results reported.

Conclusion: The paper will conclude with a brief discussion of the implications of this review for the development of future clinical librarians or informationist services along with some recommendations for future evaluation research studies.

**Evidence-based Databases versus
Primary Medical Literature:
an in-house investigation on their optimal use**

Taneya Y. Koonce, Assistant Director, Education Services, Eskin Biomedical Library, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, NT; Clista Clanton, Web development and education librarian, Biomedical Library, University of South Alabama-Mobile; Garad M. Davis, library intern; Shannon Mueller, library intern; Katherine E. Szigeti, library intern; and Nunzi B. Giuse, M.D., AHIP, Director; Eskin Biomedical Library, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN

Purpose: Evidence-based databases comprise literature synthesis by experts for application in clinical contexts. While embraced enthusiastically by clinicians, they may not always answer patient-specific questions that arise during clinical rounds as appropriately as the primary medical literature. The use of evidence-based databases may best answer questions relating to a broad patient population, such as those that arise during the development of pathways that can serve as a generalizable guide to patient care. This study will characterize situations for optimal use of evidence-based databases compared to the primary medical literature to answer patient-specific rather than condition-specific pathways clinical questions.

Setting/Participants/Resources: Large academic health sciences library; three evidence-based databases: UpToDate, Cochrane, and EBM Solutions and eighty questions received through the library's evidence-based services.

Methods: Eighty random questions drawn equally from two library in-house evidence-based services will support this investigation. One service handles questions received by librarians via clinical rounding, while the second handles questions received in support of medical center pathways development. A team of expert librarians will determine and establish a consensus on whether a question is primarily answerable by an evidence-based database, the original literature, or a combination of these resources. Data regarding the frequency of use and opportunity for possible application of these evidence-based databases will be collected according to question type.

Results/Outcome: A better understanding of the appropriateness of use and relevance of evidence-based databases and primary medical literature that serve as the basis for evidence-based practice is crucial. This evaluation of the maturity of current evidence-based databases will explore differences in resource applicability for different types of clinical questions and enable more efficient utilization of these products in evidence-based library services. The results of this study may guide future development of these services and enhance the ability of librarians to properly guide users in the selection of appropriate resources.

(Continued on page 6)

(MLA '03 Research Award Winners — Continued from page 5)

**Sink or Swim:
Making Sense of Productivity and
Workload Measurement**

Sharon A. Phillips, AHIP, Director of Organizational Development, Wayne State University Library System

Collecting and tracking meaningful workload data can assist libraries of any size with developing an effective benchmarking program. This presentation explains the basic concepts underlying productivity and workload measurement and outlines a six-step process for developing workload standards over a six-week start up period. Simple spreadsheet calculations and time study techniques are demonstrated for collecting data about how library staff time is spent. Once developed, workload standards can be used to calculate cost information and develop benchmarking studies. Data can be tracked over time to measure the impact of process improvements and monitor trends. While the benefits can be substantial, set up time can be substantial. Suggestions are made for keeping start up time to a minimum, for managing potential problems and for using workload data effectively as part of administrative and funding discussions.

**eBay Sellers' Opinions about "Librarian" Clothes:
Frumpy or Bumpy?**

Sunny L. Worel, Library Information Specialist, R. N. Barr Library, Minnesota Department of Health – Minneapolis, and Allan R. Barclay, Information Architect, Health Sciences Libraries, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Purpose:

To assess the public's attitudes about the clothing librarians wear. To characterize attire that is considered "librarian-ish."

Setting/Subjects: Individuals peddling clothing on eBay who use the word "librarian" to describe their wares.

Methodology: Auctions on eBay in the clothing, shoes, and accessories category were monitored for modern and vintage garb listed with the word librarian in the title or description. Sellers were asked a question about their item followed by a question about why they indicated that their item was "for a librarian." A database was set up to track auction descriptions, pictures, and sellers' responses. Each seller's sex and geographic location were noted to identify possible trends. Adjectives used by eBay sellers about their auction items and librarians were recorded.

Results: Auction listings were common for vests, ties, skirts, sweaters, and dresses. Many clothing items had book or tweed themes. Some of the adjectives for the

attire and the librarians who wear them included: conservative, proper, academic, intellectual, bookish, chic, sexy, and shapely.

Conclusion: Librarian stereotypes abound in eBay clothing auctions. Two contrasting fashion statements emerged: a conservative, bookish look and a sexy, seductive look.

Honorable Mention

**Online Journals' Impact on the
Citation Patterns of Medical Faculty**

Sandra L. De Groote, Assistant Information Services Librarian, Library of the Health Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL ; Mary Shultz, Assistant Information Services Librarian, Library of the Health Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago, Urbana, IL ; Marci Doranski, Resident Librarian, Library of the Health Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of online journals on the citation patterns of medical faculty.

Setting: The college of medicine at a large urban university with three regional sites was used for this study. From 1998 to present, the number of online journals available for faculty, staff, and students at the institution has increased from an initial core of fifteen to over 7,000 online journals currently available through the Internet.

Methodology: Searches by author affiliation were performed in Web of Science to find all articles written by faculty members in the college of medicine at the selected institution. Searches were conducted for the following years: 1993, 1996, 1999, and 2002. Cited references from each faculty authored article were recorded. Use statistics of cited journals were entered into a spreadsheet. Cited journals were separated into four categories based on their availability at the institution in this study: print only, print and online, online only, and not owned.

Results: Previous research has shown that as online journal use increases, journal use in the print collections of libraries has decreased. Results of this study will show whether researchers are more likely to limit the resources consulted and cited for research primarily to those journals available online rather than those in print only.

Discussion/Conclusions: Finding new ways to promote and increase accessibility to the print collection may be a necessity if researchers are to take full advantage of the range of literature available. ■

L/ISTEN UP: Research News from the Groves of Academe

— submitted by Ellen Detlefsen, DLS and Andrea L. Ball, MLS

The following is the first in a series of interviews with recent LIS/PhD graduates regarding course requirements and research opportunities. It is our hope that this series will provide some insight into how to best train the next generation of librarians as researchers.

An interview with Catherine Arnott Smith, PhD

Dr. Smith received her doctorate from the School of Information Sciences at the University of Pittsburgh in 2002. Her dissertation was titled *The Clinical Document Architecture: XML Semantic Markup for Enhanced Clinical Information Retrieval*. Since September 2002, she has been working as an Assistant Professor in the School of Information Studies at Syracuse University, as well as an adjunct assistant professor of pediatrics at SUNY-Upstate Medical University.

1. Your doctoral committee – who was on your committee and did they have a specific background in research?

My doctoral committee was made up of five people: two MDs with extreme research experience in medical informatics and three faculty members in library and information science with varying amounts of research experience in different facets of LIS. I would say Edie Rasmussen (LIS; formerly of Pitt bur now Dean of the University of British Columbia information school) probably was strongest research person in the information retrieval area and Henry Lowe MD (Medical Informatics; now a faculty member and Director of the hospitals' Medical Information Systems at Stanford University's Biomedical Informatics Program) was the stronger of the MDs in terms of medical informatics research.

2. The past - what kind of research experience did you have before you started your doctoral studies?

I had the kind of research experience that librarians get in a corporate setting – I had been developing an in-house database for information retrieval of medical literature for four years preceding the start of my doctoral program, and had to do a lot of product investigation and executive summarizing for that project. However, that was not academic style research – it was really more "research to defend your existence". I was, however, located in the R&D division of the insurance company that employed me, and that helped.

At the time I started my PhD program, I already had a master's degree in American History/Administration of Archives as well as the MILS, and had originally been in a doctoral program in American History studying the history of medicine. So I had lots of the academic, literature-searching kind of research experience, as opposed to purely scientific, which really helped – up to a point.

3. The advisor - what role did your advisor and/or mentor play in your research decisions?

Because I was a pre-doctoral fellow in the biomedical informatics program, I had two advisors – one LIS, one medical informatics. It was a condition of my fellowship that I work 10 hours a week on a research project to earn my stipend. That research project was always located within medical informatics (that is, within that academic unit – which was within the medical center). I worked with the same advisor for four years; my last year was spent working on the same project for his successor.

4. Were you advised/required to take research methods courses?

Yes.

The format - describe the course format for your research course/s. Was it theoretical, practical, other? What was your role in the research projects (if you had that experience)?

I had two courses I consider to be research-based in nature. One was an education course called Research Methodology in Education. The other was a statistics course taught through the IS (not LIS) department which was much more useful. It focused on one particular statistical software package (SPSS) but taught about methodology at the same time. So it had elements of both the theory and the practice.

The 10-hour-a-week research project was much more useful than anything else. Why? I was working on real-life problems that had real-life funding.

5. Your opinion - what was most/least useful from your research course/project? What would you change?

Most useful: see above comment.

Least useful: Can't think of anything. It was ALL useful.

The most problematic aspect of the course work, which I would definitely change if I had it to do over again, in-

(Continued on page 8)

(Structured Abstracts — Continued from page 7)

volved my lack of experience with statistics. This kind of knowledge was essentially nonexistent before I started my PhD and if I had known how important it was going to be, I would have taken stats before starting my program. I did in fact take two stats courses but really floundered for a few years because I was taking those stats courses concurrently with my other required courses and it was a lot of new material to absorb at once.

I see this as a particular challenge for librarians like me who pole-vaulted from the humanities side of the brain to the computer geek side!

6. *Your future research - what research projects are you currently involved in/plan to be involved in? Do you think your course work prepared you for this type of research?*

I have a research fellowship awarded by the Medical Library Association (Donald A.B. Lindberg Research Fellowship) which gives me \$25,000 over 2 years to study

8. *Any final thoughts, words of advice or lessons learned?*

The one major confusion I keep running into when I talk to practitioners (working librarians, no matter what they are doing) is that the PhD is not perceived as a research degree. Instead, it is seen as “something you have to get to teach”. This is the ‘piece of paper’ or ‘union card’ attitude, which can be a major hindrance to a library science education even on the master’s level! This attitude persists despite the fact that there are MLS’s teaching all over the place as adjuncts while working as librarians in their “day jobs”.

So one remark I hear quite too often to suit me is, “Why did you get a PhD? I don’t have a PhD and I teach.”

Yes, you can teach and you can teach very well without a PhD when it is a profession where the master’s is a terminal degree. What you CAN’T do very easily – in terms of getting the training and getting the *time* (not to mention the MONEY) – is research.

“You can teach very well without a PhD....What you CAN’T do very easily...is research.”

consumer terminology as expressed in electronic communication. My course work did not help much with this, but the research commitment I had as a pre-doctoral fellow really has helped in terms of teaching me to organize my time. I also have a grant proposal in to the NSF, and am currently exploring ways to collaborate with health-care systems here in Syracuse on medical record problems. The real-life indoctrination I received as a fellow has been just invaluable in helping me make new relationships in a new city.

7. *The researcher as mentor - where do you go for research mentoring now that you are out of school? Are you a research mentor? What would you look for in a research mentor? How can mentor's better support students/new researchers?*

I am not a research mentor – am not ready – but I am at a school which strongly supports new faculty seeking help/advice/mentoring from “old” faculty (one of my favorite research mentors here, outside of medical informatics/librarianship, is about 10 years younger than me – but I try to forget about that!). People who have been there and done that are the most important. I think that is true wherever you are and whatever you do!

I think if more people understood just what a PhD equips you to do, there might be stronger connections enabled between working librarians and us academics – there is JUST NO WAY I was equipped as a working librarian to do research, neither in terms of time, nor in terms of external funding. Full-time faculty status at a research-strong information school puts me in an ideal place to teach *and* do my own research on fundable problems that interest me.

The ONLY REASON, in my humble opinion, to get a PhD is if you want to do research OR run a library where the PhD would be useful. I am not one of nature’s library runners. But I am pretty good at the research part – at least now! ■

*Catherine Arnott Smith, PhD
Assistant Professor
School of Information Studies
Syracuse University*

email: casmit07@syr.edu

*In our next issue:
Minutes from the 2003 Annual Business Meeting and
a return of the International Research Reviews column.*



Literature Review

—submitted by Ruth Fenske, Ph.D.

Green, Rosemary and Mary Bowser. *Managing Thesis Anxiety: A Faculty-Librarian Partnership to Guide Off-Campus Graduate Education Students Through the Thesis Process.* Journal of Library Administration. 37(3/4):341-354, 2002.

Harrell, Karen J. *Reducing High Anxiety: Responsive Library Services to Off-Campus Nontraditional Students.* Journal of Library Administration. 37(3/4):355-365, 2002.

Veal, Robin. *The Relationship Between Library Anxiety and Off-Campus Adult Learners.* Journal of Library Administration. 37(3/4):529-536, 2002.

The proceedings of the Tenth Off-Campus Library Services Conference contain three research studies on anxiety among off-campus students. With many nursing schools offering off-campus courses, this is a topic of interest to us.

Karen Harrell received responses from 142 students enrolled at the three largest Extended Education Centers run by Mercer University. Response rate and number of students at the smallest, presumably less adequate, center not surveyed are not given. One of the Extended Education Centers is staffed by a librarian and another by a library assistant. The librarian travels to all four centers to do BI and reference librarians at Mercer provide telephone, e-mail, and in-person reference assistance. Inter-library loans are sent to the centers.

The survey showed that this group of students has multiple responsibilities. Ninety percent own a PC. The text tells us 78% use the libraries at the centers at least occasionally. However, the supporting table says 36% never use the center libraries. These numbers do not add up.

The author concludes with some reflections on providing responsive library services for off-campus adult services. Although the title of this paper is “Reducing High Anxiety,” anxiety is only an assumption, rather than a fact established through her research. The paper concentrates only on the use of center libraries and does not address “assignment-related research on the Internet” done on personally owned computers by 92% of those surveyed. Since the trend is now toward totally online courses, it would have been useful to delve into this type a use a little more.

Robin Veal surveyed master’s students in education attending classes at one of eleven locations throughout a

state. Responses were received from 143 students. The response rate is not given. In addition to the Bostick Library Anxiety Scale, demographic and library use questions were asked. One interesting finding is that library anxiety is inversely related to age—a finding which supports earlier research results by Jiao and Onwuebuozie. Those who had had library instruction were less anxious than those who had not. There was a small statistically significant relationship between library anxiety and perception of resource availability and distance from an academic library.

Green and Bowser also worked with off-campus graduate students in education. The students were required to write a thesis. Responding to a need documented through student evaluations, librarians began collaborating with faculty in teaching a four-course thesis research and composition process. Courses are taught face-to-face at off-campus sites. No information is given on follow-up help available from either the faculty member or the librarian.

Subjects were eighteen students at six sites. Eight are characterized as being pre-collaboration and ten as post-collaboration. Apparently all had completed the thesis at the time they were surveyed, but it is not clear how recently the pre-collaboration group had finished.

Students were asked to rate their level of anxiety on twelve thesis preparation steps. They then were asked on which of these tasks their faculty advisor, the librarian, and their peers were most helpful and least helpful. The authors conclude that the faculty-librarian collaboration has reduced anxiety. However, they did find increased anxiety in writing the literature review and no significant change in anxiety in using technology for research and composing the literature review, both tasks related to using library resources. Anxiety in conducting library research in general was reduced. It is unclear what students thought the phrase “composing the literature review” means. Librarians, as were faculty, were helpful in composing and writing the literature review. Librarians were also perceived as being helpful for library research in general and using technology for research.

A second part of the study was analyzing five theses from the pre-collaboration group and five from the post-collaboration group. Each literature review was assessed by two of four faculty selected from other departments and the library. Faculty were trained to use a seven-item, three-category rubric and inter-rater reliability was established. Nevertheless, four reviews, two from each group, were removed from the analysis because of widely varying ratings. Results for this part are not given and are characterized as being “inconclusive.”

Although all three of these studies use the word “anxiety” in the title, only one (Veal) used a standardized instrument. Harrell only assumed library anxiety, because she had documented that these students have multiple respon-

(Continued on page 10)

(Literature Review — Continued from page 10)

sibilities. Green and Bowser indicate an awareness of the Bostick Library Anxiety Scale but depend on self-definition of anxiety in their study.

The reader is also referred to an interesting article by Dinwiddie and Lillard in the same proceedings (JLA, 37 (1/2), 2002). Librarians were co-instructors in online courses in nursing and criminal justice and both instructors communicated with students via Blackboard on a regular basis.

Park, Soyeon. Research Methods as a Core Competency. Journal of Education for Library and Information Science. 44(1):17-20, Winter, 2003.

Soyeon Park examined web sites for 52 of the 56 ALA accredited programs in the United States and Canada. Definitions of research methods varied from “comprehensive coverage of both quantitative and qualitative methods to superficial inclusion of simple survey methods.” Thirty-two LIS programs require a research methods course; 20 do not. More than half of the LIS programs ranked most highly by US News & World Report do not require a research methods course. Statistics is not an admissions requirement. According to her/him, debate within ALA on core competencies has not focused on research methods as a competency. As we know, MLA, on the other hand, does require research methods as a core competency.

MBA programs at the 52 LIS schools tend to require in depth quantitative methods for decision making and quantitative methods is required for admission to many MBA programs. Accreditation standards do require quantitative methods.

The standards for accredited graduate programs in social work also require research methods. For some reason, the author only examined the MSW curricula at universities also offering high ranked LIS programs. The authors also verify that graduate programs in psychology and sociology at the same set of schools require research methods.

Graduate programs in education are very diverse, with differing requirements and pre-requisites. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education does not require research methods. The author concludes that LIS is most similar to graduate programs in education in not requiring research methods. The author recommends that ALA require research methods as a core competency.

The author also assumes that science graduate programs emphasize research methods and speculates that humanities graduate programs do not require research methods. He/she then reverses himself by saying methods courses, albeit not qualitative and quantitative methods courses, are required in the humanities. No matter what, LIS is not in tune with most graduate programs.

Harper, Judith A. Citation Inaccuracy in a Scientific Journal: A Continuing Issue. Science & Technology Libraries. 20(4):39-44, 2—1.

Despite several editorial rants, sometimes accompanied by objective, quantitative data, and having authors sign a statement saying they have verified the citations, nearly half the citations in Environmental and Experimental Botany have at least one error. Judith Harper’s original study of a 20% sample of citations published in 1990 volumes of the journal found a 35% error rate. When the study was repeated for 1999 citations, the error rate had risen to 45.4%.

Article or book title errors, author errors, and entry (volume, year, pagination, or edition wrong) were noted. Journal title errors were only counted if the true title could not be recognized from the information given. She also found that there was no correlation between the frequency of citation error and the merit rating given the article by the peer reviewers.

The author sees citation checking as being the responsibility of authors, editors, and peer reviewers. Possibly authors do try to check citations but either miss the errors themselves or delegate the job to someone equally unable to do it. If citation accuracy does not affect merit rating, authors probably won’t be motivated to do a better job. Since peer reviewers are similar to authors, asking to them to do this tedious task probably also wouldn’t be effective and might reduce the number of competent peer reviewers. Editors probably also couldn’t do the job much better than authors. The author suggests possibly asking authors to submit a copy of the first and last page of each article cited. Authors could very well choose to publish elsewhere, if they were required to do that sort of thing. Furthermore, accuracy is then dependent on the skill of the person in the editorial office who does the second check. Finally, she suggests that librarians and information specialists be involved in the review process. It seems to me that librarians are attuned to detail and certainly appreciate the necessity for good citations. Librarians could offer citation checking as a service to editors in their institution or editors could pay librarians to do the work on the side.

Van der Meijden, M.J., H.J. Tange, J. Troost, and A Hasman. Determinants of Success of Inpatient Clinical Information Systems: A Literature Review. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association. 10(3):235-243, May/June, 2003.

This is a qualitative meta-analysis of thirty-three Dutch and English articles which evaluate inpatient patient care information systems which require data entry and retrieval by health care providers themselves.

Components of success were classified into six categories, as outlined in the Delone and McLean Information

(Continued on page 11)

(Literature Review — Continued from page 10)

Systems Success Model, proposed in 1992. The six Delone and McLean categories are system quality, information quality, usage, user satisfaction, individual impact, and organizational impact. To them, success is a “process in which the six different dimensions relate temporally and causally.” In other words, success is a multi-dimensional construct.

Information quality was evaluated by 64% of the articles and organizational impact in only 39%. A variety of study designs and data collection methods was used in the articles reviewed. Although the model was developed for management information systems, most attributes of

success in the patient care information systems fit into the six categories.

Reading about the variables used by the various authors and their results is interesting and causes one to think about the components of success for information systems, in general. Librarians create information systems and are often called upon to advise on the creation of all sorts of information systems. The Delone/McLean model would seem to be a promising framework for evaluation of information systems with which we are involved. The model was updated by Delone and McLean in a Spring 2003 article in the Journal of Management Information Systems. ■

Please join me in thanking Martha Earl for all her incredible work with the Chapter Research Committees Report.

Thank you, Martha!

In addition, please welcome Priscilla Stephenson and the new editor of this important column.

Welcome, Priscilla!

(Chapter Research Award Winners — Continued from page 4)

the chapter newsletter. Research paper and poster presentations at the 2002 conference included:

Research Paper Presentations:

Marilee S. Creelan. *A Liaison Project to Improve the Information and Evidence-Based Searching Skills of First Year Dental Students.*

Gwendolyn D. Jackson. *Interlibrary Loan User Satisfaction Survey.*

Patricia Lee, Nunzia B. Giuse, Nila A. Sathe. *Adapting Ethnographic Methodology to Investigate Workflow Process To Promote Knowledge Management Practice in a Public Health Environment.*

Rozalynd McConnaughy, Sarah Gable. *Marketing the Special Collection in a Health Sciences Library.*

Susan Selig, Priscilla Stephenson, Ruth Mulvany, Kristin Robbins, Ann H. Nolen. *Utilization of Information Resources by Tennessee Occupational Therapists.*

Richard Wallace, Mary Ward, Janet S. Fisher, Biddanda (Suresh) Ponnappa, Martha Earl. *Taking Consumer Health Information to the People: A Medical and Public Library Collaboration.*

Annette Williams, Qinghua Kou, Taneya Koonce, Nunzia B. Giuse. *Applying Knowledge Management Principles to the Development of a Multi-functional Digital Library.*

Research Poster Presentations:

Karen Dahlen. *A Modified Focus-Group/Information Session to Assess Information Needs.*

Lyn Dennison, Jan H. LaBeause, Karen W. Rosati, Faith A. Meakin, BJ Schorre, Walter Morton. *LibQUAL+™: Southern Style.*

Thomas Hill. *Electronic Document Delivery Inroads: The Case of a Rural Teaching Hospital.*

More information can be found at <http://www.mc.vanderbilt.edu/biolib/scmla/resinfo.htm> ?

I have enjoyed editing this column and working with researchers from different chapters. As I step down, I encourage chapters to keep supporting their researchers and researchers to continue to ask the questions. Thanks.

*--Martha Earl
July 14, 2003*

I look forward to an interesting year for our section as we build on the work of Jon Eldredge and the rest of the officers and members to make the Platform for Change and Evidence-Based Librarianship a part of the daily practice of health sciences librarians.

Along with the usual work on awards, evidence-based librarianship implementation, international research collaboration, practice guidelines, research resources and research results dissemination, we are collaborating with Lyn Dennison of the new Assessment and Benchmarking SIG on EBL. They are focusing on institutional-level benchmarking and assessment and are interested in working with us on EBL issues. Email me if you are interested in joining us on this project.

Jon Eldredge began a new tradition for the section's paper session at the annual meeting in San Diego. He began "Shooting the Pipeline with EBL" with a brief but informative overview of the EBL levels of evidence. See his article in *Hypothesis*, 2002 Fall, v.16(3):10-13 at <http://gain.mercer.edu/mla/research/hyp_v16n3.pdf> for more on this. For this first discussion we had an example of the highest level; a systematic review of the library literature. This was the first systematic literature

Message from the Chair
—Alice E. Hadley, MLS, AHIP

review to be presented at an annual meeting. Now that we are off to a good start please think about writing up your research for next year's session.

If you are interested in reviewing abstracts for next year's presentation at MLA contact Elizabeth H. Wood <ewood@coh.org>. I am sure she would appreciate your help in divining the entrails of structured abstracts to find the gems of EBL hidden in them.

I hope that many of you will be able to join us in Washington, DC for the 2004 meeting. It is going to be a great opportunity for all sorts of professional and personal discoveries.

It may seem a little early, but I encourage those of you who have not held office recently to offer your services to Elizabeth Schneider, chair of the Nominating Committee. I think you will find the work rewarding and the section will gain by your new ideas.

—Alice E. Hadley, MLS, AHIP(D)
<ahadley@gam10.med.navy.mil>



Andrea L. Ball, MLS, Editor
Legacy Good Samaritan Hospital
Medical Library
1015 NW 22nd Avenue
Portland, OR 97210