

## PAPERS AND PROGRAMS

WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 16

### ■ SESSION 1: METHODS

Moderator: Heather Moorefield-Lang

#### Reporting research from the stacks: A systematic review of practitioner research literature in LIS

Jeffrey DiScala, Stephanie Trzeciakiewicz, and Amelia Anderson, Old Dominion University

While we continue to produce theoretical concepts, frameworks, and ideas in library and information studies (LIS), these developments are not being tested and tried 'on the ground.' There is an imbalance of research across the disciplines in LIS coming out of the field, rather than out of the academy (Morris & Cahill, 2017). This study proposes a systematic review of the literature to examine the prevalence and presentation of original research produced by LIS practitioners. Numerous calls have been made for librarians to increase their use of evidence (Luo & McKinney, 2015; Morris & Cahill, 2017; Todd, 2008) and share the results of their original data collection and analysis with others (Morris & Cahill, 2017; Todd, 2015). It is hypothesized that these calls have gone largely unanswered and practitioner research is still lacking.

For this study, we consider *practitioners* to be individuals currently working in a library or information setting and *research* to be the systematic collection, analysis, and reporting of original data. We use a more general and inclusive combined term of *practitioner research*, as this practice goes by different names, even within LIS: evidence-based practice, data-driven practice, action research, reflective practice, and more. The proposed study will examine meta-analyses already conducted on LIS research for specific trends and applications of practitioner research. Examples include Aharony (2012); Koufogiannakis, Slater, and Cumley (2004); Luo and McKinney (2015); Morris and Cahill (2017); and Turcios, Argawal, and Watkins (2014). In examining such meta-analyses in the literature, this study will include the following research questions:

1. In the meta-analyses identified, what percentage of the studies in those meta-analyses are practitioner research?
2. Of the studies identified as practitioner research, what are the methods of data gathering used?
3. Of the studies identified as practitioner research, what are the positions and institutions of the researchers and who are their collaborators?

This systematic review of meta-analyses in the LIS literature will utilize replicable, rigorous, and transparent methodologies of meta-syntheses and narrative review (Siddaway, Wood, Hedges, 2019). Both syntheses include the key stages in conducting a systematic review: scoping, planning, identification, screening, eligibility and study quality

(Siddaway, Wood, Hedges, 2019). The resulting mixed-methods synthesis will combine "the findings of qualitative and quantitative studies within a single review" (Harden & Thomas, 2010, p. 750) to understand and assess the presentation and product of LIS practitioner research.

In examining the studies reported from the original research of practitioners, there is the opportunity to improve upon that work. This study will examine the prevalence of practitioner research, identify the most common practices in the reporting of such research, provide implications for policy and practice for national organizations, and outline important directions for future research (Siddaway, Wood, & Hedges, 2019).

#### References

- Aharony, N. (2012). Library and information science research areas: A content analysis of articles from the top 10 journals 2007–8. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 44(1), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000611424819>
- Harden, A., & Thomas, J. (2010). Mixed Methods and Systematic Reviews: Examples and Emerging Issues. *SAGE Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research*, 2, 749–774. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506335193.n29>
- Koufogiannakis, D., Slater, L., & Crumley, E. (2004). A content analysis of librarianship research. *Journal of Information Science and Engineering*, 30(3), 227–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551504044668>
- Luo, L., & McKinney, M. (2015). JAL in the past decade: A comprehensive analysis of academic library research. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41(2), 123–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.01.003>
- Morris, R. J., & Cahill, M. (2017). A study of how we study: Methodologies of School Library Research 2007 through July 2015. *School Library Research*, 20. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1131164>
- Siddaway, A. P., Wood, A. M., & Hedges, L. V. (2019). How to do a systematic review: A best practice guide for conducting and reporting narrative reviews, meta-analyses, and meta-syntheses. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 747–770. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418>
- Todd, R. J. (2008). The evidence-based manifesto for school librarians. *School Library Journal*, 54(4), 38–43. Retrieved from <http://www.schoollibraryjournal.com/toc-archive/2008/20080401.html>
- Todd, R. J. (2015). Evidence-based practice and school libraries: Interconnections of evidence, advocacy, and actions. *Knowledge Quest*, 43(3), 8–15. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1048950>
- Turcios, M. E., Agarwal, N. K., & Watkins, L. (2014). How much of library and information science literature qualifies as research? *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(5), 473–479. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2014.06.003>

#### A library where research matters: Themes of academic libraries supporting researcher-librarians

Nina Exner, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina

Learning to do research is hard, yet many academic librarians must do research as part of their job. Encouraging librarians to do research helps improve the library's reputation and build