

Evidence Based Library and Information Practice (EBLIP): A Comparative Study of UK and US Academic Librarians

MOLLY BLACK

This dissertation was submitted in part fulfilment of requirements for the degree of MSc Information and Library Studies

DEPT. OF COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE

AUGUST 2019

DECLARATION

This dissertation is submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MSc of the University of Strathclyde.

I declare that this dissertation embodies the results of my own work and that it has been composed by myself.

Following normal academic conventions, I have made due acknowledgement to the work of others.

I declare that I have sought, and received, ethics approval via the Departmental Ethics Committee as appropriate to my research.

I give permission to the University of Strathclyde, Department of Computer and Information Sciences, to provide copies of the dissertation, at cost, to those who may in the future request a copy of the dissertation for private study or research.

I give permission to the University of Strathclyde, Department of Computer and Information Sciences, to place a copy of the dissertation in a publicly available archive.

(please tick) Yes **[X]** No []

I declare that the word count for this dissertation (excluding title page, declaration, abstract, acknowledgements, table of contents, list of illustrations, references and appendices is 21,987.

I confirm that I wish this to be assessed as a Type 1 2 3 [4] 5 Dissertation (please circle)

Signature: Molly Black

Date: 19/8/19

Abstract

Evidence Based Library and Information Practice (EBLIP) is a global practice of decision making in the library context. With the majority of literature surrounding the practice coming from North America little has been published regarding UK practices of librarians. No previous research has been focused on comparing the academic sector of librarianship in the US and UK and their EBLIP procedures.

The aim of this study was to reach as many academic librarians working in the United States and United Kingdom and to gather information regarding EBLIP such as, how and why evidence is used, challenges to the process, and gaps in the current knowledge base. In addition to this, the research was concerned with understanding the professional environment of both US and UK librarianship and to understand how standards of professionalism interplayed with EBLIP implementation.

The results of the study found a population of academic librarians that believe in the power of EBLIP but face challenges of lack of time, lack of training, and an unsupportive institutional environment. A holistic approach to what is considered evidence was found to be accepted by academic librarians who largely use evidence to understand the nature of a problem and to influence a specific decision. Results demonstrate a comparatively weaker UK professional environment with less professional organization engagement, less degree-qualified professionals, and a less rigorous process to achieve professional qualifications (Chartership, etc.). The conclusions of this study encourage professional bodies (ALA, CILIP) to create sector specific guidance to lead practice and to require the teaching of library research methods as a part of LIS programs and CPD to establish a strong foundation for EBLIP implementation and growth.

ii

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank David McMenemy for his guidance in completing this project, along with all of the participants of the online survey and those who helped circulate it. Finally, I would like to thank my partner Billy for his endless kindness, support, and constant supply of chocolate throughout this process.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH	1
1.3 RESEARCH PROBLEM AND OBJECTIVES	2
1.4 DISSERTATION STRUCTURE AND SUMMARY	3
1.5 CONCLUSION	4
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 HIGHER EDUCATION AND LIBRARIES IN THE UK AND US	5
2.1.1 American Higher Education	5
2.1.2 UK Higher Education	6
2.1.3 Scotland	6
2.2 LIS EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS IN THE US	7
2.2.1 American Academic Libraries	7
2.3 LIS EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATIONS IN THE UK	8
2.3.1 British Academic Libraries	8
2.4 EBLIP BACKGROUND AND MODELS	9
2.4.1 EBLIP Origins	9
2.4.2 EBLIP Models	
2.4.3 Strengths and Weaknesses of EBLIP	
2.5 PROFESSIONAL SIGNIFICANCE	
2.6 PRACTITIONER-RESEARCHERS IN EBLIP	
2.7 EBLIP IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES	
2.7.1 Academic Librarianship	
2.7.2 Evidence Base	
2.7.3 EBLIP Implementation	
2.7.4 Academic Librarians and EBLIP	
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	
3.1 INTRODUCTION TO METHODOLOGY	20
3.2 Research Context & Literature Review	20
3.3 Research Strategy	21
3.4 Research Design:	
3.4.1 Cross Sectional	
3.4.2 Grounded Theory	
3.5 Research Method:	23
3.5.1 Questionnaire	23
3.5.2 Questionnaire Analysis	24
3.5.3 Questionnaire Sample	25

3.6 Research Design:	26
3.6.1 Comparative Document Analysis	26
3.6.2 Document Analysis Sample	27
3.6.3 Data Collection	27
3.6.4 Qualitative Content Analysis	28
3.6.5 Coding Schemes	28
3.7 LIMITATIONS OF METHODOLOGY	29
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	
4.1 Online Questionnaires	
4.2 Respondent Profiles	
4.2.1 Country of Employment	
4.2.2 Professional Qualifications	
4.2.3 Years' Experience	
4.2.4 Job Role	
4.2.5 Professional Qualification Requirement	
4.2.6 Professional Organization Registration	
4.2.7 Professional Achievements	34
4.3 DISCUSSION: RESPONDENT PROFILES	35
4.4 Continued Professional Development (CPD)	35
4.5 EBLIP	
4.5.1 Evidence Consultation	
4.5.2 Sources of Evidence	
4.5.3 Professional Environment	
4.5.4 Reasons for Evidence	42
4.5.5 Challenges	45
4.5.6 Gaps	45
4.6 CONCLUSION	48
CHAPTER 5: COMPARATIVE DOCUMENT ANALYSIS	49
5.1 Document Analysis	49
5.2 Sample	49
5.3 Professional Advancement	50
5.3.1 Nature of Qualification and Requirements	50
5.3.2 Decision Makers	52
5.3.3 Forms of Evidence	52
5.4 Professional Standards	53
5.4.1 Academic Library	54
5.4.2 Librarians	55
5.5 Conclusion	56

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION	57
6.1 Analysis of Findings & Discussion	57
6.2 PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT	57
6.2.1 Professional Standards/Guidance	57
6.2.2 Professional Qualifications	58
6.2.3 EBLIP and the Profession	59
6.2.4 Professional Organization Engagement	61
6.2.5 Tenure vs. CILIP Professional Registration	61
6.3 US & UK EBLIP	63
6.3.1 Sources of Evidence	63
6.3.2 Evidence Use	63
6.3.3 Challenges	64
6.3.4 Knowledge Gaps	65
6.4 Conclusion	66
CHAPTER 7: RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSION	68
7.1 Academic Librarians & EBLIP	68
7.1 Academic Librarians & EBLIP 7.1.1 Respondent Profile	68 <i>68</i>
7.1 ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS & EBLIP 7.1.1 Respondent Profile 7.1.2 Findings	68
 7.1 ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS & EBLIP 7.1.1 Respondent Profile 7.1.2 Findings 7.2 PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT 	
 7.1 ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS & EBLIP 7.1.1 Respondent Profile 7.1.2 Findings 7.2 PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT	
 7.1 ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS & EBLIP 7.1.1 Respondent Profile	
 7.1 Academic Librarians & EBLIP 7.1.1 Respondent Profile 7.1.2 Findings 7.2 Professional Environment	
 7.1 ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS & EBLIP	
 7.1 ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS & EBLIP	
 7.1 ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS & EBLIP	
 7.1 ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS & EBLIP	
 7.1 ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS & EBLIP. 7.1.1 Respondent Profile. 7.1.2 Findings. 7.2 PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT. 7.2.1 Findings. 7.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EBLIP. 7.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH. REFERENCES: APPENDIX 1: APPENDIX 2 APPENDIX 3 	
7.1 ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS & EBLIP. 7.1.1 Respondent Profile. 7.1.2 Findings. 7.2 PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT. 7.2.1 Findings. 7.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EBLIP. 7.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH. REFERENCES: APPENDIX 1: APPENDIX 2 APPENDIX 3 APPENDIX 5	
7.1 ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS & EBLIP. 7.1.1 Respondent Profile. 7.1.2 Findings. 7.2 PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT. 7.2.1 Findings. 7.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EBLIP. 7.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH. REFERENCES: APPENDIX 1: APPENDIX 2 APPENDIX 3 APPENDIX 5 APPENDIX 6	

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 4.1	Respondent Profile Summary	31
Figure 4.2 Figure 4.3	Job Titles Professional Association Membership	32 34
Figure 4.4	Opinions of evidence requirement based on professional level	36
Figure 4.5	Frequency of Evidence Consultation	37
Figure 4.6	Frequency of evidence consultation based on professional qualification	37
Figure 4.7	Ranked Sources of Evidence	38
Figure 4.8	Professional Environment	40
Figure 4.9	Perception of the Value of Evidence for the Profession	42
Figure 4.1.1	Reasons for evidence consultation	43
Figure 4.1.2	Free text responses for reasons for evidence consultation	43
Figure 4.1.3	Free text responses for how evidence is used	44
Figure 4.1.4	Free text responses for how evidence is used	44
Figure 4.1.5	Ranking of EBLIP challenges by country	45
Figure 4.1.6	Free text response EBLIP challenges by country	45
Figure 4.1.7	Knowledge Gaps in the US	46
Figure 4.1.8	Knowledge Gaps in the UK	47
Figure 5.1	Nature of the Qualification and Requirements for tenure, Certification, Chartership, and Fellowship	51
Figure 5.2	Decision makers in awarding professional achievements	52
Figure 5.3	Forms of evidence to support promotion or qualification award	53
Figure 5.4	Standards for academic library service	54
Figure 5.5	Standards for Academic Librarians	55
Figure 6.1	Knowledge Contribution by Professional Qualification- UK	60
Figure 6.2	Knowledge Contribution by Professional Qualification- US	60

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Overview

Evidence Based Practice (EBP) or Evidence Based Library and Information Practice (EBLIP) is a structured approach to decision making that "promotes the collection, interpretation and integration of valid, important and applicable user-reported, librarian-observed, and research-derived evidence" (Booth & Brice, 2004, p.7). This dissertation conducts research into the current status of these practices within the academic sector of librarianship within the United States and the United Kingdom. The following chapter will provide the background to the research, outlining the motivations and identifying the research gap. The research problem and objectives will be identified followed by an overview of the structure of this dissertation.

1.2 Background to the research

With its origins in medicine, evidence-based medicine (EBM) was created in order to apply research evidence to clinical decision making. With the growth of EBM, librarians became central to this new approach and were often heavily involved in research teams to assist with searching for latest knowledge. With such close involvement with EBM, health librarians largely acted at the forefront of what has become known as EBLIP by transitioning the same principles of EBM into librarianship (Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016, pp.6-7).

EBLIP is a structured approach to decision making, it "promotes the collection, interpretation and integration of valid, important and applicable user-reported, librarian-observed, and research-derived evidence" (Booth & Brice, 2004, p.17). This is a vital tool for librarians to improve and maintain the highest level of professional judgement. In an article written by Library Journal which consulted library directors across the US, it stated, of the 11 identified essential skills for librarians in the next 20 years, the ability to find and evaluate research to make decisions, gain insights, and apply a narrative to explain it was amongst the most important for the future of librarianship (Schwartz, 2016, p.2). These skills highlight the importance of the librarian's ability to interpret research and data to improve library practice.

Research into sector-based implementation of EBP lends itself particularly well to academic librarianship especially with recent developments and changes in higher education

institutions and academic librarianship. With an increased focus on assessment and evaluation in the academic sector for continued improvement there is an additional stress of proving value. Academic librarians are facing challenges such as, keeping up with rapid change in the transition from print to digital and making services and information always accessible and seamless in this transition (Somerville & Kloda, 2016, p.94). Additionally, librarians must anticipate emerging publication models, new licensing platforms, and library management systems and their many features (Somerville & Kloda, 2016, p.94). Students and academics are expecting more from their libraries, and with such overwhelming new technologies and advancement on the horizon EBP will be crucial to keeping ahead of the trends to create intuitive services.

Throughout the past two decades EBLIP has been a growing field in library and information sciences (LIS), with an additional push for practicing librarians and LIS researches to conduct research into practice (Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016, p.8). Due to the origins of EBP in medicine there has been large bodies of engagement with EBP in the health library sector with less known about EBP in academic libraries, specifically in the UK. A study of the articles published in the EBLIP journal found that 70% of the new research happening in EBLIP comes out of the US and Canada with 76% of the articles coming from a single institution with cross-nation co-authorship rarely seen (Wu & Pu, 2015, p.75). With such prevalence of EBLIP in North America and health libraries, there is a gap in understanding academic librarians and information professional's engagement with EBLIP in the UK.

1.3 Research problem and objectives

The rapidly changing landscape of academic librarianship and identified gap in sector research specifically within the UK establishes the foundations of this research. The choice to compare the practices within the United States and the United Kingdom is to understand the differences in librarianship as a profession and how this effects how individuals and organizations embrace EBLIP. The problem of this research is to find out how EBLIP is being embraced within either country and to gauge the effects of professional organizations and overall professional status in the implementation of this practice. This dissertation will do this by addressing the following research questions:

• What types of decisions regarding practice and service are being supported by evidence?

- How is evidence being used to support decision making about practice and service?
- What are the challenges in the EBLIP process?
- Does the professional status of librarian's effect EBLIP engagement?
- What effect do professional organizations have in the use of EBLIP?

To answer the above questions, this project will seek to fulfill three key objectives:

- Discover the attitudes and experience of US and UK academic librarians of EBLIP
- Gauge the relationship between the academic librarian and their professional environment
- Develop recommendations to strengthen EBLIP across the academic sector to best support practitioners.

1.4 Dissertation structure and summary

The structure of the dissertation and chapter summaries are provided throughout this section.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter details the background to the research and its problem. Providing a list of research questions and objectives followed by a chapter-by-chapter summary of the dissertation.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This section provides the context of both the higher education system and academic library sector within the US and UK. Following this, a background of EBLIP is provided with specific focus within the academic sector.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Outlines the design of the research project. Firstly, identifying the approach to survey design, disbursement, data analysis techniques, and qualitative methods. Secondly, it breaks down the processes for the comparative document analysis, sample, and coding. Finally, detailing limitations of these approaches.

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter will report and analyze the information and data gathered from the survey and literature review. Here concrete findings of the survey will be delivered and processed to create a distinct image of the current status of EBLIP in academic libraries in the US and UK.

Chapter 5: Comparative Document Analysis

Will present an international comparison of the models of academic librarianship in the US and UK. Through document analysis of published guidance from professional organizations such as the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP) and the American Library Association (ALA) section will pull apart overall themes of broad differences in the model of UK and US academic librarianship such as the strength of the professional organizations.

Chapter 6: Discussion

Will provide an in-depth discussion of findings seeking to address the research objectives of the project.

Chapter 7: Recommendations & Conclusion

This chapter will discuss the objectives of the research, the findings, and overall conclusions drawn from the process. Recommendations for improved implementation of EBLIP based upon findings of the survey and document analysis will be provided along with recommendations for further research.

1.5 Conclusion

This brief chapter has provided an overview of the topic of this dissertation, the background to the research, the objectives, and the structure of presentation.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

As an investigation into the academic sector of librarianship, it will be therefore useful to define this term as it is used within this project. The academic sector consists of "the library associated with a degree-granting institution of higher education" (American Library Association, 2009, np). The main goal of this project is to compare the status of EBLIP in the academic sectors of the United States and United Kingdom. With this, the context of the academic systems of both countries needs defining along with a breakdown of the qualities and structures of the academic library systems in order to establish a comprehensive comparison. In the explanation of comparisons of these two systems this study hopes to uncover how EBLIP implementation interplays with these systems and thus is affected by them.

2.1 Higher Education and Libraries in the UK and US

2.1.1 American Higher Education

In the US, the system of higher education consists of colleges and universities which are degree granting institutions. Education is largely the responsibility of State and local authorities. The requirements for enrolment, graduation, and the curriculum are set by the authorities which create them, whether that be state, local, or private organizations. Funding of education largely reflects the state and local role with the majority of funding coming from State, local, and private sources (U.S. Department of Education, 2017, np). On the federal level, the Department of Education contributes to higher education institutions through financial aid programs which provide loans, work-study assistance, and grants (USDE, 2017, np).

At least one state university system is supported in every State in the US with several supporting many more. Aside from state institutions private universities are common throughout the US, with the majority acting as non-profit institutions. Community colleges are 2-year colleges with open admissions, lower tuition fees, and reward graduates with an Associate's degree. Commonly, individuals progress to a four-year institution to complete a Bachelor's following their Associate's degree (Ponnusamy & Pandurangan, 2014).

Universities in the US are largely research-oriented education institutions which provide programs for both undergraduates and postgraduates. The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education is the standard through which institutions are categorized

into colleges, universities, etc. As of 2016 there were 4,360 higher education institutions in the US (*College & University- Statistics and Facts*, 2019).

2.1.2 UK Higher Education

The system of higher education in the UK consists of universities, university colleges, and some high education colleges. Degree awarding programs and the 'university' title are controlled under UK law making it illegal for institutions to call themselves a university or award degrees without authorization (Check if a university or college is officially recognised, 2019). 'Recognized' or 'listed' bodies are institutions in the UK which administers degree-level courses. Recognized bodies are institutions which award degrees while listed bodies cannot. If individuals were to study at a listed body institution the degree would be awarded by a recognized body (Check if a university or college is officially recognised, 2019). Higher education is a devolved power, meaning the Scottish parliament, Welsh Assembly, Northern Ireland Assembly, and the Greater London Authority each establish rules for degree awarding within their jurisdiction (The Scottish Parliament, 2016).

Within the UK, the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) describes the different types and levels of higher education qualifications offered. The main qualifications are: postgraduate qualifications (certificates, diplomas, master's degrees, doctorates); Bachelor's degrees, Higher National Certificates (HNC) and Higher National Diplomas (HND); Foundation degrees, certificates and other academic awards (not honorary degrees) (What higher education is 2019). England, Wales, and Northern Ireland follow the FHEQ for their qualification frameworks while Scotland differs with a twelve-level qualification framework known as the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) (Qualifications: what the different levels mean, 2019).

2.1.3 Scotland

In Scotland there are 13 universities, 9 colleges, and the Open University. Higher education within Scotland differs from that of the rest of the UK primarily in the length of study for undergraduate degrees and the funding schemes for the universities. To achieve an undergraduate qualification, Scottish universities have a 4-year structured program while most other UK universities have 3-year programs (Bolton, 2018, np). The major difference worth highlighting between Scotland and the rest of the UK is the means of funding for higher education. All universities across the UK receive funding from funding councils, endowments,

taxation, and tuition fees. England, Wales, and Northern Ireland have tuition fee caps between £3,805-£9,250. While Scotland is capped at £1,820 and offers free tuition to qualified Scottish residence through the Student Awards Agency for Scotland (SAAS) (Tuition fees for university, 2019, np).

2.2 LIS Education and Qualifications in the US

2.2.1 American Academic Libraries

For most sectors of librarianship in the US, master's degrees are the standard requirement for employment. The American Library Association (ALA) policy officially states: "The master's degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association (or equivalent) is the appropriate degree for librarians" (ALA, 2008, np). The official policy from the ALA group, American and College Research Libraries (ACRL), states opposition to recognizing any "alternative certification or licensing by state agencies or by state of local professional associations in lieu of the accredited degree for academic librarians" (ALA, 2006, np). Due to the prevalence of instruction in academic librarianship there are continued debates for requiring further qualifications either in relevant subjects for subject specific work or for teaching (Judge & McMenemy, 2014, p.4). These combined professional standards and debates exemplify the strength of a degree-level qualification in American academic librarianship.

A key feature of academic librarianship in the US is the librarian's ability to become a tenured member of faculty at the university level. In order to measure what makes a librarian a member of faculty the ACRL has published 'Standards for Faculty Status for Academic Librarians'. The document highlights librarians' specific contributions to the academic community through collections development, knowledge sharing, information literacy instruction, and "research into the information process and other areas of study" (ALA, 2011, np). The standards established in this document describe the various ways in which library faculty status is equivalent to faculty at large at any given institution.

- Librarians perform professional responsibilities, subject to regular review by peers.
- 2. Library should have an academic form of governance for library faculty.
- 3. Librarians should be eligible to serve in faculty senates and governing bodies.

- 4. Librarian salaries and compensation should be comparable to faculty of equivalent rank.
- 5. Librarians should be covered by a stated tenure policy.
- 6. Librarians must be promoted in rank based on performance, service, and scholarship, in a peer reviewed system.
- Librarians must be eligible for sabbatical, other research leaves and research funds.
- 8. Librarians must hold the same protection of Academic freedom as all faculty, without censorship or restriction to information access.
- 9. Librarians should have access to the same grievance process as other faculty.
- 10. All dismissals should be carried out through the academic due process.

(Hosburgh, 2011; ALA, 2011)

The standards and expectations of faculty academic librarians is a core part of understanding the system of academic libraries in the US and the opportunities available for career progression and development within this sector.

2.3 LIS Education and Qualifications in the UK

2.3.1 British Academic Libraries

To hold employment in a library in the UK, regardless of sector, an individual is not required to hold a Master's degree. The accrediting body for library and information studies degrees, the Chartered Institute for Library and Information Professionals (CILIP) allows for entry into the profession with a Bachelor's degree through entry-level and graduate trainee positions that allows for on-the job training. Through these programs and employer support, individuals can become qualified through CILIP Certification. This is a program offered to registered CILIP members beginning a career in the library and information sector, which allows them to gain official recognitions for skills held in the profession (Professional Registration Certification, nd). The CILIP Certification process is just one way that individuals might enter into the profession without a Master's degree. While this route remains an option, avenues towards entering academic librarianship generally require a Bachelor's degree followed by a postgraduate diploma or degree in librarianship. CILIP offers multiple levels of qualification for individuals at a variety of points in their careers. These qualifications are meant to add value to an individual by demonstrating a commitment to improvement. Following Certification, Chartership is the next step for professional qualification. Chartership is defined at the "gold standard as an information professional" and allows professionals to develop skills and knowledge and plan for future development (Professional Registration Chartership, no date). The final level of qualification offered to all library and information professionals regardless of sector is Fellowship. This is the highest level of Professional Registration and achieved by individuals shown to have made a significant impact not just on their organization but on the profession of information professionals (Professional Registration Fellowship, nd.

Within the academic sector of librarianship posts such as library assistants do not require a formal qualification while more senior positions regularly require a postgraduate degree in library and information science. In the academic sector in the UK, tenure is not an option in terms of career advancement for librarians (Academic & Research librarians, no date). While CILIP Professional Registration is recognized by UK employers, Higher Education Academy (HEA) Fellowship offers a competing qualification specific to the academic sector. While a variety of options exist in the UK there is no framework for advancement outside of a professional organization.

2.4 EBLIP Background and Models

2.4.1 EBLIP Origins

In the early 1990s, Evidence Based Medicine (EBM) emerged as "a new approach to the practice of medicine wherein research literature regularly consulted by clinicians so that new research evidence can be integrated with knowledge and clinical judgement" (Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016, p.6). This method began to grow over the years and Health librarians became an important link in helping clinicians find quality research and in teaching students how to find and evaluate research literature. With such close involvement with EBM health librarians largely acted at the forefront of what has become known as EBLIP by transitioning the same principles of EBM into librarianship.

Evidence based practice as it is largely understood across professions is regarded as one of information management. The five stages of evidence-based practice identified by (Sackett et al., 1997) are as follows:

- 1. Identification of a problem or question
- 2. Finding, as efficiently as possible, the best evidence to answer the question
- 3. Appraising the evidence for validity and usefulness
- 4. Applying the results to a specific population
- 5. Evaluating the outcome of the intervention

The common stages of practice that can be applied to any profession strongly aligns itself with information practice in judging information quality, relevance, and the outcome of information provision.

With the rapid changes in traditional models of publishing and new technologies, the knowledge base is continuing to grow at exponential rates. This shift in societal engagement with information and the influence of how readily accessible it is forced practitioners "to examine more closely their abilities and skills in managing the knowledge so crucial to their performance and professionalism" (Booth & Brice, 2004, p.4). From these realizations came the awareness that librarians should be *practicing* evidence-based practice. The specific term of evidence-based librarianship (EBL) emerged from this movement with multiple definitions introduced in the developing stages of this practice.

An early attempt at creating a space for librarians' engagement in EBP came from Eldredge (2002) describing EBL as it "seeks to improve library practice by utilising the best available evidence in conjunction with a pragmatic perspective developed from working experiences in librarianship" (p.72). Another definition of EBL by Crumley and Koufogiannakis (2002) establishes its inherent nature of pushing for improvement of the profession and additionally stress the need to encourage "librarians to conduct research" (p.62). These early attempts to define a space for librarians in the use of evidence-based practice with EBL laid the foundation for what we know today as EBLIP. As time continued it was argued that the term evidence-based librarianship would lead to confusion between librarians supporting EBP and librarians *practicing* EBP. Thus, Evidence Based Library Information Practice (EBLIP) has emerged as the preferred term as the official approach to professional decision making.

2.4.2 EBLIP Models

The first mention of 'evidence-based librarianship' (EBL) was in a 1997 article by Johnathan D. Eldredge which sparked the interest of medical librarians, leading to the growth of the

subject across librarianship. The early hierarchy of evidence created by Eldredge which stressed "hard" quantitative evidence is challenged by Crumley and Koufogiannakis (2002), arguing that librarianship "tends to reflect more qualitative, social sciences/humanities in its research methods and study types which tend to be less rigorous and more prone to bias" (p.61).

In a 2012 study by Koufogiannakis she found that academic librarians' definitions of evidence extended beyond that of traditional research or hard evidence, but additionally includes soft evidence (Koufogiannakis, 2012, pp. 10-11). Soft evidence consists of feedback from users, advice from colleagues, or anecdotal evidence. This more holistic definition of evidence used in practicing EBLIP was further backed by Gillespie et al. (2017) which revealed that Australian librarians had a more encompassing view of the variety of sources of evidence to be used in EBLIP (p.107). With this noted shift in ideas of what librarians define as evidence there has been proposed changes to the EBLIP model to reflect these differences.

In the original model constructed by Booth and Brice (2004) EBLIP was a five-step process, also known as the 5A model to include Ask, Acquire, Apprise, Apply, and Assess (Luo, 2018, p.555). This model was later streamlined by Booth (2009) to reflect the cyclical nature of EBLIP. Following the push for more broad determinants of what classifies evidence a holistic approach has been developed, incorporating research evidence, professional knowledge, and local evidence (Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016, p.13). This new model equally emphasizes the importance of each form of evidence for solo and team decision making with consideration given to context. The model as proposed by Koufogiannakis and Brettle (2016) focuses heavily on the types of evidence being trusted by professionals with suggestions that traditional published research may not always be the best source and encouraging 'alternatives'. The model consists of 5 steps:

- 1. Articulate the problem.
- 2. Assemble evidence.
- 3. Assess the evidence.
- 4. Agree on best plan forward
- 5. Adapt implementation after reflection on outcomes.

(Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016, p.15)

This current model is one focused on asking the right questions at the right stages and pushing librarians towards identifying knowledge gaps during the information seeking process. The purpose of this practice is to put practitioners at the center of all aspects of the process and to operate under a sense of control.

Vital to the successful implementation of the EBLIP model as stressed throughout the literature is the leadership roles of librarians and employers in facilitating a work place environment that values and encourages the use of evidence in decision making. Decision making processes should be made transparent, and communication amongst all library staff should be kept open and encourage the exchange of ideas from all levels of staff. Senior librarians are expected to set the tone for continued learning and professional education. Thus, library management and policy act as a vitally important part of the success of the EBLIP model (Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016, p.18)

2.4.3 Strengths and Weaknesses of EBLIP

While EBLIP has been adopted across the globe, criticisms and challenges to the process have presented themselves which has stunted its growth across sectors. Pretty (2007) lists barriers to the EBLIP process such as: a small evidence base; lack of time and heavy workload; and a lack of skills or training in implementing evidence into practice (p.30). The small evidence base is addressed by Pretty (2007) identifying the lack of funding into librarianship research which is normally performed by small teams or individuals as the source of the issue (p.30). This research environment into the field leads to a 'communication gap' between practitioners and researchers harming the practitioner's knowledge and thus, ability to access any of this information (Genoni et al., 2004, p.55). According to the literature practitioners must move beyond the field of librarianship to gather their evidence. As a field that intersects with social, educational, and management fields practitioners need to be broadening their scope of literature searching in order to be fully informed (Booth &Brice, 2004; Eldredge, 2004; Pretty 2007).

An obvious weakness of the EBLIP process is the lack of time and workload of librarians and information professionals. Booth and Brice (2004) state that this complaint is not founded in the excessive workloads of librarians but rather an unwillingness to prioritize EBLIP (p.9). Pretty (2007) further supports this statement in arguing that continual evaluation is necessary for all library services and making EBLIP a regular practice might save future time for

correcting uninformed poor past decisions. Wilson (2017) suggests that with the rapid changes in librarianship, librarians will continually be faced with a learning curve for new processes and EBLIP is no different (p.186).

These statements are the foundation from which all other weaknesses of the process stem. EBLIP needs to be a priority of the profession, no matter the sector, for it to succeed. EBLIP is defined regularly as a *daily* practice, thus librarianship as a profession must take on this mentality as a part of their training of new staff and policies across organizations and institutions, and standards for practice. This shift in professional expectations will allow for further training of implementing evidence in practice and making time for this process.

2.5 Professional Significance

As highlighted in the previous section, information professionals find themselves well positioned and skilled to undertake EBLIP, but it is not only due to circumstantial skills which should influence the information professional to engage with research. It is clear that professionalism plays an important role in establishing and supporting EBLIP. An additional trend throughout the literature has been the importance of EBLIP as a means of professional advocacy and standards (Booth & Brice, 2004; Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016).

The concept of professionalism has become one strongly linked to EBLIP throughout the literature. Moody and Shanks (1999) define a professional as someone with, "implicit, or tacit, knowledge acquired from years of experience must be informed, and indeed completed, by explicit knowledge, or evidence, derived from more formal recorded sources" (Booth & Brice, 2004, p.3). The idea that professions and professional status are strengthened and upheld by evidence is advocated by Booth and Brice (2004), "The concept of professionalism requires that a practitioner remains in constant contact with the knowledge base that determines the content, nature and impact of their day-to-day activities" (p.3).

The strength of the professional status of librarianship and other information positions as a profession is crucial and EBLIP is core to sustaining a professional identity. The importance of maintaining librarianship as a 'profession' is highlighted in the mere definition of a profession, "claim to special esoteric competence and to concern for the quality of its work and its benefits to society, [and] obtains the exclusive right to perform a particular kind of work..." (Freidson, 1973, p.22). This ability to claim professional status has inherit connotations to a specific code of ethics and integrity, and skills performed to a high and established standard.

Professional status is an instrument by which individuals can gain "higher income, power, and prestige" (Brante, 1990, p.76).

The importance of maintaining professional status amongst librarians has become increasingly important with the major shifts in how information is being accessed and delivered around the world (Crowley, 2008, p.3). EBLIP has an important role to play as a paradigm that "consists of the beliefs, assumptions, and values and techniques accepted by a community of practitioners" (Gordon, 2009, p.23). Eldredge (2014) argues that EBLIP has a role in "renewing the contract our profession has with society" by sparking a newfound respect for the expertise of librarians in their user-oriented decisions (p.63). With a shift in the 'profession' from autonomy to accountability EBLIP reinforces professional authority. By making informed and transparent decisions the process enhances professional status, demonstrating value to society.

2.6 Practitioner-Researchers in EBLIP

The literature has shown that EBLIP is a cyclical process which feeds into itself. Librarians ask questions, seek answers, identify gaps, collect evidence, implement, reflect, and repeat. Existing models of EBLIP encourage librarians to identify gaps in the research and conduct research into their own practice. Librarian lead research reporting on actual practice is an important part of the process and growing the evidence base and continuing the cycle. When librarians conduct research, they are called 'practitioner-researchers'.

EBLIP ultimately is a way to improve the profession of librarianship and self-lead research should be seen as an obligation of professionals to contribute and propel everyone forward. Watson-Boone (2000) identifies the academic sector of librarianship as one particularly suited for practitioner-researchers wherein they "approach projects and problems in ways that yield 1) solutions, 2) an enlarged understanding of their actual field work- their practice and 3) improvements in the practice" (2000, p.85). Wilson (2016) further supports academic librarianship as a positive place for the practitioner-researcher, particularly in the context of North America where "tenured/tenure track faculty members, academic librarians... can and do undertake research on whatever they want, using methods that are driven by their research questions" (p.83).

In a study completed by Wilson (2016) wherein 14 librarians in Canada and the UK who identified as 'practitioner-researchers' were interviewed a list of common challenges and

benefits of this role were identified (p.87). Challenges were as follows: time, motivation, funding, lack of research skills, organizational culture (pp.84-85). Many of these have been previously identified throughout the literature of some of the main challenges of evidencebased practitioners. The benefits of being a practitioner-researcher included: professional development; enhanced work life; explore new horizons; and contribute to practice (pp.86-87). The matter of generating more 'practitioner-researchers' within the profession is a matter of great importance to the process of EBLIP but also its role in advancing the profession. An article written for the EBLIP Journal by Eldredge et al., (2015) pushes for the creation of defined research agendas to be published by the journal wherein practitioners could see these identified gaps and contribute to filling them (p.172). The issue of generating practitioner-researchers continues to persist and will be an important issue to tackle within organizations and professional bodies for years to come.

2.7 EBLIP in academic libraries

2.7.1 Academic Librarianship

Changes in higher education and publishing has changed the landscape of academic librarianship. With the transition from largely print to electronic resources it has become the task of the academic librarian to provide seamless access to resources and integrating into library management systems. These widespread changes particularly with new models of publishing, create new required skills and knowledge in licensing, acquisitions, discovery and access in the academic field (Somerville & Kloda, 2016, p.94). The function of the library has also changed from the physical facilities to the digital. Spaces are now curated with campus stakeholders and users in mind and online learning platforms are at the center allowing for customization and personalization for faculty and students. These major changes in the function of the academic library facilitate an ideal environment for EBLIP in which librarians may pull from current evidence but also learn and build the evidence base from practice.

Pressure within the academic sector to keep up with current trends and the most up-to-date information is high, particularly due to the research focus of higher education institutions. Academics in both the US (Schonfeld & Housewright, 2013) and UK (Housewright et al., 2013) report similar trends of increased use of online resources yet also still value traditional resources. In both studies additional trends identified included changes in the adoption of digital content, information seeking practices, and embracing open access. A study

performed by Pinto and Sales (2015) found amongst students that differences in disciplines of study strongly influenced perceptions of the importance of search evaluation and processing information (p.204). It is clear from studies such as these, the strong link between the academic sector and their patrons in shaping services, and it is in the research from practitioners that will drive a user-centered model.

2.7.2 Evidence Base

Participation in the entire lifecycle of the research, teaching, and learning processes is at the core of the academic library mission. Services provided are expanding to meet this challenge including, "data curation, researcher profiles, digital scholarship, scholarly publishing, creative expression, impact measures, web development, government funding mandates, and digital humanities" (Somerville & Kloda, 2016, p.94). Academic librarianship is increasingly expanding its roles and reach of services to beyond the traditional, making collaboration with information technology departments, academic faculty, and industry professionals more important. These collaborations make it possible for librarians to "design services to fit in the researcher's workflow, rather than the researcher attempting to understand or fit into ours" (Rambo, 2015, p.9). These aspirations make research into the information behaviors of researchers an important area of study within the academic sector of librarianship.

Areas of evidence that are experiencing rapid growth in the academic sector have been investigations into technology adoption such as, library web design and discovery layer services and the different features of these products (Somerville & Kloda, 2016, p.95). With the researcher experience being pushed to the forefront of library service development, librarians are urged "simply must move beyond the false choice that sees only the solutions currently available and push for a vision that is right for their researchers" (Schonfeld, 2015, p.13). With statements such as these, looking toward the future when filling research gaps especially related to technological services is an essential goal for EBLIP across all sectors. With the emergence of defining professional status as one based on accountability backed by evidence (Eldredge, 2014) this push for intuitive thinking becomes increasingly more important to the profession as a whole.

Librarianship has always had a hand in promoting information literacy to patrons across sectors. Information literacy instruction and education is a large part of the services of an

academic library and its importance is reflected in the growing evidence base around this. In recent years there has been an increase in studies which gauge the effectiveness of information literacy instructional techniques through educational impact measures demonstrated by three systematic reviews on effective information literacy instruction (Koufogiannakis and Weibe, 2006; Weightman et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2007). These reviews and current literature show the trend of assessment within academic libraries, driven by academic accreditation standards and program reviews with EBLIP playing an important role in maintaining high standards and performance.

2.7.3 EBLIP Implementation

Within the discourse of the EBLIP community there is the strong held belief that in order for the process to be successful it must become an internalized part of the profession supported by individual organizations and institutions (Wilson, 2017; Somerville & Kloda, 2016; Howlett, 2018; Dalrymple, 2010; Wilson, 2016). In order to make EBLIP 'sustainable' it must become a part of the day-to-day workflow and 'way-of-being' of practitioners (Booth, 2009; Wilson, 2017; Partridge, Edwards, &Thorpe, 2010). One of the biggest challenges for academic librarians in EBLIP implementation is the 'organizational dynamics' (Koufogiannakis, 2015, p.104). Behaviors of individuals, groups, and organizational structures are determined 'organizational dynamics' (Koufogiannakis, 2013b, 143) that act as barriers to EBLIP (Booth, 2011, p.4). Additionally, it is often commonplace for library decisions to be made by groups, teams, or require outside approval, complicating the process (Booth, 2009, p. 342; Koufogiannakis, 2013a, p.9; Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016, p. 10).

The 2015 study by Koufogiannakis exposed some key components needed to facilitate EBLIP in an academic library, including, a general culture that values evidence, collaboration, and support from colleagues (p.109). 'When the culture of the organization is generally felt to be positive and one that is open-minded with respect to decision making', EBLIP succeeds (Koufogiannakis, 2013b, 143). Acknowledging these factors could help librarians to nurture a workplace environment that allows EBLIP to flourish. Somerville (2015) suggests that from continual practice of enacting evidence-based learning experiences with co-workers over time, organizations will learn the proper decision-making processes that will change the workplace culture (p.11).

Howlett (2018) rejects the notion of evidence-based practitioners and instead champions the 'evidence-based library' (p.74). In their article a model for implementing EBLIP through an 'organizational lens' is developed, wherein criticism is given to the 2016 EBLIP model developed by Koufogiannakis and Brettle stating, "this model continues to promote EBLIP as an approach to specific situations or problems that arise from professional practice, and not explicitly as a habitual or cultural way of being" (p.75). From this identified gap in the model Howlett identified four cultural elements that must be present to support EBLIP on an organizational level:

- 1. A culture of valuing: evidence-based practice involves being valued and valuing each other.
- A culture of being: evidence-based practice involves being and becoming a professional.
- A culture of learning: evidence-based practice involves being a learner and supporting the learning of others.
- 4. A culture of leading: evidence-based practice involves leadership at many levels and leading towards one shared vision.

(Howlett, 2018, p.76)

Understanding these cultural elements and their impact on organizational EBLIP is a matter of importance for all sectors of librarianship. With these developments in organizational EBLIP models it is obvious how crucial the role of employing organizations, institutions, and the library leadership is for facilitating an environment for EBLIP to thrive.

2.7.4 Academic Librarians and EBLIP

Various studies have documented the habits of academic librarians and their engagement with EBLIP. In a study on the experience of Australian academic librarians it was found that across the different roles in the library that EBLIP was "empowering, intuiting, affirming, connecting, noticing, and impacting" (Miller et al., 2017, p.124). In another study performed by Luo (2018) it was found that evidence-based decisions were most often "Know-what (works)" scenarios where librarian sought evidence for desired outcomes with minimal cost (Luo, 2018, p.558). Practitioners were found to follow the holistic EBLIP approach (Luo, 2018, p.554). Challenges encountered center around "time, mentoring/training, availability and

accessibility of evidence, organizational culture, and personality" (Luo, 2018, p.554). The findings of Luo's study confirm an earlier study performed by Koufogiannakis (2013) which studied similar questions on the what and how of evidence use by academic librarians resulting in the highlighted importance of collaboration and organizational dynamics in decision making (p.1).

Academic librarians have shown trends in the ways in which they evaluate and seek out information. In the same study by Koufogiannakis (2013b) it was found that academic librarians seek out information through proactive methods such as, searching the literature, conducting an evaluation study and drawing on prior experience and knowledge. Additional passive methods include, social media feeds and accidental discovery (Koufogiannakis, 2013b, p.99). Koufogiannakis (2013b) found that the primary purpose of academic librarians in using evidence was to convince themselves and others (p.161). Firstly, they gather evidence as a means of confirming a personal current practice or way of thinking, and secondly seek out evidence in order to influence the decision making of colleagues and stakeholders on the organizational level (p.118). In consideration of these finding of the academic librarians' use of evidence it is clear that EBLIP helps decision making bodies in the academic sector come to a consensus.

Koufogiannakis (2015) spoke of determinants which influence how academic librarians see evidence. These determinants include: organizational dynamics; time available to librarians; personal outlook of librarians; and education and training, acting as both enablers and barriers to the EBLIP process (p.109). Some of these determinants can be combatted on an individual basis such as personal outlook, and education, while others such as organizational systems are much more difficult to change. With all these factors which have been proven to influence the experience of academic librarians in their participation of EBLIP it is clear the push for organizational changes across the board is a major change necessary for the success of EBLIP and thus the continued success of librarianship as a profession.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction to Methodology

The cause for this research initially sprung from a recognized lack of research into EBLIP practices in the academic sector within the UK identified by the researcher. Expectations for the volume of research were based on a knowledge of US publications, inciting the original intention of the research to focus only within the UK. The shift to a comparative study with the US was made in order to draw in larger observations about the status of librarianship as a profession in either country. The recognized importance of EBLIP in relation to professional status is undeniable as shown within the literature review (Section 2.5). This choice to compare the US and UK was made to uncover the symbiotic relationship between the status of professional librarianship and EBLIP, verifying the strength of both. In order to fully assess the status of EBLIP usage in academic libraries and the connections with concepts of professionalism, two research methods were adopted. Firstly, an online questionnaire was developed and distributed to UK and US academic librarians. Secondly, a document analysis of official policies of professional standards from the American Library Association (ALA) and the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP) was undertaken. This section details the processes undertaken throughout this study to fully satisfy the project objectives.

3.2 Research Context & Literature Review

In planning the research process the literature review was constructed to answer the following questions: "what is already known about the topic; what concepts and theories have been applied to the topic; what research methods have been applied to the topic; what controversies exist about the topic and how it is studied; what clashes (if any) exist; and who the key contributors to research on the topic are" (Bryman, 2016, p.6). The literature review was conducted to be as exhaustive of a review as possible with focus on identifying and reporting the key figures and books in the field. Another important aspect of the literature review was its role in providing a context to the subject of not only EBLIP but the academic systems and status of professional librarianship in both the US and the UK. A comprehensive explanation of these systems was key to understanding the impact and importance of this study, with the structure based upon the comparative study by Judge and McMenemy (2014).

Resources such as online databases; LISA, LISTA, and EBSCO; online journals such as EBLIP Journal; and various books were accessed for the literature review.

3.3 Research Strategy

Across the scope of this research qualitative and quantitative data has been collected. As the objective of this project is to gauge the overall status of EBLIP in the US and UK numbers become important to achieve a full understanding of practices. Additional qualitative data answers research questions such as, identifying questions of what kinds of challenges exist in the EBLIP process. For the sake of this research, definitions of both qualitative and quantitative will be defined. Qualitative research refers to attempting to understand meaning assigned to social problems or concepts, experiences, and purposes with a focus on the individual's perspective (Almalki, 2016, p.291). Quantitative research is an objective approach removed from the influence of observation usually focused on "gathering numerical data and generalising it across groups of people" (Almalki, 2016, p.290-291).

With the use of both research strategies in this project a mixed methods research strategy was adopted. The mixed methods approach combines both qualitative and quantitative research (Bryman, 2016, p.693). In the attempt to address both the research questions and the objectives of the project both means of research were necessary. As qualitative analysis emphasizes how individuals view and interpret their social worlds, questions of challenges, personal opinion, and experiences were addressed through this method (Bryman, 2016). The use of a mixed methods approach is justified by Almalki (2016) stating, "this approach enables a greater degree of understanding to be formulated than if a single approach were adopted to specific studies" (p.291).

The mixed methods approach involved a web-based questionnaire and a document analysis of ALA and CILIP official professional standards. The online survey collected a combination of quantitative and qualitative data and the document analysis is solely a qualitative approach, which utilized grounded theory as a means of analysis. Grounded theory adaptation for this project is addressed in section 3.4.2. The mixed methods approach using both the online survey and document analysis allowed for triangulation. Triangulation is a method which uses "more than one method or source of data in the study of social phenomena" (Bryman, 2016, p.386). Triangulation is often used so that findings of a mixed method research "may be mutually corroborated" (Bryman, 2016, p.641). This method was utilized in particular regard

to the process of evaluating impacts of professional organizations and their status in either country in EBLIP success and implementation.

3.4 Research Design:

3.4.1 Cross Sectional

To fully address the objectives and questions of this study, and apply a mixed methods approach, a cross sectional design and a grounded theory design were undertaken. As outlined by Bryman (2016, p.53), cross-sectional design is defined as:

<u>More than one case</u>: Variation in this study comes from the participants (i.e. UK and US academic librarians).

<u>Being at a single point in time</u>: The data collection period for this research spanned across a 14-day period where individuals were asked to complete the questionnaire in one sitting.

<u>Quantifiable data</u>: Methods utilized for quantifiable data were: years' experience; job title; and country of residence.

<u>Patterns of association</u>: Inferences can be made between relationships of different variables such as years' experience and EBLIP engagement, but cause-and-effect relationships are indeterminable due to the small timescale of data collection.

3.4.2 Grounded Theory

Grounded theory is a common approach used in qualitative data analysis which is focused on flexibility when studying real-world situations and processes, focused on the significance rather than the quantity (Bryman, 2016, p.575). Grounded theory as a methodology allows for flexibility, supporting the researcher's ability to explore themes as they emerge from data and to develop meaning and significance. The grounded theory approach is one that does not require a detailed plan before beginning the study but instead broadens the potential of findings from qualitative data by allowing the researcher to develop understanding and concepts through data analysis (Bryman, 2016, p.572). Grounded theory is a process that entails a 'constant comparison' which enables researchers to connect codes to a "certain category so that a theoretical elaboration of that category can begin to emerge" (Bryman, 2016, p. 573).

A key tool of the grounded theory process is coding. Coding enables researchers to breakdown data into component parts and give them names in order to categorize (Bryman, 2016, p.573). The coding process entails the reviewing of transcripts and the assignment of labels or names to parts that are deemed theoretically significant or appears "to be particularly salient within the social worlds of those being studied" (Bryman, 2016, p.573). According to Charmaz (1983) codes are significant in that they, "serve as shorthand devices to label, separate, compile, and organize data" (p.186). In order to inform the coding process of this project the Strauss and Corbin (2008) variation of grounded theory was utilized which encourages the researcher to undertake a literature review before beginning the data (Judge & McMenemy, 2014, p.30). Details regarding the creation of specific coding schemes for the questionnaire and document analysis are listed in sections 3.5.2 and 3.6.4.

3.5 Research Method:

3.5.1 Questionnaire

The online questionnaire developed using the Qualtrics Insight Platform, consisted of 24 questions, with 22 quantitative multiple-choice and ranking questions (Question 1-22), four of which allowing for additional free text responses (Q5, Q8, Q20, Q21) and 2 qualitative free text responses (Q23 and Q24). The mix of qualitative and quantitative questions arose from the cross-sectional design that allows for combining both methods to detect "patterns of association" (Bryman, 2016, p. 53). The survey began with a set of demographic information questions such as country of residence, professional qualification, years experience, library role, and professional registration (Q1-Q8, Q11). The following qualitative questions consisted of gauging experiences with professional organizations, EBLIP, and challenges of the process. Questions regarding practice such as Q20, Q21, Q22 were created based upon findings from the Luo (2018) study of academic librarians.

The online based questionnaire has distinct advantages as a means of data collection such as their low cost, faster response, professional appearance, and the ability to distribute the survey without restrictions across the globe (Bryman, 2016, p. 235). Several studies have additionally found that web-based surveys lead to better response to open-ended questions, fewer unanswered questions, and better data accuracy (p.235). For this project a web-based questionnaire was the most effective means of reaching the wide geographic area of the UK

and the US as a cost-effective option that allows participants to respond across various time zones. The web-based survey was additionally important due to the short timespan for response collection of a 14-day window. The full survey questions can be found in Appendix 1 at the end of this document.

3.5.2 Questionnaire Analysis

Due to the variety of the data being collected in the questionnaire different approaches were taken in their analysis. The qualitative data generated from the free-text response questions were analyzed through an intensive process of manually coding all responses using the grounded theory approach as described above in section 3.4.2. When coding the open-ended responses of the questionnaire a process of inductive coding was implemented. This process of grounded theory analysis was drawn from the 2018 study by Lili Luo which followed a three-step process of "open coding for initial classification and labelling of codes; axial coding to identify the core concepts, and selective coding to determine the relationships between codes and uncover the central themes" (p.557). This analysis process was applied to the open-ended questions 23 and 24 and the additional explanations provided in questions 20 and 21. In order to provide a full description of the process of analysis undertaken in this study definitions of open coding, axial coding, and selective coding will be provided.

<u>Open coding</u>: 'The process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing and categorizing data' (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 61). Concepts are derived from this process which are used later to make categories.

<u>Axial coding</u>: 'a set of procedures whereby data are put back together in new ways after open coding, by making connections between categories' (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 96). This process connects the codes to the contexts and to patterns.

<u>Selective coding:</u> 'the procedure of selecting the core category systematically relating it to other categories, validating those relationships, and filling in categories that need further refinement and development' (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 116). Selecting a core category allows all other categories to be focused on creating a 'storyline'.

Quantitative data analysis was a process that began during the data collection process. Throughout the data collection period responses were followed to gather emerging themes and trends. Upon closing the online questionnaire data was analyzed using cross-tabulation

to compare variables such as the country of residence years' experience, and job title. Visualization of results were created using Word and Excel, in the form of graphs and tables. The trends that emerged from these findings are used and discussed in Chapter 4: Results.

The outcome of the coding process and the final scheme are shown in Appendix 3 with an example of the coding process in Appendix 4.

3.5.3 Questionnaire Sample

The sample population of participants for the online questionnaire was made up entirely of persons who work in an academic library and hold the title of 'librarian', 'library assistant', or equivalent in the UK and US. In order to gain participants that fit this criterion a mixture of sampling technique was employed. A purposive sampling method known as the snowball sampling and convenience sampling were utilized in order to obtain participants for the study. Purposive sampling is a common technique employed in qualitative research sampling. According to Bryman (2016) purposive sampling is used to sample "in a strategic way so that those sampled are relevant to the research questions that are posed" (p.408). It is under this umbrella of sampling techniques that snowball sampling falls under. Snowball sampling is a method used by researchers wherein, "a small group of people relevant to the research questions" are contacted and used to get in contact with other potential participants (Bryman, 2016, p.188).

Due to the specific focus within the academic sector of librarianship yet the broad scope of accepting anyone with the title of 'librarian', 'library assistant', or equivalent, snowball sampling was deemed an appropriate fit as a means of expanding the reach of this research. Gaining further participants through the snowballing method was achieved by contacting various members of library staff in randomly chosen academic libraries via email and additionally through the use of mailing lists by JISC and the ALA Electronic Discussion lists. These bodies and individuals were chosen due to their relevance to the topic and research questions, with specific focus on mailing lists and their relevance to academic libraries. When contacted all participants received the same covering email which detailed criteria for participation requesting they complete the linked online questionnaire. All participants were asked to forward the email with questionnaire information and link to those whom they believed would be suitable potential participants (I.e. other academic librarians).

During the 14-day period in which the survey was open the link for the online questionnaire was included in email messages sent to 13 JISC mailing lists, 15 ALA mailing lists, and 195 academic library staff emails across the UK and US. During this period of time several responses were received which confirmed the successful disbursement of the survey by participants. A full list of academic library staff and mailing lists contacted can be found in Appendix 2 in addition to the questionnaire covering email.

3.6 Research Design:

3.6.1 Comparative Document Analysis

In the implementation of a mixed methods approach a document analysis of the official policies for professional standards from the two major library professional bodies of the UK (CILIP) and US (ALA) was performed. Document analysis in this case is used as a qualitative research method in order to achieve triangulation. According to Bowen (2009), qualitative researchers should draw from multiple sources of evidence to, "seek convergence and corroboration through the use of different data sources and methods" (p.28). The benefit of triangulation in qualitative research is that is allows the researcher to provide "a confluence of evidence that breeds credibility" (Eisner, 1991, p.110). Triangulation through document analysis is a process which allows researchers to verify their findings as not just random born from a single source, method, or influence by one investigator's bias, triangulation breeds credibility.

Document analysis is a valid means of qualitative methods which allows for the examination and interpretation of data in order to "elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge" (Bowen, 2009, p.27). Document analysis has additional advantages in that it is time efficient, requiring the selection of data rather than collection; it is cost-effective and beneficial due to documents easily accessible and available to the public domain; and most importantly documents are 'unobtrusive' and 'non-reactive' meaning they are not influenced by the research process (Bowen, 2009, p.31). The feature of document analysis in its ability to remain untouched in the research process strengthens the validity of research findings by providing context, highlighting additional questions to be asked, tacking development, and verifying findings from other data sources (p.30).

3.6.2 Document Analysis Sample

Document sample selection was a process which sought to compare the primary professional organizations of librarianship in both the US and UK. The decision was made to examine the requirements of professional qualifications of both the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (UK) and the American Library Association (US). Professional qualifications as covered in sections 2.2.1 and 2.3.1 of the literature review include: CILIP Certification; CILIP Chartership; CILIP Fellowship; and in the American context, tenure. In conjunction with these documents further professional standards specific to academic librarianship including general descriptions of the sector were examined in this analysis in order to provide a full understanding of the context of professional standards for academic librarianship in either country.

3.6.3 Data Collection

As a part of the analytic procedures of document analysis finding, selecting, and appraising documents are the first steps to the process (Bowen, 2009, p.28). The document finding and selecting process was carried out by using Google to navigate directly to the two websites from the ALA and CILIP. From the main webpages of the organizations, searches were carried out for relevant information. On the CILIP webpage searches for "Certification", "Chartership", and "Fellowship" were carried out to identify the appropriate resources in addition to searches for sector wide guidance with search terms such as "academic sector", "higher education". A similar search was conducted on the ALA website for "tenure" or "academic librarian tenure". In both cases of searching the sector specific groups, CILIP's Academic Research Libraries Group (ARLG) and the ALA's Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) were identified as sources for sector guidance from either association. CILIP's Higher Education Hub was utilized while the ALA's ACRL webpage for document identification and selection. The most recent publication was always chosen as the primary document for analysis and a final search of Google was conducted in order to ensure no documents were missed. With such specific criteria for document selection and restriction of two sources for document retrieval document relevance was guaranteed through this process. Specific information regarding exact documents analyzed in this study are reported in Chapter 5.

3.6.4 Qualitative Content Analysis

Qualitative content analysis is identified by Bryman (2016) as a process comprised of looking for underlying themes in the analyzed documents (p.563). In performing this kind of analysis, the grounded theory process was once again applied. According to Bowen (2009) analyzing documents involves skimming, reading, and interpretation which combines both content and thematic analysis (p.32). Grounded theory was the appropriate framework to apply to this work as it allows researchers to organize information into categories and follow the principles of coding in the analysis of documents. The 'constant comparison' feature of grounded theory was a guide for the data analysis of this portion of the research which geared the analysis toward identifying patterns and theories specifically in the thematic analysis. Multiple levels of scrutiny were applied with back-and-forth between the data and the coding schemes, monitoring development as further documents were analyzed. Code categories were compared across documents and scrutinized validity by asking questions such as, 'How is this text similar or different from the preceding text?' and 'What kinds of ideas are mentioned in both the documents and online questionnaire?' (Bowen, 2009, p.37). Questions such as these helped to identify patterns through the similarities and differences of the documents.

The systematic review of documentation began with consideration given to the original purpose of the documents, relevance to the problem, and the credibility of the authors. Due to the official nature published by long established professional bodies the credibility remained sound, while the purpose and intended audience of each document was taken into consideration through the coding process. Through this review and analysis of documents vital background information was collected which allowed for knowledge building and understanding which served to ground the questionnaire findings into the context from which they came.

3.6.5 Coding Schemes

In fulfilling the project objective to "gauge the relationship between the academic librarians and their professional environment" and to "develop recommendations to strengthen EBLIP across the academic sector to best support practitioners". Fulfilling these objectives required results from the questionnaire portion of this dissertation as well as the document analysis. Grasping the full context from which EBLIP has grown in academic libraries in the UK and US required a systematic means of analysing data which were born from the grounded theory
approach explained throughout this chapter. In order to fulfil these objectives coding schemes were developed with clear instructions which guided the coding process taking an inductive approach which allowed themes to emerge. The coding schemes for both the questionnaire and document analysis could be found in Appendix 3 and Appendix 5.

3.7 Limitations of Methodology

In the above outlined methodology, there are various limitations to the procedures. The questionnaire portion of this dissertation encountered limitations from various sources, firstly from the time-scale of this project. Due to the limited time allotted for this research procedures had to be adapted in order to allow sufficient time for processing. This included constructing survey questions for easier processing through multiple choice options when free-text responses would have been more ideal. The time limit also effected the distribution of the online survey, which did not allow for more intensive and hands on approach to identifying potential participants. The time of the year for reaching participants was another limitation encountered in this project. With the regular academic school year spanning from August/September to April/May in both the US and UK contacting academic librarians proved more difficult with the researcher receiving many "out of office" emails in response to survey requests. Thus, effecting the overall response rate. Other limitations to the questionnaire was its distribution methods. Being solely based online is restrictive in that it inherently excludes anyone who are not active online. Additionally, the method of "snowballing" as a main method of distribution to participants has its faults. "Snowballing" as a sample method does not lead to a sample of participants representative of the population and relies on the willingness of others to push data collection.

Methodology for the document analysis faced one main limitation in the subjectivity of the grounded theory and coding processes. In order to combat this, transparent explanations detailing the procedures undertaken were provided. Due to the limitations of time and funding throughout this study, additional coders were not available to aid in data analysis and streamline the process.

Chapter 4: Results

4.1 Online Questionnaires

In this section the results of the online questionnaire will be reported, addressing the following objective:

• To discover the attitudes and experiences of US and UK academic librarians with EBLIP.

As described in Chapter 3, the online survey questionnaire was used to meet this research objective. In the following section the data from the questionnaire will be used to develop a profile of respondents, and a full report of EBLIP activities including the reasons for evidence use, what types of evidence are most often used, gaps in evidence, and the challenges that are faced in this process. The questionnaire was not meant to generate strict quantitative measures rather, its purpose rather, was to gauge qualitative data regarding EBLIP practices from a range of librarians in order to develop a broad understanding of the practices in the UK and US. The purpose of this data is to draw on key themes which are to be used for further qualitative analysis and a richer understanding of practice. Overall, 321 academic librarians participated in the online questionnaire from across the United Kingdom and the United States.

4.2 Respondent Profiles

4.2.1 Country of Employment

Of the 321 respondents of the online questionnaire, 127 are employed in the UK and 194 are employed in the US. This response is broken down into 40% UK respondents and 60% US respondents. This difference in response rate is proportionate to the relevant size of each country. The rest of the following respondent profile will be broken down by country of employment to reflect patterns in the current opinions and practices in the US and UK.

4.2.2 Professional Qualifications

To gauge an understanding of the importance of professional qualifications when holding the position of a librarian, respondents were asked whether they held a professional qualification in Library Science or a relevant field. The survey found that of the respondents from the UK 114 held a professional qualification, whilst 13 did not. That equates to about 10% of UK respondents that do not hold a qualification. From the 193 respondents from the US 188 held a professional qualification, whilst 5 did not. This equates to about 3% of US respondents



without a professional qualification. The breakdown of professional qualifications included, Bachelor's, Master's, PhD, Paraprofessional, and N/A. The results can be seen in **Figure 4.1a**.

Figure 4.1- Respondent Profile Summary

4.2.3 Years' Experience

The next demographic question regarded the years of experience an individual held in the library and information profession. From the UK 17 respondents held 0-5 years' experience; 22 held 6-10 years; 40 held 11-20 years; and 48 held 20+ years. From the US 27 respondents held 0-5 years' experience; 51 held 6-10 years; 58 held 11-20 years; and 58 held 20+ years (**Figure 4.1b**).

4.2.4 Job Role

This study asked that participants work in an academic library and hold the title of 'librarian', 'library assistant' or equivalent. The options provided on the survey as multiple choice responses were: library assistant, assistant librarian, subject librarian, senior librarian, and a fifth free text option labelled 'Other'. Due to the wide variety of roles held in an academic library the 'Other' option was provided to allow for an expansion of responses which has been coded to fall under overarching categories. This variety is meant to reflect the large breadth of responsibility of the academic library and how titles are shifting in the information world from just librarians to information management titles.

Title	UK	US
Library Director	20	38
Librarian	19	28
Library Assistant	7	3
Assistant Librarian	11	15
Subject Librarian	46	61
Senior Librarian	20	47

Figure 4.2- Job Titles

Prior to the coding process responses were as follows: from the UK, 6 library assistants, 11 assistant librarians, 45 subject librarians, 20 senior librarians, and 45 provided a free text response of 'Other'. US totals included, 2 library assistants, 13 assistant librarians, 58 subject librarians, 31 senior librarians, and 90 provided a free text response of 'Other'. In **Figure 4.2** the final totals following the coding process are provided. When analyzing the free text responses two additional categories emerged: Library Director and Librarian. These additional responses were born from a lack of detailed options for those whose roles do not exactly fit the broad categories provided. Particularly in the US context in a tenure-based system of advancement respondents expressed uncertainty as to where they fell in the hierarchy. Other uncertainty arose from variant titles such as 'cataloguers' or 'user-services curator', thus the

broad category of 'librarian' was created to accommodate those doing variant forms of library work. Additionally, 'library director' emerged as a theme throughout all the responses as one that needed its own category as many identified management roles as outside of the original hierarchy of library posts provided.

4.2.5 Professional Qualification Requirement

In gauging the status of professional qualifications in holding librarian positions, the online questionnaire found that in response to the question, "is a professional library qualification required to hold your current position" 76% (97) respondents in the UK said yes, 22% (28) said no, and 2% (2) said 'Don't know'. In the US it was found that a qualification is required for 92% (179) of the respondent's current library positions, 7% (14) said no it was not required, with 1 response of 'Don't know'.

4.2.6 Professional Organization Registration

Library and Information Science (LIS) professional organization registration was gathered from participants. From the UK 82 participants were registered members of a professional LIS body, while, 45 were not. In the US 171 participants were registered members of a professional LIS body, while 68 were not.

Of those registered as members of an LIS professional organization the following organizations were identified as multiple choice options: American Library Association (ALA); Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP); International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), and a free text response of 'Other'.

Association	UK	US
American Library Association (ALA)	-	129
Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP)	78	1
International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions	1	3
(IFLA)		
Higher Education Academy (HEA)	8	-
School Library Association (SLA)	2	1
Medical Library Association (MLA)	1	13
Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL)	-	40
American Theological Library Association (ATLA)	-	4
Library Leadership & Management Association (LLAMA)	-	3
The Information Association for the Information Age (ASIS&T)	-	2
Special Libraries Association (SLA)	-	7
Society of American Archivist (SAA)	-	3
American Association of Law Libraries (AALL)	-	2
Music Library Association (MLA)	-	2
Association of Christian Librarians (ACL)	-	2
State/regional library associations	-	48
Other	10	17

Figure 4.3- Professional Association Membership

The final coded responses of professional organization affiliation are recorded in the above **Figure 4.3**. With multiple registered associations per free text response, these numbers reflect a sample population who is engaged in multiple different professional organizations. The 'Other' row was included to account for organizations that were named by only one participant. The full list of organizations named in the free text responses can be found in Appendix 7. 'State/regional library associations' was included as a category in order to accommodate the many state wide and regional library organizations that many American participants claimed to be registered with.

4.2.7 Professional Achievements

The various levels of professional achievement for both the UK and US were sampled with the majority of participants holding no extra certification. The levels of achievement common in the UK are offered through CILIP which are: Chartership and Fellowship. The common achievement of academic librarians in the US is through tenure. Results can be found in **Figure 4.1d**. This data does not include those who might be on track for tenure, Chartership, or Fellowship, only accounting for those who have achieved it.

4.3 Discussion: Respondent Profiles

The above survey questions were designed to ascertain a specific profile of the broad sample of academic librarians from across the UK and US. The responses generated from the sample indicate various trends. Firstly, professional qualifications are held by the majority of academic librarians, with the US claiming higher numbers with 97% of all participants holding a professional qualification compared to the UK's 90%. Regardless of this difference the sample across both countries shows that the majority of the qualifications held are at a Master's level. When looking at all responses this statement remains true but when comparing the US and the UK, the UK has a wider variety of professional qualifications with more significant differences in the percentage of the population holding these various qualifications (**Figure 4.1a**).

The trend of a more experienced sample population emerged from the data, with the majority of responses coming from individuals holding 11-20+ years' experience in their roles. Years' experience correlates with more responses from 'library directors', 'subject librarians', and 'senior librarians', providing a sample from a majority of more upper-level staff from academic libraries. Finally, respondents particularly from the US showed a strong trend of professional affiliation with a very broad range of organizations, while the UK, tended to have fewer professional organization affiliations.

4.4 Continued Professional Development (CPD)

The support of CPD from professional organizations and for career advancements such as, chartership, tenure, etc. were gauged with the first question, "Does your professional organization encourage continuing professional development (CPD)?". UK based participant response was: 78% (97) yes, 6% (7) no, 16% (20) N/A. US participant response was: 90% (175) yes, 2% (3) no, and 8% (16) N/A. The following question addressed procedures for attaining chartership and tenure, "As a part of CPD (chartership/tenure) are you required to provide evidence of personal performance supported by current literature/studies in the field?". UK based participants responded with 28% (34) stating yes, it is required, 41% (50) stating no, 15% (18) don't know, and 17% (21) N/A. US participants responded 38% (73) yes, 39% (75) no, 8% (15), don't know, and 16% (31) N/A.



Figure 4.4- Opinions of evidence requirement based on professional level

What these results show us when cross tabulated with respondents holding Chartership, Fellowship, and Tenure is an inconsistency between understandings of what is required to progress through either CILIP professional registration or tenure. Particularly in the case of Chartership and Fellowship respondents we see a divide between 'yes' and 'no' responses to whether 'evidence of personal performance supported by current research and literature' (**Figure 4.4**) is necessary for achieving professional registration. These inconsistencies suggest issues in the workings of CILIP as an organization in certifying its most highly qualified members. These findings suggest a lack of rigor in the evaluation process of CILIP Professional Registration if the highest qualifications can be achieved without a strict use of current research and literature as evidence of performance and growth.

<u>4.5 EBLIP</u>

While the beginning of the survey was devoted to creating a participant profile through its questions the majority of the second half of the questionnaire focused on garnering an understanding of the EBLIP processes of participants. The results of these questions are reported in the following section.

4.5.1 Evidence Consultation

The first question regarding EBLIP asked participants: "How frequently would you say you consult evidence to inform decisions in your library role?". The results show a population of respondents that consult evidence "fairly often". The breakdown between the UK and the US responses can be seen in **Figure 4.5**. The trends shown in this figure highlight a more significant trend of evidence consultation within the US versus in the UK.





The above figure shows 36% (69) of Americans consulting evidence 'very often' and 41% (79) consulting evidence 'fairly often'. Compared with UK respondents responding in the majority, 38% (48) that they 'sometimes' consult evidence for their practice. These results follow the trend of a greater focus on evidence in US library practice shown in the literature (Wu & Pu, 2015). When results are broken down by the professional achievements of respondents (**Figure 4.6**) variations emerge such as in the practice of those who hold Fellowship with a spread between 'sometimes' to 'very often' when consulting evidence. The variations once again bring to question consistency in expectations in the highest qualification from CILIP.





In order to determine the primary sources of evidence used by academic librarians, a list of common sources as identified by the literature (Luo, 2018) and expanded by the researcher was provided to participants asking them to rank the from most important to least. The

sources of evidence provided for participants to rank were: Peer reviewed articles; monographs; practitioner textbooks; conference papers; institutional statistics; vendors; user surveys; focus groups; user panels; personal experiences; colleagues. The results are shown in **Figure 4.7**.

United Kingdom		United States	
Average Ranked	Evidence	Average Ranked	Evidence
Position		Position	
4.15	Colleagues	2.91	Peer Reviewed Articles
4.30	Peer Reviewed Articles	4.09	Institutional Statistics
4.36	Institutional Statistics	4.58	Colleagues
4.68	Personal Experience	5.26	User Surveys
4.76	User Surveys	5.31	Personal Experience
6.03	Conference Papers	5.49	Conference Papers
6.68	Focus Groups	5.96	Monographs
6.81	Practitioner Textbooks	7.28	Practitioner Textbooks
7.70	User Panels	7.30	Focus Groups
7.74	Monographs	8.57	User Panels
8.78	Vendors	9.26	Vendors

Figure 4.7- Ranked Sources of Evidence

UK participants identified their 'Colleagues' as their primary source of evidence followed by 'Peer Reviewed Articles' and 'Institutional Statistics'. The UK and US had the same top three responses ranked in different order. While US participants identified 'Peer Reviewed Articles' as their primary source of evidence, it is followed by 'Institutional Statistics' second and 'Colleagues' third. These findings back those covered in the literature review (Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016; Luo, 2018) which demonstrate the rise of a more holistic model of evidence which extends beyond traditional sources such as the peer reviewed articles or institutional statistics. This holistic view of evidence is particularly true in the case of UK participants who highly rank 'Colleagues' and 'Personal Experiences'. While US participants still prefer the traditional forms of evidence above non-traditional, sources such as 'Colleagues' and 'Personal Experience' still rank within the top five for 'primary sources of evidence'.

4.5.3 Professional Environment <u>EBLIP Support</u>

As the literature review showed, the professional environment or 'organizational dynamics' (Koufogiannakis, 2013b) of practitioners can be one of the largest barriers to effectively implementing EBLIP. The second half of the online questionnaire was designed to gauge the

professional environment of the participants. The first question asked participants to what degree they agreed with the statement: "My employing institution encourages and supports the use of evidence in decision making and best practice". Results can be found in **Figure 4.8a**. Similarly, the next question asked participants to what degree they agreed with the statement: "My professional organization encourages the use of evidence in decision making and best practice" with results shown in **Figure 4.8b**. The findings of these questions show that the US reports feelings of stronger support from both their employing institution and their professional bodies with the highest response rates being 'Strongly agree' and 'Agree'. From the UK their appears to be a more mixed opinion on the types of support they receive for evidence-based practice. There is the greatest variation of opinion when discussing the support of employing institution support where half 'Agree' that they are encouraged while the other half is split between neutrality and 'strongly agree'. Similarly, opinions are largely split between agreement and a neutral 'neither agree nor disagree'. These differences in the degrees of agreement with either statement from the US and UK show a trend of a weaker support system in the UK for EBLIP than is found in the US.



Figure 4.8- Professional Environment

Training

Another trend identified in the literature as a common barrier to EBLIP was the matter of practitioner training. Questions were developed to engage with this problem and the current practices of participants. The first question regarding training asked, 'In the past five years, what amount of training have you received from your employer on conducting research into your own practice?'. Responses showed interesting trends.

A gap exists in the literature in terms of engaging with UK based academic librarians and their EBLIP procedures and experiences. The literature review reported on findings of North American librarians and the issue of a lack of training when it came to implementing EBLIP. From US respondents this remains largely true with the majority reporting having received '0-1 hours' training (39%) and absolutely 'none' in the past five years (19%). From UK respondents two opposite ends of the spectrum were represented equally with 26% (33) respondents receiving '8+ hours training' while 26% (33) report receiving 'none'. The US response confirms the findings of past studies while the UK response shows a field lacking consistency.

In contrast, participants were asked, 'In the past five years, what amount of training have you received from your employer on using evidence in your own practice?'. **Figure 4.8d** demonstrates a similar trend to the previous question. In the case of the US, respondents seemed to have received slightly more training in using evidence in practice with 42% (82) having received between '0-1 hours' and remain the same with 19% (37) having received 'none'. Interestingly with the UK a split occurs with 29% having received between '0-1 hours', 26% having received 'none', and 21% having received '8+ hours' training in the past 5 years.

Culture of Knowledge Contribution

In order to gauge the extent to which practitioners are participating in the process of EBLIP, the survey asked if they have ever published or presented research/findings from their own practice. Practitioners contributing to research is a vital part of the cyclical process of EBLIP and it was found that the majority (74%) of US participants have published or presented research from their own practice. Of UK participants 55% have contributed to the knowledge base through publication or presentation of findings.

Perceptions of Evidence

With the intention of determining the future of EBLIP, the following question was posed, "Do you believe evidence is important to advancing the profession?". Determining practitioner perceptions of the value of evidence speaks volumes to the longevity of EBLIP. One of the main arguments for EBLIP is the value it gives to librarianship as an established profession by creating an environment of specialist, up-to date knowledge amongst its practitioners. According to survey results many believe evidence to be important to the advancement of the profession with results shown in Figure 4.9 wherein the vast majority agree 'Definitely yes'.



Figure 4.9- Perception of the Value of Evidence for the Profession

4.5.4 Reasons for Evidence

Understanding the EBLIP procedures of academic librarians requires an understanding of how and why evidence is used. The literature has produced studies which have developed an understanding of North American academic librarians and their evidence use. The questions developed for the survey were based on the Lili Luo (2018) study. Firstly, participants were asked to rank the provided answers from 'most common' to 'least common' for the following question, "For what reason do you most commonly consult evidence when making decisions?". The results are shown in **Figure 4.1.1** and color coordinated to display relationships. The number one reason for evidence consultation from the entire sample population was "to understand the nature and context of a problem". The primary difference between UK and US respondents was in the second and third rankings. A free text 'Other' response gathered 19 additional responses that do were not considered in the ranking system but instead were coded separately, with new categories emerging from this data seen in

Figure 4.1.2.

United Kingdom			United States
Average	Reason	Average	Reason
Ranked		Ranked	
Position		Position	
2.21	To understand the nature and	2.19	To understand the nature and
	context of a problem		context of a problem
2 83	To investigate how to perform an	2.54	To determine what actions will lead
2.05	action or implement a solution		to desired outcomes
2.85	To determine what actions will	2.63	To investigate how to perform an
	lead to desired outcomes		action or implement a solution
2 1 2	To understand why a certain action	3.46	To understand why a certain action
5.15	is required		is required
/ 11	To identify stakeholders that need	4.36	To identify stakeholders that need to
4.11	to be involved for potential actions		be involved for potential actions
5.86	Other	5.82	Other







The analysis of free text responses allowed participants to emphasize the importance of categories already listed which can be seen in **Figure 4.1.2**. Additional categories to emerge were "to convince", "performance measure", and "dependent on situation". The next question addressed asked participants how they used evidence to support decision with the options listed below. The main difference between UK and US respondents was once again the second and third ranking where US respondents use evidence to 'to impact knowledge,

understanding, and attitudes of practitioners and decision makers' over 'as an instrument of persuasion to support or challenge existing position'. With the inclusion of a free text response option 18 new responses were coded with the results shown in **Figure 4.1.4**. A new category which emerged from the coding was the use of evidence as a means of promoting 'personal professional standards' versus as a requirement by professional bodies. This highlights a trend of self-motivation as a fuel behind the EBLIP practice.

	United Kingdom	United States	
Average	Reason	Average	Reason
Ranked		Ranked	
Position		Position	
1.80	To directly influence a specific	1 90	To directly influence a specific
	decision or solution to a problem	1.50	decision or solution to a problem
2.07	As an instrument of persuasion to	2.19	To impact knowledge,
	support of challenge existing		understanding, and attitudes of
	positions		practitioners and decision-makers
2.54	To impact knowledge,	2.22	As an instrument of persuasion to
	understanding, and attitudes		support or challenge existing
	or practitioners and decision-		positions
	makers		
3.76	As a requirement imposed by others	3.93	As a requirement imposed by others
	(employers, CPD, etc.)		(employers, CPD, etc.)
4.83	Other	4.76	Other

Figure 4.1.3- Free text responses for how evidence is used



Figure. 4.1.4- Free text responses for how evidence is used

4.5.5 Challenges

In order to develop recommendations for improvement as the final objective of this project, the key challenges faced by practitioners in the field was gathered through two types of questions. The first asked respondents to rank a list of common challenges identified through the literature review and to rank these from 'most common' to 'least'. The second question regarding challenges was a free text response, which asked for any further challenges or elaboration on challenges faced. The free text response received 39 from the UK and 70 from the US, the most common challenge for practitioners across both the US and UK was 'lack of time', even in the free text responses 'lack of time' was emphasized as a major barrier as shown in **Figures 4.1.5** and **4.1.6**.

United Kingdom United States		United States	
Average Ranked Rosition	Challenge	Average Ranked Rosition	Challenge
Position		Position	
1.63	Lack of time	1.65	Lack of time
2.92	Lack of access to evidence	2.71	Lack of training
2.94	Lack of training	2.91	Lack of access to evidence
3.31	Lack of support from employer	3.40	Lack of support from employer
4.21	Lack of willingness	4.33	Lack of willingness



Figure 4.1.5- Ranking of EBLIP challenges by country



4.5.6 Gaps

One of the major challenges that practitioners identified to EBLIP practice was 'gaps in the knowledge base'. This highlights a lack of understanding of the full EBLIP process which requires practitioners to identify gaps and work towards filling them. When participants were

asked to identify gaps in evidence that they were aware of a variety were identified as seen in the figures below.



Figure 4.1.7- Knowledge Gaps in the US





While a total of 15 categories emerged from the free text responses prominent trends emerged in both the US and UK. The category that was stressed the most by all participants was a gap in 'library science research methods'. In this category many stressed the need for a rigorous structure for research methods in the library context, particularly for qualitative research. This included standardization of findings on an institutional basis and the need for organizations to define research expectations for employees. The theme of this gap was the general lack of structure that librarians feel when evaluating research and when conducting it in the library context. Highlighting the need for broad library research methods and institutional instruction on conducting research. Collectively, amongst all respondents 'unsure' was a very common response, but particularly in the UK. This uncertainty shows a lack of awareness of the current field and thus a downfall in professional standards identified in the literature review.

From US respondents the next most identified gaps were 'expansion of forms of evidence' and 'impact measure of library services'. Responses stressed a desire for a broader range of evidence sources outside of the usual journal article, several discussed the impracticality of highly theoretical or overly academic language when trying to find evidence quickly. Preferred sources were summarized reports and even blogs. Additionally, impact of the library services on students and staff was highly recommended as many felt there was no clear and reliable means for judging impact of the library services and thus, their value in their institutions.

From UK respondents 'librarian as teacher' and 'user experience' were the next major gaps identified. Librarian as teacher refers to the instructional roll many academic librarians play and the need to gather information on teaching of study skills and information literacy, best practice, and impact measures. The user experience gap focused on gauging student experiences with e-resources, the library, and the use and opinion of the physical space of libraries.

4.6 Conclusion

Throughout this chapter the results of the online questionnaire were processed and reported. A profile of respondents was created showing a sample population of 321 academic librarians split 60% US and 40% UK. The results concerning EBLIP in either country was broken down to explore the following areas: evidence consultation, sources of evidence, professional environment, training, knowledge contribution, perceptions of evidence, reasons for evidence, challenges of the process, and gaps in knowledge. Throughout the reporting of results a comparative structure was utilized by holding US and UK against each other to draw a distinct image of the status of EBLIP in either country.

Chapter 5: Comparative Document Analysis

5.1 Document Analysis

In the following sections, the subsequent research objective will be addressed:

 Gauge the relationship between the academic librarian and their professional environment.

The process of the document analysis was discussed in Chapter 3 where the above objective will be achieved through the combination of survey results and the document analysis results. Implementing a qualitative content analysis of various guidelines for professional advancement, and sector standards from CILIP and the ALA aided in triangulating survey data and fulfilling the above objective. This chapter will detail the results of this document analysis and the comparisons derived about the status of academic and professional librarianship in the US and UK. The document analysis was performed using a grounded theory approach which drew on underlying themes which were organized into categories and coded documents appropriately for a thorough analysis.

5.2 Sample

The documents which were selected for evaluation were chosen from the two major library professional organizations in the US (ALA) and UK (CILIP). This selection was based on the categories of evaluation 'Professional Advancement' and 'Professional Standards'. The resulting CILIP documents regarding 'Professional Advancement' included: Certification: A guide for members (n.d.); Chartership: A guide for members (n.d.); Fellowship: A guide for members (n.d.). Two documents were selected regarding 'Academic Librarian Standards' including, Academic & Research Librarians (n.d.) and due to a lack of academic librarian standards the 'Code of Professional Practice for Library and Information Professionals' (2012) was analyzed.

The documents selected from the ALA included, 'Guideline for the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Librarians' (2010) falling under the 'Professional Advancement' category of assessment, and 'Academic Libraries' (2016) for 'Academic Librarian Standards'. All documents were collected using the same search methods performed using Google and through the CILIP and ALA websites. To accommodate for the lack of academic sector specific guidelines from CILIP the decision to analyze 'Code of Professional Practice...' was made in

order to gauge the overarching professional standards of library and information professionals set by CILIP. The full coding scheme for document analysis can be found in Appendix 5.

5.3 Professional Advancement

To breakdown the analysis of the opportunities for professional advancement in the US and UK context subcategories of the 'nature of qualification and requirements', 'decision makers', and 'forms of evidence' were coded and analyzed. The results of which are reported in the following section.

5.3.1 Nature of Qualification and Requirements

In 'Guideline for the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Librarians' (2010) tenure is defined as, "an institutional commitment to permanent employment to be terminated only for adequate cause" (n.p.). Tenure is a professional milestone that offers job security that is based upon institutional standards. While decisions regarding tenure originate from individual institutions the ALA produced this document for the use of all academic libraries to ensure "that the library faculty and, therefore, library services will be of the highest quality possible" (n.p.). CILIP Certification, Chartership, and Fellowship is a form of professional registration which demonstrates individuals' abilities, knowledge, and experience. The chart below highlights the differences and similarities of tenure, Certification, Chartership, and Fellowship.

Tenure	<>	Certification
 Promotion/appointment Appropriate professional degree Advancement based on institutional standards Must be recommended for advancement opportunity 	Ranked promotion (requiring different levels of expertise)	 Individually driven process Association with professional organization (I.eCILIP,ALA) Demonstration of skills development, self- evaluation, improved information service knowledge Fees Registered mentors Advancement based on professional organization standards (I.eCILIP PKSB) Annual Revalidation to
	Demonstrate Institutional contribution Must show a contribution to scholarship, the profession, and library service Ranked promotion (requiring different levels of expertise)	 demonstrate CPD Chartership & Fellowship Individually driven process Association with professional organization (I.eCILIP,ALA) Demonstration of skills development, self- evaluation, improved information service knowledge Fees Registered mentors Advancement based on professional organization standards (I.eCILIP PKSB) Annual Revalidation to

Figure. 5.1- Nature of the Qualification and Requirements for tenure, Certification, Chartership, and Fellowship

What the document analysis showed is a distinct separation in the expectations and requirements for achieving professional recognition in the UK and US. Across the various CILIP professional registrations they all have generally the same characteristics as an individually driven process, associated with the professional body of CILIP, must have a mentor, and most importantly, must demonstrate skills development, self-evaluate, and improved information service knowledge. This evaluation uses the Professional Knowledge and Skills Based (PKSB) framework and professional registration must undergo revalidation every year. What all CILIP professional registration has in common with tenure procedures is that there is a ranked

system that individuals progress through, in the UK that Certification up to Fellowship, in tenure it is begins with Instructor up to Professor.

Fellowship and Chartership are inherently more advanced qualifications which is why they share more similarities with tenure in that individuals must show a contribution to their institution and must show varying levels of contribution to scholarship, the profession, or library service. Tenure differs from any CILIP qualification in that individuals must be recommended by an employer for advancement, tenure is a promotion awarded based upon institutional standards, and individual must hold an appropriate professional degree (I.e.-Master's or greater).

5.3.2 Decision Makers

The next subsection of the document analysis looked at the decision makers in the process of awarding the various professional achievements seen in Figure 5.2. CILIP qualifications are all processed through the same board known as the professional organization registration and accreditation board. Tenure candidates are evaluated by variety of groups including, a representative panel of library faculty, colleagues and finally all findings of the various bodies are given to the chief administrator of library services. The administrator rules on whether they agree or disagree with the opinions of the various group either accepting or denying the promotion in the tenure process.

Tenure	Certification, Chartership & Fellowship
 Representative panel of library faculty Members of the academic community outside the library Professional colleagues outside the academic institution Chief administrator of library services 	 Professional organization registration and accreditation board

Figure 5.2- Decision makers in awarding professional achievements

5.3.3 Forms of Evidence

Regardless of what qualification or advancement is being sought, evidence in support of the candidate is required. In the document analysis of CILIP requirements each handbook listed the same sources of evidence, no matter which level of qualification an individual was attempting to seek (Figure 5.3). For CILIP qualifications definitions of evidence were broad and accept a variety of sources. The only CILIP qualification which required additional evidence was Fellowship, which required letters from colleagues as a form of evidence with

their submitted portfolio. This was also a similarity shared with the tenure process along with proof of professional engagement.

While evidence for CILIP qualifications are based on self-reflection, evaluations, and a wide variety of sources, tenure procedures have more prescribed types of evidence. Evidence for tenure promotion includes forms of evaluation from employers and students, publications, and outcomes of organized meetings. Largely, what this document comparison exposed is that tenure is a process focused on external evaluation whilst, CILIP is focused more on internal evaluation as a demonstration of skill and knowledge.

Tenure	<>Similarities>	Certification
Employer evaluation forms	Proof of professional	Blog posts
	engagement (I.e conference	Reports
Copies and reviews of	attendance)	Self-evaluation reflective report
publications		based on framework criteria
		Mentor/mentee evaluation
Records of committee activity		Revalidation statement
		Relevant variety of sources
Documentation of organized	Proof of professional	Chartership
workshops, meetings	engagement (I.e conference	Blog posts
	attendance)	Reports
Assessments by students		Self-evaluation reflective report
		based on framework criteria
		Mentor/mentee evaluation
		Revalidation statement
		Relevant variety of sources
	Proof of professional	Fellowship
	engagement (I.e conference	Blog posts
	attendance)	Reports
		Self-evaluation reflective report
	Letters from colleagues	based on framework criteria
		Mentor/mentee evaluation
		Revalidation statement
		Relevant variety of sources

Figure 5.3- Forms of evidence to support promotion or qualification award

5.4 Professional Standards

The ALA Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) has 42 documents most published in the last 10 years, containing official standards, guidelines, and frameworks specifically relevant to an array of academic library practices. These provide an incredibly comprehensive image of what academic librarianship is like and the standards of the profession that are established in the US. The highly specific nature of these documents do not have an equivalent offered by CILIP, which led to the exclusion of these documents from analysis, but the mere existence of them, detailing highly specific practices such as "Proficiencies for Assessment Librarians", "Guidelines for Interlibrary and Exhibition Loan of Special Collections Materials" shows a professional that is highly committed to standards of practice. With this extremely broad range of topics there was not equal comparison offered through CILIP or the Academic and Research Libraries Group (ARLG) from CILIP. Due to this only one document from the ALA on broad academic library guidance was analyzed along with two CILIP documents. The results of this coding process are discussed in the following section.

5.4.1 Academic Library

In the first subcategory of professional standards, expectations of the academic library were analyzed from the ALA and CILIP. This portion of analysis looked at documents which detailed the expected responsibilities of academic library service. The document 'Academic & Research librarians' (n.d.) from CILIP was not extensive and its only defining feature was the task of 'cataloguing' as an essential role in the academic library. Similarities between documents include providing a diverse collection in a variety of formats, information literacy instruction, IT management, and service to the institution. ALA standards stand apart in declaring the necessity of subject expertise amongst staff, tenure opportunities, more detailed standards for different positions in specialized information settings, funds management, and collaboration with different departs across the institution.

ALA	<>Similarities>	CILIP
Necessity of subject expertise	Serve needs of colleges, universities, their students, staff	Cataloguing
Tenure opportunity	and faculty	
Standards for different positions	Provision of a diverse collection	
health, etc.)	in a variety of formats	
Fundraising/funds	Information literacy instruction	
management	IT management	
Cross institution departmental collaboration		

Figure 5.4- Standards for academic library service

5.4.2 Librarians

The standards for academic librarians extend beyond just the expectation of what the library as a fixture in an institution should be doing, but instead encourages individual drive for maintaining professional expertise, current knowledge of new technologies and systems, and prioritization of users and their needs above all others. CILIP guidelines in this portion of analysis come from their code of professional practice for library and information professionals. The derived codes are not specific to the academic sector with no further guidance on standards provided in official published documents. The expectation for librarians to hold a professional degree was only expressed as a necessity for "senior staff" in the 'Academic & Research librarians' (n.d.) document analyzed above. Additionally, in the 'Code of Professional Practice for Library and Information Professionals' (2012) it stated, "qualifications and/or experience entitle them to engage by keeping abreast of developments in their areas of expertise". From this statement CILIP does not firmly require a degree-level qualification as a requirement for library work. The requirement of a Master's degree from an ALA accredited university was stressed repeatedly throughout all ALA documents, making this one of the foundations of the standards for librarianship.

ALA	<>Similarities>	CILIP
Information literacy training;	Professional expertise;	Follow institutional standards
research skills	knowledge; experience	
		Serve society
Master's degree in library	Updated knowledge of new	
science (accredited school)	technologies and systems	
Collaboration with colleagues	Prioritize service of users and	
	their needs	
Desire to increase knowledge		
base of the institution for		
research, teaching, and learning		

Figure 5.5- Standards for Academic Librarians

Due to the broad scope of the professional standards established by CILIP features such as 'serve society' and 'follow institutional standards' were unique to the standards analyzed in this document. ALA standards stress that academic librarians should have desire to increase the knowledge base of the institution for research, teach, and learning, and additionally encourages providing information literacy training and research skills as a core part of the task of the academic librarian. These standards show an understanding of the sector and its role with greater importance placed on advancing research amongst an institution.

5.5 Conclusion

Throughout this chapter the results of the comparative document analysis of CILIP and ALA standards for academic librarians and standards for different levels of professional achievement were reported. Findings showed distinct differences in the standards for professional achievement when comparing tenure with CILIP Professional Registration, displaying greater rigor in the evidence, evaluation, and attainment of tenure in comparison to Professional Registration procedures. Through the document analysis it was discovered that there were no equivalent documents for sector specific guidance offered by CILIP as were offered by the ALA. A comparison of ALA standards with the broad 'Code of Professional Conduct...' showed a shared value in expert up-to-date knowledge, and a commitment to the needs of users.

Chapter 6: Discussion

6.1 Analysis of Findings & Discussion

The purpose of this dissertation is to fill gaps in knowledge of the status of EBLIP procedures specific to the academic library sector. The comparative nature of this dissertation between the US and UK was chosen in order to derive richer conclusions about the professional environments and their influence on the practices of working practitioners. In this chapter, a discussion of the findings of the study will take place addressing the established research questions and objectives detailed in Chapter 1.

6.2 Professional Environment

The professional environment which academic librarians work in has been a major focus of this project. As evidenced in the literature review, EBLIP is a valuable tool for strengthening the concept of professionalism through advocacy and standards (Booth & Brice, 2004; Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016). To be a library professional is to have expert knowledge which awards the "exclusive right to perform particular kind of work" (Freidson, 1973, p.22). Protecting the professional status of being a librarian is even more crucial in a rapidly changing information world, and the means of protecting professional status is through the establishment of professional standards. Using a comparative document analysis and online questionnaire the status of professional standards in regard to academic librarianship and EBLIP have been analyzed and the relationship between the two are discussed in the following section.

6.2.1 Professional Standards/Guidance

The document analysis undertook an evaluation of the guidance offered by the ALA and CILIP in terms of professional standards for academic librarians. The first comparison that must be made is the availability of guidance from both organizations. The goal of the document analysis was to find standards specific to the academic sector. As noted in Chapter 5 the ALA offered 42 documents through the ACRL of official standards for practice for the various roles and responsibilities found in the academic sector. The specificity and breadth of these documents show a commitment to standards of practice with a strong sector focus. Sectors of the library and information profession all have different roles and purposes in institutions and society, with focused standards from a governing professional body, the highest of quality of work can be promoted with a collective standard to work toward. The document analysis for CILIP found only one document which clearly stated standards for practice for all library and information professionals. The lack of sector focus leaves the implementation of sectorbased expectations to individuals or institutions. This difference in standards was noted as a way of gauging the differing professional environments existing in the US and UK.

While the guidance analyzed from CILIP and the ALA have different audiences, similarities exist in the expectation that individuals maintain a professional expertise and current knowledge of new technologies and systems. These standards of practice align with EBLIP in the promotion of continued professional development and maintaining current knowledge as a means of best practice. This standard shows how EBLIP can align and aid in meeting professional standards across both the UK and US.

6.2.2 Professional Qualifications

A significant difference in UK and US standards for academic librarians is the acceptable level of degree qualifications. CILIP does not have a firm policy for the requirement of degree level qualifications in order to perform library work as discussed in Chapter 5. CILIP equally values degree qualifications and experience given that individuals keep "abreast of developments in their areas of expertise" (Code of Professional Practice for Library and Information Professionals, 2012). Cannon (2017) argues that it is the lack of public acknowledgement of a collection of LIS professional knowledge that hinders "the universal recognition of librarianship as a profession" (p.149). Without strong policies for the requirement of a library degree as a means of confirming librarianship as one that requires expert knowledge and training this lack of acknowledgement will continue. Without strong advocacy for educating professionals to Master's degree level CILIP leaves the "recognition of the value of professional qualifications [as] a matter of choice amongst relevant employers" (Cannon, 2017, p.149). Leaving a powerful tool for professional advocacy to employing institutions is a loss to the profession in the UK.

Alternatively, librarianship in the US has a strong foundation of degree qualified librarians with clear policies for the requirement of a Master's degree from ALA accredited programs. Survey results show that 75% of UK participants hold a Master's or PhD, while 98% of US participants hold a Master's or PhD. This trend demonstrates the policies of the ALA and CILIP, with an entire quarter of UK participants lacking a Master's degree or above. In identifying knowledge gaps a top answer with participants across the UK and US was a need for standardized library research methods and more training in conducting research into

practice. When asked how much training individuals received in the past 5 years for using evidence in practice and conducting research into practice the answer from both US and UK respondents were largely 'none' or '0-1 hours' (**Figures 4.8c&d**). These results show a lack of institutional responsibility for the training of staff advancement, leaving these research skills to fall towards LIS education or CPD. From these findings, it is clear greater pressure should be placed upon LIS programs and their accrediting bodies (ALA, CILIP) to address gaps in knowledge and training in research methods. Changing the teaching of research skills for librarians will not only aid in EBLIP practices but also allow ALA and CILIP to connect library training to their policies of promoting expertise and up to date knowledge from practitioners.

6.2.3 EBLIP and the Profession

The professional environment or 'organizational dynamics' (Koufogiannakis, 2013b) of practitioners can be one of the largest barriers to effectively implementing EBLIP. The survey found that the majority of respondents from the UK and US 'strongly agree' or 'agree' that their employing institution and professional organization encourages and supports the use of evidence in decision making and best practice. While this may be true, as discussed above, very little training is provided by employing institutions on how to conduct research into practice and to use evidence in practice. The document analysis showed that both CILIP and the ALA encourage keeping an up-to-date knowledge of the profession but do not provide guidance on how to do so.

The ALA lists, 'copies and reviews of publications' as one of the sources of evidence for achieving tenure, this demonstrates the necessity to contribute to the knowledge base of library practice. Of the survey respondents 74% of US participants have published or presented research from their own practice. Of UK respondents 55% have contributed to the knowledge base through publication or presentation. When the data is broken down by professional qualification, 55% of UK respondents with a Master's degree and 73% US respondents with Master's degree have contributed to the knowledge base (**Figures 6.1, 6.2**).



Figure 6.1- Knowledge Contribution by Professional Qualification- UK





In order for EBLIP to be successful, practitioner contribution to research from practice is vital. Brettle and Mande (2015) identified a lack of high-quality research in the sector which is argued to hinder professional recognition. Suggested improvement that needs to take place is, "at a local level, librarians need to determine what outcomes are important to their stakeholders and provide the evidence that meets these needs" (Brettle & Mande, 2015, p.22). In free text responses of the online survey one of the greatest challenges under 'unsupportive institutional environment' is highlighted by Respondent 1, "The complete inability of the manager driving this discussion to describe desired outcomes or facilitate us coming up with them was incredibly frustrating". This quote highlights a lack of institutional management's ability to define outcomes for research which backs suggestions

from Brettle & Mande (2015) that local evidence needs improving across the board. Cannon (2017) looks directly toward CILIP in the suggestion that they need to "engage its members to build upon its knowledge-base, turning phronetic practice into defining its new epistemological boundaries" (Cannon, 2017, p.149). What Cannon suggests and what this study finds is the need to define the knowledge boundaries of library professionals through continued research and knowledge-building into practice.

When participants of the survey were asked whether they believed evidence is important to advancing the profession from the UK, respondents 73% (92) believe 'Definitely yes' evidence is important to advancing the profession, while 25% (31) believe 'Probably yes' and 2% (3) believe evidence 'might or might not'. Of US respondents 87% (168) believe 'Definitely yes', 13% (25) believe 'Probably yes' and less than 1% (1) believe 'might or might not'. Determining practitioner perceptions of the value of evidence speaks volumes to the longevity of EBLIP. The degree of certainty of respondents from the US and UK speaks to the existing commitment to evidence with a larger percentage of US participants belief that 'definitely yes' evidence is important to the future of the profession. In these responses there is an acknowledgement that the profession is changing, and evidence will be key to advancing.

6.2.4 Professional Organization Engagement

In order to achieve the highest levels of professional recognition from both the ALA and CILIP required evidence for candidate applications included engagement with the wider profession and demonstration of impact on the wider profession. The online survey showed that 35% of UK respondents did not belong to a professional organization while only 12% US of respondents did not. Additionally, in the free text response UK respondents identified 12 additional professional organizations not listed while US respondents identified 31 additional professional organizations plus 48 'State/regional library associations'. With multiple registered associations per free text response, these numbers reflect a sample population who is engaged in multiple different professional organizations. The sheer quantity of library organizations and communities that exist across the US speak to the status of professional librarianship in the country.

6.2.5 Tenure vs. CILIP Professional Registration

When comparing the professional environment of US and UK academic librarianship, the professional milestones within sector play an important role of determining standards and even the value of the profession. As it has been made clear tenure is an opportunity available

to US academic librarians as a mean of promotion within in an institution. Tenure as a measure of professional success is valuable to librarians because it ensures job security for life. It is an achievement which considers the entire body of work of an individual, the impact they have had, and the opinions of their colleagues, students, and superiors and then deems them invaluable to the entire institution and the library service. Making tenure the ultimate professional milestone of the academic librarian in the US.

CILIP Professional Registration includes three different levels, Certification, Chartership, and Fellowship. These qualifications can be achieved by any practicing LIS professional, in any sector, holding any position or years' experience. The achievement of CILIP professional registration does not have the immediate job benefits as tenure does, but instead drives individuals to performing continued professional development. These qualifications show a commitment to personal professional growth at different levels. The document analysis showed the similarities and differences between tenure and CILIP professional registration and what is clear is a difference in the rigor of the processes. Tenure procedures require extensive external reviews of an individual and is judged through multiple panels and institutional levels, while all the levels of CILIP qualification are judged by the same board with no difference in the evidence required between level besides letters from colleagues for Fellowship.

Findings from the online survey show inconsistencies between understandings of whether 'evidence of personal performance supported by current research and literature' is required to progress through either CILIP professional registration (Figure 4.4). These inconsistencies suggest issues regarding the professional registration system. If professional registration can be obtained without providing evidence supported by current findings in the field, this brings to question whether the process is too easy. If professional registration is a process which promotes CPD how can individuals prove continued development without showing a connection with the current literature.

Cannon (2017) highlights the importance of a more rigorous system of professional development and the role it plays in professionalism suggesting further research to understand "measures its members would accept in order to move the sector into the professional realm" (p.149). Without a drive from the professional organization (CILIP, ALA) to build the knowledge base and enhance professionalism with compulsory CPD librarianship

as a profession will be in danger of losing out to other professions, reducing the status of librarians to that of an occupation.

6.3 US & UK EBLIP

While the previous section highlighted the precarious state of the professional status of librarianship, particularly in the UK context, this section will discuss the current EBLIP trends and procedures at place in the US and UK. In this, a discussion of the powerful tool which is EBLIP and how this tool could aid in repairing and improving practices of CPD, professional achievements such as tenure, Certification, etc., and professionalism as a whole.

6.3.1 Sources of Evidence

A key research objective for this project was to discover the experiences and attitudes of academic librarians in the US and UK. From this objective research questions involving procedures, challenges, and gaps emerged. This section will cover the types of evidence that respondents most commonly consulted for use in practice. From the results of the online questionnaire detailed in section 4.5.2 of Chapter 4, a wide array of evidence is utilized by the academic librarian. From the order of the ranked sources of evidence, themes in evidence preferences can be derived from UK and US respondents. When looking at the top five ranked responses of both the US and UK both groups had equal parts 'hard' and 'soft' evidence as defined by Koufogiannakis (2012) with two categories of 'hard' and three of 'soft' (Figure 4.1.1). What sets UK and US responses apart is the ranking of these types of evidence. US respondents ranked the 'hard' evidence as the top two sources of evidence while the UK first source of evidence would be considered 'soft'. The demonstrated preference towards a mixed or holistic collection of evidence is backed by the Koufogiannakis (2012) study and further backed by Gillespie et al. (2017).

6.3.2 Evidence Use

An evaluation of evidence usage amongst participants showed similarities between the US and UK in that the number one reason for using evidence was "to understand the nature and context of a problem". This would fall under what Luo (2018) defines as the "Know-about" category which contradicts her findings where this category ranked second under "Know-what", "To determine what actions will lead to desired outcomes". Outside of the ranked options the free text response reinforced the original categories while creating two new. The categories which emerged we "To convince" and "Performance measure". The "to convince"

category falls under how evidence is used rather than why, but "performance measure" was identified by US participants where they claimed that evidence was used "to ascertain program or service effectiveness" (Respondent 11). This category highlights evidence as a comparison tool to gauge performance of library services.

Following the findings of Luo (2018) the online questionnaire showed that UK and US participants number one use of evidence was "to directly influence a specific decision or solution to a problem". This finding was additionally backed by the free text responses which generated further categories with one emerging as the most significant, "Personal professional standards". Respondents 2, 3,& 4 represent this category, "as good policy", "due diligence", "For my own understanding and best practice". This new category shows a collection of academic librarians that engage with evidence through self-motivation, taking the responsibility onto themselves. Overall, this study showed similar trends to those discussed by Luo (2018) wherein, evidence has an "instrumental use" to directly influence a specific decision solution to а problem, highlighting the practicality or of academic librarianship.

6.3.3 Challenges

Amongst participants the number one ranked challenge for using evidence in practice was 'lack of time'. This is a common finding amongst studies of academic librarians and the EBLIP process (Luo, 2018; Pretty, 2007; Wilson, 2016; Koufogiannakis, 2015). Lack of time as a challenge was additionally stressed by participants via free text response. Some of the responses included: "Constantly increasing workload means there is an increasing lack of time to research" (Respondent 5), "The day job feels very full already, taking the time to reflect and then research prior to being able to integrate any evidence researched into practice can be tricky when there are other immediate deadlines that work needs to be produced for" (6), "Research is not built into my job because I am non-tenure track, though on a promotion system" (7), "Although assessment is part of my job I still lack adequate time" (8). Some participant responses cross code to demonstrate an "unsupportive institutional environment" where due to a lack of resources and heavy workload individuals feel they do not have the time.

The following quote from Respondent 8 was a major trend in responses of an "unsupportive institutional environment" from both UK and US respondents, "Institution says it supports evidence-based decision making, but then will ignore the evidence if it doesn't support their
desired outcome/course of action". Many respondents agree that senior librarians and particularly non-librarian managers are eager to dismiss evidence findings if it does not align with current practice or plans in place. These responses are corroborated by findings from an array of major voices in field of EBLIP which agree that 'organizational dynamics' and the complicated channels of library decisions are significant barriers to the success of EBLIP (Booth, 2009, p. 342; Koufogiannakis, 2013a, p.9; Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016, p. 10; Koufogiannakis, 2013b, p.143).

Another challenge identified throughout this study was the gaps in knowledge that exist in the field. While the process of EBLIP is supposed to naturally fill these gaps through the cyclical process of using and generating evidence, the identification of knowledge gaps as a challenge to using evidence demonstrates an inherent lack of knowledge of the process of EBLIP. Pretty (2007) acknowledges the small evidence base discussing the lack of funding in librarianship research as a primary cause. What the challenges data gathered through this study acknowledge a distinct institutional problem where evidence is not valued consistently across organizations and practitioners lack the support and understanding to conduct EBLIP properly. These challenges demonstrate a need for further training and understanding of how to conduct research and use current evidence in practice and for library management to understand the long-term benefits versus short term convenience.

6.3.4 Knowledge Gaps

As discussed above, knowledge gaps have been identified by practitioners as one of the challenges to the process of using evidence in practice. What data concerning the identification of gaps in knowledge showed is that in both the US and UK there is a desire for rigorous, structured, library science research methods. The important aspect of EBLIP that many seem to not grasp is the filling of knowledge gaps and the importance of the practitioners taking on the role of the 'practitioner-researcher'. What findings from the identifying knowledge gaps shows is that many academic librarians feel there is a lack of standardized methods for performing research in the library context, evaluating that research, which ultimately hinders the process of EBLIP.

Respondents commonly expressed this sentiment like the following quote,

"Librarians use surveys too much, probably because they don't know how to get information any other way. They need to be taught other methodologies and protocols. And many librarians don't know what to do with the data when they get it. It puts librarians at a disadvantage. EBP should be taught in graduate school. Research methods for librarianship and equivalent should be taught in graduate school". (Respondent 9)

A 2016 study by Wilson showed that one of the major barriers to 'practitioner-researchers' was a lack of research skills. The respondent quote mentions the need for EBP to be taught in graduate school. This sentiment was expressed by multiple respondents across the UK and US and Crowley (2008) states, the ALA "needs to change the current definition of library and information studies to specifically include a commitment to lifelong learning and reading" arguing they should promote "lifecycle librarianship" (p.131). While Crowley (2008) specifically focuses on the ALA, findings from this study show that CILIP should also be making changes to accredited library programs pushing for the inclusion of instruction of library research methods and the overall process of EBLIP.

6.4 Conclusion

Throughout the course of this study many conclusions regarding the professional environment of the academic librarian and the relationship with EBLIP has been drawn. It has been found through the document analysis and online questionnaire that CILIP and the ALA have standards for professional expertise and up to date knowledge of practitioners which EBLIP could help maintain and improve if promoted amongst practitioners. Promotion of EBLIP through ALA and CILIP accredited graduate programs is found to be essential to EBLIP success. Through the teaching of EBLIP to early professionals, problems in addressing knowledge gaps and skills training and research methods can be addressed early on, establishing a foundation of "lifecycle librarianship" (Crowley, 2008). Across the professional landscape the need to define the knowledge boundaries of librarianship has become evidence in order to maintain professionalism within the field.

The EBLIP procedures of academic librarians was discovered to align largely with past studies into the subject. Evidence is found to be valued amongst academic librarians, but they report lacking the skills or support to adequately engage with it. US and UK engagement showed a trend of more US librarian engagement with evidence than UK participants. Additionally, the status of professional organizations in both countries shows that the US holds more diverse and numerous organizations and when combined with trends shows the strength of professional librarianship in the US. The rigor of the CILIP professional registration process compared to that of US tenure was brought into question throughout this study,

66

bringing a critical eye toward whether the sources of evidence and requirements are challenging enough for levels such as Chartership and Fellowship.

The academic librarian's definition of evidence aligned with literature (Koufogiannakis, 2012) wherein a more holistic evidence base is preferred consisting of both 'hard' and 'soft' evidence. And consistent with Luo (2018) is the finding that evidence is largely used as a practicality to address and influence a specific decision or solution to a problem. The final conclusions from this study show that major challenges of time, organizational dynamics, and lack of research skills all influence one another. Organizational dynamics effect time and supporting practitioners research skills and vice versa. The challenges presented are wide reaching but all of these could be addressed through changes in the teaching of library school. With the implementation and shift of LIS education towards library science research methods and EBLIP, changes in opinions of evidence use could be shifted and values of the library professional changed through a shift in how we think about the library profession.

Chapter 7: Recommendations & Conclusion

The purpose for this study emerged from a distinct gap in understanding the procedures of UK academic librarians in relation to EBLIP. The comparative nature of the project emerged with the intention of drawing parallels between the two and verifying findings of US studies of academic librarians. The problem of this research was to find out how EBLIP is being embraced within either country and to gauge the effects of professional organizations and overall professional status in the implementation of this practice. The objectives, as established at the beginning of this project are as follows:

- Discover the attitudes and experiences of US and UK academic librarians of EBLIP
- Gauge the relationship between the academic librarian and their professional environment
- Develop recommendations to strengthen EBLIP across the academic sector to best support practitioners.

These objectives were the guiding force behind the procedures of this research and the means of meeting these objectives are detailed in the following sections.

7.1 Academic Librarians & EBLIP

Data regarding the first objective of this dissertation was largely derived from the online questionnaire. This section will summarize the findings regarding EBLIP and academic librarians in the UK and US.

7.1.1 Respondent Profile

The collection of respondents for the online questionnaire consisted of 127 from the UK and 194 from the US. Of these respondents 75% from the UK and 98% from the US held a master's degree or PhD. The majority of respondents held between 11-20 years or 20+ years' experience in the LIS field and held the role of 'subject librarian'. A professional qualification is required of 76% of UK respondents and 92% of US respondents to hold their current job position. In the UK 65% of respondents were registered with a library professional organization while 88% of US respondents were registered with a library professional organization. Finally, of UK respondents professionally registered 33% held Chartership while 7% held Fellowship, and of US respondents 33% held tenure.

7.1.2 Findings

What the above profile indicates is a US population of academic librarians who are highly educated, engaged in their professional organization and whose professional qualifications are valued by employers. While UK respondents have slightly more experience a quarter of respondents do not hold a degree-level qualification due to the fact that a quarter of respondents are not required by their employer to hold a Master's qualification and report less engagement with their professional organizations. This profile shows a trend of direct influence of the standards of the professional bodies of the ALA and CILIP on the library profession.

In understanding the relationship between academic librarians and their professional environment findings showed trends that brought to question the strength of standards of evaluation for the most qualified professionals in the UK. The document analysis backs these findings showing no detailed difference between any of the levels of CILIP professional registration particularly in required evidence. Further findings show that when discussing evidence, trends indicate a higher level of engagement from US librarians versus those from the UK. While this is true, training received from employers on evidence use and collection from both the UK and US was minimal, showing a lack of employer responsibility for ensuring high quality practice. While training is minimal in collecting evidence, it was found that 55% of UK respondents have contributed to the knowledge base through publication while 74% of US respondents have done the same. These numbers once again display trends of a higher engagement with the EBLIP process in the US versus UK.

This study confirms that academic librarians view evidence from a holistic perspective equally accepting 'hard' more scientific evidence such as peer review literature and 'soft' less scientific evidence such as advice from colleagues. This finding was further backed by free text responses from participants identifying the need for a wider body of evidence integrating more 'soft' evidence to inform everyday practice. UK and US respondents have largely similar practices when it comes to the reasons for evidence use acting out of practicality to solve particular problems. The major challenges to using evidence in practice which emerged from this study are challenges of time, organizational dynamics, and lack of research skills all influencing one another.

7.2 Professional Environment

Eldredge (2014) argues that EBLIP has a role in "renewing the contract our profession has with society" by sparking a newfound respect for the expertise of librarians in their user-oriented decisions (p.63). By making informed and transparent decisions the process enhances professional status, demonstrating value to society. The power of EBLIP when effectively implemented could have profound effects for the professional status of librarianship but the findings reported below highlight the professional barriers which restrict the process from flourishing.

7.2.1 Findings

EBLIP has the ability to strengthen the professional status of librarianship through establishing a basis of evidence and generating a population of librarians operating with expertise in practice. Evidence was found in this study to be valued amongst academic librarians across both the UK and US, but they report lacking the skills or support to adequately engage with it. The findings of this study confirm a general lack of support from professional organizations and institutions. The professional organizations of both the US and UK agree that they need expert knowledge but on the job training isn't standardized and it is proven in this study that employers are not taking responsibility for the training of staff in using or creating evidence. The result is uneven training and values of practice amongst practitioners. There is a need for professional qualifications which adhere to standards by the ALA and CILIP. As the accrediting bodies of library programs, they need to push for greater focus on Research Methods as shown in the survey results, to better train practitioners to achieve best practice.

Additionally, the strength of a degree-level qualification is not supported by CILIP which weakens the professional status through accepting on the job training as sufficient. CILIP shows that expert knowledge is necessary for practice yet, they do not champion an educated professional equally valuing education with experience. Without promoting the need for formal training and learning, the boundaries of what makes librarianship a profession begins to blur. While the US shows greater acceptance and use of evidence than UK participants the same problems persist in either countries with a long way to go before EBLIP is effectively operating in the academic library sector.

70

7.3 Recommendations for EBLIP

With all these factors which have been proven to influence the experience of academic librarians in their participation of EBLIP it is clear the push for organizational changes across the board is a major change necessary for the success of EBLIP and thus the continued success of librarianship as a profession. Based upon this, the following recommendations have been generated to address problems and help strengthen EBLIP across the academic sector to best support practitioners.

• Professional bodies (ALA, CILIP) must create official standards which lead individual practice and the overall profession towards the highest standards of practice. Without professional pressure institutional attitudes will never change and librarians will continue to be trained without a knowledge of EBLIP. Missing the opportunity to gain a skill which will help individual and institution throughout the working career of a professional.

- CILIP should support the importance of a degree level qualification in library work.
- CILIP should produce sector specific guidance to push the highest standards of practice relevant to the work performed.
- CILIP should evaluate the performance measures used for Professional Registration, consider creating more rigorous evidence requirements that engages practitioners with current evidence in the field.

• Professional bodies (ALA, CILIP) must require library research methods as a part of all LIS programs and CPD. The teaching and training of librarians in using evidence and conducting research into practice falls to the responsibility of library education programs and their accrediting bodies. If librarians are taught that EBLIP is the only way to conduct practice and are given the tools to succeed through education and CPD, organizational dynamics will begin to be challenged and shifted towards embracing change and moving towards the highest standards of practice.

7.4 Recommendations for Future Research

There is a vast array of avenues for future research in this area of study. Based upon this project areas for further research have been recommended by the researcher:

• Further focused case studies in the UK on EBLIP. Further studies in the UK could increase the awareness of EBLIP and deepen understanding of the influences of professional forces specific to UK librarians.

• Critical analysis of ALA and CILIP requirements for accrediting graduate LIS programs. Understanding the differences in standards for the training of librarians could lead to a greater understanding of librarianship as a profession in either country.

References:

- Almalki, S. (2016) 'Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Data in Mixed Methods Research--Challenges and Benefits'. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *5*(3), pp.288-296.
- American Library Association (2010) A Guideline for the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Librarians. Available at: http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/promotiontenure (Accessed: 3 July 2019)
- American Library Association (2009) *Academic Libraries*. Available at: <u>http://www.ala.org/tools/research/librarystats/academic</u> (Accessed: 6 May 2019).
- American Library Association (2011) ACRL Standards for Faculty Status of Academic Librarians. Available at: <u>http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/standardsfaculty</u> (Accessed: 24 May 2019).
- American Library Association (2008) *Becoming a Librarian*. Available at: <u>http://www.ala.org/educationcareers/careers/paths/librarian</u> (Accessed: 18 May 2019).
- American Library Association (2006) *Statement on the Certification & Licensing of Academic Librarians*. Available at: <u>http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/statementcertification</u> (Accessed: 18 May 2019).
- Bolton, P. (2018) *Tuition fee statistics*. Available at: <u>https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN00917</u> (Accessed: 15 May 2019).
- Booth, A. and Brice, A. (2004) *Evidence-based practice for information professionals: A handbook*. London: Facet.
- Booth, A. (2000) 'Librarian heal thyself: evidence-based librarianship, useful, practicable, desirable'. In 8th International Congress on Medical Librarianship, 2nd-5th July.
- Booth, A. (2009) 'EBLIP five-point-zero: towards a collaborative model of evidence-based practice'. *Health Information & Libraries Journal, 26*(4), pp.341-344.
- Booth, A. (2011) 'Barriers and facilitators to evidence-based library and information practice: An international perspective'. *Perspectives in International Librarianship*, 2011(1), p.1.
- Bowen, G.A. (2009) 'Document analysis as a qualitative research method'. *Qualitative research journal*, *9* (2), pp.27-40.
- Brante, T. (1990) 'Professional types as a strategy of analysis', in Burrage, M. & Torstendahl,
 R. (eds.) *Professions in theory and history: rethinking the study of the professions*.
 Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 73-85.
- Brettle, A. and Maden, M. (2015) "What evidence is there to support the employment of trained and professionally registered library, information and knowledge workers? A systematic scoping review of the evidence", available at: www.cilip.org.uk/sites/default/fi
- Bryman, A. (2016) Social research methods 5th ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Cannon, P. (2017) A review of professionalism within LIS. *Library Management*, 38(2/3), pp.142–152.
- Crowley, W.A., (2008) *Renewing professional librarianship : a fundamental rethinking*, Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited.
- Crumley, E. and Koufogiannakis, D. (2002) 'Developing evidence-based librarianship: practical steps for implementation'. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 19(2), pp.61-70.
- College & University- Statistics and Facts (2019) Available at: <u>https://www.statista.com/topics/829/college-and-unive</u> (Accessed: 7 May 2019).
- Check if a university or college is officially recognised (2019) Available at: <u>https://www.gov.uk/check-a-university-is-officially-recognised</u> (Accessed: 6 May 2019).
- Dalrymple, P. (2010) 'Applying evidence in practice: What can we learn from healthcare'. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 5(1), pp.43-47.
- Eisner, E. W. (1991) 'The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice'. Toronto: Collier Macmillan Canada.
- Eldredge, J.D. (2000) 'Evidence-based librarianship: an overview'. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, *88*(4), p.289.
- Eldredge, J.D. (2002) 'Evidence-based librarianship: what might we expect in the years ahead?'. *Health information and libraries journal*, *19*(2), pp.71-77.
- Eldredge, J.D. (2004) 'Inventory of research methods for librarianship and informatics'. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 92(1), p.83.
- Eldredge, J.D. (2014) 'The Evolution of Evidence Based Library and Information Practice Part III: Revitalizing the Profession Through EBLIP'. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 9(1), pp.62-73.
- Eldredge, J.D., Holmes, H.N. and Ascher, M.T. (2015) 'Moving the EBLIP community's research agenda forward'. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 10(2), pp.170-173.
- Freidson, E. (1973) 'Professions and the occupational principle'. in Freidson, E. (ed.), *The* professions and their prospects. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 19-38.
- Genoni, P., Haddow, G. and Ritchie, A. (2004) 'Why don't librarians use research?'. In Koufogiannakis, D. and Brettle, A. (eds.) *Evidence-Based Practice for Information Professionals*. London: Facet Publishing, pp. 49-60
- Gillespie, A. et al. (2017) 'What Do Australian Library and Information Professionals Experience as Evidence?'. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 12(1), pp.97–108.
- Gordon, C. A. (2009) 'An emerging theory for evidence based information literacy instruction in school libraries, part 2: Building a culture of inquiry'. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 4(3), pp.19-45.

- Haynes, R.B., Sackett, D.L., Richardson, W.S., Rosenberg, W. and Langley, G.R. (1997) 'Evidence-based medicine: How to practice & teach EBM'. *Canadian Medical Association. Journal*, 157(6), p.788.
- Hosburgh, N. (2011) 'Librarian faculty status: What does it mean in academia?'. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1(1).
- Housewright, R., Schonfeld, R.C. and Wulfson, K. (2013) 'Ithaka S+ R/Jisc/RLUK UK Survey of Academics 2012'. *London: University of London*.
- Housewright, R., Schonfeld, R.C. and Wulfson, K. (2013) '*Ithaka S+ R US faculty survey 2012*' Ithaka S+ R., pp. 45-80.
- Howlett, A. (2018) 'Time to move EBLIP forward with an organizational lens'. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, *13*(3), pp.74-80.
- Judge, C.S.S. & McMenemy, D. (2014) 'Leading for learning: A model for best practice in school libraries'. *Advances in Librarianship*, 38, pp.101–135.
- Koufogiannakis, D. (2012) 'Academic librarians' conception and use of evidence sources in practice'. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 7(4), pp.5-24.
- Koufogiannakis, D. (2013a) 'EBLIP7 keynote: What we talk about when we talk about evidence'. Evidence Based Library and Information Practice, 8(4), 6-17. https://doi.org/10.18438/B8659R
- Koufogiannakis, D.A. (2013b) 'How academic librarians use evidence in their decision making: Reconsidering the evidence based practice model'. Doctoral dissertation, Aberystwyth University.
- Koufogiannakis, D. (2015) 'Determinants of evidence use in academic librarian decision making'. *College & Research Libraries*, *76*(1), pp.100-114.
- Koufogiannakis, D. and Brettle, A. eds. (2016) *Being evidence based in library and information practice*. London: Facet Publishing.
- Koufogiannakis, D. and Slater, L. (2004) 'A content analysis of librarianship research'. *Journal* of Information Science, **30**(3), pp. 227-239.
- Koufogiannakis, D. and Wiebe, N. (2006) 'Effective methods for teaching information literacy skills to undergraduate students: A systematic review and meta-analysis'. *Library and Information Science: Parameters and Perspectives*, *3*(3), pp.3-43.
- Luo, L. (2018) 'Experiencing Evidence-Based Library and Information Practice (EBLIP): Academic Librarians' Perspective'. *College & Research Libraries*, *79*(4), p.554.
- Miller et al. (2017) 'How academic librarians experience evidence-based practice: A grounded theory model'. *Library and Information Science Research*, 39(2), pp.124–130.
- Moody, D.L. and Shanks, G.G. (1999) 'Using knowledge management and the internet to support evidence based practice: a medical case study'. In *Proceedings of the 10th Australasian Conference on Information Systems* (pp. 660-676).
- Partridge, H., Edwards, S., & Thorpe, C. (2010) 'Evidence-based practice: Information professionals' experience of information literacy in the workplace'. in Lloyd A. & Talja S. (Eds.) Practising information literacy: Bringing theories of learning, practice and

information literacy together (pp. 273-298). Wagga Wagga, N.S.W.: Centre for Information Studies, Charles Sturt University.

- Pinto, M. and Sales, D. (2015) 'Uncovering information literacy's disciplinary differences through students' attitudes: An empirical study'. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 47(3), pp.204-215.
- Ponnusamy, R. and Pandurangan, J. (2014) *A Hand Book on University System* (Vol. 1). Allied Publishers.
- Pretty, H.J. (2007) 'Barriers to Evidence-Based Library and Information Practice'. *Feliciter*, **53**(1), pp. 30-32.
- Qualifications: what the different levels mean (2019) Available at: <u>https://www.nidirect.gov.uk/articles/qualifications-what-different-levels-mean</u> (Accessed: 14 May 2019).
- Rambo, N. (2015) 'Research Data Management Roles for Libraries'. New York: Ithaka S+R. Retrieved from: <u>www.sr.ithaka.org/publications/research-data-management/</u>.
- Sackett, D.L. et al. (1997) 'Evidence based medicine: how to practise and teach EBM'. Edinburgh, Churchill Livingstone
- Schonfeld, R.C. (2015) 'Meeting researchers where they start: Streamlining access to scholarly resources'. *New York: Ithaka S+ R*.
- Schwartz, M. (2016) 'Careers: Top Skills for Tomorrow's Librarians'. *Library Journal*, vol. 141, no. 4, pp. 38.
- Somerville, M.M. (2015) 'Adopting Informed Systems learning theory: How 21st century organizations can move from theory to practice'.
- Somerville, M.M. and Kloda, L.A. (2016) 'Academic libraries. In: Being evidence based in library and information practice'. Facet, London, pp. 93-104.
- Strauss, A., and Corbin, J.M. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- The Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (no date) Academic & Research librarians. Available at: https://www.cilip.org.uk/page/AcademicResearchLibrarians (Accessed:24 May 2019).
- The Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (2012) *Code of Professional Practice for Library and Information Professionals*. Available at: <u>https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.cilip.org.uk/resource/collection/B29DAF42-6319-</u> <u>406F-8985-52CF355B98D7/code of professional practice for library and .pdf</u> (Accessed 6 July 2019).
- The Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (no date) *Professional Registration Certification*. Available at:<u>https://www.cilip.org.uk/page/ProfessionalRegistrationCertification</u> (Accessed:24 May 2019).
- The Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (no date) *Professional Registration Chartership.* Available at:

https://www.cilip.org.uk/page/ProfessionalRegistrationChartership (Accessed:24 May 2019).

- The Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (no date) *Professional Registration Fellowship.* Available at: <u>https://www.cilip.org.uk/page/ProfessionalRegistrationFellowship</u> (Accessed:24 May 2019).
- The Scottish Parliament (2016) *Devolved and Reserved Matters*. Available at:<u>https://www.parliament.scot/visitandlearn/Education/18642.aspx</u> (Accessed: 14 May 2019).
- *Tuition fees for university* (2019) Available at: <u>https://www.mygov.scot/tuition-fees/</u> (Accessed: 14 May 2019).
- United States Department of Education (2017) *The Federal Role in Education*. Available at: <u>https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html</u> (Accessed: 6 May 2019).
- Wilson, V. (2016) 'Practitioner-researchers and EBLIP'. In: *Being evidence based in library and information practice*. Facet, London, pp.81-91.
- Wilson, V. (2017) 'Research in Practice: Mythbusting EBLIP'. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, **12**(2), pp. 184.
- Watson-Boone, R. (2000) 'Academic librarians as practitioner-researchers'. *The Journal of academic librarianship*, *26*(2), pp.85-93.
- Weightman, A.L., Farnell, D.J., Morris, D. and Strange, H. (2015) 'Information literacy teaching in universities: a systematic review of evaluation studies: preliminary findings for online v traditional methods'. In *Poster presentation at 8th Evidence Based Library and Information Practice Conference, Brisbane*.
- What higher education is (2019) Available at: <u>https://www.nidirect.gov.uk/articles/what-higher-education</u>(Accessed: 14 May 2019).
- Wu, C.C. and Pu, H.T. (2015) 'Bridging the Gap of Practice and Research: A Preliminary Investigation of Evidence-based Practice for Library and Information Science Research'. Journal of Library & Information Science, 41(2).
- Zhang, L., Watson, E.M. and Banfield, L. (2007) 'The efficacy of computer-assisted instruction versus face-to-face instruction in academic libraries: a systematic review'. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 33(4), pp.478-484.

Appendix 1:

Online Questionnaire

Final EBLIP Survey				
Q1 What country do you work in?				
O United Kingdom				
O United States				
Q2 Do you hold a professional qualification in Library Science or a relevant field?				
○ Yes				
○ No				
Q3 What qualification do you hold?				
O Bachelor's				
O Master's				
○ PhD				
O Paraprofessional (e.g., CILIP's ACLIP, CILIP's MCLIP through ACLIP route, etc.)				
○ N/A				

Q4 How many years experience do you hold in the library and information profession?

0-5
6-10
11-20
20+

Q5 What is your role in the library?

Library Assistant
Assistant Librarian
Subject Librarian
Senior Librarian
Other ______

Q6 Is a professional library qualification required to hold your current position?

○ Yes		
◯ No		
O Don't Know		

Q7 Are you a current registered member of an LIS professional organization? (e.g., CILIP, ALA, ACRL, SLA, ASIS&T)				
○ Yes				
◯ No				
Q8 What prof	essional organization(s) do you belong to? [Select all that apply]			
	American Library Association (ALA)			
	Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP)			
	International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA)			
	Other (please specify)			
	N/A			

Q9 Does your professional organization encourage continuing professional development (CPD)?

○ Yes			
◯ No			
○ N/A			

Q10 As a part of CPD (chartership/tenure) are you required to provide evidence of personal performance supported by current literature/studies in the field?

○ Yes
○ No
O Don't know
○ N/A

Q11 Have you achieved Tenure, Chartership, or Fellowship in your role?

○ Tenure	
O Chartership	
○ Fellowship	
○ N/A	

Q12 How frequently would you say you consult evidence to inform decisions in your library role?

O Never

O Almost never

○ Sometimes

○ Fairly often

○ Very often

Q13 What are your primary sources of evidence (i.e.- facts or information) used to make decisions in your role? Please rank 1-11. [1= most important, 11=least important]

Click and drag choices to the appropriate ranking.

 Peer reviewed articles

 Monographs

 Practitioner textbooks

 Conference papers

 Institutional statistics

 Vendors

 User surveys

 Focus groups

 User panels

 Personal experiences

 Colleagues

Q14 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "My employing institution encourages and supports the use of evidence in decision making and best practice."

O Strongly agree

○ Agree

O Neither agree or disagree

O Disagree

O Strongly Disagree

Q15 To what extent do you agree of disagree with the following statement: "My professional organization encourages the use of evidence in decision making and best practice."

O Strongly agree
O Agree
O Neither agree or disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

Q16 In the past five years, what amount of training have you received from your employer on conducting research into your own practice?

0-1 hours
1-3 hours
4-8 hours
8+ hours
None

Q17 In the past five years, what amount of training have you received from your employer on using evidence in your own practice?

O 0-1 hours
O 1-3 hours
O 4-8 hours
O 8+ hours
○ None
Q18 Have you ever published or presented research or findings from your own practice?
○ Yes
○ No
Q19 Do you believe evidence is important to advancing the profession?
O Definitely yes
O Probably yes
O Might or might not
O Probably not
O Definitely not

Q20 For what reason do you most commonly consult evidence when making decisions? Please rank from 1-5 [1=most common, 5=least common] Click and drag choices to the appropriate ranking.

- _____ To understand why a certain action is required
- _____ To determine what actions will lead to desired outcomes
- _____ To identify stakeholders that need to be involved for potential actions
- _____ To understand the nature and context of a problem
- _____ To investigate how to perform an action or implement a solution
- _____ Other [Please specify]

Q21 Why do you use evidence to support decision making? Rank from 1-5 [1= most common, least common]

Click and drag choices to the appropriate ranking.

To directly influence a specific decision or solution to a problem
 As an instrument of persuasion to support of challenge existing positions
 As a requirement imposed by others (employers, CPD, etc.)
 To impact knowledge, understanding, and attitudes of practitioners and decision-makers
 Other [Please specify]

Q22 Which of these challenges are the greatest hinderance to you using evidence in practice? Please rank 1-5 [1=greatest hinderance, 5=least] If other, please elaborate in Q26

Click and drag choices to the appropriate ranking.

_____ Lack of time

_____ Lack of training

- _____ Lack of access to evidence
- _____ Lack of support from employer
- _____ Lack of willingness

Q23 Please elaborate on any challenges you face in using evidence in practice.

-	
-	
-	

Q27 Are there types of evidence that you believe have gaps that need to be filled?

Appendix 2:

Questionnaire Cover Letter

&

List of Emailed Potential Participants

Hello,

I am writing to you to request your participation in a brief survey. My name is Molly Black and I am a current student at the University of Strathclyde in Glasgow, UK pursuing my MSc in Information and Library Studies.

My dissertation, A Comparative Study of EBLIP in UK and US Academic Libraries is an attempt to gauge the status of Evidence Based Library and Information Practice (EBLIP) engagement in the academic library sector in both the United States and United Kingdom. Target participants for this study are persons who work in an academic library and hold the title of 'librarian', 'library assistant', or equivalent in their current position. Further information regarding this project can be found in the attached information sheet.

The survey is very brief and will only take about 10 minutes to complete. If you wish to participate, please fill out the attached consent form and return to the following email address: **molly.black.2018@uni.strath.ac.uk**.

Once you have completed the consent form please click the link below to go to the survey web site (or copy and paste the link into your Internet browser).

Survey Link: https://strathsci.gualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_7VUu8T3gEUO6ouN

Please feel free to circulate this email to relevant parties.

Your participation in the survey is completely voluntary and all of your responses will be kept confidential. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses to any reports of these data. The Institutional Ethics Board and supervising advisor David McMenemy have approved this survey.

Should you have any comments or questions, please feel free to contact me at: molly.black.2018@uni.strath.ac.uk. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely, Molly Black Information and Library Studies MSc University of Strathclyde

UK Mailing Lists Used
knowledge-management-forum@jiscmail.ac.uk
lis-arts-humanities@jiscmail.ac.uk
lis-link@jiscmail.ac.uk
lis-profession@jiscmail.ac.uk
lis-e-resources@jiscmail.ac.uk
archives-nra@jiscmail.ac.uk
lis-e-books@jiscmail.ac.uk
lis-infoliteracy@jiscmail.ac.uk
lis-arlg-londonandsoutheast@jiscmail.ac.uk
lis-arlg@jiscmail.ac.uk
lis-arlg-scotland@jiscmail.ac.uk
lis-arlg-eastern@jiscmail.ac.uk
Number of Individuals in the UK contacted via email
76
US Mailing Lists Used
scholcomm@lists.ala.org
lita-l@lists.ala.org
collib-l@lists.ala.org
cicls-l@lists.ala.org
sts-I-request@lists.ala.org
uls-l@lists.ala.org
acrl-aaslig-l@lists.ala.org
acrl-rig@lists.ala.org
dss-l@lists.ala.org
dls-l@lists.ala.org
acr-dggls@lists.ala.org
acr-dghps@lists.ala.org
acr-srrmig@lists.ala.org
acrliparldg@lists.ala.org
acrInm@lists.ala.org
academicpr@lists.ala.org
Number of Individuals in the US contacted via email
105

Appendix 3:

Coding Scheme for Online Questionnaire

TABLE 1 Coding Scheme For Analyzing Data From The Online Questionnaire				
Area of Inquiry	Code	Code Label	Code Definition	
Challenges in the EBLIP process	1	Lack of time	Lack of time due to conflicting priorities and obligations.	
	2	Lack of access to evidence	Barriers to accessing and collecting evidence including: paywalls and the inaccessibility of patron feedback.	
	3	Lack of training	Lack of knowledge of how to conduct research, evaluate, and apply findings.	
	4	Unsupportive institutional environment	The environment of academic institutions (not only the library) does not support EBLIP. Through a lack of understanding the process, ignoring evidence if it disagrees with current practice, differing definitions of what is 'evidence' and when it is needed, lack of direction from management for project outcomes.	
	5	Lack of willingness	Lack of willingness to participate developed from a lack of incentive. Participants were not encouraged to engage and EBLIP seen to not help with their career advancement.	
	6	Lack of resources	Lack of funding, staff, and effective Library Management Systems to collect, find, and process evidence.	
	7	Gaps in knowledge base	Gaps in the knowledge base impede practitioners who do not have the resources to fill identified gaps. These include a lack of relevant literature, and the format of findings presentations such as concise reports.	
	8	None of the above	Respondents did not experience barriers or challenges to the EBLIP process.	
Knowledge Gaps	1	Unsure	Participants could not identify any gaps.	
	2	EBLIPs effect on creativity in practice	The negative effects of EBLIP on creativity and implementing innovative solutions.	
	3	Intersectionality, inclusion, and diversity in library practice	Inclusivity and diversity with tailored library services based on the needs of all cultures, groups, and individuals.	

4	User experience	Gauging student experiences with e-resources, the library, and the use and opinion of the physical space of libraries.
5	Librarian as teacher	Effectiveness of librarians as teachers of study skills and information literacy, best practice, and impact measures.
6	Patron information behavior	How and why patrons use the library, at what stage is help sought. Behaviors of potential patrons and reasons for not accessing the library.
7	Small academic libraries	Small academic libraries that cater to a small population of patrons including, community colleges, higher education, and further education institutions.
8	Library science research methods	The importance of an established an rigorous set of library science research methods with particular focus on qualitative research in the library context. A standardization of findings across organizations and defined research expectations.
9	Library marketing	Library promotion, displays, and engagement across an institution.
10	Impact measures of library services	Create a standard for measure the value and impact of the library on student learning.
11	Expansion of forms of evidence	Necessity for a more broad definition of evidence to include more qualitative data, and non-traditional sources such as blogs.
12	Cross institution collaborations	Instruction on methods for collaborating with other institutions and working on a regional basis or more broadly.
13	Effective workflow structures in libraries	Understanding different workflow structures of a variety of libraries to understand what garners great results.
14	Methods of curriculum-based practice to support student learning	How to build a service directly linked to the curriculum of the student body and institution the library is serving.
15	Vendor comparisons	Comparing specific vendor products (coverage, efficacy, usage).

<u>Appendix 4:</u> Worked example of online questionnaire coding Q23 Please elaborate on any challenges you face in using evidence in practice.

Free Text Responses:

Respondent 3:

"About 2 years ago I changed jobs. My previous institution really prioritized using evidence in practice. There's not the same expectation of that across my current library. People aren't opposed to it but it's also not necessarily their first thought. Recently, we began a series of discussions within the library about research help models. The complete inability of the manager driving this discussion to describe desired outcomes or facilitate us coming up with them was incredibly frustrating. Many other librarians were also frustrated, and while they didn't necessarily use the language around evidence-based practice (which is still much more common in health sciences librarianship in the US than other areas, in my experience), they were certainly raising evidence-based concerns like "what are we trying to do?"" Original coding from 'Open coding':

4 Lack of support from employer

10 Institutional environment

Final code following axial and selective coding:

4 Unsupportive Institutional Environment

Open coding:

1 Lack of time

3 Lack of training

11 Lack of funding

Final coding:

1 Lack of time

- 3 Lack of training
- 6 Lack of resources

Respondent: 10

Lack of <mark>time, training and funding</mark> makes it challenging to devote adequate time and resources to using evidence in practice. Challenging time financially for many UK academic institutions. Appendix 5:

Coding Manual for Document Analysis

Coding Manual:
Professional Advancement & Professional Standards
Professional Advancement
Nature of Qualification and Requirements:
0 Not mentioned
1 Promotion/appointment
2 Appropriate professional degree
3 Advancement based on institutional standards/practice/regulations/guidelines
4 Contribution to scholarship, the profession, and library service
5 Institutional contribution
6 Ranked promotions (requiring different levels of expertise)
7 Must be recommended for advancement opportunity
8 Individually driven process
9 Association with professional organization (I.eCILIP,ALA)
10 Demonstration of skills development, self-evaluation, improved information service knowledge
11 Fees
12 Registered mentors
13 Advancement based on professional organization standards (I.eCILIP PKSB)
14 Annual Revalidation to demonstrate CPD
Decision Makers:
Oa Not mentioned
Ta Representative panel of library faculty
2a Members of the academic community outside the library
Ba Professional colleagues outside the academic institution
4a Chief administrator of library services
5a Professional organization registration and accreditation Board
Forms of Evidence:
ub Not mentioned
The Employer evaluation forms
20 Letters from colleagues
Ab Records of committee activity
Ab Records of committee activity
Sb Documentation of organized workshops, meetings
ob Assessments by students The Bread of professional angagement (Lo., conference attendance)
Phono of professional engagement (i.e conference attendance)
ob Blog posis
10b Self-evaluation reflective report based on framework criteria
11b Mentor/mentee evaluation
12b Revalidation statement
13b Relevant variety of sources

Professional Standards

Academic Library

Oc Not mentioned

1c Serve needs of colleges, universities, their students, staff and faculty

2c Necessity of subject expertise

3c Tenure opportunity

4c Standards for different positions in library (I.e.-subject-specialist, health, etc.)

5c Provision of a diverse collection in a variety of formats

6c Information literacy instruction

7c IT management

8c Fundraising/funds management

9c Cross institution departmental collaboration

10c Cataloguing

Academic Librarian/Professional Standards:

0d Not mentioned

1d Professional expertise; knowledge; experience

2d Information literacy training; research skills

3d Master's degree in library science (accredited school)

4d Collaboration with colleagues

5d Desire to increase knowledge base of the institution for research, teaching, and learning

6d Updated knowledge of new technologies and systems

7d Prioritize service of users and their needs

8d Serve society

9d Follow institutional standards

<u>Appendix 6:</u> Document analysis line-by-line coding

A Guideline for the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Librarians

Section: Introduction & A

Length: 285

Introduction

This Guideline for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure is intended for use where librarians have faculty status. It is intended for application within the context of two ACRL policy statements on faculty status for academic librarians, <u>1</u> as well as related statements issued by the American Association of University Professors. <u>2</u> The objective of this Guideline is to propose criteria and procedures for appointment, promotion in academic rank, and tenure (continuous appointment) for use in academic libraries. Utilizing these criteria and procedures will ensure that the library faculty and, therefore, library services will be of the highest quality possible. These criteria are intended to be minimal only. These procedures may need to be adjusted in minor detail to conform with existing institutional procedures for other faculty. Any contractual procedures must be observed.

I. Appointment

A. General Policies

- Appointment of librarians shall follow the same procedures that are established for appointing all institutional faculty members. Any librarian appointed to a college or university library faculty shall have the appropriate terminal professional degree. <u>3</u> Appointment to any rank shall meet the criteria appropriate to that rank.
- 2. To ensure that only candidates of the highest quality are appointed to the library faculty, there shall be at least one committee representative of the library faculty selected to participate in the reviewing and screening of all candidates, participate in the interview process, and make recommendations for appointment.
- 3. The terms and conditions of every appointment to the library faculty shall be stated and confirmed in writing, and copies of all relevant documents, including the official document of appointment, shall be given to the faculty member. Subsequent extensions or modifications of an appointment shall be stated and confirmed in writing.

1 Promotion/appointment

2 Appropriate professional degree

Suggested, 6 Ranked promotions (requiring different levels of expertise)

7 Must be recommended for advancement opportunity

1a Representative panel of library faculty
<u>Appendix 7:</u> List of professional organization registration from online questionnaire

UK Responses:
Ligue des Bibliothèques Européennes de Recherche (LIBER)
Library Association of Ireland
Society of College, National, and University Libraries (SCONUL)
British Computer Society
Association of British Theological and Philosophical Libraries (ABTAPL)
United Kingdom Serials Group (UKSG)
NASIG
European Association for Heath Information and Libraries (EAHIL)
Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD)
New Zealand Library Association (LIANZA)
US Responses:
Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL)
Copyright Licensing Agency (CLA)
American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)
Library Information Technology Association (LITA)
Association of Jewish Libraries (AJL)
American Chemical Society (ACS)
International Visual Literacy Association (IVLA)
Association of Seventh-day Adventist Librarians (ASDAL)
Catholic Library Association (CLA)
Open Textbook Network
Rare Books and Manuscripts Section RBMS
International Society for Knowledge Organization (ISKO)
Asian Pacific American Librarians Association (APALA)
REFORMA
British and Irish Association of Law Librarians (BIALL)
United States Agricultural Information Network (USAIN)
American Public Health Association