



Supplemental electronic content to

J Med Libr Assoc. Apr;104(2):DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.104.2.015

www.mlanet.org

© Lessick, Perryman, Billman, Alpi, De Groote, Babin Jr. 2016

Research engagement of health sciences librarians: a survey of research-related activities and attitudes

Susan Lessick, MA, MLS, AHIP, FMLA; Carol Perryman, PhD; Brooke L. Billman, MA, AHIP; Kristine M. Alpi, MLS, MPH, AHIP; Sandy L. De Groote, MLIS, AHIP; Ted D. Babin Jr.

Table 8Conduct research studies, by subject

Broad subject categories	n	%	Topics	n	%
Applied*	223	87.8%			
Public services	72	28.3%	Assessment of public services	32	12.6%
			Information needs of health professionals	13	5.1%
			Librarian integration with health care team, residency programs, or faculty programs	11	4.3%
			Reference transaction/service assessment	6	2.4%
			Information needs of students	4	1.6%
			Embedded/ liaison librarian assessment	3	1.2%
			Informationist/ clinical librarian service assessment	3	1.2%
Information behavior & use	54	21.3%	Bibliometric studies/ citation analysis	19	7.5%
			Health literacy/information seeking for consumers	13	5.1%
			Assessment of search skill (health professionals, students)	8	3.1%
			EBM/P: knowledge and barriers for health professionals	5	2.0%
			Information seeking behavior of students	5	2.0%
			Utilization of literature for making decisions	3	1.2%
			Faculty copyright knowledge	1	0.4%
Collection management & development	35	13.8%	Use assessment of library resources (online & print)	15	5.9%
			Consumer health services /resources in libraries	5	2.0%
			Database assessment/comparison	5	2.0%
			Clinical tools/point-of-care assessment	5	2.0%
			E-journals: assessment of access to online journals	4	1.6%
			Defining core journals in a discipline	1	0.4%
Technology	30	11.8%	Handheld/mobile/e-reader use in health care (Kindles, iPads, PDAs)	12	4.7%
			Web page usability study	9	3.5%
			Use of technology/ Web 2.0 in libraries or education / instruction	9	3.5%





Supplemental electronic content to

J Med Libr Assoc. Apr;104(2):DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.104.2.015

www.mlanet.org

© Lessick, Perryman, Billman, Alpi, De Groote, Babin Jr. 2016

Broad subject categories	n	%	Topics	n	%
Education (end users)	26	10.2%	Instruction/information literacy assessment	26	10.2%
Administration & management	3	1.2%	Leadership	1	0.4%
_			Budgets	1	0.4%
			Strategic planning	1	0.4%
Information access & retrieval	2	0.8%	Federated search engine/meta search engine effectiveness	2	0.8%
Marketing & communication	1	0.4%	Student participation in library marketing	1	0.4%
Professional concerns*	17	6.7%			
Professional issues	10	3.9%	Professional issues/trends	10	3.9%
Continuing education (librarian)	7	2.8%	Librarian's needs/knowledge assessment	7	2.8%
Related fields*	14	5.5%	•		
Health research	12	4.7%	Health research	12	4.7%
Institution/environment	2	0.8%	Return on Investment, history of discipline	2	0.8%
Theoretical*	0	_			
General*	0	_			
Total usable responses	254	100.0%		254	100.0%
Unusable responses	21				
Total responses	275				

^{*} Broad subject categories (general, professional concerns, theoretical, applied, and related fields) were based on Dimitroff's classification scheme of published research in the *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* [10].