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**Process and Methods**

- Students in a designated SPN, ECN and PSY class complete and research a topic
- Faculty members provide follow-up comments
- Librarians and faculty plan and lead a research session
- Students compile draft bibliographies
- Students and faculty complete bibliography surveys
- Students revise bibliographies

**Results**

**Faculty and Student Bibliography Item Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1 - 5</th>
<th>N = 39 students, 3 faculty members</th>
<th>1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft: Faculty Rating</td>
<td>Revised: Faculty Rating</td>
<td>Revised: Student Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bibliography Items Changed**

Avg. bibliography length = 5 items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPN 343</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECN 380</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 225</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Data:**

**Student Survey Responses**

- "I learned about new ways to find sources which I had not known about before, and found that these new sources were more relevant to my topic."
- "The most influential source for me presented a convincing argument's points that had previously never been proposed as the main source. It invited me to know more and to better understand the point of view."
- "I learned how to determine the quality of a source beyond whether or not it is peer-reviewed, like evaluating for bias and looking at the purpose of the research."

**Discussion**

- Source relevance rated as expected by both faculty and students
- Faculty rated source timeliness and authority higher than students
- Students changed an average of 2.45/5.0 sources on revised bibliographies
- In contrast to quantitative results, students report finding stronger sources following a research instruction session
- Students also report learning useful strategies for searching and source evaluation

**Next Steps**

Can Further Analysis of Qualitative Data Help Explain...

- Students’ struggle to determine source authority
- The reasons students are omitting and adding sources
- The impact of faculty-librarian collaboration and students’ revision of bibliographies
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