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Abstract

There has been considerable debate over many years as to the relevance of LIS research to practitioners. Numerous findings, published over that time, show that this relationship has been seen by most (researchers and practitioners) as at best, tenuous, and at worst, non-existent, through much of the profession. Following a review of these findings, Haddow and Klobas identified 11 factors that contributed to the lack of communication and impact between researchers and practitioners. Two of these factors, terminology and relevance, were the focus of this paper.

A questionnaire was distributed to senior staff in 30 Australian academic libraries. They were required to assess five abstracts, drawn from articles appearing during 2006 in the top ranked LIS journal literature, against criteria for relevance, clarity and applicability in the work place. Results indicated a relatively high level of understanding of the articles, indicating that terminology (at least in the abstracts) was not a problem, with two thirds of the articles rated as relevant to the LIS profession as a whole. This positive result suggests that among senior academic library staff, there is less of a gap in understanding between researchers and professionals than has generally been perceived. It may be that involvement of practitioners from this group in joint projects, long called for by the profession, is more feasible than was previously thought.
1. Introduction

The ongoing development of the Research Quality Framework (RQF) for Australian universities has highlighted the need for LIS researchers to consider carefully the nature and impact of their work. In addition, in the rapidly changing – and challenging – environment within which most LIS practitioners work, the need to provide a leading edge service, efficiently and effectively, is now more than ever, the key to survival. Thus both groups would benefit enormously from a fruitful, symbiotic relationship, one building on and informing the other. But numerous findings, published over many years, show that this relationship has been seen by most (researchers and practitioners) as at best, tenuous, and at worst, non-existent, through much of the profession.

Yet the role of research in developing and shaping a profession or discipline is fundamental. Without it, as Biggs (1991, p. 74) pointed out, “there is only unsystematic observation, intuition and superstition – no body of trustworthy knowledge, no data to support or challenge….” She then goes on to note that most research is conducted within universities with the result that its outcomes may or may not be communicated to, or even relevant to, the practitioner’s world. For the LIS profession concerns over this gap between research and its application to the workplace have been expressed over many decades. In Australia, Maguire (1986) was noting what appeared to be a lack of mutual respect between researchers and practitioners (and indeed, between researchers themselves) while Rayward (1990) argued that getting published was relatively easy, but having the work read or assimilated into professional action quite another matter (p. 129). At the same time, Van House (1991, p. 92) was concerned that LIS practitioners tend to criticise research as irrelevant while researchers criticise practitioners for their lack of interest in research outcomes. However, another view expressed by Ward (1986) was that possibly, the transfer process of research into practice was osmotic, being less obvious and more effective than practitioners realised. Despite this possibility, the generally recurring theme in the literature shows a concern for the low levels of research being undertaken and the limited impact that research has on practice. This has led to a large number of studies aimed at identifying the causes for this and proposing strategies for its resolution (see Haddow and Klobas, 2004). In addition, the Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA) has expressed a strong interest in research “that underpins the improvement of professional practice” (ALIA 2002), initiating a project to better understand the nature and scope of LIS research in Australia. One of the key findings resulting from this project was the lack of evidence of collaborative research between LIS academics and those in the workplace and that the research priorities expressed by academics did not match those voiced by practitioners. This was a cause for concern with ALIA noting that it could play a role in facilitating better understanding between the two groups in order to encourage a closer and more mutually satisfying relationship.

This overall concern, expressed succinctly in the sub-title of the ALIA report, “how research makes good practice; how practice makes good research”, affirms that without a close link between research and practice, both will suffer a diminution in their effectiveness as the two groups need to inform each other and so progress together. This is emphasised by Haddow and Klobas (p. 30) who argue that the interaction between research and practice is vital to ensure the practitioner community can develop and thrive; Brown and Ortega (2005, p. 232) point out the benefits that research may provide practitioners in time savings and reducing the need to “reinvent the wheel”; and Joint (2005, p. 289) emphasises the corollary, that for LIS research to flourish, practitioners and researchers need to work closely together. Thus the importance of the link appears to be without question, justifying the volume of literature devoted to the issue within the LIS profession.

Perhaps reassuringly, this unease over the research/practice relationship is not limited to the LIS professions but seems to be a broadly held view across a range of vocationally oriented disciplines. Thus Catterall (1998) notes a similar concern for market researchers and Latham (2001) details his disquiet over the transfer of learning from journals into practice in psychology. He goes on to propose that “if the journal article does not transfer, if it does not inform the practice of psychology, it was arguably not worth publishing” (p. 207) and points to what should
be the circular nature of the process, with knowledge gained from academic research being transferred to practice where the results are then picked up in further research. In education, Robinson (1998) talks of the enduring debate over the contribution research makes to educational policy and practice, highlighting the complexity of narrowing the research-practice gap and in nursing, Maben et al (2006) note the consistent evidence of a theory-practice gap in their profession.

Despite the profusion of studies within and outside the LIS profession, (Haddow and Klobas reference over 50 LIS papers), the issue has not been resolved and papers written today, echo very much the sentiments of those published a generation ago. From this it seems that a continuing dialogue is necessary if any form of progress is to be made in strengthening the links between research and practice in order to assist the profession generally meet the demands arising from the rapidly changing environment in which it operates.

In order to better understand one aspect of the issue, the authors decided to focus in on two of the eleven categories Haddow and Klobas identified as major factors or gaps behind these “seemingly intractable barriers to communication” between academics and practitioners (Hewitt, 1991 p. 166). These eleven factors were derived following an extensive review of the literature and provide a useful framework for highlighting specific areas for attention. The eleven factors or ‘gaps’ comprised:

Knowledge – sharing of communication between the groups
Culture – failure to understand each other’s roles and work
Motivation – lack of interest
Relevance – research not focused on issues relevant to practitioners
Immediacy – timeliness of research
Publication – little written by practitioners
Reading – the two groups do not read each other’s literature
Terminology – the use of language and terms
Activity – few practitioners undertake research
Education – having the knowledge and skill to undertake research
Temporal – having the time to read and do research.

With better understanding of these factors, it may be easier to determine ways of overcoming them on an individual basis rather than taking the broad-brush approach to the issue which has not proven to be that successful in the past.

2. The two factors – relevance and terminology

From the eleven ‘gaps’ identified by Haddow and Klobas the current research will focus on two, the ‘relevance gap’ and the ‘terminology gap’.

The relevance gap refers to issues relating to the perceived relevance or usefulness of the research to practitioners. Hewitt (p. 165) comments that generally research is not noted among practitioners for its utilitarian value and in an extensive survey undertaken by Powell, Baker and Mika (2002), they reported that one of the two most cited reasons for practitioners not reading research-based articles was the perceived “lack of relevance to their work” (p. 57). The other major factor was a lack of time. Again, time constraints were found to be the number one factor in a smaller study conducted in New Zealand (Turner, 2002) with the view that research was not addressing practical problems of the workplace rating as the third major cause for professionals not consulting published research (p. 4) and Brown and Ortega (p. 236) reported that among physical science librarians in the US, a lack of relevance was one of the reasons noted for not
using the research literature. The same study also reported over 10% of respondents agreeing they found little of practical value in the literature or that they felt it was of marginal quality (p. 238). In their discussion, Brown and Ortega concluded that physical science librarians placed a high value on research information that could be applied to their daily activities (p. 244).

Again, this concern is not limited to the LIS profession with Westfall (1999) discussing the issue in a related discipline, information systems, where there had been significant debate around the point of "why most IS academic research lacked relevance to practice". He looked at it in a broader context, linking relevance to professional identity, exhorting the IS profession to accept its role in educating good students to be effective in the workplace. He called for the profession not to be ashamed of undertaking research that can be readily applied in practice and if that causes difficulties within the world of academia, then it should "unhesitatingly lobby for academic reforms that reflect the realities of our identity." At a library conference Wilson (2002) drew from the IS discussion where he saw common themes that could usefully inform the debate within our own discipline, with both fields (IS and LIS) "being affected by almost exactly the same factors when it comes to the relationship between research and practice."

The terminology gap refers to the ease with which practitioners find the research understandable and interesting. Thus Powell, Baker and Mika quote respondents comments for not reading research articles because they are "dry and boring usually" or because of poor style, presentation and overuse of stats and tables (p. 58) and Turner reported practitioners concerned over research being presented in "a way that is difficult to understand and apply" (p. 4). Looking specifically at web information-seeking behaviour, Fourie (2006) reported that one of the factors keeping practitioners from adopting research findings was the "highly academic language and style of the research articles" (p. 21) and concludes that in order to make the outcomes of such studies more accessible, researchers need to consider the language of discussion and the clarity with which they present their findings as well as how the research is disseminated (p.29). McClure (1991, p. 262) also points out the importance of tailoring research reports to be appropriate for different audiences.

In an issue devoted to the subject of research relevance, Benbasat and Zmud (1999), writing in *MIS Quarterly*, provided a list of criteria that make articles more likely to be read by IS professionals. Of these seven criteria, virtually all referred to presentation style and content, calling for shorter articles, with briefer literature reviews and written in everyday language. In their list of recommendations for increasing the relevance of IS research, readability and presentation style was seen as an important factor, with the need for clear, simple and concise prose emphasised.

In countries where English is a second language the problem is exacerbated with Kim (2005), in a study of Korean university librarians, finding that the biggest problems related to making better use of published research was that its relevance to practice was frequently seen as unclear and that the English language report and statistical analysis was "incomprehensible."

These two ‘gaps’ relate closely to each other. If a paper is written in an engaging, accessible style it should help stimulate the reader to do more than just skim its contents but read it more closely and consider its relevance to their own situation. It may be that they would then find that the relevance gap is not such a common phenomenon as first thought and that in fact the data and results reported can have applicability to their workplace.

Thus this research sought to gain an overview of the relevance and level of understanding of recently published LIS literature to academic librarians in order to assess the significance of these two ‘gaps’ in restricting the dissemination and application of research into practice.

Specifically, the research questions thus sought to answer the following:

- The range of top ranked LIS journals read by academic library staff
- The extent to which research articles published in the top ranking LIS journals make sense to senior LIS staff in Australian universities? Were the aims and outcomes of the research clear from the abstract provided?
- The extent to which such articles provide ideas or information that could be translated into positive actions within the respondents own university library or within the profession more broadly?
- The level of impact or relevance the research article may have on stimulating thinking and discussion within the university library on that specific topic.

Methodology

In order to gain a better understanding of the relevance and applicability of a range of recently published literature in the LIS field, it was determined to survey senior library staff throughout the Australian university sector. It was felt that this group were likely to be those with most exposure to this wide range of journals and thus in a position to be more familiar with their style and content. Also, it may be that the contents of such journals would have more applicability to the university sector, given the preponderance of research undertaken either within the academic library or covering topics highly relevant to that sector. Thus outcomes of this research are clearly limited to the university library sector and cannot be applied to the LIS profession more generally.

In order to gather the data, a questionnaire was developed which asked respondents to evaluate an associated group of five abstracts against certain criteria regarding the content and applicability and terminology of the reported research. There was also provision for free text comment against each abstract. The survey questions are provided in the Appendix.

The abstracts were taken from 19 of the top 25 LIS journals as recently ranked, in terms of importance, for the Australian RQF exercise. The journal titles are shown in table 2. This list, distributed in June 2007, was based on a survey of Australian LIS researchers undertaken by the ALIA Research Committee, and divided these journals into tiers 1 and 2. Of the 25 journal titles, six were inaccessible to the authors and thus not included. Ten abstracts were drawn from each journal from 2006 issues. Abstracts were drawn starting with the earliest publication in 2006, then the following issue until 10 had been accumulated. If there was a themed issue only two articles were drawn from it before moving to the next issue. All articles had to be substantive and research oriented. Only the title and abstract were printed with no reference to the source journal or the author(s) included. Thus a total of 190 articles were compiled. These were photocopied in order to have enough copies to distribute. They were then sorted to ensure abstracts were well distributed in order to avoid attaching multiple articles from the same journal to one survey package.

Survey packages comprising the questionnaire and sets of five abstracts randomly assigned, were mailed to 31 university libraries within Australia. The Librarian at each of these institutions had been contacted previously to discuss distribution of the surveys. The remaining university librarians either did not respond to the initial email or declined to participate. It was decided to limit the number of potential respondents to the senior staff in each library. There were two major reasons for this focus on the most senior staff. One was that they were likely to have the highest level of professional experience and knowledge with which to judge the abstracts and secondly, would have a more developed picture of broader, strategic direction of their library and its future which lower level staff may not possess. With this long term view they may be in a better position to assess the value of the research to their particular workplace and the profession more broadly. The number of packages sent to each institution to be distributed varied depending upon the size
of the library and ranged between five and ten surveys with associated abstracts. The total number of surveys distributed was 230.

The questionnaire was accompanied by an information sheet outlining the nature of the research. It was emphasised that responses were anonymous, to be returned in stamp addressed envelopes and that the researchers did not expect anything other than a personal, subjective response based on their reading and understanding of the abstract.

The resultant packages were distributed in August 2007.

Results

A total of 91 completed surveys comprising the evaluation of 454 abstracts (one person only evaluated four of the five abstracts) were returned by September 30. This represented a response rate of 39.5%. A further eight surveys were returned after this date and have not been included in the results.

Table 1 shows that the sample, as expected, represents mostly mid-senior staff, at least in terms of professional experience. An interesting finding is that the median number of listed journals read (or claimed to be perused) amongst those respondents with more than 15 years’ experience is four, whereas amongst less experienced staff it is two. Whether senior staff read more LIS journals in general (and the reasons behind this) would be a worthy topic of further research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire asked respondents to identify which journals, out of the 25 included in the list based on the ALIA survey, they had read or browsed over the last six months – the terms ‘read’ and ‘browsed’ were not defined and respondents interpreted them in their own way. Across the sample, the median number of journals from the list of twenty-five that were reported read or browsed in that period was three, with respondents ranging from no contact at all with any of the journals to two respondents indicating they had accessed 13 titles during the previous six months.

As might be expected, the distribution across the twenty-five journals is uneven. Table 2 shows that three of the journals were perused by a majority of respondents, whereas two journals (not surprisingly, given the focus on university library staff, those related to school libraries) were unopened. The two Australian journals came out on top, and again, fairly predictably, other journals covering academic librarianship in general also did well. There was no particular correlation between level of readership and the journals’ classification (into tiers 1 and 2) derived from the ALIA survey – of the thirteen Tier 1 journals, only six appear in the top 13 in terms of readership.
Table 2 Journals read/browsed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Academic &amp; Research Libraries</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Library Journal</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Academic Librarianship</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Research Libraries</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Trends</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Quarterly</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Monday</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Librarianship &amp; Information Science</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlending &amp; Document Supply</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Information Science</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Information Management</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Research</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Digital Information</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Documentation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Education for Library and Information Science</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library and Information Research</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Information Science Research</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIST: Annual Review of Information Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging &amp; Classification Quarterly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Retrieval</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Processing &amp; Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Libraries Worldwide</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Library Media Research</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were then asked to assess the five abstracts attached to the survey form against a number of criteria relating to the impact of the reported research and its relevance to academic libraries or the profession more broadly; its intelligibility and its application in their workplace.

Responses were scored as follows:
1 – Not at all
2 – Slightly
3 – Moderately
4 – Significantly
Not scored - Undecided

Respondents’ overall ratings of the abstracts indicated that these journals, as a whole, publish articles that are of some interest and application to university librarians. The median rating based on the four-point scale was ‘moderately’ for questions 1-4 and 6, and ‘slightly’ for questions 5 and 7-9. The abstracts were generally considered intelligible, and the articles they represented (based on the abstracts) pertinent to academic librarianship and the broader the profession. However, respondents were less sure that the articles were of direct relevance to their own workplace. The distributions of the ratings for each criterion are shown in table 3. The modal ratings for criteria 1, 2, 5 and 9 were either ‘not at all’ or ‘significantly’, i.e. the outer responses on the scale, which suggests that there was little tendency for respondents to use an inner point on the scale because of indecision of lack of commitment.
Table 3 Ratings by question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 1 and 2 related to overall understanding of the purpose behind the reported research and its outcomes. The results indicate that this was achieved to a moderate degree in most abstracts, with only a little over 10% of abstracts proving to be completely unintelligible while 37% obviously explained the research clearly and well.

Question 3 related to the relevance of the research to the LIS profession in general. Again, responses were quite positive with only 8% of the abstracts reported as having no relevance and 66% reported as being moderately or significantly relevant.

Question 4 asked about originality and caused many respondents to answer ‘undecided’. However, of those who did feel they could make a judgment, 73% of the abstracts were rated as comprising moderately or significantly original research.

Question 5 asked the likelihood of the respondent following up the full article after having read the abstract. 70% reported they either would not follow it up or there was only a slight possibility that they would follow up the full article. This despite the fact that in answer to Question 3, 66% of respondents had seen the abstracts as relevant or highly relevant to the LIS profession, suggesting that following up on interesting or relevant research is a highly selective process for most senior academic library staff.

Question 6 focused in on relevance in a practical sense to academic libraries specifically. 54% responded that there was a moderate or strong level of relevance, a high figure given the wide ranging coverage of the abstracts supplied. This indicates that a significant amount of published LIS research in these ‘top’ journals relates in some manner to the activities of an academic library.

Question 7 was concerned with future directions and the academic library. Responses on this were fairly evenly split, with 33% either undecided or reported that the article had no relevance to better understanding the future directions of academic libraries, while 35% felt the articles did provide a moderate or significant contribution to better understanding academic libraries and the future.

Question 8 related to the local workplace and the likelihood the reported research would provoke discussion. 63% felt there was only a slight chance of this or none at all, with only 8% reporting that it was significantly likely.

Finally, question 9 asked about relating the research to their specific workplace, its policies and practices. 72% reported none or only a slight relevance to their own workplace, contradicting to some degree, the earlier result reported for Question 6 which saw 54% rating the research as moderately or highly relevant to the academic library. It would seem that this may be so theoretically, but less relevant in a practical day-to-day sense.
A small number of free text comments were made by respondents. Some of these concerned the contents of the abstract itself and its usefulness or otherwise, but those more relevant to this research commented on the abstract more generally, with complaints about their jargon, their overly technical nature, a lack of relevance to librarians and the Australian context, or their theoretical nature the major points raised. In addition, a small but significant number of comments related to journal reading itself, with statements such as ‘I read very few LIS journals these days – focus on reports and conference papers. They are MUCH more relevant and up-to-date’ and ‘More likely to pick up things from say blogs… and other different ways of keeping up.’

Conclusion

The aim of this survey was to assess the nature of published LIS research against two criteria reported as being significant reasons for practitioners not engaging with such research, namely the relevance of the research to practice and the accessibility of the research to the practitioner in terms of terminology, presentation, and legibility.

Specifically, in response to the research questions, this survey indicates:

1. Many senior academic library staff make use of the LIS research literature. The mean number of journals drawn from the top two tiers read or browsed in the previous six months was three, with only a small minority of respondents (12 of the 91) reporting non-use of any of the titles. Although the two Australian publications were the most common, many other journals were read by at least one or two librarians. Bearing in mind that there are many other titles outside of the list that might also be read (or browsed), this would indicate a reasonably healthy level of interest in the field’s research journals. Whether this situation continues is another matter, with the comments regarding accessing up-to-date information in other ways, rather than through journals, noteworthy.

2. There was a reasonably high level of understanding of the reported research as described in the abstracts. Since some of the articles would have been in fields outside of particular respondents’ specialisations, that only 10% of their abstracts were reported as unintelligible was not of great concern, and suggests that the problems with terminology, presentation, language etc reported as being a major reason for practitioners avoiding reading of published research may be exaggerated. However, it should be noted that abstracts should, by their nature and purpose, especially strive to be clear and readable.

3. Overall, the relevance of the abstracts to the broader LIS environment and specifically, the academic library environment was good. Over two thirds of respondents reported a moderate or significant level of relevance to the profession and over half reported direct relevance to the academic library sector. Again, this could suggest that concerns over the relevance of published LIS research are based more on perceptions rather than the actual situation.

4. While a majority of the abstracts were reported as being relevant to the academic library setting, actually taking the research ‘on board’ and implementing its findings in the workplace was another matter. Only 26% reported they were moderately or significantly likely to think about the role of this research in their own work environment, suggesting that for many, while they could see its relevance, actually going the next step to making use of the research in a practical sense was more challenging.

Overall, these results suggest a level of optimism that perhaps the gap between practitioners and researchers, for senior staff in Australian academic libraries at least, is not quite so great as is sometimes reported. It is also encouraging to note the levels of relevance reported and the
manner in which, the abstracts least, reported the research in a readable and understandable way. The challenge seems to be embedding the results of the research into practice, confirming the necessity that ALIA and others have highlighted regarding the need for closer links between researchers and practitioners. If, as reported above, practitioners generally do see a level of relevance in research to their practice, then taking the step of involving them in that research so that it can cross over into practice should be easier than it seems to have been. For LIS researchers looking at building research groups, involvement of practitioners in such groups may be more feasible than has previously been thought.

Appendix – Survey Questions

Q1. Do you feel you have gained an overall understanding of the research and its aims?
Q2. Were the major goals and results of the research clearly expressed?
Q3. How important to the LIS profession is the topic being researched?
Q4. How original do you think the research is?
Q5. How likely are you to follow up the full article having read this abstract?
Q6. For university libraries generally, do you think the research is relevant in practical terms to either short or long term activities?
Q7. Do you think the research provides insights into better understanding the future direction of the university library?
Q8. What is the likelihood this research would provoke discussion in your workplace?
Q9. Has the abstract stimulated you to think about your own workplace and how you do things?
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