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From the Editor

I hope this issue finds all of you well and adjusting to the fiscal realities affecting your individual libraries and institutions. The economic situation has hit everyone, and SELA is not exempt. As you will note from this issue, we are publishing the journal on a lesser quality paper stock than was done in the past. This should decrease our printing costs by about half. This decision was made at the SELA business meeting held as part of the September Arkansas Library Association/SELA joint conference. At this meeting, it was discussed whether The Southeastern Librarian should be published totally in an online format. A survey previously posted on the SELA listserv regarding this issue revealed that while most respondents understood the need to go this direction, preference was given for the continuation of the print format for the “scholarly” issues. As a compromise, I suggested that we investigate a lower quality format and reassess the situation again in the future. If you have opinions regarding this issue, feel free to contact me at bratcher@nku.edu. A formal survey will most likely be administered again in 2011.

This issue contains three articles which span the interests of public and technical service librarians. Making Research Make Sense: Guiding College Students into Information Literacy Through the Information Search Process by Jeffrey M. Mortimore is based on a presentation given at the Arkansas Library Association/SELA conference as part of the New Voices program. This program provides the opportunity for new librarians with less than five years of experience to share their work with others. This particular article outlines a method for presenting the “one shot” information literacy session using C.C. Kuhlthau’s Information Search Process model.

The Mississippi Digital Library’s Civil Rights Thesaurus: An Evolving Authority Control Tool for Civil Rights-Related Headings in Metadata Records by Kathleen L. Wells presents process of creating headings for records limited to a specific genre. The challenges for creating metadata for a local specialized collection are addressed. These challenges would need to be addressed for other specialized collections as well.

As a contrast to the article by Mortimore, Ellen K. Wilson and Jeffrey M. Blankenship discuss a collaborative effort for addressing information literacy in their article entitled Integrated Information Literacy Instruction in an Upper-Division Writing-Intensive Class. While this effort had varied degrees of success, the issues offer room for rethinking and improvement.

Perry Bratcher
Editor

Correction

In the Spring edition, the author of the book review Northern Money, Southern Land: the Lowcountry Plantation Sketches of Cholotilde R. Martin was attributed to J.W. McR ee of the Florida County Library System. Mr. McR ee is actually with the Florence County (SC) Library System. My apologies for the error.
MAKING RESEARCH MAKE SENSE:
Guiding College Students into Information Literacy
Through the Information Search Process

Jeffrey M. Mortimore

Jeffrey M. Mortimore is the Reference Librarian at Bennett College for Women in Greensboro, NC and can be reached at jmortimore@Bennett.edu.

Introduction

Bennett College for Women is a private, four-year college serving approximately 725 African-American women in Greensboro, North Carolina. Because of its unique demographic as one of only two all-female, historically black colleges in the United States, Bennett College attracts women from across the country and the world with a profound diversity of talents and preparation for undergraduate study. The Thomas F. Holgate Library supports the research needs of the college through an active instructional services program at the undergraduate level. While the library has provided library orientation and traditional bibliographic instruction for decades, during the 2007/8 academic year, and with the support of a Mellon Foundation grant, the library staff undertook a significant overhaul of its instructional services to better align with information literacy best practices and to respond to the diversity of preparation among its student body.

This overhaul has been all-encompassing and continues today. Prior to the fall of 2007, the library provided an average of ten instruction sessions per year, reaching a limited number of students to equally limited effect. Through careful retooling of the library’s website, print and electronic resources, instructional curriculum, marketing, and faculty training, the library staff has significantly increased the instructional services program’s presence in courses and in the academic life of the college. For instance, during the 2009/10 academic year, the library provided 103 faculty-requested and drop-in instruction sessions for a 930% increase over 2006/7. Similarly, during this period print reference item use has increased 810%, item views in the library’s online databases has increased 715%, reference questions have increased 272%, the library door count has increased 153%, and general circulation has increased 145%.

Through these overhaul efforts, and by significantly increasing the number of faculty and programs for which the library provides instructional services, the library has ensured its role in the college’s ongoing General Education Curriculum revision, as well as its Quality Enhancement Plan for re-accreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. As part of this plan, the library currently provides multi-session course-integrated information literacy instruction for every section of the college’s required first-year literature and writing seminar, ensuring that that the library reaches every incoming student at least twice during her first two semesters at the college.

Central to the success of these program revisions has been a careful retooling of the library’s curriculum for course-related and course-integrated instruction. Pursuant to bringing instruction into line with information literacy best practices, the library staff has addressed two critical areas: 1) increasing student motivation and 2) engaging students in reflection about the research process. First, following the lead of Jacobson and Xu (2004) and Gibson (2006), and drawing upon studies by Cokley (2000, 2003), the library staff has implemented a series of instructional and service strategies for supporting students’ academic motivation in the research setting. These findings have previously been reported (Mortimore & Wall, 2009) and recommend the importance of perception of faculty encouragement to African-American college students’ academic self-concept.
Second, the library staff has sought to develop an outline for information literacy instruction that balances the requirement to introduce students to the research process with the traditional time, technological, and course-related constraints placed upon library instruction. The theoretical model upon which this outline is based is Kuhlthau’s Information Search Process as articulated in Seeking Meaning: A Process Approach to Library and Information Services (Kuhlthau, 2004). The present report investigates this process and shows how the library staff has integrated this model into its one-shot information literacy instruction to positive effect.

One-Shot Instruction and the Information Search Process

Whether library practitioners like it or not, the one-shot, 50-75 minute library instruction session remains, and likely will remain, the bread and butter of most undergraduate instructional services programs. For instance, while the Holgate Library staff has made considerable strides in increasing collaboration with faculty and in the number of multi-session sequences within courses, over 65% of faculty-requested instruction sessions offered during the 2009/10 academic year remained one-shot. The constraints that one-shot instruction places on meeting information literacy objectives are well documented and mitigate the effectiveness of instruction when measured in terms of course outcomes (e.g., Coulter et al., 2007).

Ideally, information literacy instruction should involve students in critical thinking about the process of research. However, such critical thinking may be difficult to achieve within 50-75 minutes. Often there is little opportunity for follow-up with students unless they voluntarily contact a librarian; faculty generally expect emphasis on resource coverage during sessions; and one-shot instruction is less likely than multi-session instruction to be coordinated with particular research assignments. Most published studies are of little help here. On the one hand, a majority of studies start by assuming close faculty-librarian collaboration, collaborative assignment development and integration, or multi-session instruction. Indeed, given her emphasis on faculty-librarian “inquiry teams,” Kuhlthau’s own model for collaborative instruction articulated in Guided Inquiry: Learning in the 21st Century (2007) does not appear to address the one-shot context at all. While Kracker (2002) has shown the benefits of including explicit standalone research process instruction in library sessions, still her approach seems better suited to multi-session contexts.

On the other hand, while an increasing body of research has turned to technological innovation and integration where limited face-to-face instruction is unavoidable (e.g., Bell & Shank, 2007; Daugherty & Russo, 2007), such studies do not address contexts where these technological resources are unavailable. In order to meet the objectives of information literacy instruction while accommodating the traditional constraints of the one-shot format, sessions require a considered framework for balancing resource coverage with the introduction of the research processes. In order to address these challenges, the Holgate Library staff has sought to adapt Kuhlthau’s Information Search Process as a conceptual framework for organizing one-shot instruction.

Kuhlthau offers the Information Search Process as a heuristic for understanding the stages through which any individual passes as she seeks to fulfill an information need (Kuhlthau, 2004, 44-51). As the individual addresses and resolves her information need, Kuhlthau argues, she passes through six stages of varying emotional certainty and confidence, as well as cognitive clarity and focus. At every stage, this process may be characterized in terms of three realms: the cognitive (thoughts), the affective (feelings), and the physical (actions). By acknowledging and validating the thoughts, feelings, and actions that the individual is likely to experience as she attempts to resolve an information need, Kuhlthau claims, librarians are more likely to foster positive, lasting research practices (86).

The first stage identified in the Information Search Process is task initiation, during which the individual recognizes a need for information in order to complete a task or assignment (44). This stage is often accompanied by feelings of
uncertainty and apprehension, and involves thinking about the task pursuant to comprehending what needs to be known or done to achieve success. The second stage is topic selection, during which the individual selects “the general topic to be investigated and the approach to be pursued” (46). During this stage, the individual’s uncertainty tends to lessen, and is replaced by optimism as she prepares to begin her research. The third stage, prefocus exploration, involves the individual in research “on the general topic to extend personal understanding and to form a focus” (47). During this stage, Kuhlthau explains, “information encountered rarely fits smoothly with previously held constructs, and information from different sources commonly seems inconsistent and incompatible.” Because of this, the individual’s optimism is likely to be overcome by feelings of confusion, doubt, uncertainty, and sometimes threat. It is during this stage that the individual is at greatest risk of losing motivation, and of falling back into the inertia of bad habits (e.g., relying solely on Wikipedia or other non-peer-reviewed sources).

The fourth stage is focus formulation. During this stage, the individual formulates from the information she has encountered a focused perspective on her topic. As the individual’s focus increases, she tends to experience “increased confidence and a sense of clarity” (48). This stage, Kuhlthau claims, “is for many the turning point of the search process,” when researchers begin to feel confident in their work and with their ability to assess and assimilate information as it pertains to their topic. The fifth stage, information collection, is when the individual’s focused research begins: “The user, with a clearer sense of direction, can specify the need for relevant, focused information to librarians… thereby facilitating a comprehensive search of all available resources” (49). At this stage, as the individual realizes the scope of the task at hand, confidence, interest, and motivation increase, and uncertainty subsides. Finally, the sixth stage is search closure. During this stage, the individual’s attention turns from research to presentation, and “there is a sense of satisfaction if the search has gone well or disappointment if it has not” (50).

Interpreted for students during the one-shot instruction session, Kuhlthau’s Information Search Process provides a simple and clear model for communicating to students the experience of academic research. By translating these stages into generic session modules and presenting topics and resources accordingly during one-shot instruction, the Holgate Library staff involves students in reflection on the research process while balancing in the presentation of resources and library policies and procedures. Additionally, when taken as a general heuristic for understanding the experiences of students as they engage in research, the Information Search Process has proven a useful scheme for engaging students’ thoughts, feelings, and actions during these sessions. Figure 1 shows the generic outline used by the library staff for coordinating the presentation of these stages with topical and resource elements. This outline is sufficiently under-determined to be adaptable to a range of instructional settings and faculty’s content requests.

During each one-shot instruction session, the library staff involves students in reflection on the process of research through five session modules which correspond to and translate the stages of the Information Search Process. Beginning with task initiation, the librarian engages students in the experience of receiving a research assignment and the thoughts and feelings attending this. By addressing students’ feelings of uncertainty and apprehension, the librarian validates their experiences, establishes empathy between herself and the students, and places students’ thoughts and actions into a context of realistic expectations. By establishing this context, the librarian may segue into stage-appropriate session topics and resources, in this case a discussion about the pitfalls of the Internet.

Kuhlthau’s second, third and fourth stages (topic selection, prefocus exploration, and focus formulation) are translated into the session modules “Selecting your topic” and “Finding Your Focus,” during which the librarian introduces the general topics of general vs. subject, popular vs. peer-review, basic reference resources for developing topic, and periodical resources for developing focus. Kuhlthau’s fifth
stage, information collection, is addressed under
the session module “Digging In,” where the
librarian transitions from periodical literature to
the more extensive and refined monographic
literature and evaluating websites for research.
Stage six, search closure, is addressed under the
module “Putting It All Together,” where the
librarian engages students in reflection on
plagiarism and the ethical presentation of
information through proper citation.

Throughout one-shot instruction sessions, the
library staff is careful to keep focus on the
research process—and students’ attending
thoughts, feelings, and actions—rather than
particular resources. While this emphasis may
appear contrary to the purpose of one-shot
instruction, the expectation is that, by focusing
on students’ research anxiety through meaningful
engagement with the research process, librarians
may mitigate the negative effects of students’
confusion, doubt, and uncertainty, especially
during task formulation and prefocus exploration
(Kuhlthau, 2004, 84-86). In addition, the library
staff has coordinated the library’s online subject
and course guides, standalone Research
Strategies Workbook, and handouts and quick
guides to correspond to session modules,
supporting synergies between the content of one-
shot sessions and the library’s other print and
electronic curricular supports.

**Assessment**

Since adopting this generic outline for one-shot
information literacy instruction during the fall of
2007, the Holgate Library staff has measured its
effect on session and course outcomes. Assessment has included direct and indirect
measures, and points to the value of the library’s adaptation of the Information Search Process for
framing one-shot instruction. For instance, during sessions, students are administered a pre-

---

**Figure 1: Kuhlthau’s Information Search Process (ISP) Stages with Corresponding One-Shot Session Modules, Topics, and Resources.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kuhlthau’s ISP Stage</th>
<th>Instruction Session Module</th>
<th>Instruction Session Topic</th>
<th>Resources Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Task Initiation</td>
<td>Getting Your Assignment</td>
<td>Resist going to the Internet</td>
<td>Gen. &amp; Subj. Encyclopedias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Topic Selection</td>
<td>Selecting Your Topic</td>
<td>General vs. Subject Resources</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Prefocus Exploration</td>
<td>Finding Your Focus</td>
<td>Popular vs. Peer-Reviewed Sources</td>
<td>Periodical Databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Focus Formulation</td>
<td>Digging In</td>
<td>Periodicals &amp; Books</td>
<td>Library Catalog &amp; Electronic Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Information Collection</td>
<td>Evaluating Websites</td>
<td>Evaluating Websites</td>
<td>Select Websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Search Closure</td>
<td>Putting It All Together</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>Acknowledging Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proper Citation</td>
<td>Citation Styles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
test and post-test to measure immediate attainment and retention of information literacy concepts and skills (see Appendix). Tests are administered to every session where time, format, and content permits, and data are analyzed for frequency of correct answers per question and for the total number of questions answered correctly per test. Questions ask students to contemplate a number of research tasks and show proficiency in identifying appropriate resources and their features, criteria for determining the quality and fitness of information, and standards for the ethical use of information. While pre-tests and post-tests are not identical, questions on each test are designed to assess corresponding concepts and skills, thereby permitting direct comparison of results.

Since adopting session pre-tests and post-tests in the spring of 2008, results show a marked increase in correct responses between pre-tests and post-tests, suggesting students’ improved understanding of the research process and resources over the course of instruction. For example, as Table 1 shows, for the 2008/9 academic year, students displayed a positive increase in correct responses to all corresponding assessment questions.

Table 1: Academic Year 2008/9 Frequency of Correct Responses per Corresponding Pre-Test and Post-Test Question and Percent Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Pre-Test % Correct (n=141)</th>
<th>Post-Test % Correct (n=123)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>271%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>420%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>140%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the 2009/10 academic year, the library staff initiated a programmatic assessment of the instructional services program to measure students’ attainment of information literacy skills over the course of their time at the college. Early in the fall semester, the library staff administered programmatic assessments in the form of pre-tests to six upper-division courses. Assessment questions corresponded with the library’s standard pre-tests, permitting direct comparison of performance on each question. During the fall 2009 semester, the library staff collected thirty-four programmatic assessments and compared these with all fall 2008 session pre-tests.

Table 3 shows the total number of correct responses per completed fall 2008 pre-test and fall 2009 programmatic assessment, and the percent change between assessments. As the percent change column of Table 3 shows, the total number of fall 2009 programmatic assessments with four or more correct answers increased significantly over fall 2008 pre-tests. Again, this positive shift in total correct responses between fall 2008 pre-tests and fall 2009 programmatic assessments suggests outline efficacy.

Taken together, these direct measures provide strong evidence that Kuhlthau’s Information Search Process offers an effective conceptual framework for organizing one-shot session content. Furthermore, once adapted to the time, technological, and course-related constraints of particular one-shot instruction sessions, this model provides a common framework under which to assess otherwise distinct instructional contexts and settings.

In addition to these direct measures, the library staff has sought to indirectly measure the impact of library instruction on students’ affective, or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Correct Answers Per Test</th>
<th>Pre-Test % of Total (n=141)</th>
<th>Post-Test % of Total (n=123)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>(88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>(67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>(71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>322%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>755%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1600%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
emotional, responses to research tasks. During the 2009/10 academic year, library staff administered end-of-semester student satisfaction surveys to a random sample of students. Surveys asked students to indicate whether they had attended at least one library instruction session during the semester and, if so, evaluate its impact on their research and writing. For the fall 2009 semester, of 149 students (21% of total FTE) responding to the survey, 92% indicated that they felt more confident about their research after instruction. For the spring 2010 semester, of 189 students (26% of total FTE) responding to the survey, 95% indicated greater confidence. These indirect results are further supported by responses to the library’s array of faculty satisfaction surveys. While direct measurement is in order here, these indirect measures suggest a positive correlation between the library’s one-shot instructional model and reduced research anxiety.

Table 3: 2009/10 Programmatic Assessment: Total Number of Correct Answers Compared to Fall 2008 Pre-Tests and Percent Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Correct Answers Per Test</th>
<th>Pre-Test % of Total (n=117)</th>
<th>Programmatic Assessment % of Total (n=34)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>(77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>(68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>289%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Kuhlthau’s Information Search Process has proven to be a dynamic and flexible conceptual framework for organizing one-shot session content at Bennett College for Women. As part of Holgate Library’s two-pronged effort to address student motivation and engage students in reflection about the research process, this model and corresponding instructional outline have proven invaluable for increasing the effectiveness of the library’s one-shot instruction sessions. Additionally, as anticipated by Kracker, reinforcement of this model over multiple instructional experiences appears to increase students’ “knowledge of the [Information Search Process] for improving research, cognitive, and information literacy skills” (Kracker, 2002, 291).

Finally, Kuhlthau’s Information Search Process provides a robust framework for increasing consistency across sessions and permits easier
comparison of session outcomes for assessment. Because this model is generic and extensible to a variety of instructional contexts and settings, it gives library staff the ability to adapt instructional modules as the library’s array of resources and services evolves. In short, while no substitute for focused faculty-librarian collaboration and multi-session course-integrated instruction, this approach to one-shot library instruction is something with which the library—and its students—can grow.
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Appendix: One-Shot Instruction Session Pre-Tests and Post-Tests

I. Pre-Test

Before we get started, please answer the following questions. Circle the best answer for each question. These questions will not be graded, so don’t put your name on this sheet. The librarian will collect your answers in about three minutes.

1. If you are looking for information about the Roman Empire, which would be the best place to begin your research?
   a) the Internet
   b) a newspaper article
   c) a periodical article
   d) an encyclopedia
   e) I don’t know

2. The library catalog is a list of
   a) books held in the library
   b) periodicals held in the library
   c) videos held in the library
   d) all of the above
   e) I don’t know

3. Why are articles from scholarly, peer-reviewed journals better to use in a research assignment than articles from popular magazines?
   a) they are more current
   b) they are longer
   c) they are written by specialists
   d) they aren’t biased
   e) I don’t know

4. If you want to find magazine articles on a popular topic, you should
   a) search the library catalog for your topic
   b) search a periodical database (like Academic Search Premier) for your topic
   c) leaf through the library’s magazines until you find your topic
   d) all of the above
   e) I don’t know

5. If you were searching a database for information about the effects of crime on the elderly, what should you type into the database’s search box?
   a) effects crime elderly
   b) the effects of crime on the elderly
   c) elderly
   d) crime
   e) I don’t know
6. If you were searching a database for information about the effects of crime on the elderly, which of the following searches is likely to give you the most results?
   a) crime and elderly
   b) crime or elderly
   c) I don’t know

7. Which criterion is least important for deciding if a website is appropriate for your assignment?
   a) the information on the website has an identifiable and trustworthy author
   b) the information on the website has been recently updated and includes a date
   c) the website includes numerous pictures and diagrams
   d) the website is published or sponsored by a trustworthy organization
   e) I don’t know

8. Of the following examples, when do you not need to provide a citation in your assignment?
   a) when you directly quote another author’s work
   b) when you paraphrase another author’s work
   c) when you recount your own, lived experiences
   d) when you paraphrase from an unsigned website
   e) b and c
   f) I don’t know

II. Post-Test

Now that we have spent some time getting familiar with the library’s resources, please answer the following questions. Circle the best answer for each question. These questions will not be graded, so don’t put your name on this sheet. The librarian will collect your answers in about three minutes.

1. If you are looking for information about the Civil War, which would be the best place to begin your research?
   a) a book
   b) a popular magazine
   c) a peer-reviewed journal
   d) an encyclopedia
   e) I don’t know

2. In the library catalog, you may find materials at which of the following colleges:
   a) Bennett College
   b) Guilford College
   c) Greensboro College
   d) Salem College and Academy
   e) all of the above
   f) I don’t know
3. What is the most important difference between articles you find in popular magazines and articles you find in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals?
   a) articles in scholarly journals have been reviewed by specialists
   b) articles in scholarly journals have pictures and diagrams
   c) articles in scholarly journals are unbiased
   d) a and b
   e) I don’t know

4. If you want to find magazine articles on a popular topic, you should
   a) search a periodical database (like Academic Search Premier) for your topic
   b) search the library catalog for your topic
   c) leaf through the library’s magazines until you find your topic
   d) all of the above
   e) I don’t know

5. If you were searching a database for information about differences in academic achievement between middle-school boys and girls, what should you type into the database’s search box?
   a) boys girls achievement “middle school”
   b) boys girls middle school
   c) boys and girls
   d) middle school
   e) I don’t know

6. If you were searching a database for information about violence against women, which keyword search would give you fewer results?
   a) violence and women
   b) violence or women
   c) I don’t know

7. Which is not a criterion for evaluating the quality of a website for research?
   a) Authority
   b) Accuracy
   c) Popularity
   d) Objectivity
   e) I don’t know

8. Documenting a source is important when you are
   a) using a direct quotation from it
   b) using facts or statistics from it
   c) paraphrasing it
   d) all of the above
   e) I don’t know
THE MISSISSIPPI DIGITAL LIBRARY’S CIVIL RIGHTS THESAURUS: 
An Evolving Authority Control Tool for Civil Rights-Related Headings in Metadata Records

Kathleen L. Wells

Kathleen L. Wells is a Senior Catalog Librarian at the University of Southern Mississippi Libraries and can be reached at Kathleen.Wells@usm.edu.

History of the Civil Rights Thesaurus

The online Civil Rights Thesaurus (CRT) at the University of Southern Mississippi (USM) had its beginnings in the digitization of civil rights materials in the university’s McCain Library and Archives in the early 2000s. The materials included oral history interviews, letters, newspaper clippings, photographs, and other items from the rich history of the civil rights movement in Mississippi, including materials from the Freedom Summer of 1964. In addition to the creation of digitized images, making these materials available online as the Civil Rights in Mississippi Digital Archive included the formulation of descriptive records using Dublin Core metadata and the development of a controlled vocabulary for subject access.

The Civil Rights Thesaurus was conceived as a list of subject headings appropriate to the subject of civil rights, along with the name headings used in metadata records for the digital objects making up the archive. At first, metadata records were created and subject headings were assigned by staff in the USM Libraries’ Digital Laboratory, but catalog librarians were responsible for maintaining the official list of authorized terms used in the records. The Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) was the source for most of the CRT headings; a supplementary list of locally created subject terms that “filled in” areas where LCSH was lacking in specificity was also added (Graham, 2002). Some subject headings that began as locally used terms, such as “African American schools,” later became authorized LC subject headings.

With the birth of the Mississippi Digital Library (MDL) in 2003, the Civil Rights in Mississippi Digital Archive became part of a multi-institution effort to digitize civil rights resources. Like the USM digital archive, the digital library was established with the aid of an Institute of Museum and Library Services grant. The MDL originally included images and descriptions of civil rights-related materials from the University of Southern Mississippi, Delta State University, the University of Mississippi, Tougaloo College, Jackson State University, and the Mississippi Department of Archives and History. Other institutions have since become members. Each institution is responsible for the creation of its own descriptive metadata, which appears in a public interface on the individual libraries’ Web sites and is also integrated into the ContentDMTM database of MDL records at the University of Southern Mississippi. However, responsibility for the creation and maintenance of the official list of CRT headings and authority records has remained with catalogers at USM, who review the name and subject headings in metadata contributed to the digital library by other institutions and add selected headings from these records to the CRT. In 2007, USM catalog librarians also began sharing in responsibility for the creation of descriptive metadata records for digitized materials from the McCain Library and Archives, including the assignment of appropriate headings.

Challenges

The thesaurus expanded in scope and usage as other MDL member institutions began to create metadata records for their digital objects. One significant change from the early days has involved the inclusion of precoordinate Library of Congress subject headings—i.e., subject heading character strings consisting of headings plus subdivisions. Originally, the CRT was
intended to be a list of postcoordinate headings. For example, a metadata record would contain separate subject headings for “Mississippi,” “History,” and “Civil rights movements,” as opposed to a string such as “Civil rights movements—Mississippi—History.” Non-catalogers’ responsibility for the initial assignment of subject headings was a factor in the decision to use postcoordinate headings, as was the popularity of keyword searching (Graham, 2002). It was acknowledged that the loss of specificity inherent in postcoordinate headings could affect searching effectiveness in some cases. The subsequent shift of responsibility for creating subject headings in USM’s metadata records to catalog librarians, and the digital library’s addition of metadata records from other institutions that contained detailed, specific precoordinate subject strings, resulted in a policy change that allows precoordinate headings. Today the MDL records, and the thesaurus, contain a mix of pre- and postcoordinate subjects.

From the beginning, an important component of the thesaurus has been the authority records that correspond to the list of name and subject terms. The Library of Congress’s authority file serves as the source for authority records that are loaded into the USM Libraries’ local authority file. Authority records for name headings that are not already represented in LC’s name authority file are either submitted to the Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO) by USM catalogers who have received NACO training, or are created as local records in USM’s file. As described below, these authority records are made available in MARC format for use by Mississippi Digital Library participants. The budget and staff reductions that have become all too familiar to librarians can make finding the time and resources for detailed authority work something of a challenge, but work with the CRT continues.

**Organization of the CRT**

To facilitate the use of the CRT, the list of headings is made available on the USM Libraries’ Web site in two forms. The main Web display is list of the headings for MDL participants to use as a quick reference tool in the creation of descriptive metadata for their digital collections (Figure 1), with a clickable alphabetical index. Cross-references are included in the list (see the reference below from Advocate (Jackson, Miss.) to Jackson advocate).
As noted above, some local subject headings had to be created to cover areas where LCSH lacked in specificity. One of these headings is Trials (Civil rights) (see the display in Figure 2). This heading does not exist in the LC authority file, but there is an obvious need for it in a collection of civil rights-related materials. The designation “local only” in the thesaurus indicates headings for which a local authority record was created in USM’s online authority file.
The introductory screen for the alphabetical list contains a link to a display of MARC authority records for the thesaurus headings (Figure 3). This Microsoft Excel™ display is generated from a Microsoft Access™ database that contains copies of the authority records for CRT headings from the USM Libraries’ online authority file; this feature enables MDL participants to use the authority records for constructing headings in their metadata records. The sample below shows a Library of Congress record from the LC authority file (#1), a locally created name authority record from the USM Libraries’ catalog (#2), and a NACO record submitted by a USM cataloger to the Library of Congress (#3).
Civil Rights Thesaurus headings in the public view of a Mississippi Digital Library metadata record from a contributing institution are shown in Figure 4. The subject terms can include personal names as well as topical and geographic headings.
Conclusion

Building on its civil rights beginnings, the Mississippi Digital Library continues to expand and include new participants and materials in more diverse subject areas. The library now contains images and metadata records from eleven institutions. It is hoped that the Civil Rights Thesaurus will assist MDL members, and any other libraries interested in providing access to civil rights-related materials, in creating metadata for their digital collections. The thesaurus can be accessed at http://www.lib.usm.edu/techserv/cat/tools/erm_index. More information on the Mississippi Digital Library is available at http://www.msdiglib.org/cdm4/about.php.
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Introduction

Writing-intensive courses are a required component of undergraduate education at the University of South Alabama, but often the courses are designed to test students’ writing skills, rather than to teach the research and writing process. In the fall of 2008, an instruction librarian and an assistant professor in political science collaborated to redesign one writing-intensive course, Public Administration (PSC 401), in an attempt to address this dilemma. This project was born out of frustration – frustration on the part of the professor about the generally poor quality of writing and research skills by students in the course the previous year, and frustration on the part of the librarian at a lack of opportunities for integrating information literacy instruction (beyond one-shot bibliographic instruction sessions) into the curriculum. The project was also born out of optimism that a new approach could make a difference in improving students’ abilities in terms of researching and writing papers.

Context

The University of South Alabama (USA) is a co-educational, public university located in Mobile, Alabama. According to the USA Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA), the enrollment at USA in the fall of 2007 was 13,779 students, of whom 10,203 were full-time students. The entering freshman class in 2007 consisted of 1,529 first-time students, of whom 609 were enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences. Of first-time students in the fall of 2007, 71% were from Alabama and another 10% from Mississippi. Additionally, 6.3% of first-time students were from foreign countries. The mean ACT composite score for first-time, full-time freshmen was 21.7, compared to 20.3 for Alabama and 21.2 nationwide (IRPA).

At USA, students fulfill the writing requirements for graduation by passing with a grade of C or better two semesters of English composition (EH 101 and 102) and two designated writing (W) courses, one of which must be within a student’s major or minor area of study. The courses EH 101 and EH 102 are prerequisites for W courses; however, a student may be exempted from the English composition requirement with suitable scores on the ACT, SAT, CLEP, Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate exams. The only course at USA with a required library instruction component is EH 102, where IL instruction is limited to a one class period with a reference librarian. Since some students are exempt from this course – or may simply be absent the day of the library session – it is possible that a student may reach an upper-division writing-intensive course without any past library instruction.

Political Science 401 (Public Administration) is an upper-level, writing-intensive course that focuses on “national, state, and local administration, with special attention to the relationship between formal agency structure and policy execution” (USA). Because it is designated as a writing course, students have traditionally been expected to complete a research paper through a process requiring an initial draft followed by revision of the final paper. This paper assignment accounts for a significant part of the course grade. However,
such an approach tends to test a student’s research and writing skills, rather than teach the student much to improve his or her existing ability (Campbell and Stevens 2006, 10).

**Literature Review**

While the benefits of collaborating with academic faculty to teach of information literacy (IL) skills are widely touted in the literature of library and information science, examples of such collaborations in the field of political science are rare. Part of the reason may be that information literacy is a term that is used predominantly by librarians, and political scientists may be more apt to refer to research skills and critical thinking skills. However, Hubbell argues that undergraduate research methods courses should roughly mirror the research process itself, by providing students with practice in formulating a research question, conducting a literature search, collecting and analyzing data, and analyzing political phenomena (Hubbell 1994). Marfleet and Dille argue that such courses are ideal ground for developing ACRL targeted competencies (Marfleet and Dille 2005).

Many faculty members assume that students have learned these skills long before arriving in their classroom. However, as Parker-Gibson (2005) notes, several assumptions are implicit in many professors’ research paper assignments, including that students will:

- use library resources,
- be able to distinguish between free Web site documents and scholarly publications,
- be able to identify scholarly databases available through library websites,
- know and be able to use databases that are important in the field of study,
- use print materials as well as those available electronically,
- and be willing and able to evaluate materials they have found in order to decide what is appropriate for a particular project (85).

Furthermore, faculty may assume that students will be familiar with the research process and understand discipline-specific and research or library vocabulary (Parker-Gibson 2005, 85).

Notable collaborations between a political science professor and an instruction librarian have also taken place at the University of West Georgia, where Stevens and Campbell integrated IL instruction into courses in global studies, American government, comparative politics, and African politics (Campbell and Stevens 2006; Stevens and Campbell 2006; Stevens and Campbell 2007).

**Study Design and Methodology**

Following an approach similar to that used by Stevens and Campbell, this study incorporated research and writing instruction with assignments designed to provide students with guidance and practice using different research and writing skills based on the principles contained in ACRL’s IL standards (ACRL). The class initially consisted of 14 students, but four withdrew early in the semester. The course met one night per week from 6:00 until 8:30. The first segment of the class period followed a traditional lecture format covering basic, introductory public administration concepts and theories. Following a short break, the second part of the class usually lasted approximately 45 minutes and was devoted to writing instruction.

A pre-test and post-test were given anonymously asking basic questions about the student, such as class standing, whether the student was a full-time or part-time student, and his or her general experiences using the library and past instruction involving the use of library catalog and databases to find sources. There were also 15 questions relating to specific knowledge about different types of sources and methods of performing research.

A basic “how to” manual on writing research papers was assigned as a required text. It covered the areas of: choosing and focusing a topic;
developing a thesis statement; types of sources and research skills; plagiarism; structuring and preparing a draft paper; and refining the final paper with emphasis on grammar, style, and proper citation form (Baugh 1996). Each week a reading assignment from the writing manual was discussed and students were encouraged to raise and discuss any questions or problems they were having as they researched and wrote their papers.

In addition to the assigned reading, weekly writing assignments were developed to ensure that students had practice utilizing many of the subjects covered in their readings, as well as developing skills and abilities identified in the IL standards. Campbell and Stevens (2006) note “students must be given opportunities to practice, receive feedback, and revise in order to develop their competencies. Several smaller assignments that take students through the steps in the research process … are preferable to one large research assignment due at the end of the term (10).

Most of the assignments were designed to correspond with stages in the students’ progression in the researching and writing of their papers. On the first night of class students were instructed to write a three to four page essay on their future career goals. This initial assignment was intended to get a base-level measure of the students’ writing abilities using a topic that would only require them to think about what to write, rather than perform any research.

The second assignment was designed to assist the students in picking and focusing a paper topic. They were required to pick a topic and perform one of the methods for narrowing or focusing their topics as described in the reading assignment: freewriting, clustering, or listing (Baugh 1996, 13-15). Another assignment was to write an essay explaining their paper topics and thesis statements and why they had chosen them, all skills associated with IL Standard 1.

Several of the reading and writing assignments concerned knowledge about libraries and basic research skills. The students spent two class periods in the library computer lab where they were instructed on different types of sources, how to find books and journal articles in the library, and how to perform computer database searches (IL Standard 2). In addition, the students were required to complete two research logs describing the process they went through in locating various types of sources and performing database searches in the lab.

The first library session focused on strategies for choosing research topics by investigating resources such as subject-specific encyclopedias and books, while the second session focused on conducting a literature review once the topic had been selected. In a one-shot session, normally the question of selecting a topic is not addressed. Students were also encouraged to make appointments with a librarian for further assistance with their topics, and two students did make such visits.

There were also assignments that required the students to: read sections of a website concerning plagiarism (www.plagiarism.org) and summarize the major points they learned from their review (IL Standard 5); use a library database to find an academic journal article, read the article, and write an essay analyzing the article (IL Standard 3); write an essay outlining and explaining how they planned to structure their research papers (IL Standard 4); practice proper citation form by creating a reference list from various sources provided and creating an annotated bibliography using the sources they had found and intended to use in their own research papers, including several sources they had examined but determined were not suitable (IL Standards 3 and 4). At the end of the semester, students were required to revise their original essays concerning career goals using the knowledge they gained in the course to improve their work (IL Standard 4). The longest of the assignments involved the writing of the research papers. Students were required to submit a first draft of their research papers and later revise the papers to a final version, using not only feedback received from the instructor but also their own reassessment of and improvements to the paper (IL Standards 1-5).

Each of the assignments was evaluated based on how well the students followed the instructions.
given and the quality of their written work. To evaluate the final papers, a rubric was used to assign scores in the areas of: topic; thesis statement; content; organization; tone; sentence structure; word choice; grammar, spelling, and mechanics; use of references; quality of references; conformity to style manual; academic integrity; and evidence of revision based on feedback.

Results

The output obtained from the course using the methods discussed above produced mixed results. Some students failed to complete the assignments as specified, or even attend class, on a consistent basis. Others were much more reliable in both regards. Not surprisingly, student performance tended to vary greatly and better results were obtained by students who completed assignments over the course of the semester. Only nine of the 10 students who remained in the class at the end of the semester turned in a paper. One student failed to submit a final research paper without offering any explanation.

The data obtained from the pre-test and post-test are not very meaningful. Only six students completed both tests, and results between the two tests could not be compared at an individual level because of an IRB requirement that students be allowed to choose their own anonymous identifier, which most students forgot shortly after completing the pre-test. The percentage of correct answers to the 15 questions testing specific knowledge of research skills on the pre-test and post-test was 73% and 75% respectively. Some of the answers to the questions were contradictory, indicating at least one student did not understand the questions or did not take the test seriously. Furthermore, there was a noticeable disconnect between student answers on the tests and their actual information seeking practices, as evidenced by the types of sources selected.

The initial career goal assignments, which were not graded, were evaluated with feedback provided to the students concerning how well their thoughts were organized, whether they addressed the topic, writing style, and grammatical or other problems that existed in the papers. The revisions of the career goal assignment that were written at the end of the semester were compared to the originals. Only six students completed the second assignment. Of these one was exactly the same as the original, with no changes whatsoever. Another was half the length of the original and, while it mentioned the student’s career goal briefly, it tended to ramble and was focused on other things. The four assignments that were actual revisions of the original essays showed some improvement. However, almost all the students tended simply to correct only those grammatical errors or other problems that were specifically noted in the feedback they received. Suggestions that were more general in nature, such as advising the student to organize his or her thoughts more clearly, were for the most part not addressed in the revisions.

The two assignments intended to encourage the students to focus on their paper topics and thesis statements showed progress. Students were better able to express their topics and develop clearer thesis statements when they completed their essays in week four than they had been in week two when they performed and discussed the focusing exercises. Presumably, in addition to the readings and class discussions, the students had begun to do research during this time which helped them improve in these areas.

Researching and finding good sources were areas where the students showed the least amount of interest and effort. Only half of the class attended each of the sessions in the computer lab, with only one student attending both. While students claimed they already knew how to perform searches for academic journal articles and other sources, for most students there was little evidence to reflect this in their assignments and final papers. Only four students used appropriate articles in the assignment calling for them to analyze an academic journal article. The others either did not perform the assignment or used an inappropriate source. The final papers were heavily reliant on sources other than academic journal articles or other authoritative sources.
The exercise involving reading about plagiarism was in many ways the best performed assignment for most students. Their essay tended to focus on the main points made by the website and the students seemed to understand the various types of plagiarism and how and why one should avoid them. In addition, all students correctly answered the pre-test question about plagiarism. However, two of the final papers had large portions that were blatantly plagiarized, using large amounts of material, word for word, either from sources without citation or attributed to a source other than the one from which they actually obtained the information. There were also incidences where other students’ papers contained citation errors which appeared to be unintended.

The first drafts of the papers demonstrated a wide range of quality. While only one student failed to submit anything for the required first draft, four of the nine drafts submitted were little more than outlines of the paper. However, the final papers were much better than those from prior classes. While the papers tended to rely too much on sources other than academic journal articles and other reliable sources, they were much better than the previous year’s class papers in terms of expressing a thesis statement and supporting the thesis with an organized argument. Additionally, the content and tone of the papers were more of an academic research paper than the prior year’s papers. Table 1 shows the rankings of the papers on 14 scored areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Needs significant work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis statement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word choice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar, spelling, and mechanics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of references</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of references</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforms to style manual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic integrity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall the students’ papers were acceptable or better in terms of the specified criteria for each of the different areas. In addition to the use and quality of references, some of the weaker areas for students included length of the paper, thesis statements, and evidence of revision.

**Discussion**

Attempting to design, implement and assess this project turned out to be an ambitious goal, and perhaps one that is best viewed through the lens of lessons learned. Overall, the experience was one of some frustration, but also one that is believed to have represented some improvement in the overall quality of work submitted as evidenced by student progress over the semester and in comparison to other students’ performance in more traditional classes.

A considerable investment of time was required to design the syllabus, assignments, and teaching plans. While further revision will also require additional time investment, much of this work can be reused, lessening the time commitment for
The increased number of writing assignments, however, also required the professor to spend more time grading, a time commitment that will not decrease in future semesters.

The major source of frustration encountered in this project was the lackluster participation of some students. This problem is hardly limited to this class, but strategies for increasing student motivation and participation must be examined. The research paper was responsible for 25% of the final course grade, other writing assignments counted for another 25%, and the midterm and final exam each contributed 25% to the final grade. Perhaps some students took the course with the intention of simply getting by and fulfilling the W class requirement, and never intended to attempt full participation. Students may also have felt overwhelmed with the number of writing assignments. Another factor that may have played a role in the lack of motivation was that the class was a once-a-week evening class. Only one student in the class was a part-time student, and perhaps full-time students accustomed to daytime classes meeting more than once a week had difficulty with the format. It is also possible, of course, that the instructors simply failed to engage students or were poor teachers (though not for a lack of trying).

From an IL standpoint, a major problem was a serious case of “I Already Know This” (IAKT) syndrome. Steven Bell writes that IAKT syndrome “is fairly easy to diagnose. The next time a faculty member says, ‘I’ve invited a librarian here today to help you learn how to research our assignment,’ and the librarian hears a collective sigh… the librarian will know the students are suffering from IAKT syndrome” (Bell 2007, 100). Pre-test results indicated that ten of the 11 students had attended at least one library session prior to this course. From a student perspective, all IL instruction may appear the same, leading students to assume that the instruction provided for this course (both sessions of which were poorly attended) would be a rehash of earlier presentations from English composition courses, when in fact the sessions dealt with different types of resources.

How to combat IAKT syndrome? Bell writes that “the burden is on the librarian instructor to employ pedagogical methods that will enable students to distinguish between multiple sessions to recognize their distinctive and differentiated features” (Bell 2007, 99). Such methods would ideally demonstrate to students that they do not actually already know all that. Active learning techniques, such as having student volunteers rather than the librarian demonstrate the various resources, may be appropriate, although such methods do carry an element of risk.

Both library instruction sessions for this course were scheduled to be held during the second half of the class period in the library’s instruction laboratory. This location was chosen to allow students access to computers for hands-on instruction. However, since many students chose to skip the second half of class entirely, it may be preferable to instead hold the library session during the first half of class, and perhaps even conduct it in the regular classroom using only the instructor’s computer. The element of surprise might also be employed by leaving the librarian’s visits off the syllabus. While taking away the ability of all students to gain hands-on instruction at computers is a drawback, it may be worth it in order to address a larger captive audience.

However, such approaches still consign IL instruction to the dreaded library session. One possible remedy for this would be to extend the research log assignment into a semester-long activity. The research portfolio could incorporate both the weekly writing assignments and IL instruction by including a section requiring students to think and write about the information employed in the writing section. It would be essential to stress to students the importance of completing this portfolio over the course of the semester as a measure of the steps they have taken and the improvements they have made in their work as a result.

Another possibility would be to further integrate the research and writing components of the course with the substantive course material. Even in the better papers, students did not relate the topics of their research papers to the major themes and concepts covered in the course and its
readings. Revisions to papers also tended to focus only on specific feedback mentioned by the instructor, rather than more general suggestions to relate their paper to aspects of public administration. Perhaps dividing the course period into distinct public administration and writing sections contributed to this oversight.

**Conclusion**

While the overall experience of the semester involved some frustration, it is important to remember that the quality of student work did improve over the semester. The quality of the final papers was also an improvement when compared to those of the prior year’s students, many of which showed signs of similar shortcomings that were not apparent until the paper was submitted for final grading. This indicates that small steps were made by this semester’s experiment in restructuring the class, and gives hope for future collaboration and experimentation.

This project was a time-intensive one, and for this reason, it was not repeated in the same manner with later classes. However, certain elements of the collaboration, such as involving librarians in the design of assignments and publicizing research appointments with subject-specialist librarians, have been implemented with success in other courses.

While the collaboration did not flow as smoothly as had been envisioned before the start of the semester, the experience gained from the project was valuable. Our advice to others interested in such a project is to step out of your comfort zone, try something new, and remember that there are lessons to be learned from both successes and failures.
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**BOOK REVIEWS**


*Statesmen, Scoundrels, and Eccentrics: a Gallery of Amazing Arkansans* is an outstanding masterpiece enlightening readers with two to six pages each of terrifically researched narratives on seventy-four astounding people of Arkansas. The monograph includes Contents, Foreword, Acknowledgments, Introduction, the excellent chapters Chapter One Natives, Explorers, and Early Settlers, Chapter Two Antebellum Politicians, Chapter Three Postbellum Politicians, Chapter Four Twentieth-Century Politicians, Chapter Five The Law, Chapter Six Entrepreneurs, Chapter Seven Artists and Writers, Chapter Eight Education, Science, and Medicine, Chapter Nine Entertainers and Performers, Chapter Ten Religious Leaders, Chapter Eleven Seers, Spiritualists, and Skeptics, and Chapter Twelve Eccentrics, Frauds, and the Inexplicable. The contents page lists the twelve chapters and the names of the people within the chapters by topic and the chapter pages. Each essay starts with the person’s name. For example, from Chapter Nine Entertainers and Performers is Scott Joplin. Joplin’s music “The Entertainer” dazzled in the movie The Sting featuring Paul Newman and Robert Redford.

The perceived interest to the readership of the journal is superb by providing preceding information on the southeastern state Arkansas. The writing style is expressive. Seventeen black and white photographs adorn the brilliant book. One photograph is of a deceased man discovered in Prescott City Park 1911 never known who remained in an Arkansas morgue for sixty-five years before being placed in a grave. The morgue workers leaned the deceased male referred to as Old Mike against a car momentarily for the portrait. Another print splendidly assists in describing Dr. William Baerg, creator of the University of Arkansas Entomology School. The image is of Gretchen Baerg with her father Dr. William Baerg while Gretchen holds a tarantula. Dr. Baerg enabled persons to not be afraid of bugs. Baerg was poisoned by a black widow among other bugs yet lived to ninety-four in 1980.

Other vibrant persons written about are as follows. Samuel Lee Kountz started kidney transplants, developed prednisolone to aid the body in keeping the new kidney, and alerted the world of giving human organs. Governor Winthrop Rockefeller set up residence in Petit Jean Mountain, Arkansas after a wealthy existence in New York. Rockefeller desired to inspire Arkansas and strove for human rights. His son Winthrop Paul Rockefeller was Arkansas Lieutenant Governor.

After the Louisiana Purchase, Spain employed Pirate Jean Lafitte to study Arkansas. Lafitte was a dexterous emissary due to his knowledge of Spanish, English, and French. Davy Crockett travelled to Texas to the Alamo and was shortly at the Jeffries Hotel, Little Rock. Spain’s Hernando De Soto was at Fourche la Fave River. Senator Hattie Caraway was an initial female United States Senator. Lieutenant Governor Maurice Footsie Britt received medals for his superior service in World War II: the Purple Heart, the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, and the Bronze Star. Being drafted to World War II prevented Britt from playing for the Detroit Lions. John R. Eakin’s spouse was Elizabeth Erwin relative of Edgar Allan Poe.

Ben Pearson lived in Pine Bluff and was a seller of archery worldwide. Pearson’s archery business became Los Angeles Leisure Group. Pearson won National Archery Hall of Fame and National Bow Hunters Hall of Fame. Art genius Dionicio Rodriguez’s “The Old Mill” created at T.R. Pugh Memorial Park in Little Rock consisting of a ten thousand pound wheel of water with bridges and benches was used in the start of *Gone with the Wind.* Hot Springs’ Keller and Marian Breland’s Animal Behavior Enterprises educated animals for Opryland, Six Flags, Sea World, Busch Gardens, television commercials, Knott’s Berry Farm, and were on Ed Sullivan.
Glen Campbell was from Arkansas. Little Rock’s Broncho Billy Anderson in “The Great Train Robbery,” the earliest cowboy short movie kicked off cowboy movies in 1903. In 1870, Bishop Edward Fitzgerald disapproved with one other Italy bishop on pope fallibility while five hundred thirty-three did approve. Harold M. Sherman’s book *Your Key to Happiness* greatly sold several editions. Liberty party presidential nominee William Hope “Coin” Harvey suggested using silver not gold for United States currency. Nebraska’s William Jennings Bryan ran for president in the 1890’s on Harvey’s ideas of silver opposed to gold. McKinley, however, triumphed as President. Hazel Walker was on the national Red Heads basketball team and Women’s Basketball Hall of Fame. Academic and public libraries will educate and delight patrons with the enchanting book, Statesmen, Scoundrels, and Eccentrics: *A Gallery of Amazing Arkansans*, revealing extraordinary and, sometimes, shocking details on the wonderfully charming Arkansas.

Melinda F. Matthews
University of Louisiana at Monroe

The five volume series Portrait of A Patriot reprints, with meticulously researched and exhaustive annotations, the writings of Josiah Quincy Jr. (1744-1775), an important figure in Colonial American history. Volumes Four and Five, released together in April 2010, represent the final two volumes in the series and contain Quincy’s Law Reports.

Quincy was a highly informed observer of the proceedings of the Superior Court of Judicature of the Province of Massachusetts Bay from the years 1761 through 1772, troubled years leading up to the American Revolution. He was a visionary who wanted the colonial courts to have their own law reports just as the English courts did. His law reports, although not published until after his death, arguably represent the very first American Law reports written, and provide extensive insight into both the legal and social history of colonial America.

These two volumes reproduce the text of the edition edited by Quincy’s grandson, Samuel Quincy Jr., which was published in 1865. Samuel Quincy Jr. transcribed the volumes while simultaneously commanding troops during the American Civil War, and noted in his introduction that he regretted being unable to provide much in the way of background information or annotation to his transcriptions because of the pressures of war. This omission is impressively amended in the modern edition by editors Daniel R. Coquillette and Neil Longley York.

The two volumes provide introductions and copious notes, citations, and other documentation that helps to illuminate the reports and highlight their importance to Colonial American History and American Legal History. The cases themselves are often either historical landmarks influencing later legislation, or cases that help provide a clear picture of the many issues and complexities life in colonial times.

Many southeastern libraries may have already purchased volume three of the series, Josiah Quincy Junior’s journal of the journey he took through the South beginning in 1773, with his vivid descriptions of Southern culture and society. Libraries with collections in early American history or American legal history will want to consider also purchasing the final two volumes of this set.

Allison Faix
Coastal Carolina University (SC)
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