

Evaluating the Research Literature

Cat White

Library Science Program, Middle Tennessee State University

LIBS 6060: Understanding Research for Evaluation in Libraries

Dr. Frank Lambert

8 March 2026

Evaluating the Research Literature

Both articles share similarities and differences. The articles, “Sneak It in”: Information Literacy Instruction Related to Misinformation and “With Friends Like These...”, examine how librarians and instructors respond to current challenges in information literacy and the modern information environment. Each article highlights the importance of information literacy instruction and notes that librarians' role is crucial in these circumstances, helping students critically evaluate information sources. Technology is also the central focus in both articles. However, one article examines how misinformation spreads, while the other looks at how AI chatbots influence how young adults find information and emotional support. Additionally, the immediate difference between the articles lies in the authors’ approach and scope.

Enis (2026) writes a professional periodical article that combines existing studies, surveys, and reports to discuss how young adults are increasingly using AI chatbots and why librarians should learn about and teach AI literacy and critical evaluation skills. In contrast, Bugre et al. (2026) introduce a peer-reviewed study that uses qualitative data from librarian workshops to examine how misinformation instruction is designed and how trust influences those decisions. Because of this difference, the Bugre study provides direct research evidence and a methodological approach, while the Enis article offers a broader overview of existing studies and commentary on current trends. Therefore, the scholarly articles provide stronger research findings, whereas the professional article helps frame the issue and highlights the practical implications for librarians and educators.

Regarding the research for both articles, they differ in the type of research and how it is used in each application. The article, “Sneak It In,” can best be described as applied research. In this study, the authors examine how librarians design information literacy instruction and how

issues of trust influence those decisions. The end goal of the research is to generate knowledge that librarians can use to improve how to teach misinformation and information literacy. Because this research directly addresses professional practice and design, it fits the definition of applied research rather than basic or action research. On the other hand, Enis (2026) does not conduct his original research, so it does not fall into such categories. However, the article is closer to actionable research as it combines findings from existing studies and reports to help librarians understand AI chatbots and why AI literacy is becoming a crucial topic in the literary world. The main purpose of the article is to raise awareness and provide guidance for professionals, rather than to present new research findings.

Additionally, Bugre et al. (2026) meet the criteria for rigorous scholarly research because they are published in a peer-reviewed journal and clearly explain the research question, methodology, participant selection, and data collection. The authors use the initial data to situate their current study within existing research, thereby strengthening the credibility of their conclusions. In contrast, “With Friends Like These...” does not represent rigorous scholarly research because it summarizes existing studies and research rather than presenting original research and methodology. However, it still provides useful information for librarians by highlighting these AI trends. Finally, a noteworthy difference is the intended audience and writing style. The scholarly article uses a formal academic tone in order to present its research, findings, and suggested outcomes, while the professional periodical uses a more accessible writing style to communicate information to librarians and instructors. These characteristics influence how each article presents knowledge and how readers can interpret and apply all of the information.

References

- Bugre, C., Wedlake, S., Arif, A., Glaze, S., & Young, J. C. (2026). "Sneak It In": Information Literacy Instruction Related to Misinformation. *Library Quarterly*, 96(1), 79–99.
<https://doi-org.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/10.1086/738386>

"Sneak It In": Information Literacy Instruction Related to Misinformation

Charles Bugre, Stacey Wedlake, Ahmer Arif, Shaun Glaze, and Jason C. Young

ABSTRACT

Misinformation continues to impact communities through its ability to spread distrust and undermine confidence in public institutions. However, experts struggle to identify the most effective strategies for discussing and addressing misinformation. This article investigates how librarians can get people interested in misinformation topics without ruining their public trust. We analyzed data from five half-day workshops that included 16 librarians from Washington and Texas using a thematic analysis approach. The librarians argue that information literacy instruction related to misinformation needs to be short, easy, entertaining and grounded in nonpolitical issues that resonate with the learner. They also argue that staff need to be empathetic when discussing misinformation. Finally, librarians can take advantage of their personal networks and opinion leaders to indirectly discuss skills related to dealing with misinformation. This article contributes to library and information science (LIS) research on how to get people interested in discussing and addressing misinformation.

The ability to easily create and share information quickly using digital technologies and platforms has partly enabled the rise of misinformation, with no clear solutions to the problem (Benkler et al. 2018). Given the large and growing impact across many domains of society, it is increasingly critical to build the resilience of the general public to misinformation (Tripodi et al. 2023). Librarians are important players in building the resilience of the public against misinformation (Young et al. 2021; Tripodi et al. 2023). This is often based on a recognition of their historical role in providing information literacy instruction to their patrons (Young et al. 2021) and because of the trust that community members have in librarians (Sullivan 2019a). However, scholarly research suggests that librarians are often reluctant to run information literacy instruction related to misinformation issues because of its politicized nature and complexity as a social and technological problem related to trust (Young et al. 2021). Jason C. Young and colleagues (2021) argue that librarians do not want to engage with the topic out of fear that they might ruin their trust with the public. They want updated instructional strategies to teach information literacy that reflect the complexities of the topic while allowing them to

Figure 1. Screenshot from Bugre et al. (2026) discussing misinformation instruction strategies

Enis, M. (2026). With Friends Like These.... *School Library Journal*, 72(1), 14–17.

With Friends Like These...

A growing number of young people are using artificial intelligence chatbots as companions or therapists

LAST APRIL, ADAM RAINE TOOK HIS OWN LIFE. While his parents were well aware that their teenaged son had been coping with social anxiety, they were not aware of how severe it had become, or that he was increasingly turning to ChatGPT, the generative artificial intelligence (AI) tool developed by OpenAI, for both advice and companionship. After his death, his parents discovered that he had confided with ChatGPT about his suicidal thoughts. Not only did the AI chatbot discourage him from seeking help, it eventually offered to help him write a suicide letter.

"As we came to find out more about Adam's final weeks, we learned that he had replaced virtually all human friendship and counsel for an AI companion. We were shocked to see the entrancing power of this companion and devastated to read the in-depth conversation that created the environment that led to his suicide," the family wrote on theadamraine-foundation.org, the website of a nonprofit they have established in his name.

A report published last July by the nonprofit organization Common Sense Media—based on a nationally representative survey of more than 1,000 teenagers—indicated that 72 per-

cent of teens have used AI as companions at least once, while 21 percent use them as companions a few times per week, and 13 percent use them daily. While almost half of survey respondents (46 percent) said they view AI as tools or programs, 33 percent said they use them for social interaction and relationships, 18 percent said they use them for conversation or social practice, 12 percent said they use them for emotional or mental health support, and another 12 percent said they use them for role-playing or imaginative scenarios (multiple responses to the question were allowed).

What happened to Raine is clearly the worst-case scenario, but teachers and parents should be aware that young people are increasingly using generative AIs for "advice and comfort and even friendship," says

Elissa Malespina, New Jersey teacher librarian and author/editor of the *AI School Librarians Newsletter*, as well as *AI in the Library: Strategies, Tools and Ethics for Today's Schools* and *The Educator's AI Prompt Book: Copy-and-Paste Prompts for Lesson Planning, Libraries, and Learning*. Aside from the small number of cases such as Raine's, in which chatbots have been linked to teen suicides, Malespina points out that there have been many reported cases in which teens have used AI chatbots for advice on hiding problems or budding disorders from parents and friends.

Many "teens sort of perceive AI as a safe space to talk about their feelings," Malespina says. Discussing problems or difficult topics with an AI chatbot might be easier for them than a conversation with a parent, teacher, librarian, or therapist. Unlike humans, chatbots don't judge—and tend to respond to conversational prompts in ways that reinforce a user's train of thought. There's a false sense of anonymity and confidentiality. And use

By Matt Enis

ILLUSTRATION BY EVA VÁZQUEZ

Figure 2. Screenshot from Enis (2026) discussing the social impact of AI companions