

1-1-2016

Developing a Primary Source Lab Series: A Collaboration Between Special Collections and Subject Collections Librarians

Adam Rosenkranz
Claremont University Consortium

Gale Burrow
Claremont University Consortium

Lisa L. Crane
Claremont University Consortium

Recommended Citation

Rosenkranz, Adam; Burrow, Gale; and Crane, Lisa. "Developing a Primary Source Lab Series: A Collaboration Between Special Collections and Subject Collections Librarians." *Collaborating for Impact: Special Collections and Liaison Librarian Partnerships*. Edited by Kristen Totleben and Lori Birrell. Chicago: ACRL:/ALA, 2016. 163-86.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Library Publications at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Staff Publications and Research by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.



CHAPTER 12*

Developing a Primary Source Lab Series:

A COLLABORATION BETWEEN SPECIAL COLLECTIONS AND SUBJECT COLLECTIONS LIBRARIANS

Adam Rosenkranz, Gale Burrow, and Lisa Crane

Introduction

In 2014, special collections and subject specialist librarians at the Claremont Colleges Library came together to pilot a lab series giving graduate students the opportunity to analyze a primary source closely as an artifact, explore related digital primary sources, identify potential research questions, and find examples of secondary scholarship that spoke to those questions. The lab series emphasized research not as a linear sequence, but a process with a holistic view of the range of available resources, paper and digital, historic and contemporary. Although the librarians who developed the lab series were excited about collaborating with graduate school faculty, they have grown to see the value of collaboration among librarians with differing expertise.

* This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License, CC BY (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Four librarians have been the leaders in developing the Primary Source Lab series. Carrie Marsh, one of the early lab planners and participants, and Lisa Crane are librarians in special collections. Adam Rosenkranz is the subject specialist for history, philosophy, German, and Arabic. Gale Burrow is the subject liaison librarian subject specialist for British and American literature and a special collections librarian.

Institutional Background

The Claremont Colleges (TCC) is a consortium of seven private institutions: five undergraduate colleges and two graduate schools: Pomona College (1887), Claremont Graduate University (1925), Scripps College (1926), Claremont McKenna College (1946), Harvey Mudd College (1955), Pitzer College (1963), and Keck Graduate Institute (1997). Many central services, including the Claremont Colleges Library, are provided by an eighth entity, the Claremont University Consortium (CUC).

Intended by first president of The Claremont Colleges, James Blaisdell, to be modeled on Oxford University, each academic institution has its own administration, its own students and faculty, and its own distinctive mission. Situated on slightly less than one square mile of land approximately thirty-five miles east of Los Angeles, the schools are contiguous, classes on different campuses are within easy walking distance, and students take classes and occasionally major in disciplines not offered on their home campus. These highly ranked institutions offer rigorous curricula, small classes, distinguished professors, and personalized instruction in a vibrant residential college community that provides intensive interaction between students and faculty. Located at the geographic center of the seven academic institutions, and serving and supported by all seven, the library provides TCC with the research resources and support of a medium-sized university library.

The library has a long history of course-integrated library instruction in both undergraduate and graduate TCC courses. Subject specialist librarians work closely with most first-year seminar courses and with many advanced courses, generally focusing on the resources and strategies important for research with scholarly sources. Librarians also schedule many individual appointments with both students and faculty every semester. Special collections librarians work with faculty and their classes to introduce students to the wealth of primary source materials in special collections and archival collections. Because they are considered teaching collections, students are able to work with them as any research scholar. Many students return individually to work with the primary source materials they have seen in class and to request more.

Impetus for Collaboration

TCC librarians responsible for general and subject specific reference and instruction find that very often students looking for sources for their research projects have selected a topic before doing any preliminary research to determine the state of scholarship, or lack thereof, on that topic. They already committed to the topic and, even when faced with the near impossibility of finding relevant, appropriate sources, they do not want to give up that topic. A major challenge for librarians has always been reaching students early in the research process, working with them to articulate research questions based on exploration of primary and secondary sources to develop their own voices, and find relevant scholarly conversations before choosing a research focus.

In fall 2011, Burrow was talking with an early modern studies professor in Claremont Graduate University's School of Arts & Humanities about working with the students in her graduate Shakespeare class. In the course of that conversation, the professor expressed her concern that new graduate students often choose their topics without first exploring relevant primary and secondary sources. This conversation was the impetus for a Primary Source Lab Series.

Project Scope

The Primary Source Labs integrate instruction for research with both physical and digital primary sources and research with scholarly sources in order to help students understand a more complete research process. A major goal in the lab series was to help students see themselves as part of relevant scholarly conversations by enabling them, not only with the technological tools (search strategies, databases), but conceptual tools as well: what to look for in the physical objects, differences among types of sources, and the give and take, non-linear nature of research itself.

Spring 2012—First Primary Source Lab

Several weeks of planning went into developing the first primary source lab, which was piloted in spring 2012. The planning group included graduate faculty representatives in literature, history, religion, philosophy, and cultural studies in the School of Arts & Humanities, librarian subject liaisons for those subjects, and special collections librarians. The plan for the lab was based largely on resources and concepts the planning group identified as important for graduate level research. Faculty and librarians agreed the starting point would be primary sources. Faculty identified print resources they thought were important, such as Selden Society reprints. Librarians identified primary and secondary digital

sources to be included. Twelve student participants were selected by the faculty planners and represented all the disciplines in the School of Arts & Humanities.

The pilot lab was scheduled for two and a half hours and included three segments. The outcomes for the lab were announced at the beginning: Participants should be able to ask questions about the primary source provenance and themes; understand that there is more to be found than initial research will produce; and expect that knowledgeable people (faculty and librarians) be available to advise them.

The first segment of the lab was held in special collections. Marsh introduced the goals/outcomes of the lab and led the exploration and questioning of a single, selected primary source, one which the librarians and faculty hoped would inspire research ideas for all participants across all disciplines. The source was a hand-drawn and colored map of an internment camp in China from the scrapbook of a female Christian missionary held in the camp during World War II. The faculty members and librarians imagined potential topics the source might inspire, including art/art therapy as a coping mechanism, representation vs. reality, history of internment/POW camps, living conditions in camps or prisons, trauma and incarceration, cultural geography and mapmaking, gender aspects of POW experience, and life in separation from larger society.

Students spent forty-five minutes in examination and directed discussion of the primary source, with attention to its physical attributes and what it had to say about its cultural and historical context. The students were next divided into groups of three or four, accompanied by a librarian, to visit specific areas in the general collections where different faculty pointed out “hidden” research sources they thought were particularly important. Finally, the students gathered in the library classroom for an introduction to digital primary sources and scholarly journal databases, led by Rosenkranz and Burrow.

Immediately after the pilot lab ended, librarians and faculty in the planning group met to discuss their perceptions of the lab. They felt the students had not engaged with the primary source as they had hoped. Even with prompting, the students had difficulty finding significant relationships between the map and their own areas of interest. Workshop leaders also realized the second segment, the physical tour to see specific resources, took longer than the allotted forty-five minutes and lasted over an hour. That meant that there was too little time for the students to benefit as much as they might have from the third segment in the library classroom.

Following the pilot lab, participants were asked what had been effective about the lab and what needed to change to be more effective. Their responses confirmed what the faculty and librarians had observed. In summary, students felt the idea of a research lab was valuable, but the pilot had tried to cover too much in too little time, had not been sufficiently focused on student research interests, and had not allowed time for deep engagement or practice.

Spring 2014—Primary Source Lab Series

Other library priorities put the primary source lab concept on hold, but in 2013–2014, librarians began revising the lab plan. This time four librarians, Marsh, Crane, Rosenkranz, and Burrow, formed the core planning group in consultation with the professor in early modern studies. With the proliferation of access to more and more resources, the librarians felt that practice with both primary and secondary sources, as well as both physical special collections and digital resources, would be necessary to present a full picture of research. This collaboration allowed for special collections librarians to draw from their collections knowledge to choose the primary sources, and subject specialist librarians to draw from their subject expertise to select the digital resources and tools most important for the specific research process. As evident from the lab worksheets included at the end of this chapter, each lab consists of several modules. Special collections librarians led the exploration and discussion of primary sources in Lab 1 modules, and subject specialist librarians led the exploration and discussion of digital sources, search techniques, and other tools and techniques in Lab 2 and 3 modules. Having taught several of these lab series together and shared their expertise, Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow find that they are confident teaching most modules of the labs, but they appreciate the support of partner teachers.

Lab 1

The preliminary outline included three two-hour labs. In Lab 1 students would work with materials in special collections. The special collections librarians, in conversation with the collaborating professor, decided to have the students focus on the materials as artifacts, paying close attention to everything except the main text. What could they learn, what research questions might arise from examination of the binding, the paper, the illustrations, the front matter, etc.?

Learning outcomes for Lab 1 were developed using both information literacy and visual literacy concepts and skills. These are the learning outcomes that guided development of the worksheet (see Appendix 12A) and discussion in Lab 1.

Students will be able to:

- Define/differentiate/identify primary sources in relation to other types of sources.
- Describe differences in information, format, and production for documents from the period.
- Identify the kinds of information that could be found in Early Modern documents, including writers/producers, intention, etc.
- Locate appropriate primary documents.

- Articulate how sources discussed/examined in the lab are relevant for the work they're doing in their courses.
- Cite primary sources appropriately.
- Articulate the importance of using primary sources, not just the scholarship on those sources.

Students in Lab 1 of the early modern studies lab were presented with an array of primary sources to choose from for the duration of the lab. The early modern studies worksheet asked students to first glean basic information from the physical source they had chosen to explore: author creator, printer, place of publication, and date of the document. The worksheet also asked students to look for unique characteristics such as illustrations, signatures and pagination (foliation), and marginalia, and what these characteristics might say about society in the Early Modern period. They were also supplied with an early modern studies glossary (see Appendix 12B).

Lab 1 for early modern studies concluded with discussion asking students to consider three questions:

- What do you know about early modern texts and the early modern period based on your study of these documents? How do you know these things?
- What problems do the documents help you to solve?
- What questions for further research do these documents raise?

Discussion of these questions led early modern studies students to begin to understand how a thorough investigation of the primary text as artifact might contribute to more complete research.

Lab 2 and Lab 3

Learning outcomes for Lab 2 and Lab 3 focused on skills and concepts described in the *ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*¹ approved by the ACRL Board of Directors in January 2000. Using the ACRL Standards, the librarians formulated specific learning outcomes to guide the development of the worksheets and discussion in Labs 2 and 3.

Students will be able to:

- Navigate and use primary sources online.
- Define/differentiate/identify secondary sources in relation to other types of sources.
- Use primary/contemporary sources to explore Early Modern contexts and themes.
- Explore current/modern scholarship focused on the Early Modern period.
- Choose the best research strategy/strategies for their particular question.

- Identify key scholars and key journals in their disciplines.
- Develop effective research strategies, whether using physical or on-line resources.
- Evaluate sources (articles, books, etc.) to determine appropriateness for their particular research.
- Determine when it is necessary to ask for permission to use materials created by someone else.
- Make reasonable choices about how to manage their research; i.e., whether or not to use a citation management tool like Zotero or RefWorks.
- Cite sources appropriately within their discipline or for publication.
- Find dissertations by others in their fields.
- Recognize the issues around open access and take advantage of the opportunities available to them via Scholarship@Claremont.

The pilot Lab 2 for early modern studies included exploration of various editions of Early Modern texts available in digital format, of responses to those texts and related sources from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, and of scholarship from the nineteenth to the twenty-first centuries.

In Lab 2, led by subject specialist librarians, students were asked to expand their research conversation to include other editions, contemporary sources, and modern scholars as well. Students looked for different editions and/or contemporaneous reactions to the topic of the original documents, as well as scholarly and non-scholarly responses to the documents and/or the events and ideas surrounding the documents. For example, students might compare John Smith's *Generall Historie of Virginia* with accounts of the new world from Smith's time found in Early English Books Online and explore commentary by Early Modern writers and modern scholars. Librarians wanted to emphasize that different types of sources and scholars are in conversation with one another and that students working with the sources are part of the scholarly conversation as well.

As in Lab 1, Lab 2 concluded with discussion of a series of questions:

Based on the research you have done so far, what are some areas for further research that might interest you?

- What research questions would you articulate?
- What disciplines would be relevant for researching those questions in your areas of interest?
- Based on the disciplines and questions you've identified; what resources might be useful in pursuing research in your areas of interest?
- What research strategies make the most sense at this point?

Lab 3, taught by Rosenkranz and Burrow, focused on tools and techniques for research, developing more complex search strategies and selecting among databases, books, and archives as research sources. Lab 3 also offered opportunity for discussion about publishing in the digital age, emphasizing issues

of copyright and open access, and demonstration of options for managing research using tools like Zotero.

The lab series pilot was very successful, with ten graduate students who responded to a call for volunteers by their early modern studies faculty advisor. Their experience in the early modern studies graduate program ranged from two students in their second semester to one student who had completed coursework and was writing her dissertation. Questions from their follow-up evaluations offered rave reviews, such as “Wish I had this lab when I started in the program!”

Here are two questions posed to participants in the pilot lab series, followed by summaries of their responses.

1. What did you find most beneficial in the lab series?

- Guidance offered by the worksheets
- Working with primary sources in context
- Learning about pagination, binding, etc.
- Exploring historical and cultural contexts of the sources
- Identifying appropriate databases and effective search strategies
- Citing Early Modern sources
- Having hands-on experience

2. What in these labs would have most benefited you in your first year as a graduate student?

- Realizing that the physical book itself, not just its contents, reveals important information
- Understanding where to look and what to look for
- Realizing the value of different editions of “my” source and the value of sources contemporary with “mine”
- Learning how to handle special collections materials
- Using questions from worksheets 1 and 2 as guiding questions for doing research—excellent starting points for scholarly inquiry for new graduate students
- Learning more about database selection and search strategies
- Being introduced to new research sources, tools, and practices: re-print series (e.g., Selden Society publications), the BASE open access search engine, citation management software, open access

Conclusion

As the labs have developed, librarians have changed specific components, but each version has had one constant: starting with physical primary sources in special collections. Throughout the lab series, moreover, librarians have em-

phasized that primary sources, whether physical or digital, serve as the inspiration for research.

One of the goals of the lab series was to enable students to see themselves as part of relevant scholarly conversations and, just as importantly, to recognize the give and take, non-linear nature of research itself. With this in mind, the primary source lab model reverses the assumption topics should come first, instead letting the topics emerge during active engagement with sources. In this model, research is experienced as a process, with research questions defined—and changed—as the scholar encounters different sources. Rosenkranz coined the phrase “process research” inspired by the term “Process Philosophy,” a school of philosophy most often associated with the philosopher Alfred North Whitehead that emphasizes “the dynamic nature” of being and reality, emphasizing change.²

This holistic approach integrates exploration of special collections sources, digital primary sources, and scholarly secondary sources. In the lab series students and faculty get to see the full range of resources available to them. When students (and faculty) begin with primary sources in special collections—a 1611 *King James Bible*, Holinshed’s *Chronicles* from 1586, Shakespeare’s 1632 second folio—they get excited about research. It is also an approach that could only come from collaboration between subject specialist librarians and librarians in special collections, making the fullest use of their differing domains of knowledge and expertise.

Impact

As this project continues to grow and evolve, lab series planners continue to adapt the workshop to the needs of specific courses and academic levels. Rosenkranz is learning more about the topics and materials special collections has to offer. Crane is learning more about the electronic databases for research in both primary and secondary sources. Recently, Crane has been assigned the duties of subject specialist for United States History and American Studies. Her participation in this lab series and collaboration with other subject specialists has provided a strong foundation as she begins her subject specialist duties. Burrow, who is both a subject specialist librarian and a special collections librarian, is able to facilitate the process and help expand the knowledge base of her colleagues. Her participation in the labs also facilitated her transition into a new position as a special collections librarian two years ago. Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow have begun to collaborate on projects outside of the primary source workshop including collection development for both open stacks and special collections materials. Recently, an international travel and movie archive was offered to the library. These three librarians were able to pull from their respective backgrounds to write a proposal to successfully fund the acquisition.

The biggest winners of all, therefore, may be the collaborators. In developing these workshops, Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow have learned about each other's respective domains of knowledge and broadened awareness of collections, empowering them to offer better reference and instruction. They have integrated elements from the workshops into their general undergraduate instruction, further offering the benefits of this more holistic approach to a larger audience, and enabling undergraduates to do more original research. They have also shared the process with colleagues at the library, adding to the variety of instruction options. They hope that the full benefits they have received from their collaboration will gradually spread among their colleagues.

Lessons Learned

In response to evaluations from participants in the 2014 pilot lab series and the librarians' own experience in teaching the labs, labs 2 and 3 have been combined into a single lab. Tools and techniques are now integrated throughout research in the digital environment. As of 2016, the full lab series includes two three-hour labs, allowing even more time for engagement with the primary sources in special collections.

In 2014, Marsh moved into the new position of Director of Special Collections & Libraries, leaving Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow to continue to adapt and develop the lab series. Since then, the lab series has been adapted and taught for a graduate history class, a graduate class on Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and undergraduate history and religion classes.

In general, the early modern studies labs had a strong focus on book history, which is a central theme of the Early Modern period. When offered for other classes, such as History 300, an historiographical course required of all beginning graduate students in history, Lab 1 focused less on book history and offered a wider range of primary sources: books, manuscripts, archival files, and other objects from different time periods in history, based on research interests of the students.

Iterations of the Lab 1 worksheet for other groups, such as that for History 300 (see Appendix 12C), asked students to explore their document(s) for hints on the purpose: intended audience, what the document "is trying to do," and why the writer created "the document." Concluding discussion also focused on three questions:

- What do you know of your topic based on these documents? How do you know these things?
- What problems do the documents help you solve?
- What question(s) are, to you, left unanswered?

As with the concluding discussion for Early Modern Studies Lab 1, this discussion led history students to think about how an investigation of rele-

vant primary sources could inform their research topics (see Appendices D and E).

As previously stated, the learning outcomes for the labs were largely based on the 2000 *ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*. Librarians have come to realize the labs also reflect the core concepts of the much newer *ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*.³ (See Appendix 12F for how the lab series integrates concepts from the Framework.)

Challenges Posed

Challenges for the primary source lab include adaptability, limitations of the collection, and sustained student engagement. The primary source lab worked very well with Early Modern Studies graduate students because a good part of their research focus is “the book as an artifact.” The history of an item—its provenance, its publisher, its patron—is just as important as the contents of the item. But “the book as an artifact” isn’t always so important with other classes, especially undergraduate courses. Adapting the lab series to these other classes has required the focus of Lab 1 be topical, based on the subject matter of class or individual interests, furthering the importance of collaboration between subject specialists, special collections librarians, and faculty.

A second challenge is limitations of the collections. As with most libraries, special collections do not have the financial, spatial, or human resources to collect everything that might be taught at the Claremont Colleges, nor materials which cover all research interests of students at the Claremont Colleges. It is this challenge that underscores the importance of collaboration between subject specialists and special collections librarians. Subject specialists can provide topical insights for a particular class or subject as well as identify targeted electronic primary sources. Special collections librarians rely on their intimate knowledge of their collections to find related, even tangentially, materials when their collections lack materials for a specific research interest or class topic.

Rosenkranz observed that the underlying excitement and sense of novelty that students brought to the physical sources explored in Lab 1 did not always carry over to the digital sources explored in Lab 2. A challenge is how to sustain the excitement when making the transition from the three dimensional sources of special collections to the flatland of PDFs and digital text. Of course, the challenge of having students remain interested when doing digital research is one with which most librarians teaching research instruction are familiar. In Lab 2 it is especially important to include strategies that maintain engagement, something that Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow will continue to develop. For example, having images of the physical items explored in special collections

during Lab 1 might reengage the senses. It is also important for lab leaders to introduce relevant, less familiar databases and online resources, ask challenging questions related to class and/or individual research topics, guide students in discovering the intricacies of effective searching in individual search engines, and model more complex search statements.

Challenges for the collaboration between subject specialists and special collections librarians rest primarily in the division of duties. While there has been increased collaboration incorporating special collections visits and materials into subject specialist information literacy instruction, librarians continue to focus on tasks specific to their knowledge base and skillset. Subject specialists focus more on the digital environment and electronic database search skills. Special collections librarians continue to perform material selection due to their knowledge of the special collections and guide students' exploration of physical primary sources. More integration of knowledge and skills is desirable, closing the gap between respective domains.

Another challenge rests in the faculty perception of the amount of library time they feel their students require. Often it is difficult to convince faculty that their students would benefit more from two visits—one for a special collections hands-on session with primary sources and another for subject intensive instruction in the use of electronic resources. As such, librarians are often required to combine what should be covered in two sessions into a single seventy-five-minute class session at the library. On the other hand, it is this necessity for a condensed lesson plan that has resulted in increased collaboration between subject specialists and special collections librarians.

Next Steps

In summer 2014, following the primary source lab pilot, lab planners presented a workshop to Claremont librarians on the development and implementation of the series and encouraged all librarians to incorporate aspects of the lab series into their instruction. The original worksheet for the primary source workshop has been adapted for a variety of courses and student information literacy levels. Faculty have shown an increased interest in exposing students to primary sources in special collections, especially in first-year writing courses. Special collections class visits for these courses are in demand and require more subject specialist librarians and information literacy librarians to incorporate these visits into their information literacy teaching curriculum. This has increased collaboration as these librarians partner with special collections librarians for material selection and lesson-planning. Subject specialists are starting to attend and participate in special collections class visits and special collections librarians are starting to attend and participate in the information literacy instruction sessions. Frequently, librarians express how surprised and

impressed they are by the breadth and depth of the library's special collections and archives.

In addition to the variety of worksheets and other tips that have been shared, special collections librarians would like to offer more instruction to subject specialists on searching for special collections materials and material selection for class visits. For example, the recent migration from Archivists' Toolkit to ArchivesSpace offers a more user-friendly interface for searching archival collections within special collections. Similarly, special collections librarians need to become more familiar with the electronic databases for primary and secondary sources.

Ideally, collaboration between subject specialist and special collections librarians should extend beyond simply dividing instruction time equitably and attending each other's instruction sessions. Developing truly integrated lesson plans and building course specific research guides incorporating relevant special collections materials would benefit students, regardless of whether a class visits special collections or not. Research guides have typically been created without a special collections component; yet as a result of recent increased collaboration, special collections librarians have been more involved in adding research guide content for special collections materials related to a class. Additionally, it would be great if all librarians could be involved in suggesting relevant acquisitions for special collections based on their subject expertise.

For Rosenkranz, Crane, and Burrow, this collaboration has been both rewarding and fun. Despite the significant time real collaboration requires, they feel it has been well worth the effort for themselves and for the students and faculty they work with. They will continue to work together, offering the full lab series for as many graduate and upper-division undergraduate classes and groups as possible, and incorporating segments of the lab into other instruction sessions as the opportunity arises. They will also look for ways to make it easier for other subject specialist/teaching librarians to participate in the labs and to adapt segments from the labs to fit their own teaching.

Appendix 12A: CGU Primary Source Lab 1, Early Modern Studies

How to Read Primary Sources

A primary source is a document or object which was written or created during the time under study. It was present during an experience or time period and offers an inside view or firsthand account of a particular event. Primary sources are imbued with the spirit of the time in which they were written. Secondary sources interpret and analyze primary sources.

- I. Record the following information about the document with which you are working; this information will help you build your citation:**

Author/Creator	
Position of author/creator (if ascertainable)	
Printer	
Place	
Date(s) of Document	

Other Information that will be helpful to note:

Archive/Institution Name

Collection Name

Number (Box/Folder/Collection)

Document Type

- II. Unique physical characteristics of Early Modern printed books**

Binding style

What story does the binding tell about the book?

In what ways does the binding affect your experience of using the book?

Illustrations

What illustrations are present?

Number of illustrations?

Size of illustrations—how important is the scale of the illustrations

to your reading/use of the text? To the author's thesis?

How significant is the placement of the illustrations within the text of the book?

How do the illustrations relate to the text?

How do the illustrations enhance (or not) your knowledge of the book's subject?

Typefaces

What style of typeface is used in the book: Roman, *Italic*, **Gothic**, or ?

How many typefaces are used in the book? If there is more than one typeface used, what might be some reasons for the printer to use different typefaces?

Are there other ink colors used in the book besides black and to what effect?

Pagination

Which type of sequence mark(s) is used in the book? Where is it on the page? Follow the sequence mark(s); do you find any errors?

- Foliation—numbering of the “leaves” in a signature. Signature marks can be letters, numbers, and sometimes symbols, usually located at the bottom of the first portion of gatherings; they were used to help binders assemble the sheets of a book into the right order. * When a printed book isn't paginated, recto and verso are important to note. E.g. for a non-paginated octavo: signature A, leaf 3, recto side would be cited as A3r .
- Pagination—numbering of the pages e.g. 1, 2, 3, 4.
- Catchwords—Printed at the bottom of a page, the catchword links the text at the bottom of one page with the start of the next.

*Signatures—distinguishing the printed sheets which constitute two or more pages of a book, depending upon format. Most often signatures are noted by capital letters A, B, C, and so on. Early modern books typically use a 23-letter alphabet, treating I/J as one letter, U/V as one letter, and omitting W.

III. Title pages in Early Modern printed books

IV. Questioning Early Modern primary sources

Argument of the document:

What is the document trying to do? How does the document make

its case? What is its strategy for accomplishing its goal?
Who is the intended audience of the document? How might this influence the writer's rhetorical strategy?

Purpose of the document:

Why did the writer write/create the document?
Does the writer have a thesis? What is it? How important is it to your understanding of your research/topic?

Bias of the document (writer):

Do you think the writer/creator is credible and reliable? Why or why not?
What is the relationship of the author/creator to the events and issues described and does the author/creator have a stake in how the events/issues are remembered? What judgments or assumptions are embedded in his or her choice of words?
What presumptions and preconceptions do you have as the reader?
How do you compensate for bias?

Knowledge from the document:

How typical is this document for your research/topic?
How widely was this document circulated?
What problems, assumptions, arguments, ideas and values, if any, does it share with other documents you've examined about your research/topic?

The Ultimate Questions...

- What do you know of your topic based on these documents? How do you know these things?
- What problems do the documents help you to solve?
- What question(s) are, to you, left unanswered?

Appendix 12B: CGU Primary Source Lab

Early Modern Studies

GLOSSARY

Archive: a collection of primary source documents that have accumulated over the course of an individual or organization's lifetime; materials are generally not organized by standard library classification systems.

Bookplate: also known as *ex-libris*, is usually a small print or decorative label pasted into a book, often on the inside front cover, to indicate its owner.

Catchword: a partial or complete word located at the lower-outer corner of a page corresponding to the first word of the first line of the following page.

Chainlines: the lines left on a sheet of laid paper caused by the pattern of wires in the paper mold.

Colophon: a brief statement containing information about the publication of a book such as the place of publication, the publisher, and the date of publication.

Duodecimo/12o: a format in which each sheet is typically folded and cut to produce one twelve-leaf or one four-leaf and one eight-leaf gathering.

Edition/Variation > Impression > Issue > State

Facsimile: a copy or reproduction of a book, manuscript, map, art print, or other item of historical value that is as true to the original source as possible.

Finding Aid: a document containing detailed information about a specific collection of papers or records within an archive.

Folio/2o: a format in which each sheet is folded to produce a two-leaf gathering.

Gathering: a sheet folded to produce a particular number of leaves according to the chosen format.

Gutter: the space between columns of printed text, including the gap at the inner edge of a book where leaves come together and where typically the book is sewn.

Incunabula (incunabulum; incunable, incunables): a book, pamphlet, or broadside that was printed—not handwritten—before the year 1501 in Europe; from the Latin for “Swaddling clothes” or “cradle”.

Justify: to adjust the spacing of a line of type so that the left, right, or both margins align.

Leaf: one piece of paper in a book containing a recto and verso page.

Ligature: two or more characters combined into a single type, for example, æ or œ.

Majuscule: capital, or upper-case letters.

Manicule: originating in medieval manuscripts, the manicule or “little hand” points to noteworthy passages in a text.

Marginalia: scribbles, comments and illuminations in the margins of a book.

Miniscule: lower-case letters.

Octavo/8o: a format in which each sheet is typically folded to produce one eight-leaf gathering.

Provenance: the chronology of the ownership, custody or location of a historical object; in the case of books, provenance refers to the study of the ownership of individual copies of books, and usually includes study of the circumstances in which individual copies of books have changed ownership, and of evidence left in books that shows how readers interacted with them.

Quarto/4o: a format in which each sheet is typically folded to produce one four-leaf gathering.

Quire: 1) *n.* one or more gatherings; 2) *v.* to collect multiple gatherings into a single binding unit.

Recto: front side of a leaf.

Rubrication: text in red ink added by hand, for decoration or emphasis.

Sans Serif: letterforms without serifs.

Serif: block or flared extensions to strokes on a letterform.

Signature: reference text at the bottom of a recto leaf identifying the gathering and leaf.

Transcription: a written or printed representation of something from another medium.

Type: Blackletter, Gothic, Roman, Italic.

Verso: reverse side of a leaf.

Watermark: a recognizable image or pattern in paper visible when viewed by transmitted light caused by variations in thickness or density of the paper; in laid (handmade) paper, watermarks are created by a wire profile “sewn” onto the face of a paper mold.

For additional information on books and printing, see:

Dane, Ralph A. *What is a Book? The Study of Early Printed Books*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2012.

Gaskell, Philip. *A New Introduction to Bibliography*. New Castle, Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 1995.

Appendix 12C: CGU Primary Source Lab 1, History 300

How to Read Primary Sources

A primary source is an original document relating to a particular subject, time period, or event. Primary sources enable the researcher to get as close as possible to what actually happened during an historical event or time period. Primary sources were either created during the time period or were created at a later date by a participant in the events (as in the case of memoirs) and reflect the individual viewpoint of a participant or observer. Primary sources are imbued with the spirit of the time in which they were written.

Secondary sources interpret and analyze primary sources.

I. Describe your item

→ **Basic bibliographic information:**

Author/Creator:

Position of author/creator (if ascertainable):

Printer/publisher:

Place:

Date(s):

→ **Other information that will be helpful to note, especially if you are not describing a book:**

Archive/Institution Name:

Collection Name:

Number (Collection/Box/Folder):

Document Type:

→ **Physical description**

What type of item do you have? What is the format? Provide a full physical description of your item.

Do the bibliographic or physical characteristics of your item raise any questions? Is any information missing or incomplete?

II. Questioning the primary source

→ **Author/creator**

Are you familiar with the creator? What do you already know about her/him?

What is the relationship of the author/creator to the events and issues described? Does the author/creator have a stake in how the

events/issues are remembered? What judgments or assumptions are embedded in his/her choice of words?

Does your knowledge of the author create expectations or assumptions you may have about your item?

→ **Purpose and argument of the item**

What is the item trying to do? What strategies does the author/creator use to accomplish the goal?

Who is the intended audience of the document? How might this influence the writer's rhetorical strategy?

→ **Argument of the item**

What is the item trying to do? How does it make its case? What is its strategy for accomplishing its goal?

Is there a clear thesis? What is it?

In what ways might you read this that weren't intended by the writer/creator? How would you read this "against the grain"?

III. The historical perspective

→ **Cultural milieu**

What do you already know about the cultural milieu surrounding this item? How does this item fit into that environment?

→ **Audience reaction**

Based on your current knowledge of the time, what would audience reaction have been? How would reactions have been expressed?

→ **Relationship to other sources**

How does this source relate to other materials you are familiar with in your area of research?

IV. The Ultimate Questions

→ What have you learned from this source? How have you learned these things?

→ What problems does this source present?

→ What did you find about this source that surprised you?

→ In what ways can you read this that weren't intended by the writer/creator? How would you read this "against the grain"?

→ What questions related to your research interests does this item raise?

→ What question(s) are, for you, left unanswered?

Appendix 12D: CGU Primary Source Lab 2, History 300

Research Strategies, Tools, & Techniques

In this lab we will focus on expanding your understanding of primary sources by using contemporary related sources and secondary scholarship.

Primary sources

What primary source(s) support your topic?

If there are alternate editions or variations, what do these tell you?

How do modern print or electronic versions illuminate or detract from the original?

Contemporary responses and related sources

What types of responses/reactions would you expect?

What contemporary issues might be related to the issues in your primary source?

What would you like to find?

Look for responses and related texts

- What contemporary responses and related texts do you find?
- What related issues do you find?

Search strategies

Keyword searching

Full text searching

Scholarly conversations

Where would you look?

What, if any, scholarly conversations do you find?

Areas for further research

Based on the research you have done so far, what are some areas for further research that might interest you?

- What research questions would you articulate?
- What disciplines would be relevant for researching those questions in your areas of interest?
- Based on the disciplines and questions you've identified; what resources might be useful in pursuing research in your areas of interest?
- What research strategies make the most sense at this point?

Publishing in the digital age

- Copyright
- Open access

Managing your research

Zotero

Appendix 12E: CGU Primary Source Lab 2, Early Modern Studies

Research Sources

Search tools for primary sources (books, documents, archives, etc.)

Reprint Sources

Early English Text Society

Hakluyt Society

Parker Society

Selden Society

Historical Manuscripts Commission

Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores (Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland During the Middle Ages)

Calendars of State Papers

State Papers Online (British State Papers of the Tudors, Domestic, 1509–1603, and Stuarts, Domestic, 1603–1714)

Selected library catalogs and web sites:

Blais library catalog (includes special collections)

blais.claremont.edu

WorldCat

libraries.claremont.edu/resources/databases/dbr.asp?id=214

National Archives UK

www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/

Gallica—Bibliothèque nationale de France

gallica.bnf.fr/?lang=EN

British Library

www.bl.uk

BASE (Bielefeld Academic Search Engine)

www.base-search.net/about/en/

Search Engines for Open Access Scholarship

bit.ly/MR4Cps

Search Engines for Open Access Images, Video, Other Media

bit.ly/1gV66by

Wikimedia Commons

commons.wikimedia.org

Internet Archive

archive.org

Google and Google Books
google.com
books.google.com

Selected databases from the Library's database list:

American Periodical Series
ARTFL–French texts from 12th to 20th centuries
Early American Imprints
Early American Newspapers
Early English Books Online
Eighteenth Century Collections Online
Making of the Modern World (documents from 1500–mid-19th century)

Search tools for modern scholarship

Library catalogs

Blais library catalog
blais.claremont.edu
WorldCat
libraries.claremont.edu/resources/databases/dbr.asp?id=214

Main Subject Databases

For history

- America: History & Life (for U.S. and Canadian history)
- Historical Abstracts (for the rest of the world)
- History of Science, Technology, & Medicine

For literature

- MLA International Bibliography

For religion

- ATLA

Other Disciplines

- Academic Search Premier
- Econlit
- JSTOR
- Periodicals Index Online
- Project MUSE

For a more complete list and more detailed guidance, see these subject portals:

For history: libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/historyportal

For literature: libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/languageportal

For religion: libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/religionportal

Appendix 12F: The Lab Series & the Framework for Information Literacy

Examples of the Frames seen in the lab series include:

- “Authority is Constructed and Contextual”: Students explore the cultural construction of authority through both primary and scholarly sources.
- “Information Creation as a Process”: Students consider the creation of information in the primary and secondary sources they work with and begin to develop an awareness of their own creation process.
- Students also engage in deep exploration of the frame “Research as Inquiry” (<http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework#inquiry>), which emphasizes, “experts see inquiry as a process that focuses on problems or questions in a discipline or between disciplines that are open or unresolved.”
- Above all students in the labs focus on the frame “Scholarship as Conversation,” recognizing that scholarly conversations may extend from the distant past into the present, and will include their own contributions to those conversations.

Notes

1. *ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*, accessed March 14, 2016, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>.
2. Johanna Seibt, “Process Philosophy,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2016 Edition), ed. by Edward N. Zalta, <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/process-philosophy/>.
3. *ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*, accessed March 17, 2016, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>.

Bibliography

- ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*. Accessed March 17, 2016. <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>.
- ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*. Accessed March 14, 2016. <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>.
- Seibt, Johanna. “Process Philosophy.” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2016 Edition), Edited by Edward N. Zalta. <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/process-philosophy/>.