



Information Literacy and Higher Education: Placing the Academic Library in the Center of a Comprehensive Solution

by Edward K. Owusu-Ansah

This article seeks a comprehensive approach to information literacy instruction. The author suggests a programmatic solution that ensures that every undergraduate is provided information literacy instruction before graduation. The recommended process anticipates an eventual evolution of the academic library into a bonafide teaching department.

As information literacy permeates the discourse in colleges and universities in the United States, and accrediting bodies emphasize its necessity, academic libraries prepare to assume duties their own professional associations brought to the attention of a nation seeking new results in higher education. The institutions these libraries serve, whether they see an actual need or simply respond to political expediency, seek to address concerns that calls for information literacy have generated. Many turn to their libraries for suggestions and solutions. Academic librarians, hardly ever on an equal footing with classroom faculty, suddenly find themselves compelled to address issues and provide solutions that may go beyond their library walls and even infiltrate the domain of subject faculty.

Academic leaders, in the course of engaging librarians and subject faculty in the search for solutions, frequently try to please both by encouraging librarians to try what they can while avoiding the potential wrath of subject faculty by refusing to delineate or mandate any new requirements. Unfortunately, little gets done in many instances. Librarians, doubting their ability to achieve any far reaching results and conceding the lack of institutional, human, and monetary resources to proceed with any ambitious programs, often attempt limited solutions or, worst still, continue to debate the purportedly unresolved nature of information literacy. Administrators struggle with what it is they really hope for. Faculty marches on as though no concerns existed.

Thus, although there appears to be a reasonable amount of consensus on the necessity of information literacy,¹ concurrence on concrete steps to achieve it are

often distant, at best. Patricia Senn Breivik's observation about library instruction, made two decades ago, appears to be true today for information literacy. "Despite the educational justification for library instruction, few campuses . . . welcome it unreservedly," Breivik wrote in 1982.²

This article seeks a comprehensive answer to the question of what role the academic library should play in achieving information literacy on campus. In the search for an answer, such issues as whether or not librarians should teach arise as natural attendants to the discourse. Prevailing academic library instructional practices and their levels of popularity emerge as relevant issues of interest. The relationship between librarians and subject faculty receives attention because of its significance to the instructional aspirations and activities of the academic library. In the end, a solution is presented that draws from existing options to create a comprehensive approach.

The approach has two fundamental underpinnings. The first is a concession that information literacy is an issue for every college and university. The second is the argument that librarians should occupy a unique position in attempts to define and achieve campus-wide information literacy. Both flow from recognition of the fact that the goal of producing students knowledgeable in their disciplines and capable of adjusting and advancing in college and life after college is universal to all institutions of higher learning. Lifelong learning is an inherent desire of the educational mission of colleges and universities. So also is the desire to equip students for effective academic investigation and its intellectual advancements. From such commitments of the

Edward K. Owusu-Ansah is Reference Librarian/Assistant Professor, Coordinator of Information Literacy and Library Instruction, College of Staten Island, City University of New York, 2800 Victory Boulevard, Staten Island, NY 10314 <owusu-ansah@mail.csi.cuny.edu>.

higher educational enterprise emerges a justification for a comprehensive solution to information literacy.

ON THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE SOLUTION

Regardless of whatever confusion surrounds information literacy, there is a sufficient consensus on what information literacy is and what it aims at achieving.³ Furthermore, information literacy appears to be an educational goal that educators can neither ignore nor openly refuse a need to achieve. The Middle States Commission on Higher Education recognized the importance of information literacy when it encouraged colleges and universities to "foster optimal use of . . . learning resources through strategies designed to help students develop information literacy."⁴ That was in 1994. In 2002, the Commission went a step further by declaring information literacy a necessary requirement of undergraduate education.⁵

However, it was not only the opinions of academic librarians and the expectations of accreditation bodies that fueled the need for information literacy. The actual constellations of a changing society, and the information/knowledge transformations attending those changes, compelled such an engagement. Paul Zurkowski⁶ foresaw what those changes portended for the future of American society and called for "a major national program to achieve universal information literacy." The American Library Association (ALA) acknowledged and responded to the changes and what was yet to come when it spoke of a new world in need of a new foundation, and posited that information literacy was an appropriate solution:

To respond effectively to an ever-changing environment, people need more than just a knowledge base, they also need techniques for exploring it, connecting it to other knowledge bases, and making practical use of it. In other words, the landscape upon which we used to stand has been transformed, and we are being forced to establish a new foundation called information literacy. Now knowledge—not minerals or agricultural products or manufactured goods—is this country's most precious commodity, and people who are information literate—who know how to acquire knowledge and use it—are America's most valuable resources.⁷

James Wilkinson saw an increasing need for resource-based education, which multiplies required resources and complicates access and evaluation. In

Wilkinson's view, students, in such an environment, had to learn skills for retrieval, evaluation, and use of the growing information and knowledge they must acquire and use in a research-centered learning environment.⁸ Hannelore Rader was of the opinion that librarians and teachers were jointly responsible for ensuring the acquisition of such skills.⁹

Common to the above observations, opinions, and arguments was an effort to improve higher education in an admittedly changing milieu of operation, and in preparation for a transformed workplace. Colleges and universities had to prepare students for a society in which information took center stage and the ability to navigate, retrieve, and use information effectively became central to educational, professional, and civic success. The question, as it emerged, was not of whether or not to prepare for an information age society, but rather of how best to do so.

To higher education and its students, to the faculty charged with the preparation of those students, and the administration responsible for providing the requisite conditions for that preparation, this 'how to' was and remains the essence of all deliberations on information literacy. Who ensures information literacy in higher education and how it is ensured is truly what all the debates are about.

"Who ensures information literacy in higher education and how it is ensured is truly what all the debates are about."

Academic libraries gained a lead role in those debates not just because they were the segment of academe preoccupied with the problem, but also because they were the campus department that from a professional predisposition and intellectual standpoint lived and operated on a terrain best suited for the initiation of steps necessary for achieving information literacy. Unfortunately, that was where the headaches began for the library and academia, for here was an educational mission that involved teaching and yet was naturally rooted in the structure, functions, and expertise found in academic libraries rather than within higher

education's accepted teaching segment, subject faculty.

The development was troubling for all constituents of the academic enterprise as academic libraries, seen predominantly and exclusively as providers of support services now appeared to be entering territory that had hitherto been the domain of subject faculty. This was infiltration by a group never really considered legitimate faculty members, not even when its members had that official status.¹⁰ The unease and dilemma for librarians, administrators, and conventional teaching faculty remains a hurdle to be overcome.

Yet, regardless of what the rest of higher education saw as the librarian's place in the educational enterprise, it was library associations, library affiliated institutions, and their advocates who brought information literacy to the attention of the nation. Librarians were the most familiar with the issues at stake. They were higher education's information brokers and experts. A greater part of the goals that information literacy sought were goals most at home on the library's turf. Librarians were the most prepared by virtue of their training, professional inclination, and commitment, to initiate the processes, supply the expertise, and define the framework within which those goals could be accomplished. They also appeared to be the ones most committed to that goal.

The academic library was thus the natural venue for designing solutions toward information literacy in the academic arena. But those solutions could only produce desired results if the library approached information literacy as a campus-wide necessity. With prevailing practices that left some students out and repetitively engaged others, the deficiency of existing systems of library instruction could not be sincerely denied. Any far-reaching solution had to be comprehensive and diversified. An integrated approach with a programmatic arrangement that avoided haphazard distributions of engagement and ensured an organized plan for engaging the entire student population at one time or the other of their college attendance could ensure that comprehensiveness and diversification. For academic libraries, accepting such a responsibility not only expresses an educational concern for the future of students and society, but also represents a recognition of the utilitarian foundations upon which the very *raison d'être* of

academic libraries may eventually be predicated.¹¹

ON THE RATIONALE AND NATURE OF A LIBRARY-SPECIFIC SOLUTION

To assert that the library needs a distinct approach coming out of its own institutional setting and depending primarily on its resources is not to reject the need for a holistic solution. Some writers have suggested a distinct separation of functions in information literacy education, insisting that librarians teach generic skills, while subject faculty teach subject-specific skills. Debbie Orr, Margaret Appleton, and Margie Wallin, relying on Christine Bruce's seven faces of information literacy,¹² concluded that information literacy had to be taught cooperatively between librarians and faculty.¹³ They did not however specify who should do what.

Ann Grafstein, on the other hand, argued that librarians should teach generic information literacy skills, while subject faculty imparted "IL [information literacy] skills that are embedded within the research paradigms and procedures of their disciplines."¹⁴

Grafstein's argument appears akin to shadow boxing. No proponent of information literacy ever imagined librarians teaching subject content and its implications or required that the business of higher education be renamed information literacy. Information literacy was a response to concrete developments. To address it outside the context of those developments and what it was designed to remedy does not do justice to the phenomenon. Although some may argue that librarians are not equipped to teach all that some ambitious, and occasionally overreaching, definitions of information literacy require, librarians can rightfully aspire to teach or facilitate information literacy within the context of the developments that brought to the attention of a nation the concept as a concern, a movement, and preoccupation.

Those developments were products of an information explosion. Therein emerged the imperatives to which information literacy education hoped to respond. To burden the discourse on achieving information literacy with theoretical considerations unrelated to the emergence and crystallization of the concept only succeeds in stifling movement toward its realization.

Furthermore, the demarcation between generic expertise and subject expertise is one that has always characterized con-

ventional bibliographic instruction.¹⁵ Most bibliographic instruction sessions have been in response to faculty requests and faculty have been principally interested in soliciting from librarians the bibliographic skills for finding and retrieving information.¹⁶ Interpretation and application remained within the purview of subject faculty. Therefore, the kind of distribution of roles Grafstein recommends offers nothing new in response to changing constellations. After all, whether faculty do a good job at what they do or not, teaching and helping students with subject content, empowering them with skills and know-how for analyzing and applying that content, as well as incorporating and synthesizing new content into existing bodies of knowledge is what faculty members have always done and continue to do. Librarians on the other hand have always been preoccupied with bibliographic skills. Addressing such an already existing distribution of responsibilities could not have been the principal mission of the information literacy movement.

What distinguishes information literacy as a more ambitious instructional engagement than conventional bibliographic instruction is its recognition and willingness to assert the need to go beyond teaching mainly retrieval skills, to addressing a more total research environment in the course of finding and using information/knowledge.¹⁷ Conventional bibliographic instruction devoted a great deal of time and energy to teaching the art and science of finding information and only occasionally veered into limited evaluations of the retrieved information. Information literacy education concedes the importance of retrieval as a starting point and all the skills and competencies required thereto. It seeks, however, to reach beyond that and place information itself into context by addressing social, economic, and legal as well as other concepts and issues related to such information.¹⁸

Information literacy education ventures into conceptual issues related to the very generation of information, the dynamics of its organization and processing and the implications of those processes for access, retrieval, and use. It aims at delving into issues of copyright, intellectual property, and plagiarism. Whereas bibliographic instruction provided a limited experience with the information universe, information litera-

cy seeks to traverse the full length and breadth of that universe as it relates to the process of acquiring and using its products for learning and research. Such concepts and issues evaded bibliographic instruction sessions perhaps exactly because of their limited time and scope. Information literacy, as a contemporary response to a contemporary problem, implies, therefore, a commitment to a new way of doing things.

Calling for a library-specific solution to information literacy education should be seen as an attempt to move the phenomenon from the status of debated uncertainty to a state in which practical experimentations allow practice to shape the continuing discourse rather than have information literacy unraveled in a choking barrage of theoretical fuzz, professional uncertainty, institutional passivity, and perceived departmental impotence. The aim is to assign to the academic library and its librarians duties and functions that flow from the very nature of the library's institutional makeup, as well as the training and expertise of its professionals.

Clearly, like any department on campus, the library has to contemplate its programs and solutions within the overall mission and objectives of the parent institution. There should be, however, sufficient focus on what the library, acting uniquely as a department, can do independently. No academic library should be reduced to having as its central concern and assumed responsibility the task of prescribing or deliberating what other departments on campus need to do. So, although the number of librarians in many academic libraries may at times appear insufficient to satisfy the learning needs of students, and librarians may feel occasionally overwhelmed by existing duties, such concerns should not be used to justify departmental capitulation.¹⁹ The academic library has the historical, intellectual, and institutional wherewithal to enrich the teaching-learning experience, and that potentiality, as Mary Biggs so passionately and eloquently declared, carries with it the obligation to teach.²⁰ Much depends, however, on academic librarians for such a commitment to be accepted by the academic library. Glenna Westwood's words should inspire as well as caution her colleagues: "If we as librarians question our place in the educational process, or our right to that place, how can others see us as having anything to offer?"²¹

THE ACADEMIC LIBRARIAN AS TEACHER: A TOUCHY ISSUE

To operate as a teaching department, the right of academic librarians to teach should be conceded and their credentials for that role acknowledged. However,

“To operate as a teaching department, the right of academic librarians to teach should be conceded and their credentials for that role acknowledged.”

although some writers do see and advocate a teaching role for the academic librarian,²² others wonder if the library should be involved in active teaching or have any direct instructional role. Tom Eadie's²³ opposition to the librarian's instructional role is well known. One of the bluntest rejections of the librarian's teaching function was however expressed some seventy-seven years before Eadie, when Lucy M. Salmon blatantly rejected the presence of librarians in the classroom. Salmon argued, “the good teacher must individualize the student, the good librarian must individualize the book.”²⁴ She insisted the nature of the college instructor's responsibilities did not permit separation of a subject's bibliography from the subject itself. Librarians could not be offered the task of teaching bibliographic skills.

J. T. Gerould and L. L. Goodrich, in response to Salmon, defended the librarian's teaching role. Gerould argued it was time for university libraries to “define their position as a distinct educational integer, not a mere adjunct to the academic departments.”²⁵ Goodrich insisted librarians were more familiar with the skills and content to be taught in bibliographic instruction than were their classroom counterparts.²⁶

The opinions expressed by Salmon, Gerould, and Goodrich still permeate the unending debate and dilemma over the extent, content, and legitimacy of the academic librarian's teaching role. *Academe* appears more confused than divided on the issue as accrediting bodies set standards without specific prescriptions for their achievement, administrators scramble to ensure that their institutions meet those standards, librarians ponder their mandate

but concede a lack of authority or resources to succeed with anything ambitious, and members of teaching faculty protect their exclusive right to teaching and the controlling influence of credit offering authority.²⁷ Perhaps things have not changed much since Ernest L. Boyer lamented *academe's* willingness to pursue the protection of departmental interests even when that pursuit was to the detriment of the more desirable goal of “shaping a coherent general education program.”²⁸

The dilemma regarding the academic librarian's right to teaching status persists even when academic departments concede the lack of expertise to teach library research skills.²⁹ The library literature is inundated with observations of subject faculty's lack of acceptance of the legitimacy of the librarian's teaching role³⁰ and unwillingness to welcome librarians into the classrooms. Gresham Riley, President of Colorado College, conceded that most members of teaching faculty were “not predisposed as scholars to recognize” or “acknowledge a legitimate educational role for the library and librarians.”³¹ That is unfortunate, for most academic librarians are members of a profession that requires at a very minimum two masters degrees, the second masters being in a subject specialty other than librarianship.

William K. Stephenson,³² Professor Emeritus of Biology at Earlham College, believed that the constraints of time were to blame, since “most college and university faculty members are very subject matter- and discipline-oriented. They likely view library instruction, even in their areas of expertise, as an intrusion into and displacement of time spent on their favorite topics.”

Such observations hint at the task librarians, *academe*, and its administrators face as they seek consensus on what the expectations should be for information literacy. They illuminate obstacles in the way of implementing programs that can foster more efficient and exhaustive information literacy education. They may also be partially responsible for a frequent but tacit and rarely verbalized feeling of inadequacy on the part of academic librarians who see themselves operating in environments populated by ceaseless phantasms of opposition, which, specifically identified and confronted or not, can become stifling obstacles to potential achievements.³³

Yet, whatever the environment may be and whatever biases may exist in higher

education, there remains a need for an approach in the discourse on information literacy that places the academic library and its librarians at the center of its focus. What librarians mean by information literacy need not be different from what other segments of the academic community understand by the concept. Library solutions should, however, emanate from and take shape within the departmental confines of the library, with an awareness of Loanne Snaveley and Natasha Cooper's recommendation that when librarians use the term information literacy they do so with a clear thought about “the unique contribution of the library to learning.”³⁴

Furthermore, they should do so aware and accepting of what Snaveley and Cooper rightfully perceived as the role and significance of such activities in the educational enterprise: “Librarians implementing information literacy programs will, indeed, be promoting learning, and they will be making a specific contribution to the learning process, one which complements other parts of the learning process occurring in classrooms, learning halls and other parts of an academic institution.”³⁵ But the academic library, in its instructional capacity, should not only complement learning “occurring in classrooms.” It must become part of the classroom itself. Within the academic library's institutional structure and intellectual confines lies the ability to contribute toward the graduation of individuals conversant with a fundamental demand of an information society: the ability to access, evaluate, and use information/knowledge.³⁶

As the academic library aspires to assumption of a more active teaching role, expediency dictates that the library be aware of, and sensitive to, the importance of the different stakeholders in academia. Among those stakeholders, relationship between librarians and teaching faculty appears the most critical,³⁷ although it still is a truism that nothing thrives in *academe* without the blessing and encouragement of the administration.

THE COLLABORATIVE PRECEDENCE AND IMPERATIVE: LIBRARIANS, TEACHING FACULTY, AND INFORMATION LITERACY

A History of Collaboration and Tensions

There is a long history of collaboration between teaching faculty and academic

librarians in the United States.³⁸ Although the attribution may be anecdotal and factually suspect,³⁹ Ralph Waldo Emerson is credited with being the first to suggest the importance of the librarian's educational role in the academic enterprise.⁴⁰ The bestowing of that honor on a man Haynes McMullen described as consistent in his portrayal of libraries and librarians as symbols of conservatism⁴¹ appears to owe its justification to Emerson's assertion of a need for colleges to appoint a "professor of books" to support a liberal education: "colleges, whilst they provide us with libraries, furnish no professor of books; and I think no chair is so much wanted."⁴²

Emerson may have gotten his wish, for as Frances L. Hopkins relates, most of the earliest academic librarians "were professors, responsible part-time for the library."⁴³ Harvard's Justin Winsor became one of the first to act in a capacity of full-time librarian with his 1877 appointment as professor of bibliography. He too was a respected scholar. According to Hopkins, the presence of scholar librarians in academic libraries continued until increase in number of universities, changes in the curriculum, and the emergence of graduate education resulted in Melvil Dewey's establishment of the School of Library Economy at Columbia in 1877. "There is no doubt that Dewey's good intentions depressed the profession as a whole," Hopkins lamented.⁴⁴

Redemption was however to arrive for the instructional librarian as the developments of the 1920s and 1930s thrust the academic librarian back into the instructional role the developments toward the close of the 19th century had forced librarians to essentially abort. The new and inducing condition was a realization in that period that the sprawling undergraduate numbers that the revolutionary increase in colleges and admissions had spurred, contained students who were often ill prepared for independent study. Librarians and subject faculty had to collaborate to improve the student's research abilities. The aim was to move the student from the classroom to the library.⁴⁵ The result was the beginning of course-related/course-integrated instruction.

Thus unfolded a history of unified status and aspiration flowing into one of collaboration with a common purpose, which through numerous ups and downs survived to the current time. In the beginning, librarians were recognized educa-

tors, operating side by side with subject faculty, while subject faculty performed

**"In the beginning,
librarians were recognized
educators, operating side
by side with subject
faculty, . . ."**

occasionally such librarian duties as the teaching of the history of books, library organization, and bibliography. Although the quest for more librarians might have forced Dewey to initiate a trend that would put an eventual end to this hybrid but creative solution, the collaboration between academic librarians and subject faculty remained one that neither academic library nor subject faculty could truly afford to sacrifice.⁴⁶

Edward Owusu-Ansah saw a utilitarian motive and justification for that collaboration.⁴⁷ James Wilkinson thought that current changes in higher education and demands of parents, alumni, and students for an undergraduate education focused on the learner and emphasizing research made such collaboration necessary.⁴⁸ Howard L. Simmons concluded, "programs to improve the teaching and learning process in colleges and universities should include an appropriate emphasis on information literacy and other resource-based learning strategies."⁴⁹ Simmons, however, cautioned: "the task of convincing CHE [Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools] that information literacy is important to the improvement of the teaching and learning process was a relatively easy feat compared to the task of convincing faculty and administrators."⁵⁰

Larry Hardesty believed an entrenched faculty culture, that militated against the sharing of classroom time and space, was responsible for faculty's lack of support for bibliographic instruction.⁵¹ Gloria Leckie and Anne Fullerton placed emphasis for the divergence of interests on the differing pedagogical discourses of librarians and classroom faculty.⁵² Hardesty, Leckie, and Fullerton all agreed, however, on the indispensability of faculty to the success of the academic library's instructional aspirations. Evan Farber, who Hardesty described as "the most successful proponent of bibliographic in-

struction"⁵³ and "one of the most respected and influential contemporary librarians,"⁵⁴ shared this view of indispensability of subject faculty, notwithstanding Farber's awareness of faculty resistance to bibliographic instruction.⁵⁵

Diverging Duties, Converging Interests

The information age argument for incorporating information literacy skills into the curriculum was made most forcefully by the ALA when it acknowledged the critical importance of information in all areas of life and contemporary civilization. The association posited that knowledge, of which information is a critical and determinant component,⁵⁶ had become America's most valuable commodity, making those who were information literate the nation's "most valuable resource."⁵⁷ That observation recognized the growing proliferation of records containing that information/knowledge.⁵⁸ The size and rate of growth of those records complicated their navigation, retrieval, and use.⁵⁹ Today's teachers had to provide tomorrow's graduates skills and concepts necessary for that navigation, retrieval, and use.

Committing to teaching students to find, evaluate, and use information and knowledge in a dynamically evolving information/knowledge universe required an integration of the librarian's qualifications into the requirements of the curriculum. Support of faculty, the preeminent arbiter of curriculum content, was indispensable if that integration was to be successful. The scenario provided the strongest case yet for faculty-library collaboration.

Higher education was now presented with a scenario in which subject experts were charged with the responsibility of training future experts as competent in the retrieval, evaluation, and use of information as they were conversant with the subject matter of their respective disciplines. Left solely to subject faculty, the concrete steps involved in the realization of such expectations in higher education presented a formidable task. The academic librarian's participation became indispensable. Limiting the library to the passive functions of collecting, processing, storing, and occasionally and sporadically aiding faculty and students with the retrieval of information was no longer tenable.⁶⁰ Academe had to concede Glenna Westwood's claim that "there is no one in an academic institution more qualified to teach students information literacy than a librarian."⁶¹ Westwood's supporting argument was a poignant one: "It made sense to

me that if . . . chemists teach students how to identify, use, and critically evaluate the use of chemicals, so . . . librarians teach students how to identify, use, and critically evaluate the use of information."⁶²

The Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools therefore expressed an appropriate and timely view when it saw the need for librarians to play an important role in the information literacy endeavors of higher education.⁶³ Although the commission provided no roadmap for doing so,⁶⁴ the assertion of the need for the academic library's direct participation in the education of students forced many libraries to reevaluate and address their place in the educational process. Historical precedence, professional predisposition, and institutional pragmatism suggest that the focus should be on improving aspects of the student's research abilities. Mark Jacob provided a useful operational description of the research process as it may be understood in that undertaking, when he identified it as "the selection and refinement of a topic, the search for information, the formulation of a focus, the collection of information, the evaluation of information sources, and the presentation of the results."⁶⁵

In all the enumerated stages of Jacob's definition, the academic library could provide training consistent with its expertise. Herein lay the full wisdom of Kevin Guinagh's words: "The faculty needs the library and the library needs the support of the faculty: whatever can be done to warm up this relationship will greatly improve the general vitality of the college."⁶⁶

INSTRUCTIONAL PREFERENCES AND THE STATE OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION: OVERVIEW

To assert the need for a more active educational role for the academic library requires an overview of current and past instructional preferences and practices. The overview, in addition to facilitating understanding of antecedents to current practices, provides a context for exploring options and issues the academic library may have to contend with as it proceeds with the forging and design of a new instructional agenda and program.

It took over a century after its emergence for the first detailed surveys of library instruction in higher educational institutions in the United States to be conducted. Among the earliest attempts were two studies reported in 1973. The ACRL Committee on Bibliographic In-

struction conducted the first of these studies,⁶⁷ the second was by Mary Butterfield of Project LOEX (Library Orientation Exchange).⁶⁸ Dennis Robison, one of the librarians involved in the 1973 ACRL survey, reported that thirty-four of the responding institutions offered a formal course "teaching bibliographic instruction or library use."⁶⁹ That accounted for 19.5 percent of the total of 174 respondents.⁷⁰ According to figures provided by Hannalore Rader, also a participant in the 1973 ACRL survey, course-related bibliographic instruction was the most popular choice of reporting libraries.⁷¹

Butterfield's study revealed that all LOEX members offered basic instruction in library use.⁷² Classroom lectures (bibliographic instruction sessions) were offered by 73 percent of the libraries responding to the survey, while 22 percent had a separate credit course.⁷³ Carolyn Kirkendall's findings largely confirmed trends reported by Butterfield, although Kirkendall observed the percentage of libraries offering separate credit courses had increased from 22 percent in 1973 to 42 percent in 1979.⁷⁴

When Teresa Mensching reported the results of her survey in 1989, popularity of credit courses had dropped from the level they enjoyed in 1979, while bibliographic instruction still remained the most prevalent choice.⁷⁵ Credit courses were down from Kirkendall's 42 percent to 29 percent, and although Mensching conceded it was difficult to compare bibliographic instruction figures for the two studies, she still found enough evidence to support the claim of an increase in the number of libraries offering bibliographic instruction. Linda Shirato and Joseph Badics reaffirmed in 1997 most of Mensching's findings.⁷⁶

The continued surge of course-related/course-integrated instruction, and decline of credit course offerings may be no coincidence. The period of the 1970s was an

"The continued surge of course-related/course-integrated instruction, and decline of credit course offerings may be no coincidence."

active one for bibliographic instruction, seen predominantly as a course-related or

-integrated activity, while many independent library course offerings not only saw poor enrollment but, were often seen as "too time consuming to prepare with a limited budget and personnel."⁷⁷ It would be difficult to imagine the continued popularity of a method plagued with such problems in the face of the enthusiasm for bibliographic instruction expressed by such acknowledged practitioners as Evan Ira Farber.

The indefatigable and pragmatic Farber established at Earlham College an instructional effort that earned national recognition.⁷⁸ Whatever the reason may be that perpetuated bibliographic instruction as a leading instructional preference in academic libraries, the concrete development of the distribution of preferences could not be independent of the leading practitioners of the field. As Ernest L. Boyer⁷⁹ prepared his report, and Farber aimed at gaining a place in the report for the academic library, Farber's preference was clearly in favor of bibliographic instruction.⁸⁰ His reasoning behind the rejection of an independent course revealed, however, a casual dismissal of the merits of a credit course, and insistence on political expediency regarding what academic libraries should attempt:

Learning how to use the library does not really impress most students until they need it for a particular course or a particular assignment. . . . There is another real disadvantage—a realpolitik disadvantage, if you will—with a required separate course. If it is built into the curriculum, it is politically vulnerable.⁸¹

The influence of Farber's inclination on Boyer's work and later efforts by accreditation bodies such as the Middle States Commission on Higher Education can only be surmised from their pronouncements on the role of the academic library. Espousing the importance of the library to the undergraduate experience, Boyer proclaimed: "Students should be given bibliographic instruction and be encouraged to spend at least as much time in the library—using its wide range of resources—as they spend in classes."⁸² The Middle States Commission on Higher Education echoed that sentiment: "the centrality of a library/learning center in the educational mission of an institution deserves more than rhetoric and must be supported by more than

lip service. An active and continuous program of bibliographic instruction is essential to realize this goal."⁸³ It was obvious that Farber's leanings toward conventional bibliographic instruction had prevailed.

Yet the complaints about time constraints by those who teach such bibliographic instruction sessions, and the desire of information literacy advocates to expand the scope of instruction to include more than learning tools and specific resources, remain convincing. One cannot but reflect on Robert Hauptman's frustration as he bemoaned the ineffectiveness of bibliographic instruction and detected the unwillingness of librarians and administrators to seek "different and more effective solutions" due to political considerations.⁸⁴ Hauptman concluded: "Once a process or system is in place, once it has been sanctioned by years of practice regardless of value, it is extremely difficult to make drastic changes; so it is with bibliographic instruction."⁸⁵

In a survey of faculty, students, and library staff attitudes toward various instructional methods for teaching library and research skills, Jeanne R. Davidson observed that although student preference for credit courses was weak, 72 percent of the surveyed students were nonetheless willing to consider taking such a course to learn library research skills.⁸⁶ Librarians perceived a credit course as a viable option for teaching such skills. Davidson concluded: "...credit-bearing courses do provide an important method for teaching library and research skills ... a strong instructional program should provide this opportunity."⁸⁷ Kimberley M. Donnelly believed the availability of a credit course "demonstrates the campus commitment to information literacy" and "can change the way students perceive the library."⁸⁸ Mignon Adams and Jacquelyn Morris pointed out: "Giving academic credit is the way in which higher education legitimizes learning; the way by which students are told that certain skills and knowledge are important."⁸⁹

Bibliographic instruction still prevails, however, bolstered perhaps by sheer practice and the daunting prospect of the library taking on more expanded teaching roles. This remains the case even as many academic librarians concede that the material they need to cover cannot be done within the constraints afforded by an instructional format that permits a total of only one or two total contact hours with

students.⁹⁰ Larry Hardesty, on the other hand, pointed out that teaching faculty complain about the insufficiency of time for subject coverage even without the librarian asking for time to teach bibliographic skills.⁹¹ Craig E. Nelson attempted an explanation of that faculty attitude:

When I introduce faculty to various approaches to fostering critical thinking in their classes, many still initially fear that teaching critical thinking will mean that they have to teach less content. There is, of course, a sense in which these faculty are right. If one measures teaching by what the teacher presents or 'covers,' then time spent on anything except lecturing on content is, by definition, a reduction in coverage.⁹²

If faculty members are unwilling to give up time and may even be right in doing so, then how can librarians justifiably be required to persistently ask these faculty members for more time to be devoted within their courses to sessions taught by librarians? Such is the contradiction and vicious entrapment those who advocate more elaborate and effective instruction on the part of the librarian but would not concede the need for an independent course find themselves in.

A decade ago, Theresa Wesley⁹³ asked what "teacher-librarians" should teach. For Wesley, simply teaching mechanical skills for information retrieval was inadequate. Wesley suggested more attention should be given to "the analysis of information needed, tangent material discovered, and the necessary evaluation of the information sources found."⁹⁴ To these, the current deliberations on information literacy have added use, presentation, and legal and ethical dimensions. It would appear difficult to conceive of all these being done within the time allotted by faculty to librarians.

ON THE CONTENT AND NEED FOR EXTENDED TIME AND LATITUDE

Teaching librarians need more time and latitude to develop appropriate content, instruct, solicit feedback, respond and engage students in an active learning process aimed at improving and fortifying their information literacy. Any instructional librarian who has ever had a class of students for an hour or two session will concede they wished they had them a little longer. How much longer would be enough to achieve all that is desired, or at least a reasonable portion thereof? How much time is nec-

essary for students to acquire skills and knowledge needed to determine exactly what kind and amount of information is needed, how to isolate the key terms for their bibliographic searches, as well as the useful and effective combinations of those terms for effective retrieval? How much time do they need to develop good strategies for locating appropriate resources, evaluating their retrievals, and possibly modifying their search strategies? How much time is further needed for indulging in issues relating to the use of information, the legal and ethical issues involved therein?

How much time must librarians and students spend together as the former attempt to help the latter learn the technicalities of how to present the information they have, how to construct the structure of the paper, and the formal requirements of citations? Then, after these are accomplished, how much time would be necessary for the practice and reinforcement of what was learned? Can it be realistically hoped that all these can be done within an hour, two or three hours, even four? The answer appears to be a definitive no. The need for more time, control, and engagement to properly initiate students on the road to the desired destination of information literacy is evident. Rosemary M. Young and

"The need for more time, control, and engagement to properly initiate students on the road to the desired destination of information literacy is evident."

Stephena Harmony suggested that credit courses offer opportunities that the limiting constraints of standard one-shot bibliographic instruction sessions do not.⁹⁵ Like Deborah Fink,⁹⁶ Young and Harmony argued that credit courses have the advantage of providing "social context as a conceptual framework for instruction."⁹⁷ This potential, Young and Harmony contended, places information literacy within the academic mainstream by expanding its scope beyond merely teaching skill sets.

The desire and need to go beyond teaching skills and processes, to addressing broader concepts with social, ethical, economic, and legal considerations as

they relate to information and knowledge transfer, acquisition, and use are indeed expressed, or at the very least alluded to, in many credit courses offered by academic libraries.⁹⁸ Such expanded content offers credence to Tom Gilson's observation that preparing students for a complex information environment cannot be realistically done within reference encounters at the reference desk or through the current framework of bibliographic instruction.⁹⁹ Gilson concluded: "It is only in the expanded format of a library credit course that justice can be done to this expanded vision of information literacy."¹⁰⁰

That surveys of library practices show a persisting popularity of course-related/course-integrated bibliographic instruction does not change the reality that what can be offered in a one- or two-hour session is far less than what the changing constellations of a new information universe demands, and an effective information literacy program requires. The findings of Donald A. Barclay and Darcie Reimann Barclay are therefore not surprising:

As for the extended BI course, there is no doubt that such courses have the potential to provide more in-depth instruction than can be given in a one-shot instruction session. The desirability of such courses became evident when a number of respondents commented that they would like to offer a BI course (preferably a required course) but lacked the resources and/or administrative support to do so... This suggests that relatively few institutions have both the resources and the desire to offer BI courses regardless of the potential benefits.¹⁰¹

Academic librarians may have to avoid insistence on popular solutions driven by inadequacy of resources and lack of political capital and move toward defense of solutions necessitated by evolving realities, if any significant inroads are to be made by librarians in the information literacy arena.

INFORMATION LITERACY: THE STRUCTURE AND COMPONENTS OF A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM

When librarians like Lori Arp¹⁰² ask if information literacy instruction and bibliographic instruction are not really the same activity, they actually remind everyone that instruction of users by librarians is not a new concept, even if the name under which it is done and the specific scope and content may be occa-

sionally different.¹⁰³ Peter Herson¹⁰⁴ found evidence of library instruction in as early as the 1820s. Mary F. Salony¹⁰⁵ claimed that the practice gained ground after the Civil War. As it developed, the phenomenon assumed different names.¹⁰⁶ Information literacy advocates therefore have a rich history to fall back upon. What now constitutes renewed focus is a difference in scope, a shift from teaching predominantly tools to a greater emphasis on concepts and transferable skills. Most bibliographic instruction encounters, for all their popularity, were and continue to be largely instruments for teaching skills for retrieval. Mostly given upon the request of faculty, they are usually offered as immediate point-of-need instruction.

This concentration on immediate point-of-need usually dictates a contextual pertinence that provides immediate gratification, but denies students the chance to engage or master broader concepts. That is why a new approach is needed toward implementing information literacy. However, the new initiatives that a comprehensive information literacy program needs will still have to build on the lessons of the past, even as it addresses developments in the present. Nothing with such a rich history as information literacy can pretend to require totally new beginnings. The crux remains user instruction, but no longer library user instruction. It is now information user instruction, with all the implications and expectations that the information literacy movement has come to propagate and stand for.

On the Structure of a Comprehensive Information Literacy Program

That any successful information literacy program emanating from an academic library must identify what librarians can and must do on their own, as well as what faculty and librarians can and must do together is an observation dictated by pragmatic considerations. The unwillingness of teaching faculty to give up classroom space and time is documented. Yet the continued triumph of conventional bibliographic instruction suggests a concession on the part of faculty of the need to involve librarians in the process of providing students knowledge and skills librarians are more familiar with.

Librarians, on the other hand, concede that the changed constellations of the current information universe, with its growing resources and complexity,

requires increased awareness and conceptual understanding that cannot be covered within the limited structure and time of prevailing bibliographic instruction formats. All these realizations call for a modified approach in the implementation of the broader concept of information literacy. This article takes an approach to information literacy instruction that involves different methods and phases, coordinated within a structure with an ultimate objective.

The realities of the current situation suggest that a continued presence of bibliographic instruction practices should not and need not be abandoned. More effective and coordinated procedures have to be however instituted to ensure maximum results. In the end, as Tom Gilson argued,¹⁰⁷ no real justice can be done to a true quest for students' information literacy without the introduction of a credit course. To that end, the academic library will have to be elevated to the status of an academic teaching department, a future that some find both necessary¹⁰⁸ and pragmatically expedient.¹⁰⁹ Regardless however of whether there be such a department or not, the library should offer an independent credit course in information literacy, one that offers in-depth engagement with issues inherent in and skills attendant to information literacy. Ideally, this course will become part of the general education curriculum, and a prerequisite for graduation.

"...the library should offer an independent credit course in information literacy, one that offers in-depth engagement with issues inherent in and skills attendant to information literacy. Ideally, this course will become part of the general education curriculum, and a prerequisite for graduation."

The arguments for such a solution are overwhelming and have been reiterated within discussions and debates that have established and convinced librarians and other stakeholders in higher education of

the necessity of information literacy. The attributes/skills/experiences to be developed therein and necessary thereto have been identified and articulated by a number of leading writers on the topic.¹¹⁰ What is needed now is an appropriate program with an identifiable structure for attaining student information literacy. Kimberley Donnelly reinforced that by acknowledging "the need for colleges and universities everywhere to establish a concrete structure for teaching information literacy."¹¹¹

In the search for such a structure, Deborah Grimes' remarks become as true as ever. "We can distinguish ourselves as librarians and faculty members by advocating and building strong linkages between the classroom and the academic library," Grimes wrote.¹¹² Those linkages can be achieved through an arrangement that institutionalizes information literacy as a necessary and integral part of undergraduate education. A combination of mandated and optional course-related/course-integrated solutions running concurrently with a credit course to be eventually mandated as a graduation requirement can provide such an arrangement.

On the Components

None of the components of the structured approach suggested here is unknown in existing instructional practices of academic librarians. Cheryl LaGuardia and her co-authors¹¹³ demonstrated the diversity of the library's instructional approaches by listing ten distinct instructional methods. They included course-related and course-integrated instruction, and credit-bearing course. Keith Gresham¹¹⁴ also noted the use of various instructional methods by academic libraries, such as "course-related and course-integrated instruction, workshops, seminars, individualized instruction, and printed and electronic tutorials," as well as credit courses. Providing an information literacy solution that incorporates one or more of these methods is therefore not a novel idea. What is however different about the approach taken in this article is its use of such existing methods to construct a comprehensive and total program, centered in the library, and with the full and complete academic ambitions of a teaching department.

In view of the ambitions and convictions that embolden such an approach, only instructional methods that have shown relative success are incorporated

into the structured solution. For all their popularity, many librarians concede the ineffectiveness of the library tour.¹¹⁵ The brevity of encounters heavily compromise the individualized instruction that reference desk interactions have the potential to provide. Drop-in workshops are an unpredictable vehicle for ensuring that students acquire crucial skills, precisely because of their voluntary nature. That same voluntarism compromises the impact of print and online tutorials. Course-related and course-integrated instruction, the two popular methods for bibliographic instruction, and independent credit courses remain the most viable vehicles for delivering information literacy instruction.

Ideally, a required credit course at the early stages of undergraduate education would provide the most appropriate method for developing student information literacy.¹¹⁶ However, because the development and entrenchment of such a course requires some time and effort and the conditions for implementation may not be readily available at many institutions, an interim arrangement may be inevitable. This article suggests continuing and expanding the two dominant bibliographic instruction methods as an interim measure to take advantage of existing acceptance of the librarian's participation in teaching. They will, however, be coordinated on two levels, serving two distinct purposes, as two components of a comprehensive information literacy program. The first level/component will have such instruction mandated within a general educational requirement. The second will guarantee continuation of existing supply-on-demand bibliographic instruction offerings.

Such an approach remedies a chronic malady of most bibliographic instruction endeavors. The lack of well-articulated objectives and limitations of the academic library perpetuated a situation in which some students took multiple hours of identical sessions, while others graduated without attending a single library session. By instituting mandatory segments of information literacy spearheaded and taught by librarians, first within basic courses that every undergraduate must take and early in their university careers, such as, but not limited to, English composition/writing courses,¹¹⁷ a chance is given to all students to have a first introduction to the basic skills and concepts of information literacy.¹¹⁸

The supply-on-demand option offers an opportunity to provide students in a specific subject field information literacy instruction tailored to the needs of experts, and addressing concerns of researchers in that field. This offers invaluable fortification of research abilities as students advance in their studies. Since subject faculty in the various departments and disciplines request these sessions, their convening will be exclusively within the discretion of those instructors, although librarians may initiate contacts to solicit requests for instruction.

Concurrent with the above two arrangements, availability of an elective credit course, as a third component of the comprehensive program, would provide more elaborate and complete training in information literacy, and provide an avenue for fully developing the structure and content of an eventual required course. The offering of a required course at the lower levels of undergraduate study would constitute the final component/phase of the program. The course would have the expressed intent of eventually eliminating the need for the mandated course-related/course-integrated bibliographic instruction component of the program. Continued offering of an elective course could serve students who desire more in-depth study of information literacy skills, knowledge, and concepts, but are beyond the stage at which the newly required credit course is offered. With time, the elective can be phased out, as successive classes of upcoming students have the opportunity to take the initial required course, and older generations of students graduate. In the end, only two of the four components discussed would remain: the supply-on-demand bibliographic instructional component and the required credit course.

This gradual but ultimately complete integration of information literacy instruction into the general education curriculum is consistent with Eric Plotnick's conviction that "inclusion of information competencies as a graduation requirement is the key that will fully integrate information literacy into the curricula of academic institutions."¹¹⁹ The continuance of subject-oriented bibliographic instruction (course related and course integrated) would provide ongoing opportunities for students to reinforce and fortify skills and knowledge they need to apply continuously and repeatedly throughout their college experience and beyond. It would also offer a tested avenue for collaboration between librarians and subject faculty, as

both engage students in a resource-based educational paradigm that enriches the educational experience and facilitates life-long learning.

At the heart of such a program is a desire to reach as broad a student population as possible, at the early stages of

“At the heart of such a program is a desire to reach as broad a student population as possible, . . .”

college life. Such a desire is dictated by the recognition that information literacy skills are not only vital to effective research and improved on-the-job success of the educated professional, but also fundamental to the creation of the competent student.¹²⁰

The ALA underscored that point when it posited the need in education for a new learning model that recognizes “teaching facts is a poor substitute for teaching people how to learn.”¹²¹

Ensuring that every student becomes information literate should be an expressed goal of every academic library. Virtually all the accrediting standards for higher education in the United States recognize and advocate the significance of information literacy.¹²² But no significant gains can be made, given the magnitude of the task, without overall institutional support and administrative commitment. Elizabeth Hutchins, Barbara Fister, and Kris MacPherson¹²³ acknowledged, “support by the administration is integral to the success of any information literacy program.”

The academic library must however continue to make the case for active and greater participation in the educational enterprise within which it operates. Given the importance of information literacy and the role academic librarians can play in ensuring it, Stanley H. Benson’s observation is indeed saddening. “While library services have grown and improved in many ways, little progress has been made toward a genuine integration of the library and the classroom,” Benson wrote.¹²⁴ Some may disagree.¹²⁵ Yet librarians, despite talk of progress made, cannot but concede that their instructional activities are still not an integral part of the student’s educational experience.¹²⁶

The academic library shares some of the responsibility for that bleak result. Many programs and methods have been

lacking in ambition. Insufficient personnel and/or funds have too often been cited to justify limited action, instead of attempting the most that existing conditions may still allow. Deborah Grimes¹²⁷ also questioned the librarian’s preparation for classroom instruction and faulted library schools for not teaching their students how to teach. It would be hard to refute, however, that the same concerns could be raised for subject faculty as well. Not much preparation for teaching actually takes place outside education departments. The pedagogical insights of the average faculty member are learned on the job, as results of progress forged through failures, successes, feedbacks, and adjustments. In this regard, teaching librarians will be no different from other faculty, nor will they be at any distinct disadvantage.

CONCLUSION

From the vision of the teacher-librarian that Emerson allegedly emboldened to the librarian-teacher at the core of current approaches, the academic librarian has, for the greater part of the existence of that breed within academe, been primarily concerned with educating students. From reference encounters to library tours, single-session engagements within general educational requirements, or specialized instruction for specific disciplines, the goal has been to impart skills and knowledge that enrich and empower students in their learning and research engagements.

Thus, even as librarians debated their teaching role and wondered in that process what to call what they did, all the descriptive captions they provided (library instruction, bibliographic instruction, and now information literacy), essentially addressed and continue to address a single concern. That concern was and still is access to and use of information and knowledge, two social utilities, whose transfer and engagement is the core mission of all education. Those who lead the interactions facilitating that transfer and moderate the engagements that shape the beneficiaries of the process have been called teachers and educators. Those who are primarily at the receiving end have been named pupils and students. In this light, librarians have always been teachers and educators, regardless of what others thought of them or what they thought of themselves.

However, defending the librarian’s teaching role and status often evokes concern and unease. The academic as well

as administrative environment of higher education has not made it easy on the librarian. As Richard Kaplan and Julia Whelan¹²⁸ put it, “librarians have struggled with their role as educators in academia and with efforts to gain acceptance from faculty and entrance into the classroom.” But if a profession was to be handcuffed by the institutional discomforts confronting it and the traditional lack of influence it thought necessary for implementing what it desired from a professional standpoint and the personal philosophy of its practitioners, then that would be a profession awaiting the guillotine of social condemnation. It would be an attempt at political suicide to see a chance to exist and an action that one’s existence dictated and yet shy away from it for fear of the magnitude of the challenges or intensity of the resistance that might emerge.

Librarians, always teaching, whether at the reference desk or in formal classroom settings, must accept formally their teaching role and engage actively in it, not sporadically, but as a generally accepted mandate of the profession and of the academic library in academe. Information literacy is the current matrix within which the need for such a change is dictated; social pragmatism is the enforcer that demands the shift. What has been provided in this article is a background and one concerned individual’s attempt at a solution. Hopefully, future efforts will be directed toward polishing the solution, as academic librarians explore ways of developing campus-wide information literacy programs, with their libraries at the core. Hopefully, they will recognize and accept Helen Rippier Wheeler’s¹²⁹ argument that “what relates to the condition of collegiate education is not merely a pleasant, busy-work experience in the use of one library, but a respectable, academic, credit course that provides instruction in use of subject information, all media forms of publication, and libraries, on both local and principles basis, for research.”

In the end, and for its own good, the profession will have to bow to the wisdom of the concession that social institutions must not only submit to the dictates of the social good; they must also resist the temptation to assume that anything good, or even their own survival, can be achieved or maintained without requisite work, sacrifice, commitment, and a lot of daring.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. According to Thomas Kirk, "many librarians and others involved in higher education now view the development of information literacy skills as an essential element of a liberal arts education." See Thomas Kirk Jr., "Information Literacy: New Buzzword or New Library Service?" *Library Issues* 21 (July 2001). Jeremy Shapiro and Shelley Hughes called information literacy a new liberal art, "as essential to the mental framework of the educated information-age citizen as the trivium of basic liberal arts (grammar, logic and rhetoric) was to the educated person in medieval society." See Jeremy J. Hughes & Shelley K. Hughes, "Information Technology as a Liberal Art," *Educom Review* 31 (March/April 1996): 31-35.
2. Patricia Senn Breivik, *Planning the Library Instruction Program* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1982), p. 7.
3. See Edward K. Owusu-Ansah, "Information Literacy and the Academic Library: A Critical Look at a Concept and the Controversies Surrounding It," *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 29 (July 2003): 219-230.
4. Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Eligibility Requirements and Standards for Accreditation* (Philadelphia, PA: Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 1994), p. 15.
5. Middle States Commission on Higher Education, *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Standards for Accreditation* (Philadelphia, PA: Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 2002), p. 38.
6. Paul G. Zurkowski, *The Information Service Environment: Relationships and Priorities* (Washington, DC: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1974), p. 27.
7. American Library Association Presidential Committee on Information Literacy, *Final Report* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1989), p. 14.
8. See James Wilkinson, "From Transmission to Research: Librarians at the Heart of the Campus," *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 6 (2) (2000): 25-40.
9. Hannelore B. Rader, "From Library Orientation to Information Literacy: 20 Years of Hard Work," in *What is Good Instruction Now? Library Instruction for the 90s*, edited by Linda Shirato (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Pierian Press, 1993), pp. 25-28.
10. Pauline Wilson even suggested that librarians' claim to faculty status had no factual or institutional basis. See Pauline Wilson, "Librarians as Teachers: The Study of an Organization Fiction," *Library Quarterly* 49 (1979): 146-162.
11. Bill Crowley predicted a future in which the only way academic libraries could retain their presence and usefulness in higher education was to be transformed "into something resembling the campus teaching department." See Bill Crowley, "Tacit Knowledge, Tacit Ignorance, and the Future of Academic Librarianship," *College and Research Libraries* 62 (November 2001): 565-584.
12. For Christine Bruce's original work see C. S. Bruce, *Seven Faces of Information Literacy* (Adelaide, Australia: Auslib Press, 1997).
13. Debbie Orr, Margaret Appleton, & Margie Wallin, "Information Literacy and Flexible Delivery: Creating a Conceptual Framework and Model," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 27 (November 2001): 457-463.
14. Ann Grafstein, "A Discipline-Based Approach to Information Literacy," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 28 (July 2002): 197-204.
15. The term bibliographic instruction has often been used interchangeably with library instruction and information literacy. However, its use in this article will be limited to its more widespread application, to identify course-related and course-integrated instruction provided by the academic library, regardless of whether those courses are components of a major or general educational requirement.
16. It is in this light that Evan Farber distinguished between teacher and librarian objectives, "the teacher's objective being those that help students attain a better understanding of the course's subject matter, and the librarian's objectives being those that enhance the student's ability to find and evaluate information." See Evan Farber, "Faculty-Librarian Cooperation: A Personal Retrospective," *Reference Services Review* 27 (1999): 229-234.
17. This is essentially what Carol Kuhlthau alluded to when she wrote: "Information skills are much broader than library skills. Where library skills center on the location of sources, information skills encompass use of sources and interpretation and application of information within sources. Where library skills center on how to use a library, information skills encompass the underlying concepts and patterns in the organization of knowledge." See Carol C. Kuhlthau, "The Instructional Role of the Library Media Specialist in the Information-Age School," in *Information for a New Age: Redefining the Librarian*, comp. Fifteenth Anniversary Task Force, Library Instruction Round Table, American Library Association (Englewood, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1995).
18. Esther S. Grassian & Joan R. Kaplowitz believed information literacy instruction required moving beyond mechanics to concepts. They argued that librarians who insist on mechanics in their instructional sessions shouldn't claim to be providing information literacy instruction. See Esther S. Grassian & Joan R. Kaplowitz, *Information Literacy Instruction: Theory and Practice* (New York: Neal-Schuman, 2001), pp. 9-10.
19. Peter Hernon noted many of these concerns in 1982, which still reverberate in the current literature: "Some librarians suggested that such practical barriers as limited staff, heavy work loads, large institutional enrollments, and a crowded curriculum kept many libraries from offering more than occasional lectures or tours. Effective instruction was seen as a time-consuming process that required large staffs." See Peter Hernon, "Instruction in the Use of Academic Libraries: A Preliminary Study of the Early Years as Based on Selective Extant Materials," *Journal of Library History* 17 (Winter 1982): 16-38.
20. See Mary Biggs, "Librarians as Educators: Assessing Our Self-Image," *Public and Access Services Quarterly* 1 (1995): 41-50.
21. See Katherine Beaty Chiste, Andrea Glover, & Glenna Westwood, "Infiltration and Entrenchment: Capturing and Securing Information Literacy Territory in Academe," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 26 (May 2000): 202-208.
22. Edward Owusu-Ansah argued such a responsibility was imposed upon the library by the utilitarian dictates of higher education. See Edward K. Owusu-Ansah, "The Academic Library in the Service of Colleges and Universities: Toward a New Paradigm," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 27 (July 2001): 282-294.
23. For Eadie's views see Tom Eadie, "Immodest Proposals: User Instruction For Students Does Not Work," *Library Journal* 115 (October 15, 1990): 42-45; and Tom Eadie, "Beyond Immodesty: Questioning the Benefits of BI," *Research Strategies* 10 (Summer 1992): 105-110.
24. Lucy M. Salmon, "Instruction in the Use of a College Library" *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 7 (July 1913): 301-309.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 309.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Debates and concerns over credit bearing courses are often accompanied by questions of what department or departments such a course would take credit away from. The library's bid could thus become an unintended casualty in the existential battles of academic departments.
28. Ernest L. Boyer, *College: The Under-*

- graduate Experience in America (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), p. 87.
29. J. Thomas, "Faculty Attitudes and Habits Concerning Library Instruction: How Much Has Changed Since 1982?" *Research Strategies* 12 (1994): 209-223; A. Cannon, "Faculty Survey on Library Research Instruction," *RQ* 22 (1994): 524-541.
 30. L. R. Oberg, M. K. Schleiter, & M. Van Houten, "Faculty Perceptions of Librarians at Albion College: Status, Role, contribution, and Contacts," *College and Research Libraries* 50 (1990): 215-230; Heidi Julien, "Information Literacy Instruction in Canadian Academic Libraries: Longitudinal Trends and International Comparisons," *College and Research Libraries* 61 (November 2000): 510-523.
 31. Gresham Riley, "The College Viewpoint," in *Academic Libraries: Myths and Realities: Proceedings of the Third National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, April 4-7, 1984, Seattle, Washington*, edited by Suzanne C. Dodson & Gary L. Menges (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1984), pp. 12-14.
 32. William K. Stephenson, "A Departmental Approach to Bibliographic Instruction," in *Bibliographic Instruction in Practice: A Tribute to the Legacy of Evan Ira Farber*, edited by Larry Hardesty, Jamie Hastreiter & David Harrington (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Pierian Press, 1993), pp. 27-40.
 33. Numerous discussions between librarians evoke a sense of anticipated opposition by faculty and administration, though the actual validity of those fears and doubts are hardly ever tested. The expectation of rejection thus becomes the preempting restraint to any action or initiative on the part of many academic librarians.
 34. Loanne Snavely & Natasha Cooper, "The Information Literacy Debate," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 23 (January 1997): 9-14.
 35. *Ibid.*
 36. Patricia Senn Breivik & E. Gordon Gee believed the contemporary information environment made "individuals who are unable to gather pertinent information . . . almost as helpless as those who are unable to read and write." See Patricia Senn Breivik & E. Gordon Gee, *Information Literacy: Revolution in the Library* (New York: Macmillan, 1989), p. 23.
 37. Larry Hardesty was convinced "the most important group, outside of librarians, who need to understand and appreciate the educational role of the academic library are the classroom faculty members." See Larry Hardesty, "Reflections on 25 Years of Library Instruction: Have We Made Progress?" *Reference Services Review* 27 (1999): 242-246.
 38. See John Mark Tucker, "User Education in Academic Libraries: A Century in Retrospect," *Library Trends* 29 (Summer 1980): 9-27; and Frances L. Hopkins, "A Century of Bibliographic Instruction: The Historical Claim to Professional and Academic Legitimacy," *College and Research Libraries* 43 (May 1982): 192-198.
 39. It is an attribution to which no direct factual evidence can be summoned since Emerson himself never made such a pronouncement. To infer from Emerson's call for a "professor of books" that he intended for professional librarians to take a central role in the teaching-learning activities of higher education is to be dismissive of the list of names Emerson provided as ideal examples of persons he saw fit for that role. For the names and Emerson's quote see Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Books," in *Society and Solitude*, edited by Ralph Waldo Emerson (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1870), pp. 187-221.
 40. Deborah Grimes, *The Library-Classroom Link: History, Theory, and Application* (ERIC, 1993), ED 364 227; John Mark Tucker, "User Education in Academic Libraries: A Century in Retrospect."
 41. Haynes McMullen, "Ralph Waldo Emerson and Libraries."
 42. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Books," p. 191.
 43. Frances L. Hopkins, "A Century of Bibliographic Instruction: The Historical Claim to Professional and Academic Legitimacy."
 44. *Ibid.*
 45. John Mark Tucker, "User Education in Academic Libraries: A Century in Retrospect."
 46. Hannelore Rader pointed out that achieving "full partnership with faculty will be difficult but certainly a necessity." See Hannelore B. Rader, "The Learning Environment—Then, Now and Later: 30 Years of Teaching Information Skills," *Reference Services Review* 27 (1999): 219-224.
 47. Edward Owusu-Ansah, "The Academic Library in the Service of Colleges and Universities."
 48. James Wilkinson, "From Transmission to Research."
 49. Howard L. Simmons, "Information Literacy and Accreditation: A Middle States Association Perspective," *New Directions in Higher Education* 78 (Summer 1992): 15-25.
 50. *Ibid.*
 51. Larry Hardesty, "Faculty Culture and Bibliographic Instruction: An Exploratory Analysis," *Library Trends* 44 (Fall 1995): 339-367.
 52. Gloria Leckie & Anne Fullerton, "The Roles of Academic Librarians in Fostering a Pedagogy for Information Literacy," in *Racing Toward Tomorrow: Proceedings of the Ninth National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, April 8-11, 1999*, edited by Hugh A. Thomson (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1999), pp. 191-201.
 53. See Larry Hardesty, "Faculty Culture and Bibliographic Instruction: An Exploratory Analysis."
 54. Larry Hardesty, "Preface," in *Bibliographic Instruction in Practice: A Tribute to the Legacy of Evan Ira Farber*, pp. v-vi.
 55. See Evan Farber, "College Libraries and the Teaching/Learning Process: A 25-Year Reflection," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 25 (May 1999): 171-177.
 56. For a discussion of the relationship between information and knowledge see Edward K. Owusu-Ansah, "Information Literacy and the Academic Library: A Critical Look at a Concept and the Controversies Surrounding It."
 57. American Library Association Presidential Committee on Information Literacy, *Final Report*.
 58. For a brief account of the growth see Martha Williams, "Highlights of the Online Database Industry and the Internet: 2000," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-First National Online Meeting*, edited by Martha E. Williams (Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc., 2000), pp. 1-5.
 59. Derek de Solla Price described the exponential nature of that growth. See Derek J. de Solla Price, *Little Science, Big Science* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963).
 60. Indeed, studies continue to show students lack of competencies needed for effective library research and information literacy. See Patricia Davitt Maughan, "Assessing Information Literacy among Undergraduates: A Discussion of the Literature and the University of California-Berkeley Assessment Experience," *College and Research Libraries* 62 (January 2001): 71-85.
 61. See Katherine Beaty Chiste, Andrea Glover, & Glenna Westwood, "Infiltration and Entrenchment."
 62. *Ibid.*
 63. "Information literacy—the understanding and set of skills necessary to carry out the functions of effective information access, evaluation, and application—is an essential component of any general education program and is promoted by the participation of professional library staff," wrote the commission. See Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, *Characteristics of Excellence in Education: Eligibility Requirements and Standards for Accreditation* (Philadelphia: Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 2002), p. 38. <http://www.msache.org>.
 64. Marilyn Lutzker explained that the ab-

- sence of a specific roadmap was the intentional result of the commission's organizational philosophy. See Marilyn Lutzker, "Bibliographic Instruction and Accreditation in Higher Education," *College and Research Libraries News* 51 (14) (January 1990): 16-18.
65. Mark Jacobs, "Speakeasy Studio and Café: Information Literacy, Web-Based Library Instruction, and Technology," *Information Technology and Libraries* 20 (June 2001): 66-77.
 66. Kevin Guinagh, "The Professor's Reliance on the Library," in *The Academic Library: Essays in Honor of Guy R. Lyle*, edited by Evan Ira Farber & Ruth Walling (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1974), pp. 137-145.
 67. ACRL Committee on Bibliographic Instruction, *Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction: Status Report 1972* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1973), ED 072823.
 68. Mary Bolner Butterfield, "Project LOEX Means Library Orientation Exchange," *RQ* 13 (Fall 1973): 39-42.
 69. Dennis Robison, "Institutions Offering a Formal Course with or without Credit," in ACRL Committee on Bibliographic Instruction, *Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction: Status Report 1972*, pp. 7-18.
 70. Thomas Kirk, "Introduction," in ACRL Committee on Bibliographic Instruction, *Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction: Status Report 1972*, pp. 1-3.
 71. Hannalore Rader, "Course-Related Bibliographic Instruction," in ACRL Committee on Bibliographic Instruction, *Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction: Status Report 1972*, pp. 19-24.
 72. Mary Bolner Butterfield, "Project LOEX Means Library Orientation Exchange."
 73. Ibid.
 74. Carolyn Kirkendall, "Library User Education: Current Practices and Trends," *Library Trends* 29 (Summer 1980): 29-37.
 75. Teresa B. Mensching, "Trends in Bibliographic Instruction in the 1980s: A Comparison of Data from Two Surveys," *Research Strategies* 7 (1989): 4-13.
 76. Linda Shirato & Joseph Badics, "Library Instruction in the 1990s: A Comparison with Trends in Two Earlier LOEX Surveys," *Research Strategies* 15 (1997): 223-237.
 77. Teresa B. Mensching, "Trends in Bibliographic Instruction in the 1980s."
 78. For some tributes to the Earlham College program see Larry Hardesty, Jamie Hastreiter, & David Harrington, *Bibliographic Instruction in Practice: A Tribute to the Legacy of Evan Ira Farber* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Pierian Press, 1993). Stanley Benson noted, however, that despite the promise of the Earlham College initiative and Farber's influence, actual success of course-integrated instruction, Farber's leading preference and Earlham's trumpeted legacy, has been rather limited. See Stanley H. Benson, "The Place of the Library in Undergraduate Education: Reflections of a College Librarian after Thirty-Plus Years," *Tennessee Librarian* 49 (1997): 29-36.
 79. Ernest L. Boyer, *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*.
 80. Evan Farber, "College Libraries and the Teaching/Learning Process: A 25-Year Reflection."
 81. Evan Farber, "Bibliographic Instruction at Earlham College," in *Bibliographic Instruction in Practice: A Tribute to the Legacy of Evan Ira Farber*, edited by Larry Hardesty, Jamie Hastreiter, & David Harrington (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Pierian Press, 1993), pp. 1-26.
 82. Ernest L. Boyer, *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*, p. 165.
 83. Marilyn Lutzker, "Bibliographic Instruction and Accreditation in Higher Education," *College and Research Libraries News* 53 (January 1990): 14-18.
 84. Robert Hauptman, "Bibliographic Instruction: A Failed Exercise," *Research Strategies* 16 (1998): 235.
 85. Ibid.
 86. Jeane R. Davidson, "Faculty and Student Attitudes Toward Credit Courses for Library Skills," *College and Research Libraries* 62 (March 2001): 155-163.
 87. Ibid.
 88. Kimberley M. Donnelly, "Building the Learning Library: Where Do We Start?" *College and Undergraduate Libraries* 6 (2) (2000): 59-75.
 89. Mignon S. Adams & Jacquelyn M. Morris, *Teaching Library Skills for Academic Credit* (Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx Press, 1985), p. 3.
 90. Carol Withers summarized that sentiment well when she wrote: "The ideal starts to fade when you have a one-hour session and will never see the learners as a whole class again." See Carol M. Withers, "Being Effective in the Classroom," in *Teaching Electronic Information Literacy: A How-To-Do-It Manual*, edited by Donald A. Barclay (New York: Neal-Schuman, 1995), pp. 23-40.
 91. Larry Hardesty, "Faculty Culture and Bibliographic Instruction: An Exploratory Analysis."
 92. Craig E. Nelson, "On the Persistence of Unicorns: The Tradeoff between Content and Critical Thinking Revisited," in *The Social Worlds of Higher Education: Handbook for Teaching in a New Century*, edited by Bernice A. Pescosolido & Ronald Aminzade (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 1999), pp. 47-53.
 93. Theresa Wesley, "Teaching Library Research: Are We Preparing Students for Effective Information Use?" *Emergency Librarian* 18 (January/February 1991): 23-29.
 94. Ibid.
 95. Rosemary M. Young & Stephena Harmony, *Working with Faculty to Design Undergraduate Information Literacy Programs: A How-To-Do-It Manual for Librarians* (New York: Neal-Schuman, 1999).
 96. Deborah Fink, "Information, Technology, and Library Research," in *Conceptual Frameworks for Bibliographic Instruction: Theory into Practice*, edited by Mary Reichel & Mary Ann Ramey (Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited Incorporated, 1987), pp. 24-35.
 97. Rosemary M. Young & Stephena Harmony, *Working with Faculty to Design Undergraduate Information Literacy Programs*, p. 57.
 98. For some syllabi see LOEX Clearinghouse for Library Instruction, *Instruction Links*. Available: <http://www.emich.edu/public/loex/islinks/syllinks.htm> (accessed December 3, 2002).
 99. Tom Gilson, "Library Instruction for Credit: A Technology Driven Need," *Research Strategies* 15 (1997): 279-286.
 100. Ibid.
 101. Donald A. Barclay & Darcie Reimann Barclay, "The Role of Freshman Writing in Academic Bibliographic Instruction," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 20 (September 1994): 213-217.
 102. See Lori Arp, "Information Literacy or Bibliographic Instruction: Semantics or Philosophy?" *RQ* 30 (Fall 1990): 46-49.
 103. Stephen Foster insisted that the changing names masked an unchanged activity. See Stephen Foster, "Information Literacy: Some Misgivings," *American Libraries* 24 (April 1993): 344-345.
 104. Peter Hemon, "Instruction in the Use of Academic Libraries."
 105. Mary F. Salony, "The History of Bibliographic Instruction: Changing Trends from Books to the Electronic World," *Reference Librarian* 51/52 (1995): 31-51.
 106. Mary F. Salony lists some of these: "Bibliographic instruction . . . user education, library instruction, orientation, and information literacy." Ibid.
 107. See Tom Gilson, "Library Instruction for Credit: A Technology Driven Need."
 108. See Edward K. Owusu-Ansah, "The Academic Library in the Service of Colleges and Universities."
 109. See Bill Crowley, "Tacit Knowledge, Tacit Ignorance, and the Future of Academic Librarianship."
 110. For some examples see Christina S. Doyle, *Outcomes Measurement for Information Literacy within the National Education Goals of 1990, Final Report to the National Forum on Information Literacy, Summary of Findings* (Syracuse, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, 1992), ERIC, ED 351033; C. S. Bruce, in *Seven Faces of Information Literacy, Seeking Meaning: A Process*

- Approach to Library and Information Services*, edited by Carol Collier Kuhlthau (Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1993). Also see Association of College and Research Libraries, *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* (Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2000).
111. Kimberley M. Donnelly, "Learning from the Teaching Libraries," *American Libraries* 29 (December 1998): 47.
 112. Deborah J. Grimes, *The Library-Classroom Link: History, Theory, and Application* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1993), ED 364 227, p. 25.
 113. Cheryl LaGuardia, et al. *Teaching the New Library: A How-To-Do-It Manual for Planning and Designing Instructional Programs* (New York: Neal-Schuman, 1996), pp. 45–57.
 114. Keith Gresham, "Creating an Electronic Information Literacy Course," in *Teaching Electronic Information Literacy: A How-To-Do-It Manual*, edited by Donald Barclay (New York: Neal-Schuman, 1995), pp. 121–146.
 115. Evan Ira Farber called it ineffective and counter-productive. See Evan Farber, "Bibliographic Instruction at Earlham College."
 116. Mignon S. Adams & Jacquelyn M. Morris offered compelling arguments for a credit course. See Mignon S. Adams & Jacquelyn M. Morris, *Teaching Library Skills for Academic Credit* (Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx Press, 1985), pp. 3–15.
 117. There is sufficient precedence for such a solution. Donald A. Barclay & Darcie Reimann Barclay found that the freshman writing course was the most popular medium for delivering bibliographic instruction. See Donald A. Barclay & Darcie Reimann Barclay, "The Role of Freshman Writing in Academic Bibliographic Instruction."
 118. Tracy Hull & Kelley Lawton observed that required classes provide "the most effective way to reach a majority of students." See Tracy L. Hull & Kelley A. Lawton, "The Development of a First-Year Student Library Instruction Program at Duke University," *Reference Librarian* 73 (2001): 323–336.
 119. Eric Plotnick, "Definitions/Perspectives," *Teacher Librarian* 28 (September 2000): 27–29.
 120. "Information literacy . . . is central to all successful learning and, by extension, to all successful living," wrote Christina Doyle. See Christina S. Doyle, "Information Literacy in an Information Society," *Emergency Librarian* 22 (March/April 1995): 30–32.
 121. American Library Association Presidential Committee on Information Literacy, *Final Report*, p. 7.
 122. See Ann Grafstein, "A Discipline-Based Approach to Information Literacy"; Edward K. Owusu-Ansah, "Information Literacy and the Academic Library: A Critical Look at a Concept and the Controversies Surrounding It."
 123. Elizabeth O. Hutchins, Barbara Fister, & Kris MacPherson express a similar view in their article, "Changing Landscapes, Enduring Values: Making the Transition from Bibliographic Instruction To Information Literacy," *Journal of Library Administration* 36 (1/2) (2002): 3–19.
 124. Stanley H. Benson, "The Place of the Library in Undergraduate Education."
 125. See for example Thomas G. Kirk, "Course-Related Bibliographic Instruction in the 1990s," *Reference Services Review* 27 (1999): 235–241.
 126. Larry Hardesty noted, "Almost 30 years into the modern era of library instruction, rarely does a writer on higher education discuss the educational role of the library. . . discussions of the educational role of the library remain conspicuously absent from higher education literature." See Larry Hardesty, "Reflections on 25 Years of Library Instruction: Have We Made Progress?"
 127. Deborah J. Grimes, *The Library-Classroom Link: History, Theory, and Application*, p. 24. Keith Gresham shared a similar concern. See Keith Gresham, "Creating an Electronic Information Literacy Course," p. 122.
 128. Richard B. Kaplan & Julia S. Whelan, "Buoyed by a Rising Tide: Information Literacy Sails into the Curriculum on the Currents of Evidence-Based Medicine and Professional Competency Objectives," *Journal of Library Administration* 36 (1/2) (2002): 3–19.
 129. Helen Rippier Wheeler, *The Bibliographic Instruction-Course Handbook: A Skills and Concepts Approach to the Undergraduate, Research Methodology, Credit Course—For College and University Personnel* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1988), p. 2.

Copyright of Journal of Academic Librarianship is the property of Elsevier Science Publishing Company, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.