

Anna D. Sandelli. Practices and Perceptions of Academic Library Instruction: A Survey of *Composition & Rhetoric* Instructors. A Master's Paper for the M.S. in L.S degree. April, 2014. 63 pages. Advisor: Barbara B. Moran

Instructional services play a central and growing role in academic libraries' offerings. As these services continue to evolve, librarians are increasingly called upon to not only plan and deliver instruction, but also to assess their efforts. This study sought to evaluate library instruction through an electronic survey of English 105 and English 105i course instructors within the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Writing Program. Survey questions were designed to examine both the attitudes and behaviors of respondents, with the goal of gaining an understanding of factors involved in instructors' decisions to include library-led instruction sessions in their courses, their expectations of this instruction, and their motivation for future use. Individual responses are highlighted, as are potential associations observed among length of teaching experience, course objectives, assignment development practices and perceptions of library instructors. Implementations for both practice and further research are also discussed.

Headings:

Academic Libraries – Use Studies

Information Literacy

Librarian-Teacher Cooperation

Library Surveys

PRACTICES AND PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC LIBRARY INSTRUCTION:
A SURVEY OF *COMPOSITION & RHETORIC* INSTRUCTORS

by
Anna D. Sandelli

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

April 2014

Approved by

Dr. Barbara B. Moran

Table of Contents

List of Tables	2
Acknowledgements	3
Introduction	4
Purpose of Study	6
Study Environment.....	7
Literature Review	9
Background	9
Calls for Collaboration.....	12
Use of Assessment	15
Methodology	21
Results	24
Responses to Individual Questions	24
Associations Among Responses	31
Limitations and Opportunities	39
Discussion	42
Practices of Instruction	42
Perceptions of Library Instruction	46
Conclusion.....	49
References	51
Appendix A: Survey Instrument	56
Appendix B: Survey Invitation	60
Appendix C: Survey Reminder	61

List of Tables

Table 1	24
Table 2	26
Table 3	29
Table 4	34
Table 5	35
Table 6	37
Table 7	37
Table 8	38

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the following individuals for their support and insights throughout this project, particularly in assistance with survey development and pre-testing: *Jonathan McMichael*, Undergraduate Experience Librarian; R.B. House Undergraduate Library; *Kim Vassiliadis*, Head, User Experience, UNC University Libraries; *Dr. Barbara Moran*, Louis Round Wilson Distinguished Professor, UNC School of Information and Library Science; and *Kevin Michael Klipfel*, Information Literacy Coordinator, California State University, Chico, and MSLS '13, UNC School of Information and Library Science. I would also like to thank the members of UNC's Writing Program and its English 105 and English 105i instructors for their participation in this study.

Introduction

Since their start, academic libraries have been synonymous with learning. Depictions of early academic libraries frequently include imagery of a lone scholar immersed in the text before him. Today, representations of these libraries, both in popular culture and in college and university publications, often continue to feature scenes of students engrossed in reading or writing, a book or laptop their sole companion. Learning in today's academic libraries, however, is increasingly seen not as a solitary pursuit but as a shared experience. On campuses of all sizes, libraries have, and continue to, evolve from places to find information to active partners in working with information, from its gathering and evaluation to its attribution and distribution.

As academic libraries' roles have evolved, librarians' responsibilities have also changed. Rather than serving primarily as gatekeepers to materials, librarians today stand as guides to both faculty and students as they navigate a complex information landscape. Often, their guidance takes the form of teaching all or part of class sessions. In recent years, this teaching has itself undergone growth and transformation, due in large part to increased attention on information literacy in higher education.

Introduced by Information Industry Association president Paul Zurkowski in 1974, the concept of being "information literate" has been interpreted in varied ways (Behrens, 1994). Perhaps the most basic way to define it is with a description put forth by the American Library Association (ALA): "Ultimately, information literate people are those who have learned how to learn" (1989, para. 3). Fostering information literacy,

to paraphrase a common aphorism, is not about giving a man a fish but about teaching him how to fish, so that he will not simply have food for a day but instead develop a skill to use the next time that he is hungry. In an academic library setting, a parallel could be a librarian helping a student develop keywords to find articles for a research paper, rather than the librarian conducting his or her own search and jotting down the titles of a few promising results. By experiencing the former method, the student not only leaves with materials to use for this assignment but with knowledge to apply in future coursework.

Teaching library instruction in general, and information literacy in particular, is not a one-size-fits-all endeavor. Instead, librarians must collaborate with faculty and campus partners to deliver instruction that targets specific research needs and skill levels. The fact that much library-led instruction involves a single session within a professor's semester-long course further demonstrates this need for collaboration with faculty to maximize student learning within a short time frame (Meulemans & Carr, 2013, p. 80). Meanwhile, the work that the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) embarked on in 2011 to review and revise the information literacy competency standards that it adopted in 2000 (Bell, 2013, para. 1-2) stands as just one distinct example of the fact that discussions about information literacy remain an ever-changing dialogue.

As part of this ongoing dialogue, librarians involved with developing and maintaining information literacy instruction must not only plan, teach and promote it; they must also assess their efforts. Assessment can provide insights into what libraries and librarians are doing effectively and should continue, as well as identifying areas in which they could improve. Assessment can also play a key role in supporting and enhancing collaboration by giving librarians an opportunity to see if they are speaking the

same language as faculty and campus partners, in terms of both information literacy skills and these partners' instructional needs. Oakleaf and Kaske (2009) note that, in addition to augmenting student learning and enhancing instruction, data from information literacy assessment can serve as a response to "calls for accountability," enabling libraries to collect and share tangible evidence of their activities with stakeholders (p. 273).

Purpose of Study

As the focus of academic library instruction continues to shift from telling patrons about the physical library to helping them learn how to learn, librarians not only need to foster this evolution but to evaluate their efforts. One insightful way of conducting such evaluation is by examining the practices and perceptions of faculty. While library-led information literacy instruction is delivered to, and primarily impacts, students, it is their professors who often have the power to decide whether to incorporate such instruction into their courses. Consequently, if librarians want to bolster their contributions to undergraduate education, they must connect with faculty (Hardesty, 2001, p. 128).

Before librarians reach out to forge connections with faculty, however, they first need to gain awareness of faculty behavior and attitudes. Such an undertaking can provide a valuable window into whether these faculty see library instruction in the same way that the librarians with whom they work do. For instance, for faculty, is library instruction about teaching information literacy and cultivating students' understanding of learning as a process? Or, is it instead focused on presenting particular tools, such as the library's online catalog and its database offerings? Uncovering answers to such questions has potential to kindle outreach efforts that could fuel more effective conversations with faculty. Such conversations could then translate into more impactful student learning.

To gain a deeper awareness of faculty practices and attitudes, this study undertook a survey of instructors in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Writing Program. Instructors who had taught at least one section of *ENGL 105: Composition and Rhetoric* or *ENGL 105i: Writing in the Disciplines* during the Fall 2013 semester were eligible to participate. A survey instrument was chosen as the method of evaluation, with the aim of gathering participant feedback in a way that was accessible and anonymous.

The study's purpose was three-fold: first, to gain an understanding of factors involved in instructors' decisions to include or exclude library-led instruction sessions in their courses; second, to learn of their expectations of, and experiences with, this instruction; and third, to investigate their motivation for its future use. Also of interest was examining possible associations among responses. For instance, were instructors who had taught *ENGL 105* or *105i* for multiple semesters more or less likely to utilize library instruction than those newer to teaching it? Did instructors who wrote their own assignments tend to seek library instruction more or less frequently than those who took a collaborative approach to assignment creation? It was hoped that both responses to individual questions and associations among responses would provide insights that could be used to enhance instructional services at libraries with established information literacy instruction programs, as well as those in the early stages of implementing one.

Study Environment

Instructional services in the form of classroom teaching have long been a hallmark of UNC's University Libraries. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the R.B. House Undergraduate Library, which oversees logistics for a majority of instructional services involving undergraduates, hosted 380 classroom instruction sessions for 7,081 participants (University of North Carolina Library, n.d.). The 2012-2013 academic year

also brought the appointment of an Undergraduate Engagement Librarian, a new role that involves delivering instruction, leading assessment projects and examining “new ways of engaging with undergraduate students” (UNC Library News and Events, 2012). This librarian also serves as UNC Libraries’ primary liaison to the UNC Writing Program.

Overseen by the Department of English and Comparative Literature, the UNC Writing Program is a self-described “model both for teacher training and for composition instruction” (n.d., *About*). The program’s *ENGL 105* and *105i* courses, which were added to the curriculum in Fall 2012, were selected for this study because they form a large portion of library-led instruction sessions at the University. *ENGL 105* focuses on writing across Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities units, while *ENGL 105i* enables students with an interest in a particular discipline, such as medicine or business, to focus on that discipline in greater depth (UNC Writing Program, n.d., *Courses and placement*).

In addition to being courses that frequently incorporate library-led instruction, *ENGL 105* and *105i* serve as foundational courses. According to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Office of Undergraduate Curricula, students must complete one of the courses to graduate (n.d., *Foundations requirements*). Moreover, a majority of students in these courses are first-year undergraduates with little previous exposure to college research and writing. Consequently, it was thought that exploring the practices and perceptions of the courses’ instructors could provide insights for other institutions that offer similar first-year writing requirements, whereas focusing on subject-specific, upper-level courses could limit the study’s generalizability. Due to the fact that many *ENGL 105* and *105i* instructors are doctoral candidates, it was also envisioned that the findings could be of interest to librarians working with new and future faculty.

Literature Review

A review of literature related to this topic proceeded in three stages. In the first, the focus lay in examining literature about information literacy's development and growth in higher education, as well as its connections to library instruction. The second focused on librarian and faculty collaboration, while the third reviewed the literature of library instruction assessment.

Background

Dialogues about how to define information literacy emerged in the 1970s, alongside discussions about why it was an important concept. In his 1974 proposal to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Paul Zurkowski described the information services environment as being in a state of transition. The Information Industry Association (IIA) president observed that, "People trained in the application of information resources to their work can be called information literates," and noted that being able to use information effectively involved learning both skills and techniques (as cited in Behrens, 1994, p. 310). By decade's end, further discussions of the concept had led to the sentiment that information literacy involved acquiring new skills in both locating and using information; that it could help foster an active civic culture; and that it was not simply about information use in the workplace (Behrens, 1994, p. 310).

Interestingly, these early discussions of information literacy arose soon after what Lorenzen (2001) calls "the reemergence of academic library instruction" (p. 10). He notes

that academic librarians in the United States had engaged in teaching activities during the 19th century, while German library literature suggests even earlier origins, which likely influenced American practices. By the 1930s, however, library instruction in the U.S. seemed to have stagnated, and it remained in this state for close to three decades before blossoming again. By the early 1970s, its resurgence could be seen in initiatives such as the inaugural Library Orientation Exchange (LOEX) Conference (Lorenzen, 2001, p. 8-11). During this decade, Thompson (2002) posits, there was also a growing awareness among librarians of the need to change traditional instruction practices to better meet students' needs (p. 223). Links between library instruction and information literacy to facilitate this change, however, were not strongly established during the 1970s. Overall, the decade focused on defining information literacy, rather than demarcating the skills and knowledge needed to manage information (Behrens, 1994, p. 311).

Discussion about information literacy in the 1980s and early 1990s expanded its definitions while also beginning to delineate academic libraries' involvement. In 1985, Martin Tessmer of the University of Colorado Denver's Auraria Library described the concept as "the ability to effectively access and evaluate information for a given need" (as cited in Behrens, 1994, p. 312). Writing nine years later, Behrens (1994), notes that Tessmer's definition was both more detailed and more impactful than many before it.

"The definition can also be seen as an important milestone in the information literacy movement, since it marks the point at which information literacy and library user education appear to meld, and information literacy becomes a dominant issue in librarianship" (p. 312).

The decade's end saw information literacy become even more of a dominant issue in librarianship, due in large part to the American Library Association's *Final Report* to the Presidential Committee on Information Literacy. This report not only introduced a

definition of information literacy still widely used today; it also emphasized the concept's importance, calling it a "survival skill in the Information Age" (1989, Opportunities to Develop Information Literacy section, para. 1). Simultaneously, the report encouraged librarians to take a leading role in championing information literacy. New mandates from regional accreditation agencies during the 1990s further fueled this call to action, both for institutions of higher education and for libraries (Thompson, 2002).

For libraries, taking a leading role in championing information literacy during the end of the 20th century and early years of the 21st century involved much discussion of what constituted information literacy instruction. While some saw it as a new direction, others saw it as building upon an established foundation of "bibliographic instruction," which was based on what a library physically owned and the mechanics of using these materials. Although some viewed the two concepts as divergent, others saw information literacy instruction as an outgrowth of bibliographic instruction, with the former a way of incorporating the best of the latter and of "helping people learn to help themselves by becoming powerful, critical-thinking information users" (Grassian, 2004, p. 53) who were poised to succeed not only throughout college but in future careers.

Other recent discussions about information literacy have focused on its relationship to technology. Badke (2010) notes that having technological skills does not necessarily make an individual information literate and that a number of studies demonstrate that technologically savvy students continue to perform poorly on tasks that require information handling more complex than Google searches (p. 135-136). The Association of College & Research Libraries' (ACRL's) *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* (2000) echoes the idea that technological

literacy, while important, is a subset of information literacy, rather than a synonym for it.

As the competencies state:

“‘Fluency’ with information technology may require more intellectual abilities than the rote learning of software and hardware associated with ‘computer literacy’, but the focus is still on the technology itself. Information literacy, on the other hand, is an intellectual framework for understanding, finding, evaluating, and using information--activities which may be accomplished in part by fluency with information technology, in part by sound investigative methods, but most important, through critical discernment and reasoning” (2000, Information Literacy and Information Technology section, para. 3).

Calls for Collaboration

As the 21st century has continued, conversations about information literacy have progressed from what it is to how to best foster and encourage it. Regional accreditation standards such as those referenced by Thompson (2002), have continued to be in place, while the ALA and ACRL have developed and disseminated guidelines, proficiencies for library instructors and characteristics of best practices for instruction programs (Muelemans & Carr, 2013). In addition to presenting recommendations, these documents also highlight the importance of libraries and librarians collaborating with faculty and other campus partners to deliver information literacy instruction (Mounce, 2010, p. 306).

An exploration of the literature on librarian-faculty collaboration reveals the contrasting themes of possibility and challenge. Raspa and Ward (2000) offer enthusiastic perspectives on the first theme as they describe both how their own partnership began and share case studies of other librarians and faculty working together. The humanities professor and coordinator of library instructional services describe collaboration as an act of listening that “has the power to bring the enterprise of learning to life” (Raspa & Ward, 2000, p. 3). Such a relationship, the authors note, enables both parties to see perspectives that they might otherwise overlook. Beyond being beneficial, they call such

partnerships an imperative in an information age that is increasingly interdisciplinary and in which one individual cannot know everything. Interestingly, they also posit that librarian-faculty partnerships may provide personal fulfillment in what they envision as an era where people desire more than monetary rewards from their work (2000, p. 15-16).

While a number of case studies describing instruction-based collaboration exist, of more interest to this study's focus was literature that highlights faculty perspectives on such collaboration. In many instances, this literature also delves into how faculty perceive information literacy. Although the general consensus seems to echo ALA, ACRL and accreditation standards' stance that information literacy skills are important, and even essential, to acquire, there is less agreement about how this acquisition should occur.

The idea that students will obtain information literacy skills via osmosis is a recurrent theme. McGuinness' (2006) cross-disciplinary study of Irish faculty found an implicit assumption of "learning by doing," or of developing information literacy skills simply by completing research-based assignments (p. 577). Moreover, a number of the faculty whom she surveyed indicated that successfully developing information literacy skills depended on students' "personal interest, individual motivation and innate ability, rather than on the quality and format of the available instructional opportunities" (2006, p. 577). DaCosta's (2010) surveys of faculty in the United Kingdom and United States similarly echo the idea of learning by osmosis while also suggesting a gap between respondents' rankings of the information literacy skills students that need and the actions that they as faculty take to teach these skills.

Tied to the idea of a lack of consensus about how students acquire information literacy skills is confusion about what "information literacy" means. Faculty responses to

Gullikson's (2006) survey of Canadian faculty included written complaints about the language she used and verbal feedback expressing confusion with her wording and comments about vagueness. One respondent even circled every instance of the phrase "information literacy" on the survey and added the comment "a horrible term!" (p. 591). Saunders (2012) echoes the idea of confusion over information literacy, as well as noting that the concept is frequently linked too closely with library skills. Such an association, she adds, could lead faculty to view cultivating information literacy skills as something that is outside of their realm of responsibility. This attitude, she notes, could "encourage faculty to focus on discipline content and assume that information literacy will be addressed in other ways," (2012, p. 227), an observation that echoes McGuinness' (2006) premise that information literacy is often seen as acquired through osmosis.

An additional challenge to collaboration involving information literacy is uncertainty about what librarians can do to foster it. Rather than asking how a librarian may best support their class' needs, faculty often come to the librarian with requests based on their own perceptions and which remain grounded in bibliographic instruction, or a focus on specific materials rather than broader concepts of learning how to learn. Muelemans and Carr (2013) highlight such thinking by citing faculty requests such as "Take the student[s] on a tour of the library so they can learn how to do research" and "Tell them to not use the Internet and use scholarly sources," (p. 81). Saunders (2012), found that, despite expressing appreciation for librarians' skills, few faculty respondents to her survey signaled that they saw librarians as instructional partners. Such a finding, she notes, demonstrates that "library instruction seems to be regarded as an add-on, and heavily dependent on whether the faculty member can give up class time" (2012, p. 231).

Encouraging faculty to see the value of giving up class time for library instruction involves fostering dialogue. Throughout the literature reviewed for this study, an idea that appears frequently is that faculty do not appear unwilling to participate in such dialogue. Instead, they seem unsure of how to best initiate it. As Saunders (2012) posits, what may seem faculty reticence to partner with librarians has less to do “with a lack of respect for the position, and more to do with a lack of understanding of how librarians can contribute to and support their instruction” (p. 232). Responses to Shellie Jeffries’ surveys to faculty echo this perspective, particularly through one respondent’s observation that new and part-time faculty often neither know what librarians are able to do nor that they would like to partner (as cited in Raspa & Ward, 2000, p. 126). Such observations bring up another theme found throughout the literature: the idea that the onus is on librarians to proactively kindle dialogue with faculty (Meulemans & Carr, 2013, p. 82). It may, as the saying goes, take two to tango, but, as Raspa and Ward (2000) note, “If we wait for others to invite us, we may be waiting a long time to enter the dance” (p.11).

Use of Assessment

If librarians are to take the lead in fostering dialogue, assessment can serve as a valuable tool in making this dialogue effective. Like information literacy instruction, assessment is neither a one-size-fits-all endeavor nor one with a universally accepted definition. Often, “assessment” and “evaluation” are used interchangeably, although the terms are not quite synonymous. Houlihan and Click (2012) reference several definitions of assessment that highlight its focus on measuring outcomes, which they contrast with Rabine and Cardwell’s (2000) description of evaluation as concerned with appraising services, initiatives or individuals (p. 36). Although the terms are not identical, the authors note that assessment can build upon evaluation. Evaluating instructors ‘strengths

and weaknesses, for instance, may lead to the development of training, and a librarian could then assess this training to measure whether it has impacted instructors' skills.

The demarcation between assessment and evaluation is not widely discussed in the literature (Houlihan and Click, 2012, p. 37) and even those who note the difference may choose to use the terms interchangeably, as Tancheva, Andrews and Steinhart (2007) do (p. 31). Because "assessment" is used more frequently throughout the literature, it is the term referenced throughout this section for the sake of consistency. Nonetheless, the distinction is discussed here, both as a consideration that emerged when planning this study and as a factor that others may wish to consider as they develop projects.

Planning an assessment project begins with consideration of the project's logistics, goals and implications. Radcliff, Jensen, Salem, Burhanna and Gedeon, (2007) note that those planning assessment have the option to undertake it at an individual classroom level, at a program level or at an institutional level. Time and money involved, access to participants and the amount of faculty collaboration and outside expertise needed are among the additional considerations that Radcliff et al. (2007) suggest librarians consider when exploring assessment options. Oakleaf and Kaske (2009) expand upon these considerations by proposing key questions to guide projects, including determining why the project is being conducted, which stakeholders are involved and whether the project will tell those administering it what they seek to know (p. 274).

Understanding the distinction between "formative" and summative" assessment is also referenced throughout the literature as a criterion to keep in mind. Formative assessment is administered as a program is taking place, with the goal of improving it (Tancheva, Andrews and Steinhart, 2007, p. 31). Summative assessment, in contrast, is

concerned with measuring outcomes and generally occurs at the end of a set point, such as after a semester of library instruction sessions. The two forms of assessment can be used together effectively, although there may be times when the nature of an initiative guides the decision to use one or the other. For instance, as Schilling and Applegate (2012) note, a library instruction program that consists of single, one-hour classes is a difficult initiative for which to use iterative formative assessment (p. 260).

The techniques available for conducting assessment include affective, behavioral and cognitive methods and can involve direct contact or indirect observation (Radcliff et al., 2007). This literature review will focus specifically on survey instruments, in keeping with the technique employed by the study. As with every assessment technique, surveys present both benefits and drawbacks. Among their positive attributes are their ability to efficiently gather data from a large group in a short amount of time while preserving anonymity (Radcliff et al., 2007, p. 47-48). Surveys can also enable those administering them to efficiently ask about a range of topics and gain insights into respondents' opinions and attitudes (Schilling and Applegate, 2012, p. 264). Although surveys are frequently used for stand-alone assessment projects, they can also be used in longitudinal studies, enabling librarians to track changes over time. Those who use surveys for longitudinal studies also have opportunities to alter questions or add questions, based on findings and the needs of the particular survey period (Gaspar & Wetzel, 2009, p. 580).

Alongside their advantages, surveys also present challenges, and often what may be seen as a benefit in some instances can become a limitation in others. While surveys lend themselves well to anonymity, there may be situations where identification is necessary for providing useful feedback, and the loss of anonymity could limit

respondents' comfort level in answering questions (Houlihan & Click, 2012, p. 45).

Making surveys easy to follow can result in short responses that provide limited detail and no opportunity for elaboration or clarification (Radcliff et al., 2007), as one might have in a direct contact setting, such as a focus group. As a measure of indirect assessment, surveys also open the possibility of a gap between beliefs and actions. How respondents view their skills, for instance, may be different than how someone administering or analyzing a survey would (Schilling & Applegate, 2012, p. 262).

The likelihood of low responses rates, which could limit the generalizability of takeaways, is another potential pitfall echoed throughout the literature. Gonzales (2001), for instance, received a 23.4% response from her Web-based survey to faculty, and she cites earlier surveys that suggest a similar rate is not uncommon (p. 193). Hrycaj's and Russo's (2007a) survey sent to 1,340 Louisiana State University faculty yielded a response rate of just 14% (p. 16). Other surveys, however, have had more success. Anita Cannon's (1994) survey, on which both of the above were based, yielded a 41% response rate. In addition, even those whose surveys had lower response rates than desired uncovered findings that they pinpointed as interesting opportunities for further study. In Gonzales' case, for instance, she found that faculty with the least teaching experience were proportionally more likely to have received library instruction when learning to research, but that this relationship did not correlate to their decision to request library instruction for their own students (2001, p. 201). Such a finding led to her to propose additional research to explore what motivates faculty to seek library instruction.

A review of the literature also unveiled reflections on how survey design may affect outcomes. Hrycaj and Russo (2007b), for instance, followed up their survey with a

discussion of how both their findings and those of two widely-cited earlier surveys from which they drew inspiration included a notable gap between the library instruction that faculty respondents actually used and what they said that they would use (p. 692). They suggest that this gap can be attributed to “social desirability bias,” or the idea of participants positively responding to something that they believe society will also view positively. The authors further note that asking faculty about the actions they *would* take does not bear the weight of a formal commitment to actually undertake an action (p. 694).

Findings such as the above illustrate the value of designing surveys that focus more specifically on behavior, rather than attitudes, or that include a combination of questions focused on both behavior and attitudes. For instance, Gaspar and Wetzel (2009), in their survey of The George Washington University faculty, asked respondents to share their learning goals for library instruction sessions. This question not only provided an open-ended opportunity to identify the key principles valued by faculty; it also offered a chance to see how – and if – these principles synced with those that the library had previously defined (p. 580-581). The authors also strove to avoid questions that could be construed as vague or overly broad by breaking them into smaller, more specific categories. When asking about the effectiveness of library sessions, for instance, the authors requested that respondents rate effectiveness in three separate categories: students’ information needs, faculty expectations and support of the course (p. 582).

Guided by learnings from the literature, this study sought to build and expand upon earlier information literacy assessment projects. It strove to take such projects in a new direction with a survey instrument designed to gain insights into both attitudes and behavior. Following review of previous studies, survey questions were designed to learn

both of respondents' use of library instruction and of their own teaching practices. The aim of such a survey arrangement was to fuel the study's goals of understanding what drives faculty to include library-led instruction, their expectations of, and experiences with, this instruction and their motivation for its future use. This survey could be best described as a formative evaluation project, as it seeks to apprise services and identify areas of improvement. As the literature suggests, evaluation can lead to assessment (Houlihan & Click, 2012) and formative projects to summative endeavors (Schilling & Applegate, 2012). Consequently, what is notable about this survey is not only that it builds upon previous research and strives to take it in a new direction, but also that it may help provide a building block or roadmap for future scholarship.

Methodology

This study sought to develop an assessment instrument that would go beyond affective measurement and provide behavioral insights while also examining potential relationships among attitudes and behavior. Following discussions with University Libraries' Undergraduate Engagement Librarian, Fall 2013 was selected as the time frame around which survey questions would be centered. This semester marked the beginning of the second full year of *ENGL 105* and *ENGL 105i* as course requirements, meaning that survey respondents could include both those who had taught the course before and those new to it. To facilitate ease of responding, an online tool, Qualtrics, was selected as the instrument for survey design.

To further assist ease of responding, the survey was designed to employ branch logic, so that respondents who had not utilized library instruction would not answer inapplicable questions and vice versa. Both closed and open-ended questions were included, with the hope of mitigating the lack of detail described as a potential drawback to this assessment technique. No question required a response, other than the question of whether a participant had used library instruction during the Fall 2013 semester, as an answer was needed here to employ branch logic. Although both full-time librarians and graduate student assistants from UNC's School of Information and Library Science, following observation and training activities, teach library instruction sessions, survey questions did not differentiate among or ask respondents to identify whether their library instructor was a librarian or graduate student. In addition to being another way to

facilitate ease of responding by keeping survey questions brief, it was thought that *ENGL 105* and *ENGL 105i* might not know if their instructor was a librarian or a graduate student, as stating this status is not a requirement when speaking with instructors.

Three librarians, each of whom had taught library instruction for at least two years, pretested the survey, as did a School of Information & Library Science faculty member and a current *ENGL 105* instructor. Their insights led to rewording and combining several questions, helping employ more concrete language while streamlining the survey. They also confirmed that the survey was accessible on mobile devices and tablets. The final survey instrument can be viewed in Appendix A, beginning on page 56.

A link to the survey was sent to *ENGL 105* and *ENGL 105i* instructors via two UNC Writing Program departmental listservs on February 3, 2014. These electronic mailing lists are open to all affiliated with the Writing Program, rather than solely shared with *ENGL 105* and *ENGL 105i* instructors, so the invitation e-mail was worded to reference criteria for eligibility in its opening lines. The listservs seemed to offer an appropriate balance between sending a targeted message and retaining anonymity, as neither the study author nor the Undergraduate Experience Librarian with whom she collaborated to draft and send these messages had access to the individual e-mail addresses of listserv subscribers.

Based on the amount of e-mail that UNC affiliates receive, it was initially determined that sending an invitation e-mail from the Undergraduate Experience Librarian, with whom many *ENGL 105* and *ENGL 105i* instructors had worked, might lead to increased name recognition and higher response rates than sending it from the e-mail account of this study's author. Because neither the study's author nor the librarian

served as an administrator for these listservs, however, the invitation instead needed to be sent from the e-mail account of the Writing Program Assistant. This e-mail invitation strove to emphasize that the survey was not solely a student project; but instead an endeavor designed to garner insights that could enhance library services. The complete text of the invitation can be seen in Appendix B, found on page 60.

Although the survey had been scheduled to remain open for two full weeks, North Carolina experienced an unexpectedly harsh bout of winter weather that closed the campus for two and a half days during this planned period. Given the potential this weather caused for loss of Internet access, as well as instructors' regular routines, the survey was extended an additional week and closed on Sunday, February 23. During this three week period, three brief reminder messages were sent to the Writing Program listservs, again via the e-mail of the Program Assistant. Text of a reminder message can be seen as Appendix C, found on page 61. Several modifications were made to the reminder messages. Following observations that respondents were generally taking approximately five minutes to complete the survey, references to the estimated time needed to take the survey were changed from ten minutes to five, in the hopes that the more accurate measure would encourage responses. Reminder messages also emphasized the fact that instructors did not need to have utilized library instruction during the Fall 2013 semester in order to participate.

Results

Thirty-four Writing Program instructors responded to this survey. Of these, one response was discarded because the participant indicated in an open-ended answer that the courses he or she taught during Fall 2013 did not include either *ENGL 105* or *105i*. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Office of the University Registrar (2013) lists 87 total *ENGL 105* and *105i* instructors for the Fall 2013 semester. Thus, excluding the ineligible respondent, the survey yielded a 38% overall response rate. It also yielded a 100% completion rate: all who started the survey also finished it.

Responses to Individual Questions

Responses to individual questions provided information about participants' backgrounds, their use of library instruction, their expectations and experiences of this instruction and their motivation to request it in the future. Of the 33 eligible respondents, a slight majority had taught a first-year composition course for four or more semesters, and those who had taught such a course for more than five semesters comprised the highest percentage of respondents. Table 1, below, lists a full breakdown of responses.

Table 1: *Semesters of teaching ENGL 105/105i (or equivalent first-year writing course)*

Semesters	Responses	%
1	3	9%
2	10	30%
3	1	3%
4	6	18%
5+	13	39%

In terms of their own teaching practices, 76% of instructors utilized more than one assignment-planning process during the Fall 2013 semester, and 74% incorporated a practice that involved either another person's input or their materials. Using existing assignments that the instructor had developed without outside assistance and modifying existing assignments developed by other instructors were listed as the most frequently used processes, at 64% each, followed by updating assignments that the instructor had developed by himself or herself, at 55%. The least frequently selected responses all involved the process of developing new assignments, either on one's own (27%), through collaboration with a colleague (24%) or through collaboration with a librarian (18%).

One of the first questions in the survey asked participants to rank up to three research-related course objectives for teaching *ENGL 105* or *105i* by order of importance. All 33 respondents ranked at least three objectives from a list of seven options, which included an "Other" option. Although the survey requested that respondents rank three or fewer objectives, its setup did not impose any limits on the number that they actually could select, and nearly a quarter ranked a fourth and fifth objective as well. *Teach students how to evaluate information* was ranked as an important objective by 32 of 33 respondents, followed closely by *teach students how to find information*. *Teach students how to develop research topics* came in third among overall responses, with 22 of 33 respondents ranking it at some place along their list. As illustrated in Table 2, on page 26, however, this statement had the highest total number of respondents ($n=11$) rank it as number one in importance, slightly edging out *teach students how to find information*, which was ranked as most important by 10 participants. Three respondents selected *Other* as an objective, and in the open-ended text box that followed the question listed *Teach*

students how to synthesize info and come up with an argument, use research to refine their own ideas about a topic and Zotero as their objectives.

Table 2: Research-Related Course Objectives, In Order of Importance (#1 as highest)

Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total Responses
Teach students how to develop research topics	11	6	3	1	0	0	0	21
Teach students how to find information	10	9	9	0	0	0	0	28
Teach students how to evaluate information	6	14	9	2	0	0	0	31
Teach students how to cite information	2	1	8	3	3	0	0	17
Teach students about specific resources (eg - electronic journals)	2	3	2	1	3	1	0	12
Teach students about specific technologies (eg - Publisher, WordPress)	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	7
Other (Please describe)	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3

Thirty-one of the 33 eligible respondents indicated that they had used library instruction for their *ENGL 105* or *105i* courses during Fall 2013. A schedule of Fall 2013 library instruction sessions, maintained by the Undergraduate Experience Librarian, revealed that 65 *ENGL 105* and *105i* instructors signed up for at least one library-led session during this semester. Thus, based on the fact that 87 instructors taught *ENGL 105* or *105i* during this semester, the 31 respondents who indicated that they had used library-led instruction represented a 48% response rate for this population. In contrast, only two

of 33 respondents indicated that they had not used library-led instruction, representing a 9% response rate for this population. The low response rate and small number of respondents in this category limit its utility in analysis. Consequently, much of the analysis and discussion of results presented in the pages that follow will focus on those who did use library-led instruction.

More than three-quarters of respondents indicated including a library instruction session for their Natural Sciences unit. For *ENGL 105* courses, Natural Sciences is generally the first unit introduced during a semester, so it is perhaps unsurprising that 81% of those who had used library instruction included a session during this unit, in comparison to 16% for Social Sciences, which is generally taught as the second unit of the semester, and 35% for Humanities, which is typically last. Nineteen percent of those who had used library instruction indicated using it for a unit other than the three referenced above. Because the number of Writing Program instructors who teach *ENGL 105i* and focus on other units is much smaller than the number who teach *ENGL 105*, this question did not ask respondents to name the specific other unit for which they had used library instruction, as their answers may have impacted anonymity.

Respondents were more likely to have included multiple library instruction sessions throughout the semester (55%) than just a single session (45%). Just five respondents, or 16%, indicated that they signed up for more sessions than they had originally anticipated. In response to an open-ended follow-up question that asked why they had requested additional sessions, the three themes that emerged were: the need to explore additional, subject-specific resources, referenced by four respondents; a desire to teach students a particular technology, referenced by two respondents; and the

helpfulness of librarians, also referenced by two respondents. One respondent noted that the suggestion of the library instructor with whom he or she had worked played a part in the decision to schedule a subsequent session, alongside a realization of students' needs to better understand online databases used to locate scholarly and reliable sources.

A large majority of *ENGL 105* and *105i* instructors came to their most recent library instruction session with multiple goals. *Expose students to electronic resources* was selected most often, with 11 instructors ranking it as their most important objective and an additional 12 selecting it elsewhere in their ratings. *Teach research skills that support and elaborate on the instruction I already offer* was listed as the most important objective by 11 respondents, with an additional 11 selecting it elsewhere in their ratings. *Introduce students to librarians* stood as the third most frequently referenced, with one respondent listing it as his or her most important objective and an additional 12 respondents including it elsewhere in their rankings. As in the question about course objectives, participants were asked to rank up to three objectives but the survey instrument did not prevent them from ranking more, and several respondents included additional objectives. A full list of responses can be seen as Table 3, found on page 29.

All 31 respondents indicated that their library session either met most (32%) or all (64%) of their objectives. A greater percentage rated their library instructor as highly proficient in subject knowledge (62%) than in presentation and delivery or engagement with students (42% each). Online tutorials that could be assigned as homework and collaborating with a librarian to develop assignments were selected most frequently as other instructional offerings that respondents would use, if available.

Table 3: Ranking of Objectives for Library Instruction Session (#1 as Highest)

Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total Responses
Expose students to physical library	3	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	10
Expose students to print resources	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Expose students to electronic resources	11	8	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	23
Introduce students to librarians	1	2	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	13
Teach research skills not otherwise part of my regular instruction	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Teach research skills that support and elaborate upon instruction I already offer	11	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	22
Teach tech. skills not otherwise part of my regular instruction	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Teach tech. skills that support and elaborate upon instruction I already offer	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Teach students how to use specific software (eg- Photoshop, RetWorks)	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	6
Give students in-class time to work on assignment	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3

Among those who had utilized library instruction during Fall 2013, all 31 stated that they would sign up for such instruction again. Twenty-three responded to an open-ended question asking them to share their reasons for being willing to sign up for future instruction. Themes that emerged were: the benefits of this instruction to students, its benefits to Writing Program instructors and the nature of librarians, each illustrated in the selected responses below:

“It is helpful to get students into the library and to help them realize that they have other resources to tap into when they are having trouble with an assignment.”

“The library instructors tend to have a good strategy for helping students navigate the different tools available on the site. It's also helpful because it would take me a long time to find the perfect examples for everything that I would want to cover. It takes a lot of the burden off of me as an instructor.”

“I find it helpful for students to receive instruction from someone other than myself, and the library instructors have the expertise to deliver this instruction in a helpful and engaging way.”

Although, as noted previously, the two respondents who had not utilized library instruction represented a small percentage both of participants and of this population of *ENGL 105* and *105i* instructors, their answers will be referenced briefly. Both indicated that their decision stemmed from feeling able to teach necessary skills and concepts themselves. One respondent also cited a negative past experience with library instruction, while the other indicated that he or she did not consider it a productive use of time. In a question about what would make library instruction of use, one respondent listed additional communication about what library instruction is, an opportunity for shorter sessions and an opportunity to collaborate with a librarian to develop and test assignments. A second respondent selected *Nothing; do not see a use for it in my class.*

The survey's last question, which was open-ended, asked respondents to share any additional comments that they had about library instruction. Nine participants responded. Several included praise for individual librarians and library instruction as a whole, echoing the comments found in the survey's earlier question about why instructors would or would not sign up for library-led instruction in the future. Other responses either noted recent progress or offered recommendations for improvement. Two respondents specifically referenced their experiences with graduate student assistants leading their instruction sessions, one with a positive perspective; the other with suggestions based on an off-putting experience:

“I’ve noticed a big improvement in the librarians’ teaching skills over the past couple of years. Old sessions could be VERY boring and not engage the students at all; it seems that SILS [the School of Information and Library Science] is being attentive to pedagogy in its instruction these days, because the ‘teaching’ element is definitely getting better.”

“frankly with my negative experience with a grad student leading the instruction i felt that i could do a better job myself – esp since the lib website has made it

easier and after so many years of doing library visits. maybe you need to develop expertise in specific use of lib resources and make that available to 105 classes?"

Interestingly, although this respondent expressed dissatisfaction, he or she also referenced currently working with librarians in two of UNC's other subject-specific libraries as part of *ENGL 105* or *ENGL 105i* instruction.

Other comments from this final open-ended question included a suggestion to make library-led sessions more engaging by having students complete certain tasks, rather than listening to a lecture. One respondent shared experiences of librarians being "well-meaning" but trying to engage in dialogue to a larger degree than he or she desired:

"I have sometimes decided against having a library session because I knew that the librarian would try to impose on me more services than I was seeking and turn the email exchange into a long dialogue, always with requests for more material....When this happens, I feel like it is the librarian's needs that are being serviced instead of my own needs."

Associations Among Responses

While responses to individual questions shed light on *ENGL 105* and *105i* instructors' experiences with and attitudes toward library instruction, it was thought that examining possible associations among quantitative responses could provide additional illumination. Knowing that there are many approaches to analyzing data, and that this survey contained varied categories of data, the goal was not an exhaustive analysis of every set of responses' relationship to each other set. Rather, the investigation focused on exploring potential connections that could be of use in both planning library instruction and in identifying and developing further research opportunities in this field.

The first part of this investigation involved examining whether evidence of association could be drawn between length of teaching experience (*Survey Question #1*) and its impact on the number of library sessions requested (*Question #6*), the instructor's

ranking of library instruction's value to his or her teaching (*Question #9*) or the instructor's ranking of how well his or her most recent library session met objectives (*Question #11*). Following a commonly accepted practice in the social sciences, a p-value of 0.05 or below was deemed statistically significant. *STATA 13* data analysis and statistical software was used to calculate three ordered logistic regression models, using length of teaching experience as the independent, or causal, variable in each case. All of the resulting models yielded a p-value of greater than 0.05. The model for *Question #6* had the lowest p-value, at 0.156. Nonetheless, in each case, the models suggested that length of teaching experience had no statistically significant impact on any of the three practices or perceptions described above.

The second part of this investigation turned to survey questions that involved categorical variables and began by exploring whether associations existed among their answers and respondents' length of teaching experience. In addition to not having an intrinsic order, questions that involved categorical variables often enabled respondents to select more than one answer. For instance, comparing respondents' rankings of their research-related course objectives (*Question #2*) seemed an area of interest. However, respondents were told that they could rank up to three objectives in this question. All respondents ranked at least three, and several ranked more than three, initially making it difficult to use responses as a point of comparison.

To rectify this issue, data was imported in Excel and recoded. Recoding began with removing the three objectives ranked by fewer than half of participants, leaving *teaching students how to develop research topics*, *find information*, *evaluate information* and *cite information* as the remaining objectives for analysis. Initially, respondents who

had listed each of these objectives as either their most important or second-most important received a “1” in their column, and all other respondents, including both those who had ranked the objective lower on their list and those who had avoided ranking it, received a “2.” *STATA* was then used to conduct Fisher’s exact tests, a method of calculating associations among small samples for which Pearson chi-square tests are not appropriate. A p-value of 0.05 or lower was again considered statistically significant.

Using this method to compare length of teaching experience with course objectives resulted in no statistically significance evidence of association, as shown in Table 4, found on page 34. Data was then recoded to place a “1” in the columns of those who had ranked each objective as their most important objective and a “2” for those who had ranked it lower. Returning to *STATA* to calculate Fisher’s exact tests yielded p-values of lower than 0.1 but higher than 0.05 for *developing topics*, *finding information* and *citing information*. For *evaluating information*, however, the test yielded a p-value of 0.012. As Table 5, on page 35, shows, all three instructors with one semester of *ENGL 105* or *105i* teaching experience ranked this as their most important objective, while only one of 13 instructors with five or more semesters’ experience did. Interestingly, just one of 10 instructors with two semesters’ of experience teaching such a course ranked *evaluating information* as his or her most important objective, demonstrating more similarity to those with five or more semesters’ experience. Comparing Table 4 to Table 5, however, shows 60% of respondents listed *evaluating information* as one of their top two objectives, although less than a quarter saw it as their number one objective.

This same process of recoding data to explore potential associations with length of teaching experience was next undertaken with other ranking-based questions. For both

library session objectives (*Question #10*) and which other library instructional offerings participants would use (*Question #15*), recoding again proceeded in two stages. In the first, any objective or offering that the respondent had ranked as his or her top or second choice was coded with a “1” and anything ranked lower was coded with a “2.” In the second stage, to narrow the focus, only the objective or offering that the respondent had ranked as his or her top choice was coded with a “1.” This process revealed no statistically significant associations among respondents’ objectives for their most recent library instruction session and their length of first-year composition teaching experience.

Table 4: *Association Between Teaching Experience and Top Two Course Objectives*

Semesters Taught	Evaluate Information		Total
	1	2	
1	3 1.8	0 1.2	3 3.0
2	6 6.1	4 3.9	10 10.0
3	1 0.6	0 0.4	1 1.0
4	4 3.6	2 2.4	6 6.0
5	6 7.9	7 5.1	13 13.0
Total	20 20.0	13 13.0	33 33.0
Fisher's exact =			0.532

**Note:* Actual values are displayed without decimal points, with expected frequencies listed immediately below, calculated to two decimal points.

Table 5: Association Between Teaching Experience and Top Course Objective

Semesters Taught	Evaluate Information		Total
	1	2	
1	3 9.09	0 0.00	3 9.09
2	1 3.03	9 27.27	10 30.30
3	0 0.00	1 3.03	1 3.03
4	1 3.03	5 15.15	6 18.18
5	1 3.03	12 36.36	13 39.39
Total	6 18.18	27 81.82	33 100.00
Fisher's exact =			0.012

*Note: Actual values are displayed without decimal points, with expected frequencies listed immediately below, calculated to two decimal points.

For association between length of teaching experience and rankings of additional library instruction offerings, a different story emerged. Again running Fisher's exact tests to measure association, no evidence of statistically significance differences among groups emerged for the first two offerings listed in the question (*online tutorials in place of in-person library instruction and online tutorials that could be assigned as homework*).

For the next two offerings, *collaborating with a library instructor to develop an assignment or library instructor development of a class assignment*, however, suggestions of statistical significance did emerge. With the first round of recoding, or using a "1" to indicate the offerings ranked as respondents' first or second-highest choice, the resulting p-values were 0.013 and 0.010, respectively. With the second round of

recoding, or using a “1” to only indicate the offering ranked as respondents’ first-highest choice, p-values rose to 0.051 and 0.036, respectively. Although, at 0.051, the p-value for association between length of teaching experience and selection of *collaborating with a library instructor to develop an assignment* is slightly above the level deemed statistically significant, overall these four Fisher’s exact tests suggest that respondents with two or three semesters’ teaching experience selected these two offerings at a higher rate than those with other lengths of teaching experience, as shown in Tables 6 and 7, on page 37.

A similar recoding process was next undertaken to explore whether associations existed between length of first-year composition teaching experience and instructors’ Fall 2013 assignment planning processes (*Question #3*), with a particular focus on collaborative versus individual planning processes. An equitable recoding process was also undertaken to investigate length of teaching experience and perceptions of library instructors’ (*Question #12*). In both cases, no evidence of statistical significance emerged.

After exploring possible associations among length of teaching experience and other variables, the next step lay in examining these other variables’ associations with one another. Performing Fisher’s exact tests to compare respondents’ rankings of the value of library instruction to their teaching (*Question #9*) with their ratings of library instructors’ subject knowledge, presentation and delivery and engagement with students (*Question #12*) yielded p-values below 0.05. As demonstrated in Table 8, on page 38, these statistically significant p-values occurred for all categories when data was coded to group ratings of “highly proficient” as “1” and ratings of “proficient” or “fair/acceptable” together as “2.” They also occurred for every category except “subject knowledge” when data was recoded to group ratings of “highly proficient” and “proficient” together as “1.”

Table 6: Association Between Teaching Experience and Top-Two Ranked Library Offerings

Semesters Taught	Collaborating with Library Instructor		Total
	1	2	
1	1 1.5	2 1.5	3 3.0
2	9 5.2	1 4.8	10 10.0
3	1 0.5	0 0.5	1 1.0
4	1 3.1	5 2.9	6 6.0
5	5 6.7	8 6.3	13 13.0
Total	17 17.0	16 16.0	33 33.0
Fisher's exact =			0.013

Semesters Taught	Library Instructor Assignment Development		Total
	1	2	
1	0 0.4	3 2.6	3 3.0
2	3 1.2	7 8.8	10 10.0
3	1 0.1	0 0.9	1 1.0
4	0 0.7	6 5.3	6 6.0
5	0 1.6	13 11.4	13 13.0
Total	4 4.0	29 29.0	33 33.0
Fisher's exact =			0.010

*Note: For both Tables 6 and 7 actual values are displayed without decimal points, with expected frequencies listed immediately below, calculated to two decimal points.

Table 7: Association Between Teaching Experience and Top Ranked Library Offering

Semesters Taught	Collaborating with Library Instructor		Total
	1	2	
1	0 0.9	2 1.1	2 2.0
2	8 4.6	2 5.4	10 10.0
3	0 0.5	1 0.5	1 1.0
4	1 2.3	4 2.7	5 5.0
5	4 4.6	6 5.4	10 10.0
Total	13 13.0	15 15.0	28 28.0
Fisher's exact =			0.051

Semesters Taught	Library Instructor Assignment Development		Total
	1	2	
1	0 0.1	2 1.9	2 2.0
2	0 0.4	10 9.6	10 10.0
3	1 0.0	0 1.0	1 1.0
4	0 0.2	5 4.8	5 5.0
5	0 0.4	10 9.6	10 10.0
Total	1 1.0	27 27.0	28 28.0
Fisher's exact =			0.036

Table 8: *P-Values of Comparisons Between Library Instruction's Value and Library Instructor Rankings*

	Rankings of <i>Highly Proficient (1) vs. Proficient and Fair/Acceptable (2)</i>	Rankings of <i>Highly Proficient and Proficient (1) vs. Fair/Acceptable (2)</i>
Subject Knowledge	0.002	0.488
Presentation and Delivery	0.004	0.048
Engagement with Students	0.004	0.021

Fueled by these findings, subsequent Fisher's exact tests sought to explore other potential associations involving ratings of library instruction's value to respondents' teaching. Tests were run between instruction's value and respondents' *ENGL 105* or *105i* course objectives, their library session objectives, the number of library sessions that they used and how well their most recent library session met the objectives that they had for it (*Question #11*). In each of these cases, no p-values of 0.05 or below occurred, indicating that there was no statistically significant association among respondents' rating of library instruction's value and any of the other four variables. Thus, the statistically significant associations that emerged in analyzing survey responses remained:

- Length of first-year composition teaching experience and listing of *evaluating information* as a top course objective
- Length of teaching experience and ratings of *collaborating with library instructor to develop an assignment* or *library instructor development of a class assignment* as the top additional instruction opportunities respondents would use if available
- Rating of library instruction's value to respondents' teaching and rankings of library instructors' skills in *subject knowledge*, *presentation and delivery* and *engagement with students*

Limitations and Opportunities

Before further discussing the survey's responses and their implications, it is helpful to consider the study's limitations. As noted in the literature review, surveys tend to suffer from low response rates. While this survey's 38% response rate is higher than several others referenced in the literature review, the fact remains that fewer than half of the population eligible to take this survey completed it. Moreover, with 33 respondents, the survey has a small sample size, and respondents represent a rather homogenous population, both of which could limit the generalizability of results. This is especially important when considering associations among responses. Given the small and exploratory nature of this study, these potential associations should be seen as areas of interest for replicating or expanding upon this research, rather than as associations to attribute to other populations, or even to extend to all of UNC's *ENGL 105* and *105i* instructors. It could be particularly enlightening to conduct a similar survey with a larger population of faculty instructors, culled from either other departments' introductory, first-year coursework or from other colleges and universities with comparable first-year composition courses that likewise have an opportunity to utilize library-led instruction. It could also be insightful to focus on other groups of faculty. As noted in the description of this study's environment, a majority of *ENGL 105* and *105i* instructors are doctoral candidates. Exploring the practices and perceptions of full-fledged and veteran faculty could yield different insights or deepen those gleaned from this study.

Social desirability bias stands as another potential caveat to keep in mind. This survey strove to incorporate questions about both behavior and attitudes to lessen the risk of respondents answering questions a particular way because it seemed politically correct. Nonetheless, it is possible that some amount of this bias occurred, particularly because

respondents knew that the survey was being conducted with involvement from the Undergraduate Experience Librarian. The fact that 100% of respondents indicated that they would sign up for library-led instruction again stands as one potential example of this bias. Although a unanimously positive response may seem encouraging, indicating a willingness to sign up for instruction does not carry the same weight as actually doing so. An open-ended follow-up question asking participants why they would choose to sign up again provided some specific insights into respondents' reasoning. Again, however, describing why one would do something is not equivalent to actually doing it. In addition, eight respondents, or approximately 26%, chose not to answer this follow-up question.

Survey timing and question wording stand as two final limitations to consider. Initially, it was thought that launching the survey early in the Spring 2014 semester would encourage responses because faculty would not be consumed by end-of-semester deadlines that may have weighed upon them if the survey were administered in December. Nonetheless, it is worth considering whether launching the survey at the end of the Fall 2013 semester, or in early January of the Spring 2014 term, would have made experiences fresher in respondents' minds or increased response rates.

Survey wording stands as a related consideration. Several questions asked respondents to think about their "most recent library instruction session." This wording was purposefully selected with the thought that this session would be clearest in respondents' minds and prevent the potential for skewed respondents that could occur if the phrasing "most memorable" Fall 2013 session were used instead. However, for respondents whose classes received more than one library instruction session in Fall 2013, it is possible that their most recent session differed significantly from earlier

sessions. In addition, since the survey launched during Spring 2014, it is also possible that instructors may have taken “most recent session” to include any that they had already had during this new semester. To mitigate these potential issues, the survey could have instead asked respondents whose classes received more than one library instruction session to discuss each of these sessions separately, although this could have led to convoluted processes in both completing the survey and analyzing and coding data.

Issues with wording stand as an overall drawback of surveys as a methodology. As Radcliff et al.(2007) note, surveys generally do not allow for follow-up on, or clarification of, questions. In this survey, several results emerged that led the principal investigator to consider further research questions she would have liked to ask, which are addressed further in the *Discussion* section that follows. Because of the survey’s design and the desire for collecting anonymous responses, however, there was no way to reach out to ask these questions of participants, as there may have been in a focus group or interview setting.

Discussion

Despite the limitations described above, both individual study findings and associations among findings present considerations for practice, as well as opportunities for further research. Moreover, the introduction of certain practices, based on study findings, could itself pave the way for additional research. In terms of both applications to librarianship and further research, findings could be grouped into two broad categories: respondents' practices, both in terms of their own teaching and in their use of library instruction, and their perceptions of instruction and library instructors.

Practices of Instruction

Survey respondents' listings of their course objectives suggest one interesting area of exploration. As illustrated in Table 2, *ENGL 105* and *105i* instructors had a range of objectives for their teaching. Such a finding reinforces the idea of personalization in conversations with faculty, rather than assuming that one objective fits all for library instruction, or that a library instructor's objectives parallel those of the faculty instructor. It is also worth noting that some of the objectives that respondents selected focused on particular tools and resources, rather than broader concepts of learning, such as evaluating information. For instance, 21% of respondents ranked *teach students about a specific technology (eg – Publisher, WordPress)* as one of their objectives, while 36% ranked *teach students about specific resources (eg – electronic journals)*, and one referenced citation management software *Zotero* as his or her write-in response.

Of the course objectives that respondents selected, analysis revealed that only one, *teach students to evaluate information*, appeared to have a statistically significant association with respondents' length of first-year composition teaching experience. Respondents with one or two semesters' of teaching experience were the only groups in which more than half of participants listed this as one of their top two course objectives. Those with one semester of experience were the only group in which a majority listed it as their top objective. Such an observation suggests that both librarians involved in instruction and researchers may wish to explore potential differences in teaching goals among faculty with different lengths of experience. Also of note is the fact that respondents who had taught a first-year composition course for one or two semesters are likely to have only worked with UNC's Undergraduate Experience Librarian as their library instruction liaison. An area of further study may be to explore whether and to what extent faculty instructors' teaching objectives change through their work with particular librarians.

Another area that seems to have implications for both librarians' work and further research is the objective of *teaching students how to develop topics*. As evident in Table 2, there is a noticeable drop-off between the number of respondents who ranked this as their highest objective and those who ranked it second or third. Looking at the other frequently ranked objectives, *finding*, *evaluating* and *citing information*, the opposite scenario occurs. In each case, the number of respondents ranking it as important either stays steady or actually increases in moving down the list from top-ranked to third-highest ranked objective. It appears that developing topics is something that *ENGL 105* and *105i* instructors either feel strongly about or do not deem particularly important. This

survey does not offer evidence of a clear association between ranking of this objective and other variables, paving the way to explore whether it occurs in other populations and, if so, why. Librarians may also wish to be cognizant of how faculty feel about topic development and make this a discussion as they both launch and continue collaboration.

Assignment development practices and collaboration with librarians provide other study findings that could be explored further. As responses to *Question #3* revealed, nearly three quarters of respondents engaged in at least one assignment development practice that involved some form of others' input, whether that meant using or revising materials that a colleague had created or collaborating with someone else to update and plan materials. Practices that involved developing new assignments, either on one's own or through collaboration, were selected the least frequently. It could be that these practices involve more time than faculty instructors feel that they can devote to them, or instructors could feel that using or modifying existing assignment materials is sufficient for students' needs. An open-ended follow-up question that asked respondents to explain their reasons for using particular practices, or a direct method of research, such as an interview or focus group, could help better illuminate this study observation.

It is also interesting to observe what seems a large gap between respondents' current collaboration with librarians and their expressed interest in collaboration. In *Question #3*, only 18% of respondents indicated that they collaborated with a librarian to write a new assignment, while in *Question #8*, seven respondents, or 23%, indicated that a librarian had helped with the development or design of an assignment. This change in rates likely occurred because the former question asked about the creation of a new assignment, while the latter did not impose that stipulation. Turning to *Question #15*,

however, which asked about which additional practices respondents would use if available, 19 respondents, or 61% selected *collaborating with a library instructor to develop an assignment*. Thirteen respondents, or 42%, even listed this as the offering that they would be most likely to use. In addition, eight respondents selected *library instructor development of a class assignment* as something that they would use.

Such a gap could have occurred as a result of social desirability bias, as discussed earlier, but it is also possible that its occurrence could be attributed at least in part to either faculty instructors not realizing that such collaboration was available or not knowing how to request it. It is also interesting to note that, as demonstrated in Tables 6 and 7, respondents with two or three semesters of teaching experience formed the only groups in which a majority of respondents listed these two library offerings as their top two options. This observation is more striking for instructors with two semesters' experience, given the fact that there was only one instructor listed with three semesters' experience. Nonetheless, for library practitioners, this finding may point to a need to enhance communication and marketing of collaboration opportunities. It may also indicate a need to target communications and marketing to groups who have a small amount of first-year composition experience but who are not completely new to it. These instructors may not receive the same level of departmental or library orientation and guidance as new instructors do, while also not having the same level of familiarity with their department or their librarian liaison as their more seasoned colleagues. They may also have learned that the assignments or teaching practices that they employed during their first semester as an instructor were not as effective as they envisioned and thus be actively looking for ways to discuss and enhance them.

Perceptions of Library Instruction

Turning from respondents' instructional practices, both within their own teaching and their library-led sessions, to their perceptions of library instruction adds another dimension to discussion. As illustrated in the *Results* section, tests of association among respondents' rankings of their most recent library session's instructor and their rating of library instruction's value revealed statistical significance. This significance occurred for rankings of the library instructor's subject knowledge, presentation and delivery and engagement with students. For librarians, particularly those concerned with their instruction being seen as an "add-on" rather than an imperative, this finding hints at the importance of the library instructor in shaping faculty attitudes toward instruction.

In terms of additional research, this finding presents several distinct opportunities. It could be enlightening to explore whether associations exist for all of a faculty instructor's library sessions throughout a semester, rather than just the most recent. It would also be interesting to examine whether this library-led session marked the faculty member's first experience with a particular library instructor or if he or she had worked with the library instructor in the past, either in a classroom session or in instructional planning. This area also seems ripe for employing additional methodologies, such as focus groups or interviews, as well as self- or peer-observations of library instructors. It would also be interesting to compare faculty perceptions of their library instructor's knowledge, presentation and engagement with students' perceptions. It is possible that students are getting more – or less – out of a class than their instructor believes.

Drawing on responses to the survey's open-ended questions, additional areas of discussion emerged. First, several open-ended responses referenced graduate assistants teaching library instruction versus full-time librarians at the helm. As noted previously, at

UNC, graduate research assistants from the School of Information and Library Science teach a significant portion of *ENGL 105* and *105i* sessions, following a day-long training “bootcamp” at the Undergraduate Library, observation of at least three library sessions taught by a full-time librarian or an experienced graduate assistant and planning and discussion of at least one session with a librarian mentor. Initially, asking survey respondents about whether their library sessions had been taught by a librarian or graduate assistant seemed a direction to consider, but this question was ultimately discarded because of concerns that respondents may not know their library instructor’s status. However, examining if perceptions changed based on knowing a library instructor’s status could provide insights for both practice and research. This knowledge could help librarians identify potential training opportunities, as well as communications opportunities when talking to faculty members. A study of whether telling faculty members what graduate assistants do to prepare for leading library instruction affected their perceptions of these assistants as instructors could be a thought-provoking one.

A last area to consider in terms of perceptions of library instruction is the role of physical space in attitudes toward its value. At UNC, there are several different library spaces used for *ENGL 105* and *105i* instruction. Faculty instructors also have the option of having their library session in their own classroom. These spaces include rooms with rows of desktop computers and no aisles, rooms with rows of desktop computers separated by an aisle, and rooms with no desktop computers and furniture arranged in rows, pods of four to five desks or seminar-style. Some of these setups allow more mobility or greater ease of presenting than others, which could result in higher engagement, or higher perceptions of engagement, as well as of library instructors’

presentation and delivery. Although this survey did not ask about instructional spaces, doing so seems a direction well worth considering.

A final area of perceptions worth considering is that of faculty instructors who choose not to utilize library instruction. Although, as noted earlier, only two eligible members of this population participated in the study, limiting the generalizability of their responses, it is perhaps illuminating that both echoed the idea that they felt capable of teaching all aspects of *ENGL 105* or *105i* by themselves. Their answers suggest a need to demonstrate how library instruction adds value to other classroom instruction. The challenge, however, perhaps also suggested by the very low survey response rate among this population, is first getting those who have never opted to use library instruction, as well as those who have had negative experiences with it, to listen to librarians. Finding a way to reach this population presents an opportunity for both librarians and researchers. It may also represent a chance for librarians to build upon existing collaborations and the relationships that they have already developed with other faculty instructors to see if these faculty can play a role in engaging their colleagues. Examining not only *what* leads faculty to library instruction, as this survey strove to do, but *who*, may result in insights that could enhance both the use of library instruction and attitudes toward it.

Conclusion

By combining affective queries with questions that asked about specific behaviors, this study sought to expand upon earlier research and to gain insights into what leads first-year *Rhetoric and Composition* course instructors to incorporate library instruction, their expectations and experiences with this instruction and their motivation for using it again in the future. As a small, exploratory method of evaluation that took place within one program of one university, initially this study's findings may appear limited. Nonetheless, by providing information about actions and behaviors, as well as suggesting findings of association among several variables related to teaching experience, instructional objectives and perceptions, it is hoped that this study can both stand as a tool and serve as a springboard for library practice and library research.

Perhaps one of the key contributions that this study can make to library practice is to reemphasize the idea that effective collaboration with faculty is person-centered, rather than method-dependent. Responses to this survey can be categorized by the number of those who selected certain options, and even in some instances, by associations among responses. Ultimately, however, participants' experiences with and attitudes toward library instruction, were many and varied, as were learning objectives for their students, both in their own classroom and in those led by a library instructor.

Interestingly, this study occurred during a period where discussions about information literacy are in a state of evolution. As noted at the start of this paper, this

evolution can perhaps best be seen in the ARCL's forthcoming revision of its 14-year-old *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*. Although the ACRL standards' replacement, currently referenced as the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*, will not be finalized until later in 2014, its publicly available draft version echoes the idea of varied factors playing a role in information literacy instruction. Shifting demographics, the rise of collaborative work, students being seen as creators and contributors to projects that increasingly involve digital technology and a growing focus on active and blending learning are some of the chief considerations that the draft *Framework* takes into account as it "moves beyond the *Standards*' concept of information literacy, which provides a limited, almost formulaic approach to understanding a complex information ecosystem" (Association of College & Research Libraries, 2014, p. 3). As this study suggests, in order to connect with faculty and effectively participate in this evolving information ecosystem, those involved in library instruction must not simply acknowledge the need for collaboration, but instead take a leadership role in cultivating it.

References

American Library Association. (1989). Presidential committee on information literacy.

Final report. Retrieved from:

<http://www.ala.org/acrl/publications/whitepapers/presidential>

Association of College & Research Libraries. (2014). *Framework for Information*

Literacy for Higher Education [Part I, draft]. Retrieved from

<http://acrl.ala.org/ilstandards/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Framework-for-IL-for-HE-Draft-1-Part-1.pdf> (accessed 29 March 2014).

Association of College & Research Libraries. (2000). *Information literacy competency*

standards for higher education. Retrieved from:

<http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>

Badke, W. (2010). Why information literacy is invisible. *Communications in Information*

Literacy, 4 (2), 129-141.

Behrens, S. (1994). A conceptual analysis and historical overview of information literacy.

College & Research Libraries, 55(4), 309-322.

Bell, S.J. (2013, June 4). Rethinking ACRL's information literacy standards: The process

begins [Web log post]. Retrieved from

<http://www.acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/archives/7329>

Cannon, A. (1994). Faculty survey on library research instruction. *RQ*, 33 (4), 524-41.

- DaCosta, J. W. (2010). Is there an information literacy skills gap to be bridged? An examination of faculty perceptions and activities related to information literacy in the United States and England. *College & Research Libraries*, 71 (3), 203-222.
- Gaspar, D. B., & Wetzel, K. A. (2009). A case study in collaboration: Assessing academic librarian/faculty partnerships. *College & Research Libraries*, 70(6), 578-590.
- Gonzales, R. (2001). Opinions and experiences of university faculty regarding library research instruction: Results of a web-based survey at the University of Southern Colorado. *Research Strategies*, 18, 191-201.
- Grassian, E. (2004). Building on bibliographic instruction. *American Libraries*, 35(9), 51-53.
- Gullikson, S. (2006). Faculty perceptions of ACRL's information literacy competency standards for higher education. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32 (6), 583-592.
- Hardesty, L. (1991). *Faculty and the library: The undergraduate experience*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Houlihan, M., & Click, A. (2012). Teaching literacy: Methods for studying and improving library instruction. *Evidence Based Librayr and Information Practice*, 7(4), 35-51.
- Hrycaj, P. L., & Russo, M. F. (2007a). A survey of LSU faculty attitudes toward library research instruction. *Louisiana Libraries*, 69(4), 15-25.

- Hrycaj, P., & Russo, M. (2007b). Reflections on surveys of faculty attitudes toward collaboration with librarians. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 33(6), 692-696.
doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2007.09.008
- Lorenzen, M. (2001). A brief history of library information in the United States of America. *Illinois Libraries*, 83(2), 8-18.
- McGuinness, C. (2006). What faculty think – exploring the barriers to information literacy development in undergraduate education. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32 (6), 573-582.
- Meulemans, Y. N., & Carr, A. (2013). Not at your service: Building genuine faculty-librarian partnerships. *Reference Services Review*, 41(1), 80-90.
doi:10.1108/00907321311300893
- Mounce, M. (2010). Working together: Academic librarians and faculty collaborating to improve students' information literacy skills: A literature review 2000-2009. *Reference Librarian*, 51(4), 300-320. doi:10.1080/02763877.2010.501420
- Oakleaf, M., & Kaske, N. (2009). Guiding questions for assessing information literacy in higher education. *Portal: Libraries & the Academy*, 9(2), 273-286.
- Radcliff, C.J., Jensen, M.L., Salem, J.A., Jr., Burhanna, K.J., & Gedeon, J.A. (2007). *A practical guide to information literacy assessment for academic librarians*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Raspa, D., & Ward, D. (Eds.). (2000). *The collaborative imperative: Librarians and faculty working together in the information universe*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

- Saunders, L. (2012). Faculty perspectives on information literacy as a student learning outcome. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 38(4), 226-236.
- Schilling, K., & Applegate, R. (2012). Best methods for evaluating educational impact: A comparison of the efficacy of commonly used measures of library instruction. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 100(4), 258-269.
- Tancheva, K., Andrews, C., and Steinhart, G. (2007). Library instruction assessment in academic libraries. *Public Services Quarterly*, 3 (1-2), 29-56.
- Thompson, G.B. (2002). Information literacy accreditation mandates: What they mean for faculty and librarians. *Library Trends*, 51 (2), 218-241.
- UNC Library News and Events. (2012, June 19). Appointments: Scholarly communications, TRaCS Institute, knowledge management, GIS, undergraduate experience, undergraduate library head [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://blogs.lib.unc.edu/news/index.php/2012/06/appointments-unc-library-june-2012/>
- UNC Writing Program. (n.d.). *About*. Retrieved from <http://writing.unc.edu>
- UNC Writing Program. (n.d.). *Courses and placement*. Retrieved from <http://writing.unc.edu/courses> (accessed 9 Jan 2014).
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Office of Undergraduate Curricula. (n.d.) *Foundations requirements*. Retrieved from <http://www.unc.edu/depts/uc/Curriculum/Foundations.html> (accessed 9 Jan 2014).
- University of North Carolina Library. (n.d.) *Table VI: Instruction Sessions and Participants*. Retrieved from <http://library.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/instruction13.pdf>

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Office of the University Registrar. (2013).

UNC-Chapel Hill Schedule of Classes for 2013 Fall. Retrieved from

<http://registrar.unc.edu/files/2013/10/2139-SSB-10-14-13.pdf>

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

1. How many semesters have you taught ENGL 105/105i (or an equivalent First-Year Composition course)?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5+

2. Please rank your research-related course objectives for ENGL 105/105i, with #1 being the most important. You may rank up to three.

- _____ Teach students how to develop research topics
- _____ Teach students how to find information
- _____ Teach students how to evaluate information
- _____ Teach students how to cite information
- _____ Teach students about specific resources (eg - electronic journals)
- _____ Teach students about specific technologies (eg - Publisher, WordPress)
- _____ Other (*Please describe*) _____

3. During the Fall 2013 semester, which of the following assignment planning processes did you use? Please check all that apply.

- Used existing assignment(s) that I developed
- Updated existing assignment(s) that I developed
- Used existing assignment(s) developed by others
- Modified existing assignments developed by others
- Collaborated with colleague(s) to write new assignments
- Collaborated with librarian(s) to write new assignments
- Wrote my own, new assignment without outside assistance
- Other (*Please describe*) _____

4. Did your Fall 2013 classes include library instruction sessions, either in your classroom or in the library?

- Yes
- No

If "No" is selected, then survey skips to Question 16: "Which of the following describe your decision not to sign up for library-led instruction? Please check all that apply."

5. For which unit(s) during the Fall 2013 semester did you include a library instruction session? Please check all that apply.

- Natural Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Humanities
- Other

6. How many times did each of your classes receive library instruction during the Fall 2013 semester?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4+

7. Did you request more library instruction sessions for the semester than you originally anticipated?

- Yes
- No

If "Yes" is selected, then Question 7a will be displayed.

7a. What factors led you to request additional library instruction sessions? (*text box*)

8. Did a librarian help with the development and design of any of your unit assignments?

- Yes
- No

9. To what extent is library instruction valuable to your teaching?

Little to no utility	Limited utility	Adds some value but also has drawbacks	Important but not essential	Absolutely essential
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Thinking about your most recent library instruction session, please rank your objectives for requesting the session, with #1 being the most important. You may rank up to three.

- _____ Expose students to the physical library
 _____ Expose students to print resources
 _____ Expose students to electronic resources
 _____ Introduce students to librarians
 _____ Teach research skills that would not otherwise be part of my regular instruction
 _____ Teach research skills that support and elaborate upon instruction I already offer
 _____ Teach technological skills that would not otherwise be part of my regular instruction
 _____ Teach technological skills that support and elaborate upon instruction I already offer
 _____ Teach students how to use specific software (eg - Photoshop, RefWorks)
 _____ Give students in-class time to work on assignment
 _____ Other (*Please describe*) _____

11. Thinking about your most recent library instruction session, how well did this session meet these objectives?

Did not meet any	Missed majority	Met about half	Met most	Met all
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Thinking about your most recent library instruction session, how would you rate this session's library instructor in the following areas?

	Very Low	Low	Fair / Acceptable	Proficient	Highly proficient
Subject knowledge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Presentation and delivery	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Engagement with students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. Would you sign up for library-led instruction again?

- Yes
 No

14. Please briefly describe why or why not. (*text box*)

15. If available, which other library instruction opportunities would you use? Please rank your preferences with #1 being most likely to use.

- _____ Online tutorials in place of in-person library instruction
- _____ Online tutorials that could be assigned as homework
- _____ Collaborating with a library instructor to develop an assignment
- _____ Library instructor development of a class assignment
- _____ Other (Please describe)

Survey now skips to Question 18

16. Which of the following describe your decision not to sign up for library-led instruction? Please check all that apply.

- Did not realize it was available
- Did not understand how to request or schedule it
- Did not feel that it was a productive use of time
- Did not feel that I had enough time in the semester
- Felt able to teach all skills and concepts to students myself
- Felt that students had adequate research skills to complete assignments
- Had a negative experience with library-led instruction in the past
- Other (*If selected, text box with "Please describe" message displays*)

17. What, if anything, would make library-led instruction of use to your class? Please check all that apply.

- More communication about scheduling
- More communication about what library instruction is
- Opportunities for short sessions rather than an entire class period
- Opportunities to use online tutorials rather than in-class sessions
- Opportunities to collaborate with librarians to develop and test assignments
- Other (*If selected, text box with "Please describe" message displays*)
- Nothing; do not see a use for it in my class

18. Are there any additional comments that you have about library instruction? Please share here. (*text box*)

Appendix B: Survey Invitation

Dear Instructors:

As coordinator of library instruction for First-Year Composition, I am constantly looking at ways to improve our offerings to faculty and students. As ENGL 105/105i instructors, I particularly value your insights and feedback.

I am writing to invite your participation in a brief online survey about your ENGL 105 and ENGL 105i experiences during the Fall 2013 (last) semester. This survey is being conducted by School of Information & Library Science graduate student, Anna Sandelli, who is undertaking a study of teaching practices and perceptions of library instruction for her master's paper.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and all who taught at least one section of ENGL 105 or ENGL 105i during the Fall 2013 semester are eligible. No personally identifiable information will be collected, and responses will remain confidential. In addition to informing Anna's research, survey results will be used to provide insights into how to enhance the library services that we offer.

To complete the survey, please click the link below (or copy and paste it in your browser). The survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. The survey will remain open until Friday, Feb. 14.

[Survey Link]

For any questions about the survey, please contact Principal Investigator Anna Sandelli at sandelli@email.unc.edu and myself at jmcm@email.unc.edu. This project has been reviewed by the UNC Office of Human Research Ethics.

Thank you for your time,

Jonathan

Jonathan McMichael
Undergraduate Experience Librarian
R. B. House Undergraduate Library
CB# 3942
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-8890

Appendix C: Survey Reminder

Hi all,

With last week's winter weather, we wanted to send a final reminder to please participate in our library assessment survey via the following link: *[Survey link]*

If you taught at least **one** section of **ENGL 105 or 105i** during the **Fall 2013 semester** you are invite to participate. **We encourage you to participate regardless of whether or not you used library instruction**, and we particularly welcome feedback from those who did not use library instruction. Your perspectives are invaluable for helping deliver library services to meet the Writing Program's needs.

No personally identifiable information will be collected, and the survey will take approximately **5 minutes**. Please contact Principal Investigator Anna Sandelli at sandelli@email.unc.edu and myself at jmcm@email.unc.edu with any questions.

Thank you!

Jonathan McMichael
Undergraduate Experience Librarian
R. B. House Undergraduate Library
CB# 3942
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-8890