Introduction

A.P. MARSHALL

IN THE 1960s there was a resurgence of interest in library user education which ran concomitantly with a period of intense searching for values. The mood of the time required the stripping of facades from old and traditional practices in order to determine if the original truths, reasons, and assumptions supporting them were still valid. It was a time of intensive personal searching to make certain that everything was right and, if not, to determine how to make it so.

A sizable number of librarians during this period seemed to see their profession as amibivalent, claiming no sound discipline of its own, but clinging tenaciously to the more established fields of study. There was very strong, even emotional desire for clearer definitions of the library profession and better-defined objectives. To be librarians in what they perceived as the old tradition was not enough. They felt that there had to be more to the profession than was immediately apparent.

College enrollments mushroomed during the 1960s, and new laws and intepretations of laws were followed by avalanches of so-called nontraditional students to college campuses, seeking to equip themselves with the advantages that college education could offer. Educational theorists had a heyday as they resurrected philosophies and principles which might have some bearing on the new college student. Still others occupied themselves by structuring theories which could be applied to this evolving educational phenomenon.

A.P. Marshall is Professor of Library Services at Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, and is currently Acting Director of the University Library.

Librarians, concerned with their roles as transmitters of important knowledge and concepts, started questioning their own abilities to meet the challenges brought by this "nontraditional student." Did they have sufficient understanding of these students to participate maximally in their learning processes? Could exposure to more ideas help librarians to be of greater assistance to the new students? What stance should librarians take regarding students who questioned the relevancy of some courses as preparation for life work?

The "inner incentives" which drive librarians to serve patrons are no different from those which inspire teachers. Librarians were as concerned about this new student as were the classroom teachers. These concerns come normally in three phases. First, there is the feeling of responsibility to the profession. If this is taken seriously, every effort will be made to help the patron toward his learning objectives. Second, there is a strong desire to assist in the growth and maturity of patrons as intellectuals and as citizens. Third, there is the fulfillment and satisfaction that come from successfully promoting and engaging in the learning process.[1]

Emerging from this milieu of concerns came the somewhat dormant idea that librarians could do more to contribute to the teaching/ learning process than play a waiting role. Courses of action had to be determined, and time had to be found for strategic planning. A general but unexpressed feeling developed that "the difference between good [librarianship] and poor [librarianship] is not so much a matter of being 'born' to it, but caring enough to learn how to do it better, to take some calculated risks, to engage in the life of dialogue which is, as Martin Buber long ago said, the life of education."[2]

The vibrancy of librarian concerns was illustrated in the response to the first call for a national conference on library orientation at Eastern Michigan University (Ypsilanti) in 1971. Interest had been building at state and national library conferences, and information was beginning to appear in library journals. A few grants had been received and news of them was getting around. In subsequent years, the conference at Ypsilanti was to become a kind of crossroads for those seeking ideas for developing tailored programs for their own campuses.

Recollections of many programs, hundreds of concerned librarians, and dozens of organizations with funds to dispense came to mind as preparation for this issue began. An effort was made to select from a large number of informed and qualified persons those who would be willing to contribute in this unique way to an "update" on the general subject of library user instruction (or bibliographic instruction). Mark

Introduction

Tucker was asked to develop the historical perspective of the subject, and he has succeeded quite well. Crediting Ralph Waldo Emerson with the basic concept, Tucker rather expertly intertwines the development of educational thought and philosophy with an increasing consciousness of the need for users to understand libraries. He reminds his readers of the early twentieth-century experiments and their importance in the process. He reviews the conflicts which emerged as stronger assertions were made in favor of library user instruction, and discusses quite candidly the continuing lack of "sound philosophical and theoretical foundations" to support the movement. Predicting benefits from the never-ending search, he forecasts an increasing importance for library user instruction.

Carolyn Kirkendall provides an overview from the advantage of the Library Orientation/Information Exchange (LOEX) office at Eastern Michigan University. A rationale for a clearinghouse of library user instructional materials is established as she offers her evaluation of the project.

Thomas G. Kirk, James R. Kennedy, Jr., and Nancy P. Van Zant begin their paper, "Structuring Services and Facilities for Library Instruction," with an assumption of full and unquestioned support by the academic administration. They then proceed to outline what they see as the three elements of a successful program. Dividing their paper between the philosophic and practical aspects, and the physical aspects, their discussion might be considered as a "how-to-do-it" part of this issue. They raise several pertinent questions which are designed to incite further useful research into the values to be derived from such a program.

With competency-based education capturing so much attention these days, Carla J. Stoffle and Judith M. Pryor were asked to examine this teaching/learning technique as it is being applied to library user education. The authors discuss briefly the meaning of competency-based education before applying the concept to library user education. Their article describes programs at Alverno College, Doane College, Sangamon State University, the University of Louisville, Findlay College, and the University of Wisconsin-Parkside, providing a variety of models. Stoffle and Pryor recognize the limitations of competency-based programs and their unsuitability at some institutions, but point out that in some cases "it can be a very effective approach." In other institutions, it may be "too time-consuming and too demanding in terms of the need for faculty cooperation and acceptance, and of the skills required of the instruction librarian."

Sharon Rogers examines the theory and practice involved with the subject of "Research Strategies: Bibliographic Instruction for Undergraduates." Her approach is scholarly and analytical. Recognizing disagreements among professionals on definition of terms, she expertly divides the subject in terms of levels of students to be instructed, the content of the instructional materials, the methods used to teach, and who should teach—divisions which provide an opportunity to examine each facet carefully. She feels that there must be a translation of knowledge from the academic library experience into the conceptual frameworks and habits of users.

Mignon Adams writes about the "Individualized Approach to Learning Library Skills." Various methods of helping individual users are discussed—the library tour, handbooks, guides, programmed instruction, and computer-assisted instruction. Every library which has tried to do something in this field will find here a technique with which it can identify.

Hannelore Rader addresses "Reference Services as a Teaching Function" in a related article. The absence of an acceptable theory of reference service has not diminished librarian interest in library user instruction. Tracing the origin of reference service to the late nineteenth century, Rader cites the efforts of Samuel S. Green, W.W. Bishop, J.I. Wyer, and Samuel Rothstein, all of whom brought dignity and recognition to reference work.

The "Training and Education of Library Instruction Librarians" is discussed by Sharon Anne Hogan. She explains the thrust of "bibliographic instruction" as it emanates from continuing education. The contributions of ALA-related programs to the development of the bibliographic instruction concept are described briefly. Even as she reviews the resistance of library schools to adding courses which would train prospective teachers for bibliographical instruction, she is hopeful that recognition of the need for formal training for the teaching librarian or the teacher of bibliography will strengthen the role of the library in the institutional setting.

Beverly P. Lynch and Karen S. Seibert write about the librarian's involvement in the total educational process. They begin by comparing pre-1930, classically oriented teaching with current methods which rely heavily on library resources. Reviewing some of the institutional programs in which the library has been made the actual center of instruction and librarians have been assigned important functions in the teaching/learning process, the authors recognize that true involvement in the total educational planning process is still unrealized on a vast

scale. There are a few programs of informal involvement which are easier to achieve and seem to be effective, however. In the final analysis, the classroom instructor prefers to remain independent of librarians when structuring academic programs.

No coverage of library user instruction could overlook the impact of the computer. Gail Herndon Lawrence believes that the impact of on-line bibliographic searches will beome even greater in the future. Writing on "The Computer as as Instructional Device," she urges her colleagues to be creative in their use of machines but, at the same time, advises caution. The possibility of "on-line data base searching" obscuring "the true nature of library research" is always there, she argues. She believes that "the challenge of automation is a total redefinition of the role and function of library user education."

Richard Werking brings a scholarly approach to evaluation to this issue and shows that measurement of teaching effectiveness is not easy. His article reviews various techniques used on different campuses, showing the strengths and weaknesses of each type of measurement. He also reviews evaluation of library user instruction programs in a few European institutions. None of these, however, is completely satisfactory, and it may be some time before testing procedures catch up with user instruction programs.

The fortunes of bibliographic instruction and library user education are so inextricably tied to institutional health that announcements which border on educational doom cause the same concerns among librarians as they do among teaching faculty. Such was the case when the January 28, 1980, issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* carried a report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education.[3] By carefully analyzing demographic factors, changing population mix, labor market changes, institutional types, state populations; and fiscal trends, the council, under the chairmanship of Clark Kerr, predicts enrollment declines in the next two decades which will have a devastating effect on higher education. The council also predicted that there will be a decrease in quality and integrity in higher education, and that survival will replace excellence as a major objective.

How reasonable is it to assume that despite possible decreases in budgets, college administrators will have a better understanding of the relationships between library resources and campus excellence so that quality will be maintained? Of course, those who have been involved in library user education over the past few years hope that their impact has been great enough to assure continuity of programs. Thousands of students have had the benefits of user instruction programs, and should

now be among that vast educated public and should have learned to rely on libraries. Their sophisticated knowledge should be sufficient to evoke loud outcries in protest of any reduction in library support.

Unfortunately, no paper within this group addresses the future in the same way that the Carnegie Council does, but the document is important for all who must consider the future of education in our time. If some new thought has been generated by one of the authors here, and if one new convert to bibliographical instruction or library user education is attracted by this issue, then efforts made here have not been wasted.

I want to thank each of the contributors, who found time among hectic schedules to develop their thoughts and ideas on paper in order to share them with colleagues. Whatever future there is for the library profession in general and library user education in particular will be dependent on them and others like them. Among the people who have played important roles in making this publication possible are the following: Carolyn Kirkendall, director of the LOEX office at Eastern Michigan University; Hannelore Rader, coordinator of the Education and Psychology Division of the Eastern Michigan University Library, and one of the leaders and pioneers of library user education; Ruthe L. Marshall, a constant counselor and a librarian's librarian; Ruth Doland, secretary to the director, Eastern Michigan University Library; and the editorial staff of *Library Trends*.

References

1. Halio, Jay L. "What is Good Teaching?" (letter), *Chronicle of Higher Education* 19:22, Nov. 5, 1979.
2. Ibid.
3. Scully, Malcolm G. "Carnegie Panel Says Enrollment Declines Will Create a 'New Academic Revolution,'" *Chronicle of Higher Education* 19:1, Jan. 28, 1980.