A COMPARISON OF THE PROFILES OF FRESHMAN

LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS IN

FOUR TYPES OF ACADEMIC INSTITU-

TIONS IN THE UNITED STATES TO

THE ACRL GUIDELINES

By

CAROL FULTON AHMAD

Bachelor of Arts
University of Texas, Austin
Austin, Texas
1965

Master of Librarianship
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington
1967

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1983

A COMPARISON OF THE PROFILES OF FRESHMAN

LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS IN

FOUR TYPES OF ACADEMIC INSTITU-

TIONS IN THE UNITED STATES TO

THE ACRL GUIDELINES

Thesis Approved:

_____
Thesis Adviser

_____

_____

_____

_____
Dean of the Graduate College

ii

PREFACE

Using data from a random sample of 400 academic libraries, this study constructs profiles of freshman library use instruction programs in four types of academic institutions--two-year, four-year, five-year, and doctoral degree-granting institutions. The profiles are compared to the Association of College and Research Libraries "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries."

I would like to express my appreciation to my adviser, Dr. William Adrian, for his guidance and assistance throughout the study. Appreciation is also expressed to the other committee members--Dr. Thomas Karman, Dr. Robert Kamm, and Dr. Helga Harriman--for their assistance in the preparation of this study.

My thanks also go to the librarians who pre-tested the survey and gave me invaluable suggestions for improving the data collection instrument, especially Susan Gray Byrd, Sheila Dowd, Anita Evans, Kathy Fulton, Claudette Hagle, Jill Holmes, Beverly Joyce, Mildred Kirsner, Yvonne Kozlowski, Maria Soule, June Stillman, Judy Young, and Kay Womack. My thanks also to Dr. Victor Pestien for his advice on the selection of the random sample of libraries for the study. To the many busy instruction librarians who took the time to respond to the survey, I owe a debt of gratitude.

A very special appreciation goes to my husband, Shair Ahmad, and children, Amy Sayle and Schaud Ahmad, who gave me a great deal of

encouragement and assistance. My daughter Amy, in particular, gave me invaluable help in copying and collating the surveys and preparing the envelopes for mailing.

This thesis is lovingly dedicated to my parents, Karin Dodd Fulton and Joseph Donald Fulton, who are devoted to their children and whose lives stand as a testament to all that is worthwhile. I shall always be indebted to them for their immeasurable and unfailing love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Academic libraries in the United States are in the midst of a
technological revolution that will greatly affect their traditional
patterns of operation. By utilizing the advances in computerization,
telecommunication, and minaturization, libraries have the opportunity
and the ability to become more service-oriented and user-oriented than
ever before.

Historically, academic libraries were founded for two chief pur-
poses: (1) to preserve library materials, and (2) to establish a
collection for scholarly research (Pugh, 1970, p. 267). The concept
of providing reference service to users began in the last quarter of
the nineteenth century (Brough, 1953, p. 145), the formative period
of American librarianship, and included two overlapping spheres of
activity: one is the actual provision of information for an inquirer
and the second is teaching the academic library user how to locate
the information available in library resources. Not until the
twentieth century was the first activity--the provision of informa-
tion to users--generally practiced in academic libraries. Today,
most academic libraries have a reference department staffed with one
or more librarians who specialize in finding and providing information

1

upon request or in directing the library user to an information source. But not all academic libraries provide the second reference activity, which is conducting active and comprehensive library use instruction programs designed to teach their users how to devise search strategies to locate information sources. The ultimate goal of such programs is to produce library patrons who can use library resources effectively and efficiently.

In the past fifteen years there has been a resurgence of interest in the second sphere of reference activity--educating the academic library user in how to use library resources in a systematic fashion. Since 1977 over 3,000 librarians have joined the Association of College and Research Libraries Bibliographic Instruction Section (Roberts, 1982, p. 21). The number of articles on bibliographic instruction has increased tremendously.

> Between 1876 and 1921 an average of eight citations a year were indexed; between 1921 and 1945 an average of 18 per year were indexed; and between 1945 and 1958 an average of 26 per year were indexed (Bonn, 1960, p. 1).

From 1958 to 1971 there were an average of 35 per year and from 1974 to 1979 an average of 70 references per year (Morris, 1979, p. 7). Project LOEX (Library Orientation Exchange), established by a grant from the Council on Library Resources in 1972 and now supported by over 450 libraries, serves as a clearinghouse for instructional materials and ideas and sponsors an annual conference devoted to bibliographic instruction. Many other library conferences have devoted all or a portion of their meetings to library instruction topics. In some cases, instruction activity is used as a criterion in granting promotions or tenure and some libraries have created positions for

full-time instruction librarians.

> Library instruction, long the neglected stepchild of
> librarianship, now seems likely to develop, along with
> networking and resource sharing, as a focus of profes-
> sional interest and activity in the next several years
> (Galvin, 1978, p. vii).

Libraries that were almost exclusively "materials-centered" seem to be moving towards a "client-centered mode of operation" (Galvin, 1978, p. vii).

Despite all the reports in the literature and the interest shown through professional association activities, there are concerns that not enough is being accomplished in library use instruction on college campuses. An article in the Chronicle for Higher Education highlights the problem.

> The sad fact is that on many campuses there are those
> who rarely venture farther than the library lobby. Stu-
> dents have been known to boast about never walking beyond
> the reserve-book desk. At more than a few colleges and
> universities there are administrators, faculty members,
> and students who have never browsed in the stacks. Why
> browse in the stacks when they are dark and overwhelming?
> In some libraries they are actually dangerous.
>   This is a grim picture. Even in good years, access
> to information housed in this country's academic libraries
> is difficult. For users, there are simply too many paper-
> and-pencil tasks and too many shelves to contend with, and
> the buildings, built to impress, are generally uncomfort-
> able (Cohen, 1981, p. 56).

The need for library use instruction has been documented time and time again in the literature. Melum (1971a) outlines some of the reasons:

> The phenomenal increase in source materials and their
> indexes, new methods of bibliographic control and the
> introduction of new media of communication, the increased
> emphasis on individual study, the widespread adoption of
> the Library of Congress classification system--these fac-
> tors confuse and bewilder many students to the point where

they avoid the library, totally unaware of the wealth of
materials which could be of use and of interest to them.
Yes, good students usually find their way around but often
inefficiently; students who lack initiative or are easily
discouraged often flounder and give up (p. 59).

The ideal solution to the problem of effective use of academic li-
braries is a comprehensive library use instruction program for all
levels of users, from freshmen to faculty. The level where most
academic libraries initiate a library use instruction program is at
the freshman level.

Purpose of Study

An extensive review of the literature indicates that many
academic libraries provide some type of orientation or library use
instruction for entering freshmen. However, past surveys have not
attempted to assess these programs in terms of the norms and guide-
lines for the development of successful programs as described in
the literature. Nor have previous surveys been comprehensive enough
to give a complete picture of orientation and library use instruction
for freshmen in the United States in four types of institutions--
the two-year, four-year, five-year, and doctoral-granting institu-
tions.

The purpose of this study is to assess library instruction
programs for college freshmen in the United States. With academic
libraries in the United States as the universe, data was collected
and analyzed from a random sample of these libraries to:

1. determine the extent of library administrative support for
library orientation and instruction activities and programs for

college freshmen and

    2. determine the program elements, i.e., the ways in which
these activities and programs are implemented.

    The components identified in the data were utilized to construct
a profile for each of four types of academic institutions: two-year,
four-year, five-year, and doctoral institutions. These profiles were
compared to the nationally-recognized norm for developing a success-
ful program, the "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic
Libraries" prepared by the Association of College and Research Libra-
ries (ACRL) of the American Library Association. The ACRL Guidelines,
reprinted in Appendix A, appeared in the April, 1977 issue of College
and Research Libraries News. The comparison provided an assessment of
freshman library use instruction programs and activities in the United
States by showing the percentage of institutions in each of the four
categories that met the ACRL Guidelines.

    The study answered these questions:

    1. What is the extent of administrative support for freshman
library use instruction programs in the four types of academic
institutions?

    2. Which program elements of freshman library use instruction
are employed in the four types of academic institutions?

    3. How does a profile for each type of institution compare to
the established guidelines, the "ACRL Guidelines for Bibliographic
Instruction in Academic Libraries"?

Definitions of Terms

The definitions of key terms used in this study are given below:

Library orientation is an introduction to the physical layout of a particular academic library, emphasizing the location of service areas. During a library orientation, the location of the most used reference sources, such as the card catalog and the periodical indexes, may be shown. The orientation may also include a brief description of the library's policies, such as stating the rules governing the circulation of books and other library materials. Library orientation is the most elementary kind of library use instruction. The types of library orientation are a tour conducted by a tour guide, a self-guided tour with a cassette tape, a printed walking tour, or an audio-visual presentation. A system of graphics and signs designed to orient the user to library facilities may also be considered a part of a library orientation program. In addition to giving factual information, library orientation activities may be designed from a public relations point of view with the idea of eliciting a positive response to the library from the users by making them feel comfortable and welcome.

Library use instruction is a broader term than library orientation and includes a wide variety of activities designed to teach users how to use library resources effectively. It includes library orientation as described above. Two synonymous terms for library use instruction are bibliographic instruction, the term used by the Association of College and Research Libraries and by many academic

librarians in the United States, and user education, a term frequently used in Great Britain.

Library use instruction can be given on a very basic level, such as instructing freshman students in the use of the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature and the card catalog. It can also include more in-depth instruction that teaches students how to evaluate the information they find or gives them specific knowledge of library sources used in the study of a particular discipline. At the graduate level, instruction can include the most sophisticated library resources and an explanation of the bibliographic structure of a specific discipline showing the relationship between the reference sources and the structure of information in that discipline.

In addition to levels of library use instruction, there are the basic types of library use instruction--individualized instruction, separate courses, course-related instruction, and course-integrated instruction.

Individualized instruction includes the use of workbooks, computer assisted instruction, worksheets, and point of use equipment.

A second type of library use instruction is the separate course, which is an introduction to library resources. The course may be for credit or non-credit, may be for one or more hours per week or semester, and is usually taught by a librarian.

Course-related library use instruction is instruction given to answer the needs of a particular class assignment. The assignment is usually designed by a faculty member in an academic department

outside the library. The librarian gives a brief lecture or designs a handout that explains how to use library resources to complete the assignment. For example, an English class is given the assignment to find three critical sources for a particular short story. The library use instruction would be limited to providing information on how to find criticism on short stories.

A fourth type of library use instruction is course-integrated library use instruction in which the learning objectives are devised by librarian and faculty planning together. The learning objectives are designed to support the subject content of the course as well as develop certain library skills or knowledge. For example, an introductory class in the humanities might have a weekly assignment to read a book and compile an annotated bibliography on the subject of the book. This type of assignment provides an experience which satifies the objectives of the library use instruction program and the course.

In all of these cases the purpose of library use instruction is to provide the knowledge and skills needed to help users identify and retrieve relevant information using library resources.

Search strategy is the term used to describe the process of how one devises the most efficient and effective methods to collect all of the pertinent information needed to answer a question or to research a topic. A typical search strategy for a freshman term paper is to find an overview of the topic in a general or specialized encyclopedia in order to find a bibliography and a list of terms on the topic, then to consult periodical indexes, the card catalog, and

other library sources, such as government documents, as needed. The purpose of devising a search strategy is a dual one--to save time, i.e., promote efficiency, and to find all the pertinent information, i.e., promote effectiveness. To sum up, search strategy is choosing "the approach that appears most likely to yield the best results in the least time" (Gore, 1969, p. 117).

The administrative elements of library use instruction programs are the activities at the library's highest administrative levels which provide for the establishment of the library use instruction program. These activities include the provision of a mechanism for establishing the overall goals of the program, funds and personnel for the program, and a mechanism for evaluation of the program.

The program elements of library use instruction are the activities involved in implementing the broad goals of the library use instruction program. Normally the implementation of a freshman library use instruction program is carried out by librarians below the highest administrative levels. The librarians charged with implementing the program have a wide range of program elements which must be examined. They must decide how much emphasis and time to give to each element. These program elements are defined as the following:

1. an assessment of the academic community's need for library orientation and instruction

2. a written profile of the information needs of the students and faculty on campus

3. specific written program objectives for implementing the broad goals of the program

4. specific written instructional objectives which can be measured to indicate learning achieved by the student

5. the types of programs or activities

6. the disciplines or subject areas in which the orientation and instruction is offered

7. instructional content

8. instructional methods

9. instructional materials

10. publicity for promotion of the program to faculty, students, and the administration

11. record keeping and

12. specific evaluation methods to evaluate program and instructional objectives.

The norm for the development of successful freshman library use instruction programs is the "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries" published by the Association of College and Research Libraries. As a general rule in the academic library world in the United States, the guidelines and standards issued through the auspices of the American Library Association's Association of College and Research Libraries are considered the most authoritative guidelines for the assessment of academic library programs. Appendix A contains the "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries" published in April, 1977 in the College and Research Library News. These guidelines outline the administration's role in and the program elements of a successful library use instruction program. While these guidelines are to be used in planning a

comprehensive library use instruction program for all levels of users, they are applicable to this study because a well planned program of library use instruction for college freshmen includes by necessity all the planning and activities that a comprehensive library use instruction program includes.

Summary of the Organization of the Study

The first chapter introduces the topic and states the purpose, defines the terms, and summarizes the organization of the study. Chapter II is a review of the relevant literature on the topic and describes how this study differs from previous studies. Chapter III describes the research design, the data collection instrument, pretesting procedures, and the methods used to collect and analyze the data. Chapter IV displays the survey data which show the extent of administrative support for freshman library use instruction programs. Chapter V displays the survey data which describe the program elements used in freshman library use instruction programs. In Chapter VI, profiles for four types of academic institutions are constructed using the data displayed in Chapters IV and V. Chapter VII is a comparison between the institutional profiles and the norm for the development of successful programs, i.e., the Association of College and Research Libraries' "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries." (See Appendix A.) Chapter VIII summarizes the results of the study, describes the implications of the research, and suggests further areas for investigation. The bibliography and appendices follow Chapter VIII.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

A multitude of sources in the literature deals with the general topic of library use instruction. The most pertinent articles, essays, books, government publications, and ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) documents are discussed in the following sequence. First, the major bibliographies and bibliographic essays are described. Secondly, literature on the history and the rationale of library use instruction is reviewed. A third section reviews the literature on the philosophy and practice of library use instruction. The fourth section is a discussion of the most significant articles describing the special problems of instructing freshmen. In the fifth section, previous surveys of library use instruction activities are compared and, in the last section, an indication is given of how the present study will contribute to the previously published work.

The following types of materials are excluded from the literature review: descriptions of library use instruction for students in elementary and secondary schools, descriptions of library use instruction designed solely for college students above the freshman level, literature that describes programs in countries other than the United

12

States unless the history or rationale of library use instruction is included, non-English language materials, brief articles describing typical library use programs or activities, unpublished reports, textbooks for the college students, and directories of programs.

B. Bibliographies and Bibliographic Essays

The most useful bibliography is Lockwood's (1979) Library In-struction; a Bibliography which lists 934 items, is well annotated, and is comprehensive in subject scope citing literature on school, public, special, and academic libraries. The literature on library use in-struction is covered comprehensively for items published during 1970 to 1978. For publications prior to 1970 the coverage is selective and includes only classical statements of philosophy or those items which describe innovative, unusual ideas. The bibliography is divided into three sections for convenience of use--general philoso-phy, types of libraries, and teaching methods--and includes an index and generous cross references for items that fall into more than one of the three categories. The in-depth coverage of the literature from the philosophical as well as the practical point of view and the easy-to-use format make Lockwood's bibliography an excellent starting point for any research on the topic of library use instruc-tion or for any librarian designing library use programs and activi-ties.

Rader's (1974) annual annotated bibliographes, which serve as a supplement and update to Lockwood's bibliography are entitled "Library Orientation and Instruction." They have appeared in the

Reference Services Review since 1974 with the first bibliography
listing items published during 1973. For the most current materials,
Project LOEX (Library Orientation Exchange) includes a bibliography
in each quarterly issue of the Loex News. Current awareness
searches in the computerized data bases such as LISA (Library and In-
formation Science Abstracts) and ERIC (Educational Resources Informa-
tion Center) as well as current issues of Library Literature also
provide access to current publications.

Another excellent bibliography is The Education of Users of
Library and Information Services: an International Bibliography,
1926-1976 (Taylor, 1979) published in England. The bibliography is
a compilation of the references from 20 bibliographies and biblio-
graphic essays with additional material from other sources. The year
1926 was chosen as a starting date in part because the first paper
"concerned entirely with user education" (Taylor, 1979, p. 2) was
delivered at the 1926 Aslib Conference in England and this date
"usually forms the starting point in surveys of user education ac-
tivities in Britain" (Taylor, 1979, p. 2). The chronological ar-
rangement makes it possible to trace trends and documents the growing
interest in library use instruction. This unannotated bibliography
lists 1,578 references on all types of libraries and includes a num-
ber of non-English language and British publications.

A bibliography covering the very recent past is Morris's
(1979) Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries with 174
entires covering materials published from 1975 to 1979. Most of
the entries are briefly annotated. Mirwis's (1971) "Academic

Library Instruction; a Bibliography, 1960-1970" covers a time period when interest in academic library use instruction began to grow. Miller's (1978) highly selective but extremely useful bibliography, compiled in connection with a survey of 13 libraries, lists 84 items, is limited to items published prior to December, 1977 and is a selection of the most significant publications available.

Two books, which are collections of very useful essays on library use instruction--Educating the Library User (Lubans, 1974) and Progress in Educating the Library User (Lubans, 1978)--contain two unannotated bibliographies. A third unannotated bibliography compiled by Cammack (1979) appears in Community College Library Instruction and lists items published from 1965 to 1978 on library use instruction at the college and university level.

For historical coverage of library use instruction in all types of libraries, Krier's (1976) chronological checklist contains 362 references to articles published between 1931 and 1975. For coverage of the historical formations of academic library use instruction, Tucker's (1980b) "Articles on Library Instruction in Colleges and Universities, 1876-1932" provides the most complete coverage. Chronologically arranged, this bibliography is so well annotated that it reads like a history itself and provides access to literature on the origins, growth, philosophy, and rationale of library use instruction from the late 1800s to the early 1930s.

There are a number of outstanding bibliographical essays which survey the literature of library use instruction and discuss the most significant publications. These essays are discussed below in the

chronological order of the date of publication of the essay.

Butler (1942) reviews research on all types of libraries in relation to the educational setting. She notes a new trend in school and college libraries of the early 1940s to become an integrated part of the institutions they serve rather than to remain as separate entities.

The purpose of Bonn's (1960) essay, "Training Laymen in the Use of the Library" was

> to review some of the significant contributions from the wealth of literature in the general area of training in the use of the library; to indicate trends, advances, problems, and prospects in the area; and to suggest further studies that may be useful in making a more substantial assessment of the problem (p. 1).

In his essay Bonn uses the word "training" to mean library use instruction and describes the literature on library use instruction in all types of schools--elementary, high schools, colleges and universities, public libraries, and non-academic libraries. The essay has 448 footnotes and is particularly helpful because it provides comprehensive coverage of library use instruction programs, is international in coverage, and provides a section on evaluation.

Tidmarsh's (1968) essay compares the development of library use instruction in Great Britain and the United States. For the purposes of this study, the most useful section is entitled, "The American Scene," and traces the historical development of library use instruction in the United States, describing programs at different types of higher education institutions, the teaching methods used, and the librarian/faculty relationship.

An update of Bonn's review is Given's (1974) essay, "The Use of

Resources in the Learning Experience," which reviews the state of
the art of library use instruction as of the early 1970s. The essay
explores the development and progress of the concept that "learning
to use the resources of a library effectively in the learning/teaching
experience is somewhat different from learning to master library
skills" (p. 151). The essay briefly reviews the history of library
use instruction; demonstrates how library use instruction was affected
by the educational climate of the 1960s; describes changing objectives,
organizational patterns, and programs as the 1960s decade ended; and
makes predictions for the future development of library use instruc-
tion. Givens found that most instructional programs were planned
without the knowledge of what others had been doing. She stated that
librarians must become more familiar with modern technology, educa-
tional psychology, and management theory in order to construct better
library use instruction programs.

Scrivener's (1972) essay treats a number of issues. He outlines
the development of the theory and practice of library instruction in
academic libraries, summarizes the growth of the different levels of
instruction, describes a variety of programs, discusses the library/
faculty relationship, and outlines the major problems in giving li-
brary use instruction.

The purpose of Stevenson's (1977, p. 54) essay is to "illuminate
the present state of the art of user education in Britain, by refer-
ence to recent contributions from the literature." He lists 167
references, most published between 1965 to 1976. Despite the stated
intent to concentrate on British libraries, this essay is useful

because it includes a section on user education in the United States and a long section on the current status of various developments in user education, which apply to the United States as well. He discusses the literature that describes on what level instruction should begin, the librarian/faculty relationship, library buildings, problems in designing signage systems, printed library guides, publicity for library use instruction programs, reinforcement of skills learned, teaching aids, exchange of information, use of learning objectives, evaluation methods, and alternative methods of user education.

A recent bibliographical essay is Young's (1980) "And Gladly Teach: Bibliographic Instruction and the Library." His purpose is to chronicle and assess "the strivings, accomplishments, and failures of bibliographic instruction . . . with special reference to the past 10 years" (p. 64). Principal topics encompass literature reviews and bibliographies; assumptions and rationale; research findings related to attitudinal factors, measures of library competence and educational variables; evaluation; and the strengths and shortcomings of various instructional strategies. All types of libraries are considered; more literature on academic and school libraries is included than any other types of library. The review is "selective and highlights that portion of the literature that stresses hypothesis testing, statistical inference, generalizability, and analyses of primary source material" (p. 64). This bibliographic essay is built on two previously published review essays (Young, 1974, 1978).

History and Rationale of Library

Use Instruction

The history of academic library use instruction in the United
States can be traced back to at least two sources in the nineteenth
century. The first is the Harvard University regulation in the
1820s stating that the librarian was to give occasional lectures
to the students to acquaint them with the valuable and rare books
in the library (Brough, 1953, p. 152). The second source, Emerson's
(1881) essay, "Books," recommends that colleges include a Professor
of Books whose primary responsibility would be the encouragement
of systematic, fruitful, and evaluative reading.

Harvard's requirement of an occasional lecture was not the usual
situation on other campuses. During the first half of the nineteenth
century, most college libraries were small, open only a few hours
a week, and staffed by part-time and untrained personnel (Brough, 1953,
p. 13) whose primary duty was to keep the books from harm rather than
promote their use (Rothstein, 1955, p. 21). Most colleges required
an annual inventory of books which included a count of volumes as
well as an inspection of their physical condition. Preservation
rather than use of library materials was the primary goal (Brough,
1953, p. 17). Obivously these conditions did not encourage the
people in charge of libraries to try to stimulate students to use
library materials. In addition, students made few demands on the
library because the teaching methods of the time--recitation and
lectures--did not require use of library resources nor was the idea

of students doing research accepted as a norm (Rothstein, 1955, p. 20).

Several landmark events and trends of the latter half of the nineteenth century resulted in libraries assuming a broader educational role in colleges and universities. The Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 established publicly-supported institutions that offered technical and practical courses. At Johns Hopkins University, which was established in 1876, the idea of "the university as a community of scholars engaged in the equivalent activities of teaching and research" (Tucker, 1980a, p. 10) became a reality. The seminar method of teaching which required extensive use of library resources, and the new elective course system all gave impetus to the concept of offering instruction and courses in how to use library resources. As early as 1879 Raymond C. Davis, librarian at the University of Michigan, was offering an elective course in bibliography (Bonn, 1960, p. 28).

Along with these developments, the profession of librarianship began to grow in significance. In 1876, the first annual conference of the American Library Association was held, the first issue of the American Library Journal appeared, and the historic and comprehensive report, Public Libraries in the United States of America, was issued by the U. S. Bureau of Education (Tucker, 1980a, p. 11).

During this time period several prominent librarians, among them Justin Winsor, Otis Robinson, and Frederic Beecher Perkins, eagerly embraced Emerson's idea of a professor of books, using it to construct a rationale for establishing the rudiments of academic library use instruction programs. The comprehensive report on public

libraries (which included public college libraries as well) published
by the U. S. Bureau of Education recommended establishing a chair at
the leading colleges for a professor whose duty was to teach students
what and how to read. At the smaller colleges the chair could be
held by an English literature professor "or by an accomplished li-
brarian" (Mathews, 1876, p. 251). The content of the course would
be the science and art of reading for a purpose and would involve
teaching "a method for investigating any subject in the printed
records of human thought" (Perkins, 1876, p. 231).

Otis Robinson (1876b), librarian of the University of Rochester,
stated that with the growth of library collections "special instruc-
tion should be given in method of investigation " (Robinson, 1876b,
p. 15). He believed that the librarian's chief concern should be to
see that books are "used most extensively, most intelligently"
(Robinson, 1876b, p. 15). As early as a century ago, his lectures
to classes and his Saturday morning sessions with students show a
high regard for bibliographic instruction. He commented that

> I sometimes think students get most from me when they
> inquire about subjects that I know least about. They
> learn how to chase down a subject in a library. They
> get some facts, but especially a method . . . if we
> can send students out self-reliant in their investiga-
> tions, we have accomplished very much (p. 124).

By 1880 the librarian at Harvard University, Justin Winsor (1880)
took up a related theme, proposing that the college library should
assume its rightful function as "the central agency of our college
methods, and not remain a subordinate one, which it too often is"
(p. 7). He proposed to accomplish this by making the librarian into

a teacher who acquainted students with a wide range of books. He believed that students needed to go beyond their textbooks which are only one author's view of knowledge and investigate many authors in order to get at the subject "from many angles" (p. 8). He saw the library "as the great rendezvous of the college for teacher and pupil alike" (p. 9) and the librarian's role as the student's "counsellor in research, supplementing but not gainsaying the professor's advice" (p. 9). He describes how the librarian should take the students through the library section by section explaining the use of various reference sources--a concrete example of Emerson's Professor of Books concept. Winsor voices a lament that echoes throughout library literature--that students suffer from

> generally a great lack of knowledge of the most common
> books of reference, with little understanding of the
> help they can be in literary research for the sources
> of knowledge (p. 11).

Several college presidents also promoted instruction in how to use the library. President Barnard of Columbia College in his annual report for 1883 states:

> The average college student, not to say graduate, is
> ignorant of the great part of the bibliographical
> apparatus which the skilled librarian has in hourly
> use . . . . A little systematic instruction would so
> start our students in the right methods, that for the
> rest of their lives all their work in libraries would
> be more expeditiously accomplished and vastly more
> efficient (Columbia University, 1883, p. 26).

In 1902 President William Rainey Harper (1902) of Chicago advocated full-time instruction librarians.

> . . . the equipment of the library will not be finished
> until it shall have upon its staff men and women whose
> entire works shall be, not the care of books, not the

cataloguing of books, but the giving of instruction
concerning their use (p. 458).

Another renowned librarian who believed firmly in the necessity
of library use instruction was Azariah Root, Chief Librarian at
Oberlin College from 1887 to 1927. He designed three practical
courses in librarianship that would "develop systematically library
skills as part of the liberal arts curriculum" (Rubin, 1977, p. 254)
because he viewed "bibliographical training as another requisite of
a well-rounded student" (Rubin, 1977, p. 255).

Required library use instruction programs were recommended by
Babcock (1913) who said

> there is great need for systematic bibliographic in-
> struction. It should be individual, differentitated to
> fit the tastes of the student, free from special fees,
> required, not elective, and accredited toward a degree
> (p. 136).

A 1914 U. S. Bureau of Education survey of university and col-
lege libraries showed the growth in library use instruction activi-
ties from the late 1870s (Evans, 1914). Of the 446 libraries
responding to the 1914 survey, 91 (20 percent) offered courses in
bibliographic instruction; of the 166 normal schools reporting, 93
(56 percent) offered instruction in library methods and bibliography
(Evans, 1914, p. 5).

The next survey of library use instruction, although not as
comprehensive, was published by the American Library Association
in 1926 and showed that "about half the colleges and universities
with large libraries were offering some sort of instruction in the
use of libraries" (Bonn, 1960, p. 28).

During the period between World War I and World War II, library use instruction activities continued to grow. Peyton Hurt, librarian at the University of California at Los Angeles, was "one of the first people to advocate bibliographic instruction as a graduated process, spread through the whole of an undergraduate course" (Tidmarsh, 1968, p. 44).

The year 1937 saw the publication of Branscomb's Teaching with Books, a report of a study commissioned by the Association of American Colleges which investigated "the library educational effectiveness and . . . the extent to which the efforts of the library are integrated with those of the institution as a whole" (Breivik, 1977, p. 23). While Branscomb did not actually propose library use instruction, his argument that the library should assume a chief role in undergraduate education and that the entire academic community should be concerned with library use has been the basis for the rationale of much of the later activity (Kirk, 1977a, p. 16).

During the 1930s the library-college concept was promoted by Louis Shores (1970) and others. In a library-college as envisioned by Shores, the library becomes the classroom and the independent learning of the student is guided by a librarian who is also an academic faculty member and who shows the student how to take full advantage of all of the possible sources of information (Miller, 1978, p. 7). Although the library-college has been labeled "impractical, expensive, non-specific and totally unrealistic" (Miller, 1978, p. 8) and although it has never been fully achieved, it has emphasized the potential of the academic library to hold a truly central role

in the educational goals of higher education institutions.

A more practical blending of library and course goals was achieved
by B. Lamar Johnson, the librarian at Stephens College. He designed
and implemented integrated library use instruction for courses through-
out the college curriculum at Stephens College (Tucker, 1980, p. 15).

White (1938) summarized the trends in library use instruction
in the early part of the twentieth century, noting that academic
standards were higher, methods of instruction had improved, the cur-
ricula had been revised drastically, and the increasing size and
complexity of libraries made them more difficult to use. "University
librarians recognize this problem and are assuming the role of instruc-
tor more than formerly" (p. 675). He noted a trend toward increased
library budgets and new buildings. He also reiterated Winsor's
complaint.

> On the whole, the rank and file of university students,
> from graduate to freshmen, appear to be rather poorly
> equipped to find their way about in a modern library
> (p. 674).

In reviews of the literature, Givens (1974) and Tucker (1980a)
stated that the programs reported in the 1940s developed in isolation
with little sharing of ideas among librarians and institutions. Most
programs were limited to orientation activities.

One important event of the mid-1940s was the work of the Ameri-
can Library Association's Committee on Postwar Planning (1946) which
recommended that academic libraries divert funds from the book
budget, if necessary, to fund library instruction programs that would
result in a true integration of library instruction with regular
classroom activities. The Committee recommended that academic

libraries should "formulate a detailed and well-supported plan, closely integrated with the work of its faculty, for instruction in the use of the library" (p. 48).

The two major events of the 1950s that affected academic libraries and ultimately library use instruction were the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka Supreme Court decision which outlawed state-imposed racial discrimination and the launching of a Soviet satellite in 1957. Sputnik led to the National Defense Education Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Tucker, 1980a, pp. 17-18). With the admittance of minority students and the increased emphasis on higher education, academic libraries were flooded with students needing assistance in using library resources.

In the 1950s academic libraries concentrated on orientation programs and brief introductions to basic library tools, "generally offered as part of freshman composition" (Givens, 1974, p. 158). Planned instruction beyond that level generally did not exist (Knapp, 1956, p. 224).

A third important event of the 1950s was the initiation of the Monteith College Library experiment designed by Patricia Knapp, one of the most, if not the most, influential and creative conceptualists in the library instruction field. Her work has undoubtedly given impetus to the increased interest in library use instruction in the last 20 years and her study is cited many times in the literature, although it was in operation for only three years, from 1959 to 1962. Knapp and her associates "attempted to design and evaluate a program of instruction for a four-year liberal arts curriculum that

integrated library use assignments with the regular course work"
(Morris, 1979, p. 6). This program has been described as "the most
thorough-going attempt at a comprehensive and fully integrated ap-
proach to library instruction" (Scrivener, 1972, p. 99). A detailed
description of the program appears in The Monteith Project (Knapp,
1966).

In the 1960s academic libraries were affected by the changing
teaching methods, such as more honors programs, independent study
projects, tutorials, mini-courses, and modular learning. During this
time of expansion, library collections continued to increase greatly
in size along with the numbers of students (Givens, 1974, pp. 161-
162). Knapp (1968) summarized the trends of the 1960s by stating
that the academic library was

> coping, in a rather remarkable fashion, I believe, with
> the changing demands placed on us as higher education has
> moved from the role of a cultural adornment, a transmitter
> of the heritage, to that of a major industry in our
> society (p. 142).

The 1970s were a time of accelerating interest in academic
library use instruction in the United States. A survey by Melum
"corroborated the commitment to instruction, and also confirmed
the rise of audiovisual technology" (Hacker, 1978, p. 106) as a
means of library use instruction. With the establishment of the
Association of College and Research Libraries Bibliographic Instruc-
tion Section and Project LOEX (Library Orientation Exchange) and
the proliferation of publications and conference, interest in the
library use instruction field has visibly increased. Dyson (1975,
p. 9) observed that "librarians are taking a more aggressive view of

their campus role. Throughout the country, librarians are committing staff time to library instruction." Kirk (1977b, p. 37) noted the continuing "acceleration in the rate of change in undergraduate curricula." With more independent study projects and with under-graduates conducting actual research projects "these methods have significant implications for libraries and library use, for they make the need for library use more immediate and obvious" (p. 37). Veit (1976, p. 374) notes the trend toward "establishing and improving contact between the student and his library." Stevenson (1977, p. 53) found that the field of library use instruction was "approaching a critical period of reappraisal and rethinking of methods." The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1977, p. 11) noted that "skill in using library resources is becoming more and more essential." Hacker (1978, p. 106) noted that in the mid-1970s "duplication of effort has been and still is a fundamental issue" in library use instruction. She believes there had been a "small but detectable shift toward teaching concepts and values in library instruction" (p. 106).

Carolyn Kirkendall (1980, p. 31), Director of Project LOEX, the national clearinghouse of library instruction materials, described the trends evident in library use instruction in the late 1970s in libraries which belonged to Project LOEX. She found that "required units of library units in beginning-level English composition, and communication courses are more prevalent than in years past." She also found interest in computer assisted instruction, widespread use of self-paced workbooks, installation of library signage systems,

point of use audio-visual tools, and instruction in computerized database searching.

Several authors have discussed the rationale for library use instruction. Miller (1978, p. 2) believes there are two basic assumptions which provide the rationale for library use instruction-- that students do not use library resources often enough and that, when they do use library resources, they do not use them efficiently. The purposes of library use instruction, which grew out of these two basic assumptions, have been stated a number of ways. Rader (1978, p. 279) says the purpose is "to help students become independent researchers and independent library users." Breivik (1977, p. 13) states the purpose of library use instruction is to show students "that using the library is a necessary and meaningful part of education, and they must be able to function independently and effectively in these pursuits." Knapp (1956, p. 225) notes that library use instruction is needed because of "the quantity and diversity of library materials." The financial constraints of the 1970s produced several reasons for giving library use instruction that are tied to economics. Morris (1979, p. 5) sees "the need to maximize the use of the existing collection." The traditional one to one service is expensive and should not be the only method of reaching library users. Instruction can reach the non-users as well as those students who use libraries bud do not ask questions when they should. Hodgin (1978, p. vii) writes that "dollar for dollar, the library can be the most economical and effective learning tool in existence, the perfect laboratory for independent learning."

Two purposes for library use instruction involve the future. Garlock (1942, p. 128) states that libraries should give library use instruction to the future teachers and professors so that libraries would be given a more central role in the educational institutions of the future. Another future-oriented purpose is that the students of today are the taxpayers and voting citizens of the future; there-fore, libraries need to be involved in educating well-informed citizens who will support libraries (Dickinson, 1981, p. 855).

Young (1980, p. 68) has advanced the idea that one of the pur-poses of library use instruction is to give librarians who desire faculty status the opportunity to identify more closely with the teaching professions and to allow librarians to be judged on the same criteria as the regular collegiate faculty in questions of promotion and tenure.

Philosophy and Practice of Library
Use Instruction

From this brief discussion of the rationale for library use instruction, let us turn to the philosophy underlying the concept of library use instruction. In a much-quoted article, Schiller (1965, p. 53) presents two opposing views of the functions of reference service: one is the information function which is to provide the needed information to an inquirer and the other is the instruction function which is showing the patron how to find information. She believes that the two functions are incompatible and "when incorporated within reference service, often reduce overall effectiveness of this

service." She views library use instruction as a secondary goal and
not necessarily a reference function.

Katz (1974, p. 62) presents an even more strongly worded philos-
ophy of reference service claiming that many users "do not want to
know any more about the library than where to find the reference li-
brarian." He believes users "want information, not instruction"
(p. 64) and recommends that libraries give users a choice of being pro-
vided with information or receiving instruction in how to obtain
information.

Veit (1976, p. 370) summarizes the different viewpoints by placing
the two points of view on a continuum of thinking on the philosophy
of reference service--from mere guidance to providing information.
Berry (1977) states that these two functions--either providing informa-
tion or instructing users in how to find information--are

> not really in conflict . . . . Society will always need
> information specialists, if not to deliver the informa-
> tion, to teach others how to get it, and to acquire and
> organize the resources for that task (p. 1699).

The philosophy of library use instruction also involves the
different theories concerning the best methods of instruction. As
Scrivener (1972, p. 93) points out, library use instruction is two
distinct but overlapping activities--one part of instruction efforts
is "teaching the use of libraries, the other is teaching . . . the
use of subject literature." Kobelski (1981) discusses the conceptual
frameworks that can be used in teaching library use. Theories of
Bibliographic Education (Oberman, 1982) is a collection of essays
which discuss the application of edcuational and bibliographic
instruction theory to current instructional practices. The essays

reinforce the current thinking that teaching the use of concepts, how to devise a search strategy, and problem-solving techniques are more productive than concentrating solely on teaching the use of specific library reference sources.

McGinnis (1978) argues that library research methods can be better integrated into the classroom by showing students how to use the structured inquiry approach. This approach demonstrates the structure of a discipline, stressing the two main components-- bibliographic and substantive structure--and describes the character- istic processes and practices of inquiry in that discipline. He uses various disciplines in the social sciences to demonstrate his ideas.

As yet there appears to be no general agreement among the theorists on whether library use instruction is simply teaching a set of skills, is one of the liberal arts, is a science, or is part of an emerging discipline. Stevenson (1977, p. 57) sees library use instruction simply as a practical skill "that is acquired through practice, not by being taught." Gwynn (1954), Knapp (1956), and Rader (1978) believe learning to use library resources is one of the liberal arts that every educated person should possess.

> The ability to use a library effectively, like the ability
> to write and read effectively, ought to be one of the at-
> tributes of a liberally educated person and should be one
> of the prerequisites for graduating from college (Rader,
> 1978, p. 279).

Knapp has written that "competence in the use of the library is one of the liberal arts. It deserves recognition and acceptance as such in the college curriculum" (Knapp, 1956, p. 230).

Holler (1975, p. 301) defines reference theory as "a cohesive

set of postulates for linking the user to needed information in documents provided by libraries and other documentation centres." Learning how to use a library is "nothing less than a full-fledged discipline and not simply a minor skill acquirable as a byproduct of other studies" (p. 308).

Hopkins (1981) suggests that library use instruction is part of an emerging discipline, which is the theory and research "about the patterns of production, communication, synthesis, and use of knowledge within various fields of inquiry" (p. 19). This new discipline has been called informatics, social epistemology, or simply the science of research.

Turning to the practice of library use instruction, Knapp (1970a) outlined some basic principles that librarians must keep in mind when planning library use programs or activities. The first is that a suitable grade point average is "the single most important influence on the student's academic behavior" (p. 40). Other principles are the tendency of faculty to identify with their disciplinary peer group rather than the local administrative hierarchy, the indifference to learning theory and instruction methods on the part of many librarians and non-library faculty, and the fact that faculty view library use instruction as a means to an end, which is "the achievement of their own teaching objectives" (p. 39). Some faculty have a "limited under-standing of the intellectual processes involved in sophisticated libra-ry competence" (p. 39). Some disciplines and some individual faculty members are more amenable to library use instruction than others. Often faculty see the library as playing a subsidiary part rather than

a central part in the educational process. Because library activities have to be coordinated, the autonomy of any individual librarian is limited, which means that the "academic style" of the non-library faculty compared to the "professional style" of the librarian may be an "obstacle to the achievement of a colleague relationship" (p. 38) between librarians and faculty.

In the last five years, a number of books have been published which are geared to the needs of the practicing instruction librarian. The Association of College and Research Libraries' (1979) Bibliographic Instruction Handbook was the first to appear. Produced by the ACRL Bibliographic Instruction Task Force's Policy and Planning Committee, the purpose of the handbook is to provide an elaboration of the ACRL Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction by including checklists and models as illustrations of how the guidelines could be implemented. The Handbook also includes a glossary of bibliographic instruction terminology and a guide to locating materials on bibliographic instruction.

Roberts (1982) Library Instruction for Librarians is a well-organized discussion of the modes and methods of academic library use instruction and a description of how to plan a library use instruction program in an academic library. Learning the Library; Concepts and Methods for Effective Bibliographic Instruction (Beaubien, 1982) concentrates on the concepts underlying library research and the planning of an academic library use instruction program. Two chapters describe how to plan and use effectively the single lecture and the separate course as instructional methods. Another guide for the

practicing librarian is Rice's (1981) <u>Teaching Library Use</u>: <u>A Guide</u>
<u>for Library Instruction</u>. Designed to be used by librarians and teach-
ers responsible for library use instruction at any level, the book
could also be used as a text in a library science source. In addition
to covering instructional planning, instructional design, teaching
techniques, and instructional materials, there are chapters on evalua-
tion techniques and on the role of building design and signage in
library use instruction. <u>Bibliographic Instruction</u>; <u>a Handbook</u>
(Renford, 1980) concentrates on the advantages and disadvantages of
various instructional methods with an introduction on how to plan a
library use instruction program. Breivik's (1982) <u>Planning the Li-</u>
<u>brary Instruction Program</u> is a guide to the appropriate methods in-
volved in the planning and practical implementation of a library use
instruction program. The book relates the library instruction pro-
gram to its campus setting by discussing the politics involved in
initiating an instruction program and how to set priorities in de-
ciding which campus groups to give the instruction.

<div align="center">College Freshmen and Library Use Instruction</div>

The special problems of orienting college freshmen to the
library are mentioned in several sources. Orvitz (1913, p. 150)
noted that freshmen "spend more time in looking up a reference than
in reading it after they find it" and most freshmen "know nothing of
the resources of the library." Elbridge (1928) stated that

> the question of teaching the freshmen of a large uni-
> versity to use the library is no longer Why? and When?
> but How? . . . . We stand armed with plenty of good

and sane reasons why we should teach freshmen to use the
library but we are not so sure as to how we can go about
it (p. 986).

Several programs specifically for college freshmen have been re-
ported in the literature. Givens (1974, p. 156) noted that in the
1940s most of the programs reported in the literature "were directed
to orienting the student to the library building and to helping him
develop skill in using the tools of a library." Many of these pro-
grams were presented in conjunction with English composition classes.

Erickson (1949, p. 446) questioned the usefulness of library
orientation for college freshmen. He suggested three methods for
instructing freshmen: a separate course, library orientation as part
of a general orientation course, or instruction given "in the regular
freshman composition classes usually preparatory to working on a term
project."

Sellers (1950) noted that the conducted tour was the least satis-
factory of all the types of instruction offered to the college fresh-
men. She believed that, although the most used instructional method
was a one-hour lecture offered in connection with an English composi-
tion class, the best method of instruction was a separate credit
course required of all freshmen.

Hartz (1964, p. 78) predicted that libraries would have to
expand their usual freshman orientation week activities because of
increased enrollments and the increased emphasis on the students as
individuals. By the late 1960s the efficacy of the orientation tour
was still being questioned. Kaser (1967, p. 77) indicated that the
tour of the library during orientation week, "a time when the

student's head is agog with many competing, interesting and useful bits of information," is not successful.

> Some colleges have relegated the whole problem to the English department which has been supposed to incorporate a library unit into the freshman course, but few have felt that these programs have been wholly successful (p. 77).

Scrivener (1972, p. 101) found that several impressive programs for freshmen were reported in the literature but they were only the highlights "and do not represent the generality of practice." He believed that the most general approach was a one-hour lecture to freshmen during the orientation period or early in the first semester--a talk sometimes augmented by audio-visual presentations. He stated his belief that "most librarians are dissatisfied or even disillusioned with their attempts at user instruction" (p. 101).

More criticism of instruction programs for college freshmen is contained in an article by Hills (1974). Many freshmen use the library only to satisfy requirements for assignments and have difficulty understanding how learning to use library resources will have any long-term value. The author recommends that library use instruction include the teaching of problem-solving skills rather than concentrating entirely on orientation and specific reference library tools. Penland (1975, p. 114) noted that "instruction is 'unloaded' on students at the freshman level with little if any thought given to the developmental approach of integrating resources instruction with the curriculum."

Boisse (1979) suggested that, although a separate course for freshmen could be worthwhile, it would be better to teach basic library skills in connection with a freshman English course or some

other course in order to reach all the undergraduates.

Ford (1982a) discusses how the term paper requirement of many English composition classes is the means for providing appropriate library use instruction. He recommends that "library use instruction efforts should be primarily committed to the English department writing program in most institutions" (p. 379).

Kirkendall (1980, p. 31) found that by the late 1970s, subject-related library use instruction was growing and would help "solve the universal problem of freshman-level orientation, which is often too much too soon."

This review of the literature on library use instruction for college freshmen indicates that historically there has been a need to introduce college freshmen to the academic library, but there is no agreement on the "best" method nor have librarians been wholly satisfied with their efforts to instruct freshmen in how to use the library. The most common orientation method mentioned in the literature is the guided tour, although there are several statements outlining the reasons why this approach is not efficacious. The two most often mentioned approaches to instructing college freshmen in the use of basic library resources is a unit offered as part of the freshmen English composition classes and in a separate course devoted solely to library use instruction. The need to consider alternative instructional modes, such as teaching problem-solving skills, and the need to relate the library use instruction to the total curriculum are also noted in the literature.

Surveys of Library Use Instruction

A number of surveys of library use instruction programs have also included information on library use instruction activities and programs for college freshmen. The principal findings of these surveys are described below.

In October, 1912, the American Library Association surveyed 200 college and university libraries to determine the extent of instruction in the use of books and libraries (Wolcott, 1913, p. 380). Of the 149 who responded, 85 institutions or 57 percent gave some attention to library use instruction, although

> no uniformity whatever exists in regard to time given to this instruction or in importance attached to it in different schools. It varies from occasional talks to freshmen to systematic teaching for which credit is given (Wolcott, 1913, p. 381).

The required instruction was frequently given to freshmen "in connection with English classes" (Wolcott, 1913, p. 381). Only seven institutions offered "required courses with credit toward graduation, designed to train all the students in effective use of books and libraries" (Wolcott, 1913, p. 382).

The most extensive survey ever conducted on library use instruction in terms of sample size was the 1914 U. S. Bureau of Education survey (Evans, 1914) which was sent to 596 colleges and universities and 284 normal schools. The purpose of the survey was "to obtain statistical and other data relating to 'book arts, bibliography, library economy, or any instruction in the management of libraries'" (p. 4). Of the 446 college and university libraries which responded,

91 or 20 percent reported that they offered "courses more or less

adequate and complete" (p. 4) in library use instruction. Of the

166 normal school libraries replying to the questionnaire, 93 or

56 percent

> reported instruction in library methods and bibliography,
> emphasis being laid on the organization and administration
> of school libraries and the study of children's literature.
> Some of these courses are meager, others quite elaborate
> (p. 5).

The report includes a brief two or three sentence summary of each

institution's program. A supplement and update to the survey is

found in the 1914 report of the Commissioner of Education (Utley,

1915).

Veit (1976) discusses an unpublished 1936 review of surveys by

Evelyn Little which showed

> that library instruction varied widely among various
> institutions. Up to 50 percent of the participants
> included in some of the surveys did not have any library
> instruction at all, not even brief library orientation.
> The methods of instructing students in library use were
> of varying scope, depth and intensity: one or two
> orientation lectures explaining the layout of the facili-
> ties, instruction consisting of five to six lectures
> (usually without credit), library instruction integrated
> with a subject course such as English, and independent
> courses consisting of fourteen to sixteen lectures (usually
> elective and for credit) (p. 371).

William Randall (1932) surveyed approximately 200 colleges and

found that one to two lectures during an orientation period was the

most usual form of instruction.

Sellers (1953) reported the results of a questionnaire sent to

200 liberal arts colleges. Of the 151 respondents, 117 (or 77 per-

cent) of the libraries offered formal instruction in library use. In

four of these libraries, the instruction was given by a full-time

instruction librarian. The greatest need felt by the respondents was to establish or expand library use instruction activities.

In a study of the course catalogs of 1,900 institutions Mishoff (1957) found four types of undergraduate library education programs. One type was instruction in the use of libraries; the other three involved technical training for the library profession. He found that 233 higher education institutions in the 1956-57 academic year offered separate library use instruction courses. Other types of library use instruction, although not listed in the college catalogs, were popular, such as the library tour during freshman orientation week or a library instruction unit offered in an English course.

In a survey of 500 colleges and universities, Josey (1962) found that 221 libraries (or 56 percent) of the 397 responding libraries offered some instruction in library use in conjunction with freshman English classes. An additional 23 percent gave instruction to groups other than English classes. Forty-five percent offered some kind of orientation activity but

> a growing number of librarians seem to be doing away with the orientation week approach, because of the large enrollments and the helter-skelter fiesta-type affair that characterizes most orientation periods (p. 497).

He concludes that "it is of utmost importance that college students be given the skills to use the library at the beginning of their college education" (p. 498).

Phipps (1968) surveyed 200 colleges in the 500 to 5,000 enrollment range in 1965. The 157 returns indicated a wide range of library use instruction activities. Lectures to freshman English classes were given by 98 (62 percent) of the respondents. The

increasing numbers of freshmen resulted in increased need for library orientation and instruction. Only 29 percent of the respondents offered lectures during orientation week which Phipps saw as an indication of the decline in popularity in this type of activity.

Larson (1969) surveyed 200 randomly selected libraries in institutions that were members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education to ascertain their orientation and library use activities for students. From the 94 returns she found that 95 percent of the libraries gave orientation for freshmen using a variety of methods from guided tours to combinations of handbooks, lectures, and tours. Once again, "few of the participants reported satisfaction with the current method" (p. 186) and "the most effective methods seemed to be those coordinated with the research paper; or with problems, real or imagined, as they acquainted the student with a larger variety of tools" (p. 186).

In 1969 Melum (1971a) visited over 50 college and university libraries to discuss library use instruction programs. The 50 libraries represented a wide geographical area as well as sizes of institutions. She found "keen, enthusiastic interest" (p. 59) in library instruction programs and a "search for ways of introducing freshmen to the library" (p. 59). She found that orientation tours of the library were still popular, despite the fact that "many librarians question the value of tours" (p. 60) due to the "difficulty in hearing the guides, misinformation given out by student guides, fatigue and inattention" (p. 60), disturbance to other library users, and the staff time involved. Most importantly she found that

librarians are forced to admit that the traditional library orientation given to freshmen has been largely in vain. Freshmen are not ready for library instruction until they come to grips with an assignment requiring source materials to be found in the library. Then--and not until then--does the library begin to have meaning for them (p. 60).

Two years later Melum (1971b) published a survey of a sample of 107 colleges with varying enrollments and geographical locations. Of the 74 respondents, only one indicated no library use instruction activity. She found that "much less is being done for freshmen during Orientation Week or in early fall than formerly" (p. 227). The trend was to give library use instruction "to freshmen only when it can be tied directly to term paper assignments" (p. 228).

A 1972 status report on academic library bibliographic instruction (Kirk, 1973) for the Association of College and Research Libraries reviewed the status of the following types of library use instruction activities: formal courses, library use instruction as part of a regular class activity, self-instruction (printed, audio-visual, and computerized), orientation activities, and other miscellaneous types of library use instruction. The report is based on 174 questionnaires returned from a mailing to 225 librarians who had indicated an interest in library use instruction by attending a conference or who saw a notice in professional journals concerning the study. Eighty of the respondents indicated that "library tours are ineffective and should be given in slide-tape shown form, and more importantly, bibliographic instruction is only effective when related to a class assignment" (p. 20).

The 1972 survey was updated five years later (Association of College and Research Libraries, 1977) by a survey of libraries known

to have active programs in several areas. The specific areas discussed
in the 1977 report were the use of printed self-guided library tours,
conducted library tours, point-of-use instructional devices, use of
cassette tapes and transparencies, computer-assisted instruction,
general library skills credit courses, upper-level subject related
credit courses, term paper clinics and consultations, and library
school courses on instruction.

Reeves (1973) sent 600 questionnaires to junior college libraries
in the United States and visited 53 junior colleges around the country.
Of the five different areas of library operations she surveyed, one
area was library use instruction. The most common approach was group
instruction to classes, most frequently English classes--a method of
instruction offered by 88 percent of the 250 respondents. Seventy-
three percent used a library handbook or manual ranging from text-
books to handout sheets. "Required orientation or class visits are
not very prevalent or popular" (p. 8). She also found that 19 percent
offered credit courses in library use and 40 percent used audio-visual
techniques in making presentations, most often a slide-tape presenta-
tion.

In 1973-1974 Dyson (1975) conducted a study of the administrative
organization of library instruction programs for undergraduates in the
United States and Great Britain. He visited ten American libraries
and twelve British ones interviewing 35 librarians involved in instruc-
tional programs. He also mailed a questionnaire to 48 United States
and Canadian libraries which "had active instructional programs and
which had enrollments of approximately 8,000 students or more" (p. 12).

Most of the libraries were members of Project LOEX (Library Orientation Exchange). He identified four patterns of organization and found that "those that involve a large number of library staff members" are the most effective and the success of a program depends upon "the extent of commitment to it by the library administration" (p. 12).

Dyson (1978, p. 94) conducted another survey of the 25 largest university undergraduate libraries in order to compare his earlier results. He found "a substantial increase in the amount of time spent on library orientation and bibliographic instruction over the past five years."

Another survey sent to large academic libraries in 1975 (Zeidner, 1977) collected data on the administrative aspects of library use instruction programs. Most libraries still provided tours and the most used instruction method was the standard lecture format.

Ward (1976, p. 151) surveyed college and university libraries in the ten states comprising the Southeastern Library Association. He found that "orientation programs were presented most frequently during the early weeks of the term" in 191 or 57 percent of the libraries and that 21 percent of the institutions required all freshmen to take some form of library orientation.

Rader (1976) assessed ten academic library instruction programs in the United States and Canada, selecting libraries that represented different geographical areas, different sizes of institutions, different types of institutions, and different types of library instruction methods. She found, as Dyson did, that the success of a program

is closely related "to the degree of administrative support for it"
(p. 10). Other success factors are "the support of other librarians
and library staff for the library instruction program" (p. 11). Li-
brary use instruction affected the libraries by increasing the use of
materials, by the need to replace reference materials more frequently,
by more difficult questions asked at the reference desks, and by a
need for more public service personnel and for funds to produce instruc-
tional materials. In some cases, personnel charts had to be reorgan-
ized. She found that "the larger libraries rely more on media to
orient and instruct students in library use" (p. 19).

In a 1975/1976 survey of 31 community college libraries, Dale
(1977b, p. 409) found that many of the libraries "produced their own
orientation programs using a variety of techniques, with a slide/tape
program being the most popular." Handbooks, credit courses, and self-
instructional materials were also in use.

Lindgren (1978) surveyed 220 undergraduate institutions, pri-
marily liberal arts colleges "to gather concrete details of the present
state of user instruction in the small academic library" (p. 37). He
found

> no overwhelming trend toward the wedding of students'
> experiences in library user instruction with their
> actual course work . . . no ground swell or participa-
> tion and support by classroom teaching faculty and
> college administrations (p. 73).

He discovered "an abiding sense that existing instructional programs
are modestly developed and modestly successful" (p. 73). Of the
160 responses, 85 percent indicated programs of user instruction and
99.3 percent indicated that they provided library orientation to

individuals and groups.

Benson (1979) visited eight academic libraries which had established "successful, formal, course-related library instruction programs" (pp. 2-3) to determine how these programs were organized and administered. The eight institutions included four large universities, three small and medium-sized public universities, and one private liberal arts institution. He found that administrative support is more apt to produce a stable and successful program; special funding may assist a program in getting started but the program may be seriously affected when the funding is dropped; as the number of librarians involved in the program increases, the likelihood of the success of the program increases; organizationally all library instruction programs were located within the public services area; committed and qualified librarians were a large factor in the success of a program; and the librarian/faculty relationship was another factor in the success of a program. The basic level of instruction was an intensive program designed to reach all or most first-year students and was usually offered in conjunction with the freshman English courses. Benson conjectured from the data in his study that few libraries reach more than 50 percent of their undergraduate student body with library use instruction programs.

In a survey of 397 colleges and universities to ascertain the extent of research paper instruction in freshman English and advanced composition courses, Ford (1982b) found that 76.09 percent of the schools offered some library-related training to freshman composition classes, either in the form of an orientation tour of the library and/or a lecture by a librarian.

A 1981 survey (Metz, 1982) of 203 directors of academic libraries

asked seven questions concerning library use instruction activities

for all levels of library users. The results indicated that although

> most academic libraries are pursuing relatively active
> programs of bibliographic instruction, /the majority of
> academic are7 still in the primitive stages
> of instruction, providing what would be termed as the
> 'basics' (p. 125).

Justification for Present Study in Light
of Literature Review

The present study is focused on the library administrative sup-

port for the freshman library use instruction program and the program

elements, i.e., the ways in which these programs are implemented.

Previous surveys have not investigated the library administrative

support and the program elements of freshman library use instruction

programs. This study presents a valid indication of the status,

extent, and support of library use instruction programs for college

freshmen in the United States at this time. Also, it will serve as

a stimulus to the development of successful, well-coordinated programs

for library use instruction for college freshmen. These programs,

which are a concerted and conscious effort to produce knowledgeable

library users, are of vital importance to the future of libraries and

to the future educated populace. The library world is entering a new

age that will be vastly different from the old because of the rapidly

changing methods of locating and retrieving information. With the

advent of today's computerized information retrieval services and to-

morrow's even more sophisticated information access sources, the

seeker of information will need to become equally sophisticated and knowledgeable about the means of finding information. Instruction in the use of libraries and information retrieval methods is the first step in producing an informed citizenry who know where and how to find information.

This study concentrates on college freshmen because it is at the freshman level that academic libraries have the opportunity to instruct any student who attends college whether or not the student later transfers to another institution. The freshman level is an appropriate level for an investigation because it is the level where most academic libraries begin their instructional efforts, if they have any formal instructional activities at all. Instruction in library use received by college freshmen may be the only point during a student's academic career when he or she will receive this type of instruction.

The current study is the first comprehensive survey of freshman library use instruction programs in the United States. Unlike earlier surveys, this study is not limited by geographical area, by type of institution, or by whether institutions are known to have active library use instruction programs. Earlier surveys have, in most cases, utilized extremely small samples (some limited to only eight or ten libraries) or they have been limited to libraries that were already involved in library use instruction. Other surveys have been limited to a certain geographical area or to certain types of institutions. As Ward (1976) pointed out in his survey of library orientation and instruction programs in ten southeastern states,

> to date, information is somewhat incomplete regarding
> the status of such programs throughout the nation--
> most surveys having been confined to relatively small

samples, individual states, or small geographic regions
(p. 148).

Tidmarsh (1968) in a bibliographical essay article gives a brief

summary of some of the library use instruction programs that have

appeared in the literature. She states that

> numerous as these accounts of different academic libraries
> are, the evidence is too fragmentary to draw a firm pic-
> ture of the extent of library instruction in the United
> States. American librarians themselves are very cautious
> in drawing conclusions, and sometimes contradict one
> another (p. 50).

She cautions that "one must remember that there are many institutions

in the United States, but only those who do offer instruction are

featured in the literature" (p. 29). Kirk (1974) points out that

> although there has been a substantial increase in the
> development of library instruction programs, there remain
> many college libraries that do not provide library instruc-
> tion and college librarians who do not recognize its value
> (p. 86).

This study, then, gives a more complete picture of the extent of

library use instruction for college freshmen in the United States.

This study can also serve as a stimulus to the development of

well-coordinated, successful programs by presenting a summary of the

ways library administrators can support these programs and by listing

the program elements used to implement these programs. This study

produces results that can be used by four types of institutions, i.e.,

two-year, four-year, five-year, and doctoral-degree granting

institutions.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to survey a sample of academic libraries in the United States to examine two major components of library use instruction programs for college freshmen--library administrative support for the programs and the program elements, i.e., the tasks involved in implementing these programs. Using the data gathered by examining these two components in depth, a profile was drawn for four types of academic institutions. These profiles were compared to the nationally-recognized standard guidelines for establishing and implementing library use instruction programs--the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries" approved by the Association of College and Research Libraries Board of Directors on January 31, 1977. See Appendix A for a copy of the Guidelines.

Sampling Procedures

The sample was chosen in the following manner. The colleges and universities listed in the American Council on Education's (1981) 1981/82 Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education; Programs, Candidates were used as the universe from which to draw the sample.

The following types of institutions were eliminated from the universe: technical, professional, home study, upper-division schools, institutions offering graduate degrees only, institutions on probationary status, and institutions which were candidates for accreditation. The remaining colleges and universities were divided into four groups according to the highest degree offered. The definitions below were used to form the four groups:

Two-year institutions: Includes those institutions offering at least two, but less than four years of work beyond Grade 12 and offering the Associate degree.

Four-year institutions: Includes those institutions which offer a course of study leading to the Bachelor of Arts or the Bachelor of Science degree as the highest degree offered.

Five-year institutions: Includes those institutions which offer lower and upper-division courses and which offer a course of study leading to the master's degree as the highest degree offered.

Doctoral institutions: Includes those institutions which offer a course of study leading to a Doctorate of Philosophy or equivalent degree and which offer lower and upper-division courses.

Table I gives the number of institutions in each of the four categories included in the typology of colleges and universities in the United States.

In order to receive as representative a return as possible, 100 institutions were chosen at random from each of the four categories of institutions to receive the questionnaire. Since most of the data are displayed by the four categories of institutions described above,

it was felt that the separate characteristics were more important than the combined characteristics of all four groups, so an equivalent number rather than a proportionate sample was drawn from each of the categories.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS IN EACH CATEGORY
OF THE TYPOLOGY

Category	Number of Institutions
Two-Year	769
Four-Year	627
Five-Year	487
Doctoral	249

Date Collection Instrument

A data collection instrument was developed, which was a survey form consisting of 33 questions plus three optional questions. The data collection instrument asked for specific data which would demonstrate the administrative support and the program elements in a library use instruction program for college freshmen. The survey was sent to the libraries of the institutions drawn for the sample.

Pre-Testing of the Data Collection Instrument

The survey instrument was pre-tested in December, 1982 by sending it to a small sample of 20 librarians who are active practitioners in library use instruction programs for freshmen and who work in a variety of academic institutions in various geographical regions of the United States. These 20 librarians were asked to respond to the survey instrument and to critique it in terms of its efficacy in gathering appropriate data to use in this study. After receiving the replies from the pre-test respondents and after consultation with the advisory committee, the survey instrument was modified according to the suggestions made.

Data Collection

The survey instrument was mailed on February 10, 1983 to the selected sample of 400 academic libraries with a return date of February 25, 1983. A cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey was addressed to the bibliographic instruction librarian or coordinator if one was listed in the 1982 American Library Directory. If no instruction librarian or coordinator was listed, the survey was sent to the Head of the Reference Department or, in the case of those libraries that had no separate Reference Department, the Director of the Library with a request that the survey be given to the appropriate person. The cover letter requested the return of the questionnaire within two weeks. Appendix B contains a copy of the cover letter and the data collection instrument.

The data were analyzed in March, 1983. Of the 400 surveys that were mailed, 302 surveys were returned, a 75.5% return rate. Seventeen of the surveys were received too late to be included in the data analysis. Of the remaining 285 surveys, 14 or approximately 5.0% of the libraries were unable to complete the survey because none of their library use instruction activities were geared specifically or solely for college freshmen. In general, these libraries offered instruction to any student or instructor who requested it but did not have a planned program for freshmen. Of these 15 libraries, five were at five-year institutions, five were at doctoral institutions, three were at four-year institutions, and one was at a two-year institution. From the remaining 271 surveys, the return rate by institution type was the following: 68 returns from two-year institutions, 70 returns from four-year institutions, 70 returns from five-year institutions, and 63 returns from doctoral institutions.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data were analyzed by tabulating the responses and recording the data by number and percentage of libraries in the appropriate tables in Chapters IV, V, VI, and VII. The results were compiled for each of the four types of institutions--two-year, four-year, five-year, and doctoral degree-granting institutions. A profile for each type of institution's activities in library use instruction for college freshmen appears in Chapter VI. Each profile was then compared to the Association of College and Research Library's "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries" in Chapter VII.

Limitations of Study

One limitation of the data collection instrument was the possibil-
ity that not all respondents interpreted the questions in the same con-
text as the surveyor intended. Another limitation was that those
academic libraries which do not have active library use instruction
programs for college freshmen might be unwilling to return the
instrument even though space was provided to indicate that they did
not have an active program. A third limitation was that the study
focused specifically on first-time freshmen as a homogenous group and
did not attempt to focus on the special problems of transfer students,
older returning students who might be first-time freshmen, or the
special needs of international students who are freshmen. A fourth
limitation was that the surveys were filled out by the person respon-
sible for the success or failure of the activities described in the
survey. Although it can be assumed that the respondents were as
accurate as possible in their replies, there might be some instances
of positive bias on the part of the person filling out the survey.

CHAPTER IV

LIBRARY ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FOR FRESHMAN

LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Introduction

One way to measure library administrative support for a freshman
library use instruction program is to ascertain the existence or lack
of certain activities at the library's highest administrative levels
which establish programs and encourage their implementation. These
activities can be categorized into four major areas: goal setting,
funding, personnel, and evaluation. Survey questions 3 through 15
elicited responses concerning library administrative activities in
these four areas, which are described in more detail below.

The library administration supports freshman library use instruc-
tion programs by initiating goal-setting activities, such as the
following:

a. involving the academic community in the formulation of
broad goals for the program

b. ensuring that written long-range goals and short-range
objectives with a timetable for implementation are provided.

Funding is another crucial area in which the library administra-
tion supports the freshman library use instruction program by:

a. providing within the library's budget clearly identifiable funds to carry out the program

b. assigning appropriate funds for the program in order to provide the personnel, equipment, teaching materials, and facilities to implement the objectives of the program.

Administrative decisions concerning several personnel-related matters can affirm administrative support for a library use instruction program. For example, the library administration shows support for the program by:

a. assigning appropriately-trained personnel to the program

b. designating the place of these personnel in the organizational structure of the library

c. providing job descriptions that include library use instruction as an expected responsibility

d. using library instruction activities as a criterion for promotion, tenure, and/or merit raises for librarians involved in the program

e. providing funds and opportunities for the librarians involved in the program to participate in continuing education activities.

Evaluation is a fourth area where the library administration can support freshman library use instruction programs by providing a monitoring mechanism to ensure:

a. the overall evaluation of the program

b. the evaluation of the individual components of the program.

Goal Setting

Involving the Academic Community in the Formula-
tion of Broad Goals for the Program

The support of faculty outside the library for library use in-
struction activities is extremely important, if not absolutely
necessary. In order for librarians to succeed in their efforts to
teach students how to use more effectively and efficiently the li-
brary's resources, librarians are dependent on faculty outside the
library to provide the appropriate student motivation to use library
resources. The library's administrators in their role as interpreters
of the library's programs and services to the institution's adminis-
tration are in a position to involve the faculty outside the library
in the formulation of broad goals for the library use instruction
program. In the case of a freshman library use instruction program,
this may mean that the library administration arranges a meeting to
discuss common goals between the English Department's composition
faculty and the librarians responsible for implementing library use
instruction programs for freshmen. In a broader context, the library
administration may involve an advisory committee of outside faculty
in the formulation of broad library use instruction goals.

Table II displays the results of survey question three which
elicited responses concerning the involvement of the academic com-
munity in the formulation of goals for the library use instruction
program for college freshmen.

TABLE II

INVOLVEMENT OF ACADEMIC COMMUNITY IN FORMULATION OF GOALS FOR
LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS BY NUMBER AND PERCENT-
AGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Involved	29	42.6	31	44.2	25	35.7	24	38.1
Not involved	29	42.6	31	44.2	34	48.6	37	58.7
Other	3	4.4	-0-	-0-	2	2.9	1	1.6
No response	7	10.3	8	11.4	9	12.9	1	1.6

Ensuring that Written Long-Range Goals and
Short-Range Objectives with a Timetable
for Implementation are Provided

Establishing long-range goals and writing short-range objectives
for the library use instruction program contribute to the success of
the program. The library administration can demonstrate its
commitment to the program by ensuring that these goals and objectives
along with a timetable for implementation are established.

Table III displays the results of survey question four concern-
ing the existence of written goals and objectives. Table IV displays

TABLE III

EXISTENCE OF WRITTEN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR FRESHMAN LIBRARY
USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Have goals and objectives	13	19.1	13	18.6	13	18.6	17	27.0
Goals only	5	7.4	1	1.4	4	5.7	3	4.8
Objectives only	5	7.4	5	7.1	6	8.6	8	12.7
Do not have	39	57.4	43	61.4	41	58.6	34	54.0
No response	6	8.8	8	11.4	6	8.6	1	1.6

the results of survey question five concerning the existence of a

timetable for implementation of goals and objectives. A timetable

for implementation of goals and objectives indicates that the

library administration and the librarian or librarians responsible

for implementing the freshman library use instruction program

have given careful consideration to the time frame involved and

the steps involved in carrying out short-range objectives and

long-range goals.

TABLE IV

EXISTENCE OF TIMETABLES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF WRITTEN GOALS
AND OBJECTIVES OF FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION
PROGRAMS BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Have timetable	10	14.7	9	12.9	5	7.1	6	9.5
Do not have timetable	43	63.2	34	48.6	41	58.6	43	68.3
No response	15	22.0	27	38.6	24	34.3	14	22.2

Funding

Providing within the Library's Budget Clearly

Identifiable Funds to Carry out the Program

One way the library administration can demonstrate support for a
freshman library use instruction program is to clearly identify the
funding source for the program. Table V displays the results of
survey question six concerning the existence of a separate budget for
freshman library use instruction programs.

TABLE V

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS
BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Separate funds	3	4.4	1	1.4	1	1.4	6	9.5
General library budget	50	73.5	55	78.6	61	87.1	57	90.5
Grant from institution	3	4.4	1	1.4	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Grant from outside source	-0-	-0-	1	1.4	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Other	6	8.8	5	7.1	2	2.9	-0-	-0-
No response	6	8.8	7	10.0	6	8.6	1	1.6

Assigning Appropriate Funds for the Program in
Order to Provide the Personnel, Equipment, Ma-
terials, and Facilities to Implement the
Program

Another way the library administration can demonstrate support
for the program is to provide sufficient funds for professional staff,
support staff, equipment, instructional materials, and facilities.
Table VI displays the results of survey question seven concerning the

TABLE VI

SUFFICIENCY OF FUNDS FOR VARIOUS COMPONENTS OF FRESHMAN
LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS BY NUMBER AND
PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Professional staff	36	52.9	37	52.9	40	57.1	37	58.7
Support staff	18	26.5	17	24.3	26	37.1	22	34.9
Equipment	26	38.2	19	27.1	28	40.0	27	42.9
Materials	36	52.9	31	44.3	37	52.9	35	55.6
Facilities	32	47.1	28	40.0	28	40.0	29	46.0

sufficiency of funds for the various components of the program.

Personnel

Assigning Appropriately-Trained Personnel to
the Program

The library administration supports library use instruction for freshmen by providing professional staff who are knowledgeable about various disciplines and who have had training in teaching skills, the preparation and use of audio-visual materials, and the preparation

and use of evaluation techniques. Table VII displays the results of survey question eight concerning the prior training and qualifications of instruction librarians.

TABLE VII

PRIOR TRAINING OF LIBRARIANS INVOLVED IN FRESHMAN LIBRARY
USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Various disciplines	49	72.1	55	78.6	56	80.0	60	95.2
Teaching skills	41	60.3	38	54.3	30	42.9	31	49.2
Preparation of audio-visual material	46	67.6	33	47.1	28	40.0	25	39.7
Preparation and use of evaluation techniques	22	32.4	21	30.0	14	20.0	18	28.6

A personnel issue important to the success of a freshman library use instruction program is the location of the library use instruction program within the library's organizational structure. The library administration can demonstrate support for the program by clearly designating which position or positions are responsible for implementing the program. Table VIII displays the results of survey question nine concerning the place in the organizational structure of the library of the librarians who are responsible for implementing the freshman library use instruction program.

A related personnel issue that has an affect on the success of a freshman library use instruction program is the reporting responsibility of those librarians who are designated as part-time or full-time instruction librarians. It is assumed that the higher the official to whom these librarians report the closer their access to top library administrators. There is a strong likelihood that the director perceives library instruction as a high priority if the librarian reports to the library director. Table IX displays the results of survey question ten concerning the reporting responsibilities of part-time and full-time instruction librarians.

Providing Job Descriptions that Include Library
Use Instruction as an Expected Responsibility

Another way to show the commitment of the library's administration to library use instruction is to include instructional activities in the job descriptions of librarians. Table X shows the responses to survey question 11 concerning job descriptions.

TABLE VIII

PLACE OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL IN THE LIBRARY'S ORGANIZATIONAL
STRUCTURE BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Appointed committee	2	2.9	2	2.9	-0-	-0-	2	3.2
Volunteer committee	-0-	-0-	1	1.4	1	1.4	1	1.6
Public service librarians	9	13.2	7	10.0	9	12.9	21	33.3
Ad hoc	4	5.6	4	5.7	5	7.1	2	3.2
Part-time instruction librarians	4	5.6	5	7.1	7	10.0	11	17.5
Full-time instruction librarians	2	2.9	1	1.4	6	8.6	13	20.6
Reference Department Head	11	16.2	20	28.6	16	22.9	6	9.5
Public Services Head	2	2.9	8	11.4	7	10.0	2	3.2
Library Director	27	39.7	12	17.1	6	8.6	-0-	-0-
Other	1	1.5	3	4.3	6	8.6	4	6.3
No response	6	8.8	7	10.0	7	10.0	1	1.6

TABLE IX

REPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES OF PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME INSTRUCTION
LIBRARIANS BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 6		N = 6		N = 13		N = 24	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reference Department Head	1	16.7	-0-	-0-	3	23.1	15	62.5
Public Services Head	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	2	15.4	4	16.7
Director	4	66.7	5	83.3	6	46.1	5	20.8
Subject Department Head	1	16.7	-0-	-0-	2	15.4	-0-	-0-
Collection Development Head	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Technical Processing Head	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Other	-0-	-0-	1	16.7	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

Using Library Instruction Activities as a Criterion for Promotion, Tenure, or Merit Raises

In addition to hiring staff with the understanding that instruction is one of the duties, library administrators can use activity in

TABLE X

PROVISION OF JOB DESCRIPTIONS THAT INCLUDE LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION
AS AN EXPECTED RESPONSIBILITY BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE
OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Instruction included in job description	46	67.6	42	60.0	54	77.1	55	87.3
Instruction not included in job description	10	14.7	11	15.7	5	7.1	4	6.3
No job descriptions available	4	5.9	9	12.9	3	4.3	2	3.2
No response	8	11.8	8	11.4	8	11.4	2	3.2

instruction as a consideration in decisions on tenure, promotion, and/
or merit raises. Table XI shows the responses to survey question 12
concerning the use of library use instruction as a criterion for pro-
motion, tenure, and/or merit raises.

Providing Continuing Education Opportunities

Another way the library administration can support library use

TABLE XI

USE OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES AS A CRITERION FOR DECISIONS
ON PROMOTION, TENURE, AND/OR MERIT RAISES BY NUMBER AND
PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is used	10	14.7	14	20.0	30	42.9	43	68.3
Not used	48	70.6	44	62.9	30	42.9	18	28.6
No response	10	14.7	12	17.1	10	14.3	2	3.2

instruction is to provide opportunities and funds for the librarians
involved in the freshman program to participate in continuing educa-
tion activities. Librarians who have not taught previously need to
learn the basics of curriculum design, writing objectives, planning
teaching activities, learning how to sequence these activities, and
how to conduct evaluations. In response to survey question 13,
Table XII shows the number of libraries where librarians engaged in
some type of continuing education activity within the past 12 months.

TABLE XII

LIBRARIES WHERE LIBRARIANS PARTICIPATED IN SOME TYPE OF CONTINUING
EDUCATION ACTIVITY BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE
OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Did partici-pate	24	35.3	18	25.7	37	52.9	42	66.7
Did not par-ticipate	35	51.5	44	62.9	27	38.6	20	31.7
No response	9	13.2	8	11.4	6	8.6	1	1.6

Evaluation

Evaluation of a freshman library use instruction program takes
two forms. One is a detailed evaluation of the various components of
the program and the second is an assessment of the program as a whole
in order to monitor progress and decide whether or not to modify or
continue the program. The Library administrator's role in evaluation
is to ensure that a mechanism exists for both types of evaluation.

Table XIII displays the results of survey question 14 concerning
the library administration's encouragement to establish evaluation
procedures to monitor the overall program, the various parts of the
program, and the teaching objectives.

TABLE XIII

KINDS OF EVALUATION OF FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS
BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Evaluate entire program	27	39.7	27	38.6	30	42.9	32	50.8
Evaluate various parts	16	23.5	15	21.4	18	25.7	16	25.4
Evaluate teaching objectives	8	11.8	12	17.1	12	17.1	12	19.0
Evaluation not done	20	29.4	30	42.9	26	37.1	23	36.5
Other	1	1.5	1	1.4	1	1.4	-0-	-0-

Table XIV displays the results of survey question 15 concerning
the participation of the academic community, i.e., the non-library
faculty and the students, in evaluating the goals and objectives of
the freshman library use instruction program. The role of the library
administration in this case is to encourage the academic community
to participate in the evaluation of the program.

TABLE XIV

PARTICIPATION OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY IN EVALUATING THE GOALS AND
OBJECTIVES OF FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS BY
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Academic community participates	31	45.6	26	37.1	24	34.3	24	38.1
Academic community does not participate	30	44.1	37	52.9	37	52.9	37	58.7
No response	7	10.3	7	10.0	9	12.9	2	3.2

CHAPTER V

PROGRAM ELEMENTS IN A FRESHMAN LIBRARY

USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Introduction

The program elements of a library use instruction program for
college freshmen are the activities involved in implementing the
broad goals of the program. In order to fully implement a freshman
library use instruction program, the reference or instruction libra-
rians charged with the responsibility for implementation of the pro-
gram must make decisions involving the following areas:

a. needs assessment techniques

b. the specific objectives of the program

c. the type of program or activities to implement

d. the disciplines or subject areas in which to offer the
instruction

e. the instructional materials

f. the content of the instruction

g. public relations techniques to promote the program

h. record keeping and statistics

i. evaluation methods.

Survey questions 16 to 29 elicited responses to questions concerning
the program elements of freshman library use instruction programs.

74

Needs Assessment

A needs assessment of library use instruction includes a written profile of the needs of each group of type of library user or potential library user for library orientation and instruction. Freshman students are a group of library users with special needs and should be included in a needs assessment. Table XV displays the results of survey question 16 concerning the existence of needs assessments.

TABLE XV

EXISTENCE OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY FOR
LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE
OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Needs Assessment conducted	15	22.0	14	20.0	13	18.6	17	27.0
No needs assessment	47	69.1	49	70.0	48	68.6	45	71.4
No response	6	8.2	7	10.0	9	12.9	1	1.6

Table XVI shows the results of survey question 17 concerning the existence of a written profile of the institution's needs assessment for library orientation and instruction.

TABLE XVI

LIBRARIES WITH WRITTEN NEEDS ASSESSMENTS BY NUMBER AND
PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Written needs assessment	7	10.3	6	8.6	8	11.4	7	11.1
No written needs assessment	55	80.9	55	78.6	49	70.0	53	84.1
No response	6	8.8	9	12.9	13	18.6	3	4.8

Objectives

In the previous chapter, the existence of broad long-range goals and immediate objectives for the library use instruction program were discussed. This section concentrates on the specific instructional

objectives of a freshman library use instruction program, which are defined as measurable objectives that indicate what students are expected to learn. Table XVII displays the results of survey question 18 which ascertains the existence of instructional objectives in freshman library use instruction programs.

TABLE XVII

LIBRARIES USING INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES IN FRESHMAN LIBRARY
USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE
OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Use instructional objectives	25	36.8	19	27.1	11	15.7	19	30.1
Do not use instructional objectives	35	51.5	44	62.9	49	70.0	42	66.7
Other	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1.6
No response	8	11.8	7	10.0	10	14.3	1	1.6

Types of Programs and Activities

One of the major tasks in implementing a library orientation and instruction program for college freshmen is determining the type of activity or program to implement. Basically, there are four major types of instruction that are applicable to freshman library use instruction programs. The first is orientation to the building and physical facilities. The second is course-related or course-integrated instruction. Either orientation or instruction can include the third type of library program which is individualized instruction, such as self-paced workbooks. A fourth major type of instruction is a separate course designed to teach basic library skills. The next three tables display the results of survey questions 19 through 21 concerning these four major activities. Table XVIII displays the results of survey question 19 concerning the kinds of orientation activities offered to college freshmen. Table XIX displays the results of survey question 20 concerning the use of course-related, course-integrated, and individualized instruction. Table XX displays the results of survey question 21 concerning the characteristics of credit courses in library use instruction.

Discipline in Which Instruction is Offered

In the literature, one of the most often mentioned types of library use instruction for freshmen is course-related instruction offered in conjunction with English composition classes. There are two reasons why English composition is the most popular class in

TABLE XVIII

TYPES OF LIBRARY ORIENTATION ACTIVITIES FOR COLLEGE FRESHMEN BY
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Conducted tour	50	73.5	53	75.7	52	74.3	47	74.6
Slide/tape to large groups	19	27.9	8	11.4	13	18.6	23	36.5
Slide/tape for individuals	13	19.1	7	10.0	10	14.3	8	12.7
Self-guided tour with audio equipment	4	5.9	2	2.9	6	8.6	6	9.5
Self-guided printed tour	8	11.8	4	5.7	16	22.9	25	39.7
Videotape	3	4.4	3	4.3	5	7.1	4	6.3
Signage system	7	10.3	9	12.9	18	25.7	16	25.4
Handbook	38	55.9	44	62.9	34	48.6	28	44.4
Tabloid handout	4	5.9	3	4.3	12	17.1	8	12.7
Other	12	17.6	9	12.9	11	15.7	13	20.6

which to offer course-related library use instruction. Because

English composition students are often required to use and quote

TABLE XIX

TYPES OF LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION FOR COLLEGE FRESHMEN BY
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Course-related	55	80.9	53	75.7	55	78.6	54	85.7
Course-integrated	35	51.5	30	42.9	25	35.7	25	39.7
Non-credit	12	17.6	10	14.3	14	20.0	18	28.6
Credit course	23	33.8	5	7.1	20	28.6	16	25.4
Point-of-use printed materials	20	29.4	18	25.7	31	44.3	31	49.2
Point-of-use audio-visual materials	14	20.6	9	12.9	11	15.7	9	14.3
Computer-assisted in-struction	2	2.9	2	2.9	-0-	-0-	2	3.2
Self-paced workbook or worksheets	23	33.8	11	15.7	16	22.9	27	42.9
Other	4	5.9	2	2.9	1	1.4	1	1.6

library resources as part of term paper assignments, the objectives of

basic library use instruction are closely related to the objectives of

TABLE XX

CHARACTERISTICS OF CREDIT COURSES IN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION BY
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Number of credit courses	23	33.8	5	7.1	20	28.6	16	25.4
Required	3		2		3		2	
Optional	18		3		17		11	
No response	2		-0-		-0-		3	
Hours credit								
One hour	11		1		4		10	
One and one-half hour	-0-		-0-		2		-0-	
Two hours	5		-0-		5		-0-	
Three hours	4		1		3		3	
Four hours	-0-		1		-0-		1	
Other	-0-		-0-		1		-0-	
No response	3		2		5		2	
Duration								
One term	19		5		14		15	
One year	-0-		-0-		-0-		-0-	
Other	2		-0-		6		-0-	
No response	2		-0-		-0-		1	
Instructor								
Librarian	19		4		16		13	
Non-librarian	-0-		-0-		3		-0-	
Librarian and non-librarian	1		1		1		1	
Other	-0-		-0-		-0-		2	
No response	3		-0-		-0-		-0-	

the English composition course. Since English composition is usually a
required course, the instruction offered by the library through this
course will reach virtually all freshmen. Table XXI displays the re-
sults of survey question 22 concerning the disciplines in which course-
related library use instruction for freshmen is offered.

TABLE XXI

DISCIPLINES IN WHICH COURSE-RELATED LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION IS
OFFERED BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
English composition	51	75.0	51	72.9	46	65.7	51	81.0
Other English course	31	45.6	19	27.1	16	22.9	10	15.9
Business	29	42.6	14	20.0	16	22.9	10	15.9
Education	7	10.3	10	14.3	16	22.9	7	11.1
Journalism	9	13.2	7	10.0	11	15.7	10	15.9
Humanities	14	20.6	15	21.4	17	24.3	10	15.9
Social science	20	29.4	21	30.0	21	30.0	13	20.6
Sciences	13	19.1	13	18.6	12	17.1	14	22.2
Other	19	27.9	17	24.3	11	15.7	8	12.7

Instructional Materials

A wide range of instructional materials are used in conjunction with freshman library use instruction. Table XXII displays the results of survey question 23 concerning the types of instructional materials used.

Content of Instruction

The amount of material to cover in a freshman library orientation and instruction program has been a question of debate among librarians. Some believe freshmen should be given a basic knowledge of how to use the card catalog and one or more periodical indexes and nothing more. Others believe that freshmen should receive more in-depth instruction, especially a method for conducting a search strategy or skills in solving information retrieval problems. A variety of topics are listed in Table XXIII which displays the results of survey question 24 concerning the content of the freshman library use instruction.

Public Relations and Publicity

Freshman library use instruction programs are promoted and publicized in a variety of ways to the faculty and students. Table XXIV displays the results of survey question 25 concerning the methods and techniques used to market the freshman library use instruction program to the academic community.

TABLE XXII

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS USED IN FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PRO-
GRAMS BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Worksheets	36	52.9	30	42.9	33	47.1	36	57.1
Workbook	18	26.5	7	10.0	10	14.3	17	27.0
Textbook	13	19.1	3	4.3	8	11.4	3	4.8
Slide/tape	21	30.9	7	10.0	15	21.4	15	23.8
Slides	6	8.8	3	4.3	9	12.9	13	20.6
Transparencies	19	27.9	21	30.0	18	25.7	29	46.0
Videotape or television	7	10.3	4	5.7	3	4.3	6	9.5
Motion picture	1	1.5	-0-	-0-	1	1.4	-0-	-0-
Filmstrips	7	10.3	4	5.7	5	7.1	-0-	-0-
Videodisc	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Other audio-visual	1	1.5	1	1.4	3	4.3	2	3.2
Computer-assisted instruction	3	4.4	2	2.9	-0-	-0-	3	4.8
Chalkboard	19	27.9	20	28.6	26	37.1	32	50.8
Large note pad	5	7.4	4	5.7	3	4.3	6	9.5
Handbook	35	51.5	38	54.3	34	48.6	28	44.4
Floor plans	29	42.6	25	35.7	35	50.0	37	58.7

TABLE XXII (continued)

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Printed bibliographies	26	38.2	28	40.0	33	47.1	30	47.6
Handouts	38	55.9	41	58.6	51	72.9	48	76.2
Sample pages from super-seded ref-erence sources	18	26.5	20	28.6	21	30.0	13	20.6
Other	2	2.9	6	8.6	3	4.3	1	1.6

Statistics

Keeping statistics and documenting activities on an annual basis is one way to demonstrate the worth and extent of the freshman library use instruction program over a period of years to the library and the university administration. Table XXV displays the results of survey question 26 concerning the production of an annual report on library use instruction.

Table XXVI displays the results of survey question 27 concerning the kinds of statistics of freshman library use instruction activities recorded by libraries.

TABLE XXIII

CONTENT OF LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION FOR COLLEGE FRESHMEN BY
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
How to use: card catalog	56	82.4	61	87.1	61	87.1	58	92.1
online catalog	4	5.9	2	2.9	4	5.7	10	15.9
online circulation system	2	2.9	-0-	-0-	2	2.9	6	9.5
computer output microfilm catalog	9	13.2	2	2.9	7	10.0	8	12.7
subject headings list	41	60.3	46	65.7	52	74.3	52	82.5
Readers' Guide	59	86.8	55	78.6	58	82.9	49	77.8
Other periodical indexes	46	67.6	48	68.6	56	80.0	56	88.9
list of periodical holdings	21	30.9	18	25.7	29	41.4	33	52.4
read a call number	59	86.8	57	81.4	57	81.4	49	77.8
locate material on shelves	55	80.9	54	77.1	54	77.1	52	82.5
use audiovisual equipment	36	52.9	27	38.6	29	41.4	19	30.2
take notes	4	5.9	10	14.3	12	17.1	1	1.6
prepare a bibliography	19	27.9	13	18.6	20	28.6	11	17.5

TABLE XXIII (continued)

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
choose a topic for a paper	21	30.9	23	32.9	23	32.9	22	34.9
narrow a topic	22	32.4	24	34.3	26	37.1	25	39.7
devise a search strategy	30	44.1	35	50.0	27	38.6	38	60.0
specialized reference tools	43	63.2	41	58.6	41	58.6	35	55.6
government publications	11	16.2	20	28.6	29	41.4	28	44.4
newspaper indexes	39	57.4	33	47.1	43	61.4	46	73.0
library poli- cies and regu- lations	49	72.1	43	61.4	43	61.4	42	66.7
Other	2	2.9	2	2.9	7	10.0	4	6.3

Evaluation Methods

Evaluation of freshman library use instruction is undertaken for two purposes. One is to assess the quality and effectiveness of the entire program. The second is to improve the components of the program and includes an evaluation of the instructional methods used in

TABLE XXIV

PUBLICITY METHODS USED TO PROMOTE FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION
PROGRAMS BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fliers to faculty and/or students	9	13.2	12	17.1	21	30.0	24	38.1
Bulletin boards	10	14.7	2	2.9	8	11.4	14	22.2
Course catalogs	20	29.4	8	11.4	16	22.9	12	19.0
Campus newspaper	9	13.2	3	4.3	7	10.0	14	22.2
Campus radio or television	1	1.5	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	5	7.9
Library newsletter	5	7.4	7	10.0	7	10.0	14	22.2
Personal contact	46	67.6	50	71.4	53	75.7	47	74.6
Faculty meetings	12	17.6	11	15.7	18	25.7	18	28.6
Word of mouth	27	39.7	20	28.6	38	34.3	31	49.2
Poster and signs	10	14.7	5	7.1	8	11.4	15	23.8
Other	9	13.2	8	11.4	6	8.6	8	12.7

TABLE XXV

PRODUCTION OF ANNUAL REPORTS ON LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION BY
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Have annual reports	10	14.7	13	18.6	23	32.9	23	36.5
Do not have annual reports	44	64.7	37	52.9	32	45.7	19	30.2
Included in other report	8	11.8	12	17.1	9	12.9	20	31.7
No response	6	8.8	8	11.4	6	8.6	1	1.6

specific classroom situations or other activities.

The previous chapter contains a discussion of the library admin-
istration's role in setting up a mechanism to monitor the program
as a whole as well as evaluate the individual components. This chapter
concentrates on the role of the librarian responsible for implementing
the program. The librarian must decide which evaluation techniques to
employ to evaluate the components of the program and to evaluate the
success in attaining overall goals. Tables XXVII and XXVIII display
the results of survey question 28 concerning the informal and formal
techniques used to evaluate the components of a program. Table XXIX

TABLE XXVI

KINDS OF STATISTICS RECORDED FOR FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION
PROGRAMS BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Number of freshmen	22	32.4	33	47.1	36	51.4	48	76.2
Professional staff time	9	13.2	12	17.1	19	27.1	18	28.6
Number of sessions	30	44.1	33	47.1	45	64.3	53	84.1
Overall cost of program	1	1.5	1	1.4	1	1.4	-0-	-0-
Cost per freshman student	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Other	-0-	-0-	1	1.4	4	5.7	4	6.3
Statistics not recorded	28	41.2	24	34.3	14	20.0	5	7.9

displays the results of survey question 29 concerning the ability of

libraries to document a substantial attainment of their written

program goals.

TABLE XXVII

INFORMAL EVALUATION TECHNIQUES USED TO EVALUATE THE COMPONENTS OF
FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS BY NUMBER
AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Observing students during presentations	41	60.3	43	61.4	45	64.3	50	79.4
Observing students' use of resources	50	73.5	47	67.1	37	52.9	37	58.7
Questionnaire of students' opinions of usefulness of instruction	14	20.6	14	20.0	20	28.6	20	31.7
Conversation with students and instructors after presentation	41	60.3	49	70.0	40	57.1	43	68.3
Videotape of a session for feedback to librarian	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1.4	-0-	-0-
Other	1	1.5	1	1.4	4	5.7	3	4.8

TABLE XXVIII

FORMAL EVALUATION TECHNIQUES USED TO EVALUATE THE COMPONENTS OF
FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS BY NUMBER AND
PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
In-house test	19	27.9	14	20.0	13	18.6	22	34.9
Standard test	2	2.9	2	2.9	1	1.4	1	1.6
Evaluation of research diaries	2	2.9	1	1.4	3	4.3	2	3.2
Evaluation of student bibliographies	8	11.8	6	8.6	12	17.1	7	11.1
Evaluation of worksheets or workbooks	24	35.3	13	18.6	13	18.6	21	33.3
Measure of students' attitude change	5	7.4	2	2.9	3	4.3	8	12.7
Measure of achievement of behavioral objectives	4	5.9	2	2.9	3	4.3	5	7.9
Comparison of control and experimental groups	3	4.4	1	1.4	1	1.4	3	4.8
Other	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1.4	-0-	-0-

TABLE XXIX

LIBRARIES WHICH CAN DOCUMENT THE SUBSTANTIAL ATTAINMENT OF THE WRITTEN
PROGRAM OBJECTIVES FOR FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS
BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Can document	7	10.3	3	4.3	5	7.1	11	17.5
Cannot document	23	33.8	17	24.3	18	25.7	26	41.3
No program objectives available	30	44.1	40	57.1	39	55.7	24	38.1
No response	8	11.8	10	14.3	8	11.4	2	3.2

CHAPTER VI

PROFILES OF FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION
PROGRAMS IN FOUR TYPES OF
ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS

Introduction

This chapter contains a profile of freshman library use instruction activities in each type of institution using the data displayed in Chapters IV and V concerning library administrative support and the program elements and the data obtained from survey questions 30 through 33.

Survey questions 30 through 33 were designed to elicit responses that would summarize the results of the programs by describing the problems and benefits of freshman library use instruction, estimate the number of freshmen reached by the programs, and state the future disposition of the programs. An additional optional question asked the respondents to rate the effectiveness of their programs on a scale of one to five, one being the least effective and five the most effective and to state the reasons for the rating.

Table XXX displays the results of survey question 30 concerning the problems encountered in freshman library use instruction programs. Table XXXI displays the results of survey question 31 concerning the benefits of freshman library use instruction programs.

TABLE XXX

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS
BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Lack of: funds	7	10.3	10	14.3	7	10.0	16	25.4
professional staff	19	27.9	21	30.0	28	40.0	35	55.6
clerical staff	10	14.7	9	12.9	7	10.0	17	27.0
cooperation from faculty outside the library	16	23.5	20	28.2	14	20.0	22	34.9
library administration support	-0-	-0-	1	1.4	1	1.4	6	9.5
administrative support outside the library	5	7.4	11	15.7	3	4.3	9	14.3
support from library faculty and staff	1	1.5	1	1.4	1	1.4	3	4.8
Program does not reach all freshmen	37	54.4	31	44.3	29	41.4	37	58.7
Too much information too soon	4	5.9	12	17.1	12	17.1	3	4.8
Space	16	23.5	14	20.0	11	15.7	22	34.9
Personnel changes	1	1.5	-0-	-0-	4	5.7	6	9.5
Other	1	1.5	4	5.7	7	10.0	4	6.3

TABLE XXXI

BENEFITS OF FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS BY
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Increased student use of library	53	77.9	55	78.6	55	78.6	53	84.1
Librarians' knowledge of resources increased	29	42.6	23	32.9	29	41.4	25	40.0
Good publicity	34	50	29	41.4	31	44.3	42	66.7
Enhanced standing for librarians	29	42.6	26	37.1	24	34.3	24	38.1
More library staff interaction	30	44.1	20	28.6	23	32.9	31	49.2
Increase in funding	1	1.5	-0-	-0-	1	1.4	3	4.8
Improved collection development	9	13.2	10	14.3	7	10.0	4	6.3
Improved librarian/faculty relationship	35	51.5	36	51.4	33	47.1	38	60.3
Other	3	4.4	5	7.1	2	2.9	4	6.3

Table XXXII displays the results of survey question 33 concerning an estimation of the percentage of freshmen reached by library use instruction programs and activities in each of the four types of institutions.

TABLE XXXII

MEAN AND MEDIAN PERCENTAGE OF FRESHMEN REACHED BY LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION AS ESTIMATED BY RESPONDENTS FROM FOUR TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

	Two-Year	Four-Year	Five-Year	Doctoral
	N = 33	N = 42	N = 41	N = 48
Mean percentage	62.0	80.2	68.2	69.1
Median percentage	75.0	87.5	80.0	75.0

Table XXXIII displays the results of survey question 33 concerning the future disposition of the freshman library use instruction program.

TABLE XXXIII

FUTURE DISPOSITION OF FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS BY
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

	Two-Year		Four-Year		Five-Year		Doctoral	
	N = 68		N = 70		N = 70		N = 63	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Continue as is	17	25.0	27	38.6	19	27.1	24	38.1
Continue but modify	16	23.5	15	21.4	19	27.1	23	36.5
Reduce	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1.6
Expand	23	33.8	17	24.3	24	34.3	11	17.5
Discontinue	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1.4	-0-	-0-
Other	3	4.4	1	1.4	1	1.4	-0-	-0-
No response	9	13.2	10	14.3	6	8.6	4	6.3

Table XXXIV displays the results of optional survey question 34
on the effectiveness of the freshman library use instruction program.
The respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of their li-
brary use instruction activities and programs for college freshmen
on a scale of one to five. A one rating indicates the least effec-
tive program and a five rating indicates the most effective program.

TABLE XXXIV

EFFECTIVENESS OF FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION PROGRAM BY
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Rating[1]	Two-Year N = 43		Four-Year N = 43		Five-Year N = 45		Doctoral N = 41	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	3	7.0	-0-	-0-	1	2.2	1	2.4
Two	6	14.0	14	32.6	13	28.9	8	19.5
Three	21	48.8	16	37.2	18	40.0	18	43.9
Four	9	20.9	11	25.6	11	24.4	12	29.3
Five	4	9.3	2	4.7	2	4.4	2	4.9

Profile of Freshman Library Use Instruction

Programs in Two-Year Academic Institutions

Introduction

Of the 68 two-year academic institutions that responded to survey
question two, six (9%) libraries indicated that they do not have an
orientation and library use instruction program for freshmen. Of the
remaining two-year institutions, 34 (50%) have a formal program and

---

[1] The rating of one indicates the least effective; five indicates
the most effective.

28 (41%) have an informal program.

Library Administrative Support

The responses to survey questions 3 through 15 concerning library administrative support for freshman library use instruction programs by the two-year institutions are outlined below.

Goal-Setting Activities. Twenty-nine libraries (42.6%) include the academic community in the formulation of goals for their program, 13 (15.1%) have written goals and objectives, and 10 (14.7%) have a timetable for implementing the goals and objectives.

Funding. A majority of the freshman programs (50 libraries or 73.5%) are funded from the general library budget. Three (4.4%) programs have budgets that are clearly separate from the general library budget, three programs (4.4%) are funded by a special grant from within the institution. Six (8.8%) libraries indicate that other sources of funding are used. In these cases, the program expenses are charged to another budget within the institution, such as a general orientation budget or an instructional budget. Other libraries explained that students bear part of the cost of the program by purchasing workbooks or other materials. In terms of having sufficient staff and materials to carry out the program, about half of the two-year institutions indicated that they have sufficient funds for professional staff (36 or 52.9%), instructional materials (36 or 52.9%), and facilities (32 or 47.1%). Only 18 libraries (26.5%) indicated that they have sufficient clerical staff and 26 (38.2%)

indicated they have sufficient equipment.

Personnel. More than 70 percent of the libraries have instruction librarians who have training in various disciplines (49 or 72.1%), teaching skills (41 or 60.3%), and the preparation and use of audio-visual material (46 or 67.6%). Twenty-two (32.4%) of the libraries have librarians who are trained in evaluation techniques.

Organizationally, the library director (27 or 39.7% libraries) is the one most likely to be in charge of implementing the instruction program. Six libraries have a part-time or full-time instruction librarian. Of these six libraries, four of the instruction librarians report to the library director, one to the reference department head, and one to a subject department head. Many two-year schools indicated that they have only one or two librarians, all of whom are involved in library orientation and instruction.

In terms of job descriptions, 46 (67.6%) libraries include library instruction as an expected responsibility but only 10 (14.7%) libraries include instruction as a criterion in administrative decisions regarding promotion, tenure, and merit raises.

Librarians at 24 (35.3%) of the institutions participated in the past 12 months in continuing education activities. Several of the 35 librarians who indicated no participation in continuing education activities also indicated that funds for travel are very limited.

Evaluation. In terms of types of evaluation undertaken, 27 (39.7%) libraries evaluate their entire program and 16 (23.5%) libraries evaluate parts of the program. Twenty (29.4%) libraries do

not conduct any evaluation of their programs. The academic community participates in evaluation of the goals and objectives of the program in 31 (45.6%) libraries.

Program Elements

In response to survey questions 16 through 29 concerning the program elements of freshman library use instruction, the two-year institutions indicated that their programs are implemented in the following manner.

Needs Assessment. Needs assessments were conducted by 15 (22.0%) libraries. Seven (10.3%) libraries prepared a written report of the needs assessment.

Instructional Objectives. Twenty-five (36.8%) libraries use instructional objectives that can be measured.

Types of Programs. The two most popular orientation methods at two-year institutions are the guided tour (50 or 73.5%) and the handbook (38 or 55.9%). Lesser used methods are the slide/tape presentation to large groups (19 or 27.9%), the slide/tape for individuals (13 or 19.1%), the self-guided printed tour (8 or 11.3%), a signage system (7 or 10.3%), the self-guided audio tour (4 or 5.9%), a tabloid-type handout (4 or 5.9%), and a videotape (3 or 4.4%). Twelve of the libraries (17.6%) indicated other methods of orientation, such as a brief lecture sometimes accompanied by handouts of a library exercise.

The type of library use instruction most offered in the two-year

institution is course-related instruction (55 or 80.9% of the libraries). In descending order of use, the other types of instruction are course-integrated (35 or 51.5%), self-paced workbooks (23 or 33.8%), point-of-use printed materials (20 or 29.4%), credit courses (23 or 33.8%), point-of-use audio-visual materials (14 or 20.6%), and non-credit instruction (12 or 17.6%). Computer-assisted instruction is offered at only 2 or 2.9% of the libraries.

Of the 23 libraries that offer credit courses in library use instruction to freshmen, three of the courses are required. Twelve libraries offer a one-credit course, five offer a two-credit course, and four offer a three-credit course. Most of the credit courses meet for one term, one meets for one-third of the year; another for eight weeks. All of the courses except one are taught by librarians.

Disciplines or Subject Areas. The subject most likely to receive course-related library use instruction is English. Fifty-one or 75% of the libraries have course-related instruction offered through English composition classes and 31 (45.6%) offer instruction in other English classes. Other disciplines that receive course-related library use instruction are business (29 or 42.6%), the social sciences (20 or 29.4%), the humanities (14 or 20.6%), the sciences (13 or 19.1%), journalism (9 or 13.2%), and education (7 or 10.3%). Other course-related instruction is given to classes in career planning nursing, data processing, and study skills.

Instructional Materials. The types of instructional materials most popular in the two-year institution are handouts (38 or 55.9%),

worksheets (36 or 52.9%), library handbooks (35 or 51.5%), floor plans
and maps (29 or 42.6%), printed bibliographies (26 or 38.2%), work-
books (18 or 26.5), sample pages from superseded reference sources
(18 or 26.5%), and textbooks (13 or 19.1%).

The most used audio-visual instructional materials are the slide-
tape presentation (21 or 30.9%), transparencies (19 or 27.9%), and the
chalkboard (19 or 27.9%). Other less used audio-visual materials are
videotape or television (7 or 10.3%), filmstrips (7 or 10.3%), slides
(6 or 8.8%), notepad and easel (5 or 7.4%), computer-assisted instruc-
tion (3 or 4.4%), and motion pictures (1 or 1.5%). One library uses
large catalog cards as a visual device. None of the libraries uses
videodiscs.

Content of the Instruction. In the two-year institutions, the
content of freshman library use instruction emphasizes instruction in
how to use the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature (59 or 86.8%),
how to read a call number (59 or 86.8%), how to use the card catalog
(56 or 82.4%), and how to locate material on the shelves (55 or 80.9%).
At least 50% of the libraries also give instruction in library policies
and regulations (49 or 72.1%), specialized reference tools (43 or
63.2%), major periodical indexes (46 or 67.6%), subject headings lists
(41 or 60.3%), newspaper indexes (39 or 57.4%), and the use of audio-
visual equipment, such as microfilm readers (36 or 52.9%).

Less than 50% of the libraries give instruction in how to con-
struct a search strategy (30 or 44.1%), how to choose (21 or 30.9%)
and narrow (22 or 32.5%) a topic, and how to write a bibliography and

footnotes (19 or 27.9%).

Because computer-based equipment is not generally available in the majority of libraries, the survey data discussed below indicates the number of libraries that have this equipment available and give instruction in its use. Twenty-one (20.9%) libraries give instruction in the use of computer-produced lists of periodicals. Other types of instruction offered are instruction in the use of online catalogs (4 or 5.9%), online circulation systems (2 or 2.9%), and COM (computer output on microfilm) catalogs (9 or 13.2%).

Libraries in two-year institutions are least likely to give instruction in the use of government publications (11 or 16.2%) and instruction in how to take notes (4 or 5.9%).

Other types of instruction mentioned by the respondents include an introduction to the Library of Congress classification system, a description of the parts of a book, an introduction to the library's vertical files, and how to order articles via interlibrary loan.

Public Relations and Publicity. The programs are most likely to be publicized via personal contact with faculty (46 or 67.6%) and word of mouth (27 or 39.7%). Other methods include information in the college bulletin (20 or 29.4%), faculty meetings (12 or 17.6%), bulletin boards (10 or 14.7%), posters or signs (10 or 14.7%), fliers mailed to faculty or students (9 or 13.2%), notices in the campus newspaper (9 or 13.2%), and library newsletters (5 or 7.4%). Only one (1.5%) library advertises on a campus radio or television station. Other sources of publicity mentioned by the respondents include publicity during orientation week activities and information given to

counselors and advisors.

Record Keeping and Statistics. Forty-four (71.0%) libraries do
not produce an annual report on library use instruction. Ten (14.7%)
libraries produce an annual report and eight (11.8%) include informa-
tion on the program in a library or other type of annual report.

Statistics are not recorded by 28 or 41.2% of the libraries. Of
the libraries who do record statistics, the types of statistics re-
corded are the number of sessions of instruction (30 or 44.1%), the
number of freshmen reached through the program (22 or 32.5%), and the
professional staff time involved in the program (9 or 13.2%). Only
one (1.5%) library could determine the overall costs of the program.

Evaluation Methods. Informal evaluation techniques include ob-
serving whether students could use the resources (50 or 73.5%), ob-
serving students during presentations (41 or 60.3%), and conversation
with the instructor and students after presentations (41 or 60.3%).
Questionnaires to assess the students' opinions of the usefulness of
the instruction are used by 14 (20.6%) libraries.

Formal evaluation techniques are used by less than 40% of the
libraries. The most used formal technique is evaluation of worksheets
or workbooks (24 or 35.3%). Other less frequently used methods are
a test designed by librarians (19 or 27.9%), evaluation of bibliogra-
phies produced by students (8 or 11.8%), questionnaires to measure
attitude change (5 or 7.5%), measurement of achievement of behavioral
objectives (4 or 5.9%), a comparison of control and experimental
groups (3 or 4.4%), a standardized library test (2 or 2.9%), and

evaluation of research diaries (2 or 2.9%).

Thirty (44.1%) libraries indicated that they have no written program objectives. Twenty-three (33.8%) cannot document the substantial achievement of their program objectives. Only 7 (10.3%) libraries can provide documentation to prove the attainment of their program objectives.

Summary

The major problem encountered by two-year institutions is that the programs do not reach all freshmen in a majority of the libraries (37 or 54.4%). Other problems are lack of professional staff (19 or 27.9%), lack of support from faculty outside the library (16 or 23.5%), lack of sufficient space (16 or 23.5%), lack of clerical support (10 or 14.7%), lack of sufficient funds (7 or 10.3%), lack of support from the institution's administration (5 or 7.4%), and attempting to teach the freshmen more than they need to know (4 or 5.9%). Lack of support from library faculty and changes in personnel were checked by one library as problems.

The three top benefits of the program as indicated by more than 50% of the libraries are increased student use of the library (53 or 77.9%), improvement in the librarian's relationship with faculty outside the library (35 or 51.5%), and good publicity for the library (34 or 50%). Other benefits mentioned by at least 40% of the libraries are more interaction among library staff (30 or 44.1%), an increase in the librarians' knowledge of library resources (39 or 42.6%), and enhanced standing for librarians in the eyes of non-library faculty

(29 or 42.6%). Another benefit reported by 9 (13.2%) libraries is improved collection development activities. Only one library (1.5%) reported increased funds for the library as a result of the programs. Other benefits noted by the respondents are that effective use of the library increased and that students became more aware and appreciative of library resources.

Of the 33 libraries that were able to estimate the percentage of freshmen reached through their programs, the median percentage was 75.0% and the mean was 62.0%.

In response to the survey question on the future disposition of the program, 23 (33.8%) libraries indicated the would expand their programs, 17 (25.0%) will continue their programs as they are, and 16 or 23.5% will continue their programs but modify them slightly. Several libraries indicated that, although they had indicated they would expand their programs, the expansion was based more on hope than an established reality. Three libraries (4.4%) indicated they were uncertain of future plans as they were expecting changes in personnel.

Forty-three libraries responded to an optional question concerning a rating of the effectiveness of their freshman library use instruction program on a scale of one to five, one being the least effective and five the most effective. The highest number of libraries (21 or 48.8%) rated their programs as average (a three rating). Four libraries (9.3%) rated their programs as highly effective with a five rating. Nine libraries (20.9%) rated their programs a four. Six libraries (14.0%) gave their programs a two rating, and three

libraries (7.0%) rated their programs a one.

The comments following the optional survey question on a rating of the effectiveness of the program are summarized below.

The comments from libraries that gave their programs a one or two (i.e., a low) rating centered around the lack of a formal, planned instruction program and the lack of class time available for library use instruction. Others commented that many faculty do not take library instruction seriously, perhaps because they believe their students already know enough about library use. One librarian commented about faculty: "they don't seem to care if their students know anything about the library, yet at term paper time the students are expected to look up materials and use the Readers' Guide." Several librarians mentioned that instruction was not high on their priority list. One commented that their program is only an improvisation until they "can work through our priorities and put together a formal program."

Several libraries that gave their programs a three (or average) rating commented that their programs deserve an average rating because they do not reach all freshmen, the content of the instruction is too superficial, the students need more practice devising search strategies, the library needs written program objectives and way to evaluate presentations, or the wide range of student abilities is a handicap. Many respondents commented on the lack of staff to plan and implement a program. "Not enough students are being reached. Because our staff is very small and library use by students and faculty is very heavy, we feel a bit helpless about expanding our efforts."

The comments from the libraries that gave their programs an

above average (four or five) rating centered around the ability of
these libraries to reach a high percentage of students and a good rela-
tionship with faculty.

Profile of Freshman Library Use Instruction
Programs in Four-Year Academic Institutions

Introduction

Of the 70 libraries from four-year institutions that responded to
the survey, 7 or 10.0% of these libraries have no program at all for
freshmen, 21 (30.0%) have formal programs, and 42 (60.0%) have infor-
mal programs.

Library Administrative Support

The responses to survey questions 3 through 15 concerning library
administrative support are outlined below.

Goal-Setting Activities. The academic community is involved in
formulating the goals of the freshman library use instruction program
in 31 (44.2%) libraries. Thirteen (18.6%) libraries indicated they
have formal goals and objectives, and only 9 (12.9%) libraries have a
timetable for implementing the written goals and objectives.

Funding. The largest number of libraries (55 or 78.6%) reported
that funding for the freshman program is part of the general library
budget. Only one (1.4%) library reported a separate library fund for
the program; one library (1.4%) has a grant from outside the college;

and one library (1.4%) has a grant from within the institution. The libraries that indicated other sources of funding noted that the freshman programs are funded from such sources as an orientation budget, a study skills budget, a humanities budget, or a special budget for freshman topics.

Support staff and equipment are the two items less likely to be checked as sufficient by libraries in four-year institutions. Support staff is deemed sufficient in 17 (24.3%) libraries, equipment by 19 (27.1%), facilities by 28 (40.0%), materials by 31 (44.3%), and professional staff by 37 (52.9%) libraries.

Personnel. The prior training of instruction librarians includes training in various disciplines in 55 or 78.6% of the libraries, teaching skills in 38 or 54.3% of the libraries, preparation and use of audio-visual material in 33 or 47.1% of the libraries, and preparation and use of evaluation techniques in 21 or 30.0% of the libraries.

The reference department head (20 or 28.6%) or the library director (12 or 17.1%) are more likely to be responsible for implementing the program. Public service librarians (7 or 10.0%) and the public services head (8 or 11.4%) are also responsible for implementing the program. Several of the respondents who checked "other" on this survey question indicated that their institution had one reference librarian who implemented the program.

Of the five (7.1%) part-time and one (1.4%) full-time instruction librarians, five or 83.3% report to the library director. The sixth librarian reports to the chair of the humanities division.

Forty-two (60.0%) libraries include instruction in job descriptions. Eleven (15.7%) libraries do not include instruction in job descriptions.

Library use instruction is used as a criterion for merit raises, promotion, and/or tenure decisions in 14 (20.0%) libraries. In 18 (25.7%) libraries, one or more librarians participated in some type of continuing education activity in the past 12 months.

Evaluation. In terms of evaluation activities, the library administration encourages librarians to evaluate the entire program in 27 (38.6%) libraries. Fifteen (21.4%) libraries evaluate various components of the program and 12 (17.1%) libraries evaluate teaching objectives. The highest number of libraries, 30 or 42.9%, do not evaluate their programs. In 37 (52.9%) libraries the academic community does not participate in the evaluation of the goals and objectives of the programs.

Program Elements

The responses to survey questions 16 through 29 concerning the program elements of freshman library use instruction are outlined below.

Needs Assessment. Fourteen (20.0%) libraries have conducted a needs assessment of the academic community for library orientation and instruction. Six libraries (8.6%) have produced a written needs assessment. Nineteen (27.1%) libraries have written instructional objectives.

Types of Programs. The two most popular types of orientation activities in the four-year institutions are the guided tour offered by 53 (75.7%) libraries and handbooks by 44 (62.9%) libraries. The other types of orientation mentioned in the survey are used by fewer than 13.0% of the libraries.

Course-related instruction is done by 53 (75.7%) libraries and course-integrated by 30 (42.9%) libraries. Non-credit instruction, such as term paper clinics, is offered by 10 (14.3%) libraries. Point-of-use printed materials are used by 18 (25.7%) libraries, self-paced workbooks by 11 (15.7%) libraries, and point-of-use audio-visual materials by 9 (12.9%) libraries. Only 2 (2.9%) libraries offer computer-assisted instruction.

Five (8.3%) libraries offer credit courses. Two of the courses are required; three are optional. All of the five courses last one term. Only three libraries reported the number of credit hours received for the course. One course is for four hours of credit, another is three hours of credit, and another is one hour of credit. Four of the courses are taught by a librarian; one is co-taught by a librarian and a non-library instructor.

Disciplines or Subject Areas. English composition is the subject most likely to receive course-related instruction in four-year institutions. Fifty-one (72.9%) libraries offer course-related instruction to English composition classes. In descending order of use, the subject areas that receive course-related library use instruction are the social sciences in 21 (30.0%) libraries, other English classes in

19 (27.1%) libraries, the humanities in 15 (21.4%) libraries, business in 14 (20.0%) libraries, the sciences in 13 (18.6%) libraries, education in 10 (14.3%) libraries, and journalism in 7 (10.0%) libraries. Course-related instruction is also given to classes in computer science, drama, music, occupational therapy, reading development, nursing, study skills, and physical education.

Instructional Materials. The three most popular types of instructional materials in four-year institutions are handouts (used by 41 or 58.6% of the libraries), library handbooks (38 or 54.3%), and worksheets (30 or 42.9%). Other types of instructional materials are printed bibliographies used by 28 (40.0%) libraries, floor plans and maps used by 25 (35.7%) libraries, transparencies used by 21 (30.0%) libraries, a chalkboard used by 20 (28.6%) libraries, and sample pages from superseded reference sources used by 20 (28.6%) libraries. The types of instructional materials which are little used in four-year institutions are workbooks (7 or 10.0%), slide/tape (7 or 10.0%), large note pad and easel (4 or 5.7%), filmstrips (4 or 5.7%), videotape or television (4 or 5.7%), slides (3 or 4.3%), textbooks (3 or 4.3%), and computer-assisted instruction (2 or 2.9%). Other types of instructional materials mentioned by respondents are reference materials, mimeographed lecture notes, and a poster board replica of a catalog card.

Content of the Instruction. In the four-year institutions the content of the instruction focuses on the use of the card catalog (61 or 87.1% of the libraries), how to read a call number (57 or 81.4%), the use of the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature (55 or 78.6%),

and how to locate material on the shelves (54 or 77.1%).

At least 50% of the libraries give instruction in the use of major periodical indexes other than Readers' Guide (48 or 68.6%), how to use a subject headings list (46 or 65.7%), library policies and regulations (43 or 61.4%), specialized reference tools (41 or 58.6%), and search strategy (35 or 50.0%).

Less than 50% of the libraries give instruction in how to use newspaper indexes (33 or 47.1%), how to use audio-visual equipment (27 or 38.6%), how to narrow a topic (24 or 34.3%), how to choose a topic (23 or 32.9%), how to write a bibliography (13 or 18.6%), and how to take notes (10 or 14.3%).

The number of libraries in four-year institutions that offer instruction in the use of computer-based equipment is small in three specific areas. Two (2.9%) libraries give instruction in how to use an online catalog, two (2.9%) give instruction in the use of COM (computer output on microfilm) catalogs, and no library gives instruction in the use of an online circulation system. In a fourth computer-based area, 18 libraries (25.7%) give instruction in how to use a computer-produced list of periodical holdings.

Other instruction mentioned by the respondents are an introduction to the use of the library's reserve section, the names of librarians and the location of their offices, how to find bibliographies, and how to use interlibrary loan.

Public Relations and Publicity. The programs are most likely to be publicized through personal contact (50 or 71.4% of the libraries).

Other less frequently used methods in descending order of use are word of mouth publicity (20 or 28.6%), fliers mailed to faculty (12 or 17.1%), and faculty meetings (11 or 15.7%). All of the other types of publicity are used by less than 15% of the libraries. Other sources of publicity mentioned by the respondents who checked "other" are publicity in the library handbook for faculty and informing student advisors of the program.

Record Keeping and Statistics. Over 50% of the four-year institutions do not produce an annual report on library use instruction (37 or 52.9% of the libraries). Thirteen (18.6%) libraries do produce an annual report and 12 (17.1%) include the information about instruction in another report.

Statistics are not recorded by 24 (34.3%) libraries. Of the libraries who do record statistics, 33 (47.1%) record the number of freshmen reached through the program, 12 (17.1%) libraries record professional staff time involved in the program, and 33 (47.1%) libraries record the number of sessions of instruction. Only one library records the overall cost of the program and no library records the cost per student.

Evaluation Methods. Three kinds of informal evaluation methods are used by more than 60% of the four-year institutions. Forty-nine (70.0%) libraries converse with instructors and students to gain feedback after a presentation, 47 (67.1%) libraries observe whether or not students can use resources described in the instruction, and 43 (61.4%)

libraries observe students during the presentations. A simple questionnaire designed to assess students' opinions on the usefulness of the instruction is used by 14 (20.0%) libraries. One respondent remarked in the comments that questionnaires are sent to faculty whose classes have received library use instruction in order to gain feedback on the value of the presentation.

Formal evaluation techniques are used in very few of the four-year institutions. An in-house test is used by 14 (20.0%) of the libraries and the evaluation of worksheets in 13 (18.6%) libraries. The other types of formal evaluation techniques listed in the survey are used by less than 15% of the respondents.

Forty (57.1%) libraries have no written program objectives and only 3 (4.3%) libraries can substantiate the achievement of their program objectives.

Summary

The major problem encountered in four-year institutions is that the program does not reach all freshmen. Thirty-one or 44.3% of the libraries mentioned this fact as a problem. Other problems are lack of professional staff (21 or 30.0% of the libraries), lack of cooperation from faculty outside the library (20 or 28.2%), insufficient space for the program (14 or 20.0%), too much information is given to the freshmen before it is really needed (12 or 17.1%), lack of support from the institution's administration (11 or 15.7%), insufficient funds (10 or 14.3%), and insufficient clerical support (9 or 12.9%). Only one library checked lack of support from the library administration

as a problem. Three other problems mentioned in the comments are the large number of students with negative attitudes towards the library, the lack of a planned program, and the lack of time slots for the program.

More four-year institutions listed benefits of the programs than listed problems. The chief benefit is increased student use of the library (reported by 55 of 78.6% of the libraries). Other benefits are an improved librarian and faculty relationship (36 or 51.4%), good publicity for the library (29 or 41.4%), enchanced standing for librarians in the eyes of non-library faculty (26 or 37.1%), increased knowledge of library resources by librarians (23 or 32.9%), more interaction among library staff (20 or 28.6%), and improved collection development (10 or 14.3%). In the comments, three libraries noted improvement in student/librarian relationships and one library noted that faculty use of the library increased as a result of the program.

Forty-two four-year institutions responded to the survey question asking the libraries to estimate the percentage of freshmen reached through their library use instruction programs. These estimates reveal that the median percentage of freshmen reached by the programs is 87.5% and the mean percentage of freshmen reached by the programs is 80.2%.

In response to the survey question concerning the future disposition of the program, the highest number of libraries (27 or 38.6%) indicated that they would continue their programs as they presently are. Seventeen (24.3%) will expand their programs and 15 (21.4%) will modify their programs somewhat. None of the libraries who responded

to this question plans to reduce or discontinue its program.

Forty-three libraries responded to an optional question asking the libraries to rate the effectiveness of their freshman library use instruction program on a scale of one to five, one being the least effective program and five being the most effective program. Of the 43 libraries which responded, 16 (37.2%) rated their program as average (a three rating). Fourteen (32.6%) libraries gave their programs a below average rating (a two rating) and 11 (25.6%) libraries gave their programs an above average (a four) rating. Two libraries (4.7%) rated their programs as very effective (a five rating) and no library gave its program a one rating.

The comments following this optional question are summarized below. The reasons given for a low (a one or two) rating centered around the lack of cooperation from faculty outside the library, lack of professional staff, the inability of the students to relate the instruction to future assignments, and the fact that library use instruction is not a high priority. One respondent commented, "we lack space and staff enough for an effective program and acquiring such is low priority."

The libraries that gave their program an average or three rating commented that their programs are average because the programs do not reach all freshmen, the lack of time on the part of the librarian to formulate objectives and evaluation methods, or the lack of classroom time to present material. One librarian wrote, "I think our program is effective in terms of our own goals. However, in terms of what larger, richer, and better-staffed libraries are doing, we probably

suffer by comparison."

Librarians that gave their programs an above average (four or five) rating credited their success to the fact that they reach almost all freshmen and/or their instruction is immediately followed by a library assignment. Some libraries commented that their programs were rated higher because the freshmen after taking the instruction know who the librarians are and go to them for assistance.

<div align="center">

Profile of Freshman Library Use Instruction

Programs in Five-Year Institutions

</div>

Introduction

Of the 70 libraries from five-year institutions that responded to the survey, 6 or 8.6% of these libraries had no program at all for freshmen, 32 (45.7%) had formal programs, and 32 (45.7%) had informal programs.

Library Administrative Support

The responses to survey questions 3 through 15 concerning library administrative support are outlined below.

Goal-Setting Activities. The academic community is involved in formulating the goals of the freshman library use instruction program in 25 (35.7%) libraries. Forty-one (58.6%) libraries do not have formal goals and objectives and only 5 (7.1%) libraries have a time-table for implementing the written goals and objectives.

Funding. Nearly all (61 or 87.1%) of the libraries reported that funding for the freshman program is part of the general library budget. Only one (1.4%) library reported a separate library budget for the program. Two libraries reported other sources of funds, such as the library science budget and the institution's orientation budget.

Support staff is sufficient in 26 (37.1%) libraries. Equipment and facilities are sufficient in 28 (40.0%) libraries. There are sufficient instructional materials in 37 (52.9%) libraries and sufficient professional personnel in 40 (57.1%) libraries.

Personnel. The prior training of instruction librarians includes training in various disciplines in 56 (80.0%) libraries, teaching skills in 30 (42.9%) libraries, preparation and use of audio-visual equipment and material in 28 (40.0%) libraries, and preparation and use of evaluation techniques in 14 (20.0%) libraries.

The reference department head (16 or 22.9% of the libraries) or the public service librarians (9 or 12.9% of the libraries) are most likely to be responsible for implementing the program. Of the 13 part-time and full-time instruction librarians who are responsible for implementing the programs in four-year institutions, six report to the library director, three report to the reference department head, two report to the public services head, and two report to a subject department head.

Fifty-four (77.1%) libraries include instruction in job descriptions. Instruction is not included in the job descriptions of librarians at 5 (7.1%) institutions; three (4.3%) libraries do not have job

descriptions, and 8 (11.4%) libraries did not respond to this question.

Library use instruction is used as a criterion for merit raises, promotion, and/or tenure decisions in 30 (42.9%) libraries. In 37 (52.9%) libraries, one or more librarians participated in some type of continuing education activity in the past 12 months.

Evaluation. The library administration encourages librarians to evaluate the entire program in 30 (42.9%) libraries. Eighteen (25.7%) libraries evaluate various components of the program and 12 (17.1%) evaluate teaching objectives. Programs are not evaluated in 26 (37.1%) libraries. In 24 (34.3%) libraries the academic community does participate in the evaluation of the goals and objectives of the program.

Program Elements

The responses to survey question 16 through 29 concerning the program elements of freshman library use instruction are outlined below.

Needs Assessment. Thirteen (18.6%) libraries have conducted a needs assessment of the academic community for library orientation and instruction. Eight (11.4%) libraries have produced a written needs assessment.

Instructional Objectives. Eleven (15.7%) libraries use instructional objectives.

Types of Programs. The two most popular types of orientation

activities are the guided tour offered by 52 (74.3%) libraries and the library handbook offered by 34 (48.6%) libraries. Less frequently used orientation activities are signage systems (18 or 25.7% of the libraries), self-guided printed tours (16 or 22.9% of the libraries), a slide/tape presentation to large groups (13 or 18.6%), and a tabloid-like handout (12 or 17.1%). The other types of orientation activities listed in the survey are used by less than 15% of the five-year institutions. In the comments the respondents noted additional types of orientation, such as a brief lecture with handouts, information on bookmarks, and information in the general student handbook.

Course-related instruction is done by 55 (78.6%) libraries and course-integrated instruction by 25 (35.7%) libraries. Other types of library instruction are the credit course (20 or 28.6% of the libraries), point-of-use printed materials (31 or 44.3%), non-credit instruction (14 or 20.0%), self-paced workbooks (16 or 22.9%), and point-of-use audio-visual instruction (11 or 15.7%).

Of the 20 libraries that offer credit courses, 3 of the courses are required and 17 are optional. Of the 15 libraries who reported the number of credit hours for the course, five reported the course is for two hours credit, four reported one hour credit, three reported three hours credit, and two reported one and one-half hours credit. Fourteen of the courses last one semester. Sixteen courses are taught by librarians, three by non-librarians, and one jointly by librarians and non-librarians.

Disciplines or Subject Areas. English composition is the subject

most likely to receive course-related library use instruction in five-year institutions. Forty-six (65.7%) libraries offer course-related library use instruction to English composition classes. Other subject areas that receive course-related library use instruction are the social sciences (21 or 30.0% of the libraries); English courses other than freshman composition, business, and education (16 or 22.9% of the libraries); the humanities (17 or 24.3%); and journalism (11 or 15.7%). Course-related instruction is also given to classes in health education, speech, and home economics.

Instructional Materials. The most popular instructional materials in five-year institutions are handouts (used by 51 or 72.9% of the libraries), floor plans and maps (35 or 50.0%), handbooks (34 or 48.6%), printed bibliographies (33 or 47.1%), and worksheets (33 or 47.1%). Lesser used instructional materials are the chalkboard (26 or 37.1%), sample pages from superseded reference sources (21 or 30.0%), transparencies (18 or 25.7%), slide/tape (15 or 21.4%), workbooks (10 or 14.3%), slides (9 or 12.9%), and textbooks (8 or 11.4%). The other instructional materials listed in the survey were used by less than 10% of the libraries. In the comments the respondents noted that additional instructional materials used are examples of microforms, reference materials, and a large chart depicting a search strategy.

Content of the Instruction. In the five-year institutions, the content of the freshman library use instruction focuses on six areas: how to use the card catalog (61 or 87.1% of the libraries), how to use the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature (58 or 82.9%), how

to read a call number (57 or 81.4%), how to use major periodical

indexes other than Readers' Guide (56 or 80.0%), how to locate ma-

terial on the shelves (54 or 77.1%), and how to use a subject headings

list (52 or 74.3%).

At least 50% of the libraries give instruction in how to use

newspaper indexes (43 or 61.4% of the libraries), library policies

and regulations (43 or 61.4%), and how to use specialized reference

tools (41 or 58.6%).

Less than 50% of the libraries give instruction in the use of

government publications, audio-visual equipment, and a computer-

produced list of periodical holdings (29 or 41.4% of the libraries);

how to devise a search strategy (27 or 38.6%); how to narrow a topic

(26 or 37.1%); how to choose a topic (23 or 32.9%); how to prepare a

bibliography (20 or 28.6%); and how to take notes (12 or 17.1%).

Instruction in the use of computer-based equipment includes

instruction in the use of a COM (computer output on microfilm) cata-

log given by 7 (10.0%) libraries, instruction in the use of an online

catalog given by 4 (5.7%) libraries, and instruction in the use of

an online circulation system given by 2 (2.9%) libraries.

In the comments, respondents noted that they also gave instruc-

tion in how to use the library's reserve section, the location of book

drops, the library's hours of opening, their library's history, the

history of libraries, the development and importance of literacy,

how to evaluate a reference source for its usefulness to the student's

topic, academic integrity (i.e., plagiarism), and how to translate key

words into search terms. One library offered demonstrations of online

information retrieval and the computerized OCLC (Online Computer Library Center) catalog.

Public Relations and Publicity. The programs are most likely to be publicized through personal contact with faculty (53 or 75.7% of the libraries). Other less frequently used publicity methods in descending order of use are word of mouth (38 or 34.3%), fliers mailed to faculty and/or students (21 or 30.0%), faculty meetings (18 or 25.7%), and course catalogs (16 or 22.9%). All of the other types of publicity are used by less than 15% of the libraries. One other type of publicity noted by some respondents is publicity by counselors and advisors.

Record Keeping and Statistics. Annual reports are produced by 23 (32.9%) libraries or information about instruction is included in another annual report by 9 (12.9%) libraries.

Statistics are not recorded by 14 (20.0%) libraries. Of the libraries who do record statistics, 36 (51.4%) record the number of freshmen reached through the program, 19 (27.1%) record the amount of professional staff time spent on the program, and 45 (64.3%) record the number of sessions. Only one library records the overall cost of the program.

Evaluation Methods. Three kinds of informal evaluation methods are used by more than 50% of the five-year institutions. Forty-five (64.3%) libraries observe students during presentations, 40 (57.1%) converse with instructors and students to gain feedback after a presentation, and 37 (52.9%) observe whether or not students can

use the library resources after a presentation. A simple questionnaire designed to assess students' opinions on the usefulness of the instruction is used by 20 (28.6%) libraries. One library (1.4%) videotapes librarians giving presentations for feedback to the librarians. In the comments, several respondents noted other forms of informal evaluation, such as faculty response and thank you notes received.

The most used formal evaluation techniques are the in-house test designed by librarians used in 13 or 18.6% of the libraries and evaluation of worksheets or workbooks used by 13 or 18.6% of the libraries. Evaluation of student bibliographies is used by 12 or 17.1% of the libraries. All other types of formal evaluation listed in the survey are used by less than 5% of the libraries. In the comments, one library identified an additional formal evaluation technique, which is an oral review and oral questions of the students.

Thirty-nine (55.7%) libraries have no written program objectives and only 5 (7.1%) libraries can document the substantial attainment of program objectives.

Summary

The two major problems encountered in five-year institutions are that the program does not reach all freshmen (29 or 41.4% of the libraries) and insufficient professional staff (28 or 40.0%). Other problems encountered in the program are lack of cooperation from faculty outside the library (14 or 20.0%), the inundation of freshmen with more information than they need (12 or 17.1%), insufficient space (11 or 15.7%), lack of funds (7 or 10.0%), lack of clerical staff

(7 or 10.0%), personnel changes that were detrimental to the success of the program (4 or 5.7%), and lack of administrative support from the institution (3 or 4.3%). One library checked lack of support from the library administration as a problem. Another library checked lack of support from library faculty and staff as a problem. In the comments, respondents noted as problems the lack of interest on the students' part and the lack of a carefully planned and integrated program.

The principal benefit of the programs is the increased student use of the library, a benefit mentioned by 55 or 78.6% of the libraries. Other benefits are improved librarian and faculty relationships (33 or 47.1%), good publicity for the library (31 or 44.3%), increased knowledge of library resources by librarians (29 or 41.4%), enhanced standing for librarians in the eyes of non-library faculty (24 or 34.3%), and more interaction among library staff (23 or 32.9%).

Forty-one libraries in five-year institutions responded to the survey question asking for an estimate of the percentage of freshmen reached by the library use instruction program. These estimates show that the median estimated percentage of freshmen reached by the programs is 80.0% and the mean percentage of freshmen reached by the programs is 68.2%.

In response to the survey question concerning the future disposition of the program, 24 (34.3%) libraries plan to expand their programs, 19 (27.1%) libraries will continue the programs as they are, 19 (27.1%) libraries will modify the program, and one library will discontinue the program.

Forty-five libraries responded to an optional question asking the libraries to rate the effectiveness of their freshman library use instruction program on a scale of one to five, one being the least effective program and five being the most effective program. Of the 45 libraries that responded, 18 (40.0%) rated their program as average (a three rating). Thirteen (28.9%) libraries rated their program as below average (a two rating) and 11 (24.4%) libraries gave their programs an above average (a four) rating. Two libraries (4.4%) rated their programs as very effective (a five rating) and one library rated its program as very ineffective (a one rating).

Comments from the libraries that gave their program a one or two (below average) rating centered around lack of staff; lack of cooperation between librarians and faculty outside the library, especially English department faculty; inability to reach all freshmen; the superficiality of the guided tour and the lack of graded library assignments; not putting instruction as a high priority in the library; and the lack of a formal program.

The reasons for a three or average rating were the lack of consistency, the need for written goals, and the large number of freshmen. One librarian commented, "what we do, we do well--but the sheer fact of the numbers per year bogs us down."

The reasons given by libraries for an above average (a four or five) rating were that the program accomplishes the broad objectives, a large number of freshmen are reached, or the program focuses on simple basic skills and does not attempt to cover too much material.

Profile of Freshman Library Use Instruction
Programs in Doctoral Institutions

Introduction

Of the 63 libraries from doctoral institutions that responded to
the survey, one (1.6%) had no program at all for freshmen, 40 (63.4%)
had formal programs, and 22 (34.9%) had informal programs.

Library Administrative Support

The responses to survey questions 3 through 15 concerning li-
brary administrative support for freshmen library use instruction
programs are outlined below.

Goal-Setting Activities. The academic community is involved in
formulating the goals of the freshman library use instruction program
in 24 (38.1%) libraries. Seventeen (27.0%) libraries have goals
and objectives and 6 (9.5%) libraries have a timetable for implement-
ing the written goals and objectives.

Funding. Funding for the freshman program is from the general
library budget in 56 (88.8%) libraries. Six (9.5%) libraries have
a separate library budget for the program.

Less than 50% of the libraries have sufficient support staff
(22 or 34.9% of the libraries), equipment (27 or 42.9%), and
facilities (29 or 26.0%). Over 50% of the libraries reported
sufficient professional staff (37 or 58.7% of the libraries) and
materials (35 or 55.6%).

Personnel. The prior training of instruction librarians includes training in various disciplines in 60 or 95.2% of the libraries, teaching skills in 31 or 49.2% of the libraries, preparation and use of audio-visual materials in 25 or 39.7% of the libraries, and preparation and use of evaluation techniques in 18 or 28.6% of the libraries.

Public service librarians are more likely to be responsible for implementing the freshman program in doctoral institutions. Twenty-one (33.3%) libraries reported that public service librarians implement the program. Others who are responsible for implementation include full-time instruction librarians (13 or 20.6% of the libraries), part-time instruction librarians (11 or 17.5% of the libraries), reference department head (6 or 9.5% of the libraries), an appointed committee (2 or 3.2% of the libraries), and the public services head (2 or 3.2% of the libraries). One (1.6%) library reported that a committee of volunteers is responsible for implementing the freshman program. The libraries that checked "other" in response to this question indicated that the persons responsible for implementation of the program were a reference librarian who coordinates volunteers from the library's public and technical services divisions, English Department faculty, the associate director of the library, or the undergraduate librarian.

Of the 24 part-time or full-time instruction librarians, 15 or 62.5% reported to the reference department head, 5 (20.8%) reported to the library director, and 4 (16.7%) reported to the public services head.

Fifty-five (87.3%) libraries include instruction in job descriptions. Four (6.3%) do not include instruction responsibilities in job descriptions. Two (3.2%) libraries have no job descriptions and 2 (3.2%) did not respond to the question.

Library use instruction is used as a criterion for merit raises, promotion, and/or tenure decisions in 43 (68.3%) libraries. One or more librarians participated in some type of continuing education activity in the past 12 months in 42 (66.7%) libraries.

Evaluation. The library administration encourages librarians to evaluate the entire program in 32 (50.8%) libraries. Sixteen (25.4%) libraries evaluate various components of the program and 12 (19.0%) evaluate teaching objectives. Evaluation is not done in 23 (36.5%) libraries. The academic community participates in the evaluation of the program's goals and objectives in 24 (38.1%) libraries. The academic community does not participate in the evaluation of the program's goals and objectives in 37 (58.7%) libraries. Two libraries (3.2%) did not respond to this question.

Program Elements

The responses to survey questions 16 through 29 concerning the program elements of freshman library use instruction are outlined below.

Needs Assessment. Seventeen (27.0%) libraries have conducted a needs assessment of the academic community for library orientation

and instruction. Seven (11.1%) libraries have produced a written needs assessment.

Instructional Objectives. Nineteen (30.1%) libraries have instructional objectives.

Types of Programs. The most popular type of orientation acti-
vity in the doctoral institutions is the guided tour, which is offered
by 47 (74.6%) libraries. Other orientation activities offered are a
handbook (28 or 44.4%), a self-guided printed tour (25 or 39.7%),
a slide/tape for presentation to large groups (23 or 36.5%), a sign-
age system (16 or 25.4%), a tabloid-like handout (8 or 12.7%), and a
slide/tape for individuals to view (8 or 12.7%). Only four (6.3%)
libraries offer orientation via videotape.

Course-related instruction is offered by 54 (85.7%) libraries
and course-integrated instruction by 25 (39.7%). Point-of-use
printed materials are used by 31 (49.2%) libraries, self-paced work-
books or worksheets are used by 27 (42.9%) libraries, non-credit
instruction is offered by 18 (28.6%) libraries, credit courses are
offered by 16 (25.4%) libraries, point-of-use audio-visual materials
are used by 9 (14.3%) libraries, and computer-assisted instruction
is offered by 2 (3.2%) libraries.

Sixteen (25.4%) libraries offer credit courses. Two of the
courses are required; 11 are optional, and 3 libraries did not
indicate whether the course was required or not. The duration of
15 of the courses is one term (one library did not indicate the
length of the course). Most (10 courses) of the courses are for

one hour credit. Three courses are for three hours credit, one course is four hours credit, and two libraries did not indicate credit hours. The instructor is a librarian in 13 of the courses.

Disciplines or Subject Areas. Fifty-one (81.0%) libraries offer course-related instruction in English composition classes. Other subjects that receive course-related library use instruction are the sciences (14 or 22.2%), English courses other than English composition (10 or 15.9%), business (10 or 15.9%), journalism (10 or 15.9%), the humanities (10 or 15.9%), the social sciences (13 or 20.6%), and education (7 or 11.1%). Course-related instruction is also given to classes in engineering and in English as a second language.

Instructional Materials. The most used type of instructional material in doctoral institutions is handouts, which are used by 48 or 76.2% of the libraries. Other types of instructional material used by more than 50% of the libraries are worksheets (36 or 57.1%), floor plans and maps (37 or 58.7%), and a chalkboard (32 or 50.8%). Instructional materials used by less than 50% of the libraries are printed bibliographies (30 or 47.6%), transparencies (29 or 46.0%), handbooks (28 or 44.4%), workbooks (17 or 27.0%), slide/tape (15 or 23.8%), slides (13 or 20.6%), sample pages from superseded reference sources (13 or 20.6%), videotape or television (6 or 9.5%), large note pad and easel (6 or 9.5%), textbook (3 or 4.8%), computer-assisted instruction (3 or 4.8%), and other audio-visual material (2 or 3.2%).

Content of the Instruction. The content of the instruction focuses on seven areas: how to use the card catalog (58 or 92.1%), how to use major periodical indexes other than Readers' Guide (56 or 88.9%), how to locate material on the shelves (52 or 82.%), how to use a subject headings list (52 or 82.5%), how to use the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature (49 or 77.8%), and how to use newspaper indexes (46 or 73.0%). At least 50% of the libraries give instruction in library policies and regulations (42 or 66.7%), how to devise a search strategy (38 or 60.3%), how to use specialized reference tools (35 or 55.6%), and how to use a computer-produced list of periodical holdings (33 or 52.4%).

Less than 50% of the libraries give instruction in how to use government publications (28 or 44.4%), how to narrow a topic (25 or 39.7%), how to choose a topic (22 or 34.9%), how to use audio-visual equipment (19 or 30.2%), how to prepare a bibliography (11 or 17.5%), and how to take notes (1 or 1.6%).

Instruction in the use of computer-based equipment includes instruction in how to use an online catalog (10 or 15.9%), how to use a COM (computer output on microfilm) catalog (8 or 12.7%), and how to use an online circulation system (6 or 9.5%).

Other instruction mentioned by the respondents are instruction in the use of the library's vertical files, an introduction to the categories of reference materials, and how to use interlibrary loan.

Public Relations and Publicity. The most used methods of publicizing the programs are personal contact with faculty, a method

used by 47 (74.6%) libraries and word of mouth used by 31 (49.2%) libraries. Other less frequently used methods of publicity are fliers mailed to faculty and/or students (24 or 38.1%), posters and signs (15 or 23.8%), faculty meetings (18 or 28.6%), bulletin boards (14 or 22.2%), campus newspapers (14 or 22.2%), library newsletters (14 or 22.2%), course catalogs (12 or 19.0%), and campus radio or television stations (5 or 7.9%). Other methods of publicity noted by respondents are fliers handed out at registration, counselors and advisors, and information given at faculty orientations to the library.

Record Keeping and Statistics. Annual reports on library use instruction are produced by 23 (36.5%) libraries and 20 (31.7%) libraries include information on instruction in other reports.

Statistics are not recorded by 4 (7.9%) libraries. Of the libraries that do record statistics, 48 (76.2%), record the number of freshmen reached through the program, 18 (28.6%) record the amount of professional time spent on the program, and 53 (84.1%) record the number of sessions. None of the doctoral institutions keeps statistics on the overall cost of the program or the cost per student.

Some respondents indicated that they keep additional statistics, such as the amount of time students spend at a computer terminal while receiving computer-assisted instruction, statistics on test results, the number of students who use a workbook, the number of departments who participate in course-related instruction, and the amount of time spent at reference desks giving instruction to individual students.

Evaluation Methods. Fifty (79.4%) libraries use the informal evaluation method of observing students during presentations, 43 (68.3%) libraries use the method of conversing with instructors and students after presentations in order to obtain feedback, 37 (58.7%) libraries observe students' use of library resources after presentations, and 20 (31.7%) libraries use a questionnaire to assess students' opinions on the usefulness of the instruction.

Formal evaluation techniques used by doctoral institutions are an in-house test designed by librarians (22 or 34.9%), evaluation of worksheets or workbooks (21 or 33.3%), measure of student's attitude change through questionnaire (8 or 12.7%), and evaluation of student bibliographies (7 or 11.1%). Other formal evaluation techniques are measurement of achievement of behavioral objectives used by 5 (7.9%) libraries, comparison of control and experimental groups used by 3 (4.8%) libraries, and a standard library test used by one (1.6%) library. Evaluation of research diaries is done by 2 (3.2%) libraries.

Twenty-four (38.1%) libraries have no program objectives and 26 (41.3%) libraries cannot document the attainment of program objectives. Only 11 (17.5%) libraries can document the attainment of program objectives.

Summary

The major problems encountered in doctoral institutions in their freshman library use instruction programs are that the program does not reach all the freshmen (37 or 58.7%) and lack of professional staff (35 or 55.6%). Other problem areas are insufficient space

(22 or 34.9%), lack of cooperation from faculty outside the library (22 or 34.9%), insufficient clerical staff (17 or 27.0%), insufficient funds (16 or 25.4%), lack of institutional administrative support (9 or 14.3%), lack of library administrative support (6 or 9.5%), personnel changes that were detrimental to the program (6 or 9.5%), and giving too much information to the freshmen (3 or 4.8%). Three respondents listed other problem areas, such as a college-wide feeling that instruction is not needed, the wear and tear on library materials, and the fact that students who transfer to the institution after the freshmen year do not receive the instruction.

The benefits of instruction are increased student use of the library (53 or 84.1%), good publicity for the library (42 or 66.7%), improved librarian and faculty relationship (38 or 60.3%), more library staff interaction (31 or 49.2%), increased knowledge of library resources by librarians (25 or 40.0%), enhanced standing for librarians in eyes of non-library faculty (24 or 38.1%), improved collection development (4 or 6.3%), and increased funding for the library (3 or 4.8%). Other benefits noted by the respondents are an improved librarian/student relationship, more sophisticated questions from students, and less professional time needed for basic one-on-one instruction at the reference desk.

Forty-eight of the libraries responded to the survey question asking the libraries to estimate the percentage of freshmen reached through their library use instruction program. These estimates reveal that the median percentage of freshmen reached by the programs is 75.0% and the mean percentage of freshmen reached by the programs

is 69.1%.

In response to the survey question concerning the future disposition of the program, 24 (38.1%) libraries will continue the programs as they are, 23 (36.5%) libraries will modify the programs somewhat, 11 (17.5%) will expand the programs, and 1 (1.6%) will reduce the program.

Forty-one libraries responded to an optional question asking the libraries to rate the effectiveness of their freshman library use instruction program on a scale of one to five, one being the least effective program and five being the most effective program. Of the 41 libraries that responded, 18 (43.9%) rated their programs as average (a three rating). Twelve (29.3%) libraries rated their programs as above average (a four rating). Eight (19.5%) libraries rated their programs as below average (a two rating), one library gave its program a one rating, and two libraries rated their programs as very effective (a five rating). The comments from the libraries that did the rating are summarized below.

The reasons given for a below average (one or two rating) are the lack of a formal plan, the lack of interesting instructional methods and materials, lack of space, and inability to reach all freshmen. Specific comments are "at present more harm than good is done by our program. It gives our students a very wrong impression of library research. It makes it seem both simple and unimportant." Another commented, "no time, money, personnel to do an interesting decent job. Emphasis has shifted to the upperclass and graduate students."

Another respondent commented, "although a very high percentage of freshmen are reached, I feel that our materials are confusing, boring, and not designed with the particular level of competency in mind." Another commented that the workbook "is not effective as I'd like it to be . . . it is certainly more effective than a herd-and-holler tour around the library and a few self-helps scattered about."

The reasons for an average rating (a three) were the inability to reach all freshmen, lack of class time devoted to instruction, and lack of personnel and space. One library summed up the reason for its average rating in this manner:

> Library instruction is an additional task performed by a
> small reference staff. We have inadequate time to pre-
> pare for talks much less prepare handouts, worksheets,
> etc. We also do not have a meeting room for classes but
> must give talks in the reference area which is quite dis-
> ruptive to others. Much improvement could be made but
> all in all we are doing well in getting a large percentage
> of English composition students at the time they are doing
> research papers.

Several libraries that gave their program an above average (a four or five) rating credited their success to their self-paced work-books and the improvement in the way freshmen use library resources.

CHAPTER VII

COMPARISON OF PROFILES OF FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE

INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS IN FOUR TYPES OF

INSTITUTIONS TO THE ACRL GUIDELINES

Introduction

The accepted standards for academic library programs and activi-
ties are the guidelines issued by the American Library Association's
Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). This chapter
compares the profiles of libraries' freshman orientation and instruc-
tion programs for each of the four types of institutions to the ACRL
Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries, show-
ing the percentage of libraries in each type of institution that are
conducting their programs in adherence with the guidelines.

Comparison of Profiles

Table XXXV lists the guidelines with an indication of which
survey question or questions provided the information to determine the
percentage of libraries in the four types of institutions that adhere
to each guideline. Table XXXVI indicates the percentage of libraries
in each type of institution that meet each of the ACRL Guidelines for
Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries. See Appendix A for a
copy of the Guidelines.

TABLE XXXV

ACRL GUIDELINES AND CORRESPONDING SURVEY QUESTIONS

Guideline	Survey question
1. Needs assessment	16
2. Written profile of needs	17
3. A-1. Written immediate and long-range goals	4
A-2. Implementation timetable	5
B. Various instruction methods	19, 20, 21
C. Instructional objectives	18
Learning objectives	28
Measures of attitude	28
Cost	27
4. Funding	
A. Budget clearly identifiable	6
B. Sufficient budget for staff, equipment, materials, facilities	7
5. Personnel	
A-1. Training in four areas	8
A-2. Clerical skills	7
B. Number	7
C-1. Clearly identifiable (i.e. part-time and full-time instruction librarians)	9
C-2 Status (i.e., reporting designation)	9, 10
6. Facilities, equipment, materials	7
7. Involvement of academic community	
A. Formulation of goals	3
B. Evaluation of goals	15
8. Evaluation	
A. Effectiveness of instructional program	14
B. Attainment of objectives	29

TABLE XXXVI

PERCENTAGE OF LIBRARIES IN FOUR TYPES OF ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS THAT ADHERE TO

THE ACRL GUIDELINES FOR BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

		Two-Year	Four-Year	Five-Year	Doctoral
		%	%	%	%
1.	Needs assessment	22.0	20.0	18.6	27.0
2.	Written profile of needs	10.3	8.6	11.4	11.1
3.	Goals and objectives				
A-1.	Written immediate and long-range goals	19.1	18.6	18.6	27.0
A-2.	Implementation timetable	14.7	12.9	7.1	9.5
B.	Various instructional methods				
	Orientation	73.5	75.7	74.3	74.6
	Other type of instruction	80.9	75.7	78.6	85.7
	Credit course	33.8	7.1	28.6	25.4
C.	Instructional objectives	36.8	27.1	15.7	30.1
	Learning objectives	5.9	2.9	4.3	7.9
	Attitude measure	7.4	2.9	4.3	12.7
	Cost	1.5	1.4	1.4	-0-

TABLE XXXVI (continued)

	Two-Year	Four-Year	Five-Year	Doctoral
	%	%	%	%
4. Funding				
A. Budget clearly identifiable	4.4	1.4	1.4	9.5
B. Sufficient budget for				
Professional personnel	52.9	52.9	57.1	58.7
Clerical staff	26.5	24.3	37.1	34.9
Equipment	38.2	27.1	40.0	42.9
Materials	52.9	44.3	52.9	55.6
Facilities	47.1	40.0	40.0	46.0
5. Personnel				
A-1. Training in				
Different disciplines	72.1	78.6	80.0	95.2
Teaching skills	60.3	54.3	42.9	49.2
Preparation and use of audio-visual material	67.6	47.1	40.0	39.7
Preparation and use of evaluation techniques	32.4	30.0	20.0	28.6
A-2. Clerical skills	26.5	24.3	37.1	34.9

TABLE XXXVI (continued)

		Two-Year	Four-Year	Five-Year	Doctoral
		%	%	%	%
B.	Number				
	Professional personnel	52.9	52.9	57.1	58.7
	Clerical staff	26.5	24.3	37.1	34.9
C-1.	Clearly identifiable (i.e., part-time or full-time instruction librarians)	8.5	8.5	18.6	38.1
C-2.	Status (i.e., reporting designation for instruction librarians)	66.7	83.3	46.1	20.8
6.	Facilities, equipment, materials				
	Sufficient facilities	47.1	40.0	40.0	46.0
	Sufficient equipment	38.2	27.1	40.0	42.9
	Sufficient materials	52.9	44.3	52.9	55.6
7.	Involvement of academic community				
A.	Formulation of goals	42.6	44.2	35.7	38.1
B.	Evaluation of goals	45.6	37.1	34.3	38.1

TABLE XXXVI (continued)

	Two-Year	Four-Year	Five-Year	Doctoral
	%	%	%	%
8. Evaluation of the				
A. Effectiveness of instructional program	39.7	38.6	42.9	50.8
B. Attainment of program objectives	10.3	4.3	7.1	17.5

Analysis of Findings

Less than 50 percent of the libraries in the four types of institutions adhere to most of the ACRL "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries." In only a few instances do more than 50 percent of the libraries show compliance with the suggested guidelines. One relatively strong area is the number of professional personnel, which is deemed sufficient by over 50% of the libraries. One other area where the libraries which responded to the survey are relatively strong is in the variety of instructional activities. More than 50% of the libraries in all four types of institutions offer at least one method of orientation and one additional method of instruction in the use of the library.

In terms of needs assessment, less than 30% of the libraries in all types of institutions have conducted needs assessment of their academic communities and even fewer (less than 12%) have prepared a written profile of the needs assessment.

Libraries are particularly weak in establishing written goals and objectives, in establishing a timetable for implementing the goals and objectives, in evaluating their program, and in having librarians who are trained in the preparation and use of evaluation techniques.

Less than 10% of the libraries in all types of institutions have a clearly identifiable budget for the instruction program. A low percentage of libraries indicated sufficient clerical staff and equipment for instructional purposes.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

A review of the literature reveals that giving instruction in
basic library skills to library users has been a concern of academic
librarians for over a hundred years. In the last fifteen to twenty
years, a variety of orientation and instruction activities have been
initiated in many academic libraries. This recent interest in library
use instruction, often referred to as the bibliographic instruction
movement, is characterized by a growing body of literature, a growing
number of librarians whose duties include instruction, regional and
national conferences devoted to the topic, the establishment of a
national clearinghouse for exchange of information and instructional
materials, and considerable interest on the part of academic librari-
ans. Programs of library use instruction have been designed by librar-
ians for various levels of library users--from freshmen to faculty.
This study focused on college freshmen and their special needs in
relation to the academic library.

The two primary needs of college freshmen in relation to the
academic library are (1) an orientation to the library building and
(2) basic library skills. First of all, freshmen need an introduction
to the physical layout and the location of the major services in the

148

library building. Secondly, freshmen need an introduction to basic
library resources, such as the card catalog and major periodical in-
dexes. Since their experience has been limited to small high school
or public libraries, freshmen are unprepared to retrieve efficiently
a variety of library resources using the complex, intricate bibliogra-
phic system that characterizes an academic library.

The purpose of this study was to provide an assessment of library
use instruction programs for college freshmen in the United States by
examining in detail the library administrative support and program
elements of these programs, preparing a profile of instructional ac-
tivities in four types of academic institutions, and comparing these
profiles to the nationally-recognized guidelines for such programs.

Using the data gathered from a 36-question survey instrument sent
to a random sample of 400 academic institutions in the United States,
profiles of freshman library use instruction in libraries in four
types of academic institutions--two-year, four-year, five-year, and
doctoral--were constructed. The profiles included information on the
kinds of administrative support from library administrators and the
specific program elements, i.e., the specific ways in which the pro-
grams were implemented. The profiles also included additional survey
data on the problems and benefits of these programs, the estimated
percentage of freshmen reached through these programs, and the future
dispositions of the programs. An optional question asked respondents
to rate the effectiveness of their programs on a scale of one to five,
one being the least effective and five the most effective. The infor-
mation from the profiles was then compared to the Association of

College and Research Libraries "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries" (reprinted in Appendix A), which are the nationally-recognized acceptable standards for academic libraries, to determine the percentage of libraries in each of the four types of institutions that adhere to the guidelines.

Summary of Findings

A detailed explanation of the findings concerning the administrative support by library administrators and the program elements of freshman library use instruction programs is found in Chapters IV, V, and VI. Below is a summary of those findings.

Less than 50% of the libraries in all four types of institutions involved the academic community in the formulation and evaluation of goals for their programs. Less than 30% of the libraries have written goals and objectives; less than 15% of the libraries have a timetable for implementation of their written goals and objectives.

Most library use instruction programs for freshmen are funded from the general library budget with no clearly identified line or fund for instruction. In terms of providing sufficient staff and materials to meet their goals, libraries were more likely to have sufficient professional staff (the percentages for the four types of libraries ranged from 52.9% to 58.7%) and less likely to have sufficient support staff (24.3% to 34.9%). More libraries indicated sufficient instructional materials (44.3% to 55.6%) than indicated sufficient equipment (27.1% to 42.9%) and facilities (40.0% to 47.1%).

The librarians responsible for instruction are more apt to have

received training in various disciplines, teaching skills, and the preparation of audio-visual material than the preparation and use of evaluation techniques.

Very few libraries have positions for part-time or full-time instruction librarians. The doctoral institutions are more likely to have librarians serving in these specialized roles. Of the institutions that do have designated instruction librarians, these librarians are more likely to report to the library director in the two-year and four-year institutions.

The doctoral institutions are more likely to include instruction as an expected responsibility in job descriptions and to include instruction in administrative decisions on merit raises, promotion, and tenure. In only 25.7% of the four-year institutions did librarians participate in continuing education activities in the past 12 months. Librarians in 35.3% of the two-year institutions, in 52.9% of the five-year institutions, and in 66.7% of the doctoral institutions participated in continuing education activities in the past 12 months.

The doctoral institutions are somewhat more likely to provide evaluation of the entire program than the three other types of institutions. Approximately 25% of all four types of libraries evaluate various components of their programs.

Less than 30% of the libraries conduct a needs assessment to determine the academic community's need for library orientation and instruction. Fewer than 12% of the libraries have produced a written needs assessment. Less than 40% of the libraries use instructional objectives in their programs.

The most popular orientation activity in all four types of libraries is the conducted tour, used in more than 70% of all types of libraries. The handbook is the next most popular orientation activity and is used in 55.9% of the two-year institutions, 62.9% of the four-year institutions, 48.6% of the five-year institutions, and 44.4% of the doctoral institutions. Self-guided tours with audio equipment and videotaped orientation tours are used in less than 10% of the libraries. The self-guided printed tour is more likely to be used by doctoral institutions than in the three other institutions.

Course-related instruction is the most popular mode of instruction followed by course-integrated instruction, self-paced workbooks or worksheets, and point-of-use printed materials. Computer-assisted instruction is used by less than 4% of all four types of libraries.

Credit courses are offered by more than 25% of the libraries with the exception of four-year institutions where it is offered in only 7.1% of the libraries. For the most part, these credit courses are optional, one-hour, one-term courses taught by librarians.

Libraries offer course-related library use instruction to English composition classes in more than 65% of the libraries. Course-related instruction is offered about equally in terms of percentages in three other subject areas--the humanities, the social sciences, and business.

The most popular instructional materials are worksheets, handouts, and library handbooks, which are used by more than 40% of the libraries The least used instructional mateials are audio-visual materials, particularly slides, filmstrips, motion pictures, videodiscs, and

videotapes.

The content of the freshman library use instruction is focused on how to use the card catalog, offered by more than 80% of the libraries. How to read a call number and locate material on the shelves are two topics taught by more than 77% of all libraries and an introduction to the use of the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature is taught by more than 75% of the libraries. Instruction in how to devise a search strategy is given by 60% of the doctoral libraries, 50% of the four-year libraries, 44.1% of the two-year libraries, and 38.6% of the five-year libraries.

The two most used publicity methods are personal contact with faculty and word of mouth. Doctoral and five-year institutions are more likely to mail fliers to faculty and/or students.

Doctoral and five-year institutions are more likely to compile annual reports. A higher percentage of doctoral institutions record statistics than do the other three types of institutions.

More than 50% of all types of libraries use three kinds of informal evaluation methods, but only a small percentage use formal evaluation techniques. Approximately 35% of the doctoral institutions use a test designed by librarians at their institutions. Evalution of worksheets or workbooks is done by more than 30% of the two-year and doctoral institutions. Less than 10% of the libraries are able to measure the achievement of behavioral objectives and less than 5% use a comparison of control and experimental groups as an evaluation technique. Less than 20% of all libraries can document the substantial attainment of their written program objectives.

The most prevalent problems are the fact that the program does not reach all freshmen, lack of professional staff, and lack of co-operation from faculty outside the library. Space is a problem for 34.9% of the doctoral institutions.

The major benefit is increased student use of the library, a benefit checked by over 77% of the libraries. An improved librarian/ faculty relationship was a benefit in over 47% of the libraries.

The estimated mean and median percentage of freshmen reached by the programs was over 60% for all libraries. Four-year institutions had the highest estimated percentage with a mean of 80.2% and a median of 87.5%. Two-year libraries had the lowest estimated percentage of freshmen reached with a mean of 62.0% and a median of 75.0%.

The libraries were approximately evenly spread among three choices for the future of their programs--continue as is, modify, or expand. Only one library plans to reduce its program and one will discontinue its program.

The highest percentage of libraries rated their programs as average. Several libraries commented that they gave their programs an average rating because they did not reach all freshman students; although, in all other respects, the programs should receive a rating of four or five, i.e., an excellent rating.

Conclusions

The unusually high return rate of the surveys (75.5%) and the number of librarians who took the time to respond by writing

extended comments and by sending examples of their instructional materials is indicative of the high interest academic librarians have in the topic of freshman library use instruction.

Data from the surveys returned by the 271 libraries revealed that some type of freshman library use orientation or instruction, however rudimentary, is carried out by a very high percentage (91.5%) of the academic libraries that responded to the survey. Only 20 or 7.4% of the libraries indicated that they have no activities or programs of library use instruction for freshmen.

A very low number (14) of the academic libraries indicated they could not respond to the survey because they were not able to differientiate their orientation and instruction activities by level of user. They offer voluntary activities which are open to all students no matter the level. These 14 libraries were not considered in the analysis of the data.

The data from the returned surveys also revealed that librarians are concentrating their efforts on the implementation of instructional activities rather than following the planning and evaluation activities as outlined in the Association of College and Research Libraries Guidelines. Librarians do not make time or do not have time to conduct extensive advance planning which includes a written needs assessment of the campus community for library use instruction, to set goals and objectives for their programs, or to establish evaluation procedures for their programs as a whole or for the individual components of the programs. In the areas of planning, goal setting, and evaluation, less than 50% of the libraries adhere to the

Association of College and Research Libraries Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries.

Until academic libraries are adequately funded and staffed, instruction librarians will continue to focus on the implementation of activities that meet pressing needs rather than follow the suggested outline of activities in the ACRL Guidelines which includes the planning and evaluation of programs.

While more and more library administrators realize the importance of library use instruction, the data show that library administrative support is not sufficient to reach all freshmen students or to carry out the programs and activities in the manner the librarians who implement the programs think they should be carried out. Few libraries reported that they had a separate budget for library use instruction, that a part-time or full-time instruction librarian is responsible for the program; that instruction is used as a criterion in administrative decisions on merit raises, promotion, and/or tenure; or that instruction activities are included in position descriptions. The small percentage of libraries reporting that librarians have participated in continuing education activities and the lack of involvement of the academic community in setting objectives and evaluating the programs suggests that library administrative support is weak in these specific areas as well. This lack of library administrative support is a detriment to the establishment of well-planned and well-evaluated programs.

The problems of library administrative support may not rest totally with the library administrators, however. Administrators

outside the library may not view library use instruction as a top priority, preferring to channel what funds are available into the library collection instead. Librarians themselves do not seem to equate lack of professional staff and time with lack of funding. Many librarians who checked lack of time as a problem did not check lack of funds as an additional problem area. Librarians are not finding effective ways to convince the library's administration, the institution's administration, and the faculty that an effective library use instruction program benefits the institution and deserves, adequate funding. One respondent's comment summarizes the situation.

> Library instruction on our campus is conducted and implemented almost totally by one librarian with some help from other library professionals. Since the demand for library instruction has increased each year, more and more professional staff time is needed. It has been increasingly difficult to 'stretch' the one librarian's time to cover these duties in conjunction with reference and interlibrary loan duties. Something has had to be neglected and that has been evaluation/goal-setting, etc. We are almost to the point of needing at least a part-time instruction librarian, but it is unlikely such a position will be funded.

A very small percentage of libraries use audio-visual and computer-based instructional materials in their programs. Instruction in the use of computer-based systems, such as online catalogs or circulation systems, is not common.

An analysis of the profiles of the four types of institutions reveals that the greatest differences among the types of institutions are found in the profiles of the doctoral and the two-year institutions. The primary differences involved personnel-related issues, such as the background of the instruction librarians and the library's organization structure; administrative support for the programs;

types of instructional materials; the content of the instruction; public relations techniques; the amount of statistics recorded; and evaluation techniques.

The doctoral institutions are more likely to have librarians with backgrounds in a variety of disciplines; the two-year institutions are more likely to have librarians with training in teaching skills and the preparation of audio-visual materials. The library director is not involved in giving instruction to freshmen in any of the doctoral institutions, but in 39.7% of the two-year institutions the library director is responsible for implementing the freshman program. Approximately 38% of the doctoral institutions have a full-time or part-time librarian whose duty is to provide or coordinate instruction activities; only 8.5% of the two-year institutions have a part-time or full-time instruction librarian.

The doctoral institutions are more supportive of library instruction in terms of certain administrative activities, such as including instruction responsibilities in job descriptions; using instruction as a criterion for decisions on promotion, tenure, and/or merit raises; and in providing continuing education activities.

In the implementation of the library use instruction programs, the doctoral institutions rely more heavily on printed sources, such as self-guided printed tours, point-of-use printed guides, printed bibliographies, handouts, and signage systems.

In terms of the content of the instruction, a higher percentage of the doctoral institutions include a variety of topics as compared to the two-year institutions. Approximately 60% of the doctoral

as compared to 44% of the two-year institutions teach freshmen how to devise a search strategy. Doctoral institutions are more likely than the two-year institutions to give instruction in the use of government publications, newspaper indexes, major periodical indexes, and a subject headings list. Two-year institutions are more likely to give instruction in the use of audio-visual equipment than doctoral institutions.

A higher percentage of doctoral institutions use fliers mailed to faculty and/or students and use library newsletters as public relations techniques as compared to the two-year institutions.

Doctoral institutions are more likely to compile statistical reports than the two-year institutions. Whereas 36.5% of the doctoral institutions compile an annual report on library instruction, only 14.7% of the two-year institutions compile an annual report. Thirty-one percent of the doctoral institutions include instruction in another type of annual report, but only 11.8% of the two-year institutions include instruction activities in another type of annual report. The number of freshmen reached by the instruction programs is a statistic recorded by 76.2% of the doctoral institutions and by 32.4% of the two-year institutions. The number of sessions taught is recorded by 84.1% of the doctoral institutions and by 44.1% of the two-year institutions. Only 7.9% of the doctoral institutions do not record any statistics on library instruction activities, but a large percentage (41.2%) of the two-year institutions do not record statistics.

The informal evaluation technique used by the highest percentage

(79.4%) of the doctoral institutions is observing students during presentations. The informal evaluation technique used by the majority of the two-year institutions (73.5%) is observing students as they use resources in the library.

A higher percentage of doctoral institutions as compared to the two-year institutions indicate that lack of professional and clerical staff, insufficient funds and space, and lack of cooperation from faculty outside the library are problem areas.

In general the data from the doctoral institutions indicates a higher level of staffing, more emphasis on the recording of statistics, a heavier reliance on printed instructional and orientation materials, and the inclusion of a wider range of content in the instruction than is evident in the two-year institutions.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study reveals several areas that need further research, which are outlined below:

1. Further research is needed that would examine the affect of the size of the institution, the student body, professional library staff, and library collection on the effectiveness of freshman library use instruction programs.

2. Further research is needed to determine how to give appropriate instruction to freshmen students who vary widely in ability and in background of library use.

3. More data are needed on the actual costs and benefits of freshman library use instruction programs. It is difficult to

justify programs or to convince administrators of their worth unless some kind of data are available that clearly demonstrate the benefits of these programs.

4. Several librarians commented that instruction for upper class students appears to be more effective. Is this the case or is instruction to upper class students simply more satisfying from the librarian's point of view?

5. Further research is needed to devise ways to involve faculty in motivating students to use library resources.

6. Several librarians mentioned the need for more in-depth instruction to freshmen; other librarians attributed their success to the fact that they concentrated on teaching a few basic skills. How much to freshmen need to know about using the library?

7. What kinds of interesting, effective programs can be development for freshmen? Why is this level of instruction so often dull and prosaic? What type or mode of instruction is more likely to appeal to freshmen?

8. What type of personality is best suited for working with freshman orientation and instruction?

9. Is one type of instruction more effective for freshmen than another? Can machines or printed sources be the sole means of instruc-tion? Is an impersonal machine-approach the best instructional method?

10. A study of the attitudes of college freshmen towards the library needs to be undertaken. Freshmen often give the impression that they think the library is a restrictive place, that they do not

know how to browse, and that they are afraid to really explore library resources.

11. This study should be replicated in five or ten years to gauge the changes in library use instruction for college freshmen.

Concluding Statement

Orientation to the library building and library use instruction for college freshmen is a widespread nationwide activity in four types of academic libraries in the United States. A variety of instructional methods and materials are used to implement these programs. The traditional methods--a conducted tour of the building and course-related instruction in English composition classes--remain the most popular instructional modes for freshmen. Most libraries concentrate on implementation of their programs, rather than careful pre-planning, the setting of goals and objectives, and evaluation. Further research is needed to provide more effective programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Mignon.

1980   "Individualized Approach to Learning Library Skills."
        Library Trends, 29 (Summer), 83-93.

American Council on Education.

1981   Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education; Pro-
        grams, Candidates, 1981/82. Washington, D.C.: The Council.

American Library Directory.

1982   American Library Directory. Ed. Jaques Cattell Press.
        35th Ed. New York: Bowker Company.

Association of College and Research Libraries.

1956   Library-Instructional Integration on the College Level.
        40th Conference of Eastern College Librarians held at
        Columbia University, November 27, 1954. ACRL Monograph
        No. 13. Chicago, Illinois: Association of College and
        Research Libraries.

1977   State-of-the Art of Academic Library Instruction; 1977
        Update. Chicago, Illinois: Association of College and
        Research Libraries. ED 171 272.

1979   Bibliographic Instruction Handbook. Chicago, Illinois:
        American Library Association, Association of College and
        Research Libraries. ED 188 623.

Babcock, Kendric C.

1913   "Bibliographical Instruction in College." Library Journal,
        38 (March), 133-136.

Barkley, Margaret.

1939   "Arrows for Freshmen." Library Journal, 64 (May 15), 402-
        404.

Batt, Fred.

1977   "Education is Illogical." Improving College and University

163

Teaching, 25 (Summer), 188.

Beardsley, Verna Melum.

1974   "Library Instruction in Colleges and Universities in the
        Seventies: A Viewpoint." Educating the Library User.
        Ed. John Lubans, Jr. New York: Bowker, pp. 111-114.

Beaubien, Anne, Mary George, and Sharon Hogan.

1982   Learning the Library: Concepts and Methods for Effective
        Bibliographic Instruction. New York: Bowker.

Benson, Stanley.

1979   "Administering Course-Related Library Instruction Programs
        in Selected Academic Libraries." (Unpub. Ph.D. disserta-
        tion, University of Oklahoma.)

Berry, John.

1977   "The Two 'Professions'." Library Journal, 102 (September),
        1699.

Bishop, William W.

1908   "The Amount of Help to be Given to Readers." ALA Bulletin,
        2 (September), 327-334.

Boisse, Joseph A.

1979   "Selling Library Instruction." Southeastern Librarian, 29
        (Summer), 81-85.

Bonn, George S.

1960   "Training Laymen in the Use of the Library." The State of
        the Library Art, vol. 2, part 1. Ed. Ralph R. Shaw. New
        Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Graduate School of Library
        Service.

Braden, Irene A.

1970   The Undergraduate Library. ACRL Monograph No. 31. Chica-
        go, Illinois: Association of College and Research Libra-
        ries.

Branscomb, Harvie.

1940   Teaching with Books: A Study of College Libraries. Chica-
        go, Illinois: American Library Association.

Breivik, Patricia Senn.

1977   Open Admissions and the Academic Library. Chicago, Illi-
        nois: American Library Association.

1978   "Leadership, Management, and the Teaching Library."
        Library Journal, 103 (October 15), 2045-2048.

1982   Planning the Library Instruction Program. Chicago, Illi-
        nois: American Library Association.

Brough, Kenneth J.

1953   Scholar's Workshop; Evolving Conceptions of Library Ser-
        vice. Illinois Contributions to Librarianship No. 5.
        Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois.

Butler, Helen L.

1942   "The Library in Education." Review of Educational Re-
        search, 12 (June), 323-335.

Cammack, Floyd M.

1979   "Bibliography." Community College Library Instruction.
        Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet Books, pp. 238-279.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

1977   Missions of the College Curriculum. San Francisco, Cali-
        fornia: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, Aaron and Elaine Cohen.

1981   "The Quiet Revolution on the Campuses." Chronicle of
        Higher Education, 23 (November 25), 56.

College and University Postwar Planning Committee.

1946   College and University Libraries and Librarianship; an Ex-
        animation of Their Present Status and Some Proposals for
        Their Future Development. Prepared by the College and Uni-
        versity Postwar Planning Committee of the American Library
        Association and the Association of College and Reference
        Libraries, William H. Carlson, Chairman. Chicago, Illinois:
        American Library Association.

Columbia University.

1883   Annual Report of the President. New York: Columbia Uni-
        versity, p. 26.

Dale, Doris Cruger.

  1977a   "Questions of Concern: Library Services to Community
          College Students." Journal of Academic Librarianship,
          3 (May), 81-84.

  1977b   "The Community College Library in the Mid-1970's." College
          and Research Libraries, 38 (September), 404-411.

Devlin, Eleanor.

  1957   "Thoughts on Freshman Orientation." Catholic Library
          World, XXIX (October), 23-27.

Dickinson, Dennis W.

  1981   "Library Literacy: Who? When? Where?" Library Journal,
          106 (April 15), 853-855.

Dougherty, Richard M., and William H. Webb.

  1976   "Editorial: Library Instruction." Journal of Academic
          Librarianship, 2 (September), 171.

Dyson, Allan J.

  1975   "Organizing Undergraduate Library Instruction: the
          English and American Experience." Journal of Academic
          Librarianship, 1 (March), 9-13.

  1978   "Library Instruction in University Undergraduate Libra-
          ries." Progress in Educating the Library User. Ed. John
          Lubans, Jr. New York: Bowker, pp. 93-103.

Elbridge, Bessie L.

  1928   "An Experiment in Library Instruction for College Fresh-
          men." Library Journal, 53 (December 1), 986-988.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo.

  1881   Power, Wealth, Books. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton,
          Mifflin.

Erickson, E. Walfred.

  1948   "Library Orientation Programs in American Teachers Col-
          leges." Wilson Library Bulletin, 23 (September), 62-63.

  1949   "Library Instruction in the Freshman Orientation Program."
          College and Research Libraries, 10 (October), 445-448.

Evans, Henry R.

  1914   "Library Instruction in Universities, Colleges, and Normal
           Schools." U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 34.
           Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, pp. 3-37.

Fjallbrant, Nancy.

  1977   "Planning a Programme of Library User Education." Journal
           of Librarianship, 9 (July), 199-211.

Fjallbrant, Nancy, and Malcolm Stevenson.

  1978   User Education in Libraries. Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet
           Books, 1978.

Ford, James E.

  1982a   "The Natural Alliance between Librarians and English
           Teachers in Course-Related Library Use Instruction."
           College and Research Libraries 43 (September), 379-384.

Frick, Elizabeth.

  1975   "Information Structure and Bibliographic Instruction."
           Journal of Academic Librarianship, 1 (September), 12-14.

Galloway, Sue, and Virginia Sherwood.

  1976   "Essentials for an Academic Library's Instructional Ser-
           vice Program." California Librarian, 37 (April), 45-59.

Galvin, Thomas J.

  1978   "Foreward." Progress in Educating the Library User. Ed.
           John Lubans, Jr. New York: Bowker, pp. vii-viii.

Garloch, Lorene A.

  1942   "Overcoming Library Illiteracy." Journal of Higher Educa-
           tion, 13 (March), 124-128.

Givens, Johnnie.

  1974   "The Use of Resources in the Learning Experience." Ad-
           vances in Librarianship, vol. 4. Ed. Melvin J. Voight.
           New York: Academic Press, pp. 149-174.

Goggin, Margaret Knox.

  1974   "Instruction in the Use of the University Library."
           Educating the Library User. Ed. John Lubans, Jr. New
           York: Bowker, pp. 104-110.

Gore, Daniel.

1969   "Teaching Bibliography to College Freshmen." Educa-
         tional Forum, 34 (November), 111-117.

Guskin, Alan E., Carla J. Stoffle, and Joseph A. Boisse

1979   "The Academic Library as a Teaching Library: A Role for
         the 1980s." Library Trends, 28 (Fall), 231-296.

Gwinn, Nancy E.

1980   "Academic Libraries and Undergraduate Education: the CLR
         Experience." College and Research Libraries, 41 (January),
         10.

Gwynn, Stanley E.

1954   "The Liberal Arts Function of the University Library."
         Library Quarterly, 24 (October), 311-321.

Hacker, Betty L., and Joel S. Rutstein.

1978   "Educating Large Numbers of Users in University Libraries:
         an Analysis and a Case Study." Progress in Educating the
         Library User. Ed. John Lubans, Jr. New York: Bowker,
         pp. 105-123.

Halpern, Jeanne W.

1976   "Library Instruction: As Seen by My Hairdresser, My
         Eighth-Grade Son, My Freshman English Class at the Uni-
         versity of Michigan, and Me." Faculty Involvement in
         Library Instruction: Their Views on Participation In and
         Support of Academic Library Use Instruction. Ed. Hannelore
         B. Rader. Papers Presented at the 5th Annual Conference on
         Library Orientation for Academic Librarians Held at Eastern
         Michigan University, May 15-17, 1975. Ann Arbor, Michigan:
         Pierian Press, pp. 23-27.

Hardesty, Larry

1977   Bibliographic Instruction: Defining, Organizing, and Pro-
         moting a Program. Paper Presented to the 1977-78 Recipi-
         ents of the Council on Library Resources' Library Service
         Enhancement Program Grants. Washington, D.C.: The Council.
         ED 163 892.

Harlow, Neal.

1973   "The Library in the Future of Higher Education." Toward a
         Theory of Librarianship: Papers in Honor of Jesse Hauk

Shera. Ed. Conrad H. Rawski. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, pp. 463-469.

Harper, William Rainey.

1902   "The Trend of College and University Education in the U.S." _North American Review_, 174 (April), 457-   .

Hartz, Frederic R.

1964   "Freshman Library Orientation: a Re-evaluation." _Improving College and University Teaching_, 12 (Spring), 78-80.

1965   "Freshman Library Orientation: A Need for New Approaches." _College and Research Libraries_, 26 (May), 227-231.

Henning, Patricia A., and Joyce Shapiro, eds.

1972   "Library Instruction: Methods, Materials, Evaluation." _Drexel Library Quarterly_, 8 (July), 219-365.

Hills, P. J.

1974   "Library Instruction and the Development of the Individual." _Journal of Librarianship_, 6 (October), 255-263.

Hodgin, Ellis.

1978   "Opening Remarks." _Proceedings_, Southeastern Conference on Approaches to Bibliographic Instruction Held in Charleston, South Carolina, March 16-17, 1978. Ed. Cerise Oberman-Soroka. Charleston, South Carolina: Continuing Education Office, College of Charleston, pp. v-vii.

Holler, Frederick L.

1975   "Toward a Reference Theory." _RQ_, 14 (Summer), 301-309.

Holley, Edward G.

1976   "Academic Libraries in 1876." _College and Research Libraries_, 37 (January), 15-47.

Hopkins, Frances L.

1981   "Bibliographic Instruction: An Emerging Professional Discipline." _Directions for the Decade: Library Instruction in the 1980s_. Ed. Carolyn A. Kirkendall. Papers Presented at the 10th Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries Held at Eastern Michigan University, May 8-9, 1980. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Pierian Press, pp. 13-24.

Hurt, Peyton.

   1934   "The Need of College and University Instruction in Use of
           the Library." Library Quarterly, 4 (July), 436-448.

James, Alan E.

   1941   "Freshmen and the Library." Wilson Library Bulletin, 15
           (January), 403-407.

Johnson, Richard D., ed.

   1977   Libraries for Teaching, Libraries for Research; Essays for
           a Century. ACRL Publications in Librarianship No. 39.
           Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association.

Josey, E. J.

   1962   "Role of the College Library Staff in Instruction in the
           Use of the Library." College and Research Libraries, 23
           (November), 492-498.

Josey, E. J., ed.

   1975   New Dimensions for Academic Library Service. Metuchen,
           New Jersey: Scarecrow Press.

Kaser, David.

   1967   "Famine in a Land of Plenty." Southeastern Librarian, 17
           (Summer), 74-80.

Katz, William A.

   1974   Introduction to Reference Work. 2nd Ed. New York:
           McGraw-Hill. 2 vol.

Kennedy, James R.

   1970   "Integrated Library Instruction." Library Journal, 95
           (April 15), 1450-1453.

Kenney, Donald J.

   1980   "Universal Library Skills: An Outdated Concept." South-
           eastern Librarian, 30 (Spring), 13-14.

Kirk, Thomas G.

   1974   "Problems in Library Instruction in Four-Year Colleges."
           Educating the Library User. Ed. John Lubans, Jr. New
           York: Bowker, pp. 83-103.

1977a   "Past, Present and Future of Library Instruction." South-eastern Librarian, 27 (Spring), 15-18.

1977b   "Course-Related Library Instruction in the 70's." Library Instruction in the Seventies: State of the Art. Ed. Hannelore B. Rader. Papers Presented at the 6th Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries Held at Eastern Michigan University, May 13-14, 1976. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Pierian Press, pp. 35-46.

Kirk, Thomas G., and Mary Jo Lynch.

1972   "Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries: New Developments." Drexel Library Quarterly, 8 (July), 357-365.

Kirk, Thomas G., et al, eds.

1973   Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction: Status Report 1972. Chicago, Illinois: Association of College and Research Libraries. ED 072 823.

1974   Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries, Edited Transcripts of a Panel Discussion. Chicago, Illinois: Association of College and Research Libraries, New England Chapter. ED 112 946.

Kirk, Thomas G., James R. Kennedy, Jr., and Nancy P. Van Zant.

1980   "Structuring Services and Facilities for Library Instruction." Library Trends, 29 (Summer), 39-53.

Kirkendall, Carolyn A.

1980   "Library Use Education: Current Practices and Trends." Library Trends, 29 (Summer), 29-37.

Knapp, Patricia B.

1956   "A Suggested Program of College Instruction in the Use of the Library." Library Quarterly, 26 (July), 224-231.

1961   "The Monteith Library Project: an Experiment in Library-College Relationship." College and Research Libraries, 22 (July), 256-284.

1965   "The Meaning of the Monteith College Library Program for Library Education." Journal of Education for Librarianship, 6 (Fall), 117-127.

1966   The Monteith College Library Experiment. New York: Scarecrow Press.

1968 "The Library's Response to Innovation in Higher Education," _California Librarian_, 29 (April), 142-149.

1970a _The Academic Library Response to New Directions in Undergraduate Education._ Review Series No. 2. Library School, University of Minnesota. ED 039 390.

1970b _The Library, the Undergraduate, and the Teaching Faculty._ San Diego, California: University of California at San Diego, University Library. ED 042 475.

Kobelski, Pamela, and Mary Reichel.

1981 "Conceptual Frameworks for Bibliographic Instruction." _Journal of Academic Librarianship_, 7 (May), 73-77.

Krier, Maureen.

1976 "Bibliographic Instruction: A Checklist of the Literature, 1931-1975." _Reference Services Review_, 4 (January-March), 7-31.

Lancaster, Frederick W.

1970 "User Education: the Next Major Thrust." _Journal of Education for Librarianship_, 11 (Summer), 55-63.

1977 _The Measurement and Evaluation of Library Services._ Washington, D.C.: Information Resources Press.

Larson, Thelma E.

1969 "Public Onslaught: A Survey of User Orientation Methods." _RQ_, 8 (Spring), 182-187.

Lester, Ray

1979 "Why Educate the Library User." _Aslib Proceedings_, 31 (August), 366-380.

Lindgren, Jon

1978 "Seeking a Useful Tradition for Library User Instruction in the College Library." _Progress in Educating the Library User._ Ed. John Lubans, Jr. New York: Bowker, pp. 71-91.

Lockwood, Deborah L.

1979 _Library Instruction; a Bibliography._ Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Lubans, John, Jr.

1974   "Selected Bibliography." Educating the Library User. Ed.
        John Lubans, Jr. New York:, Bowker, pp. 423-435.

1978   "Bibliography." Progress in Educating the Library User.
        Ed. John Lubans, Jr. New York: Bowker, pp. 211-222.

1980   "Library Literacy." RQ, 19 (Summer), 325-328.

Lyle, Guy R.

1974   The Administration of the College Library. 4th Ed. New
        York: H. W. Wilson.

MacGregor, John, and Raymond G. McInnis.

1977   "Integrating Classroom Instruction and Library Research:
        the Cognitive Functions of Bibliographic Network Struc-
        tures." Journal of Higher Education, 48 (January/February),
        17-38.

McElderry, Stanley.

1976   "Readers and Resources: Public Services in Academic and
        Research Libraries, 1876-1976." College and Research
        Libraries, 37 (September), 408-420.

McInnis, Raymond G.

1978   New Perspectives for Reference Service in Academic Libra-
        ries. Contributions in Librarianship and Information
        Science No. 23. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Marshall, A. P.

1977   "This Teaching/Learning Thing: Librarians as Educators."
        Academic Libraries by the Year 2000. Ed. Herbert Poole.
        New York: Bowker, pp. 50-63.

Mathews, William.

1876   "Professorships of Books and Reading, Part II." Public
        Libraries in the United States of America; Their History,
        Condition and Management; a Special Report of the U.S.
        Commissioner of Education, 1876. Washington, D.C.: Gov-
        ernment Printing Office, pp. 240-251. Reprinted Totowa,
        New Jersey: Rowman & Littlefield, 1971.

Melum, Verna V.

1971a   "Library Orientation in the College and University: A
        Survey to Aid Your Fall Planning." Wilson Library Bulletin,

    46 (September), 59-66.

1971b "1971 Survey of Library Orientation and Instruction Pro-
    grams." <u>Drexel Library Quarterly</u>, 7 (July and October),
    225-254.

Metz, Paul, and Donald J. Kenney.

1982 "Library Literacy; Patterns and Trends." Ed. John Lubans,
    Jr. <u>RQ</u>, 22 (Winter), 122-125.

Mews, Hazel.

1972 <u>Reader Instruction in Colleges and Universities; Teaching
    the Use of the Library</u>. Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet
    Books.

Miller, Stuart Wayne.

1978 <u>Library Use Instruction in Selected American Colleges</u>.
    University of Illinois School of Library Science Occasional
    Paper No. 134. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois
    Graduate School of Library Science.

Mirwis, Allan.

1971 "Academic Library Instruction--a Bibliography, 1960-1970."
    <u>Drexel Library Quarterly</u>, 7 (July/October), 327-335.

Mishoff, W. O.

1957 "Undergraduate Programmes of Library Education; a Current
    Summary." <u>Higher Education; Monthly Publication of the
    U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare</u>, 14
    (September), 3-7.

Morris, Jacquelyn M.

1979 <u>Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries; a Review
    of the Literature and Selected Bibliography</u>. Syracuse:
    Syracuse University, ERIC Clearinghouse on Information
    Resources.

Murray, Kay.

1981 "Advances in Reference Services." <u>Advances in Librarian-
    ship</u>, vol. 11. Ed. Michael H. Harris. New York: Academic
    Press, pp. 135-162.

Oberman, Cerise, and Katina Straugh, eds.

1982 <u>Theories of Bibliographic Education: Designs for Teaching</u>.
    New York: Bowker.

Orvitz, Delia.

   1913   "Systematic Training for Otaining Information." <u>Library</u>
           <u>Journal</u>, 38 (March), 150-152.

Palmer, Millicent C.

   1972a   "Why Academic Library Instruction?" <u>Library Orientation</u>.
           Ed. Sul H. Lee. Papers Presented at the 1st Conference on
           Library Orientation Held at Eastern Michigan University,
           1971. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Pierian Press, pp. 1-17.

   1972b   "Problems in Academic Library Instruction: Our Own
           Creation?" <u>Catholic Library World</u>, 43 (April), 447-452.

Peele, David A.

   1973   "The Hook Principle." <u>RQ</u>, 13 (Winter), 135-138.

Penland, Patrick R.

   1975   "Library Use, Instruction In." <u>Encyclopedia of Library</u>
           <u>Science</u>, vol. 16. New York: Marcel Dekker, pp. 113-147.

Perkins, Frederic Beecher

   1876   "Professorships of Books and Reading, Part 1." <u>Public</u>
           <u>Libraries in the United States of America; Their History,</u>
           <u>Condition and Management; a Special Report of the U.S.</u>
           <u>Commissioner of Education, 1876</u>. Washington, D.C.: Gov-
           ernment Printing Office, pp. 230-239. Reprinted Totowa,
           New Jersey: Towman and Littlefield, 1971.

Phipps, Barbara H.

   1968   "Library Instruction for the Undergraduate." <u>College and</u>
           <u>Research Libraries</u>, 29 (September), 411-423.

Pierce, Beverly A.

   1981   "Librarians and Teachers: Where is the Common Ground?"
           <u>Catholic Library World</u>, 53 (November), 164-167.

Pugh, L. C.

   1970   "Library Instruction Programmes for Undergraduates: His-
           torical Development and Current Practice." <u>Library World</u>,
           71, (March), 267-273.

Rader, Hannelore B.

   1974   "Library Orientation and Instruction, 1973." <u>Reference</u>

Services Review, 2 (January-March), 91-93.

1976   An Assessment of Ten Academic Library Instruction Programs in the United States and Canada. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library Resources. ED 171 276.

1978   "The Humanizing Function of the College Library." Catholic Library World, 49 (February), 278-281.

Ramey, James W.

1972   "Classroom Dynamics: or, is There a Teacher in the House?" Drexel Library Quarterly, 8 (July), 237-244.

Randall, William M.

1932   The College Library. Chicago: American Library Association.

Reeves, Pamela.

1973   "Junior College Libraries Enter the Seventies." College and Research Libraries, 34 (January), 7-15.

Renford, Beverly and Linnea Hendrickson.

1980   Bibliographic Instruction; a Handbook. New York: Neal-Schuman.

Revill, D. H.

1970   "Teaching Methods in the Library: A Survey from the Educational Point of View." Library World, 71 (February), 243-249.

Rice, James G., Jr.

1981   Teaching Library Use: A Guide for Library Instruction. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Roberts, Anne F.

1982   Library Instruction for Librarians. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited.

Robinson, Otis. H.

1876a   "Librarians and Readers." Library Journal, 1 (November), 123-124.

1876b   "College Library Administration." Public Libraries in the United States of America; Their History, Condition and

Management; a Special Report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, 1876. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, pp. 505-525. Reprinted Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1971.

1880   "College Libraries as Aids to Instruction: Rochester University Library--Administration and Use." Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Education; No. 1-1880. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, pp. 15-27.

Rothstein, Samuel.

1955   The Development of Reference Services. ACRL Monograph No. 14. Chicago, Illinois: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Rubin, Richard.

1977   "Azariah Smith Root and Library Instruction at Oberlin College." Journal of Library History, 12 (Summer), 250-261.

Samuels, Marilyn S.

1976   "A Mini-Course in the Research Paper." College English, 38 (October), 189-193.

Schiller, Anita R.

1965   "Reference Service: Instruction or Information." Library Quarterly 35 (January), 52-60.

Schwartz, Barbara A., and Susan Burton.

1981   Teaching Library Skills in Freshman English: An Undergraduate Library's Experience. Contributions to Librarianship No. 6. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas at Austin, General Libraries.

Scott, W. Wiley.

1971   "Undergraduate Education and the Academic Librarian." Improving College and University Teaching, 19 (Spring), 140-142.

Scrivener, J. E.

1972   "Instruction in Library Use: the Persisting Problem." Australian Academic and Research Libraries, 3 (June), 87-119.

Sellers, R. Z.

1950   "What Shall We Do for Our Freshmen?" Wilson Library Bulletin, 24 (January), 360-365.

1953   "Special Services in Liberal Arts College Libraries," College and Research Libraries, 14 (July), 249-254.

Shores, Louis.

1970   Library-College USA: Essays on a Prototype for an American Higher Education. Tallahassee, Florida: South Pass Press.

Smalley, Topsy N.

1977   "Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries: Questioning Some Assumptions." Journal of Academic Librarianship, 3 (November), 280-283.

Smith, Barbara J.

1980   "The State of Library User Instruction in Colleges and Universities in the United States." Peabody Journal of Education, 58 (October), 15-21.

Stevenson, Malcolm B.

1977   "Education of Users of Libraries and Information Services." Journal of Documentation, 33 (March), 53-78.

Stoffle, Carla J.

1978   "Focus on Objectives: A Workshop on Writing Objectives on Bibliographic Instruction Programs." Proceedings. Southeastern Conference on Approaches to Bibliographic Instruction Held at College of Charleston, March 16-17, 1978. Ed. Cerise Oberman-Soroka. Charleston, South Carolina: Continuing Education Office, College of Charleston, pp. 7-32.

Stoffle, Carla J., and Gabriella Bonn.

1973   "An Inventory of Library Orientation and Instruction Methods." RQ, 13 (Winter), 129-133.

Stueart, Robert, and Richard D. Johnson, eds.

1979   New Horizons for Academic Libraries. Papers Presented at the 1st National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, Boston, Massachusetts, November 8-11, 1978. New York: K. G. Saur.

Taylor, Peter J., Colin Harris and Daphne Clark.

1979   The Education of Users of Library and Information Services:
        an International Bibliography, 1926-1976. Aslib Bibliogra-
        phy No. 9. London: Aslib.

Taylor, Robert S.

1957   "A Coordinated Program of Library Instruction." College
        and Research Libraries, 18 (July), 303-306.

Thorpe, Marjorie

1969   "Library Reference Work in the Two-Year College." Improv-
        ing College and University Teaching, 17 (Spring), 120-121.

Tickton, Sidney G.

1970   To Improve Learning. New York: Bowker.

Tidmarsh, Mavis N.

1968   "Instruction in the Use of Academic Libraries." University
        and Research Studies. Ed. William L. Saunders. London:
        Pergamon Press, pp. 59-83.

Trinkner, Charles L.

1970   Teaching for Better Use of Libraries. Hamden, Conn.: Shoe
        String Press.

Tucker, John Mark.

1980a   "User Education in Academic Libraries: a Century in Retro-
        spect." Library Trends, 29 (Summer), 9-27.

1980b   Articles on Library Instruction in Colleges and Universi-
        ties, 1876-1932. Occasional Paper No. 143. Urbana, Illinois:
        University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science.

Utley, George B.

1915   "Library Instruction in Colleges, Universities, and Normal
        Schools." Report of the Commissioner of Education for the
        Year Ended 1914. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Of-
        fice, pp. 477-479.

Veit, Fritz

1976   "Library Service to College Students." Library Trends, 25
        (July), 361-378.

Vogel, J. Thomas.

 1972   "A Critical Overview of the Evaluation of Library Instruc-
         tion." Drexel Library Quarterly, 8 (July), 315-323.

Vuturo, Robert.

 1977   "Beyond the Library Tour: Those Who Can, Must Teach."
         Wilson Library Bulletin, 51 (May), 736-740.

Ward, James E.

 1976   "Library and Bibliographic Instruction in Southeastern
         Academic Libraries." Southeastern Librarian, 26 (Fall),
         148-159.

White, Carl M.

 1938   "Trends in the Use of University Libraries." School and
         Society, 48 (November), 669-677.

Wheeler, Helen R.

 1965   The Community College Library; a Plan for Action. Hamden,
         Connecticut: Shoe String Press.

Wilkinson, Billy R.

 1972   Reference Services for Undergraduate Students: Four Case
         Studies. Metuchin, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press.

Wilson, Pauline.

 1979   "Librarians as Teachers: the Study of an Organization
         Fiction." Library Quarterly, 49 (April), 146-162.

Winsor, Justin

 1880   "College Libraries as Aids to Instruction: the College
         Library." Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Edu-
         cation: No. 1-1880. Washington, D.C.: Government Print-
         ing Office, pp. 7-14.

Wolcott, John D.

 1913   "Instruction in Use of Books and Libraries in Colleges and
         Universities." Report of the Commissioner of the Bureau of
         Education for the Year Ended June 30, 1912, Vol. 1. Wash-
         ington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, pp. 380-384.

Young, Authur P.

1974   "Research on Library-User Education: a Review Essay."
        Educating the Library User. Ed. John Lubans, Jr. New
        York: Bowker, pp. 1-15.

1978   "Bibliographic Instruction: a Review of Research and Ap-
        plications." Progress in Educating the Library User. Ed.
        John Lubans, Jr. New York: Bowker, pp. 13-28.

1980   "And Gladly Teach: Bibliographic Instruction and the Libr-
        ary." Advances in Librarianship, Vol. 10. Ed. Michael H.
        Harris. New York: Academic Press, pp. 63-88.

Zeidner, Nancy I.

1977   "Library Instruction Survey Analysis, April 1975." SPEC
        Kit 17, Library Instruction. Washington, D.C.: Associa-
        tion of Research Libraries Office of Management Studies,
        Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, 1975, revised 1977,
        pp. 1-15.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

ACRL GUIDELINES FOR BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION

IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries

The college and university library performs a unique and indispensable function in the educational process. It bears the central responsibility for developing the college and university library collections; for extending bibliographic control over these collections; for instructing students formally and informally; and for advising faculty and scholars in the use of these collections.

In order to assist college and university libraries in the planning and evaluation of effective programs to instruct members of the academic community in the identification and use of information resources, the following guidelines for bibliographic instruction in academic libraries are suggested:

The library should:

(1) assess the needs of its academic community for orientation to the library's facilities and services, and for instruction in the use of the library's collections and bibliographic structure;

(2) prepare a written profile of the community's information needs;

(3) develop a written statement of objectives of bibliographic instruction which:

    (a) includes immediate and long-range goals with projected timetables for implementation;

    (b) is directed to specific identified needs within the academic community, and permits various methods of instruction for all segments of the academic community who have a need to use library resources and services;

    (c) outlines methods by which progress toward the attainment of instructional objectives can be measured. Methodology must provide for measures of learning, attitude and cost.

(4) provide continuing financial support for bibliographic instruction,

    (a) clearly identifiable within the library's budget program and statements;

    (b) sufficient to provide the professional and supportive staff, equipment, materials and facilities necessary to attain the delineated objectives.

(5) employ librarians and other qualified staff to plan, implement and evaluate the program,

    (a) inclusive of persons with training in: various academic disciplines, the identification and use of library resources, teaching skills, preparation and use of audiovisual and other instructional materials, preparation and use of evaluative instruments, clerical skills;

    (b) in sufficient numbers necessary to attain the delineated objectives;

    (c) clearly identifiable and of a status similar to persons responsible for planning, implementing and evaluating the other major functions of the library.

(6) provide facilities, equipment and materials

    (a) to accommodate the preparation of instructional materials and the presentation of various modes of instruction (individual, small or large group, lecture, discussion, media, etc.);

    (b) of sufficient size, number and scope to accommodate the attainment of the delineated objectives.

(7) involve the academic community in the formulation of objectives and the evaluation of their attainment.

(8) evaluate regularly the effectiveness of the instructional program, and demonstrate substantial attainment of written objectives. ■ ■

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER AND SURVEY INSTRUMENT

February 10, 1983

I am conducting a study of the characteristics of library use instruction activities for freshman students in U. S. colleges and universities. I would like to ask your cooperation in completing the attached form or in passing it along to the individual responsible for library use instruction in your library. It should take about fifteen minutes to complete the form, mostly by checking the blanks provided. Please return the completed form in the enclosed envelope by February 25, 1983.

This study is being conducted as part of the requirements for a doctoral degree. In the final report, I will use aggregate figures and will not use statistics or statements attributed to a specific institution. If you would like to have a summary of the results of this study, please indicate on the form. If you have any questions, please call me collect at (305) 233-8216.

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Your time and effort are very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Carol F. Ahmad
Assistant Director for Public Ser-
    vices
University of Miami Library

Enc.

SURVEY OF LIBRARY USE INSTRUCTION FOR COLLEGE FRESHMEN

1. The highest degree offered at this institution is
   ____Associate
   ____Bachelor
   ____Master
   ____Doctorate

2. Which of the following statements best describes your library
   use instruction activities for freshmen?
   ____We have a formal program.
   ____We have an informal program.
   ____We do not have any library use instruction activities
        for freshmen. (If you check this blank, there is no
        need to continue. Please return the survey in the
        envelope provided. Thank you.)

3. The library administration involved the academic community
   (i.e., faculty and students) in the formulation of goals for
   the freshman program.
   ____yes
   ____no
   ____other. Please explain.

4. Long-range goals and specific short-range objectives for the
   freshman library use instruction program have been established
   in writing.
   ____yes
   ____no
   ____goals only have been established
   ____objectives only have been established

5. These written goals and objectives include timetables for
   implementation.
   ____yes
   ____no

6. The funding for the freshman library use instruction program
   (check all that apply)
   ____is clearly identifiable in the library's budget
   ____is from the general library budget but is not clearly
        identifiable
   ____is a special grant from within the institution
   ____is a special grant from an outside funding source
   ____other (Please explain.)

7. Present funding allows the attainment of the goals and objec-
   tives by providing sufficient (check all that apply):
   ____professional staff
   ____support staff
   ____equipment
   ____materials
   ____facilities

8. The librarian or librarians involved in instructing freshmen
    ____have backgrounds in various academic disciplines
    ____have had training in teaching skills
    ____have had training in the preparation and use of audio-
          visual and other instructional materials
    ____have had training in the preparation and use of evaluation
          techniques

9. The responsibility for implementing the freshman program is
    given to
    ____an appointed committee of librarians
    ____a volunteer committee of librarians
    ____public service librarians working part-time on library
          instruction under the Reference or Public Services
          Head
    ____no one specific person or group. Instruction is done on
          an ad hoc basis.
    ____a part-time instruction librarian who coordinates the program
    ____a full-time instruction librarian who coordinates the program
    ____Head of the Reference Department
    ____Head of Public Service
    ____Library Director
    ____other (Please describe.)

10. If the person who coordinates the program is a full or part-
    time Instruction Librarian, to whom does he or she report?
    ____Reference Department Head
    ____Public Services Head
    ____Director of Library
    ____Subject Department Head
    ____Head of Collection Development
    ____Technical Processing Head
    ____other. (Please describe.)

11. Is library use instruction included in the job description of
    the librarian(s) who does the actual instruction?
    ____yes
    ____no
    ____There are no job descriptions.

12. Is library instruction activity used as a criterion for
    promotion, tenure, and/or merit raises for librarians?
    ____yes
    ____no

13. One or more librarians involved in freshman library use
    instruction have participated in the past 12 months in con-
    tinuing education activities on the topic of library instruction.
    ____yes
    ____no

14. The library administration encourages library instruction librarians to (check all that apply)
    ____evaluate the entire program
    ____evaluate various parts of the program
    ____evaluate teaching objectives
    ____Evaluation is not done.
    ____other. (Please describe.)

15. The academic community (i.e., faculty and students) participates in evaluating the instruction program's goals and objectives.
    ____yes
    ____no

16. A needs assessment of the campus community concerning library orientation and instruction has been conducted.
    ____yes
    ____no

17. A written report of the needs assessment has been prepared.
    ____yes
    ____no

18. Are there written instructional objectives i.e., measurable objectives which indicate what a student is expected to learn?
    ____yes
    ____no
    ____other (Please explain.)

19. Orientation activities for freshmen include (check all that apply)
    ____conducted tour of the building
    ____slide/tape shown to large groups
    ____slide/tape for individuals to view
    ____self-guided tour with audio equipment, such as casette and
         headphones
    ____self-guided tour with printed guide
    ____videotape
    ____signage system/graphic displays
    ____handbook
    ____tabloid (newspaper-type format) handout
    ____other (Please describe.)

20. The freshman library use instruction program includes the following types of instruction: (check all that apply)
    ____course-related instruction i.e., lectures to classes
    ____course-integrated instruction i.e., librarian and faculty
         plan series of assignments that satisfy course and
         library use objectives
    ____non-credit formal instruction of one or more hours e.g.,
         term paper clinics, seminars, mini-courses
    ____credit course on library use
    ____point-of-use printed materials
    ____point-of-use a/v materials
    ____computer-assisted instruction
    ____self-paced workbook or worksheets
    ____other. (Please describe.)

21. A formal credit course in library use is available for
    freshmen.
    ____yes
    ____no
    If yes, the course is
    ____required
    ____optional
    ____a credit course for ____ hours credit
    ____non-credit
    Length of course is
    ____one term
    ____one year
    ____other (Please describe.)
    The course is taught by
    ____librarians
    ____non-library faculty
    ____librarian(s) and non-library faculty together
    ____other (Please describe.)

22. If any part of the freshman instruction is course-related or
    course-integrated, which disciplines or classes receive the
    instruction? (check all that apply)
    ____English composition classes
    ____other English courses
    ____business
    ____education
    ____journalism, mass media, or communication
    ____humanities
    ____social sciences
    ____science
    ____other (Please specify.)

23. Instructional materials used in freshman library instruction
    activities are (check all that apply)
    ____worksheets
    ____workbook
    ____textbook
    ____slide/tape
    ____slides
    ____transparencies
    ____videotape or television
    ____motion picture
    ____film strips
    ____videodisc
    ____other a/v material (Please describe.)
    ____computer-assisted instruction
    ____chalkboard
    ____large note pad and easel
    ____library handbook
    ____floor plans, maps
    ____printed bibliographies
    ____handouts
    ____sample pages from superseded reference sources
    ____other (Please describe.)

24. The content of the instruction for freshmen includes (check all that apply)
    ____ how to use the card catalog
    ____ how to use an online catalog
    ____ how to use an online circulation system
    ____ how to use a COM catalog
    ____ how to use a subject headings list, such as the LC Subjects
    ____ how to use Reader's Guide
    ____ how to use other major periodical indexes
    ____ how to use a computer-produced list of periodical holdings
    ____ how to read a call number
    ____ how to locate material on the shelves
    ____ how to use audio-visual equipment, e.g., microfilm readers
    ____ how to take notes
    ____ how to write a bibliography and footnotes
    ____ how to choose a topic for a paper
    ____ how to narrow a topic
    ____ how to devise a search strategy
    ____ how to use specialized reference tools
    ____ how to use government publications
    ____ how to use newspaper indexes
    ____ library policies and regulations
    ____ other (Please describe.)

25. How is the library use instruction for freshmen publicized? Check all that apply.
    ____ fliers mailed to faculty and/or students
    ____ bulletin board announcements
    ____ college course catalogs
    ____ campus newspaper
    ____ campus radio/TV station
    ____ library newsletter or other library publication
    ____ personal contact with faculty
    ____ faculty meetings outside the library
    ____ word of mouth
    ____ posters and signs
    ____ other. (Please describe.)

26. Does your library produce an annual report on library use instruction?
    ____ yes
    ____ no
    ____ other report (Please describe.)

27. The kinds of statistics recorded are (check all that apply)
    ____ number of freshmen reached through instruction activities
    ____ professional staff time involved in the program
    ____ number of sessions taught
    ____ overall cost of program
    ____ cost per freshman student
    ____ other (Please describe.)
    ____ Statistics are not recorded.

28. Evaluation techniques used in freshman instruction are
    (check all that apply)

    Informal Techniques
    ____observation of students during presentation i.e., facial
           expressions, number of questions asked
    ____observing whether or not students can use the resources
           described in the instruction
    ____simple questionnaire that assesses the students' opinions
           of the usefulness of the instruction
    ____conversation with instructors and students after the
           presentation
    ____videotape of a session for feedback to the librarian
    ____other (Please describe.)

    Formal Techniques
    ____in-house test designed by librarian(s)
    ____standardized library test
    ____evaluation of student research diaries
    ____evaluation of students' bibliographies
    ____evaluation of worksheets or workbooks
    ____measure of students' attitude change through questionnaries
    ____measurement of achievement of behaviorial objectives
    ____comparison of control and experimental groups
    ____other (Please describe.)

29. Can the library document the substantial attainment of the
    written program objectives?
    ____yes
    ____no
    ____There are no written program objectives.

30. The problems encountered in our freshman program are (check
    all that apply)
    ____lack of adequate funds
    ____lack of sufficient professional personnel
    ____lack of sufficient clerical support
    ____program does not reach all freshmen
    ____the program gives too much information to the freshman
           too early
    ____lack of cooperation from faculty outside the library
    ____lack of the library administration's support
    ____lack of administrative support outside the library
    ____lack of support from library faculty/staff
    ____insufficient space to conduct the program
    ____changes in personnel that have brought about detrimental
           changes in the program
    ____other (Please describe.)

31. The benefits of the freshman program are (check all that apply)
    ____students' use of library resources has increased
    ____librarians' knowledge of library resources has increased
    ____good publicity for the library
    ____enhanced standing for librarians in eyes of non-library
           faculty
    ____more interaction of library faculty and staff
    ____increased funding for the library
    ____improved collection development
    ____improved librarian/faculty relationship
    ____other (Please describe.)

32. Estimate the percentage of freshmen reached by your freshman library instruction activities and programs:
____percent
____This information is not available.

33. In the future, the program for freshmen will be
____continued as is
____continued but modified somewhat
____reduced
____expanded
____discontinued
____other (Please explain.)

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE OPTIONAL:

34. On a scale of one to five, one being the least effective and five the most effective, please rate the effectiveness of your program for freshmen.

_____

Please state the reasons for this rating.

35. Comments on the survey or freshman library use instruction.

36. ____I would like to receive a summary of the results.

Your name:

Institution & Address:

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING!

VITA ᐫ

Carol Fulton Ahmad

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A COMPARISON OF THE PROFILES OF FRESHMAN LIBRARY USE INSTRUC-
TION PROGRAMS IN FOUR TYPES OF ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS IN THE
UNITED STATES TO THE ACRL GUIDELINES

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Luling, Texas, February 12, 1943, the
daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. Fulton.

Education: Graduated from W. B. Ray High School, Corpus Christi,
Texas, in May, 1961; attended Del Mar College 1961-62; re-
ceived Bachelor of Arts with Honors from the University of
Texas at Austin in 1965; received Master of Librarianship,
University of Washington in 1967; enrolled in doctoral pro-
gram at Oklahoma State University, 1978; completed require-
ments for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State
University in May, 1983.

Professional Experience: Librarian I, University of Washington,
1967-69; Reader Services Librarian, Atlanta Public Library,
1973-74; Librarian, Colegio Internacional de Carabobo,
Valencia, Venezuela, 1974; Assistant Humanities Librarian,
Oklahoma State University Library, 1974-78; Humanities Li-
brarian, Oklahoma State University Library, 1978-81;
Humanities Bibliographer, University of Miami Library, 1981-
82; Assistant Director for Public Services, University of
Miami Library, 1982 to present. Member American Library
Association, Southeastern Library Association, Florida Li-
brary Association, and Dade County Library Association.