8-17-2012

Whose Hands Ply the Strands? Survey of Eastern Michigan University Psychology Faculty Regarding Faculty and Librarian Roles in Nurturing Psychology Information Literacy

Keith Stanger
Eastern Michigan University, keith@stanger.com

Whose Hands Ply the Strands? Survey of Eastern Michigan University Psychology Faculty Regarding Faculty and Librarian Roles in Nurturing Psychology Information Literacy

KEITH STANGER

Eastern Michigan University Library, Ypsilanti, Michigan

The Association of College and Research Libraries developed information literacy standards and associated performance indicators for undergraduate psychology students. A survey of tenure-track faculty members and full-time lecturers in the Psychology Department at Eastern Michigan University was conducted to discover how those professors viewed the importance of these indicators, and how those professors perceived their role, as well as the role of librarians, in supporting instruction that develops those skills. The psychology faculty acknowledged the curricular value of the information literacy performance indicators and perceived librarians as having a supportive role relative to their own more primary role in developing the skills.

KEYWORDS faculty role, librarian role, psychology faculty, psychology information literacy, survey

The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* (2000) serves as a benchmark for colleges and universities in the United States, offering an information literacy definition, five competency standards, 22 performance indicators, and multiple outcomes for each performance indicator to assess student progress toward information literacy. According to the ACRL, "Information literacy is a set of abilities requiring individuals to recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information" (2000, 2).

The Psychology Information Literacy Working Group of the ACRL Education and Behavioral Sciences Section was charged with creating information literacy standards for undergraduate psychology students. The resulting standards are more compact than the ACRL higher education standards—four competency standards, 11 performance indicators, and 45 learning outcomes. In June 2010 the ACRL Board of Directors approved the resulting Psychology Information Literacy Standards (Association of College and Research Libraries [ACRL] 2010).

The ACRL's (2010) four psychology information literacy competency standards are:

1. The information literate psychology student determines the nature and extent of the information needed.
2. The information literate psychology student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.
3. The information literate psychology student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into her or his knowledge base.
4. The information literate psychology student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.

A survey was conducted of Eastern Michigan University (EMU) Psychology Department faculty members to assess: (1) their perception of the importance of the ACRL psychology information literacy undergraduate student performance indicators to the EMU psychology undergraduate curriculum; (2) their perception of the importance of psychology faculty providing instructional support to develop the student skills measured by those information literacy performance indicators; and (3) their perception of the importance of librarians providing instructional support to develop the student skills measured by those information literacy performance indicators.

Does the concept of information literacy resonate with departmental faculty members? To gauge disciplinary faculty perceptions of the ACRL's *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*, Shelley Gullikson (2006) surveyed faculty at five small Canadian universities. She asked how important faculty believed it to be for their students to realize each of the 87 outcomes reflected in the information literacy standards. The results indicated that responding faculty thought it was important for their students to achieve most of the 87 ACRL higher education information literacy outcomes. Weetman DaCosta's (2010) surveys of faculty in the United Kingdom and the United States revealed that most faculty members want their students to acquire the component skills that comprise the construct of information literacy, for example, ability to compare and evaluate information from

different sources; the ability to organize, apply, and communicate information to others in ways appropriate to the situation. Sophie Bury (2011, 51), in her survey of faculty at York University, Canada, found that more than 93 percent of responding faculty members "thought students in their disciplines could benefit from receiving instruction to enhance IL [information literacy] competencies."

Who bears the responsibility for designing and delivering instruction that supports these standards—course instructors, librarians, both? While "information literacy" is a single phrase, it is comprised of different elements, each with its own vector of outcome success. Different instructional facilitators (e.g., disciplinary faculty, librarians) might be best suited to support and develop the different aptitudes and attitudes that constitute the different strands of what is called information literacy.

Consider the four ACRL psychology information literacy standards. The first information literacy standard asks students to be able to determine the nature and extent of information needed. In the academic setting, organized around courses, it is disciplinary faculty members who define the boundaries of the information needed for student projects.

The third information literacy standard asks students to critically evaluate disciplinary information and its sources and then incorporate that information into their knowledge base. Librarians offer generic evaluative rubrics, such as the CRAAP Test (Currency, Relevance, Authority, Accuracy, Purpose) from the Meriam Library at California State University, Chico (2010). However, it is the faculty members who design courses and who are best situated to communicate disciplinary values and the frameworks for critically evaluating the concepts, methods, and conclusions of those who engage disciplinary problems.

The fourth information literacy standard asks students to use information to effectively accomplish a purpose. It is the role of the faculty member to stipulate instructional purposes, design instructional interventions, and assess how well students have realized project goals.

The second information literacy standard asks students to access information effectively and efficiently. It is for instruction that supports this standard that many faculty members open their classrooms to librarians. The library, first and foremost, provides access to the social transcript (the records of the creations, observations, and discoveries of others), as well as tools that can be used by students and faculty to discover the location of content relevant to their explorations and learning. Academic communities welcome the cultural resources and research tools libraries manage. Disciplinary faculty perceive librarian training as supporting the discovery and management of information.

Consequently, psychology faculty, charged with communicating disciplinary knowledge via the credit-bearing course infrastructure, as well as advancing the knowledge base of the discipline, seem perfectly situated to support and develop at least three of the four components of what the ACRL refers to as "psychology information literacy"—helping students to determine the information needed, to evaluate the information found, and to use the information to reflect their understanding of it. Psychology faculty members are critical to transforming students from meaning seekers into meaning makers.

O'Connor (2009a; 2009b) has argued that over the last 30 years, librarians have worked to extend their professional jurisdiction of expertise from content access to education and have embraced the concept of information literacy as the framework for their instructional mission.

In the *Value of Academic Libraries*, Megan Oakleaf (2010, 37) writes:

> In the past, academic libraries functioned primarily as information repositories; now they are becoming learning enterprises. This shift requires academic librarians to embed library resources and services in the teaching and learning activities of their institutions. In the new paradigm, librarians focus on information skills, not information access; they think like educators, not service providers.

However, there is some ambivalence, particularly among faculty, regarding the instructional and curricular role of librarians. When Ithaka S + R, a consulting and research service, compared the responses of faculty members from its 2009 survey with the responses of U.S. academic library directors in its 2010 survey, it found:

> On one hand, faculty respondents place strong value in the traditional functions of the library as an institution that collects and maintains collections for research, while library directors focus more on the services that they provide to users, including students, teachers, and researchers. . . . Significantly, a smaller share of the faculty members supported the library directors' strong appreciation for the library's role in teaching and learning. (Long and Schonfeld 2010, 15)

It is understandable why psychology faculty might see the primacy of their own role in developing the skills that define the multiple facets that, taken together, constitute the ACRL's construct of information literacy. Most of the components of the ACRL information literacy competency standards represent goals and outcomes that are actually foundational to, and embedded in, the courses that the faculty themselves currently develop and deliver. Examine the American Psychological Association's *APA Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major* (APA 2007). One can easily find in this APA document, reflecting "a set of optimal expectations for performance at the completion of the baccalaureate degree by students who major in psychology" (APA 2007, v) all the psychology information literacy standards and learning outcomes outlined in the ACRL's 2010 psychology undergraduate information literacy standards document. Gretchen Revie (2003) created a webpage showing the explicit connections between the APA's undergraduate psychology learning goals and outcomes and the ACRL's (2000) information literacy competency standards for higher education.

Psychology faculty members are not the only faculty that may perceive the primacy of their role, and the supportive role played by librarians, in developing the multiple elements defining the frame of information literacy. Boon, Johnston, and Webber (2007) engaged in a large phenomenographic study that sought to describe the conceptions of information literacy held by United Kingdom faculty members in four disciplines: English, marketing, chemistry, and civil engineering. They published one paper devoted solely to the information literacy conceptions of English faculty. For those faculty members, the focus of the first conception of information literacy was accessing and retrieving textual information.

The concept of information literacy was often limited to retrieval skills, which was differentiated from the use and manipulation of the acquired information, actions that were described in disciplinary terms, for example, "close reading." The focus of those faculty members' second conception of information literacy was being able to use information communication technology (ICT) to access and retrieve information. The focus of those faculty members' third conception of information literacy was on possessing basic research skills and knowing how and when to use them. These basic research skills were often described holistically as "bibliographic skills" or "library skills." Again, the focus was on information access and retrieval skills, and not the use or interpretation of the acquired information. The focus of those faculty members' fourth conception of information literacy was on becoming confident, autonomous learners and critical thinkers. Emphasis was "placed on critical analysis, questioning processes and evaluating results. . . [students] need to be able to work out . . . and then derive a sort of critical reading, critical opinion of what they've found from what they've seen" (Boon et al. 2007, 218, 219).

 But whose responsibility is it to provide support for the development of "critical reading skills"? In this paper, Boon, Johnston, and Webber do not address this question. However, Webber, Boon, and Johnston (2005), in a paper comparing conceptions of information literacy of UK academics in the disciplines of English and marketing, add another observation about English faculty members. While some English academics identify critical thinking as key to their conception of information literacy, "others explicitly claimed sense making aspects and critical analysis as being part of English, not as part of information literacy. These aspects are seen as part of disciplinary learning" (14).

Hine, Gollin, Ozols, Hill, and Scoufis (2002) describe a project to develop information literacy skills in a cohort of 340 students in an undergraduate psychology course at the University of Western Sydney in Australia. They embedded information literacy instruction in the course via a collaborative partnership between subject lecturers, academic learning advisors, and librarians. Information literacy concepts were "explicitly incorporated into course and subject learning outcomes, and embedded into teaching and learning strategies as well as assessment processes" (103). In a table laying out the agreed- upon information literacy objectives and which partners were primarily responsible for each objective, librarians were responsible primarily for the objectives related to the discovery and acquisition of information: consider and list keywords; consider sources of information, traditional and nontraditional; construct simple search strategies using the Boolean "AND" operator; apply these search strategies to catalogues and electronic indexes; and identify a wide variety of types of information that relate to unit theory and research (104). The information literacy objective "identify information needs" was seen by the authors as the primary responsibility of librarians and academic learning advisors, with subject lecturers not mentioned. This is perhaps surprising, as one could see the subject lecturer framing the students' needs for information for each project. The other components of the information literacy construct (the evaluation and use of information) were mostly the primary responsibility of subject lecturers, with some assistance from academic learning advisors: link critical reading and thinking with theory and practice; encourage students to reflect on the development of their own information literacy; analyze, synthesize, organize, communicate, and critically evaluate information; develop reflective

thinking skills and critical reflection; analyze and interpret the quality and relevance of the subject information in relation to practical observations, underpinning theory and research (104). This collaborative model for course development seems ideal. All elements of the information literacy construct were consciously addressed (define need for information; discover and access information; evaluate information; use information) and instructional support staff (librarians and academic learning advisors) were engaged in the planning of the entire course and in the delivery of instruction *in their areas of expertise*.

Psychology professors Judith Larkin and Harvey Pines (2005) offer a case study in "developing information literacy and research skills in introductory psychology." What they call the "information literacy assignment" part of the project focused on facilitating information retrieval from library subscription databases. Online information retrieval is a narrower conception of the construct of information literacy than that elucidated by the ACRL, but very much in accord with how disciplinary faculty might conceive of the concept. Larkin and Pines's information literacy assignment addresses the ACRL's second psychology information literacy standard, "The information literate psychology student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently." The most interesting thing about their case study is that what they call the "information literacy assignment" is actually embedded in a larger student research project that cultivates additional student learning outcomes that, in fact, mirror the other three strands of the ACRL's psychology information literacy construct, that is, that students should be able to recognize the need for information, as well as be able to evaluate and use the information found. These professors do not see these latter three standards as components of something called "information literacy," but rather as being "intrinsic and necessary part[s] of students' learning the research methods of an academic discipline" (41).

Librarians have wrapped the phrase "information literacy" around the preceding four standards. Having traditionally been seen as the information stewards of their communities, librarians are now using the information literacy construct to justify expanding their instructional roles in colleges. However, at least three of these information literacy standards are integral to understanding and learning any discipline, and the position can easily be taken that it is disciplinary faculty members who bear the primary responsibility of designing and delivering instruction that helps students realize the need for information and nurtures their ability to evaluate and use information. As Barbara Fister observed in her *Library Journal Academic Newswire* column on December 15, 2011:

> In my experience, faculty admire librarians' know-how, but feel this thing we call information literacy—the ability to frame a question, seek information, make informed choices among sources, and use them effectively—is their job. When students fail to choose and use sources well, faculty don't blame us. But they also don't expect us to instill these skills, not when it's something they ask students to do all the time.

METHOD

Participants

Twenty-five Eastern Michigan University (EMU) Psychology Department tenure-track faculty members and full-time lecturers were asked via e-mail to participate in an anonymous survey, accessed via a link to SurveyMonkey.com. The Eastern Michigan University Psychology Department has 22 full-time tenure-track faculty members and three full-time lecturers. The department offers an undergraduate major (30 credit hours) and minor (20 credit hours) in psychology, three master's programs (experimental, general clinical, clinical behavioral), and a PhD (doctoral) program in clinical psychology. The psychology major is the second most popular major at EMU, with more than 700 declared majors. The author is an EMU librarian serving as the library liaison to the Psychology Department, providing instructional and research support services to students and faculty members. The Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee approved the project.

Procedure

The faculty members were told the survey was to assess how well the ACRL psychology information literacy standards' performance indicators resonate with current practice in the Eastern Michigan University (EMU) Psychology Department. A link was provided to the five pages of psychology information literacy standards, performance indicators, and outcomes on the ACRL web site. The survey entailed looking at each of the 11 undergraduate psychology information literacy performance indicators:

1. Student defines and articulates the need for information.
2. Student understands basic research methods and scholarly communication patterns in psychology necessary to select relevant resources.
3. Student understands the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information.
4. Student elects the most appropriate sources for accessing the needed information.
5. Student constructs and implements effectively designed search strategies.
6. Student effectively organizes and credits information sources.
7. Student summarizes the main ideas to be extracted from the information gathered and synthesizes to construct new ideas.
8. Student combines critical and creative thinking, implementing the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes.
9. Student compares new information with prior knowledge to determine its value, contradictions, or other unique characteristics.
10. Student applies new and prior information to the planning and creation of a particular project, paper, or presentation.
11. Student communicates the product effectively to others.

For each indicator, faculty members were asked to respond to three questions:

1. How important is this performance indicator as part of the curriculum for EMU undergraduate psychology students?
2. How important is it for psychology faculty to design and deliver instruction that supports this

performance indicator?

3. How important is it for a librarian to work with psychology faculty and/or psychology students to support this performance indicator?

For each question the faculty member could select one of five responses: little or no importance; some importance; moderate importance; great importance; or very great importance.

After completing the survey, faculty members were told they could print the last page, which thanked them for their participation and said that they (or a proxy of their choosing) could bring the page to a library office manager, who would then give the bearer $10 as a "thank you" for the time taken to engage the survey.

RESULTS

Of 25 EMU Psychology Department faculty members who were invited to participate, 14 completed the survey. Table 1 shows that 50 percent or more of the psychology faculty who completed the survey thought that 10 of the 11 psychology information literacy performance indicators were of great or very great importance to the undergraduate psychology curriculum. The 11th performance indicator, "Student understands the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information," was thought to be of great or very great importance to the curriculum by 42.9 percent of respondents and of little or some importance to the curriculum by 28.5 percent of respondents.

At least 57 percent of the respondents thought that it was of great or very great importance for psychology faculty to provide instructional support for 10 of the 11 psychology information literacy performance indicators. Only 42.8 percent of the respondents thought it was of great or very great importance for psychology faculty to support the indicator "Student understands the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information."

Of the 11 performance indicators there was only one for which more psychology faculty members attributed great or very great instructional support importance to librarians (64.3 percent) than attributed that level of instructional importance to psychology faculty (57.1 percent)—"Student constructs and implements effectively designed search strategies."

For five of the 11 performance indicators, 50 percent or more of the responding psychology faculty thought it was of great or very great importance for librarians to be involved in instructional support for the indicator. These five performance indicators were:

• Student defines and articulates the need for information.
• Student understands basic research methods and scholarly communication patterns in psychology necessary to select relevant resources.
• Student elects the most appropriate sources for accessing the needed information.
• Student constructs and implements effectively-designed search strategies.
• Student effectively organizes and credits information sources.

For five of the 11 performance indicators, more psychology faculty members thought that it was of little or some importance for librarians to be involved in instructional support for that indicator than that it was of great or very great importance for librarians to be involved in instructional support for the indicator. The five performance indicators were:

• Student understands the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information.
• Student summarizes the main ideas to be extracted from the information gathered and synthesizes to construct new ideas.
• Student combines critical and creative thinking, implementing the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes.
• Student compares new information with prior knowledge to determine its value, contradictions, or other unique characteristics.
• Student applies new and prior information to the planning and creation of a particular project, paper, or presentation.

DISCUSSION

Responding Psychology Department faculty members saw curricular value in the psychology information literacy performance indicators—10 of the 11 psychology information literacy performance indicators were thought to be of great or very great importance to the undergraduate curriculum by more than 50 percent of the Psychology Department faculty. Responding Psychology Department faculty valued their role in providing instruction to support the information literacy performance indicators— more than 50 percent of the faculty thought that it was of great or very great importance for psychology faculty to provide instructional support to develop and nurture the skills measured by the same 10 of the 11 psychology information literacy performance indicators. Responding Psychology Department faculty saw librarians having a role working with psychology faculty and students in supporting all 11 of the performance indicators. For 5 of the 11 information literacy performance indicators more than 50 percent of the responding psychology faculty thought it was of great or very great importance that librarians provide instructional support, including defining information need, understanding scholarly communication patterns, selecting sources for accessing information, implementing a search strategy, and crediting information sources. However, for 9 of the 11 performance indicators more psychology faculty valued their instructional role as of great or very great importance than valued the instructional role of librarians at that level of importance. Only for the performance indicator "Student constructs and implements effectively designed search strategies" did more psychology faculty say that librarians had great or very great importance in supporting the indicator than said that psychology faculty had that level of importance in supporting the indicator.

Eastern Michigan University Psychology Department faculty perceive librarians as having a supportive role in developing the elements of information literacy, particularly in areas relating to understanding scholarly communication, search tools, search strategy, and documenting sources. Nevertheless, for the responding EMU Psychology Department faculty members, the strands of information literacy are

primarily in their hands. What do librarians bring to the table to develop the dexterities that are collected under the framework of information literacy?

First, the professional training of librarians leads both students and faculty to look to them for assistance with the discovery and delivery of the creative and informative works of others (psychology information literacy standard 2). Librarians share with disciplinary faculty a common culture of seeking out and critically evaluating new ideas and evidence to help make better sense of the world. Librarians strive to facilitate the identification and acquisition of relevant content and, at the same time, are attentive to the problems people encounter when they attempt to tap into communication/information networks. Disciplinary faculty and librarians can share their perspectives on the information search process to enrich and improve instructional activities that advance student learning.

Second, librarians are in an interesting position relative to disciplinary faculty. Students approach librarians asking for help with faculty- designed assignments. Since librarians do not evaluate and award grades to students, students are often candid with librarians about their level of understanding, or lack of understanding, of the subjects they are working with, and of exactly what their teachers are asking of them. Librarians are well situated to perceive the gaps between faculty expectations of student knowledge and skills and actual student understanding and abilities. While disciplinary faculty themselves often see these gaps in their own students, adding the perspective of librarians should expand the number of students whose academic needs are understood and for whom academic interventions are applied. Librarians also see the specific challenges students encounter as they strive to complete the projects that faculty design for them. For example, as noted in the University of Minnesota Libraries' *Improving Student Research: A Faculty/Instructor Guide* (2008, 8), "Librarians can be wonderful 'debuggers,' making sure that the research component of . . . [an] assignment is doable and that there aren't any unforeseen roadblocks in the way." Further, since librarians share with faculty the desire to help students develop their ability to find, evaluate, and use information, librarians can collaborate with faculty to craft student activities and assignments that facilitate these learning outcomes. For example, the Memorial University Libraries, Newfoundland, Canada (2010), provides faculty with ideas for library/information assignments that offer students opportunities (in addition to the traditional term/research paper) to develop their skills in finding, evaluating, and using information.

The questions in this survey of EMU psychology faculty asked about the importance of information literacy elements in the undergraduate psychology curriculum and about the importance of providing support for information literacy instruction by psychology faculty and librarians. Further research could extend the survey to psychology faculty at other institutions. In addition, research could follow up with questions about how much is actually delivered to students in terms of instruction that fosters the skills that comprise the construct of information literacy and whether that instruction enhances those skills. Weetman DaCosta's (2010, 216) research reveals there was about a 33 percent gap between the number of faculty members who said they wanted their students to acquire information literacy skills and the number of faculty members who said they actually taught or assessed those skills in their classes. While Bury (2011, 54) reported that 93 percent of responding faculty members thought their students could benefit from receiving instruction developing information literacy competencies, she also found that

47.1 percent of faculty respondents stated that they do not incorporate information literacy instruction in their classes at all. It is as if faculty see the information literacy skills espoused by librarians as comprising a separate subject, representing content that faculty do not have instructional time for in their discipline-focused classes.

It has been argued that the learning objectives subsumed under the construct of information literacy are actually among the same core outcomes that faculty members strive to develop in their disciplinary classes. However, to insure that their students achieve these outcomes and master the component concepts and skills, faculty members must furnish students with appropriate guidance and practice (exercises and projects). Paglia and Donahue (2003) report on a pilot study of how a librarian and a psychology faculty member collaborated to integrate "information competencies" into an undergraduate psychology research methods class. They worked together to define the learning objectives and to develop activities and assignments for students to demonstrate what they learned. They began their collaboration

> by identifying [information competency] objectives in relation to course objectives, and we quickly realized that our objectives were identical. We identified the following primary objectives: first, the ability to identify and define a research topic; second, the ability to identify resources appropriate for the assignment; third, the ability to critically evaluate these resources and to synthesis [sic] this material effectively. (322)

They team taught two class periods, providing approximately five contact hours. They filled that time with brainstorming and other active-learning tasks, hands-on work in a computer lab, and an annotated bibliography assignment. Various assessment methods, including pretest/posttest surveys, reflected the success of the interventions. What stands out is the amount of instructional time devoted to multiple exercises that developed these skills that are critical for learning psychology research methods (and vital for learning most other disciplines as well). Librarian involvement was indeed helpful to both the psychology faculty member and the students. With or without the collaboration of librarians, disciplinary faculty should insure that enough time is devoted to educational transactions that provide students opportunities to understand and acquire these skills. To obtain that time, disciplinary faculty might even reassess the content they include in their courses. Saunders (2012) interviewed a biology professor who said that her department completely restructured the introductory course, partly in response to a perceived need to address information literacy concepts. They threw out half the content of the course and spend more time teaching students how to obtain, interpret, and use data. Thaxton, Faccioli, and Mosby (2004) reported some success shaping student information literacy skills in an undergraduate psychology research methods course when four contact hours over two class periods were devoted to instruction and hands-on exploits. The availability and willingness of librarians to collaborate with and support both disciplinary faculty and students in advancing these skills makes for a more robust community of learners, enhancing the effectiveness of faculty and increasing the likelihood of student growth and transformation.

REFERENCES

American Psychological Association. 2007. *APA guidelines for the undergraduate psychology major*. http://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/about/psymajorguidelines.pdf (accessed July 7, 2012).

 Association of College and Research Libraries. 2000. *Information literacy competency standards for higher education*. http://www.ala.org/ala/ mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/standards.pdf (accessed July 7, 2012).

Association of College and Research Libraries. 2010. *Psychology information literacy standards*. http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/psych_info_lit (accessed July 7, 2012).

Boon, Stuart, Bill Johnston, and Sheila Webber. 2007. A phenomenographic study of English faculty's conceptions of information literacy. *Journal of Documentation* 63(2): 204–28.

Bury, Sophie. 2011. Faculty attitudes, perceptions and experiences of information literacy: A study across multiple disciplines at York University, Canada. *Journal of Information Literacy* 5(1): 45–64.

Fister, Barbara. 2011. Information literacy: Undervalued or ubiquitous? *Library Journal Academic Newswire*, December 15. http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2011/ 12/opinion/barbara-?ster/information-literacy-undervalued-or-ubiquitous-peerto-peer-review (accessed July 7, 2012).

Gullikson, Shelley. 2006. Faculty perceptions of ACRL's information literacy competency standards for higher education. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32(6): 583–92.

Hine, Alison, Sandra Gollin, Anita Ozols, Frank Hill, and Michele Scoufis. 2002. Embedding information literacy in a university subject through collaborative partnerships. *Psychology Learning and Teaching* 2(2): 102–7.

Larkin, Judith E., and Harvey A. Pines. 2005. Developing information literacy and research skills in introductory psychology: A case study. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 31(1): 40–45.

Long, Mathew P., and Roger C. Schonfeld. 2010. *Ithaka S + R library survey 2010: Insights from U.S. academic library directors*. http://www.sr.ithaka.org/researchpublications/library-survey-2010/ (accessed July 7, 2012).

Memorial University Libraries (Newfoundland, Canada). 2010. *Ideas for library/information assignments*. http://www.library.mun.ca/qeii/instruction/ assignment_ideas.php (accessed July 7, 2012).

Meriam Library, California State University, Chico. 2010. *Evaluating information—Applying the CRAAP test*. http://www.csuchico.edu/lins/handouts/eval_websites. pdf (accessed July 7, 2012).

Oakleaf, Megan. 2010. *Value of academic libraries: A comprehensive research review and report*. http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/issues/value/val_report.pdf (accessed July 7, 2012).

O'Connor, Lisa. 2009a. Information literacy as professional legitimation: The quest for a new jurisdiction. *Library Review* 58(7): 493–508.

O'Connor, Lisa. 2009b. Information literacy as professional legitimation: The quest for professional jurisdiction. *Library Review* 58(4): 272–89.

Paglia, Alison, and Annie Donahue. 2003. Collaboration works: Integrating information competencies into the psychology curricula. *Reference Services Review* 31(4): 320–28.

Revie, Gretchen. 2003. *Connections between the APA undergraduate psychology learning goals and outcomes and the ACRL information literacy competency standards for higher education*. http://www.lawrence.edu/fast/revieg/ acminfolit/apa.html (accessed July 7, 2012).

Saunders, Laura. 2012. Faculty perspectives on information literacy as a student learning outcome. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 38(4): 226–36.

Thaxton, Lyn, Mary Beth Faccioli, and Ann Page Mosby. 2004. Leveraging collaboration for information literacy in psychology. *Reference Services Review* 32(4): 185–89.

University of Minnesota Libraries. 2008. *Improving student research: A faculty/instructor guide*. http://www.lib.umn.edu/research/instruction/guides/ FacultyGuide.pdf (accessed July 7, 2012).

Webber, Sheila, Stuart Boon, and Bill Johnston. 2005. A comparison of UK academics' conceptions of information literacy in two disciplines: English and marketing. *Library & Information Research* 29(93): 4–15.

Weetman DaCosta, Jacqui. 2010. Is there an information literacy skills gap to be bridged? An examination of faculty perceptions and activities relating to information literacy in the United States and England. *College & Research Libraries* 71(3): 203–22.

Table 1

Percentage of Psychology Faculty Attributing Great/Very Great, Moderate, or Little/Some Importance to the Curricular Importance, Faculty Instructional Involvement, and Librarian Instructional Involvement in Supporting 11 ACRL Psychology Information Literacy Performance Indicators

Student defines and articulates the need for information

	Curriculum Importance	Psychology Faculty Instructional Involvement	Librarian Instructional Involvement
Great/Very Great Importance	50.0%	64.3%	64.3%
Moderate Importance	42.9%	28.6%	21.4%
Little/Some Importance	7.1%	7.1%	14.3%

Student understands basic research methods and scholarly communication patterns in psychology necessary to select relevant resources

	Curriculum Importance	Psychology Faculty Instructional Involvement	Librarian Instructional Involvement
Great/Very Great Importance	78.5%	78.6%	57.1%
Moderate Importance	14.4%	14.3%	28.6%
Little/Some Importance	7.1%	7.1%	14.3%

Student understands the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information

	Curriculum Importance	Psychology Faculty Instructional Involvement	Librarian Instructional Involvement
Great/Very Great Importance	42.9%	42.8%	28.6%
Moderate Importance	28.6%	28.7%	28.5%
Little/Some Importance	28.5%	28.5%	42.9%

Student elects the most appropriate sources for accessing the needed information

	Curriculum Importance	Psychology Faculty Instructional Involvement	Librarian Instructional Involvement
Great/Very Great Importance	78.6%	78.6%	64.3%
Moderate Importance	21.4%	21.4%	35.7%
Little/Some Importance	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Student constructs and implements effectively-designed search strategies

	Curriculum Importance	Psychology Faculty Instructional Involvement	Librarian Instructional Involvement
Great/Very Great Importance	64.3%	57.1%	64.3%
Moderate Importance	28.6%	42.9%	21.5%
Little/Some Importance	7.1%	0.0%	14.2%

Student effectively organizes and credits information sources

	Curriculum Importance	Psychology Faculty Instructional Involvement	Librarian Instructional Involvement
Great/Very Great Importance	78.6%	78.6%	50.0%
Moderate Importance	14.3%	14.3%	21.4%
Little/Some Importance	7.1%	7.1%	28.6%

Student summarizes the main ideas to be extracted from the information gathered and synthesizes to construct new ideas

	Curriculum Importance	Psychology Faculty Instructional Involvement	Librarian Instructional Involvement
Great/Very Great Importance	71.5%	78.6%	35.7%
Moderate Importance	28.5%	21.4%	21.4%
Little/Some Importance	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%

Student combines critical and creative thinking, implementing the scientific approach to solve problems related to behavior and mental processes

	Curriculum Importance	Psychology Faculty Instructional Involvement	Librarian Instructional Involvement
Great/Very Great Importance	78.5%	78.6%	35.7%
Moderate Importance	14.4%	14.3%	14.3%
Little/Some Importance	7.1%	7.1%	50.0%

Student compares new information with prior knowledge to determine its value, contradictions, or other unique characteristics

	Curriculum Importance	Psychology Faculty Instructional Involvement	Librarian Instructional Involvement
Great/Very Great Importance	71.5%	78.6%	35.7%
Moderate Importance	21.4%	14.3%	14.3%
Little/Some Importance	7.1%	7.1%	50.0%

Student applies new and prior information to the planning and creation of a particular project, paper, or presentation

	Curriculum Importance	Psychology Faculty Instructional Involvement	Librarian Instructional Involvement
Great/Very Great Importance	71.4%	71.4%	35.7%
Moderate Importance	21.5%	21.5%	21.5%
Little/Some Importance	7.1%	7.1%	42.8%

Student communicates the product effectively to others

	Curriculum Importance	Psychology Faculty Instructional Involvement	Librarian Instructional Involvement
Great/Very Great Importance	64.3%	78.6%	35.7%
Moderate Importance	28.6%	14.3%	28.6%

| Little/Some Importance | 7.1% | 7.1% | 35.7% |