

Training and Education of Library Instruction Librarians

SHARON ANNE HOGAN

FROM THE MOMENT OF REBIRTH of the bibliographic instruction (BI) movement in 1967, practicing librarians have voiced a persistent, indeed almost fervent, need for specialized education and training. The response by the library profession to this perceived need has been twofold: first, a dynamic and expanding program of continuing education by and for the practicing professional, and second, a campaign by those same professionals to incorporate training for bibliographic instruction into the curricula of the library schools.

The thrust of the BI education effort over the past decade has been in the area of continuing education, as evidenced by an ever-increasing number of programs, conferences and workshops devoted exclusively to bibliographic instruction. The efforts have been reinforced by other responses as well: library association committees devoted solely to education; clearinghouses established to exchange materials and ideas; continuing education seminars offered by library schools; a wealth of writing and publishing on techniques, methodology and local implementation; and most recently, a move toward in-service training programs by individual libraries. It is a remarkable history, one that could not have been written without the determination of countless individual librarians to equip themselves and others with the skills necessary to plan and implement a program of bibliographic instruction. It was

Sharon Anne Hogan is Assistant to the Director, University of Michigan Library, Ann Arbor.

Convinced that bibliographic instruction should be a component of public services, frustrated at having to implement instruction programs with no prior training, and incredulous that new library school graduates continued to lack skills in or even knowledge of bibliographic instruction, practicing librarians gradually began to pressure library schools to include instruction as a topic in the curriculum. Surveys of library schools, a conference devoted to the place of library instruction in the MLS curriculum, proposals in the literature for the adoption of courses on the topic, and a national committee charged with encouraging the formal teaching of bibliographic instruction—all these developments demonstrate the depth of recent concern for this critical aspect of library education. In spite of this activity, there is still a dearth of formal training for bibliographic instruction in library schools.

That interest in specialized training for bibliographic instruction has persisted and increased throughout the 1970s validates the demands of the early practitioners. Furthermore, the continued expansion of instruction programs in libraries around the country, the prevalence of BI training as a criterion for public service positions, and the introduction of in-service training programs by individual libraries suggest a growing market; yet the question of who should meet the demand of the market remains unresolved. This is an appropriate time to review the past contributions of continuing education to the BI movement, to survey the current mix of continuing and formal education, and then to assess the ability of the status quo to supply the profession with manpower skilled in the techniques of bibliographic instruction.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

The elaborate network of educational opportunities that exists today began to crystallize with the establishment of the American Library Association standing committee on Instruction in the Use of Libraries in 1967. Since then, the growth and pattern of continuing education opportunities has closely paralleled the institutionalization of the bibliographic instruction movement by the profession.¹ In fact, the phenomenal organizational growth can only be rivaled by the equally phenomenal growth of educational opportunities. In retrospect, one might hypothesize that one of the driving forces behind institutionalization was the need to establish a basis for the production of programs, conferences and seminars.

The American Library Association is perhaps the premier example

Training and Education of Librarians

of organizational diversification, with no less than eight separate units devoted to library use education.² The Instruction in the Use of Libraries Committee oversees and coordinates the activities of the other units. It is charged to review on a continuing basis activities within ALA which center on instruction, to encourage instruction activities within the units of ALA, to coordinate activities as they develop, and to act as a clearinghouse for information on significant programs of instruction.³ The committee membership represents a cross section of librarians from all ALA divisions, including public, elementary, secondary, college, and research librarians, library administrators, and library educators. Its broadly based membership, it was hoped, would enable the committee to identify problems common to all types of library instruction, and to coordinate the development of a continuum of library skills from kindergarten to college.

One of the early goals of instruction librarians was the establishment of a clearinghouse for instructional materials and ideas. It was hoped that such a mechanism would foster a productive exchange of materials among librarians already involved with instruction, as well as assist those who wished to establish instructional programs; in effect, it was to serve an educational function. The charge to the ALA Instruction in the Use of Libraries Committee, formulated in 1967, formalized the desire for a clearinghouse and identified a body to carry out the activity. Although a formal clearinghouse was not successfully established under the auspices of this committee, the climate of cooperation and support promoted by it was an early barometer of the organizational spirit of the instruction movement.

Contributions of the Instruction in the Use of Libraries Committee ranged beyond the scope of committee work. In 1972 at the ALA annual conference in Chicago, the committee sponsored a Show-and-Tell Clinic intended to introduce librarians to multimedia programs and equipment. With hundreds of items available for demonstration, resource people on hand for consultation, and 2000 librarians attending, the program was rated an overwhelming success.⁴ It was but the beginning of an avalanche of programs, workshops and conferences aimed at the needs of this audience.

Program meetings and regular committee meetings of the Instruction in the Use of Libraries Committee served as magnets for those interested in library instruction. A large number were academic librarians, and eventually a "critical mass" developed which led to the formation of yet another organizational unit. In 1971 the Executive Board of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) passed a

draft resolution establishing an Ad Hoc Committee on Bibliographic Instruction. It was charged "to consider the possibility of establishing a clearinghouse for information on instructional programs currently in operation; to explore methods of evaluating existing programs and materials; and to investigate the need for research into problems connected with instructional programs."⁵

The charge "to consider the possibility of establishing a clearinghouse" reflects the failure of the Instruction in the Use of Libraries Committee to fulfill that part of their charge to the satisfaction of academic librarians. There was still a need to learn about library instruction programs that had been successfully established, and neither the literature nor continuing education opportunities were at this time fulfilling that need. In 1972, Project LOEX (Library Orientation/Instruction Exchange), a clearinghouse located at Eastern Michigan University, established the exchange mechanism desired by academic librarians. With the formation of LOEX and the publication of a detailed survey of library instruction programs,⁶ the Ad Hoc Committee concentrated on developing a statement of instructional objectives for college-level library programs. The objectives were intended to serve as guidelines for librarians planning and implementing bibliographic instruction programs, and to stand as a bench mark in the process of defining bibliographic instruction needs at various educational levels.⁷

The work of this committee sparked much interest among librarians, especially those from college and university libraries. The Ad Hoc Committee, officially designated a Task Force on Bibliographic Instruction by ACRL in January 1974, concentrated its activities on committee work. Only occasionally did it venture into other areas, such as the cosponsorship with the ALA Instruction in the Use of Libraries Committee, the ACRL Community and Junior College Libraries Section Committee on Instruction and Use, and Project LOEX of a one-day Consultants Program for instruction librarians at the Library Instruction Resource/Hospitality Center, Chicago, in 1976. Like the Instruction in the Use of Libraries Committee, however, the task force unwittingly became a communications center, serving as a news broker for academic instruction activities around the country. Programs, workshops and clearinghouse activities were first announced, then reported on as part of committee business until the reporting of activities threatened to swallow all of the committee's allotted working time. Attendance at committee meetings—which were intended to be working sessions and not program meetings—grew beyond the boundaries of

Training and Education of Librarians

assigned rooms, with the overflow spilling into the halls nearby. It was evident that there was a very large audience interested in the library instruction movement and that another forum was needed to accommodate increased participation.

In June 1977 the task force formally dissolved but, phoenix-like, was reborn as the Bibliographic Instruction Section (BIS) within the Association of College and Research Libraries. In the first six months the new section attracted over 2600 members. From the beginning, education and training were acclaimed as top priorities. The BIS steering committee established five standing committees, including both a Committee on Continuing Education and a Committee on Education, and also provided for ad hoc committees devoted to programming and preconferences.

In addition to BIS, there are presently two other units within ACRL devoted to bibliographic instruction. The Community and Junior College Libraries Section (CJCLS) Committee on Instruction and Use, organized in the mid-1960s, is charged to survey materials being used for instruction in two-year college libraries and to evaluate commercially available aids for library instruction.⁸ The committee has been particularly active in programming and often sponsors a day-long workshop on some aspect of instruction at ALA annual meetings. The Education and Behavioral Sciences Section Committee on Bibliographic Instruction for Educators was created in 1977. The charge of this committee is very specific with regard to the tools of education and behavioral science and to the special needs of education librarians serving teacher education programs.⁹ These two committees have a narrower focus than that of the ACRL Bibliographic Instruction Section, and librarians drawn to them have specialized needs and interests.

The BI groups within ACRL have in common the academic setting, unlike the remaining four units within ALA that have identified an interest in bibliographic instruction. Three of these—Evaluation of School Media Programs Committee (within the American Association of School Librarians), Education for Information Science and Automation Committee (within the Library and Information Technology Association), and Education Task Force (within the Government Documents Round Table)—serve the needs of their respective ALA constituencies and indicate the wide range of BI activity in the profession. The fourth and largest of these units is the Library Instruction Round Table (LIRT), formed in January 1977 at the same time as the ACRL Bibliographic Instruction Section. Although each sprang from the same organizational momentum and have many members in com-

mon, the purposes and goals of each unit are quite distinct. The ACRL Bibliographic Instruction Section speaks to one audience, focusing its energy and attention on the commonality of the problems encountered in academic libraries. As part of the policy-making chain of the American Library Association, BIS may propose guidelines and standards for adoption first by ACRL and then by ALA, and in return may call upon the prestige and legitimacy of ALA when needed. LIRT, on the other hand, while affiliated with ALA, is not part of the policy-making chain. It encourages membership from all library fields regardless of division allegiance and invites participation through its low membership fee. A small portion of the fee goes to ALA, but the majority of the funds can be used for programming, workshops and communication among members via a newsletter. The LIRT charge reflects the intended broader membership, emphasis on programming, and a direct concern with the education and training of librarians: "To provide a forum for discussion of activities, programs, and problems of instruction in the use of libraries; to contribute to the education and training of librarians for library instruction; to promote instruction in the use of libraries as an essential library service; and to serve as a channel of communication on library instruction between the ALA divisions, ALA and ACRL committees, state clearinghouses, Project LOEX, [and] other organizations."¹⁰

The record of programs, day-long workshops, preconferences, and publications sponsored by the various committees, sections and round tables is indeed impressive. As more units have been formed within ALA, the number of such offerings has continued to increase, presenting a veritable cornucopia of learning experiences for the conference-goer. For example, in 1979 the ALA conference in Dallas offered a two-day preconference on library instruction sponsored by ACRL BIS, a half-day workshop entitled "The Learning in Learning Resources" sponsored by ACRL CJCLS, five programs on instruction, and twenty-two committee meetings.¹¹

Although nearly 10,000 librarians attend the ALA annual conferences, a national organization cannot hope to meet the needs of all librarians. National involvement does not appeal to many librarians; for others, the expense is prohibitive. As the library instruction movement gained momentum in the United States, librarians interested in bibliographic instruction began to congregate at meetings of regional and state library associations.

Of the regional library associations, those of New England, the Southeast, and the Southwest have developed the strongest and most

Training and Education of Librarians

active library instruction committees. Just as at the national level, BI librarians met at committees dedicated to reference or public service, then splintered off to form separate, identifiable units. In 1974 the ACRL New England Chapter presented a day-long workshop on instruction. In 1975 a Bibliographic Instruction Committee was formed within the chapter. Also in 1975, the Southeastern Library Association (SELA) Reference and Adult Services Section presented a one-day workshop on instruction. In 1977 the Library Orientation and Bibliographic Instruction Committee was formed within SELA. The Southwest Library Association (SWLA) accepted the application of the Interest Group for Educating the Library User for affiliation with SWLA in 1975. Directories of library instruction programs have been published by SWLA, SELA, and the ACRL New England chapter, and the last two have also established regional clearinghouses. Quadrennial meetings of the Midwest Federation of Library Associations have offered day-long programs devoted to library instruction in 1975 and 1979.

At the close of 1979, twenty state associations had embraced library instruction to the extent that a clearinghouse had been established, a survey of instruction programs conducted, or a directory published. Many others have sponsored workshops or programs at state conventions.¹² Once formed, bibliographic instruction units within regional and state library associations have continued to provide programs and workshops devoted to library instruction on an annual or biennial basis, capitalizing on geographic proximity to encourage frequent meetings and idea exchanges among practitioners.

The programs, conferences and workshops under the auspices of national, regional or state library associations have been organized primarily *by* practicing instruction librarians *for* practicing instruction librarians. Three other sources of continuing education programs can be identified: library schools, institutions of higher education and independent conferences.

Continuing education programs of library schools provide short course offerings which relate directly to the trends and issues of the moment. As the instruction movement has spread, library schools have responded by offering workshops for instruction librarians, such as those sponsored by Drexel University (Teaching the Library User, 1979); Columbia University (Educating Library Users Today, 1978); and University of Kentucky (Bibliographic Instruction Workshop, 1977). In some cases workshops offered through the continuing education programs of library schools are aimed at a broader population, but become very relevant to instruction librarians. Examples are workshops

at University of Denver (Media Production, Supervision and Execution, 1977, and Grantsmanship, 1977); Rutgers University (Statistical Methods for Professional Librarians, 1979); Drexel University (Measuring the Library Use of Young Adults, 1979); and Kansas State University (Open Learning and Non-Traditional Study, 1978).

Institutions of higher education often have adjunct specialized programs which offer aid to faculty or staff in developing teaching skills or adapting new technology to the classroom. For instance, the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan offers workshops to the university community on a wide variety of topics: evaluation, large group discussions, personalized system of instruction, small group discussions, utilization of microcomputers in learning and teaching, lecture improvement, and transparency production. Instruction librarians at the University of Michigan have participated in these programs regularly and found them to be of benefit not only with respect to the personal skills acquired, but also as a vehicle to meet other faculty or staff interested in the area of learning skills.

Independent conferences, those not held in conjunction with professional meetings, are of two types: national meetings geared for large audiences which cover issues of broad concern, and seminar-like gatherings intended to focus on one library's instruction program or one teaching technique. The oldest of the national independent conferences is the Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries held at Eastern Michigan University since 1971. The annual Southeastern Conference on Approaches to Bibliographic Instruction, hosted by the College of Charleston, South Carolina, began in 1978 and the third conference was held in March 1980. Both conferences attract librarians from states outside the immediate region (attendance is limited to 150); the Michigan conference has recently begun to attract librarians from foreign countries as well. These independent gatherings of librarians who desire to meet and talk apart from the hoopla of other conventions symbolize the grassroots nature of the entire library instruction movement. Conferences sponsored by a single library, while less frequent, are, nevertheless, an interesting phenomenon of the instruction movement. "Use of Media," sponsored by the University of Michigan Undergraduate Library (1975), and "Librarians, Faculty, and Bibliographic Instruction: A Workshop," sponsored by Earlham College (1979), are examples of these smaller conference-seminar meetings.

As the number of separate, identifiable bodies within professional organizations has grown, so has the number of educational offerings, and the popularity of bibliographic instruction has in turn generated

Training and Education of Librarians

even more educational opportunities. Advertisements for workshops, institutes, conferences, or programs dealing specifically with instruction totaled thirty-seven in 1979 (see appendix). Seven of these were held at the national level by professional associations, three at the regional level, and twenty-one at the state level. Two were hosted by library schools, one by a university, and three were independent conferences. If one added to this list other workshops potentially applicable to library instruction and offerings restricted to staff of institutions of higher education, the quantity of educational opportunities in a given year is staggering. It is not only the availability, however, but the accessibility of educational opportunities in geographically convenient locations that has been an important factor in developing the continuity and momentum of the bibliographic instruction movement. Ideas acquired by attendance at national meetings or workshops are transmitted to others at regional or state meetings. Ideas popular in one locale are disseminated to the country via clearinghouse exchanges or national meetings. The cycle is continual and the cross-fertilization is healthy.

While quantity and accessibility of educational opportunities are considerations, it is, after all, the substance of the workshops, conferences and programs which draws the audience and becomes both a response to and reflection of the needs of that audience. A survey of the themes of continuing education programs for bibliographic instruction librarians over the past decade shows a distinct shift in emphasis. Programs held in the late 1960s and early 1970s were characterized by the emphasis on introducing the library profession at large to the practice of bibliographic instruction and to the notion that librarians could teach. In 1966, the ALA Preconference on Library Orientation Programs in New York highlighted orientation by audiovisual methods, but the discussion turned to questions of the value, timing and need for more than orientation by students, and the role of the librarian in providing something else.¹³ Papers delivered at the first Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries in 1971 continued to explore the role of the librarian in the academic learning environment.¹⁴ The informational, inquiring, "what is bibliographic instruction?" theme of the early 1970s was quickly replaced with a concern for technique, methodology and evaluation. The ALA Instruction in the Use of Libraries Committee's Show-and-Tell Clinic in 1972 demonstrating the new audiovisual technologies, the University of Denver conference "Evaluating Library Use Instruction" in 1973, and the Fourth Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries in 1974, "Academic Library Instruction; Objectives, Programs, and Faculty

Involvement," signaled the change in emphasis.¹⁵ The realization by instruction librarians that BI is only one part of the large public service program of the institution has introduced the need for discussion of the organization and management of instruction programs. Several recent presentations have responded to this need.¹⁶

While there has been a gradual maturation of topics across the spectrum of continuing education offerings during the past decade, there continues to be a need for and interest in how-to workshops. For example, the 1972 ALA Show-and-Tell Clinic was a hands-on workshop for librarians wishing to view the new audiovisual hardware available for instruction. In 1976 the ACRL-BIS preconference included very practical how-to workshops on constructing workbooks, designing one-hour lectures, and integrating instruction into courses. In 1977 the California Library Association devoted a workshop to audiovisual hardware, and the ACRL New England Chapter Bibliographic Instruction Committee sponsored a workshop on signage. These workshops continue to be as popular and well attended today as they were in 1972, because the bibliographic instruction movement is still growing. Three-fourths of the participants at the May 1979 Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries had never attended the conference before. New people drawn into bibliographic instruction find basic workshops—in audiovisual techniques, videotape production, evaluation, and creation of objectives—relevant. There is a need for diversity, and certainly the wealth of educational opportunities being provided by the national, regional and state associations serves this need.

PRESENT MIX OF CONTINUING AND FORMAL EDUCATION

The most significant new trends in continuing education have been the development of internal in-service training programs by individual libraries and the proliferation of clearinghouses. The first trend has been a direct result of the growth of bibliographic instruction programs beyond the capacity of one or two persons. More staff must be involved. Expansion may be accomplished by hiring new staff; more often, however, existing staff become involved who were not so initially, either because of personal preference or assignment to other duties. Whether or not the library staff is willing to participate in instruction, there are two administrative problems: restructuring library duties and

Training and Education of Librarians

integrating staff who may or may not have teaching skills into an ongoing BI program.

In-service training allows "newcomer" librarians to acquire skills and techniques from staff who have been performing library instruction, and provides a forum in which all concerned can share experiences, discuss programmatic changes and work out problems. When a BI program expands, in-service training ensures a commonality of approach among staff and agreement as to the goals of various components of the program.

While interest in developing in-service training programs is a recent trend, it is surprisingly widespread. "Teaching Fellow Librarians to Teach," a demonstration of the in-service training program used at Cornell University, was one of the more popular workshops at the ACRL-BIS preconference on Library Instruction in June 1979, and was summarized at the third annual Southeastern Conference on Approaches to Bibliographic Instruction in March 1980.¹⁷

While workshops, conferences and in-service training programs allow the sharing of personal expertise, clearinghouses facilitate the sharing of materials. Initial interest in the clearinghouse idea, which surfaced early in the 1970s, was only momentarily assuaged by the establishment of Project LOEX in 1972. Increasing membership figures, materials deposits, demand for conference exhibits, and most importantly, exchange of materials among individual librarians reflected not only the growing number of BI programs but also the value of a clearinghouse as a mechanism for continuing education.¹⁸

The success of Project LOEX was not lost on others; regional and state clearinghouses have sprung up around the country, some specializing in type-of-library materials (e.g., elementary/secondary, community college), while others are topic-related (e.g., theology). According to a survey by the ACRL-BIS Committee on Cooperation, twenty-eight clearinghouses were functioning in 1979.¹⁹ Coordination of and cooperation among clearinghouses has now become desirable; the ACRL-BIS Committee on Cooperation Sub-Committee on Clearinghouses sponsors a discussion group for clearinghouse directors which meets twice a year at ALA meetings.

Although the history of continuing education for library instruction spans the decade of the 1970s and includes such diverse features as conferences, committees, directories, clearinghouses, and in-service training, the campaign of instruction librarians to see bibliographic instruction taught in library schools has been less successful. As early as 1971, practitioners were commenting on the lack of preparation for

library instruction in library schools,²⁰ but it was not until the middle years of the decade that the omission began to be documented. In 1975 Sue Galloway surveyed fifty-five accredited library schools in the United States. At that time only four were found to offer courses specifically on library instruction, although four others noted that they planned mini-courses in 1976-77. Thirty schools offered no course nor even part of a course incorporating library instruction.²¹ In 1977 Esther Dyer surveyed sixty-three accredited library schools and broadened the inquiry to include courses for credit, course modules or special courses for credit, and institutes offered by library schools. The survey identified sixteen schools which integrated library instruction into other courses such as reference, media, and type-of-library. As an integrated component, bibliographic instruction receives the greatest attention in school media-related programs, where the time spent per semester averages three to four classes; in literature (bibliography) and reference courses, an average of one-half to two classes is spent per term. The Dyer survey also noted new BI course offerings at University of Michigan, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, State University of New York-Albany and Kent State University, all begun since the Galloway survey.²²

The low response to the Dyer study (twenty-six schools) and the slightly broadened focus makes comparison of the surveys' results or judgments of growth between 1975 and 1977 difficult. In the interim there were modest advances in the number of full course offerings and introductions to the topic via mini-courses, independent studies, or intersession offerings.

In fall 1979, another survey of library instruction in library schools was conducted by the ACRL-BIS Committee on Education. Unpublished preliminary results indicate little change from the 1977 survey. The University of Michigan and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee continue to offer separate courses. The University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of South Carolina and Rutgers University all offered a separate course on library instruction for the first time in summer 1979. Separate courses offered by Kent State University, SUNY-Albany and Pratt Institute, which were cited in the 1977 study, were not continued. None of these separate courses has yet been adopted as a regular part of the curriculum; each has been offered as a seminar or special topic and must be approved each year.

Even though bibliographic instruction has not been overwhelmingly embraced by library schools, there certainly has been no hesitation on the part of practicing librarians to declare the necessity of including BI in the library school curriculum. In June 1975, Galloway polled

Training and Education of Librarians

librarians attending a workshop of the California Clearinghouse on Library Instruction. She asked: "Did your library school offer a course or seminar on library instruction while you were there?"; only one answered "yes." Eighty percent responded affirmatively when asked: "Do you feel a course or seminar on library instruction should be offered as part of library school curriculum now?"²³ Lubans has cited a 1978 survey of twenty-eight selected instruction librarians in which one of the questions was "Do you think library schools should provide the basic training for newly graduated librarians to be effective in front of a class and in the design of an instructional methodology for the purpose of library skills instruction?" Of all the questions asked, this received the most unanimous response. Twenty librarians responded "yes," six felt that the class should be elective and could not provide all the training necessary, and two felt that the library school was not the place to teach these skills.²⁴ The ACRL-BIS Committee on Education is currently undertaking a survey of library instruction practitioners who have graduated from library school within the last three years. The survey will inquire about the relationship of the jobs they hold to their library school training.

The formation of two separate committees within ACRL BIS devoted to the problem of education (the Committee on Continuing Education and the Committee on Education) and similar activities of other associations, such as the Committee on Education in Library Use of the Wisconsin Association of Academic Libraries, are further evidence of the conviction of practicing librarians that education and training are essential.

During the formation of ACRL BIS in 1977, the need for education and training was discussed at great length. The proposal for two separate committees caused considerable division and discussion among members of the steering committee. Some felt that two committees highlighted the importance of this topic and underscored the amount of work needed to be done. Others thought that establishment of two committees invited duplication of effort. Two distinct committees were formed, but not without the guarantee that the activities of each would be closely monitored by the BIS Executive Council in order to prevent overlap.²⁵

The Committee on Continuing Education received the following charge:

To study and review the educational needs of librarians working in the area of bibliographic instruction; to gather and disseminate to the Executive Committee information about continuing education in the

field of academic bibliographic instruction; to suggest and encourage opportunities for continuing education in academic bibliographic instruction; to provide guidelines for continuing education in the area of academic bibliographic instruction;...and to assist ACRL chapters, upon request, in developing programs on academic bibliographic instruction.²⁶

In slightly less than two years, the committee has already established a remarkable record. *Organizing and Managing a Library Instruction Program* became both a publication and the inspiration for the Preconference on Library Instruction in Dallas in 1979.²⁷ The precedent established by the BIS preconference will be continued on a biennial basis.

The ACRL Committee on Education for Bibliographic Instruction was formed "to explore, encourage, and foster the development and expansion of the study of bibliographic instruction in library schools; to promote communication between librarians working in the area of bibliographic instruction and library schools; and to survey and report to the Executive Committee on the status of library education in bibliographic instruction."²⁸ The committee began its work by conducting a survey, mentioned earlier, on the status of bibliographic instruction in library schools in order to provide current data for comparisons with older survey results. The survey will be used to serve as an indicator of the present state of bibliographic instruction in library schools, to serve as a basis for discussion with library educators, to provide a working list of schools that now offer courses or discrete modules on bibliographic instruction, and to facilitate collection of course syllabi. It is hoped that from a combination of course syllabi examination and the personal experiences of committee members, guidelines will be developed for a full course or a series of course modules on bibliographic instruction.

One goal of the Committee on Education in Library Use in Wisconsin was to promote the development of a library instruction course in one of the graduate schools of the state. Toward this end, a draft of a course proposal was circulated in 1976 among directors of library education programs and administrators of academic libraries. Comments were solicited about the validity of such a course offering. The committee's action not only supported the establishment of a course at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, but also offers insight into the attitudes of library administrators toward the need for education and training for instruction librarians. On the whole, the attitude was positive, as indicated by a quote from one respondent: "I support your appeal for exposure to 'Instruction in Library Use' in library schools. I've discovered through a quick check with our newest staff members that they, at least, did not receive this; they also felt that it should have

Training and Education of Librarians

been offered."²⁹ Another administrator's viewpoint was given as part of the Seventh Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries, "Putting Library Instruction in its Place: In the Library and in the Library School." Joseph Boisse commented that the lack of preparation of new graduates by library schools made it difficult for them to compete for jobs requiring knowledge of instruction. Among the recent graduates he had interviewed, none had an understanding of what bibliographic instruction was all about or what kinds of skills are required.³⁰

Within scarcely six months of that conference and the formation of the ACRL-BIS Committee on Education, the ALA Instruction in the Use of Libraries Committee turned to the question of formal education and training by library schools for bibliographic instruction. Bringing a broader perspective to the issue, the committee unanimously passed a resolution stating that library instruction be included in the curriculum as a requisite for library school accreditation.³¹

Although surveys, committees, course proposals, and opinions abound, there is limited discussion in the literature concerning the place of bibliographic instruction in the curricula of library schools. Approaches that could be taken by library schools to include bibliographic instruction in curricula and needs that should be addressed from the practitioner's viewpoint are discussed in papers by Beaubien, et al., Galloway, and the Committee on Education in Library Use of the Wisconsin Association of Academic Librarians.³² Justification for a full course on bibliographic instruction by a library educator and a description of the content of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee instruction course appears in *Progress in Educating the Library User*.³³ Factors behind the omission of bibliographic instruction in library school curricula were discussed by Patricia Breivik in an essay published in *Educating the Library User*.³⁴ Breivik's explanation of the absence of library instruction from the curricula was underscored by the comments of four library school deans published in the November 1976 issue of *Journal of Academic Librarianship*. The deans were asked to comment on the question "Do the deans of library schools agree on the need for library instruction in the library school curriculum?" General consensus was that library instruction was a trend, issue or fad, and therefore did not require serious consideration as a separate, permanent part of the curriculum. Most felt that the topic could be handled adequately as a part of other courses.³⁵

Charles Bunge, director of the University of Wisconsin-Madison Library School, further articulated the library educator's position dur-

ing the Seventh Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries:

Not enough students have library instruction as a career goal to make elective course offerings for them a viable proposition. The students don't know the value of a course in library instruction until they are job hunting, and then it's too late. Also, students who do become interested in the field often lack the requisite background in communication skills and in educational concepts and techniques, so that what they need to be taught adds up to an impossible course.³⁶

In general, there seem to be two separate schools of thought. On one hand, library instruction librarians practicing in the field believe there is a need for concerted effort on the part of library educators to provide training in the techniques and methodology necessary for library instruction, and furthermore, that the topic is both complex and broad enough to warrant the attention of a separate formal course. On the other hand, the library educators feel that bibliographic instruction can be dealt with in the context of one or more existing courses, such as reference, audiovisual services, planning and evaluation, and trends and issues. The reluctance of library educators at the onset of the 1970s was certainly understandable, but perhaps they should review their stance in light of the continuing momentum of the instruction movement, the present demands of the job market, and the apparently unsaturated market for continuing education. As Stanton has pointed out: "The topic has not been taught in the past in a way that meets the needs of the employers; otherwise they would not be stating their need so directly."³⁷

IS IT TIME TO CHANGE THE MIX?

At the present time the burden of specialized education and training for bibliographic instruction lies in continuing education, with sporadic and occasional mention of BI in formal library education. There are, however, a number of disadvantages inherent in this arrangement. The first is the problem of attitude. Some years ago in an article reviewing the failure of library schools to discuss future media service requirements as part of the curricula, Harold Goldstein commented that the absence of such instruction led to a negative attitude on the part of graduates toward the use of new media.³⁸ The assumption is made, he claimed, that if it was not important enough to teach in library school, it is not important on the job. Although librarians involved in library

Training and Education of Librarians

instruction have overcome this attitudinal problem, there is often a negativism which surfaces in new graduates who have not been exposed to BI, an attitude which they perpetuate on the job and transmit to colleagues, and which ultimately impedes expansion of bibliographic instruction programs.

A second disadvantage is the uneven nature of continuing education. Despite the widespread occurrence of continuing education programs and their relatively convenient locations, the fact remains that a workshop on audiovisual techniques offered in New England is far less accessible to librarians in Arizona than to those in Maine. Further, there is no assurance that an audiovisual workshop will even be available to librarians in Arizona. Cost, the variability of topics and speakers, and geographic accessibility prevent the uniformity of even basic skills and concepts among instruction librarians in the sense that reference courses taught in all library schools ensure a minimum level of reference competence. Stanton has summarized the shortcomings of continuing education:

The content of a course to prepare librarians for developing instructional programs cannot be compressed into a weekend session or an all-day workshop. Although these meetings, in many cases focused on a narrowly defined concern, may be beneficial and may indeed fulfill specific needs, it is too often the background people bring to the workshop situation that is the real key....If this background has not included a basis for instructional design, the workshop or conference experience cannot be equated to the learning gained from a planned course meeting over a longer period of time.³⁹

Another problem with not having an established educational background for instruction librarians is that a commonality of approach is lost and with it the ability to attain the long-term goal of integrating a continuum of library skills into all levels of education. If the energies of librarians involved in library instruction are devoted to acquiring for themselves and providing for others the education and training necessary to practice bibliographic instruction, little time is left for theoretical discussion. It is impossible to sit down in a committee room and discuss guidelines for instruction at a college versus high-school level if all the participants are not in agreement as to what bibliographic instruction is.

Finally, continuing education faces difficulties in terms of the level and timing of the educational opportunity. Organizers of conferences and workshops work against tremendous odds when trying to provide programming that will meet the needs of both the uninitiated and the

veteran of several years of instruction. Perhaps the time has arrived for those planning conferences and workshops, at least on the national level, to indicate in publicity exactly what prior background in instruction is assumed of the participants, so that the audience will be appropriately defined and limited and those who choose to attend will know what to expect.

Mistaken attitudes, unevenness of continuing education opportunities, inability to impart uniform skills or a commonality of understanding, and the twin dilemmas of level and timing could all be addressed by the incorporation of bibliographic instruction into library schools. Library school administrators believe they are adequately addressing the topic of bibliographic instruction either by sponsorship of continuing education programs on the topic or by regular mention of the movement in their standard courses, but the evidence suggests that their efforts are not effective.

Practitioners do not expect library schools to graduate students who are fully qualified to design and implement an instruction program during the first year of employment. Nor do practitioners expect—or want—an end to the variety of continuing education opportunities now available. New applications of technologies, innovative programs, and evaluation methodologies will continue to evolve and should appropriately be demonstrated through continuing education. Practitioners do expect library educators to acknowledge bibliographic instruction as a vital, central component of public service programs and as such to include it in library school education.

References

1. The discussion is based in part on a presentation by the author at a Library User Education Conference held at Trinity College, Cambridge, England, in September 1979. (Proceedings to be published as British Library Research and Development Report No. 5503.)
2. Beaubien, Anne K. "Bibliographic Instruction within Library and Discipline Associations: A Survey of Contact Persons and Committees." Chicago, ACRL, Bibliographic Instruction Section, Committee on Cooperation, 1979. (ED 175 468)
3. American Library Association. *ALA Handbook of Organization 1979-1980*. Chicago, ALA, 1979, p. 7.
4. Kirk, Thomas G., et al. "Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries: New Developments," *Drexel Library Quarterly* 8:360, July 1972.
5. American Library Association. *ALA Handbook of Organization 1971-1972*. Chicago, ALA, 1971, p. 36.
6. Kirk, Thomas G., et al., eds. "Academic Library Bibliographic Instruction: Status Report 1972." Chicago, ACRL, Ad Hoc Committee on Bibliographic Instruction, 1973. (ED 072 823)

Training and Education of Librarians

7. The model statement of objectives was first published in Association of College and Research Libraries. Bibliographic Instruction Task Force. "Toward Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries," *College & Research Libraries News* 36:137-39+, May 1975; and in _____ "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries," *College & Research Libraries News* 38:92, April 1977. The guidelines and a revised model statement of objectives are both found in Association of College and Research Libraries. Bibliographic Instruction Section. Policy and Planning Committee. *Bibliographic Instruction Handbook*. Chicago, ACRL, 1979.

8. American Library Association, *ALA Handbook...1979-1980*, op. cit., p. 28.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 67.

11. _____ *Program of the Ninety-eighth Annual Conference, Dallas, June 23-29, 1979*. Chicago, ALA, 1979.

12. Prince, Bill, et al., comps. "List of Library Instruction Clearinghouses, Directories and Newsletters." Chicago, ACRL, BIS, Committee on Cooperation, July 1978; and _____ "List of Library Instruction Clearinghouses, Directories and Newsletters: Revisions and Additions." Chicago, ACRL, BIS, Committee on Cooperation, Oct. 1979. (typescripts)

13. See Moon, Eric. "A-V Showtime," *Library Journal* 91:3642, Aug. 1966.

14. Palmer, Millicent C. "Why Academic Library Instruction?" In Sul H. Lee, ed. *Library Orientation* (Library Orientation Series, no. 1). Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1972, pp. 1-17; and Andrew, Ann, and Rader, Hannelore B. "Library Orientation is Reaching Out to People." In Lee, op. cit., pp. 36-45.

15. See Beeler, Richard J., ed. *Evaluating Library Use Instruction* (Library Orientation Series, no. 4). Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1975; and Rader, Hannelore B., ed. *Academic Library Instruction; Objectives, Programs, and Faculty Involvement* (Library Orientation Series, no. 5). Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1975.

16. Boissé, Joseph A. "Library Instruction and the Administration." In Carolyn A. Kirkendall, ed. *Putting Library Instruction in Its Place: In the Library and in the Library School* (Library Orientation Series, no. 8). Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1978, pp. 1-13; "Library Orientation and Instruction Committee," *Southeastern Librarian* 29:55, Spring 1979; Dougherty, Richard M. "Getting a Larger Slice of the Budget Pie for Library Instruction." In Carolyn Kirkendall, ed. *Reform and Renewal in Higher Education: Implications for Library Instruction* (Library Orientation Series, no. 10). Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1980, pp. 21-27; and "Organizing and Managing a Library Instruction Program" and "Teaching Fellow Librarians to Teach" (workshops from "Tools, Techniques & Tactics: Six Workshops," ACRL Bibliographic Instruction Section pre-conference, Dallas, June 21-23, 1979). (unpublished)

17. Videotapes used during the workshop are available from Joan Ormondroyd, Uris Undergraduate Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. 14853; or from Project LOEX, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Mich. 48197.

18. See Butterfield, Mary. "Project LOEX and Continuing Education," *Michigan Librarian* 40:11-12, Fall 1974; Kirkendall, Carolyn A. "Project LOEX—The Third Year." In Hannelore B. Rader, ed. *Faculty Involvement in Library Instruction: Their Views on Participation in and Support of Academic Library Use Instruction* (Library Orientation Series, no. 6). Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1976, pp. 41-42; Kirkendall, Carolyn A. "The Status of Project LOEX." In Hannelore B. Rader, ed. *Library Instruction in the Seventies: State of the Art* (Library Orientation Series, no. 7). Ann Arbor, Mich., Pierian Press, 1977, pp. 25-30; and Kirkendall, Carolyn A. "Project LOEX and the National Scene." In _____, *Putting Library Instruction in Its Place*, op. cit., pp. 31-36.

19. Prince, et al., "List of Library Instruction Clearinghouses...Revisions and Additions," op. cit.

20. Kennedy, James. "Question: A Separate Course in Bibliography or Course-Related Library Instruction?" In Lee, op. cit., p. 26.

21. Galloway, Sue. "Nobody Is Teaching the Teachers," *Booklegger* 3:29, Jan.-Feb. 1976.

SHARON ANNE HOGAN

22. Dyer, Esther. "Formal Library Science Courses on Library Instruction," *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 18:359-61, Spring 1978.
23. Galloway, op. cit., p. 30.
24. Lubans, John, Jr. "Introduction: Seeking a Partnership Between the Teacher and the Librarian." In _____, ed. *Progress in Educating the Library User*. New York, Bowker, 1978, pp. 6-7.
25. Association of College and Research Libraries. Bibliographic Instruction Section Steering Committee. Minutes. Detroit, Mich., June 17, 1977. (typescript)
26. American Library Association. *ALA Handbook...1979-1980*, op. cit., p. 27.
27. Association of College and Research Libraries. Bibliographic Instruction Section. Continuing Education Committee. *Organizing and Managing a Library Instruction Program*. Chicago, ACRL, 1980.
28. American Library Association. *ALA Handbook...1979-1980*, op. cit., p. 28.
29. Stanton, Vida. "The Library School: Its Role in Teaching the Use of the Library." In Lubans, *Progress*, op. cit., p. 142.
30. Boissé, op. cit., p. 8.
31. Boyer, Calvin. Reproduced in *LOEX News* 4:8, Sept. 1977.
32. Beaubien, Anne, et al. "Things We Weren't Taught in Library School: Some Thoughts to Take Home." In Kirkendall, *Putting Library Instruction in Its Place*, op. cit., pp. 71-84, Galloway, op. cit., pp. 29-31; and Wisconsin Association of Academic Librarians. Committee on Education in Library Use. "A Modest Proposal for a Library School Course Dealing with Library Instruction," *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 18:241-44, Winter 1978.
33. Stanton, op. cit., pp. 139-46.
34. Breivik, Patricia. "A Rose by Any Other Name—Or Library Instruction and the Library School." In John Lubans, Jr., ed. *Educating the Library User*. New York, Bowker, 1974, pp. 410-14.
35. Kirkendall, Carolyn A., ed. "Library Instruction: A Column of Opinion," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 2:240-41, Nov. 1976.
36. Bunge, Charles A. "Library Education for Library Instruction: How the Practitioners and the Educators Can Cooperate." In Kirkendall, *Putting Library Instruction in Its Place*, op. cit., p. 66.
37. Stanton, op. cit., p. 141.
38. Goldstein, Harold. "The Importance of Newer Media in Library Training and Education of the Professional Personnel," *Library Trends* 16:259, Oct. 1967.
39. Stanton, op. cit., p. 145.

Appendix

Programs, Conferences and Workshops Held During 1979

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| March 16-17 | Wisconsin Adult Education Conference: "We're All in This Together." |
| March 16-17 | Northern Illinois University College of Continuing Education. "Strategies for Library Instruction: A Two-day Workshop." |
| March 20-24 | Oklahoma Library Association Annual Conference. College and University Division. Library Instruction Program. |
| March 22-23 | Second Annual Southeastern Conference on Approaches to Bibliographic Instruction: "Library Instruction on the Academic Curriculum: Isolation or Integration?" Charleston, S.C. |

Training and Education of Librarians

- March 24 Virginia Educational Media Association. York Region (Tidewater). Library Instruction Panel. "Survey, Grade One to College."
- March 30-31 Hawaii Library Association. Spring Conference. Library Instruction Session.
- April 4-6 Earlham College. "Librarians, Faculty and Bibliographic Instruction. A Workshop."
- April 19 South Carolina Library Association. Public Services Division. "Can Your Patron Get from Here to There?"
- April 26-28 Tennessee Library Association. Mini-workshop: "School Libraries and Bibliographic Teaching."
- May 1979 Southeastern Wisconsin Health Science Library Consortium. Workshop: "Library Guides for Health Sciences."
- May 2-4 Ninth Annual Conference on Library Orientation for Academic Libraries: "Reform and Renewal in Higher Education: Implications for Higher Education." Ypsilanti, Mich.
- May 9-11 Wyoming Library Association. Academic and Special Library Section. Program.
- May 11 Pennsylvania Library Association. College and Research Libraries. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Library Instruction. Workshop: "Indexing the Library Environment."
- May 11 Virginia Library Association. Region VI. "Librarianship Today; Keep Up Moving On." Workshops including "Graphics and Libraries," "Print Materials on Library Instruction."
- May 12 Virginia Library Association. Region I. "An Introduction to Library Graphics."
- May 17 Virginia Library Association. Region IV. "Library Graphics Program."
- May 17 New York. North County Reference and Research Resources Council Annual Meeting. Workshop: "Library Graphics."
- May 18 Michigan Library Association. Community College Round Table. "Reference Service Response to Curriculum Changes in Community College Libraries."
- May 18 Library Association of the City University of New York. Instruction Committee. Instruction Workshop and Seminar: "Librarians and Instruction: Trends and Techniques for the '80s."
- Spring 1979 ACRL New England Chapter. Bibliographic Instruction Committee. Mini-workshops. Vermont, Maine, Courtway Library. Worcester Polytechnic Institute.
- June 7-8 Maryland Library Association Annual Convention. Library Instruction Meeting.
- June 21-23 ACRL-BIS Preconference on Library Instruction: "Tools, Techniques & Tactics: Six Workshops."

SHARON ANNE HOGAN

- June 24-30 ALA Annual Conference, Dallas
ACRL-BIS Program: "Grantsmanship for Bibliographic Instruction."
LIRT Program: "Role of Librarians in Lifelong Learning."
ACRL Arts Section. "Library Instruction in the Fine Arts: Who Needs It!"
ACRL CJCLS. "The Learning in Learning Resources."
ACRL EBSS BI for Educators Program: "Faculty Liaison: Case Studies in Developing Course-related Library Instruction."
ALA Catalog Use Committee. "Where's the Catalog?"
- July 9-13 Drexel University. "Planning and Producing Audiovisual Presentations: A Workshop for Librarians, Media Specialists, Teachers and Instruction Developers."
- September 14 Illinois Library Association/ACRL. "Public Relations: Marketing the Academic Library." Continuing Education Workshop.
- September 27-28 Wisconsin Association of Academic Libraries. "Library Instruction for Non-Traditional Students."
- October 2-5 Middle Atlantic Regional Library Federation. "Library Instruction—Learning Libraries."
- October 4 Pennsylvania Library Association. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Library Instruction. Program on print and A-V.
- October 12 Drexel University, School of Library and Information Science. "Teaching the Library User."
- November 2 Midwest Federation of Library Associations. "The Other Network: A Cooperative Program of Library Instruction."
- November 3 California Clearinghouse on Library Instruction. Workshop: "And Gladly Teach: Concerns of Librarian Instructors."
- November 9 Virginia Library Association. Library Instruction Forum: "Perspectives on Library Instruction for Off-Campus Curricula."

Sources: *LOEX News*, the continuing education columns in *College & Research Libraries News*, the *Virginia Librarian Newsletter*, the organs of the Southeastern Library Association, the Southwestern Library Association and the Pacific Northwest Library Association, and Project LOEX clearinghouse files.