City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

Queensborough Community College

2017

Faculty Perception of Information Literacy at Queensborough Community College

Leslie Ward

CUNY Queensborough Community College

Miseon Kim

CUNY Queensborough Community College

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/qb_pubs/67

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Faculty perception of information literacy at Queensborough Community College

Leslie Ward and Miseon Kim

Library, Queensborough Community College, Bayside, New York, USA

ABSTRACT

This study examines how faculty perceived information literacy classes provided by Queensborough Community College. A survey was distributed in the spring of 2017 via faculty e-mail. The survey focused on the faculty's department affiliation, usage of information literacy (IL) instruction, and how they value the IL instruction. The results revealed that the highest proportion of faculty members who brought their students to the library and found it the most useful were the English and the Speech department, while faculty in the STEM fields were least likely to utilize the library instruction because they found it was irrelevant to their courses.

KEYWORDS

Faculty perception;
information literacy;
community college

Introduction

In 2000, reference librarians (Feldman and Sciammarella) at the Kurt R. Schmeller Library, Queensborough Community College (QCC), a college within the City University of New York (CUNY) system, created and disseminated a survey at six community colleges within CUNY to both librarians and faculty in order to explore interactions between the two groups. In particular, Feldman and Sciammarella reached out to faculty, “in an attempt to better understand their perceptions of librarians and librarianship” (Feldman and Sciammarella 2000, 491). The study in 2000 discovered that faculty attitudes towards bibliographic instruction (BI)¹ were of key importance to librarians.

The survey revealed that 64% ($N = \text{unavailable}^2$) of teaching faculty at CUNY community colleges, “did not make use of the BI classes offered by their libraries” (Feldman and Sciammarella 2000, 493). However, overall the faculty did find that the library and librarians were “valuable resources” (Feldman and Sciammarella 2000, 496). A considerable portion of an academic librarian's job is to work with faculty to provide the best and most current information necessary for their students. This is especially true in relation to information literacy.

In the almost two decades, since the original study, much has changed in the field of information literacy as well as at CUNY and QCC. This includes the shift towards the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education as well as working to integrate information literacy into teaching and learning. While some CUNY libraries offer one or three credit-bearing library information literacy courses taught by librarians, library information literacy instruction at QCC is not a credit-bearing course. The librarians at QCC have promoted IL classes to faculty to maximize the amount of classes brought to the library for IL instruction through outreach programs and targeted marketing. Inspired by the ever evolving nature of information literacy at QCC, the authors investigated how faculty perceived information literacy at Queensborough Community College in 2017.

A survey was distributed to faculty at Queensborough Community College in the spring of 2017. While the survey covered a range of topics related to faculty perception of library services, this article reports on the results related to information literacy. The focus on library instruction evolved due to multiple factors. Beyond the study mentioned above, there has been a lacking in the output of literature on faculty perception of library instruction in community colleges. Current literature, though detailed and specific, primarily focuses on 4-year institutions. Additionally, the original study lacks detailed data regarding the findings related to faculty perception, such as a faculty member's perception based on department, understanding of what information literacy is, or awareness of other methods of information literacy provided, such as embedded librarians. This article addresses these gaps in knowledge through a case study from a community college perspective.

Literature review

In the last 17 years, the library science field, as well as higher education as a whole, has greatly evolved. The question arises then whether or not attitudes towards the library by librarians and faculty have evolved as well. Understanding these attitudes is helpful to forward the conversation regarding how librarians can approach working with faculty to provide quality information literacy. It is necessary, therefore, to investigate these attitudes before attempting to comment on current experiences.

Librarians, generally, believe in a give and take relationship with faculty in regard to information literacy instruction. Given and Julien express a desire for faculty to, "take on large roles in IL instruction... know library resources, understand the structure of the library and its services, be familiar with library jargon and be able to teach these things to their students"

and “prepare feasible assignments that develop basic library skills” (Given and Julien 2005, 30–31). To do this, the authors recommend that librarians, “gain faculty members’ trust, by expressing an understanding of their busy lives” and to, “embrace faculty as clients themselves, deserving of the same level of respect and support afforded undergraduate and graduate students” (Given and Julien 2005, 36–37). While librarians do feel empathy towards faculty, they deemed faculty members as possessive of their time, territory, and course content (Julien and Given 2002). These expressed attitudes result in a negative outcome – a dynamic is created between librarians, who view themselves as, “owners of library territory” and faculty, who are seen as, “obstructionist, unsupportive... and unknowing” (Julien and Given 2002/2003, 180).

In order to overcome these attitudes, the literature suggests that there is strength in collaboration. Hrycaj and Russo (2007) highlight many ways in which collaboration can be successful, including in-class subject specific instruction and jointly designing assignments with a librarian. The most successful collaboration, however, results from administration supported, “curriculum-level implementation of library research instruction” (Hrycaj and Russo 2007, 695). Badke confirms that collaboration is the, “glorious common goal” and that librarians must, “seize opportunities that come our way” through friendship and to, “show them what we can do” (Badke 2005, 67–70).

However, a key component to collaboration between librarians and faculty is to understand that faculty operate within a culture outside of the library, but also have individual needs unique to their circumstances. Managing expectations in relation to faculty ability and willingness to work with librarians is imperative to the success of an information literacy collaboration.

Some librarians view faculty attitudes towards information literacy as a part of faculty culture. Badke notes that librarians who seek to provide information on how to develop broad reaching skills are seen by faculty as, “intruders” (Badke 2005, 65). Badke suggests that this is a direct result of faculty culture – that, “faculty thought in terms of content, and specifically content within their own disciplines, rather than in terms of process and skill development that could be transferable” (Badke 2005, 66). Hardesty’s study on faculty culture, which serves as the basis for Badke’s article, provides guidance for librarians when understanding faculty culture in a way that may promote empathy and understanding. Culture, Hardesty writes, “provides meaning and context for a specific group a people” (Hardesty 1995, 343). Hardesty warns about over-generalizing faculty culture, that different institutional influences created different attitudes. He did, however, note the shared experiences by faculty that librarians should be aware of, including: “a responsibility to be learned and to convey this learning by means of teaching, inquiry, and publication,” a desire to maintain professional autonomy, and a perceived lack of time (Hardesty 1995, 348).

The concept of faculty culture should not discount the individual faculty member and that they maintain their own opinions on the role of information literacy in student learning. Librarians are acutely aware of the conflicting nature of the place of faculty within the culture of higher education. In order to address this, studies have been done in an attempt to understand the hindrances faculty face when engaging with information literacy instruction.

DaCosta (2010) notes that while 88% of faculty at her institution want students to acquire information literacy skills, only 48% believe students do acquire them. This disconnect between what faculty want students to learn and what they believe students do learn is supported by other studies, notably those by Manuel, Beck, and Molloy (2005), Vander Meer, Perez-Stable, and Sachs (2012), and Saunders (2012). Librarians have attempted to identify and quantify individual faculty perceptions in order to understand trends that may impact their ability to collaborate. Though studies have shown that faculty value information literacy (Whitlock and Ebrahimi 2016), negative influences tend to have a large impact on faculty perception of information literacy. Anderson (2016) notes that faculty believe that they can provide information literacy for their students. Manuel, Beck, and Molloy (2005) highlight past negative experiences and the effect on information instruction. Yang (2000) notes that faculty may be unaware that instruction was offered. McGuinness (2006) discusses faculty who believe that students will pick up information literacy skills over time. Finally, Leckie and Fullerton (1999) highlight two significant factors, lack of time and the belief that information literacy instruction is not necessary until the third and the fourth year of coursework, as reasons for lack of engagement with library instructional services.

Many elements are at work when attempting to understand the perceptions that exist around information literacy instruction in higher education. The focus then must be on the two key players: the librarians and the faculty. Librarians provide the information literacy, but faculty have the most contact with the students and see the results in student work when information literacy skills are utilized. Librarians are encouraged to engage with faculty in ways that best suit the faculty needs. Understanding the culture that they work in can assist with this. While collaboration works best when working with faculty, the literature suggests that librarians offer solutions that will encourage faculty to return to the library and avoid over-generalizations.

Methods

While the authors constructed this survey as part of a larger study of faculty perception of library services, the authors chose to focus on attitudes

of faculty towards information literacy due to the gap in literature regarding this topic in community colleges. The survey was created using SurveyMonkey and was distributed via the QCC full-time and adjunct faculty intra-campus listserv three times during the spring semester of 2017.

Basic demographic information was collected including: department, years of employment at QCC, and full time or adjunct employment status. These were collected in order to determine overall perception as well as to learn if department or employment status impacted perception. The survey was broken down into three major questions specifically investigating areas where students would most likely encounter information literacy instruction and whether or not faculty found these encounters benefited the students. These questions were the following: (1) Have you ever referred a student to a librarian? (2) Have you ever brought a class for an information literacy class? and (3) Have you had an embedded librarian in your course? For all three questions, if the respondent chose yes, they were asked if they felt the encounter benefited the student. If the respondent chose no, they were asked why they did not engage in the service in question. Their options for response were the following: not enough time, not relevant to the course, did not know the service was offered, did not know what the service being offered was, or a past negative experience.

This project was approved and exempt by Institutional Review Board at QCC (ID #2016-1119) in October 2016.

Findings

Participants and their employment status, title, years of employment, and department affiliation

The survey asked faculty members about their employment status, title, years of service, and department affiliation at QCC. Among the participants ($N=102$), about 84% ($n=86$) were full-time faculty and about 16% ($n=16$) identified themselves as adjunct faculty. According to the report from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) at QCC, 390 full-time faculty were employed, while 496 adjunct faculty were working in the spring semester of 2017. Even though the number of respondents only represents about 22% of full-time faculty and about 3% of adjunct faculty at QCC, the response rate of about 12% of the total faculty ($N=886$) was more than the authors had expected.

The majority of respondents were composed of assistant professors ($n=37$) and associate professors ($n=30$). Approximately 18% ($n=18$) of the professors and 17% ($n=17$) of the lecturers participated in the survey. The survey also asked faculty how many years they had been at QCC. Thirty-two faculty answered that they had worked at QCC for

0–5 years, 33 faculty for 6–11 years, 22 faculty for 12–17 years, nine faculty for 18–24 years, and six faculty worked more than 25 years. Overall, a majority of participants were composed of assistant or associate professors who had worked at QCC for 11 years or less.

The largest departmental responses were received from English ($n=18$), Mathematics and Computer Science ($n=11$), Social Sciences ($n=10$), Biological Sciences and Geology ($n=9$), and Speech Communication and Theatre Arts ($n=7$). The smallest departmental responses were from Chemistry ($n=1$), Health, Physical Education and Dance ($n=1$), History ($n=3$), Music ($n=3$), and Nursing ($n=3$).

Faculty perceptions on information literacy

Question: Have you referred a student to a librarian?

The faculty were asked if they had ever referred a student to a librarian. If they did, they were asked if they believed students benefitted from a referral. If they did not refer a student to a librarian, they were asked to explain why. After removing faculty who did not identify a department affiliation, among 88 (N) participating faculty, 68% ($n=60$) answered that they had referred students to a librarian, while about 32% ($n=28$) responded that they had not. The faculty who referred students to the library the most were those in the Biological Sciences and Geology, English, Music, and Speech Communication and Theatre Arts departments. The Business, Engineering, Foreign Languages & Literatures, and Mathematics and Computer Science departments were least likely to refer the students to the library, as seen in Table 1.

Faculty were asked if referring a student to a librarian was beneficial. Of the number of faculty ($N=64$) who responded and identified a department

Table 1. Have you referred a student to a librarian?

Department	Have you referred a student to a librarian		Total
	Yes	No	
Art & Design	3	1	4
Biological Sciences & Geology	9	0	9
Business	2	4	6
Chemistry	1	0	1
Engineering Technology	1	3	4
English	16	2	18
Foreign Language & Literatures	0	3	3
Health, Physical Education & Dance	1	0	1
History	2	1	3
Mathematics & Computer Science	3	8	11
Music	3	0	3
Nursing	3	0	3
Physics	2	3	5
Social Sciences	7	3	10
Speech Communication & Theatre Arts	7	0	7
Total	60	28	88

affiliation, 58% ($n=37$) strongly agreed and 23% ($n=15$) agreed that it was beneficial for the students. About 13% ($n=8$) of them answered “No opinion,” about 2% ($n=1$) “Disagree,” 2% ($n=1$) “Strongly disagree,” and about 3% ($n=2$) chose “Other.” The results indicated that overall a large number of faculty members (81%) who had referred a student to a librarian believed that students benefitted from the referral (see Table 2).

The faculty members who did not refer their students to a librarian were asked why they did not do so. The results indicated the reason they had not referred a student to a librarian was not because they had not enough time ($n=1$) or they had negative previous experience ($n=1$), but because 65% of the faculty ($n=20$) thought that it was not relevant to the course. About 16% of the faculty ($n=5$) answered that they were not aware of the service (see Table 3).

The departments most likely to feel that referring was not relevant to the course were Foreign Languages (100%, $n=3$), Mathematics and Computer Science (73%, $n=8$), Business (50%, $n=3$), Physics (40%, $n=2$), and History (33%, $n=1$).

Question: Do you know what information literacy is? Are you aware that IL instruction was offered?

Faculty were asked if they knew what information literacy was and if they were aware that information literacy instruction was offered. Of 102 responses, 96% of the faculty ($n=98$) knew what information literacy was and 97% ($n=99$) responded that they were aware that information literacy sessions were offered. Almost all of the faculty participating in the survey

Table 2. Do you agree the students benefitted from the referral?

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	37	57.8
Agree	15	23.4
No opinion	8	12.5
Disagree	1	1.6
Strongly disagree	1	1.6
Other	2	3.1
Total	64	100.0

Table 3. Reasons for why you did not refer a student to a librarian.

Reasons	Frequency	Percent
Not enough time	1	3.2
Not relevant to the course	20	64.5
Didn't know that the service was offered	5	16.1
Negative previous experience	1	3.2
Other	1	3.2
Multiple answers	3	9.7
Total	31	100.0

knew what information literacy was and were aware that QCC library provided information literacy instruction for students.

Question: Have you brought a class for an information literacy class?

According to the QCC library IL Sessions Report instruction report for the spring of 2017 (Wengler 2017), faculty of English and Speech Communication & Theatre Arts departments were major clients in utilizing library information literacy instruction for their courses. Among a total of 168 library information literacy (IL) sessions provided in the spring semester of 2017, 42% ($n = 70$) of faculty in English department requested IL sessions while 31% ($n = 52$) of IL sessions were requested from faculty in the Speech Communication & Theatre Arts department as shown in Table 4.

In the survey of spring 2017, the faculty were asked if they have ever brought their classes for an information literacy instruction session. Among 88 respondents, 47% of them ($n = 41$) said they had, while 53% ($n = 47$) responded they had not. The English (94%, $n = 17$), History (100%, $n = 3$), Nursing (100%, $n = 3$), and Speech Communication and Theatre Arts (86%, $n = 6$) reported bringing their classes for a library information literacy instruction, while faculty in Biological Sciences & Geology (78%, $n = 7$), Chemistry (100%, $n = 1$), Engineering Technology (75%, $n = 3$), Foreign Language (100%, $n = 3$), Health, Physical Education & Dance (100%, $n = 1$), and Mathematics and Computer Science (100%, $n = 11$) had never brought their classes to the information literacy class as seen in Table 5. Therefore, the results of the faculty survey were consistent with the QCC IL Sessions Report for the spring of 2017: most IL clients were from faculty of English and Speech Communications and Theatre Arts departments while faculty in STEM fields hardly utilize IL instruction for their course.

Of those who brought their classes ($N = 43$), 63% ($n = 27$) strongly agreed and 30% ($n = 13$) agreed that the students benefitted from the

Table 4. Information literacy classes requested by department.

Department and others	Frequency	Percent
Art & Design	6	4
Biology	3	2
Business	5	3
English	70	42
Engineering Technology	1	0
Health, Physical Education & Dance	2	1
Foreign Language & Literatures	1	0
Mathematics & Computer Science	3	2
Music	3	2
Nursing	2	1
Social Sciences	2	1
Speech Communication & Theatre Arts	52	31
Others (BE, CLIP, CSTEP, CUNYStart, ST)	19	11
Total	168	100

Table 5. Have you brought a class for an information literacy class?

	Have you brought a class for an information literacy class?		
	Yes	No	Total
Art & Design	2	2	4
Biological Sciences & Geology	2	7	9
Business	3	3	6
Chemistry	0	1	1
Engineering Technology	1	3	4
English	17	1	18
Foreign Languages & Literatures	0	3	3
Health, Physical Education & Dance	0	1	1
History	3	0	3
Mathematics & Computer Science	0	11	11
Music	2	1	3
Nursing	3	0	3
Physics	1	4	5
Social Sciences	1	9	10
Speech Communication & Theatre Arts	6	1	7
Total	41	47	88

information literacy session. It is noteworthy that 93% of the faculty who brought their students for an information literacy sessions found it beneficial.

Faculty who did not bring their classes were asked why. Of those who did not bring their classes ($N=88$), 23% ($n=20$) indicated that they did not bring their classes to IL instruction because they did not have enough time to bring the class to IL instruction while 28% ($n=25$) answered that the reason they did not bring their classes to IL instruction was because IL instruction was not relevant to their courses. 78% of respondents ($n=7$) from Biological Sciences and Geology, 100% ($n=1$) from Chemistry, and 50% ($n=5$) from Social Sciences replied that they did not have enough time. On the other hand, 67% ($n=2$) of Foreign Languages & Literature, 100% ($n=1$) of Health, Physical Education & Dance, and 100% ($n=11$) of the Mathematics and Computer Science reported that it was not relevant to their course as shown in Table 6.

A majority of faculty in Biological Sciences and Geology felt that they did not have enough time to bring their classes to an IL session, while all of the faculty respondents in Mathematics and Computer Science viewed IL as unrelated to the course.

Question: Have you had an embedded librarian in your course?

QCC library has offered the embedded librarian program since the fall semester of 2013. If faculty wanted an embedded librarian in their courses, a librarian would be assigned to the course and faculty were encouraged to bring their classes to IL instruction multiple times during a semester. Even though the embedded librarian program was offered only for 3.5 years, the survey in the spring semester of 2017 ($N=102$) indicates that most faculty (83%, $n=85$) were aware that the embedded librarian program was

Table 6. Reasons for why you did not bring your class to IL class.

	Not enough time		Not relevant	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Art & Design	0	4	1	3
Biological Sciences & Geology	*7	2	1	8
Business	1	5	2	4
Chemistry	1	0	0	1
Engineering Technology	1	3	1	3
English	0	18	0	18
Foreign Languages & Literatures	0	3	2	1
Health, Physical Education & Dance	0	1	1	0
History	0	3	0	3
Mathematics & Computer Science	2	9	*11	0
Music	1	2	0	3
Nursing	0	3	0	3
Physics	2	3	2	3
Social Sciences	5	5	4	6
Speech Communication & Theatre Arts	0	7	0	7
Total (<i>N</i> = 88)	20	68	25	63

provided at QCC. Faculty in English and Speech Communication and Theatre Arts departments are most likely to have utilized the embedded librarian program as well as library information literacy sessions at QCC, which is in line with research that focused on subject specific information literacy research (Bury 2011).

The faculty were asked if they had ever had an embedded librarian in their course. Among respondents (*N*=88), only 19% of faculty (*n*=17) said they had an embedded librarian. Departments who participated in the embedded librarian program were Business, English, History, Music, Social Sciences, and Speech Communication and Theatre Arts. It is noticeable that the embedded librarian was employed mostly by English faculty (44%, *n*=8), Speech faculty (43%, *n*=2), and Business faculty (50%, *n*=3). However, none of the faculty in the STEM fields used an embedded librarian in their courses as seen in Table 7.

The faculty were asked the reason for why they did not include an embedded librarian in the course. Of those respondents (*N*=84), 44% of respondents from the Biological and Geology Sciences department (*n*=4) and 100% of the Chemistry department (*n*=1) claimed they did not have enough time, while 100% of the Mathematics and Computer Sciences department (*n*=3) responded that it was not relevant to the course (see Table 8).

Faculty who did include an embedded librarian in their courses were asked if the embedded librarian had added value to the course. Among respondents (*N*=19), 53% (*n*=10) strongly agree and 32% (*n*=6) agreed that the embedded librarian had added value to their courses. Only 5% (*n*=1) disagreed that the embedded librarian had benefitted the course. In general, most faculty (85%, *n*=16) felt that the embedded librarian was highly valuable.

Table 7. Have you had an embedded librarian in your course?

	Have you had an embedded librarian in your course?		
	Yes	No	Total
Art & Design	0	4	4
Biological Sciences & Geology	0	9	9
Business	3	3	6
Chemistry	0	1	1
Engineering Technology	0	4	4
English	8	10	18
Foreign Languages & Literatures	0	3	3
Health, Physical Education & Dance	0	1	1
History	1	2	3
Mathematics & Computer Science	0	11	11
Music	1	2	3
Nursing	0	3	3
Physics	0	5	5
Social Sciences	1	9	10
Speech Communication & Theatre Arts	3	4	7
Total (<i>N</i> = 88)	17	71	88

Table 8. Reasons for why you did not have an embedded librarian.

	Not enough time		Not relevant	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Art & Design	2	2	1	3
Biological Sciences & Geology	4	5	1	8
Business	2	4	0	6
Chemistry	1	0	0	1
Engineering Technology	1	3	2	2
English	4	14	0	18
Foreign Languages & Literatures	0	3	2	1
Health, Physical Education & Dance	0	1	1	0
History	1	2	0	3
Mathematics & Computer Science	1	2	0	3
Music	0	11	10	1
Nursing	1	2	0	3
Physics	2	1	0	3
Social Sciences	0	5	2	3
Speech Communication & Theatre Arts	2	8	4	6
Total (<i>N</i> = 84)	21	63	23	61

Limitations and suggestions for further study

This study is not without its limitations. One of the limitations was the small sample size. Although the response rate was higher than the authors had expected, the participants (12% response rate) represented only a fraction of faculty as a whole. Another factor was the use of a quantitative measurement rather than a qualitative. Individual faculty will have their own reasoning for their perceptions, which are very important to a librarian in order to best address the faculty member's needs. A more in-depth, narrative-based study would be necessary to gain a better understanding of faculty experiences. Finally, faculty perception of all library services, including instruction, can shift depending on many variables over time. While it would benefit the librarians more to understand these shifts in perception,

the conclusions made will differ noticeably. As such, any attempt to address successes or deficits in service can only be based on current institutional conditions.

On a more focused level, further study could also be undertaken based on the use of information literacy instruction within individual courses across the curriculum. As noted above, the humanities are more likely to take advantage of library instructional services than the STEM fields. However, there were discrepancies such as the low rate of use by the Foreign Language department and the high rate by the Business department. It would be noteworthy to look at individual courses within departments to investigate faculty perception further.

Finally, it would be of significant use for librarians to study any correlation between faculty and student perception of information literacy. Since faculty have preconceived ideas regarding information literacy, librarians would benefit from knowing if that has an impact on how students approach materials based on whether or not they have been exposed to information literacy. If student learning can be impacted by information literacy, as many librarians and faculty members believe, is this impact seen or felt by the students themselves?

Discussion and conclusion

The survey has had a two-fold effect: one is that it acts as a study of information literacy instruction at QCC specifically, while also acting as a comparative to the impact of information literacy instruction with the experiences of librarians in general. It is important to explore these impacts concurrently so as to help both groups adapt their own institutional needs to the findings.

A key finding of this study was that the sciences, along with mathematics, were the least likely to bring their classes for an information literacy session or refer their students to a librarian. This upholds the study done by Leckie and Fullerton (1999) that faculty in those fields do not feel information literacy is relevant to their coursework, in conjunction with a lack of time to attend such a session. This could be remedied by providing subject-specific library instruction as suggested by Dawes (2017) as well as addressing faculty expectations that science students' information literacy skills are higher than they actually are (Perry 2017). The wild card result, however, was the faculty in Foreign Language department who did not make use of information literacy instruction for their courses. The assumption would be that a significant portion of the coursework is based on memorization, not research. This is compounded by the fact that two of the three respondents to this question cited that information literacy was not relevant to the

course. However, all languages offered at QCC, with the exception of Arabic and Hebrew, offer a class on the culture and literature of said language (Queensborough Community College 2017). If these classes require writing or research, it would behoove librarians to reach out to faculty members in order to encourage the use of information literacy for these types of classes.

The embedded librarian program offers an interesting conundrum. While underutilized, embedded librarians are seen as useful by the faculty. It also demonstrates a successful use of collaboration that much of the library literature, including Gandhi (2005) encourages. However, it requires both librarians and faculty to take into account the challenges that the literature describes, most notably lack of time for proper investment. While studies encourage quality outreach to faculty (Auten et al. 2016), faculty buy in to such programs is essential (Anderson 2016). Challenges faced by anyone, faculty or librarian, regarding attitudes towards library instruction should be considered when using or promoting an embedded program.

Finally, a highlight of the results and a point of pride for all librarians is that 96% of faculty knew what information literacy was and that 97% knew that information literacy classes were offered at QCC. This demonstrates a significant shift from the 64% reported in Feldman and Sciammarella's work 15 years ago as well older studies that claimed that faculty were not familiar with their librarians (Ober, Schleiter, and Van Houten 1989). This, however, does beg the question: what do the faculty think information literacy is? By exploring this question, librarians could learn that faculty members have different ideas about what information literacy classes are, particularly what kinds of skills are imparted in these classes. When these differences are discovered, librarians will be able to better educate and target their outreach and marketing to the faculty. Ultimately, the goal of librarians should be to identify and sell certain types of skill development to faculty as it is relevant to their courses. Librarians will also find that not all classes will require information literacy purely based on course content, notably introductory mathematics courses.

This survey further demonstrates the work librarians will have to continue to do to encourage the use of information literacy by faculty. By understanding faculty needs as related to their own teaching style in conjunction with the coursework they are tasked with teaching, librarians can identify relevant skills that would best benefit the student and market the information literacy instruction accordingly.

Notes

1. Bibliographic instruction was the terminology of the 2000 study; when referring to the current work, the authors use information literacy (IL).
2. N value unavailable due to its exclusion from the original text.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Leslie Ward <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0066-5961>

Miseon Kim <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8151-2539>

References

- Anderson, A. L. 2016. Conceptualization and Practice of Information Literacy Instruction in Community Colleges. PhD diss., Iowa State University.
- Auten, B., D. Glauner, G. Lefoe, and J. Henry. 2016. Educating faculty members on the importance of requiring High-Quality information resources at a community college. *Community and Junior College Libraries* 22 (1–2):19–30. doi:[10.1080/02763915.2016.1246314](https://doi.org/10.1080/02763915.2016.1246314).
- Badke, W. B. 2005. Can't get no respect: Helping faculty to understand the educational power of information literacy. *The Reference Librarian* 43 (89–90):63–80.
- Bury, S. 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. doi:[10.11645/5.1.1513](https://doi.org/10.11645/5.1.1513).
- DaCosta, J. 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.
- Dawes, L. 2017. Faculty perceptions of teaching information literacy to first-year students: A phenomenographic study. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science* 42:1–16. doi:[10.1177/0961000617726129](https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000617726129).
- Feldman, D., and S. Sciammarella. 2000. Both sides of the looking glass: Librarian and teaching faculty perceptions of librarianship at six community colleges. *College & Research Libraries* 61 (6):491–8.
- Gandhi, S. 2005. Faculty–Librarian collaboration to assess the effectiveness of a Five-Session library instruction model. *Community and Junior College Libraries* 12 (4):15–48. doi:[10.1300/J107v12n04_05](https://doi.org/10.1300/J107v12n04_05).
- Given, L. M., and H. Julien. 2005. Finding common ground: An analysis of librarians' expressed attitudes towards faculty. *The Reference Librarian* 43 (89–90):25–38.
- Hardesty, L. 1995. Faculty culture and bibliographic instruction: An exploratory analysis. *Library Trends* 44 (2):339–67.
- Hrycaj, P., and M. Russo. 2007. Reflections on surveys of faculty attitudes toward collaboration with librarians. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 33 (6):692–6.
- Julien, H., and L. M. Given. 2002. /2003. Faculty-Librarian relationships in the information literacy context: A content analysis of librarians' expressed attitudes and experiences. *Canadian Journal of Information & Library Sciences* 27 (3):65–87.
- Leckie, G. J., and A. Fullerton. 1999. Information literacy in science and engineering undergraduate education: Faculty attitudes and pedagogical practices. *College & Research Libraries* 60 (1):9–29.
- Manuel, K., S. E. Beck, and M. Molloy. 2005. An ethnographic study of attitudes influencing faculty collaboration in library instruction. *The Reference Librarian* 43 (89–90): 139–61.

- McGuinness, C. 2006. What faculty think – Exploring the barriers to information literacy development in undergraduate education. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32 (6): 573–82.
- Oberg, L. R., M. K. Schleiter, and M. Van Houten. 1989. Faculty perceptions of librarians at albion college: Status role, Contribution, and contacts. *College & Research Libraries* 50 (2):215–30.
- Perry, H. B. 2017. Information literacy in the sciences: Faculty perception of undergraduate student skill. *College & Research Libraries* 78 (7):984–77. doi:10.5860/crl.78.7.964.
- Queensborough Community College. 2017. *Course Catalog, 2016–2017*. Queens, NY, pp. 172–5. Accessed December 21, 2018. <http://www.qcc.cuny.edu/academics/docs/College-Catalog.pdf>.
- Saunders, L. 2012. Faculty perspectives on information literacy as a student learning outcome. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 38 (4):226–36.
- Vander Meer, F., P. M. A. Perez-Stable, and D. E. Sachs. 2012. Framing a strategy: Exploring faculty attitudes toward library instruction and technology preferences to enhance information literacy. *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 52 (2):109–22.
- Wengler, S. 2017. “QCC IL Sessions – Spring 2017”. Internal report.
- Whitlock, B., and N. Ebrahimi. 2016. Beyond the library: Using multiple, mixed measures simultaneously in a college-wide assessment of information literacy. *College & Research Libraries* 77 (2):236–62. doi:10.5860/crl.77.2.236.
- Yang, Z. Y. (L.). 2000. University faculty’s perception of a library liaison program: A case study. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 26 (2):124–8.

Copyright of Community & Junior College Libraries is the property of Taylor & Francis Ltd and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.