The Evolution Of Bibliographic Instruction In College Libraries

Gail Glynn
MLS Graduate
Indiana University

In the beginning, there was chaos. And the students moved aimlessly upon the face of the library. And the reference librarians said, "Let there be instruction." And there was instruction. The reference librarians brought forth the workbook, and the fifty-minute lecture; and the students no longer moved aimlessly about, but searched purposefully through the card catalog and the journal indexes and the serials catalog. And the reference librarians looked upon what they had wrought and they found it good.

In spite of the fact that the number of academic libraries and the size of their collections and staff have grown many fold and the student body has changed from a predominantly homogeneous group to a heterogeneous one, the philosophy of librarians who are proponents of library instruction has not changed. In 1880, Otis Hall Robinson, Professor of Mathematics and Librarian at the University of Rochester, wrote that, "The time is passing also when the chief duty of a librarian was to collect books and preserve them. How to get them used most extensively, most intelligently, and at the same time carefully, is becoming his chief concern."[1]

Librarians of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries faced the same problems and barriers in pursuit of their goal to educate the library user as librarians in academic institutions today. The constantly changing technology developed to handle the information explosion has lent an added dimension to the complexity of the library instruction. Terminology has changed from library use instruction to bibliographic instruction to information literacy (the ability to effectively access and evaluate information for a given need - Tessmer, 1985).[2] Yet the ultimate goal of all library instruction has remained the same and it is "...to enable all recipients of the instruction to use any library..."[3]

Throughout the library instruction movement in the United States, the conviction has been that the ability to find and evaluate information is as important as the information itself.

The following survey of the history of bibliographic instruction will be divided into time frames much as Hardesty, Schmitt, and Tucker organized their *User Instruction in Academic Libraries*. Emphasis will be placed upon the writings of leaders in field of bibliographic instruction, how professional organizations have reflected the increased awareness of bibliographic instruction, and the importance of the faculty in the successful pursuit of library instruction. In almost all instances the focus will be on undergraduate or college libraries as opposed to graduate, research, or university libraries.

Pre 1880

"Although reports on instruction about the library's 'most rare and valuable works' date from the 1820's, substantial, continuous course offerings and course-related lectures came about only as a result of major developments in the library's academic environment in the latter part of the nineteenth century."[4]

"Despite repeated calls for reform, higher learning in 1865 remained much as it had been decades earlier. Through the traditional methods of memorization and recitation, the colleges fulfilled their purpose of training young men to meet their professional and civic obligations."[5] Mark Hopkins, president of Williams College from 1836 to 1872, typified the educational philosophy of the era when he said, "I don't read books, in fact I never did read any books." President James Garfield stated that the 'ideal college was Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and a student on the other."[6]

Following the Civil War the old-time college philosophy of reconciling reason and natural law with Christian theology was replaced by the adoption of original research, the introduction of the seminar method of instruction, and the new curricula in the social sciences and in professional and technical education.[7] "All these trends resulted in unprecedented growth in the production of knowledge as well as faculty and student demands for library resources and services."[8] Between 1870 and 1890, the number of academic institutions grew from 563 to 998."[9] Library collections grew dramatically - Pennsylvania's and Columbia's quadrupled while Cornell's grew tenfold. Library hours were extended as librarians became aware of the need to make their collections more accessible.[10]

1880-1900

"Significant growth in library use instructions during the 1880s and 1890s followed naturally from the dramatic changes occurring in higher education in the same period."[11] The optional credit course usually taught by the college librarian not only stressed bibliography, the history of books and printing, or even history of libraries but also contained a solid library-use compo-

nent. Book talks, bibliographical lectures, and orientation tours were also given by librarians, but no established structure or accepted method for effective instruction was created. However, they did call for "...clearly stated objectives for their instructional programs, they sought conceptual models for the library,...and they caught a vision of the educational potential of the library in the academic community."[12]

Amongst the leaders of this movement, Justin Winsor, the first president of the American Library Association, (1876 to 1885) and head of the Harvard University Library (1877-1897) stands out. Ernest Cushing Richardson of Princeton described "...Winsor's appointment as 'professor of books' and his work at Harvard as watershed events in the history of bibliographic instruction.[13] While at Harvard, Winsor "...enlarged the reserve book collection, authorized stack privileges for students, brought a number of small libraries into the main building, encouraged interlibrary loan, and...installed electric lights, new furniture and better ventilation."[14]

In an article written in 1880 Winsor expresses his ideas on the role of the college library and librarians when he writes:

> To fulfill its rightful destiny, the library should become the central agency of our college methods...the librarian becomes a teacher...not with a text book, but with a world of books. The proposition then is to make the library the grand rendezvous of the college for teacher and pupil alike, and to do in it as much of the teaching as is convenient and practicable...As he (the librarian) needs the cooperation of his colleagues of the faculty, his first aim is to make everything agreeable to them and himself indispensable, if possible...In this way suavity and sacrifice will compel the condition of brotherhood which is necessary and is worth the effort.[15]

Otis Hall Robinson, credited by Holley in the *Dictionary of American Library Biography* as having done "as much as anyone in the American library profession to push the idea of the educational role of the college library"[16] wrote in 1880

> "that next to the acquisition of knowledge itself is the learning where and how it may be acquired. The range of knowledge is rapidly increasing. We believe, therefore, that the demand can be met best, not by making the curriculum cover everything, but by giving special attention to the <u>where</u> and the <u>how</u> of acquisition.[17]

He also believed that professors working with students on a voluntary, personal basis in the library would do more "...to encourage

broad scholarship and to make men independent in their investigations than any amount of class lecturing."[18]

Raymond C. Davis, librarian at the University of Michigan from 1877 to 1905, is credited by Arthur Q. Hamlin in The University *Library in United States as teaching the first course in bibliography in an American university in 1879.*[19] The Board of Regents of the University of Michigan approved the course for credit in 1881. Davis justified his request for the course by stating, "The book is the student's chief tool, — his *sine qua mon.* Has he mastered the *Literae humaniores*, if on the day of his graduation he knows little or nothing about this tool with which he wrought — either its history or its workmanship?"[20] Davis's course does remind one more of a course for librarians that one designed for library use instruction.

In addition to creating the Dewey Decimal Classification and founding the first library school in America, Melville Dewey was also a great advocate for bibliographic instruction. In the inaugural issue of *American Library Journal* (1876), Melville Dewey wrote "The time is when a library is a school, and the librarian is in the highest sense a teacher."[21] In 1891 Dewey spoke in Philadelphia to the College Association of the Middle States and Maryland. He expounded upon the importance of the college library calling it the "laboratory library" and the "college well". He stated that the purpose of a college education was to provide tools for further study, "the most essential (tool) of all being the ability to use libraries effectively."[22] Thus by 1900 the modern day philosophy of and justification for bibliographic instruction had been written about, spoken of, and put into practice in several academic libraries. It is interesting that these early instructional librarians wrote of the same problems in dealing with faculty, limited budgets, changing student bodies, and increased and more complex resources that plague instruction librarians today.

1901-1917

The changes which began in higher education during the last decades of the nineteenth century stabilized during this period. "The libraries themselves emerged at once both more bureaucratic and more service oriented."[23] In spite of the fact that these years marked the integration of reference services into the permanent administrative staff of academic libraries, "library use instruction failed to in its efforts at full integration in to the personnel, service, and bureaucratic structures of academic libraries, perhaps because of its inadequately developed conceptual and theoretical foundations."[24] "As if to quell their uncertainties, librarians conducted a number of surveys in their attempts to verify the supposed popularity of user instruction."[25] An ALA survey conducted in 1912 found that 57 percent of 149 institutions surveyed offered required or elective courses in library instruction.[26]

Several academic librarians, at the time, continued to emphasize the importance of library instruction. "In 1905, William Harper observed, 'The equipment of the library will never be finished until it has upon its staff men and women whose sole work shall be, not the care of books, not the cataloging of books, but the giving of instruction in their use.'"[27] Joseph Schneider, library director at Catholic University, philosophically followed Davis in his belief in "...the necessity of making the study of bibliography a part of the curriculum in our colleges and universities."[29] William Warner Bishop recommended the training in the use of books to help students and professors deal intelligently with the deluge of new materials published each year. Successful bibliographic training will enable the student to "...use easily bibliographic tools of all sorts from the simple check list to the erudite works of Fabricuis and Poggendorf."[29]

Lucy M. Salmon, a history professor at Vassar College from 1887 to 1927, felt that bibliographic instruction should be "...definitely planned, systematically carried out, (with a) definite progression from year to year in the kind of bibliographic work required, and directly related to the specific and individual work of every student."[30] Interestingly, Salmon feels that professors and not librarians should be responsible for their students' library instruction as their course work requires.

1918-1940

In spite of the fact that higher education was plagued by an era of social discontent, academic libraries entered a positive phase which benefitted from private philanthropy. "The educational climate of this period proved most hospitable to user instruction, which advanced both conceptually and programmatically."[31] As curriculum innovations were developed and defined by educators such as John Dewey and Robert Hutchins, so too were thinkers in the field of library instruction defining, rethinking and clarifying library instruction programs. Charles B. Shaw, creator of the "Shaw list" developed three proposals to alleviate the "haphazard, unscientific" teaching which characterized bibliographic instruction. He proposed: 1) eliminating library lecture and replacing them with a required course taught by professors of bibliography, 2) that colleges should establish a department of bibliography, and 3) colleges "evolve and train" a group of bibliographic instructors who would have the librarian's knowledge of books with the teacher's ability to teach.[32]

Lamar Johnson, who was dean of instruction and librarian at Stephens College, was able to establish a library use instruction program throughout the curriculum. His program had three objectives: "1) to teach students how to use reference sources effectively, 2) to teach them good study habits, and 3) to make the library function as the center o the instructional programs.[33]"

This era also witnessed the creation of the concept of Louis Shores'

"Library Arts College." "Patricia Breivik sees the 'library college' as offering the only clear-cut philosophical statement of service with accompanying objectives of how academic libraries can support the educational trends of this century."[34] The Library Arts College differs from the conventional college in five essentials. 1) Regular class attendance is supplemented by voluntary and irregular library reading. 2) All instructional quarters are in the library. 3) Upper-class students will tutor lower-class students. 4) Faculty members will be library-trained, subject-matter specialists. 5) The curriculum will represent a carefully planned reading program intended to acquaint the student with man's accomplishments of the past and problems of the present.[35]

In 1940 Harvie Branscomb took a more pragmatic approach than Shores to the study of the college library's educational effectiveness and its integration into the institution as a whole in his book *Teaching With Books: A Study of College Libraries*. In summary, Branscomb sees "...the primary task of the college library is to provide certain facilities for and to aid in carrying out the instructional program of the faculty."[36] Branscomb emphasizes the relationship between the librarian and the instructor as one of cooperation with the reference librarian attending classes and the instructor entering the library to assist the librarian. He also suggests the use of a test (Miss Lulu Ruth Reed's test) during the freshman year to determine which students need extra library instruction.[37]

1941-1968

Activity without progress characterized library use instruction during this period. Numerous programs existed at the freshman orientation and basic instruction levels, but the increasing number of students overwhelmed many of even the well-established advanced efforts. As early as 1949, Erickson reported insufficient numbers of library personnel as the most serious deterrent to successful library instruction programs.

In 1956 Patricia Knapp outlined her proposals for a user instruction program which provided the foundation for many programs which followed including the Monteith Library Project at Wayne State University and the Earlham College instruction program. She summarizes her thoughts as follows:

> Competence in the use of the library is one of the liberal arts. It deserves recognition and acceptance as such in the college curriculum. It is, furthermore, a complex of knowledge, skills, and attitudes not to be acquired in any one course but functionally related to the content of many. It should, therefore, be integrated until the faculty as a whole is

ready to recognize the validity of its claim and to implement this recognition through regularly established procedures of curriculum development.

For these reasons, the librarian should accept the responsibility of initiating the program, remaining constantly aware, at the same time, that ultimate implementation must come through the teaching faculty. In other words, the librarian must convince the faculty that library instruction is necessary; he must educate the faculty on the potential role of the library and assist it in planning instruction.[38]

Louis Shores's Library-College movement reached its height of popularity during the 1960's, but few of the examples cited by Shores were extensive implementation of his ideas. "Patricia Breivik concludes that the enthusiasm that served as the strength of the Library-College also blinded its followers to the obstacles they needed to overcome and alienated many librarians and teaching faculty."[39]

All librarians were not then nor are they now convinced that bibliographic instruction should be a function of the librarian. Anita R. Schiller thinks that user instruction impedes the "...effectiveness of information service to the extent that it serves as a substitute for it, offering less service instead of more, and leaving the library clientele unsure of just what kind of service is being offered."[40] "The real future of library reference service lies in the direct provision of comprehensive and accurate information to satisfy user demands; instructing the user in the technique of information-searching is an important, but secondary, goal and is not necessarily a reference function."[41]

Library use instruction programs during the 1940s and 1950s were analyzed by Tom Kirk, and he reached the following conclusions.

1. Those involved failed to distinguish orientation from instruction and, therefore, provided only the former;
2. The instruction or orientation was not given in a context of the student's need to know how to use the library;
3. The instruction when it went beyond orientation tended to take its scope and content from the reference training which librarians had received;
4. Librarians were not sensitive to educational changes that were occurring.[42]

1968-1970s

For one unfamiliar with the history of library use instruction, one might assume that the 1960s marked the beginning of library use instruction.

"The number of articles on library use instruction indexed in Library Literature doubled from 35 in 1958 to 70 in 1971"[43] The instruction renaissance of the 1970s was facilitated by:

> 1) the changing nature of higher education, along with a rapid growth of library collections and the construction of newer library buildings that gave emphasis to a book-centered educational philosophy; 2) technological developments and their effects on libraries, especially in the area of computer applications; 3) changes in the nature of reference service: 4) grants from governmental agencies and foundations; 5) the proliferation of published articles and books on the topic of bibliographic instruction; 6) the support and activities of professional library associations; 7) numerous conferences, workshops, and similar meetings dealing with the topic; 8) the establishment of clearinghouses, along with their bibliographic instruction-related newsletters and directories; and 9) standards established by various professional groups and accrediting agencies.[44]

Professional organizations began to formally recognize library instruction as a part of the librarians's job. "In 1967, the American Library Association formed the Committee on Instruction in the Use of Libraries."[45] "In 1971, the First Annual Conference on Library Orientation was held at Eastern Michigan University."[46] Out of this conference evolved in 1972, Project LOEX (Library Orientation Exchange) which was formed to collect, organize, and disseminate library-instruction materials to interested librarians. In 1971 the Bibliographic Instruction Task Force was formed by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). The task force issued guidelines for library use instruction in academic libraries. The task force also recommended the establishment of a bibliographic instruction section with the ACRl and the section was approved in 1977. Interestingly, the Bibliographic Instruction Section became the most active section within the ACRL. At the 1977 midwinter meeting, the ALA Council voted to establish the Library Instruction Round Table to provide a means of communication among divisions and committees of ALA and state clearinghouses.[47]

"The dominant influences of the 1970s were the instruction programs at Earlham College, the University of Wisconsin-Parkside, Sangamon State University, the University of Michigan, SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, the University of Texas-Austin, and UCLA.[48] The writings and presentations of Tom Kirk, Hannelore Rader, Evan Farber, John Lubans, Miriam Dudley, Patricia Breivik, Jacquelyn

Morris, Sharon Hogan, Anne Roberts, Nancy Fjallbrant, Carla Stoffle, and Richard Werking forged the shape and direction of library instruction for the decade.[49]

> For the most part, instruction librarians in the 1970s were concerned with the mechanics of developing local instructional programs and materials and all the issues attendant with that, including how to gain faculty interest and support, organize and administer programs, market or sell programs, and plan and evaluate activities. Other major concerns centered on developing definitions and trying to appropriately label the activity; justifying the need for programs and "proving" that the instruction was effective, that is, demonstrating that instruction improves the academic performance of students; creating an underlying philosophy or foundation; developing idealized models, such as the Model Statement of Objectives; creating a history or sense of tradition for those engaged in instructional activities; and gaining recognition and acceptance for instruction as a basic library service.[50]

Yet in spite of the library instruction activity taking place across the United States, the writings of well-respected librarians in the field and the recognition of bibliographic instruction by the AlA and the ACRL, fewer than ten library schools were offering courses on bibliographic instruction in 1979 according to a survey conducted by the ACRL.[51]

A review of the research presented in Lubans' *Educating the Library User* does not support the idea of a positive correlation between library instruction and academic success. "Research on the relationship between library use and class level, academic achievement, and scholastic aptitude has failed to identify any causal connection."[52] Nor was any "evidence found that the level of library service was positively correlated with college grade-point averages."[53] Research does substantiate the dominate role of the instructor in influencing library use.[54]

Four years later in 1978, Lubans edited another collection of essays entitled *Progress in Educating the Library User*. Salient points from some of these authors will indicate the way library instruction was heading in the 1970s and into the 1980s. In the forward Lubans characterizes the change in libraries and librarianship as moving "...away from an almost exclusively materials-centered orientation and toward a client-centered mode of operation...The overriding objective of the client-centered library is to make the universe of recorded information effectively accessible to its clientele...Thus, to inform or educate the library user becomes a matter of critical importance to

librarians."[56]

Lubans is critical of librarians' "missionary-like zeal" in "convincing the converted" of the need for library instruction and failing to convince those in power - most importantly teachers -f the crucial need for library instruction. He feels that unless teachers change their existing curriculum to include information use and unless information use skills are seen as being as important as literacy, then the progress of library instruction has reached an impasse.[57]

John Talley explored library instruction in junior and community colleges and found that the majority of instructional programs fell into the category of library orientation. However, he also found that research shows these students to be desperately lacking in entrance-level library use skills - 74 percent did not understand the use of call numbers, 98 percent could not identify a book review source, 67 percent did not understand the basic author, title, and subject entries in the library catalog.[58]

John Lindgren in 1978 sent out a questionnaire to 220 college libraries to determine the perceptions of the instruction librarians on their own effectiveness, problems and needs. Lindgren found that the myth that "libraries are easy to use" persists for several reasons, two of which are: 1) users seldom ponder what resources they may have missed in the library and 2) library research is always auxiliary to other enterprises, and is, therefore, never the final object (nor should it be) of the user's attention.[59] In summary, Lindgren believes that at "the heart of the user instruction matter is the belief that the ability to use libraries effectively ought to be viewed as one of the classic resources of the educated person, that it has hitherto been much neglected in formal education, and that a corrective is badly needed."[60]

On a more positive note, Allan J. Dyson, in a 1978 study of the 25 largest undergraduate libraries in the United States and Canada, found:

> "...an almost radical expansion of library instruction progress in undergraduate libraries during the last five years. Several elements have contributed to the expansion - a sense of professional duty, a need to cope with an enormous user population, (in 1976-1977 there were an average of 5,416 undergraduate students per undergraduate librarian) a move toward a more visible teaching role, and a sense of self-preservation.[61]

An area of library instruction which had been neglected in the past and which proponents and critics had been urging library instructors to address was evaluation of their programs. brewer and Hill observed in 1976 that until very recently references to evaluation in the literature of library instruction had been virtually non-existent.[62] One of the reasons for a lack of evalua-

tion is the scarcity of adequate, valid tests. Some institutions were still using the Feagley Test developed in 1955. The survey is the most widely used method of determining systematically the effects of bibliographic instruction on the student. The real problem lies in the fact that "without standardized measuring tools and agreement on objectives, instruction librarians lack norms, whether for assessing a student's bibliography, answers on an objective test, or ratings tabulated from a questionnaire."[63] All librarians are not in total agreement with the need for statistical data to provide proof of the legitimacy and effectiveness of library use instruction. Miller, in citing the Earlham College's program, says that it has demonstrated it worth but not in a quantitative manner.[64]

1980s

By 1980, after a decade of ferment and development, instruction became an accepted basic public service activity in most libraries; it overcame most of the problems of splintering; and it gained recognition from the profession at large as evidenced by its inclusion in the various guidelines and standards issued by ALA units and by the adoption of the "Policy Statement: Instruction in the Use of Libraries" by the ALA Council. Attention now shifted to issues such as the "personality" or personal characteristics of successful instruction librarians; the high burnout rate among instruction libraries; how to develop tests to measure skills; and the lack of sustained growth of most instruction programs, which was partly attributed to the growing realization that programs were being based on the talent of individuals rather than on educational principles. Also about this same time, a number of instruction librarians began to feel that the movement had reached a plateau and was in danger of becoming stagnant. To identify new directions, challenge what had now become dogma, stimulate discussion and perhaps a little controversy, raise consciousness, and in general, create a "new" agenda and focus for the 1980s, a Think Tank was proposed and then held.[65]

The Think Tank, which was sponsored by the ACRL/BIS, was held in 1981. From this meeting six sections of focus were identified and elaborated upon with an "...introduction, recommendations, and a few statements or concepts which the participants agreed should be accepted as fact and no longer debated."[66] The six sections were:

1. Integration of bibliographic instruction and library profession.

2. Integration of bibliographic instruction and the whole of academic librarianship into higher education.
3. Integrating library use skills, bibliographic concepts, and available technology.
4. Relationships with schools of library science.
5. Importance of research.
6. Importance of publication.[67]

"The creation of a high-quality journal was stressed by the Think Tank report. Within eighteen months of the Think Tank meeting, the first issue of *Research Strategies: A Journal of Library Concepts and Instruction* was published."[68]

Library schools should play a critical role in the training of instruction librarians yet the "deans of library schools are, at best, lukewarm to the idea of separate BI courses."[69] In 1980, 11 out of 67 ALA - accredited library schools offered a separate course and four years later the number remained the same.70 Library schools argue that in a one year program it is difficult to add new courses and maintain the necessary focus of the curriculum. Another problem is the lack of staff qualified to teach a BI course because much of the course must deal with learning and instructional design theory.[71] Aluri and Engle suggest that BI concepts can be integrated into the existing library school curriculum successfully if: 1) the faculty is aware of the competencies needed by BI librarians, 2) BI concepts are included in course content where feasible, and 3) faculty are alert to the potential for students to use the various course options to develop BI proficiencies.[72]

Even though bibliographic instruction courses are not common in library schools, in the Chadley and Gavryck survey of 72 ARL libraries from 1983 to 1988, BI has become part of the mainstream library service. "Provision of instruction in these libraries increased in scope and reached a larger percentage of the student body with more types of instructional programs in 1988 than in 1983."[73] In an often sited survey by LOEX in 1987 of academic libraries to determine which types of instructional methods and materials were used in bibliographic instruction, it was found that fewer credit courses, term paper clinics, and audiotape programs were offered in 1987 as compared to 1979. "In general, the amount of publicity, evaluation, and use of print and nonprint material has increased. Of particular interest is the increase in the number of libraries in which required BI sessions (primarily required by the faculty) and/or tours are offered."[74]

Future

"The disparity between library services, including user education, on the one hand, and the information

- seeking patterns and problems of the academic community on the other represents the single most important and difficult challenge facing libraries and librarians today."[75] Stoffle and Bernero have broken down this broad challenge into several more specific areas when presenting the challenges of the future to the "Second Generation" of instruction librarians. Some of the challenges they see for future instruction librarians are as follows:

1. To be able to clearly label and articulate the characteristics of the successful product of instruction programs - identify the characteristics of the independent user.
2. Performance standards for instruction librarians themselves must be created, certified, and disseminated - criteria for assessing the suitability of librarians for the instruction role need to be identified.
3. Librarians should take the lead in initiating a more thorough review of the role and philosophical base of the academic library - librarians should lead the colleges and universities through the technological changes ahead.
4. Librarians need to develop a better understanding of the faculty.
5. Developing research skills to facilitate program evaluation and identify more effective learning environments for users should be of prime importance.
6. Instruction librarians must not let activities become "ends in themselves, but must remain committed to broad goals and objectives based on the environmental context, user needs, and available resources, if the educational role of the library is to be successfully implemented.[76]

Clyde Hendrick, dean of the graduate school of Texas Tech University, spoke in 1985 about the role of the librarian in the twenty-first century.

> The growth of knowledge will lead to ever greater complexity of knowledge. Therefore, organization of that knowledge is likely to become more complex, and the physical media for storing and, sorting information will become more diverse. The user's task, therefore, will become more difficult in two ways: a) mastery of the

physical means of getting at the information and b) mastery of the conceptual systems for the organization of the library's store of knowledge. Once the physical and conceptual systems of organization are mastered, utilization will be enormously more efficient than it is today. Thus "entry difficulties" into the library will increase, while "utilization difficulties" will decrease. Solution of the entry difficulties will require teaching by the librarian, and this teaching will need to be systematic and sustained. From the user's point of view, solutions to the entry problems of the machines and the abstract organization of knowledge will be high-level technical skills that must be mastered in order for students to succeed in college. As a matter of fact, in the next century, I expect that one or more courses on library instruction will be required for every college student, much like freshman English is required of all students today. Faculty will also need comparable systematic tutoring.

This development implies that one major role change for the professional librarian will be uniform movement to faculty status. Such faculty status, probably with tenure, will be of a special nature. It follows that the library profession should move as rapidly as possible toward the Ph.D. as the terminal degree.77

Conclusion

"The concept of library instruction in academic libraries is not new. College and University librarians have long accepted the notion that in addition to assisting users with the identification of specific needed information, they also have an obligation to teach searching skills which could enable their users to function more independently."78

An examination of the records of the past century reveals that library use instruction has had an uneven and uncertain history. During the past hundred years, library use instruction clearly has been influenced by it surrounding environment of higher education. At time instruction programs have flourished because preeminent and farsighted individuals, such as Justin Winsor, have recognized changing currents in higher education and employed library use instruction to propel the academic library into a more intellectually useful direction. At other times, these programs have waned because of the inability of individuals to capitalize on the advances of their predecessors or because of the willingness of librar-

ians during a given period merely to acquiesce to conditions rather than to anticipate and lead.

Given the history of its growth and development, library use instruction could be entering a "golden period." Advocates may have anticipated the renewed interest in under-graduate education of the 1980s, as evidence by the recent publication of numerous books and reports on the subject. Moreover, proponents of instruction currently occupy many of the leadership positions in academic libraries and professional library associations. In addition, the continuing adverse economic conditions of higher education may discourage the complacency of the more prosperous periods and encourage the innovation and creativity characteristic of user programs in the 1930s and 1970s.[79]

"It seems that librarians shall always be in pursuit, because library instruction must be dynamic to be relevant and must always strive to meet the current needs of students."[80]

"How index-learning turns no student pale yet holds the eel of Science by the tail"
Pope, *Dunciad*, I, 279

END NOTES

1. Otis Hall Robinson, "College Libraries as Aids to Instruction: Rochester University Library—Administration and Use," *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Readings*, ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 19.
2. Patricia Senn Breivik, "Putting Libraries Back in the Information Society," *American Libraries* November 1985; 723.
3. James rice Jr., *Teaching Library Use: A Guide for Library Instruction* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1981 4.
4. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker, ed., *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Readings* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 3.
5. Larry Hardesty and John Mark Tucker, "An Uncertain Crusade: The History of Library Use Instruction In a Changing Environment," *Academic Librarianship Past, Present, and Future: A Festchrift in Honor of David Kaser,* ed. John Richardson, Jr., and Jinnie Y. Davis (Englewood, Co.: Libraries Unlimited, 1989) 98.
6. Hardesty and Tucker 98.
7. Hardesty, Schmitt, and Tucker 3.
8. Hardesty and Tucker 99.
9. Hardesty and Tucker 99.
10. Hardesty and Tucker 99.
11. Hardesty, Schmitt, and Tucker 3.

12. Hardesty, Schmitt, and Tucker 4.
13. Hardesty and Tucker 99.
14. Hardesty and Tucker 99.
15. Justin Winso, "College Librar ies as Aids to Instruction: The College Library," *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings*, ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 6-8.
16. Hardesty, Schmitt, and Tucker 17.
17. Otis Robinson 25.
18. Otis Robinson 27.
19. Hardesty, Schmitt, and Tucker 35.
20. Raymond Davis, "Teaching Bibliography in Colleges," *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings,* ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 43.
21. Hardesty, Schmitt, and Tucker 46.
22. Melvil Dewey, "The Relation of the Colleges to the Modern Library Movement," *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings*, ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 50.
23. Hardesty and Tucker 100.
24. Hardesty and Tucker 101.
25. Hardesty and Tucker 101.
26. Hardesty and Tucker 101.
27. Rice 8.
28. Joseph Schneider, "A College Course in Bibliography,," *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings,* ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 63.
29. William Warner Bishop, "Training in the use of Books," *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings*, ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 83.
30. Lucy M. Salmon, "Introduction in the Use of a College Library," *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings,* ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 93.
31. Hardesty and Tucker 101.
32. Charles B. Shaw, "Bibliographical Instructions for Students," *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings,* ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 107.
33. B. Lamar Johnson, "Stephens College Library Experiment," *User Instruction In Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings*, ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 110.
34. Louis Shores, "The Library Arts College, A Possibility in 1954? *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings,* ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press,

1986) 121.

35. Louis Shores 127-29.

36. Harvie Branscomb, "Bridging the Gap" *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings,* ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 131.

37. Harvie Branscomb 136, 139.

38. Patricia B. Knapp, "A Suggested Program of College Instruction in the Use of the Library," *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings,* ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 163-64.

39. Louis Shores, "The College Becomes the Library," *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings,* ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 205.

40. Anita R. Schiller, "Reference Service: Instruction of Information," *User Instruction in Academic Libraries: A Century of Selected Readings,* ed. Larry L. Hardesty, John P. Schmitt, and John Mark Tucker (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press 1986) 193.

41. Anita R. Schiller 201-02.

42. Hardesty and Tucker 103-04.

43. Hardesty and Tucker 105.

44. Carla J. Stoffle and Cheryl A. Bernero, "Bibliographic Instruction Thin Tank I: Looking Back and the Challenge for Think Tank II," *Bibliographic Instruction: The Second Generation,* ed. Constance A. Mellon (Littleton, Co.: Libraries Unlimited, 1987) 12.

45. Rice 9.

46. Rice 10.

47. Arthur P. Young and Exir B. Brennan, "Bibliographic Instruction: A Review of Research and Applications," *Progress in Educating the Library User,* ed. John Lubans, Jr. (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1978) 17-18

48. Stoffle and Bernero 12.

49. Stoffle and Bernero 12.

50. Stoffle and Bernero 13.

51. Jacquelyn M. Morris, *Bibliographic Instruction In Academic Libraries: A Review of the Literature and Selected Bibliography* (Syracuse University: ERIC, 1979) 8.

52. Arthur P. Young, "Research on Library-User Education: A Review Essay," *Educating the Library User,* ed.

53. Young 5.

54. Young 5.

55. Thomas J. Galvin, "Forward" *Progress in Educating the Library User,* ed. John Lubans, Jr. (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1978) VII.

56. Thomas J. Galvin VII.

57. John Lubans, Jr., "Introduction: Seeking A Partnership between the Teacher and the Librarian," *Progress in Educating the Library User,* ed. John Lubans, Jr. (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1978) 2-4.

58. John Lolley, "Instruction in Junior and community Colleges," *Progress in Educating the Library User,* ed. John Lubans, Jr. (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1978) 59, 63.

59. John Lindgren, "Seeking a Useful Tradition for Library User Instruction in the College Library,"

Progress in Educating the Library User, ed. John Lubans, Jr. (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1978) 74.

60. John Lindgren 77.

61. Allan J. Dyson, "Library Instruction in University Undergraduate Libraries," *Progress in Educating the Library User*, ed. John Lubans, Jr. (New York:P R. R. Bowker, 1978) 101.

62. Richard Werking, "Evaluating Bibliographic Education: A Review and Critique, " *Library Trends* Summer 1980: 153.

63. Werking 165.

64. Werking 167.

65. Stoffle and Bernero 13.

66. Stoffle and Bernero 6.

67. Stoffle and Bernero 6.

68. Stoffle and Bernero 11.

69. Rao Aluri and June Lester Engle, "Bibliographic Instruction and Library Education," *Bibliographic Instruction: The Second Generation,* ed. Constrance A. Mellon (Littleton, Co.: Libraries Unlimited, 1987) 112.

70. Kay F. Jones, "The Role of Library Schools in Educating Bibliographic Instructors," *Teaching Libraries to Teach: On-the-Job Training for Bibliographic Instruction Librarians*, ed. Alice S. Clark and Kay F. Jones (Metuchen N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1986) 4.

71. Aluri and Engle 112-13.

72. Aluri and Engle 120.

73. Otis Chadley and Jacquelyn Gavryck, "Bibliographic Instruction Trends in Research Libraries," *Research Strategies* Summer 1989: 112.

74. Teresa B. Mensching, "Trends in Bibliographic Instruction in the 1980s: A Comparison of Data from Two Surveys," *Research Strategies* Winter 1989: 10.

75. Allan J. Dyson, "Library Instruction in University Undergraduate Libraries," *Bibliographic Instruction: The Second Generation*, ed. Constance A. Mellon (Littleton, Co.: Libraries Unlimited, 1987) 101.

76. Stoffle and Bernero 14-17.

77. Clyde Hendrick. "The University Library in the Twenty-first Century," *College and Research Libraries* March 1986: 128.

78. Sandy Ready and others, "Library Instruction in Academic Libraries Including Graduate, Four-Year, and Two-Year Institutions," from the *Library Instruction Planner Handbook* 1985: 56.

79. Hardesty and Tucker 106.

80. Sonia Bodi, "Relevance in Library Instruction: The Pursuit," *College and Research Libraries* January 1984: 65.