**ENC 1102: INFORMATION LITERACY ASSESSMENT**

**Research Design**The purpose of the Library component of this study, as stated in Goal 2, was to “introduce students to information literacy skills used in academic research.” Students were asked to demonstrate their information literacy skills, as stated in Outcome 2, by taking a 15-item questionnaire prior to library instruction and after library instruction to see if there is any improvement. The basic research design was a pretest-post-test with a control group or quasi-experiment.

The students in five ENC 1102 classes from the pilot section were given the pretest at the beginning of the semester and prior to any library instruction during a 50-minute scheduled library instructional session taught in the Library. The library instruction was a one-time session, and Lyn LaVigne, Instruction Librarian, taught all of the library instructional sessions to the classes in the non-control or treatment group. The post-test, which was identical to the pretest, was given at the end of the semester in the students’ regularly scheduled class location. A control group, which was comprised of students from five ENC 1102 classes from the standard section, did not receive any library instruction, but the students in these classes were still administered the pretest at the beginning of the semester and post-test at the end of the semester. Lyn administered both the pretests and post-tests to all non-control and control group classes.

**Results**

The accompanying Excel spreadsheet contains all of the data collected in the spring 2010.

The first Excel worksheet shows the individual scores, both correct and incorrect responses, for each of the students who participated in the pretest organized by instructor’s/librarian’s name for the classes in the non-control and control groups. There were a total of **81** students from the non-control group and **86** students from the control group who participated in the pretest. The mean score for correct number of responses for all students in the non-control group classes was calculated as **9.91,** which is slightly higher than the mean score for all the students in the control group classes, which was **9.52.**

The second Excel worksheet shows the individual scores, both correct and incorrect responses, for each of the students who participated in the post-test organized by instructor’s/librarian’s name for the classes in the non-control group and control group. There were a total of **72** students from the non-control group and **72** from the control group who participated in the post-test. The mean score for correct responses for students in the non-control group was **10.45**, and if compared with the pretest, this is about a **5%** improvement. The mean score for correct responses for students in the control group was **10.04**, and if compared with the pretest, this is about a **5%** improvement, so statistically there was no difference in the improvement from pretest to post-test for non-control or control group classes.

However, there was a concern about one of the classes in the non-control group, where the students received library instruction, but were inattentive during the administration of the post-test. The results showed that the mean for correct responses for the post-test, about **8.56**, which was significantly lower than the pretest mean of **9.60**. Therefore, if both the pretests and post-tests for this “class of concern” are eliminated then the pretest mean for the non-control group would be about **9.98** and the post-test mean for correct responses would be about **11.00** so the difference would be **1.02** which is about **9%** as shown in the Excel worksheets entitled “Pre-tests2” and “Post-tests2.” This shows that the percentage of improvement without the ‘class of concern” would be about **9%**, whereas, with this “class of concern”it would only be about **5%** for a difference of **4%**. The percentage of improvement from the pretests to post-tests for the control group classes would still remain at about **5%**. Additionally, as a limitation, more students took the pretest than the post-test, which could be due to the attrition rate and other variables, such as the way classroom instructors motivate their students or manage classes.

**Findings and Conclusions**If we include the “class of concern” from the non-control group then the percentage of improvement is both **5%** for the non-control group and **5%** for the control group, so there is no difference. However, if we compare the results using the percentage of improvement, without the “class of concern” from the non-control group, then there is an improvement of about **9%** from the pretest to the post-test results, and about a **4%** improvement between the non-control group and control group classes. This may show that information literacy sessions do help to improve students’ basic library skills and their understanding of information literacy. This may also show that the way a classroom instructor manages a class could make a difference on students’ learning outcomes.

Since the librarian was embedded in the curriculum of the ENC 1102 classes, this could mean that library instruction when it is integrated in the curriculum and connected to a research assignment, may help to improve students’ basic library skills and understanding of information literacy. However, further assessment of integrated library instruction with classes in other subject areas using the same research design, and controlling for variables, will need to be conducted.
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