

The Roles of Academic Librarians in Fostering a Pedagogy for Information Literacy

Gloria Leckie and Anne Fullerton

There is widespread agreement among academic librarians that they can make a crucial difference in ensuring that information literacy skills are integrated into university programs in some manner, and that they must make significant efforts to work with faculty to achieve this end (Warmkessel and McCade 1997; Baker 1995; Rader 1995; Lipow 1992). However, this is not an easy task, and numerous studies have shown that academic librarians and faculty do not understand each other's roles or expectations very well (Carpenter 1997; Crowley 1996; Hardesty 1995). The lack of understanding is further complicated by the existence of distinct pedagogical discourses for the two groups, which only serve to further distance faculty and librarians from each other. The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to examine the pedagogical discourses of faculty and librarians, and to put forward some ideas about how an understanding of discourse can aid academic librarians in developing pedagogical roles that will foster course/program-related integrated information literacy. The assumptions guiding the paper are that 1) academic librarians have an important role to play in higher education by helping students

to become information literate, and 2) course/program-related integrated information literacy is a desirable way to accomplish this.

Pedagogical Discourse

What is meant by "pedagogical discourse"? Pedagogy is defined by most dictionaries as the science of teaching and so the phrase "pedagogical discourse" could be made a little more transparent by wording it as "a discourse of teaching". This wording is not entirely accurate, since pedagogy actually encompasses at least two aspects: teaching per se, and the study of teaching. Although it is sometimes difficult to separate the two, this paper focuses a little more on teaching per se.

As for the word discourse, there are many meanings for the term, arising largely from the fact that a number of disciplines have developed the concept separately (McHoul 1993; Macdonnell 1986). The understanding of the term was revolutionized by Foucault (1970; 1972), who regarded discourses as bodies of knowledge with their associated practices (social control and social arrangements). Foucault also expressed

Gloria Leckie is associate professor, Faculty of Information and Media Studies, University of Western Ontario, and Anne Fullerton is liaison librarian, Biology and Chemical Engineering, University of Waterloo.

the idea that knowledge and power are inseparable—one always occurs with the other (Barker 1998). Power does not arise as a phenomenon separate from knowledge, but is present in all of the social practices and relations of daily life. The Foucauldian notions of discourse and power, then, are intertwined:

There are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterise and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse... We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth (Foucault 1980, 93).

In this paper, the sense of discourse used is from Vivien Burr (1995), who takes a socio-psychological approach to Foucauldian discourse. She describes a discourse as a “set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, statements and so on that together produce a particular version of events” or particular objects (p. 48). In other words, events or objects are socially-constructed and represented in particular ways by the discourses that surround them. Each discourse attempts to construct the event or object differently. Discourses are evident through the ‘texts’ of daily life (including speech acts of individuals, written documents, visual images, clothing, buildings etc.) and thus are available to be read. In other words, the texts of human activities or objects are the manifestations of the discourses which, in turn, inform and construct those activities and objects.

Pedagogy is one of those human activities that has a multitude of discourses surrounding it. What the discourse is depends upon who is doing the talking and the agenda being represented. For instance, ‘standardized testing’ is an object relating to the pedagogy of elementary and secondary education. Standardized testing is represented by several very different discourses. One is “testing as a means to ensure international competitiveness”. Individuals (often from government agencies) who put forward this discourse argue that Jurisdiction X needs to know whether students are able to perform in mathematics and science as compared to students in other countries, and so standardized testing is needed to de-

termine this. Another discourse is “testing as a control mechanism over teachers”. Individuals who espouse this discourse are of the view that standardized testing is a sham, that it will do nothing to ensure competitiveness, and really represents a way to break the power of teacher’s unions in meaningfully influencing the curriculum.

Each discourse has implications for a set of actions (or inactions) that flow from it, so the fact that one discourse prevails or becomes more powerful can have a very large impact on societal and institutional events. (Of course, even extremely entrenched and powerful discourses, such as communism, can be overturned and replaced by other discourses.)

Origins of Faculty Pedagogical Discourses

A discourse does not spring up from a vacuum. It arises from the context (objects, events) in which it is created, and in turn contributes further to the ongoing creation of that context by solidifying its representation. The pedagogical discourses of the faculty, then, cannot be understood outside of the dual processes of becoming a recognized scholar (through the attainment of a Ph.D.) and, for many, legitimizing that effort through becoming a tenured faculty member at an institution of higher education.

The essence of the Ph.D. process is that an individual must demonstrate that s/he can make an original contribution to knowledge within her/his chosen discipline. How this is done depends somewhat upon the discipline. In the sciences, it is common to work on one’s doctorate as part of a larger research project which is directed by established researchers. In the social sciences and humanities, it is quite often the case that the doctoral research is conceived and carried out by the student alone, with minimal guidance. Whether it takes place as part of a larger research project or not, the Ph.D. process is essentially a solitary endeavour in that it is a sink or swim situation. The wayside is littered with doctoral students who either could not start, or failed to complete, their thesis research. There is rarely a lifeboat in sight, and the old saying “Only the strong survive” is completely accurate.

To make an original contribution to any discipline is a daunting task. For the doctoral student, it may require years of studying the nuances of the discipline and its theoretical underpinnings, and passing a series of exams, before narrowing in on a particular area of study or research question. Within the area of study, it

requires a thorough grounding in the literature related to the research question, an understanding of the theoretical and methodological limitations of previous research, and insights into alternate approaches to the problem or question at hand. Disciplinary expertise is respected and is not to be taken lightly. Those who do not have the same level of expertise in a particular area will defer to those who do. Judgements about the value of one's scholarship and the quality of one's research are continually made, and are accepted as a fact of academic life. The discipline is paramount, permeating every aspect of the doctoral student's daily existence (Meadow 1998; Becher 1989, 19–35).

The process of acculturation to the discipline and to the academy continues even after the attainment of a faculty position. The new faculty member must develop a research program, must prove the value of his/her scholarship through faculty pedagogical discourses.

In the environment just described, teaching is often very much a second class citizen. In fact, as Hardesty (1995, 349) notes, university faculty often do not discuss teaching even with their colleagues. True, there are disciplinary-specific teaching journals, but are they widely read? For instance, when we asked the chair of a large social science department at the University of Western Ontario to find out whether any member of that department subscribed to the relevant pedagogical journal, he determined that no-one did. As well, the discipline-specific teaching journals are housed at the university's education library, which is removed from the main campus, making it highly unlikely that members of various departments will come there to read them. Nevertheless, whether discipline-specific journals are widely read or not, university faculty do teach, and there is a pedagogical discourse that surrounds their teaching. These discourses arise from, and further contribute to, the disciplinary focus and research-intensive nature of academia, and are bound up with the power relations between the faculty and other groups on campus.

By using a variety of documentary evidence available at virtually any university (such as clauses in faculty union agreements, Senate minutes, campus newspapers), examining *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and comparable publications, or perusing discipline-specific pedagogical journals and the LIS literature, we suggest that it is possible to identify at least four dominant discourses, and two counter discourses. The following section provides an overview of each discourse, illustrating how

they privilege certain types of teaching activities and inhibit others.

Dominant faculty discourses

Pedagogy as disciplinary integrity

This discourse represents the notion that each discipline has a sacrosanct core of concepts that students must assimilate before they can be allowed to possess an undergraduate degree in the discipline. Unfortunately, with new knowledge, most disciplines are expanding, so the amount of material that must be covered in a typical undergraduate degree is becoming increasingly unmanageable. This discourse, then, seeks to preserve the discipline by working against the addition of non-disciplinary and hence non-essential material (such as information literacy concepts) into courses. This discourse was quite evident in our interviews with faculty in science and engineering (Leckie and Fullerton 1999), many of whom complained that there was just not enough time in the typical undergraduate course to cover the amount of material that needed to be covered to prepare students for more senior work.

Pedagogy as disciplinary expertise

This discourse reinforces the faculty member's right to present the discipline to students. As a scholar who has studied the discipline, the faculty member will decide what is important to teach and what is not, how concepts should be ordered, and will establish the rhythm and flow for the course (De George 1997, 77). Strong adherence to this discourse may discourage the incorporation of other sources of expertise (such as librarians, and even colleagues) into the course. Ordering and timing of concepts may be a major issue, thus making it difficult to easily incorporate any information literacy activities into the course.

Pedagogy as academic freedom

A discourse closely related to the previous one, and arguably the most prevalent and powerful pedagogical discourse in evidence. In its pedagogical form (as opposed to its research form), the discourse of academic freedom upholds the classroom as the domain of the faculty member, who may teach any material that is deemed necessary, even if it is regarded as controversial (De George 1997, 76–81). Any interference with this right, particularly by those outside the discipline (such as administrators or librarians), is regarded as an attack on

scholarship. Furthermore, the discourse of academic freedom includes the idea that faculty members, by virtue of their expertise, own the products of their pedagogy—they cannot be forced to give or sell their classroom materials to others.

Pedagogy as self-motivated learning, or boot-strap pedagogy

This discourse represents the idea that the university is a centre of individualistic, self-motivated learning. The discourse suggests that those who do not have the motivation will fall by the wayside, and rightly so, since there are too many students in university now who do not belong there. Numerous participants in the interview phase of our study (Leckie and Fullerton 1999) expressed variations of this discourse, noting that students who had not learned the basics of library research were “unmotivated” or “lazy”. This idea has major implications for information literacy. It has been well documented in the LIS literature that faculty members often believe that students will learn library research skills on their own (as faculty members themselves did, by their boot-straps), either through exposure to the library or through contact with librarians (Thomas 1994; Hardesty 1991). Faculty members, therefore, feel little or no responsibility for students’ lack of library research skills beyond giving assignments that require some library use.

Despite the fact that pedagogy is about teaching others, these four discourses appear to have less to do with teaching others than they do with the faculty themselves. This is because, traditionally, the faculty have been the most powerful group on campus, and still are, although on many campuses they view their power as increasingly under attack. As Burr notes (1995), discourses are about power relations - who has the authority to speak and to act, and thus maintain power. The dominant pedagogical discourses are part of maintaining faculty control over the classroom and its associated activities. Nevertheless, there are some faculty pedagogical discourses that run counter to the dominant discourses (hence the term counter discourses, borrowed from Henry Giroux’s (1996) idea of counternarratives). Unlike the dominant discourses, these counter discourses tend to be more student-centred.

Counter faculty discourses

Pedagogy as the joy of discovery, of research

This discourse is voiced far less often but is still occa-

sionally in evidence (for example, Weston 1993). Faculty who have bought into this discourse have a great deal of work ahead of them, because it requires a huge amount of effort to teach in a way that actually inspires the joy of discovery in perhaps hundreds of students. The traditional lecture course with an essay assignment does not necessarily fill very many students with joy. Faculty who are committed to this way of teaching may be more open to the idea of integrating library-based research skills into their courses and may welcome the input of librarians.

Pedagogy as integrated learning

There is also some evidence of this discourse, but it seems to be highly program dependent. The discourse represents the idea that there are areas of knowledge beyond the academic discipline that are very important for the future success of students. For instance, in the interview phase of our study (Leckie and Fullerton 1999), the nursing faculty were the strongest voice of this discourse. In the nursing program, critical thinking and research skills are heavily emphasized and are integrated into the health care curriculum, in the belief that nurses need to be able to understand medical research, respond accurately to patient inquiries, and think independently. Some medical science and engineering faculty in our study also voiced elements of this discourse. Obviously, this discourse holds the most promise for faculty-librarian collaboration, and for the incorporation of information literacy into the curriculum.

As a group, faculty have distinct ways of thinking and talking about pedagogy. For the most part, their pedagogical discourse does not involve notions of information literacy. As evidence of this, Julie Still (1998) determined that of over 13,000 citations that she found in the ERIC database from discipline-specific pedagogical journals, only 53 citations (less than one half of one percent) included some form of the word library. She concludes that “if the library and library instruction have been integrated into the academic curriculum, there is little evidence of it in the discipline specific teaching journals” (229). This fact alone would serve to distance faculty from librarians, who are very preoccupied with information literacy. A further complicating factor is that librarians have pedagogical discourses of their own, which differ from those of the faculty.

Origins of Librarians’ Pedagogical Discourses

The pedagogical discourses of academic librarians are related to, and in turn reinforce, the values of the profession of librarianship. Librarians are acculturated not to the academy, but to a service profession. The values learned in library schools are concerned with responsibility to client needs, ethical behaviour, neutrality, and a commitment to making all kinds of information accessible in an equitable manner (Maack 1997). In addition, most library school curricula stress the development of rapid problem-solving and research skills, solid technology skills, team work, collaboration and professionalism (Buttler and DuMont 1996).

At the risk of oversimplifying, it is likely fair to say that in many ways, the acculturation of librarians is quite opposite to that of the faculty. The values they adhere to have more to do with upholding the best interests of the group than they do with individual concerns. Librarians tend to place their clients' needs first and foremost and seek to work collaboratively, while faculty place their own research above all else and seek to work independently. Most academic librarians do not go through the individualistic process of attaining a doctorate, with its attendant acculturation, and so the tenets of academia that are so key to faculty do not have the same meaning for them. For instance, it is very rare to hear academic librarians speaking about academic freedom, yet this discourse is extremely prevalent in the context of faculty life.

Academic librarians are increasingly concerned with teaching information literacy skills and concepts, and so also have developed pedagogical discourses of their own. A few of these discourses overlap with those of the faculty, but most differ markedly. Through an informal scan of the literature relating to academic librarianship and bibliographic instruction (as represented in the *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *College & Research Libraries*, and *Research Strategies*), we suggest that there are at least five dominant discourses, and one counter discourse.

Dominant Librarian Discourses

Pedagogy as disciplinary integrity

Like the faculty, librarians do have a strong pedagogical discourse that emphasizes the need to impart core concepts. For example, the ACRL Model Statement of Objectives for Academic Bibliographic Instruction (1987) is really part of the discourse of disciplinary integrity: these are the concepts that represent information literacy and thus should be taught. As well, the LIS

literature is full of examples of how difficult it is to adequately teach information literacy in limited time slots, because the information literacy curriculum is large and ever expanding. Adherence to the integrity discourse may make it difficult for librarians to think about new approaches to information literacy and may result in a high level of frustration that the integrity of the discipline cannot be maintained. It may also affect relations with faculty, who have their own version of disciplinary integrity and are not prepared to give time to ensure the integrity of another, less important discipline.

Pedagogy as meeting user needs

This is perhaps the most prevalent discourse underpinning information literacy pedagogy. It is slightly related to the faculty discourse about expertise, but has a different twist in that it is heavily influenced by the service and responsibility ethic (and, in turn, reinforces that ethic). Generally, faculty do not claim to be at all interested in their clients' needs—they assume that they already know what the needs are, based on the structure of the discipline they must present to their students. Librarians, on the other hand, want to know what their users' needs are so they can serve them better. With respect to information literacy, this usually entails figuring out what clients don't know, and then setting out to correct their lack of knowledge. For instance, the literature is full of examples of the mistakes that the average patron makes when attempting to search databases because they do not have the disciplinary expertise of librarians, who know how effective searching should be done. As the discourse goes, librarians have the responsibility to impart this knowledge to their patrons, who obviously have a need. Unfortunately, this discourse places all patrons (including faculty) in the position as the ignorant and uninformed. In some respects, then, it may work against true collaboration with faculty, who often are not regarded as having any real understanding of their own research processes and who cannot even identify their own informational needs.

Pedagogy as generic skills

This discourse represents the idea that librarians have a responsibility to teach generic skills (such as critical thinking and basic research skills) for lifelong learning. It is bolstered by government and institutional reports that suggest that the average citizen working in the knowledge society needs to have such skills to be able to con-

tinually learn and be productive (for example, Ontario Premier's Council on Economic Renewal 1994). Some who voice this discourse also claim that academic librarians may be best positioned to do this work and should lead the way (Perkins, 1996; Editorial 1994; Hill 1991) Although the discourse seems to be gaining prominence, it is also highly contested, with other academic librarians suggesting that librarians are not equipped to teach generic skills and should stay within more familiar boundaries. The implications of this discourse are similar to those of the discourse on disciplinary integrity: increasing the range and scope of what ought to be taught, and thus possibly increasing frustration if not achieved.

Pedagogy as efficiency

It is frequently noted in the literature that academic reference librarians are faced daily with a barrage of similar questions regarding basic library skills. It is also pointed out that although one-on-one instruction is perhaps the best way to teach library skills, it is time-consuming, expensive and inefficient. The discourse that is related to these observations is one of pedagogy as a means to greater efficiency. If many students have similar questions, the most efficient approach is to gather them together and teach them all at once, thus making better use of the librarian's time and providing better service for more patrons. The efficiency discourse, however, leads to a dilemma in that it may promote stand-alone instruction, with no connection to the curricula of other disciplines, thus robbing it of much of its value. Interestingly, there is no comparable faculty discourse to this, since faculty have always primarily taught groups and not individuals, and are not known to be overly concerned with efficiency.

Pedagogy as peer status

Academic librarians have been involved in a well-documented struggle for decades about the nature of their status vis-a-vis the teaching faculty. A large part of that struggle has to do with whether librarians do comparable work to the faculty and thus can be fitted into a similar model of career progression. Since most librarians cannot claim that they do the kinds of original research conducted by the faculty, it is even more imperative that they be able to demonstrate that they do contribute to pedagogy. This discourse, then, represents the idea that librarians are engaged in pedagogy and deserve to be considered as peers of the teaching faculty. Again,

the discourse both arises out of and continually constructs the context—academic librarians actively seek ways to be more involved in teaching, thus reifying their claims, and lending weight to the discourse. There is no comparable faculty pedagogical discourse, since faculty do not have any doubts about their contributions to teaching. This discourse does not impress the faculty, who tend to regard anything less than full-time classroom teaching to be marginal.

Counter Librarian Discourses

Pedagogy as enhanced reference service

After more than two decades of teaching, and thinking and writing about it, the dominant pedagogical discourses of librarians are well established as part of the landscape of academic librarianship. Nevertheless, there is one persistent counter narrative that refuses to die, and that is the idea that librarians should stop trying to be teachers and should concentrate on doing what they do best, which is to offer good reference service. The most cited proponent of this counter discourse is Tom Eadie (1992; 1990) who stated that bibliographic instruction is a waste of time, ineffective, unproven and costly. He suggested that academic librarians would be far better off putting their energies and budgets into enhanced reference services. A more recent variant was put forward by Herrington (1998), who argued that bibliographic instruction is a cover-up for the fact the library systems are too difficult to use, and that librarians should be concentrating on making access easier, thus doing away with the need for instruction entirely.

If the BI literature can be taken as representative of the thinking of a wide spectrum of instructional librarians, many academic librarians involved in information literacy instruction do seem to espouse one or more of the dominant pedagogical discourses, despite the presence of counter discourses.

Discourse in Perspective

Faculty and librarians, who ostensibly are working to achieve the same goal of producing well-rounded, articulate and skilled graduates, do not seem to be on the same wave-length about how to do this, or what is important in doing this, particularly when it comes to information literacy. The dilemma continues despite evidence indicating that faculty across the arts, social sciences, sciences and engineering are favourably disposed to the idea that students should be information literate,

yet many of them are doing nothing about it (Leckie and Fullerton 1999; Cannon 1994; Thomas 1994).

An understanding of the discourses that inform the work of the two groups can help us see why they have difficulty agreeing on the most appropriate courses of action, and seem to be at odds in accomplishing similar goals. Faculty are participating in discourses that serve to protect their disciplines, preserve their own disciplinary expertise and academic freedom, and uphold self-motivated, individualistic learning. Librarians are employing the pedagogical discourses related to meeting user needs, teaching important generic skills and providing efficient service. So, for instance, if instructional librarians on campus X employ the discourse of meeting students' needs, and the faculty in department X are using the discourse of disciplinary integrity, agreement on what to do about information literacy will be almost non-existent.

Of course, it is not quite so simple as that, either. Taken together, faculty pedagogical discourses work to actively maintain faculty control over the classroom. This frequently makes it difficult for academic librarians to insert themselves into classroom instruction in a meaningful way, or even to be considered seriously as a potential participant.

Roles of Academic Librarians in Information Literacy Pedagogy

As noted at the beginning, this paper takes the position that academic librarians have an important role to play in the educating university students to be information literate, and that course/program-related integrated information literacy is a desirable way to accomplish this. But are the discourses so powerful and all-pervasive that there is no hope of a meeting of minds with the faculty? Does it mean that librarians have to diminish their commitment to information literacy? Not at all.

First, librarians should give some thought to their own discourses, and identify entrenched or established ways of thinking that actually impede their own efforts to understand and work with the faculty. As well, librarians should start to identify and listen to the faculty pedagogical discourses on their particular campus. For instance, the two counter faculty discourses that have been identified in this paper (and there may be others) are hospitable to ideas about information literacy and to potential collaboration between faculty and librarians. Librarians should concentrate early efforts on those faculty members or departments known to employ those

counter discourses. As well, it may be that some of the counter discourses are more prevalent at institutions where the emphasis is placed on teaching more than research.

It is also important that librarians recognize that faculty are the more powerful group on campus and think of strategic ways to work for change within a system of essentially imbalanced power relations. It seems that librarians have not always clearly recognized this and have often dismissed faculty pedagogical discourses as somehow misguided or misinformed, preferring instead to employ their own librarian discourses as more appropriate. This approach is flawed: faculty pedagogical discourses arise out of, and reinforce, the faculty's view of the way in which academic life should be structured. It is foolish to assume that the faculty will be eager to embrace a librarian-centred pedagogical discourse that is essentially foreign to their experiences and ways of thinking. For instance, faculty will not abandon the discourse of disciplinary integrity in favour of one that stresses student needs.

Nevertheless, not all faculty adhere strongly to all of the dominant discourses noted previously, so there are opportunities within the pedagogical structures of campus to initiate some blending of faculty and librarian discourses. Thus, even within the constraints of the dominant faculty discourses, it is possible, and important, for academic librarians to develop a number of different pedagogical roles in relation to information literacy. The roles that we have identified from our research and other studies include:

1) Librarians as Pedagogical Liaison

Perhaps the prime role for instructional librarians is one related to direct, interpersonal liaison with departments and programs. Numerous studies have shown that advertising the services of instructional librarians does not make much of an impact on faculty. This was confirmed yet again in our research where 31% of the faculty responding to our survey (Leckie and Fullerton 1999) and 40% in Cannon's 1994 study were not aware of the instructional services on their campus, despite advertising of such services. As well, numerous faculty whom we interviewed indicated that although they had seen advertisements for instructional services, they did not realize until the time of the interview that librarians were actually available to come into their courses. Although costly in terms of personnel resources, interpersonal li-

ation is the best way to inform faculty of the range of services available, and to suggest ways in which they might be able to utilize such services. Talking to faculty on their home turf is also a good way for librarians to get a glimpse into the pedagogical discourses espoused by various departments and programs.

2) Librarians as Pedagogical Collaborators

Our research has shown that a surprisingly high proportion (over 60%) of faculty, in science and engineering think information literacy is desirable for their students in the lower years, the upper years, or both (Leckie and Fullerton 1999, 14). Furthermore, about 46% of the faculty in the sciences and 50% in the arts/social sciences (Cannon 1994) would support some form of librarian collaboration to introduce more information literacy concepts into their courses. These findings would suggest that there is a role for academic librarians as collaborators in planning and delivering information literacy within specific courses and programs. What form this collaboration would take, though, is very unclear, since the majority of faculty in our research also indicated they would not favour a team-teaching approach. It may be that a team approach is more appropriate at some institutions than others. Librarians should be aware that faculty may have varying definitions of what collaboration really means, and should be willing to work out several different models of collaboration in information literacy delivery.

3) Librarians as Pedagogical Leaders and Mentors

What about the 39% of faculty (Leckie and Fullerton 1999, 22) that do not favour a collaborative approach? Interviews with faculty in phase two of our study suggest that some faculty are willing to accept the discourse of librarians' own disciplinary expertise, and are quite happy to have librarians take the lead for information literacy delivery in their courses. Librarians ought to be prepared to take such a leadership role when it is warranted. This role has some drawbacks, however. First, in line with the discourse of respect for another's area of expertise, faculty frequently withdraw from the process entirely: 44% of our respondents did not attend the sessions delivered by a librarian in their courses (Leckie and Fullerton 1999, 23). Second, faculty then are subsequently unable to tell whether students have made any progress in developing their library research skills. Third, because they are unable to tell whether the information literacy

components of the course have improved students' skills, faculty may be less inclined to continue incorporating information literacy in the future.

The leadership role, then, has some pitfalls. To be successful in this role, librarians should also develop a complementary mentoring role. Our interviews with faculty revealed that a large number of them did not have a very clear sense of what information literacy entailed, how to go about incorporating it into the course syllabus, or how to evaluate it. Librarians need to act as mentors to the faculty in this regard. They need to show faculty how information literacy concepts can be related to the course material, and it is especially important to help faculty determine effective ways to evaluate the information literacy skills that they expect their students to demonstrate.

4) Librarians as Pedagogical Supporters

Finally, librarians have an important role to play by supporting faculty in developing and broadening their own information literacy, and by assisting faculty who then feel comfortable incorporating information literacy into their teaching. In our research, 69% of survey respondents indicated that they wanted more hands-on workshops (76% in Cannon's study). Of all the instructional options presented, this was by far the most popular. There is no guarantee that assisting the faculty in developing their own information literacy skills will translate directly into the incorporation of information literacy in the classroom. Nevertheless, supporting faculty in this way does work to break down the discourse of "bootstrap pedagogy", as more faculty begin to realize that contemporary information retrieval is very complex and is not necessarily learned by osmosis.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to illustrate how an understanding and consideration of the concepts of discourse and power relations can aid academic librarians as they attempt to foster a pedagogical environment that facilitates curriculum-integrated information literacy. Burr (1995) comments that "the discourses we employ often have political implications that we should investigate if we are interested in changing ourselves or the world we live in" (p. 57). Since universities are highly political places, this comment seems very appropriate when considering all the issues bound up with the teaching of information literacy on campus.

A dual process of self-reflection and informed listening may give librarians more insights into ways in which to approach faculty in different departments regarding information literacy. With respect to self-reflection, academic librarians would benefit from a thorough understanding of their own pedagogical discourses, and this entails some time spent in discussion with colleagues in the library system. Furthermore, as an object that is surrounded by discourses, information literacy cannot be viewed as separate from the power relations on campus. Librarians have tended not to see how information literacy activities construct and generate power, nor how their own pedagogical discourses may actually hamper their efforts to work with faculty.

With respect to informed listening, an understanding of faculty pedagogical discourses, and a better idea of how such discourses arise and function, will help librarians identify the particular discourses on their campuses. It must go further than understanding, however: face-face discussion with faculty is imperative. While this may seem like a time-consuming approach, it is the best way to gauge where information literacy fits in relation to how the faculty are thinking about, and representing, their own teaching activities. It is also the best way to determine what pedagogical role(s) should be taken in relation to the relative strength of each faculty member's disciplinary focus and his/her views on classroom autonomy, student needs, and collaborative approaches to teaching.

Bibliography

- Association of College and Research Libraries. 1987. Model statement of objectives for academic bibliographic instruction. *College & Research Libraries News*, 48 (5): 256–61.
- Baker, Robert K. 1995. Working with our teaching faculty. *College & Research Libraries*, 56 (Sept. 5): 377–79.
- Barker, Philip. 1998. *Michel Foucault*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Pr.
- Becher, Tony. 1989. *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines*. Stony Stratford: Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Burr, V. 1995. *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Buttler, Lois and Rosemary DuMont. 1996. Library and information science competencies revisited. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 37:1 (winter): 44–62.
- Cannon, Anita. 1994. Faculty survey on library research instruction. *RQ*, 33:4 (summer): 524–41.
- Carpenter, Kenneth. 1997. The librarian-scholar. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 23 (Sept. 5): 398–401.
- Crowley, Bill. 1996. Redefining the status of the librarian in higher education. *College & Research Libraries* 57 (Mar. 2): 113–21.
- De George, Richard T. 1997. *Academic freedom and tenure: Ethical issues*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Eadie, Tom. 1992. Beyond immodesty: questioning the benefits of BI. *Research Strategies* 10 (summer): 105–10.
- . 1990. Immodest proposals: user instruction for students does not work. *Library Journal* 115 (Oct. 15), 42–45.
- Editorial. 1994. A new order: BI librarians taking the lead. *Research Strategies* 12:4 (fall), 194–95.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. London: Harvest Pr.
- . 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- . 1970. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Tavistock.
- Giroux, Henry et al. 1996. *Counternarratives: Cultural Studies and Critical Pedagogies in Postmodern Spaces*. New York: Routledge.
- Hardesty, Larry. 1995. Faculty culture and bibliographic instruction: an exploratory analysis. *Library Trends* 44:2 (fall), 339–67.
- . 1991. *Faculty and the Library: the Undergraduate Experience*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Herrington, Verlene. 1998. Way beyond BI: a look to the future. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 24 (Sept. 5): 381–86.
- Hill, Patrick. 1991. Who will lead the reform of higher education? Librarians, of course! *Washington Center News* 5 (2): 3–8.
- Leckie, Gloria J. and Anne Fullerton. 1999. Information literacy in science and engineering undergraduate education: faculty attitudes and pedagogical practices. *College & Research Libraries* 60:1 (Jan.): 9–30.
- Lipow, Anne. 1992. Outreach to faculty: why and how. In Linda Shirato, ed. *Working with Faculty in the New Electronic Library*. Ann Arbor: Pieran Pr., 7–24
- Maack, Mary Niles. 1997. Toward a new model of the information professions: embracing empowerment. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*

- 38:4 (fall): 283–302.
- Macdonnell, D. 1986. *Theories of Discourse: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McHoul, A. 1993. 'Discourse', in *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. London: Pergamon.
- Meadow, A. J. 1998. *Communicating Research*. San Diego: Academic Pr.
- Ontario. Premier's Council on Economic Renewal. 1994. *Lifelong Learning and the New Economy*. Toronto: Queen's Printer.
- Perkins, Michael. 1996. Bibliographic instruction? More than ever! *Journal of Academic Librarians*, 22 (May 3): 212–13.
- Rader, Hannelore B. 1995. Information literacy and the undergraduate curriculum. *Library Trends*, 44:2 (fall): 270–78.
- Still, Julie. 1998. The role and image of the library and librarians in discipline-specific pedagogical journals. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 24 (May 3): 225–31.
- Thomas, Joy. 1994. Faculty attitudes and habits concerning library instruction: how much has changed since 1982? *Research Strategies*, 12:4 (fall): 209–23.
- Warmkessel, Marjorie M. and Joseph M. McCade. 1997. Integrating information literacy into the curriculum. *Research Strategies*, 15:2 (spring): 80–88.
- Weston, Julian. 1993. Research made real. *University Affairs*, Nov., 6–9.