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ABSTRACT
This research project was to investigate the information literacy collaboration challenges in JKUAT library. Information literacy (IL) is a critical pillar in all libraries. It ensures optimal usage of all forms of information resources acquired. It demands collaboration between the library, teaching departments, administrators as well as users to achieve its purpose. The challenge is that this IL partnership is often missing in many information centers. This investigation was therefore geared to unearthing insights into why there is lack of IL collaboration; poor IL evaluation practices; the potential areas for IL collaboration; and strategic outcomes of partnership in information literacy training (Montiel-Overall, 2008).

The study investigated the collaboration challenges hampering information literacy initiatives in JKUAT library. The target respondents were librarians, lecturers and masters’ students. Questionnaires were used to gather information from lecturers and masters students owing to their big numbers. The senior library staff and especially the ones in-charge of the department, user instruction or subject sections were purposively selected and interviewed by the researcher. This was to enable the researcher probe and unearth more pertinent research details of qualitative nature. The librarians were fewer in number, knowledgeable and experienced in the IL subject hence the interview was apt. Out of 35 lecturers 32 (91%) responded. Only 31 (53%) of the 58 masters students responded to the questionnaire. All the targeted senior library staff (100%) were interviewed. A total of 73 of the anticipated 98 responses were received from both questionnaires and interviews representing a percentage return rate of 74%.

The overall purpose of this study was to unearth the factors hindering effective collaboration in IL in JKUAT library. The study’s main objectives were: to establish the current IL programs and policies prevailing at JKUAT library; to establish the extent of collaboration in JKUAT library’s IL programs; to identify the factors hindering IL collaboration in JKUAT library; and to find out whether information literacy programs are cooperatively evaluated and assessed in the said library.

Data was analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. Qualitatively inferences were made from the opinion of the respondents in the open-ended responses. The responses were categorized as data was edited to sift most relevant to the objects of the study. Quantitatively descriptive statistical methods were used. Statistical data was coded and analyzed with the help of a statistician using the computer-based statistical package for social scientists – SPSS. The raw data was then saved in the spreadsheet Ms Excel. It is in Ms Excel that the researcher generated percentages, pie charts, tables and graphs used to present the data. This forms chapter four of this project.

A major concurrence with previous findings elsewhere is that there is very little collaboration between librarians, lecturers, users and administrators in information literacy. The stakeholders agree that more needs to be done and propose approaches to redress this inadequacy. As Amunga (2007) had observed, this study confirmed that IL training is still an unestablished and uncoordinated effort.

The study to a great extent corroborates previous findings on the challenges which hinder IL collaboration in university libraries in the west. Generally, these impediments to IL collaboration in Jomo Kenyatta university library and elsewhere are negative attitude of
lecturers towards IL, collaboration and library generally; negative attitude of library staff towards IL efforts hampers its development; the attitude of users towards IL and the library in general; lack of clear IL policy across the university which would nurture IL partnership; poor evaluation and assessment tradition on IL; issue of academic status for librarians and ensuing remuneration disagreements; inadequate IL training time and timing of programs reduce its impact; unmanageable or large groups viz a viz space constraints in the library.

The IL collaboration challenges strongly emerging from this investigation are (a) poor public relations in the library which puts off users and other potential IL partners. The way the library projects itself when dealing with other potential collaborators determines relations in other aspects. (b) lack of leadership or initiator of IL collaboration. Other stakeholders look upon the library to propose and lobby for such partnership since the bulk of IL content is centered on the library and information services. Nothing has been initiated so far towards this end. (c) poor planning of IL initiatives. There are pockets of IL aspects that are uncoordinated. The communication skills course, electronic resources training, Orientation and research methods ought to form the basis of IL collaboration with a view to a formal partnership. (d) lack of or reluctance to acquire or share skills/knowledge on IL by both the trainers and trainees. Some members across the stakeholders are not ready to participate in IL training either for lack of confidence, skills, embarrassment or avoid workload since IL is involving. It demands continuous skills updating if one is to remain relevant in the fast evolving information field. (e) low frequency of IL training sessions inter alia, delinks the ardent information seeker from the potential collaborator offering the IL training. This cements attitudes exhibited by users.

One sphere that would promote IL cooperation was found to be missing. The study found that there is seldom any evaluation and assessment of IL programs at JKUAT. This is an ideal area to promote tripartite collaboration between librarians, lecturers and users if they formulate objectives and content, mount training and evaluate together.

Respondents agreed that it is imperative to work in partnership to make effective apt IL training albeit with shared roles. Such concerted efforts would yield the identified benefits of IL: research skills; critical skills; problem solving skills; IT skills; evaluation skills; synthesis skills, searching skills and information usage skills. These skills are vital to survive the information society and sustain lifelong learning.

The study concludes that the identified collaboration challenges facing IL initiatives must be addressed through concerted efforts and in tandem with the CHE and ACRL standards on information literacy. Information literacy is everybody’s business and not just librarians’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACRL</td>
<td>Association of College and Research Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>American Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALIA</td>
<td>Australian Library and Information Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>Bibliographic instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAI</td>
<td>Computer Aided Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUEA</td>
<td>Catholic University of East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Commission for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAQA</td>
<td>Directorate of Academic Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFS</td>
<td>Information Fatigue Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Information literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JKUAT</td>
<td>Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KU</td>
<td>Kenyatta University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Library instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRD</td>
<td>School of Human Resources Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Scientists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UASU</td>
<td>University Academic Staff Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE</td>
<td>User education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTESU</td>
<td>University Non-Teaching Staff Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIU-A</td>
<td>United States International University of Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION
Information today is like a storm engulfing all of us. To benefit from the enormous and diverse information and the fast changing information technology, we require skills that will not only help us recall specific bits of information, but instill intellectual, critical and logical skills to enable us all, as information seekers, determine the information we need; access or locate that information fast; evaluate the information and use effectively and efficiently the retrieved information (Birks and Oesleby, 2003).

Institutions have come up with programmes through time to instill into information seekers the abilities and competencies to survive in the information society. Though the concept is as old as librarianship, its formal nature gained currency in the 1960s as user education (UE) programs, library instruction (LI) or bibliographic instruction (BI). Paul Zurkowski coined its current treatment as information literacy (IL) in 1974 (Eisenberg, 2004).

Information literacy is therefore, the ability to know when there is need for information, be able to identify, locate, evaluate and effectively use that information for the issue or problem at hand (The American Library Association – ALA, 1989). Information literacy collaboration and its successes and challenges are critical concerns for all information and academic professionals in today’s knowledge-based society. There is already a shift towards increasing emphasis on faculty-librarian partnership in IL courses despite many challenges (Virkus, 2003).
In Kenya, various problems have been blamed for ineffective IL in academic institutions (Kavulya, 1995; 2003). Lack of collaboration and/or partnership with other departments is a key problem that this researcher wanted to gain more insights to. Partnership at all stages of IL efforts is the only way to ensure that the students are competent to navigate through the information-rich 21st century to the satisfaction of all education and industry stakeholders (Montiel-Overall, 2008). Without structured, collaborative and collectively evaluated IL programs, library resources and services will not be fully utilized and users will be inadequate in college and in industry (Mutula, 2004).

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
Information literacy collaboration is gaining ground in university libraries and other information centers world over (Cunningham and Lanning, 2002). Collaboration denotes ‘a trusting, working relationship between two or more equal participants involved in shared thinking, shared planning and shared creation of integrated instruction’ (Montiel-Overall, 2008). It is through ‘a shared vision and shared objectives, that student learning opportunities are created that integrate subject content and information literacy. This is by co-planning, co-implementing, and co-evaluating students’ progress throughout the instructional process in order to improve student learning in all areas of the curriculum’ (Montiel-Overall, 2008).

Collaboration in IL is necessitated by the fast growth of information, which is doubling publications output every decade (Roberts and Konn, 1991). Information literacy inculcates into library users the essential skills for survival in the 21st century.
However, despite IL benefits many university libraries in Kenya are yet to seriously initiate such collaborations between librarians, lecturers, users and other key institutional constituencies (Kavulya, 2003). This researcher observes that, lecturers and librarians only share the dais when addressing the freshmen on campus where the librarian gives his/her address. Further, the orientation tours are poorly co-coordinated and timed (Kavulya, 1995); the only course-integrated instruction in public universities is solely taught by lecturers; the marketing of library services and resources is inadequate. This means that these libraries are unable to tap some of the previously mentioned benefits especially those dependent on close collaboration for their success. An example is research and information searching skills.

The poor or lack of IL collaboration witnessed in our academic libraries including JKUAT library between lecturers, librarians, administrators and users cannot be allowed to continue. The cost of not working together for the sake of the user is immense. It means that lecturers will not know what the library is acquiring or doing to meet the educational goals. It also means the library will not know what the lecturer is doing for the same educational goals. Users will not be able to use information effectively and efficiently to enrich their lives from the flood of information through academic achievement, apt research output and lifelong learning (Hancock, 1993).

The costly electronic and print resources in our university libraries will not be optimally utilized since users will be ill-equipped and ill-motivated to navigate such without librarian-lecturer support. The education goals of learning, teaching, research and
community service will not be met since students will be inadequately skilled in college and in industry. It is therefore imperative to unearth the factors hindering information literacy collaboration with an aim of formulating solutions to reverse the trend. These not only empower and motivate users to utilize the available resources and justify the moneys being used to acquire them but also improve working relations among the collaborating members on campus.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
1.3.1 General objective

The study generally targeted to unearth the factors hindering effective collaboration in IL in JKUAT library.

1.3.2 Specific objectives

The study had the following specific objectives:

i) To find out the IL programs and policies prevailing at JKUAT library

ii) To determine the extent of collaboration in JKUAT library’s IL programs

iii) To identify the factors hindering IL collaboration in JKUAT library

iv) To assess whether IL programs are cooperatively evaluated and assessed in the JKUAT library

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions that guided this investigation are:

1. What IL programs and policies prevail at JKUAT library?

2. What is the extent and level of collaboration in JKUAT library’s IL programs?

3. What are the collaboration challenges facing IL programs in the said library?

4. Are IL programs cooperatively evaluated and assessed in the JKUAT library?
1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY
It was the aim of the researcher to unearth the current status of IL collaboration challenges in our university libraries. The findings of this study are significant in several respects:

1. They will add to the body of knowledge relating to local IL collaboration.
2. The results will also inform decision-making, policy formulation and management of university libraries in the IL sphere in this era of electronic information.
3. They will help not only the library under study but also others to harness their human, technical and information resources to their own and users’ benefit.

1.6 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY
A number of reasons militated against an expansive and all-inclusive study. The main limitations are due to:

i. Financial constraints to cover a wider scope in travel hence only one institution was covered but in depth;
ii. Time constraints, since the researcher was concurrently expected to write the research proposal, collect data and undertake some full time examinable units within stipulated time. In the later stages, the researcher combined this exercise with office duties.

Respondents were drawn from relevant library staff, lecturers and masters students from same teaching departments, schools or institutes. These primarily responded to issues central to the study - IL collaboration challenges - and not collaboration in any other areas. The study covers only JKUAT in detail as a case study.
1.7 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY
This study is anchored on the collaboration theory as advanced by Barbara Rogoff, Jean Lave, Paul Duguid and John Seely Brown. Though collaboration is one of the most difficult challenges in contemporary higher education, these theorists believe it is necessary in order to move student-centered approaches forward, as a cultural issue, a shared thinking and communities of practice (ACRL, 2008).

These theorists categorize forms of collaboration into: (1) symmetrical – where there is equality of status and similar levels of participation, and (2) complementary or unequal – where there are leaders, followers, varying levels of participation and the collaborative attitude transcends individual characteristics of the partners (ACRL, 2008).

The key issues in campus collaboration in IL according to these theorists are: IL is everybody’s business; extensive use of standards to reveal and construct collaborative possibilities; create opportunities for conversation about engaged learning; develop “communities of practice” for information literacy (ACRL, 2008).

Shared thinking in IL and the use of standards contribute to easier assessment and accreditation, writing improvement and critical thinking, retention, graduation rates and employer satisfaction.

All the pillars of IL system must work in a collaborative synergy to realize greater success of IL efforts and achieve the requisite skills of this century – critical skills,
research skills, problem-solving, decision-making and power to wade through the information maze of our time. Their total individual input is less than what they achieve by a well-coordinated partnership or interaction, which has a multiplier effect (Montiel-Overall, 2008).

1.8 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY
The following conceptual framework shows how the study’s variables interrelate. The independent variables are the collaboration of IL programs. These are manipulated to see the effect on the dependent variables – information literacy or skills. The outcomes of effective IL partnership are such benefits as lifelong learning, research skills, searching skills, critical thinking skills, synthesizing skills, problem-solving, decision-making and others. Ideal collaboration between the library staff, faculty, technologists, administrators and users in delivery and evaluation of IL programs should result into these. Improvement in collaboration efforts of IL training results in improved information literacy skills to the users as well as the tutors.

However, the benefits of IL collaboration can only be realized on overcoming some intervening challenges or the factors that often hinder cooperation. These revolve around attitude issues, policy issues, design of IL, teaching IL, academic status wars, poor timing, improper planning, lack of feedback, IL examination, research assignments versus sit-ins tests, student assessment of tutors, ICT enhanced partnership, peer review and general evaluation (Doskatch, 2003). These are further complicated by other challenges like unmanageable group sizes, inadequate staff and space as well as lack of administrative support (Kavulya, 1995).

The independent and dependent variables interplay are depicted in the following conceptual framework diagram generated by the researcher showing how they interrelate. The independent variables are the challenges while the dependent variable is IL collaboration itself. Collaboration in IL is therefore dependent on how the challenges are overcome.
Figure 1.1: The collaboration challenges facing information literacy programs in JKFUAT library - Kenya

EXPECTED BENEFITS OF IL COLLABORATION

- Lifelong learning
- Research skills
- Searching skills
- Critical thinking skills
- Synthesizing skills
- Problem-solving skills
- Decision-making skills

- Media skills
- Evaluation skills
- Locating skills
- Usage skills
- Library skills
- Technology skills

- IL Integrated to curriculum
- Quality research
- Optimal utilization of skills
- Optimal usage of library
- Basis for other partnerships
- Mutual respect

Source: The Researcher, 2009
1.9 OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Information literacy - IL: This is a set of abilities requiring individuals to "recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information" (ALA, 2006). It is synonymous to 'information skills’ and 'information competence'.

Information literacy programs: These are institutional initiatives in form of courses or activities, which encourage students' development of IL skills. Examples are orientation tours, library skills instruction, integrated course, notices and guiding among others.

University library: This is a library that serves a university and other institutions of higher learning and is organized to meet the information, teaching and research needs of the students, staff and lecturers.

Evaluation/assessment: The act or processes of gathering data to better understand how best students are learning the skills here in the context of IL. The term refers to outcomes assessment of the recipient, tutor or the program on skills and competencies learnt and how learnt.

Collaboration: This refers to two or more partners bringing different strengths and perspectives to a task with shared goals, a shared vision, and a climate of trust and respect. The partnership here is between the librarians, faculty as well as cooperation of users. The collaboration must begin at objectives, design, implementation and assessment of the programs without prejudices.

Challenges: This implies drawbacks, hindrances or impediments to achieve a goal or objectives but can however be overcome.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter is a review of literature on the central aspects of IL in academic libraries pertinent to the study: collaboration challenges. These are broken down into the concept of information literacy, collaboration challenges as well as the importance of IL collaboration.

2.2 THE CONCEPT OF INFORMATION LITERACY
As already highlighted, IL denotes the individual skills to recognize when information is needed and the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively and efficiently the needed information (ALA, 2006).

The American Library Association Presidential Committee on Information Literacy (1989); Shapiro and Hughes (1976); ACRL (2006) and ALIA (2003) all concur by providing closely related definitions of the concept of IL. The emerging information society necessitates users skills to identify, locate, evaluate and apply information effectively, legally and ethically without suffering from information fatigue syndrome (IFS) as a result of information overload (Virkus, 2003).

The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL, 2000) has set IL standards to guide information professionals and other players. These are summarized as:

- Information literate person recognizes the need for information and determines the nature and extent of the information needed;
- the information literate person accesses needed information effectively and efficiently;
➢ the information literate person evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into their knowledge base and value system;
➢ the information literate person classifies, stores, manipulates and redrafts information collected or generated;
➢ the information literate person expands, reframes or creates new knowledge by integrating prior knowledge and new understandings individually or as a member of a group;
➢ the information literate person understands cultural, economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically, legally and respectfully;
➢ the information literate person recognizes that life-long learning and participative citizenship requires information literacy.

Any worthwhile IL program must aim at realizing these standards normally accompanied by indicators or outcome measurements for ideal IL to be realized (ALIA, 2003; ACRL, 2000).

2.2.1 Forms of Information literacy programs

Information literacy programs take two basic forms, that is, separate courses - for credit or non-credit - or activities integrated into general education courses and/or courses in major fields of study. Other informal, co-curricular - outside of class - programs do also encourage students' development of information literacy skills (ALA, 2006).

According to Virkus (2003) information literacy takes the form of short orientation courses, stand-alone courses or classes, Web-based tutorials, course-related instruction,
or course-integrated instruction. While more authors seem to agree that information literacy should be integrated into subject areas (Kemp, 1999; Joint & Kemp, 2000; Rafste, 2002; Town, 2002b), others (Webber & Johnston, 2000) prefer that it be treated as a discipline of study in its own right. Though this researcher prefers an integrated IL program, it must be collaboratively planned, designed, implemented and evaluated by all stakeholders to create campus-wide ownership.

There is also increased faculty-librarian partnership in implementation of modern ICTs in delivering information literacy courses through CAI. The web-based tutorials, like ‘ask-a-librarian’ reference facility and other online instruction present another front fertile for collaboration with immense potential. The pervasive impact of information technology has been a catalyst for many collaborative projects. Increasingly, librarians are working with academic staff to integrate new electronic information formats into the curriculum.

Roberts (1982) urges for both course-related and course-integrated instruction where the librarian and lecturer work together as a team in conducting the course. Such forms of instruction expose users and faculty to complex research skills and resources; build the library and librarians’ professional and research image; as well as reveal the librarians’ role in the teaching-learning process.

Some of the most notable institutions to integrate library instruction or information literacy with other courses are Earlham College and Wayne State University (Roberts, 1982; Thomas, 2004). The course demands cooperation between the librarian, lecturers and users from planning to evaluation. The programs promote library usage to do class assignments (Thomas, 2004).
Roberts (1982), Fjallbrant and Malley (1984), Fjallbrant and Stevenson (1978) also identify the above programs but adds others like computer-assisted-instruction, point of service, lecture, self-directed, audio-visuals.

2.2.2 Information Literacy in Kenya

Locally, Kavulya (1995, 2003) identified the information literacy programs in Kenyan university libraries as orientation, communication skills course, point-of-use instruction, instruction courses, reference service, manuals and guides. Locally, these forms have also been identified by Mutula (2004), Amunga (2007) and Mwangi (2007). Generally, information literacy programs locally are inadequate and bedeviled with a myriad of problems (Kavulya, 1995; Mwangi, 2007).

2.3 COLLABORATION IN IL

In a general sense, this denotes working in partnership to achieve a common or shared purpose. It implies cooperation between several entities to realize a goal or solve a shared problem. In a library setup, to inculcate IL skills to users demands the input of a cross section of key players in the role. Librarians, students, lecturers, media specialists and administrators ought to concert their efforts to be effective in aptly horning information skills of users (Montiel-Overall, 2008).

Montiel-Overall (2008) while looking for a theory of IL collaboration observes that to be successfully implemented on campus, information literacy depends on close collaboration or partnership between classroom faculty, academic administrators, librarians and other information professionals. However, a review of the literature show that this often does
not happen and has indeed stirred many information professionals who have through time embarked on research to unearth the underlying causes. So is the case for this researcher. Bruce (2001) identifies five different dimensions or areas potential for the librarian-lecturer collaboration or partnership: policy partnerships; research partnerships; curriculum partnerships; higher degree supervision; and academic development partnerships. If they can work closely in these areas, more synergy can be realized as they can understand and respect the expertise of each other.

Breivik (2005) arguing for resource-based learning which promotes lifelong learning, critical thinking and problem-solving says that IL cannot be just taught by librarian or faculty, it must be learned by students through experiences shaped by librarians and faculty. Hancock (1993) adds that there is need for close collaboration between librarians, lecturers and other specialists like library/media specialists and computer technicians to enhance information literacy.

Doskatsch (2003) concurs and supports partnerships between faculty and librarians arguing that the success in lecturer-librarian collaboration depends on understanding the preconceptions and perceptions of such a relationship, and the external forces that drive cross-disciplinary collaboration.

Doskatsch (2003) argues that academics and librarians must partner in curriculum decisions, materials and delivery design, student services and support, interaction with students, marking assignments and quality assurance of both course and teaching and learning process. The above views are supported by findings of a study in the
International Islamic University of Malaysian by Adikata and Anwar (2005). These two researchers concluded that lecturers believe that the tripartite encounter between students, faculty and librarians strengthened students’ self-esteem and self-confidence.

According to the ALA (ACRL Bibliographic instruction section), IL programs require leadership and support of academic administrators in terms of budget, a conducive atmosphere for cooperation among all stakeholders and a vision to develop students as skilled independent learners.

The knock-on-effect of lack of a librarian-faculty partnership supported by institutional policies and resources is too great to contemplate. It determines how users regard the initiative. If all were to work together in planning, designing, developing, mounting and evaluating the various forms of information literacy programs, all of them would achieve their individual and collective objectives. Establishing a true collaborative effort is the greatest challenge in promoting information literacy. As Cunningham and Lanning (2002) points out, in such an environment, IL participants must negotiate, submit egos and merge their agendas.

Quoting Hannelove (1999), Amunga (2007) emphasizes the need for librarians to cooperate with faculty and technology experts to achieve the best learning and teaching environments. While the faculty provides the subject expertise and understanding, the librarians compliment this through their searching and retrieving skills knowledge. The technology experts maintain and sustain the IL infrastructure in form of hardware and software.
2.3.1 Information Literacy Collaboration in local universities

Locally, Kavulya (2003) notes that there is evidence of lack of collaboration between communication skills department and other players in formulating a course that fits well with all disciplines. He observes that information literacy can only succeed if there is close cooperation between the lecturers and librarians. Kavulya further observes that there is a need to integrate information literacy as an integral part of the university curriculum so that lecturers encourage students to use the library in all their assignments.

Kavulya (2003) roots for partnership in the design and delivery of information literacy programs. Collaboration must start at the content design, delivery and assessment of IL programs with a view to enhance their effectiveness.

Kaane (2005) in a case study of USIU further reported inadequate collaboration between library staff and the lecturers at USIU-A in the then Lillian Beam Memorial Library. Despite attempts to increase collaboration, she reports minimal integration of information literacy into academic programs. The little efforts like library skills program taught within the study skills in English course and integrated information literacy course FYE 1010 integrated within Planning and Strategies for Success course are both taught by lecturers. The library staff only handles the accompanying students and lecturers’ visits (Kiondo and Msuya; 2005). Both Mwangi (2007) and Amunga (2007), who paint a gleam picture of IL collaboration in Kenya, share the above views in the local scene.

2.3.2 Challenges hampering IL collaboration

There are a number of challenges hampering effective collaboration in IL identified from the reviewed literature both globally and locally.
2.3.2.1 Lack of a clear IL policy delineating roles and responsibilities

According to Amunga (2007), there is still no formal collaboration between the librarians and academic staff in designing and mounting information literacy programs. The lack of clear policy guidelines to formally bring the two together she observed leads to uncoordinated initiatives like the communication skills course where the librarian plays a fringe role. Amunga noted that the lack of a clear information literacy policy is the key challenge to collaboration.

Mwangi (2007) concurs observing that the lack of information literacy related policy in many academic institutions locally, fuels the conflict between librarians and lecturers as well as cementing negative attitudes of users towards the library. A clear policy would not only iron out such, but would also state clearly the scope of who should teach what, where and when it should be mounted with specific objectives.

2.3.2.2 Attitudes of the users towards IL collaboration

The lack of cooperation between users and librarians is a critical challenge. Even where there is a semblance of policy, students and especially lecturers fail to attend their pre-arranged sessions (Amunga, 2007). Though Amunga’s research established that there is little or no collaboration between the librarians and faculty in imparting the skills to users, it does not say the other probable reasons apart from lack of policy guidelines on the same. The current study aimed to fill this crucial gap by generating further insights to the situation.

Quoting research findings by Nolan (1989), Thomas (2004) found that students, for whom research skills were delivered within the context of curricular tasks, tended to use
the library more, had better attitudes about the library and had higher expectations as to its accessibility and utility than students taught same skills in stand-alone lessons had had.

### 2.3.2.3 Attitudes of library staff towards IL collaboration

Among some librarians, there is inherent fear of rubbing the academic staff the wrong way or the fear of adding themselves extra workload (Doskatsch, 2003). This is a misconception. It hurts them more than if they embraced IL partnership to ensure users self-serve.

Milne (2000) quoted by O’Sullivan (2005) challenges librarians to change their attitudes in as far as information literacy is concerned by embracing partnerships with other members of the organization in realizing information literate community. This implies cooperation in this strategic partnership heralding life long learning and the 21st century survival skills.

Librarians must take initiative, be proactive and tactful in dealing with academic staff. They must champion the collaboration with faculty members. Such initiative is reported to yield fruits e.g. the Earlham College model case where success was realized in cooperation with the then librarian setting the pace (Farber, 1999). The key landmarks of Earlham College were the rapport and synergy between the librarians and lecturers; apt library skills integration into courses as well college culture demanding library usage (Thomas, 2004). This is not the case in many institutions including ours in Kenya.
Baker, quoted in Pastine and Katz (1989), is for shedding off the librarian-faculty stereotypes, which hinder collaboration. Librarians feel that the lecturers do not regard the library highly to persuade or motivate the students to use library resources. They feel that lecturers perceive libraries as mismanaged and lacking information seeking skills and hence have nothing to offer in a partnership. This makes the librarians recoil in self-pity (Pastine and Katz, 1989).

Librarians are also viewed to have an outlook weakness regarding professional self-understanding and self-definition, which has contributed to an inability to communicate to the academic community what it is they do and stand for (Doskatsch, 2003). Librarians are their own enemies for lacking the confidence to face their academic peers as co-educators and being unable to distinguish between service provision, training and teaching. This lack of confidence hinders collaboration since the two players cannot work as equal partners in such circumstances (Lupton, 2002).

According to Amunga (2007), some librarians are not collaborating among themselves to offer comprehensive information literacy training to their users. If there is no synergy within the library staff involved in IL, the initiatives will never take off and the vicious cycle of poor service and negative attitude towards the library will persist. The first line of collaboration lies between library staff themselves before tactfully approaching the lecturers and others.

**2.3.2.4 Attitudes of lecturers towards IL collaboration and librarians**

According to Van der Walt et al (2007) quoting Albrecht and Baron (2002), librarians are no longer keepers of information but teachers of information. This presents a frontier of
collision with the reluctant lecturers who may be unwilling to accommodate the librarian in the educational role as it is observed by Doskatsch (2003).

The attitudes of academics towards librarians and libraries are largely influenced by experiences, subjectivity, and prevailing public image (Black, 1993).

In the media, librarians are depicted as

“conservatively attractive, dull, young, white middle class women or aged celibate eccentrics” (Doskatsch, 2003).

Many academics see the role of the librarian as that of

“…enforcing silence and obstructing learning and information seeking process in libraries with a range of behaviors towards patrons that run from less than helpful to downright hostile” (Doskatsch, 2003).

Such prejudices often arise though in this researcher’s view it is professional-centrism.

The value a classroom instructor attaches to library research determines the students’ interest in use of library materials (Adikata and Anwar, 2005). Librarians and faculty should therefore, work together at all stages of information literacy instruction. This is not often the case since the lecturers often feel that librarians who engage in teaching IL are encroaching in their domain - teaching (McInnis, 1978; Mwangi, 2007).

According to Homann (2001) and Virkus (2003), most librarians are not qualified to take on teaching tasks. Harrison and Owen (1992) concur, asserting that for most librarians the education role would be a difficult task due to lack of educational qualification, skills
and experience (Doskatsch, 2003). This is contentious since while lecturers teach discipline content, information professionals teach the information searching process.

Cowley (1975) captures the feeling of a majority of academic members on IL saying that “despite the length of time library user education has been around, it is not widely accepted as legitimate call and mission of the librarian by academic staff” (Mwangi, 2007).

This corroborates the views by Doskatsch (2003) that the attitudes of faculty towards librarians are negative. They regard librarians as subordinates calling them ‘check-out chicks seeking self-aggrandizement’.

This is a very derogatory reference to a potential equal partner in IL efforts to achieve a common goal - benefit the students in gaining lifelong learning skills. This researcher believes that librarians just like lecturers and other actors have a lot to offer in molding information literate students. Complimentality indeed improves skills of all involved.

Despite the above views, a research done in the International Islamic University of Malaysian reveal that academic staff regards library staff as critical in training library usage biased towards library-based assignments. However, they feel that librarians need to proactively promote their resources to lecturers and students, promote course-integrated library use by supporting the lecturers in designing assignments and provide a welcome academic environment in the library to users as a way to promote usage. The International Islamic University of Malaysian research findings show that lecturers believe that IL collaboration heralds student’ self-esteem and self-confidence (Adikata
and Anwar, 2005). This researcher is not sure that the lecturers locally regard librarians that highly to effectively collaborate in IL.

2.3.2.5 Academic status for librarians’ debate

Academic status elevation for librarians does not necessarily improve lecturer-librarian partnership in IL delivery. With its attached obligations and challenges, it only triggers inter-relations tuff wars between librarians and lecturers (Doskatsch, 2003).

Research done on the rank, status and contribution of academic librarians as perceived by lecturers show that lecturers would only support academic status for librarians if their qualifications, research and publication output were at par (Cook, 1981; Divay et al., 1987; Oberg et al., 1989; Haynes, 1996). Again this creates a lacuna between equal partners in the education goal, and should be avoided.

Evans and Malley (1979) observe that lecturers fear that librarians are usurping their teaching role by engaging in IL teaching. This fear of losing clout to librarians in the eyes of the users for partners in teaching and learning is in this researcher opinion misplaced.

In Finland, a lot still need to be done to integrate IL in higher education, though in a few universities teamwork is visible. The librarians are looked down upon by the lecturers and must prove themselves pedagogically to be allowed to give input (Sinikara and Jarvelainen, 2003).

Though local studies by Kavulya (1995; 2003), Mutula (2004), Kaane (2005), Amunga (2007) and Mwangi (2007) highlight the lack of IL collaboration in university libraries,
they do not unearth the underlying reasons like the foregoing ones from Australian and Western researchers. This study should eventually fill this information gap.

The lecturer is the best authority on what will satisfy the user and his information needs. Peacock (2001) prescribes that to erect effective and professionally dynamic teaching and learning collaboration, systemic barriers between lecturers and librarians must be flattened. Librarians need to develop, exploit and foster strategic and diverse teaching and learning alliances. Such strategies include, personal touch, gaining administrative support, targeting receptive and willing lecturers, make collaboration fun and deepen curriculum and pedagogic skills among others (Riedling, 2004).

2.3.2.6 Lack of cooperation in IL assessment and evaluation

Evaluation is the key to any learning process and it allows for the assessment of skills and competencies that are used throughout life (Gomez, 1998). Users through their feedback are also supposed to assess their own tutors be they lecturers or librarians so as to enhance IL (Gaunt, et al, 2007).

Both summative and formative assessment, which tests whether users have acquired the information skills are used. They are either in form of in-class test or essay, which does not count in final mark or dissertation; essay or exam, which counts in final mark of a course. The outcomes and appropriateness of lessons is seen in quality of work from students. These are assessed formally or informally by the tutors and ascertain that the session outcomes are realized from course objectives and the earlier mentioned IL standards (Gaunt, et al, 2007).
Lecturers, librarians and others ought to work together in developing assessment instruments, strategies and do the evaluation together to ascertain whether their students are assimilating the taught skills. Colleagues or peers do assess each other. An example is the Cardiff University peer review of learning and teaching (Gaunt, et al, 2007). Locally, no such partnerships are mentioned in IL related literature, further motivating this researcher to unearth more and fill an information gap in the Kenyan scene.

The ACRL provides a framework for assessing the information literate individuals through its IL competency standards for higher education. These standards outline the process by which faculty, librarians and others pinpoint indicators identifying information literate users. The standards are also accompanied by expected outcomes, which are very critical in evaluation or assessment of the programs success (ALA, 2000). Incidentally, academic staff, librarians and others will find that discussing assessment methods collaboratively is a very productive exercise in planning a systematic, comprehensive IL program. The assessment should reach all students, pinpoint areas for further development and consolidate learning goals already achieved (ALIA, 2000).

There is little evaluation and assessment done of the IL due to lack of necessary synergy between the faculty, librarians and users locally and farther a field. Kavulya (2003) notes that the lack of evaluation is because of the lecture methods used necessitated by large number of students and less library staff. This explanation is incomplete owing to the fact that instruction takes many forms. Kaane (2005 observes that non-librarians are primarily the ones who teach and assess library skills at USIU. However, she does not explain what
factors hinder collaborative teaching and evaluation of IL in one of the leading institutions in embracing IL.

Roberts (1982), argues that evaluation in library instruction is not highly developed; but warns that this assessment should not be a barrier between the library and its users. Assessment cooperation ought to begin in program goals and objectives design, instruction mounting, assessing needs and testing results. A review ought to be done to improve the programs. This cycle is not as visible as it should be both locally and even in the far developed education institutions.

Breivik (2005) also calls for paradigm shift in assessment outlook from the input measurement to student learning outcomes assessment prescribed by ACRL in the earlier mentioned standards as well as expected outcomes.

Evans and Malley (1979) though supporting evaluation, advises against over-evaluation, which would put off users. Users with their suspicious and lukewarm regard of library and librarians would not be comfortable with too much of evaluation exercises. The motivation from lecturers’ emphasis on library use would augment the profile of IL assessment to the level of taught course works.

Thomas (2004) concludes that it is vital for the lecturer and librarian to provide assignments and activities that demand critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Only by doing so would users learn how to learn and the life long skills to navigate the information-based society.
The main challenge in evaluation and assessment of IL is therefore hampered by lack of cooperation between users, librarians and lecturers. Users often fail to attend booked sessions and ignore orientation tours for lack of drive from stakeholders (Amunga, 2007).

2.4 BENEFITS OF IL COLLABORATION
Breivik (2005) argues for resource-based learning, which promotes lifelong learning, critical thinking and problem solving. A well designed, delivered and cooperatively evaluated IL initiative imparts into users, research skills, searching skills, critical thinking skills, synthesizing skills, problem-solving, decision-making skills, technology skills, media skills, learning to learn - the essential skills for survival in the 21st century.

According to Jackson and Hansen (2006), partnership in IL ensure that students learn how to interpret research tasks, find information, assess the authority of sources, put evidence to use, and recognize their role in creating knowledge. IL ensures that students learn how to find information using library resources as well as how to evaluate that information so that they can produce better papers and research projects (Cunningham and Lanning, 2002).

Kuhlthau’s ideas on information search process emphasizing on critical thinking, decision making and problem solving has reinforced the teaching and learning roles of IL useful to students, librarians and faculty (Thomas, 2004).

According to Kavulya (2007) regardless of whatever discipline, IL skills enable users to master content and have confidence to do investigation, be self-reliant and have a sense of being in control of their learning environment. This is very vital in the current century.
Information literacy competencies are survival skills that are needed by all to counter information overload (Mutula, 2004).

Owing to the critical importance of these skills, they are not the business of only one stakeholder to teach. They call for partnership across the university (Montiel-Overall, 2008). All the challenges that hinder this collaboration must be identified and addressed if the above benefits are to be realized.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION
Among the major elements discussed in this chapter are the research design, location, the population, sampling methods (sample size), data collection methods as well as research tools or instruments of data collection. Also highlighted are central issues relating to research including data reliability, validity and ethical issues.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN
The researcher used a descriptive survey – defined by Orodho (2003) in Kombo (2006) as the collection of information through interviews or questionnaires from a sample of individuals. This study design is apt to collect data on opinions, attitudes and feelings. Though primarily qualitative, triangulation will be achieved by complimenting the primary data collection tools - interview schedules with questionnaires - both open and closed. Triangulation is the application and combination of several research methodologies and instruments in a study of the same phenomenon. It can be employed in both quantitative (validation) and qualitative (inquiry) studies to overcome the weakness or biases and the problems in one method (Wikipedia, 2008). Responses from a small sample give inferences or deductions of a whole population (Macmillan and Schumacher, 2001). The researcher endeavored to unearth in-depth details on collaboration challenges associated with IL partnerships particularly the cooperation between the three key stakeholders – librarians, lecturers and users. The responses from the target respondents are used to generalize the population traits.

3.3 LOCATION
The investigation was based in Juja 36 Kms North East of Nairobi, Thika district, Central province. The researcher studied the case of JKUAT library – a public university library,
so as to get an in-depth account of the IL collaboration challenges. The researcher stratified the public and private university libraries. Out of the public universities, the researcher randomly selected JKUAT the only public university in the province for an in-depth survey. According to the CHE there are 7 public and 18 private universities in Kenya (see appendix H). Most IL related researches are done in the Nairobi region or in institutions offering information science as a programme in a library school. Such far-flung institutions like JKUAT are usually not covered.

3.4 TARGET POPULATION
This is a whole group (universe) of individuals, events or objects having common observable characteristics (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999). The entire university population is approximately 9,000 (staff and students). In this particular study, the target population was 50 librarians, 350 lecturers (tutors) as well as 580 masters students (users) of IL. Lecturers and students were drawn from the School of human resource development - SHRD, School of architecture and building - SABs, Faculty of science, faculty of engineering, Faculty of agriculture as well as Institute of computer science and information technology - ICSIT. The students from above schools are only homogenous by academic level or programs (masters) and are undertaking research. These ought to use the library often and hence require IL skills. These departments were randomly selected and availed a list of staff as a sampling frame in time for sampling purposes. The lecturers and library staff provided insights on their views towards IL partnership. The target population is not homogenous but diverse in demographic traits. This diversity is taken into consideration when sampling so as to draw from each department to improve reliability (Kombo, 2006).
3.5 SAMPLING METHOD AND SAMPLE SIZE
According to Singleton (1998) sampling means the process of selecting a few cases from a large population of cases for the purpose of studying them and generalizing on the large population. These few cases are the sample while the total population is the universe.

3.5.1 Sampling Technique
The researcher used stratified sampling method to select the institution to be studied. All the universities in Kenya were stratified into public and private. A simple random sample was then carried out and yielded JLUAT. Random sampling denotes the selection of items for study where each element of the population has an equal chance of being selected (Kothari, 1985). The researcher purposefully sampled senior librarians who are information rich respondents for in-depth analysis of IL related issues. This was believed it could increase reliability of getting useful data from more representative and information-rich respondents (Macmillan and Schumacher, 2001; Kombo, 2006). Schools and faculties were stratified and then departments randomly sampled. The lecturers and the masters students were simple randomly sampled from each sampled teaching department. It was quite tedious sampling lecturers and students from across carious teaching departments. The library staff list and some departmental lists of lecturers and students’ list from the Board of Post Graduate Studies -BPS served as sampling frames.

3.5.2 Sample size
The sample size targeted for purposes of arriving at sought data was 98 respondents drawn from the target population as shown in the table 3.1. The sample is approximately 10% the target population but not the universe. Data reliability and instrument administration was easier for the researcher when lecturers and masters students’ samples were drawn from same department, institute or school.
### Table 3.1: Target Population and Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Targeted Respondents</th>
<th>Total Target Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Head/Reference/subject librarians</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Lecturers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Masters students</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Target</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>980</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.6 DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES
The researcher used both survey and interview methods of data collection. The mode of data collection was determined by *inter alia* the population, characteristics of the sample, types of questions, question topic, response rate, cost, and time considerations. For the survey, the researcher used both questionnaires and interviews schedules to answer the study objectives and the research questions. These are usually ideal to solicit opinions, attitudes, habits and other social and educational issues (Kombo, 2006).

For the interview, an interview schedule of semi-structured questions was developed to orally solicit for desired information from some of the target respondents - librarians. Appointments were then booked with the targeted respondents on when to conduct the interview or when to collect the questionnaire. Subsequently interviews were conducted by the researcher and the questionnaires collected by the researcher and the two assistants.

#### 3.7 RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS
Before the actual administration of the tools, permission was sought from the Deputy Vice Chancellor through the registrars. Apart from the researcher’s introductory letter, the letter from the Kenyatta University - Library and Information Science Department
was also useful when booking appointments with respondents and their departments or institutes. The questionnaire distribution and collection plus interview sessions were held within the month of March and April 2009. As much as possible, accurate transcription of responses especially to interviews was done to ensure easier analysis and presentation of data.

The following combination of data collection instruments were used to compliment the data from each other since each has its own strengths and inadequacies:

3.7.1 Questionnaires

According to Kothari (1990) this refers to common sets of questions set out on paper or online to be completed by information bearing respondents in a study. It is useful in data collection because it heralds consistency and trustworthiness since all respondents receive standard questions in the same order. It is ideal for large number of respondents as well as being simple, quick and easy to use. The questionnaires were constructed from the objectives and research questions. From general questions which answer the objectives to specific questions which provide answers to various facets of one objective. Two sets of questionnaires were formulated and administered: one for lecturers and the other for masters students. Both had open and close-ended questions. The questionnaires were attached to a covering letter assuring confidentiality as well as indicating the purpose of the study.

3.7.2 Interview schedules

Interviews are a key tool for collecting qualitative information in research. They vary in structure, content and the way in which data is elicited and analyzed. Structured
interviews have a set of pre-planned questions, the wording and order of which remain the same for each respondent. An interview schedule was constructed just like the questionnaires only that general responses from the questionnaires informed the framing. The interviews having both closed and open questions to avail both quantitative and qualitative data were conducted by the researcher. The interviewer guided the conversation with the interviewee, minimizing extensive digressions. The advantages of structured interviews are that they are less time consuming and the same information is collected from all respondents (Buros Institute, 2003).

The structured interviews were administered to university librarians/reference/subject librarians, after analyzing the questionnaires. These groups were expected to provide vital information regarding the crux of this study and clarify, confirm or refute other lecturers’ and masters students’ responses. Interviews offer the researcher a chance for probity, decipher non-verbal responses as well as maintain data uniformity.

3.7.3 Document analysis

The researcher also analyzed policy papers, library website, CAI or tutorials, orientation schedules, guides and library standards, to ascertain the cooperation areas and mode of assessing information literacy initiatives in the institution where available.

3.8 QUALITY CONTROL OF DATA
3.8.1 Pilot Study

The researcher pre-tested the questionnaires on a small scale to remove redundancies, biases, and ambiguities and streamline the instruments. Five respondents each were drawn from the lecturers and masters students from the schools/departments not picked for main survey – Institute of Tropical Medicine and Infectious Diseases- ITROMID, Institute of Energy and Environmental Technology - IEET, and Institute of
Biotechnology Research - IBR. The 5 pre-test respondents for each category (lecturers and masters students) were not included in the final study. The responses or lack of them were analyzed to ascertain if the tools were eliciting the desired answers or not. This was geared towards increased content validity, information reliability and freedom from bias to ensure that only useful and unambiguous responses are given.

3.8.1.1 Validity
According to Golafshani (2003) validity refers to

“...whether the research truly measures that which it is intended to measure or how truthful the research results are.”

By sampling across many departments and also years of study it means the researcher was able to minimize bias that would have arose from sampling from one school, department, year, category or cadres. The size of the sample is also substantial enough to give a good representation of the population. Validity was therefore ensured through instruments pre-testing as well as triangulation as illuminated shortly.

3.8.1.2 Reliability

“...the extent to which results are consistent over time and an accurate representation of the total population under study as well as the possibility that results of a study can be reproduced under a similar methodology”.

As highlighted above, the researcher sampled widely across heterogeneous groups and also did a pilot survey that led to improving the data collection instruments geared to improve on the above two critical qualities in research. A test-retest method was used to achieve reliability. The instruments were administered to the subjects involved in the pilot study in close succession after which a correlation between the two sets of data was
performed. This was to ascertain that the tools were measuring what they were expected to measure.

**3.8.2 Triangulation**

As already highlighted, the use of multiple data collection tools, multiple data sources, procedures and strategies and methods in form of qualitative (interview) and quantitative (questionnaires) all were used to complement each other. Whatever could not be elicited through questionnaires was realized through probing during interviewing. The responses from lecturers and students could therefore either be confirmed or refuted by the interview responses from librarians. The documents analyzed could also shed some light on issues being investigated and therefore confirm or refute respondents’ assertions. All these efforts were geared to realize enhanced data quality by improving on reliability and validity through complementarities. All these were employed by the researcher to achieve data validity and reliability.

**3.9 ADMINISTRATION OF RESEARCH TOOLS AND LIMITATIONS**

The researcher with the help of two research assistants – one a library assistant and the other a masters student – who were trained for three days, distributed the questionnaires within the university. The questionnaires were collected on the times agreed with the respondents. The researcher personally interviewed all the 10 senior library staff purposefully selected for their being information rich respondents. Majority of the respondents were both cooperative and candid in availing information relevant to the study despite the limited time available then due to the ISO activities being undertaken as a prelude to the ISO Certification later in the year.
The greatest challenge during data collection was the unavailability or unwillingness of some lecturers and masters students to fill the questionnaires. Out of 35 questionnaires given to lecturers across departments, only 32 were returned. Though the return rate looks high – 91%, it took a long time to track a willing or available lecturer in the respective department. Even after deploying a research assistant who was familiar with the JKUAT schools layout, it took over a month to distribute and collect questionnaires from lecturers alone. The lecturers complained that it was impossible to fill the questionnaires satisfactorily during examination period when.

Again, out of the 58 questionnaires given to masters students across disciplines, only a meager 31 responses were returned. This translates to a return rate of 53%. These respondents also complained that it was not possible to fill the questionnaire satisfactorily just near and during examination period when they were very busy.

The total response rate considering the 100% interview rate and the questionnaire rates of 91% and 53% was 86%. Probably if the data collection was done at a better time like early in a new semester the researcher is of the opinion the response rate would have been higher. However, these limitations do not invalidate the findings of this study.

3.10 DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND PRESENTATION
Both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were employed. This is because there were both qualitative and quantitative data generated. After receiving the questionnaires, the researcher sorted them for easier handling. The researcher with the help of a statistician coded the open-ended questions which facilitated analysis through
the computer-based statistical package for social scientists – SPSS. The raw data was then converted to a spreadsheet – Excel for easier presentation.

Descriptive statistical methods of frequencies, percentages, pie charts, tables and graphs were aptly used to tabulate and present the data. The specific findings and deductions arising from the analyzed data are captured in the following chapter on data analysis, interpretation and presentation done using Ms Excel and Ms Word packages.

3.11 LOGISTICAL AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical issues in research revolve around how human moral conduct affects other humans or the surroundings. Among key issues here are respect, intellectualism, fabrications, plagiarism, voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, risk of harm, anonymity and right to privacy and following laid down procedures (Trochim, 2006).

The research has been conducted within the confines of the copyright provisions and all cited authors have been acknowledged accordingly and quotations punctuated accordingly. The right protocol in terms of dealing with respondents, institutions and general introduction were observed so as not to embarrass subjects. The researcher introduced themselves and booked appointments well before administering the tools. The necessary introductory letter from the Library Science Department of Kenyatta University to the institution or institutes under study was solicited to formalize the study. The researcher also formally requested for and was granted permission to carry out the study at JKUAT by the Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of Administration, Planning and Development signaling a degree of accountability.
Further, only important data for the research was sought from the respondents. The confidentiality note was also used to assure respondents that the information they avail was purely for academic purposes. The researcher was requested and promised to submit a copy of this report to the institution under study, which in itself is a mark of accountability.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter presents the findings of the study conducted in JKUAT Library regarding the following core issues pertinent to the study objectives and research questions:

- The IL programs and policies at JKUAT library
- The extent of IL collaboration in JKUAT library
- Factors hindering IL collaboration in JKUAT library
- Level of IL evaluation and assessment in JKUAT library

The number of student respondents by year of study was 64% first years against 36% second years. However, out of the anticipated 58 students’ responses, only 31 or 53% did. Out of the anticipated 35 lecturers’ responses expected, only 32 or 90% returned their questionnaires. This can only be explained by the fact that the data collection coincided with the examination period which was busy for both categories. Ten librarians in all were interviewed and clarified some of the core issues of this investigation.

As regards the crux of the study, the various constituencies had the returns discussed in the major of this chapter, all showing that the challenges bedeviling IL collaboration elsewhere also afflict local academic libraries and more so the library under study.

4.2 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS
As already indicated in the outgoing chapter three descriptive statistical methods of frequencies, percentages, pie charts, tables and graphs were aptly used to tabulate and present the data using Ms Excel. The researcher has tried to aptly analyze and present the
data giving the most probable interpretation and meaning in view of the study objectives and the literature review.

4.3 IL PROGRAMS AND POLICIES IN JKUAT LIBRARY

4.3.1 JKUAT IL Policies

Though the Commission for Higher Education has provided IL standards for university libraries in Kenya (CHE, 2007) including collaboration, the said standards are not yet as visible as they should in JKUAT if documentary evidence is anything to go by. While the librarians interviewed said that there are a lot of documented and practiced IL policies, the lecturers and masters students were less enthusiastic. The following figures 4.1 and 4.2 reveal the lecturers’ and students’ percentages of those aware or unaware of IL policies respectively in JKUAT.

Figure 4.1 Lecturers’ Awareness of IL Policy

Figure 4.2 Students’ Awareness of IL Policy

Only 45% of the lecturers and 55% of the masters students see a semblance of an IL policy in JKUAT library as shown in the above charts. The two categories cite Library guides and regulations, Scheduled Orientation of first years, Statutes and Library policy and Basic computer skills as the IL policies in the said institution. The researchers’ view
is that while basic computer skills training and statutes and library policy are IL policy per se, they may not be as visible as these respondents may be portraying.

While 45% of the students said they were not aware of an IL policy, 55% said they were either informed by library staff; learnt about it during orientation; were informed by a lecturer; learnt from library guides provided; learnt from classmates or read in notices in campus.

However, those lecturers who argue that there are no IL policies (55%) note that there is no apt sensitization and there is no written policy to foster IL development in JKUAT. This observation is in agreement with Amunga (2007) and Mwangi (2007) as noted earlier in chapter two. Notably, 63% of all the lecturers never commented on the issue of an IL policy. Probably they did not fully understand the various aspects of IL policy or did not understand IL in its sense as defined in the introductory note.

*Figure 4.3 Librarians’ view on IL Policy at JKUAT*
For the students’ respondents, 55% indicated that there is an IL policy in JKUAT library while 45% feel that there is none that they know of. This is reflected in figure 4.2.

Eighty per cent (80%) of all the librarians indicated that there is no IL policy in JKUAT as shown in figure 4.3. Though there is an IL policy from the CHE even relating to collaboration, the operationalisation of these policies has not been effected in the university. According to 20% of the librarians who see a semblance of IL policy, apart from what is cited above by lecturers and students, there is undeveloped user education; university librarian’s address to freshmen on campus as well as inter-departmental forums where all issues even collaborative ones can be ironed out. However, the librarians’ argue that IL policies are almost absent to effectively harness all players’ ideas. This affirms the documented findings in the literature showing that lack of an IL policy impedes collaboration to delineate roles.

The similarities are only in as far as lack of policy is concerned. The large disparities in between librarians’ percentage on the one hand and those of the lecturers and students on the other could possibly be explained that librarians understand IL better than the others. With their access to the CHE library standards, they are technically aware of what IL policy ideally entails. In this regard, the researcher is also of the view that the University and the library have not domesticated the CHE library standards which extensively covers IL policy including an operating budget, collaboration and evaluation. Some of the curriculum elements like communication skills and orientation training are not well documented and reviewed to reflect current trends like e-library and OPAC training.
4.3.2 JKUAT IL Programs

As concerns IL programs in JKUAT, the three categories of respondents – lecturers, masters students and librarians had almost similar responses. Table 4.1 below captures the lecturers’ responses.

When asked about the IL programs offered in the institution’s library, 97% of the teaching staff category cited orientation tours, 84% cited library guide to information and 45% of them cited lecturer-taught course which is probably the communication skills course. Other programs mentioned albeit remotely are (i) awareness of information existence (ii) basic computer skills (iii) new material updates (iv) communication skills.

Table 4.1: IL Programs at JKUAT according to lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IL Programs</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation tours offered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib guide to info. search offered</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer aided instruction available</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian taught course available</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer-taught course available</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of existence of info available</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the researcher feels that either the lecturers did not understand the full scope of the IL programs or they are not well updated on the electronic resources training going on across campus these days, hence the 0% librarian-taught course response.

According to 74% of the 31 students respondents acknowledged having undergone some IL training in the form of: Orientation tours; library instruction on information searching; computer-aided-instruction; awareness of existing of information probably depicting SDI.
and CAS services; lecturer taught course; librarian taught course; online resources exhibition as shown in Figure 4.4 below.

Figure 4.4: IL Programs at JKUAT according to students

These are similar to what the teaching staff identified in the table 4.1 above where orientation and shelf-guiding were the most visible programs. The difference is that e-resources and research skills training features unlike for the lecturers.

Librarians interviewed concur that the above IL programs are mounted in JKUAT library but also adds others. These are address of freshmen by University Librarian; guiding and sign posting as directional within the library and communication skills taught by SHRD lecturers. These compares well with what Kavulya (1995; 2003), Mutula (2004), Amunga (2007) and Mwangi (2007) documented and is cited in chapter two of this report. A recent but critical development that is exciting information users across campus is the electronic resources training mounted by librarians for the past one year. It is inculcating IL skills to users to access e-resources across campus. However, probably due to the
collaboration challenges envisaged in this study, lecturers have not felt, heard or seen its effect. Probably the librarians are not announcing or promoting this good idea effectively to reach the teaching staff as a partner. This would be the right time to initiate and create linkages to foster collaboration in IL and other spheres.

4.3.3 JKUAT IL Training

When lecturers and students were asked whether they participated in or were offered IL training respectively, the responses were as shown in figures 4.5 and 4.6 respectively. Less than half of the lecturers (47%) indicate that they participate in any IL training. The 53% who said that they do not participate in IL training probably only know the library related IL activities as indicated in figure 4.7. This also reveals that these lecturers do not in essence work with their library counterparts to instill IL skills into the students. This means that a majority of lecturers believe that IL training is a librarian affair.

Figure 4.5: If lecturers’ participate in IL training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturers ever participated in IL training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.6: If students taught IL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether students ever offered any IL training in JKUAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As observed from the above charts, less than half of the lecturer respondents – those who indicated they participated in IL training said that the IL courses primarily entailed the modes shown in the figure 4.7. This means they may not be aware of the bigger scope of IL and probably how they can partner with librarians and students to make the training
worthwhile. This also may imply that the librarians have not done their promotion and
lobbying well among lecturers who may misconstrue IL training as a librarians’ affair.

Importantly, a high percentage of students’ respondents – 74% - said they had been
offered IL training, probably from the library staff. The students however argue that the
IL training is inadequate and suggest improvements in terms of: Proper timing or more
time be allocated to orientation; more awareness be created; make it continuous; regular
update and training; be owned by all; closer collaboration with other departments; more
training on different resources; be perfected; more involvement of other staff; more end
user points; have strict policies on IT usage to allow equitable access; increase use of
ICT; integrate it with other courses; improve its organization; more resources be added;
conduct it in small groups; seek students views as well as incorporate practical exercises.

*Figure 4.7: Mode of IL training in JKUAT*
The above mentioned IL training the lecturers concur with the students’ assertion that it emphasizes on the following traits: term papers as a course requirement; term papers as an optional assignment; extensive library usage; library use skills and proper referencing; electronic database and internet; training on database search; locating materials in library; training done in library; training by lecturers only; IL skills in communication skills curriculum as well as computer aided instruction. Apart from these IL content, others noted from the teaching staff and students respondents are research skills and IT skills training. Some of these IL content promote close collaboration between the library, students and the teaching fraternity and should draw the stakeholders to partner.

Some of the above IL skills were emphasized by the 38% of the lecturers who said that they participate in mounting student IL training. Sixty two per cent (62%) of the lecturers said that they do not teach IL skills to students of whatever level. This is indicated in the following figure 4.8 showing the number of lecturers who indicated whether they teach or not IL skills to students.

Figure 4.8: If lecturers teach IL to students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IL Training to Students by lecturers</th>
<th>Students level taught IL by Lecturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes 38%</td>
<td>Undergraduates 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 62%</td>
<td>Postgraduates 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both 84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further, figure 4.9 also indicates the level of students to which IL skills are offered by the lecturers at JKUAT. The 84% may look substantial but in essence this was only from less than half of all the targeted respondents. Indeed, 63% of all the lecturer respondents never gave a response which would mean they do not teach IL to either of the groups. In the researcher’s view, the few who teach IL probably refer to the communication skills common course offered to all freshmen in the SHRD, communications department.

The librarians also said that the same content was emphasized in the few IL courses taught to users in the institution. However, lecturers are not at the moment formally trained in IL but plans are under way to mount the training either in the library or better of in the lecturers’ offices. Individual lecturers are taught IL skills by librarians on one on one basis. It is worth noting that the ideal IL training as earlier defined is far from being practiced in the institution despite clear guidelines and standards from the CHE. The only visible efforts are not different from what is indicated in figure 4.7 above. This concurs with Kavulya’s (2003) and Amunga’s (2007) findings cited in the second chapter of this report.

4.3.4 Timing of IL training

When asked when the IL training is mounted, the lecturers and the students had the responses indicated in figures 4.10 and 4.11 below. The one off training for first years seems to be the most visible across the respondents with 67% for the lecturers and 59% for the students. Throughout the degree IL training was rated second for the lecturers while for the students the throughout the semester in first year was the other time IL training was offered. These could be referring to the common course of communication
skills offered to freshmen across campus and has a library skills component. The content is however inadequate and out of date. Documents analyzed indicate that the library skills content is lacking on the electronic resources aspect which is emerging as a critical skills area due to its being IT skills intensive.

*Figure 4.10: Lecturers’ view on when IL offered*  *Figure 4.11: Students view when IL offered*

![Pie chart showing lecturer's view on when IL training is done](image1)

Other times mentioned by the students when the IL training is mounted are for final year students; in the course of training; on demand and as one librarian said scheduled training which was launched in 2009 to teach users how to search electronic databases. Generally, librarians concur with the lecturers’ and students’ views. However, they argue that for them IL training is continuous as users are always being sharpened on information searching skills which enhance lifelong learning. The researcher is of the few that all the respondents are primarily aware of the orientation tours and the communication skills course. Information literacy today has more depth than it was during the bibliographic instruction era, hence the need for more cooperation among partners to satisfy all.
4.4 THE EXTENT OF IL COLLABORATION IN JKUAT LIBRARY
Asked at what level they participate in IL programs, only 38% lecturers responded as shown in table 4.2. Further, of this 38%, only 92% participated in IL training. Only a paltry 8% participated in IL collaboration related activities of syllabus design and IL evaluation and assessment as well as IL curriculum development. This in essence means very little collaboration in the institution since the little IL training from the lecturers is only in teaching communication skills and research skills. A lot more need to be done especially to exploit areas of common interest like research skills and searching skills which would promote partnership.

Table 4.2: Areas of lecturers’ IL collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration areas</th>
<th>No Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in designing IL syllabus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in IL curriculum development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Teaching IL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in evaluating IL programmes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other IL level participated in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked whether there are IL courses the lecturers plan and teach in collaboration with library staff, 97% of the respondents said none. These cite parallel subject domains, lack of awareness of such plans/initiatives, lack of structured partnership or co-shared IL programs, lack of formal forum and lack of initiatives for collaboration. This situation is in agreement with assertions by Doskatsch (2003) on Australia and Kaane (2004) on USIU library. The librarians and lecturers ought to share their expertise and be free to
initiate collaborative efforts as well as lobby in every forum for a common IL policy that unites all in campus rather than separate them yet their goal is common.

It is vital to note that 71% of the lecturers said they don’t participate in IL training, while 29% said they do teach students on apt library usage, correct citations, research skills, writing research papers, discipline-related content and communication skills. However, this is done haphazardly and is limited only to some of these skills. This is captured in figure 4.12.

*Figure 4.12 If Lecturers teach IL on library use*  
*Figure 4.13 Students on who teaches IL*

This means that IL training is still primarily mounted by librarians. Lecturers offer little input and equally know very little of what the librarian is doing. The little they do as shown above does not involve collaborating with librarians. This is not a new phenomenon since it echos the Australian and European scene as reported earlier in chapter two of this report. However, it differs from Kaane’s (2004) observation of the FYE 1010 course taught by lecturers to student at USIU. Collaboration in IL is also minimal here as elsewhere locally reported by Kavulya (2003) and Amunga (2007).
When asked who offers the IL training in their university, 78% of the students said librarians did the training; 14% said both the librarians and the lecturers co-taught IL; 4% each said lecturers and peers solely taught IL respectively. This is shown in figure 4.13 above. When students were asked whether they collaborated with librarians or lecturers in designing and evaluating IL tasks, the responses were as shown in the following figure 4.14.

**Figure 4.14 Students collaboration in IL Programs at JKUAT**

This means that there is also little IL training collaboration between librarians, lecturers and even students. Apart from input in evaluating IL training and writing term papers using the library, the students feature dismally in IL efforts. A rather unexpected observation is that the examinable IL taught course, in this case communication skills is
not taken seriously as an evaluation tool. This should be a serious and practical formal starting point for any collaborative efforts.

Further, the librarians’ view on who mounts IL training on campus indicates that while librarians induct users on library resources, lecturers teach communication skills. Notably, all the 10 librarians interviewed said that there is no IL courses they plan and teach or even evaluate in partnership with the lecturers which is the ideal if users were to be enthusiastic about exploiting library information resources. This again reflects minimal or lack of IL collaboration as widely observed in the reviewed literature. A lot therefore ought to be done to foster cooperation between librarians and lecturers and other concerned to effectively assist the student user.

The rating of collaboration between library and teaching departments or faculties by the lecturers and students as presented in the following charts - figures 4.15 and 4.16 confirms the foregoing status of IL collaboration in the institution under study.

**Figure 4.15 Lecturers’ Ratings**

**Figure 4.16 Students’ Ratings**
The lecturers’ rating of 40% none at all and 50% inadequate contrasts sharply with the remaining 10% for only moderately adequate. The reasons advanced by the lecturers for the above rating are that there is seldom any collaboration; departments handle issues independently; lack of awareness; library only informs lecturers about new books; underutilized resources and lack of support.

The students’ rating is also painting a gleam picture of IL collaboration at the said university. While good to excellent rating accounts for only 25%, fair to none at all accounts for approximately 75%. In this case the students must have been rating instances where lecturers demand extensive usage of the library and the librarians come in handy. The figures above corroborate with the respondents’ earlier assertions on the same situation. This implies that IL collaboration infrastructure must be weaved from the few pockets of what can be associated with IL and be beefed up with IL concepts as they are known today.

To confirm this state of affairs, the librarians’ IL collaboration rating also reveals that there is hardly any collaboration in this area. Out of the 10 respondents, 9 or 90% said there is no IL collaboration worth talking about in JKUAT library. One respondent argued that cemented attitudes between the core players militate against collaboration. The mere magnitude of these results – no IL collaboration - reflects a grave situation which calls for immediate action to redress the IL collaboration lacuna at JKUAT.

The researcher cannot see why it is hard for IL partners to collaborate while so much collaboration in research and innovative projects is taking place across departments.
When asked to rate the attitude of the various core stakeholders towards IL training, the students’ verdict was as shown in figure 4.17 below which reveals that librarians project the most positive attitude towards IL training. This is probably because IL per se has got more to do with information sciences than any of the other respondents. Therefore, most of the librarians tend to own it. Students have no choice but to embrace IL training as a new phenomenon in their changing learning environment. Due to preference of sit-ins by both students and lecturers, this rating may have arisen. Attitudes therefore play a key role in either negatively or positively affecting IL training including its attendant cooperation.

*Figure 4.17 Students’ rating of stakeholders’ attitude to IL training partnership*

The librarians rate the attitude and cooperation of users in IL programs lowly. While librarians and students are rated fairly, the lecturers are rated poorly. The students are said not to be enthusiastic about IL programs due to a number of reasons: poor timing; lack of lecturer motivation to regard the library and its programs favorably among others as observed by Kavulya (2003) and others in chapter two of this report. Lecturers on the other hand were said to be uncooperative in planning and mounting of IL training,
insisting on division of labor just as noted in the reviewed literature. Some librarians are also less enthusiastic to participate in IL and its collaboration intricacies which bring more demands and roles for them. They see it as an addition of responsibilities without commensurate rewards. This has also been observed by the researcher where some librarians avoids participating in orientation tours and most recently electronic resources training to users since it demands going an extra mile from their daily engagements.

Further, when asked about the level of IL collaboration between the librarian and other players, the librarians returned a very poor to none existent verdict. This coming from a critical constituency in IL terrain confirms a gleam picture of IL collaboration in JKUAT. Though poor collaboration was anticipated, these results are an indictment of the extent of IL collaboration in the institution under study. Critical efforts must be made to address this borrowing from success stories locally and globally.

Further, the librarians also confirm that there has never been any IL collaboration initiative to redress the problem and improve cooperation among stakeholders. Though several factors are blamed for this state of affairs as highlighted here under, it is every body’s business to promote collaboration and address all these challenges.

4.5 FACTORS HINDERING IL COLLABORATION IN JKUAT LIBRARY
According to the lecturers, librarians and students, the following challenges bedevil the IL collaboration and evaluation in JKUAT:

- Attitude of lecturers towards IL and library generally
- Attitude of library staff towards IL
➢ Attitude of users towards IL and the library
➢ Lack of clear IL policy across the university
➢ Poor evaluation and assessment tradition
➢ Issue over academic status for librarians and ensuing remuneration disagreements
➢ Inadequate IL training time and timing
➢ Unmanageable or large groups

These are highlighted in the tables 4.3 and 4.4. Notably, clear IL policy; users’ attitudes; poor evaluation and assessment as well as unmanageable groups and library staff attitudes feature in that order as critical impediments to IL collaboration according to lecturers.

Table 4.3: Challenges to IL collaboration according to lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges to IL collaboration according to lecturers</th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of lecturers towards IL &amp; library</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of library staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of users</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of clear IL policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor/ inadequate IL evaluation &amp; assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreements over academic status</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate training time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmanageable groups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correspondingly, the students identified almost the same challenges or hindrances to IL collaboration in JKUAT as depicted in the table 4.4 though with a few additions. A clear IL policy, *inadequate equipment*, attitudes of library staff, inadequate evaluation and
unmanageable groups are the main drawbacks to effective IL collaboration according to JKUAT students.

Table 4.4: Challenges to IL collaboration according to students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges to IL collaboration according to students</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of lecturers towards IL &amp; library</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of library staff towards IL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of users towards IL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a clear IL policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor evaluation &amp; assessment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences over academic status for librarians</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate training time</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmanageable groups</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack/Inadequate funding of IL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate equipments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of IL promotion and awareness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other challenges slowing IL collaboration and noted by Students are: *poor public relations* in the library; lack of clear policy guidelines; *poor planning of IL initiatives*; *lack of skills/knowledge* on IL; *low frequency* of IL training especially the recently initiated e-resources skills training. Some of these factors like poor public relations among the library staff, poor planning of IL initiatives, inadequate IL skills or knowledge and infrequency of the e-resources training put off the student users who would expect a supportive learning environment. Students also blame *lack of promotion or awareness creation of IL* efforts. These are new insights for the researcher since it adds to what was
gathered through review of the literature. It behooves librarians and others concerned to address these unique challenges to lay the foundation for better partnership and realize the benefits of best practices in IL training as envisaged by ACRL and domesticated by the CHE in its guidelines and standards for university libraries.

Though librarians corroborate the impediments expressed by the students and lecturers, they also had their unique ones. Key among them is the underutilization of IL skills in the library since the bulk of the time is taken by other tasks like shelving. The second major challenge is lack of implementation of standardized IL policy like the CHE standards and guidelines. These would inform all IL efforts including collaboration, budget, staffing, scope and responsibilities, review and assessment procedures. Thirdly, librarians blame inadequate and lethargic inter-professional leadership and lack of proper guidance into this new paradigm across campus. However, some librarians (40%) feel that there are adequate IL skills in the library and IL collaboration does not necessarily need a budget allocation to be successful but rather goodwill to promote partnerships which engender optimal usage of all information related resources including personnel.

4.6 LEVEL OF IL EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT IN JKUAT LIBRARY
4.6.1 Evaluation of IL training

There is very minimal evaluation as low as (10%) of IL initiatives as indicated in the figures 4.18 and 4.19. Though evaluation provides a good opportunity for collaboration where partners can gauge how well their efforts are, there is little if any form of evaluation visible. Even basic evaluation techniques like student feedback questionnaires; group discussions forms; peer review forms; or even tutors feedback to ascertain its
effectiveness are absent or unknown. Though student academic and research output is noted as one area for evaluating IL initiatives, the curricular, planning, objectives, standards, outcomes measure are not well structured and shared hence IL is inadequate. Communication skills may be evaluated as a taught course, research skills may be evaluated from the research output and from the point of view of the research methodology course but orientation and e-resources are not evaluated not unless as individual initiative.

According to the teaching staff, the challenges militating against evaluation of IL include difficulties in examining IT skills, limited access to relevant IL related materials, poor standards as yardstick, very slow internet in case of evaluating e-resources competencies, lack of formal evaluation, large class sizes as well as lack of a formal structure or policy to spar partnership in evaluation.

*Figure 4.18 Lecturers on IL evaluation  Figure 4.19 Students on IL evaluation*

Students also said that there is seldom any evaluation after IL training to ascertain its effectiveness. Seventy three per cent (73%) of the students respondents said there is no evaluation done when the IL training is mounted or after. Only 27% of the students felt
that there is evaluation done. This is probably in reference to the common unit communication skills course whose IL content is examinable at the undergraduate level. Apart from the feedback by students to librarians and tutors, other forms of evaluation mentioned by the students are: students’ comments to lecturers, views via suggestion boxes and commentary fill-ups. Formal feedback questionnaires are proposed by the students as an evaluation tool.

The librarians overwhelmingly aver that there is no evaluation and assessment of IL initiatives since there is no formal or planned structure for this. They argue that these can only be possible if there are set objectives, planned and shared training as well as a mechanism to evaluate or assess outcomes after the IL training. The researcher is of the opinion that there is minimal evaluation of some IL aspects like communication and research related IL skills training. However, the researcher is also of the view that an ideal well collaborated evaluated and assessed IL program would improve the IL efforts resulting in improved usage of information resources; policy formulation; user satisfaction; quality research output; improved administrative skills and enhanced information skills for all.

According to the ACRL guidelines and standards, evaluation is a critical component of characteristic of best IL practices. As highlighted in the literature review, evaluation looks at whether the IL efforts are achieving what they were meant to realize. Assessment though closely related looks at how best the IL efforts have achieved what they were meant to achieve.
4.6.2 Assessment of students on IL skills

When asked whether they assess students on completion of any IL training, the lecturers had the following responses captured in figure 4.20.

**Figure 4.20 Whether lecturers assess students after IL training**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notably, 56% of the respondents do not assess their students after an IL session if any mounted. Only 44% of the respondents assess their students on completion of IL training. These cite dissertation, in-class test, examination and term papers as their assessment tools.

More so, students’ response reveals even more the absence of assessment of IL training. Only 7% indicate that they are assessed on undergoing IL training. The other 93% said they have never been assessed after the course or session. Even in the library, after the orientation program, no practical exercises are given to the users to test whether the information retrieval and search skills have been grasped.

The Librarians’ views on post-IL training assessment for all library users show that this is none existent at JKUAT. This differs with the lecturers’ view since the later as shown
above use formally set and examinable assessment tools like communication skills examination, term papers, theses and dissertations. Orientation tours and even the e-resources training are not assessed after the sessions. Hence if there was collaboration which integrates IL content into the taught and examinable courses, the IL skills would be internalized by users easily. Evaluation and assessment of IL is therefore key to effective collaboration. It is the researcher’s view that lack of these two but related IL components impedes collaboration.

4.6.3 Administrative support of IL programs

As observed from figure 4.21, 90% of the lecturers feel that the administrative or institutional facilitation of IL efforts ranges from fair to very poor.

*Figure 4.21 Lecturers’ view on administrative support of IL*
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Only 10% indicate that the administrative support is good. Probably, this emanates from the point of view that there is little IL visible while policy formulation should be spearheaded by the administrators. However, the researcher believes that IL collaboration policy initiatives can start from one stakeholder who can lobby the policy makers for a comprehensive IL policy across the university.
Again 70% of the librarians’ rate the support from the administrators on IL initiatives as between fair and none existent. They argue that policy issues need to be reviewed often to improve the IL infrastructure relating to who should teach what IL component, scope of IL collaboration, IL capacity development, IL budget, IL content, IL goals and mission, IL evaluation criteria, frequency of IL review, as well as address the challenges already noted to hamper IL partnership.

4.6.4 Who should teach IL programs at JKUAT

Figure 4.22 Lecturers’ view on who should teach IL in JKUAT

![Lecturers' view on who to teach IL in university](image)

Just like librarians, a higher percentage of the lecturers (53%) feel that IL should be taught cooperatively between them. A big number (44%) of the lecturers also feel that IL is purely a librarian sphere and they should be the ones to teach it. Only a meager 3% prefer that lecturers mount the IL courses. This contrasts with some earlier findings in the literature review suggesting that librarians or lecturers should take lead in IL training. However, it concurs with some findings in the same chapter two suggesting that librarian-lecturer collaboration is the way to go. The researcher agrees with the partnership approach since two are better than one in terms of sharing expertise for users’ sake.
According to the lecturers, IL should be taught or mounted in the university in ways that help to appreciate what is in others. Shared strengths compliment partners’ weaknesses. Librarians bring their information searching and organization expertise while lecturers enrich the IL experience with their discipline content for integration. Other stakeholders like the users, technicians, administrators and media specialist also avail vital skills to realize IL success. Collaboration should be between different parties, giving specialized or relevant input for effective IL training. The academic staff also feels that librarians are best suited in teaching some aspects of IL while lecturers should teach theory and motivate students to practice taught IL skills.

Asked whether librarians are equipped pedagogically to teach and assess IL, only 38% of the lecturers responded. This non-comment by 62% of the lecturers also speaks volumes.

Figure 4.23 Lecturers’ view on Librarians’ IL skills
It could mean that those who did not answer do not believe librarians are endowed enough to teach IL. Out of the 38% who responded, majority feel that librarians are equipped to conduct orientation, do shelf guiding and signage, train on e-resources usage and only remotely teach communication and research skills. This observation is similar to one by Doskatsch (2003) in the reviewed literature from Australian Universities.

All these argue that the librarians should only handle the practical aspects of IL training. They advance the following proposals to effect the training: Librarians should induct practicals while lecturers teach theory; there be division of labour; lecturers are not confident with librarians handling the IL programs; Lecturers feel they are ideal for the program; Orientation done only to fresh students despite information arena changes; IL area training require specialists.

**Figure 4.24 Lecturers’ rating of JKUAT IL Programs**

When asked to rate the IL programs offered in JKUAT library, the lecturers’ answers were as captured in figure 4.24: Orientation is rated as the most visible IL program followed by guiding and sign posting to direct users in the library. Communication skills
and research skills training are rated lowest probably because they are associated with lecturers who teach such at the present time. It is the researcher’s opinion that this rating does not in a way reveal any form of collaboration. It is either being offered by librarians or lecturers. Such do not promote partnership since either does not know what the other is doing though it is their business. Again, the visibility given or deduced from what librarians do has not translated to collaboration and probably they need to take lead in initiating collaborative efforts with other potential partners.

*Figure 4.25 Students’ rating of IL programs at JKUAT*

The lecturers’ view is corroborated by the students’ ratings and reinforced by the librarians interviewed probably for the same reasons. E-resources training was emphasized by the librarians as the most critical today due to the proliferation of electronic resources in the library through the PERI program. Figure 4.25 shows the students’ ratings of IL programs at JKUAT though they do not reveal any collaboration.
4.7 MITIGATION OF THE IL COLLABORATION CHALLENGES

The respondents suggested what they think are the best mitigation efforts to address the earlier mentioned challenges facing IL collaboration in JKUAT.

Lecturers and masters students are proposing the urgent creation of awareness across the university on what constitutes IL, what is good about both IL and IL partnership. Discourse probably should be started across campus on what IL entails today and the potential role for all stakeholders. Promotion efforts must be undertaken to reach all potential collaborators by emphasizing sharing of expertise across the university.

Secondly, the two categories prefer extensive adoption of current technologies and exploitation of ICT to enhance IL training. Technology can actually be used to create awareness and to mount IL training. This is in form of online tutorials and computer-aided-instruction which information seekers can use at their own pace and place.

Thirdly, all the respondents believe that attitude change and the dismantling of other social barriers to IL collaboration must be undertaken by building mutual respect and trust. If all partners know their strengths and weaknesses and share with each other for the benefit of a good course like survival skills training, the situation would positively change.

Fourthly, they propose the formulation of strict policy guidelines to inform IL infrastructural development. The policy issue has emerged in this study as the key
challenge to IL collaboration. Formulation of such a policy and borrowing heavily from successful institutions and set standards would go along way to improve IL partnerships.

It is also suggested that librarians and teaching staff be proactive and innovative to bridge the social gaps or barriers that exist. Though partnership denotes sharing equally, leadership must emanate from one of the stakeholders in the initial stages.

The IL agenda should be discussed as an institutional and national concern. The existing IL challenges can only be solved by involving everybody in the IL programs since they are multidisciplinary in nature. All must own IL because of what they are but not because of who takes lead in their development or mounting. There is need to establish partnership by enhancing cross-department interchange of ideas in a candid and open manner. Departments should share views on IL and other collaborative areas.

The lecturers and librarians propose the establishment of an IL center to liaise and conduct IL programs in the university. This is a good proposal that would promote cooperation since its personnel would be drawn from across partnering departments. This would help tap the available IL skills across the university. The researcher acknowledges that such a liaison centre would streamline all IL efforts like orientation coordination, course integration, IL curriculum review and mounting the instruction.

More administrative support is also proposed to make IL a priority area in the university. Administrators can mar or make collaboration of whatever nature by frustrating or facilitating creation of forum and availing resources. While all respondents propose
increased availability of resources for all users in form of ICT infrastructure, personnel, time and space, all these can only be available with parental organization goodwill. All efforts that can motivate staff should not be spared because IL demands frequent training to refresh skills as well as monetary facilitation to create enthusiasm.

The modern trend in IL is that it must be allocated a budget to cater for all IL activities. Even the CHE standards locally provides for an IL budget. All the trainings, workshops, publications, equipment and other requirements must availed to facilitate smooth mounting of IL programs. If IL training tools are available to empower many people, other collaborations even in research and supervision of research work would be possible.

However, the librarians are advised to be flexible and smart in relating with other stakeholders. They need to lobby key opinion shapers across campus to ensure IL collaboration takes off. There is need to enhance their public relations skills when dealing with the sensitive partners, be they students or lecturers. Librarians themselves feel they should be visible and participate in IL related and all other courses development, evaluation and review. This is ground they can only claim if they invest in improving their skills both in IL, research and teaching.

Further, IL should be integrated in other academic programs even as some aspects are taught as stand-alone IL. Integration promotes collaboration from the curriculum development stage to evaluation and assessment. It also ensures that each partner knows what the other is doing even if they are not teaching together.
The student respondents further suggest other measures to address the IL collaboration challenges like the need to allocate enough time to it; need to train all users on IL skills importance; need to increase pool of trainers as well as frequent review of content to reflect changing information environment. The researcher concurs since collaboration would create more contact hours with users. An Information literate lecturer would inculcate the same skills a librarian is supposed to instill in a better learning atmosphere. Librarians who are aware of integrated IL and subject content would be more useful to a user since they know what the lecturer demands from students.

Lastly, the librarians interviewed also propose that there be official and deliberate efforts between library and teaching departments to cooperate. As earlier suggested, they also propose the establishment of liaison offices in all departments to improve on inter-department communication. Where they exist they should be empowered to coordinate IL related activities. Librarians believe that teaching, evaluating and assessing IL initiatives in collaboration with teaching staff has the potential to dismantle social barriers and promote synergy. As observed in chapter two, the onus is unfortunately on librarians to prove they have the necessary skills to teach IL primarily, and the lecturers with time will acknowledge them.

In the upshot, we have seen the challenges to IL collaboration as well as the mitigation measures. Before the researcher summarizes the findings in the next chapter, it is vital to note that the measures just proposed would only be feasible ironically only if collaboratively implemented by all the partners in the institution. It is only by creating
partnerships to hitherto non-collaborating members that the benefits of IL of lifelong learning, media skills, research skills, evaluation skills, searching skills, locating skills, critical thinking skills, usage skills, synthesizing skills, library skills, problem-solving skills, technology skills, and decision-making skills can be realized.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The main aim of this study was to investigate the challenges hindering effective IL collaboration in Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology. This chapter is organized as follows:

- Introduction
- Summary of key findings
- Major conclusions
- Key Recommendations
- Areas for further research

The study was considered valuable because it addresses the perceived low levels of IL collaboration in academic libraries between lecturers, librarians, administrators and users which if they were allowed to continue unmitigated, the costs to the institution and the country is great. Libraries can only succeed in inculcating IL skills to users by addressing the obstacles which impede or curtail ideal collaboration as well as establish IL programs and policies, which are cooperatively planned, mounted and evaluated. This is the only way academic pursuits can realize lifelong learning.

The significance of this investigation is that

a) It is a resourceful addition to the body of knowledge relating to local IL collaboration since very little was known hitherto this study.

b) The results will inform decision-making, policy formulation and management of local university libraries in the IL sphere in this era of electronic information.
c) Its findings will help the library under study and others to harness their human, technical and information resources to their own and users’ benefit.

d) Significantly, the identified hindrances to IL collaboration and the proposed measures if taken seriously there will be marked improvements in the IL landscape and its attendant benefits to modern society.

The main objectives of the study were:

i) To find out the IL programs and policies prevailing at JKUAT library

ii) To determine the extent of collaboration in JKUAT library’s IL programs

iii) To identify the factors hindering IL collaboration in JKUAT library

iv) To assess whether IL programs are cooperatively evaluated and assessed in the JKUAT library

The research questions which guided this investigation were:

- What information literacy programs and policies prevail at JKUAT library?
- What is the extent and level of collaboration in JKUAT library’s IL programs?
- What are the collaboration challenges of information literacy programs in the said library?
- Are information literacy programs cooperatively evaluated and assessed in the JKUAT library?

To answer these questions JKUAT was selected as the location of the study for in-depth investigation. Since IL calls for key players’ partnership, a tri-partite collaboration of masters students as users, lecturers as users/tutors and librarians as tutors were targeted. This was due to the key role they play in IL success or failure. This chapter therefore
captures the summary of the findings of this investigation; the conclusions arrived at as well as recommendations.

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

5.2.1 JKUAT IL Programs and policies

5.2.1.1 JKUAT IL programs

The information literacy programs offered at JKUAT library are: Orientation tours; address of freshmen by University Librarian; guiding and sign posting; communication skills taught by SHRD lecturers; research skills almost in all programs; and more recently the electronic resources training and exhibitions mounted by librarians. These components though not ideal fit the definition of information literacy as

“... skills to recognize when information is needed and the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively and efficiently the needed information” (ALA, 2006)

5.2.1.2 JKUAT IL Policies

There is however no written IL policy at JKUAT library at the moment. Though the orientation tour and university librarian address to freshmen is a tradition every first semester of an academic year, little has been documented or availed by respondents to indicate a clear policy to guide IL efforts. Apart from the common course called communication skills for undergraduates which have formal objectives, the others do not.

5.2.2 Extent of IL collaboration

Most importantly, there is minimal collaboration in IL training in JKUAT library. The library skills component in the common course communication skills is taught by non-librarians and librarians have no say in its syllabi or content. The researcher is aware from course documentary evidence that the course is not up to date owing to the fast
changes in the information domain (Mutua, et al 1992). The E-resources component is missing in the current communication skills syllabus showing the librarians have no say in reviewing the same. Even without the librarians teaching the course, they should play a key role in its frequent review to reflect dynamism in ICT. This is a gap arising from lack of collaboration. The absence of e-resources component in the current examinable communication skills course, yet e-information is the direction our libraries are emphasizing in collection development is of immense concerns (Mutua, et al 1992).

The study found that information literacy programs including the emerging e-resources training in JKUAT library are hampered by primarily the same impediments cited in literature review. These are negative attitude of lecturers towards IL, collaboration and library generally; negative attitude of library staff towards IL efforts hampers its development; the attitude of users towards IL and the library in general; lack of clear IL policy across the university which would nurture IL partnership; poor evaluation and assessment tradition on IL; issue of academic status for librarians and ensuing remuneration disagreements; inadequate IL training time and timing of programs reduce its impact; unmanageable or large groups viz a viz space constraints in the library; poor public relations in the library puts off users and other potential IL partners; poor planning of IL initiatives; lack of skills/knowledge on IL by both the trainers and trainees; low frequency of IL training sessions as demanded by users.

5.2.3 Collaboration challenges facing JKUAT IL programs

The study affirmed some of the IL collaboration challenges highlighted in the literature review like poor attitudes towards IL, poor IL policy inter alia.
However, some challenges emerged unique to the JKUAT library. These include inadequate equipment to support IL, poor public relations in the library, inadequate time and timing of IL programs, unmanageable large groups of users, lack of tact in planning of IL programs, inadequate IL skills among librarians to provide leadership and infrequency of IL sessions as demanded by users.

5.2.4 Evaluation and assessment of IL programs at JKUAT

Another outcome of this study is that affirms that Information literacy programs are inadequately evaluated or assessed in the JKUAT library either individually or cooperatively. Majority of the respondents overwhelmingly confirmed that there is minimal IL evaluation done in the JKUAT Library. Lecturers indicated they assess their students on IL referring to the communication skills examination.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS

5.3.1 Extent of IL collaboration

The study concluded that there is very little collaboration in IL training in JKUAT. The study primarily concludes that the challenges hindering information literacy collaboration in university libraries elsewhere are similar to what Kenya and JKUAT in particular are experiencing. However, there are some that emerged from this investigation and therefore unique to JKUAT.

5.3.2 Challenges hindering IL collaboration

5.3.2.1 Corroborated challenges to IL collaboration

The challenges that compare with those in reviewed literature include: negative attitude of lecturers towards IL, collaboration and library generally; negative attitude of library staff towards IL efforts; attitude of users towards IL and the library in general; absence of
a clear IL policy across the university which would nurture IL partnership; poor evaluation and assessment tradition on IL and issue of academic status for librarians with its attendant remuneration disagreements.

5.3.2.2 Unique and emerging challenges to IL collaboration

The IL collaboration challenges emerging from this study on the other hand include inadequate time and timing of IL programs which reduce its appeal and impact to users and potential partners.

Unmanageable or large groups viz a viz space constraints in the library militates against mounting effective collaborative IL training due to immense workload in each stakeholders’ table.

Poor public relations in the library put off users and other potential IL partners. Though other players hold a lot of sway on whether to cooperate or not, the librarians’ initiative and tact to lobby can thaw a lot or rocks and mid-wife excellent IL partnership.

Poor planning of IL initiatives again does not endear potential partners in IL and with no formal structure and forum to do so, this hampers any isolated IL efforts from maturing to fully collaborated programs.

Lack of skills or knowledge on IL by both the trainers and trainees is a barrier to collaboration due to perception. If IL trainers are not skilled enough to instill IL skills to novice but fast learners like the ones in universities today, the initiative is lost. All IL
trainers must empower themselves with those vital skills to effectively lead in inculcating the skills.

A notable challenge emanating from students is low frequency of IL training sessions. Users demand the IL skills because the information environment demands it. Though an IL collaboration challenge, this is a potential catalyst for effective collaboration since the untapped information skills market is yearning for it. All IL partners must collaboratively strategise on how to meet the IL skills training demands.

Technology related challenges also impede IL collaboration. Thanks to technology, more can be realized through online tutorials and computer-aided-instruction. The ICT infrastructure needs improvement to optimize their usage in IL training. Indeed, according to students, inadequate equipment is a critical hindrance to their acquisition of IL skills. Availability of such tools would attract users to the library and dismantle any attitude barriers they may harbor.

From the foregoing, it is clear that elaborate efforts must be made to implement the proposed solutions to redress the challenges and deepen IL collaboration.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS
Intra and interdepartmental workshops to discuss the IL collaboration discourse in the university and in the country is vital. Such forum would allow cross-pollination of ideas that enhance information literacy skills. This has a bearing on development since information literates use information smart even as citizens.
There is a need for promotion, lobbying and awareness creation of information literacy and its benefits in the 21st century. All mitigating efforts must be undertaken to address all hindrances to an information literate society. All stake holders must collaborate and cooperate as equals to realize this.

An IL integrated program as well as a student-centered approach must be employed to promote partnership and lifelong learning skills. Lecturers and librarians must of essence know what the other is doing if the user is to be eventually information literate. Users in the knowledge society must be trained to self-serve rather than rely on librarians to search or depend on lecturers’ notes to predominantly do sit-ins which only promote rote learning.

It is further recommended that domestication and operationalization of the global ACRL and the local CHE standards and guidelines in form of institutional IL competency policy would go a long way to promote IL and IL collaboration. This would lead to incorporation of the IL standards into the institutional quality assurance benchmarks like the JKUAT’s DAQA – Directorate of Academic Quality Assurance.

Universities must also create forums which promote partnerships between IL stakeholders rather than those that promote selfish competitive personal or cadre interests. Mutual respect even where there is clear division of labor is vital. Even the
multiple staff unions are anti-collaboration since it promotes class interests rather than equality and equity.

All other challenges that impede IL competency training in general as established by Kavulya (2003), must be addressed. Such issues like large user groups; limited library space for instruction; lack of IL skills; attitudes of players; timing of IL programs and inadequate evaluation must be tackled across campus. The IL curriculum must be discussed, mounted, evaluated and reviewed from time to time by all IL stakeholders since IL cuts across disciplines. The inclusion of e-resources training content in the communication skills curriculum is long overdue.

5.5 AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH
1. A further in-depth investigation on IL collaboration in other institutions of higher learning is vital to establish whether the same IL terrain and challenges prevail. Emerging findings will underscore the critical gaps that need to be addressed at all levels relating to IL and probably spark heated discourse on IL partnership.
2. Individual but in-depth research on a wider scope on either lecturer’s, librarians’ or users’ perception of Information literacy at university or college libraries is another fertile area for further research. The researcher believes that such would generate interesting findings and expand the horizons of knowledge even further in the current local information literacy collaboration lacuna.
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APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR LIBRARIANS

Background information

Academic qualifications: ........................................................................................................

Designation: ..........................................................................................................................

Years served in the institution: ...............................................................................................

Information Literacy (IL) Programmes Policy

1. Do you have an IL policy in your institution or library?   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

   Briefly explain your answer.

2. Do you offer IL training to masters’ students in your library? Yes [ ]   No [ ]

   If yes what methods do you use? If no, why?

3. Do you train lecturers in IL? If yes, what does the course entail? If no, why?

4. How often have you been trained in IL in the last five years if any? If none, how then
did you acquire the IL skills?

5. At what time of the academic year is the training usually mounted for both users and
   librarians?

Collaboration in IL

6. Are there IL courses you cooperatively participate in designing, teaching and
   evaluating? Yes [ ] No [ ]

   If yes, which ones? With whom do you cooperate?

   Lecturers [ ] Technicians [ ] Administrators [ ] None [ ]

   If no, why?

7. Are there IL courses you teach in collaboration with academic staff?   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

   If yes, which ones? If no, why?

8. How would you rate the cooperation and attitude of your users in IL programs?
9. What in your view is the level of collaboration between you, lecturers, administrators, technicians and users in effecting IL training? Excellent [ ] Very good [ ] Good [ ] Fair [ ] Poor [ ] Very poor [ ] Explain ………

10. (a) In your view, who should teach the library skills component in the communication skills common course offered in the university? Lecturers [ ] Librarians [ ] Others [ ]

(b) How should the course in (a) be taught?

11. (a) How would you rate the institutional support of the IL programs? Excellent [ ] Very good [ ] Good [ ] Fair [ ] Poor [ ] Very poor [ ] None [ ]

(b) What kind of support do you have? Funding [ ] Logistical [ ] Technical [ ] Policy [ ]

None [ ] Others explain …………………………………………………………………………………………………

c) How much money as a percentage of total library budgets are you given to support IL activities in your institution?

d) Have you ever tried to initiate IL cooperation? Yes [ ] No [ ] Explain ………………. 

12. In your view what are the main factors hindering IL collaboration in your institutional library?

(i) Lecturers’ attitudes to IL, library and librarians

(ii) Librarians attitudes to IL

(iii) Users’ attitudes towards the library and IL efforts

(iv) Lack of administrative support

(v) Lack or inadequate funding

(vi) Unmanageable user groups

(vii) Inadequate IL skills
(viii) Academic qualification and remuneration disagreements
(ix) Lack of collaboration tradition
(x) Lack of clear IL policy
(xi) Others explain ……..

13. How can these hindrances be overcome?

(i) Formulation of a clear IL policy
(ii) Promote a culture of collaboration and equal partnerships
(iii) Strategic lobbying top managers
(iv) Train Library staff on IL skills
(v) Identify and enlighten all partners on importance and necessity of IL
(vi) Exploit common forum to promote IL on campus
(vii) Lobby among key partners like the lecturers
(viii) Factor an IL budget annually
(ix) Others specify ……………

14. What other challenges hinder effective IL and what in your view should be done to improve the programmes in your institution?

**Evaluation/Assessment of IL**

15. Do you ever evaluate/assess the effectiveness of your IL initiatives? Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, what form does the evaluation/assessment take? (a) Examinable IL test (b) Post instruction assignment (c) Users assess instructors (d) Written research output (e) Peer review (f) Others specify ………………………. If no, why?

16. Who sets the evaluation objectives, teaches and evaluates or assesses the IL initiatives?
17. Generally, in what areas would collaboration improve IL activities in your library or institution?

18. If you were to rate IL as an activity among other duties that you perform, where would you place it? 1 --- 5 scale

(a) Cataloguing [ ]
(b) Classification [ ]
(c) Reference service [ ]
(d) SDI and CAS [ ]
(e) Registration and clearance [ ]
(f) Circulation [ ]
(g) IL/UE/BI/LI [ ]
(h) Others specify ……………………………………………………………………………………………

19. What initiatives have you taken to collaborate with the other players – lecturers, administrators, etc – on IL?

20. Whom would you like to cooperate with on IL activities?

21. What form should the cooperation take?

Thank you very much in deed.
APPENDIX D: MASTERS STUDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE

Introductory note

I am a student doing a Masters degree in Library and Information Science at Kenyatta University. This questionnaire is to help me collect data on the collaboration challenges facing information literacy - IL programmes in academic libraries in Kenya: the JKUAT case. As one of the selected respondents, you are requested to honestly respond to the questions. The researcher guarantees confidentiality since the data will be for academic use only. Your cooperation is highly appreciated.

For the sake of this study, collaboration refers to the partnership between the librarians, lecturers, administrators, technicians as well as cooperation of users. The collaboration must begin at objectives, design, implementation evaluation and assessment of the programmes without prejudices.

On the other hand, Information literacy – IL refers to the abilities of a user to recognize when information is needed, locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information ethically and legally. It is commonly called library skills, user education or information skills.

-------------------------------
Samuel Muthami Wanjiru
Instructions

• **Tick the appropriate choice [ ] or fill in the spaces provided.**

• **Be glad to avail any other useful information not captured in the questions.**

Background Information

*Department:* ..............................................................................................................

*Degree programme:* ...................................................................................................

*Year of study:* ..............................................................................................................

Information Literacy Programmes Policy

1. Are you aware of any information literacy (IL) policy in your university library?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   Explain how you learnt about it..................................................................................

2. Have you ever been offered any IL training by the library since joining the university?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   If yes what form(s) did the training take?

   a) *Orientation tour(s)* [ ]

   b) *Library instruction on how to search for information* [ ]

   c) *Computer-Aided-Instruction* [ ]

   d) *Librarian-taught course* [ ]

   e) *Lecturer-taught course* [ ]

   f) *Awareness of the existence* [ ]

   g) *Others (specify)* ..................................................................................................

3. What in your view ought to be incorporated to improve the current training?

......................................................................................................................................
Collaboration in IL

4. Have you ever given input as suggestions or feedback in any of the following IL tasks?

(a) Designing the IL programmes  [ ]
(b) Evaluating the training  [ ]
© Assessing the trainers  [ ]
(d) Examined on taught IL course  [ ]
(e) Written term papers requiring library use  [ ]
(f) Others specify .................................................................

5. Who offers the IL training in your institutional library?

(a) Librarians  [ ]
(b) Lecturers  [ ]
© Both librarians and lecturers  [ ]
(d) Any other ........................................................................

6. In which year of study are the IL courses offered if any?

(a) One off training for first Years  [ ]
(b) Throughout a semester in first year  [ ]
© Throughout the degree course  [ ]

Others please specify .................................................................

7. Which of the following apply to the kind of IL training offered in JKUAT library?

(i) Term papers as a course requirement/ compulsory  [ ]
(ii) Term papers optional  [ ]
(iii) Lecturers’ emphasis on library usage  [ ]
(iv) Library use skills and proper reference citations  [ ]
(v) Lecturers’ emphasis on electronic database and internet usage [ ]
(vi) Training on database searching [ ]
(vii) Training on OPAC usage [ ]
(viii) Locating materials in the library [ ]
(ix) Training done in library where students are accompanied by the lecturer [ ]
(x) Training done in class mounted by the lecturer and library staff [ ]
(xi) Training done by lecturers only [ ]
(xii) IL skills integrated in each course’s curriculum [ ]
(xiii) Computer-aided-instruction [ ]
(xiv) Any other specify …………………………………………………………………………

8. How would you rate the collaboration between students, lecturers and the librarians in ensuring success in IL programmes?

Excellent [ ]
Very good [ ]
Good [ ]
Fair [ ]
Poor [ ]
Very poor [ ]
None [ ]

9. In your view how do you rate the attitude of the following players towards IL training using the shown scale?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Moderately positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Fairly negative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation/Assessment of IL**

10. Are IL training evaluated after a session if any?

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

If yes, what form of evaluation is involved?

a) Student feedback questionnaire [ ]

b) Group discussions [ ]

c) Peer review [ ]

d) Tutors feedback [ ]

e) Others specify .................................................................

11. Have you ever been assessed on completion of the IL training if any?

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

If yes, what form of assessment is involved relating to both access and outcome?

a) In class test [ ]

b) Essay/ paper [ ]

c) Dissertation [ ]
12. Librarians are employing the following IL training methods to enhance access to information?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Method</th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Undecided (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelf-Guiding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How would you rate the following IL training offered in your university library?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding and signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What challenges among the following in your view hamper effective IL training collaboration and evaluation?

(a) Attitude of lecturers towards IL and library [ ]
(b) Attitude of library staff towards IL, lecturers and users

© Attitude of users towards the library and IL training

(d) Lack of a clear IL policy to support collaborative efforts

(e) Poor evaluation and assessment of the IL programmes

(f) Differences over academic status for librarians and their teaching skills

(g) Inadequate time for the training

(h) Unmanageable large groups

(i) Inadequate Funding

(j) Lack or inadequate equipments

(k) Promotion/ awareness

(i) Others specify………………………………………………………………………………………………

15. Give your suggestions on what should be done to improve on IL training in the university library?

..................................................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................................................

Thank you very much in deed.
APPENDIX E: LECTURERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Introductory note

I am a student doing a Masters degree in Library and Information Science at Kenyatta University. This questionnaire is to help me collect data on the collaboration challenges facing information literacy programmes in academic libraries in Kenya. As one of the selected respondents, you are requested to honestly respond to the questions. The researcher guarantees confidentiality since the data will be for academic use only. Your cooperation is highly appreciated.

For the sake of this study, collaboration refers to the partnership between the librarians, lecturers, administrators, technicians as well as cooperation of users. The collaboration must begin at objectives, design, implementation evaluation and assessment of the programmes without prejudices.

On the other hand Information literacy – IL refers to the abilities of a user to recognize when information is needed, locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information ethically and legally. It is commonly called library skills, user education or information skills.

...........................................

Samuel Muthami Wanjur
Instructions

• Tick the appropriate choice [ ] or fill in the spaces provided.

• Be glad to avail any other useful information not captured in the questions.

Background information

Designation: ..............................................................................................................

Discipline: .....................................................................................................................

Years taught at this university: ....................................................................................

Information Literacy Programmes Policy

1. Are you aware of any information literacy (IL) policy in your institution or library?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   Explain your answer. .................................................................................................

2. What IL programmes are you aware of offered in your institution or library?
   
   Tick all those applicable

   a) Orientation tour(s) [ ]
   b) Library instruction on how to search for information [ ]
   c) Computer-Aided-Instruction [ ]
   d) Librarian-taught course [ ]
   e) Lecturer-taught course [ ]
   f) Awareness of existence of information [ ]
   g) Others (specify) ....................................................................................................

3. Have you ever attended or participated in any IL training since you joined the university?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
4. If yes in 3 above, what does the IL course entail generally?

(a) General orientation  
(b) Subject-based training  
© Catalogue use  
(d) Integrated with subject in class

5. Which among the following in particular were emphasized in the training?

(i) Term papers as a course requirement/ compulsory  
(ii) Term papers as optional assignment  
(iii) Emphasis on extensive library usage  
(iv) Library use skills and proper reference citations  
(v) Lecturers’ emphasis on electronic database and internet usage  
(vi) Training on database searching  
(vii) Training on OPAC usage  
(viii) Locating materials in the library  
(ix) Training done in library where students are accompanied by the lecturer  
(x) Training done in class mounted by the lecturer and library staff  
(xi) Training done by lecturers only  
(xii) IL skills integrated in the communication skills curriculum  
(xiii) Computer-aided-instruction  
(xiv) Any other specify .................................................................

6. (a) Do you participate in training students in IL?  
   Yes  [ ]  No  [ ]

(b) If yes, for what level of users?  Undergraduates  [ ]  Postgraduates  [ ]  Both  [ ]

© What does this course if any entail?
(i) Term papers as a course requirement/ compulsory

(ii) Term papers optional

(iii) Lecturers’ emphasis on library usage

(iv) Library use skills and proper reference citations

(v) Lecturers’ emphasis on electronic database and internet usage

(vi) Training on database searching

(vii) Training on OPAC usage

(viii) Locating materials in the library

(ix) Training done in library where students are accompanied by the lecturer

(x) Training done in class mounted by the lecturer and library staff

(xi) Training done by lecturers solely

(xii) IL skills integrated in each course’s curriculum

(xiii) Computer-aided-instruction

(xiv) Writing effective papers

(xiv) Any other specify

7. When is the training offered in the university calendar?

(a) One off training for first Years

(b) Throughout a semester in first year

© Throughout the degree course

Others please specify

Collaboration in IL

8. At what level have you participated in the IL programs? Tick as appropriate.

(i) Designing IL syllabus

[ ]
(ii) *IL curriculum development* [ ]

(iii) *Teaching IL* [ ]

(iv) *Evaluating IL programmes* [ ]

*Others* ..........................................................................................................................................................................

9. Are there IL courses you plan and teach in collaboration with library staff?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If Yes, which ones? ...........................................................................................................................................................

If no, why ...........................................................................................................................................................................

10. Are there IL courses you teach on use of library materials e.g. locating materials, correct citation, reading and note making, etc without involving the library? Yes [ ]

No [ ] Explain .................................................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................................................

11. How would you rate the IL collaboration between the library and your teaching department?

*Adequate* [ ]

*Moderately adequate* [ ]

*Inadequate* [ ]

*None at all* [ ]

*Explain your ratings above* ................................................................................................................................................

**Evaluation and assessment of IL**

12. Do you evaluate the effectiveness of your IL initiatives?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, what form does the evaluation take?
a) Student feedback questionnaire  [ ]
b) Group discussions  [ ]
c) Peer review  [ ]
d) Tutors feedback  [ ]
e) Others specify ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

If no, why? ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

13. What challenges do you face when evaluating IL programs? ……………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

14. Do you ever assess your students on completion of the IL training if any?

Yes  [ ]  No  [ ]

If yes, what form of assessment is involved relating to both information access and skills outcome?

a) In class test  [ ]
b) Essay/paper  [ ]
c) Dissertation  [ ]
d) Examination  [ ]
e) Others specify ……………………………………………………………………………………………

15. How would you rate the institutional support of the IL programmes?

Excellent  [ ]

Very good  [ ]

Good  [ ]

Fair  [ ]

Poor  [ ]
Very poor [ ]
None at all [ ]

16. Who in your view should teach IL in the university?

(a) Lecturers [ ]
(b) Librarians [ ]
© Both lecturers and librarians [ ]

Explain your choice indicating how it should be taught ………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

17. In terms of the following general IL training, do you think the librarians are well
equipped pedagogically to train and assess users on information skills? Yes [ ] No [ ]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Method</th>
<th>Strongly agree (1)</th>
<th>Agree (2)</th>
<th>Not sure (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelf-Guiding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explain……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

18. How would you rate the following IL training offered in your university library?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of E-resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding and signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 What challenges among the following in your view hamper effective IL training collaboration and evaluation?

(a) Attitude of lecturers towards IL and library
(b) Attitude of library staff towards IL, lecturers and users
© Attitude of users towards the library and IL training
(d) Lack of a clear IL policy to support collaborative efforts
(e) Poor evaluation and assessment of the IL programmes
(f) Tussle over academic status for librarians and their teaching skills
(g) Inadequate time for the training
(h) Unmanageable groups
(i) Others specify

18. Give your suggestions on what in your opinion needs to be done to improve IL in your university library?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Thank you very much in deed.
**APPENDIX F: WORK PLAN/TIME SCHEDULE**

a) **Plan of Activities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature search and review</td>
<td>July to August 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing</td>
<td>August to September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of Instruments</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Defense</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Study</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>March to May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>June to July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>July to August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>August to September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) **Schedule of Activities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Literature search and review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proposal writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design of Instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Defense of the proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pilot Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Report Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Handing In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Some activities overlap since same time used for one activity may be used for another activity.
**APPENDIX G: RESEARCH BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Activity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Amount</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal preparation</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistants</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing and binding</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total tentative*  

35,000
**APPENDIX H: CHE LIST OF UNIVERSITIES IN KENYA – 2008**

**Public universities**

1. University of Nairobi Established in 1970
2. Moi University Established in 1985
3. Kenyatta University Established in 1985
4. Egerton University Established in 1987
5. Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology Established in 1994
6. Maseno University Established in 2000
7. Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology Established in 2002

**Private Universities: Chartered**

9. Catholic University of Eastern Africa Awarded a charter in 1992
10. Daystar University Awarded a charter in 1994
11. Scott Theological College Awarded a charter in 1997
12. United States International University Awarded a charter in 1999
13. Africa Nazarene University Awarded a charter in 2002
15. St Paul’s Theological College Awarded 2008

**Private Universities: Letters of Interim Authority (LIA)**

17. Kiriri Women’s University of Science and Technology
18. Aga Khan University
19. Strathmore University
20. Great Lakes University of Kisumu
21. KCA University
22. Presbyterian University of East Africa
23. Gretsa University
24. Mt. Kenya University

**Source:** _CHE website_, 2008
APPENDIX I: SCHOOLS, FACULTIES AND INSTITUTES OF JKUAT

**Schools**
- School for Human Resource Development
- School of Architecture and Building Sciences
- School of E-learning

**Faculties**
- Board of Post Graduate Studies
- Continuing Education Programme
- Faculty of Agriculture
- Faculty of Engineering
- Faculty of Science

**Institutes**
- Institute of Biotechnology Research
- Institute of Computer Science and Information Technology
- Institute of Energy and Environmental Technology
- Institute of Tropical Medicine and Infectious Diseases

**JKUAT Campuses**
- Karen Campus
- Nairobi Campus
- Taita Taveta Campus

**JKUAT Centers**
- Information Technology Centre

**JKUAT Constituent Colleges**
- Kimathi University College
- Mombasa Polytechnic

Source: *JKUAT website, 2008*