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ABSTRACT

In this age of information society, research relies significantly on individual’s ability to seek, and search for information, as well as organizing the information for easy retrieval. Academic libraries play a major role in enhancing the capacity of individual researchers to locate, evaluate, organize, effectively utilize and communicate information. This study was conducted at Tangaza University College Library (TUCL) to explore the effectiveness of information literacy programmes in academic libraries. The aim of the study was to enhance information literacy programmes in academic libraries for purposes of ensuring effectiveness of such programmes. The study adopted the use of a descriptive research design and employed the use of both qualitative and quantitative research approaches in dealing with different aspects of the research to ensure validity and reliability of findings. The target population of the study was 148 in number comprising of 8 staff members at the TUCL, and 140 undergraduate students from the School of Arts and Social Sciences. Simple random sampling technique was used to select 103 undergraduate students from the School of Arts and Social Sciences as respondents from the total population of 140. Data was gathered from both secondary and primary sources. The quantitative data gathered was sorted, coded, cleaned, entered and analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software whereas qualitative data was analyzed based on key points in the major thematic areas of the study. The findings were presented as summarized results in the form of simple frequency tables and graphs depicting opinions of the respondents. The research findings reveal that the most prevalent practice used in the delivery of the IL programme at the institution of higher learning was teaching IL as a curricular course. It was found that some major institutional IL practices include teaching of IL programmes as a curricular course, library orientation was also selected by the majority of the respondents as well as user education and use of seminars. It was further found that information literacy practices, the study established that institutions have made the IL programme mandatory and teaching it as a curricular course is more the standard practice than any other approach. The study found out that the majority of the respondents agreed that the libraries provide services that adequately meet the objectives of IL programmes at the learning institutions. Also, the libraries ably identify steps and formats of potential sources of information, and very well understands the academic, legal, ethical and social issues surrounding access and use of information by library users, besides making such information more relevant, meaningful and helpful to the information seekers. Majority of the respondents indicated that focus groups, self-assessments, classroom assignments and student’s work portfolio were the most effective mechanisms for evaluating IL programmes. On the other hand, case studies, performance appraisals, oral tests and satisfaction surveys/exit interviews were found to be less effective IL evaluation methods in institutions of higher learning. To understand impact of IL programme on learners, the study established that Continuous Assessment Tests (CATs) and Term Papers were the most used learner-impact evaluation methods adopted by instructors as found from the interview schedules. From the inferential statistics, it was found that support from institution administration (0.013<0.05.), teaching of IL as a curricular course (0.001<0.005), collaboration between librarians and faculties (0.05=0.05), and embedding of IL across the curriculum (0.00<0.05) were the major factors influencing achievement IL objectives. The study recommends that IL programme be made mandatory and ensure it is taught as a curricular course. The management should streamline internal institutional processes that influence the efficacy of IL programme.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction
This chapter introduces the study and covers the following sections: background to the study, statement of problem, general and specific objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations of the study, as well as theoretical and conceptual frameworks.

1.2 Background to the study
Information literacy (IL) is the ability to think critically and make balanced judgements about any information we find and use. It empowers us as citizens to develop informed views and to engage fully with society (CILIP, 2018). It incorporates a set of skills and abilities that every individual requires in order to undertake information-related tasks such as how to discover, access, interpret, analyse, manage, create, communicate, store and share information. IL is also concerned with the application of the competencies, attributes and confidence needed to make the best use of information and to interpret it judiciously. It incorporates critical thinking and awareness, and an understanding of both the ethical and political issues associated with using information as stated by CILIP (2018). IL relates to information in all its forms, and is associated and overlaps with other literacies such as digital literacy, academic literacy and media literacy. The concept is not independent, and is aligned with other areas of knowledge. It is also a useful concept in enabling individuals to understand the ethical and legal issues associated with the use of information such as privacy, data protection, freedom of information, open access, as well as intellectual property.
Globally, The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the International Federation of Library Associations and Federations (IFLA) are recognized for the rapid growth of IL. These organizations have made the promotion of IL possible through their publication entitled Beacons of the Information Society: The Alexandria Proclamation on Information Literacy and Lifelong Learning (2005), which states that IL: comprises of the competencies useful for recognizing the need for information, locate, evaluate, appropriate use, enables individuals to create information within cultural and social contexts; is key to the competitive advantage of persons, businesses, regions and nations; provides the key to effective access, use and creation of content to support all aspects of contemporary societal issues; extends beyond current technologies to encompass learning, critical thinking and interpretative skills across professional boundaries and empowers individuals and communities.

The same proclamation asked governments across the world and development partners to support the professional development of employees in education, library, and information services in the principles and practices of IL and lifelong learning. It also asked for inclusion of IL into initial and continuing education for key economic sectors and government policy making and administration and into the practice of advisors to the business and agriculture sectors. Finally, the proclamation recognized lifelong learning and IL as key elements for the development of generic capabilities which must be required for the accreditation of all education and training programmes.

In Africa, the development of IL faced a rapid growth in the 1990s through to the 2000s with the emergence of automated libraries. Even though there was the emergence of
such libraries, the process was characterized by poor or no infrastructure, inadequate ICT equipment such as computers and low uptake of new technologies.

In Kenya, both public and private universities already had various IL initiatives in place by the 1980s. According to King’ori et al (2012), user education as a form of information literacy existed in some academic libraries even in the 1980s. They however lacked a logical approach as well as a policy framework to guide the implementation of these initiatives. He further states that by 1990s, IL became paramount as a result of information explosion forcing most institutions of higher learning in Kenya to embrace IL programmes to bridge the gap created by the then existing inadequacy of library orientation and user education programmes. In year 2007, the then Commission for Higher Education (CHE), came up with Standards and Guidelines for University Libraries in Kenya, a document that outlined Information Literacy and Competency as a key component of the guideline.

Following the Gazettement of the University Bill 2012 in September 2012, CHE was abolished and replaced with the Commission for University Education (CUE), who then came up with the new Information Literacy and Competency Guidelines in 2014 and is currently used by universities in Kenya (CUE, 2014). Every institution of higher learning in Kenya is expected to implement IL programmes in accordance to these standards and guidelines.

In Higher Education, IL contributes to academic competencies, research methodologies and an understanding of plagiarism as highlighted by CILIP (2018). It allows students to discover new ways of thinking, new knowledge and equips them with employability
skill useful for lifelong learning making IL programmes key aspects of academic libraries. Even though IL programmes are regarded as significant component of academic libraries globally, and institutions of higher learning are implementing the programmes based on specific Standards and Guidelines provided with the intention of assisting users make effective and efficient use of the available information resources and services, the effectiveness of IL programmes still remain questionable. Noted from observation is that most university students still lack the required skills to exploit their library research potential and still underutilize the most significant library resources despite going through an IL programme.

This study explores the effectiveness of IL programmes in academic libraries with the aim of establishing the effectiveness of IL programmes in academic libraries. Tangaza University College Library (TUCL) was considered as the case study because it has an operational IL programme in place.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

In this age of information society, research relies significantly on individual’s ability to seek, search and to effectively use the information found. IL is not just about good information seeking behavior, it entails the ability to take cognizance of the need for information, identify, asses and efficiently using the information for the intended purpose. It has however been observed by researchers such as Kavulya (2003) and Hall (2010) that most university students lack the required skills to exploit the library’s research potentials and therefore are experiencing difficulties in utilizing the library resulting in them underutilizing library information services. Sithole et al. (2015) further asserts that developing countries are also faced with challenges of
underutilization of the most significant resources with current information and knowledge due to lack of IL skills.

Currently, as students continue to rely more on libraries and other internet sources for academic research information, acquisition of IL skills has also become crucial for each and every student. However, Noa and Jenny (2014) indicate that university students have not acquired IL skills to the expected level. They have a gap in searching skills, possess poor information evaluation skills, and cannot effectively and efficiently utilize the information to resolve issues or make informed decisions despite them undergoing an IL programme.

Considering the fact that academic libraries have IL programmes in place intended to equip students with optimal library utilization skills, the researcher is left asking why there are gaps in the students’ search skills. Previous studies (Jess, Bhat, Rao, 2016; Laskin, Zoe, 2017; Muhia, 2017) have also recommended further research studies on the effectiveness IL programmes in higher education for purposes of understanding why the gap, but to this end, no such studies have been conducted. It is against this background that the researcher had a reason to undertake a study on the effectiveness of IL programmes in academic libraries with the aim of establishing the effectiveness of IL programmes in academic libraries.

1.3.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to establish the effectiveness of information literacy programme at TUCL to facilitate full utilization of the library by the university students.
1.3.2 Objectives of the Study

The study sets out to:

1) Establish the information literacy practices at Tangaza University College Library;
2) Determine whether the Tangaza University College Library is achieving the objectives of its information literacy programme;
3) Find out the mechanisms in place for evaluating the IL programme at Tangaza University College Library;
4) Determine factors influencing efficacy of the information literacy programme at Tangaza University College Library.

1.3.3 Research Questions

The study sets out to answer the following questions:

1. What are the information literacy practices at Tangaza University College Library?
2. To what extent is the library achieving the objectives of the information literacy programme?
3. What mechanisms are in place to ensure evaluation of the IL programme at Tangaza University College Library?
4. Which factors influence efficacy of the information literacy programme at Tangaza University College Library?

1.4 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study are useful to TUCL policy makers and management in making informed decisions regarding implementation of the information literacy programme at the TUCL. In addition, the findings are also useful in assisting the TUCL staff to model
appropriate information literacy programmes for their library users. Further to this, the findings of the study also sheds more light on the usefulness of IL programmes thereby enabling users to gauge their expectations and probably prompt the TUCL staff on what aspects to concentrate on.

1.5 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The study experienced some limitations and delimitations as highlighted below.

1.5.1 Limitations

The study faced the following limitations:

- The respondents of the study were out of session by the time the researcher was ready to collect data leading to delay in data collection.
- Some of the respondents were not very keen on providing information citing that they did not attend the IL programme fully prompting the researcher to try as much as possible to convince them that it is okay if they just gave the information they are able to give.

1.5.2 Delimitations

The target population of the study did not cover all the students at Tangaza University College. The study was confined to Library Staff and Undergraduate students from Tangaza University, School of Arts and Social Sciences. The findings cannot therefore be generalized to represent other academic libraries in Kenya.
1.6 Assumptions of the Study

The study is be based on the following assumptions:

- That all the students of Tangaza University College have gone through the library IL programme.
- That the respondents will give honest responses.

1.7 Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

1.7.1 Theoretical framework

According to Abend (2008), theories are meant to describe, project, and understand a specific set of phenomena. They also challenge and extend existing knowledge within the limits of critical bounding assumptions. Theoretical framework is the structure that can hold or support a theory of a given research study. It introduces and describes the theory that explains why the research problem under study exists.

This study adopted Christine Bruce’s seven faces model of information literacy. Bruce (1997) examines information literacy using different methods to determine how individuals experience information. The model categorizes information literacy into seven different faces of interacting with information where from the first face to the seventh face, information literacy is experienced as: using IT for information awareness and communication; a way of finding information from appropriate sources; as an execution process; as controlling information; building up personal knowledge base in a new subject area of interest; working with knowledge and personal perspectives adopted in a manner that new insights are gained; using information wisely for the benefit of others.
Its relevance to this study is that it promotes critical thinking skills and also assists users to understand how to access, use and utilize information.

1.7.2 Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework represents the researcher’s understanding of how the particular variables under his or her study connect with each other. It identifies the variables required in the research investigation and is basically the researcher’s map in pursuing the investigation. According to Adom, Hussein and Agyem (2018) a conceptual framework refer to the Researcher’s explanation of how a research problem can be investigated. According to Granto and Osanlooit (2014) the framework assists the researcher in identifying and constructing a worldview on the phenomenon to be investigated, and is a simple way through which a researcher presents his/her asserted remedies to the problem under investigation.

The conceptual framework in this study shows how the variables under study relate with one another. It specifically highlights how the independent variables influences the dependent variable in order to achieve an effective IL programme or an ineffective one.
**Independent Variables**

- IL Practices
- Objectives of IL Programmes
- Evaluation of IL Programmes,
- Factors influencing the effectiveness of IL Programmes

**Dependent Variable**

- Information Literacy Programme.

**Effect**

- Effective IL Programmes
- Ineffective IL Programmes

**Intervening Variable**

**SOURCE:** Researcher, 2019.
1.8 Operational Definitions of Key Terms

This section provides for definitions of terms used in the study that individuals outside the field of study may not understand and that go beyond common language as stated by Locke (2013).

**Information Literacy:** Refers to the ability to establish that there is need for information, locate, accurately evaluate, and use it effectively for the purpose for which it was sort.

**Information Literacy Programme:** A structured training conducted by librarians in order to equip their users with skillful approaches to seeking and using information.

**Information Literacy Skills:** This refers to the abilities that one must possess in order to be categorized as being information literate.

**Effectiveness:** The extent to which TUCL achieves the objectives of its IL programme.

**Lifelong Learning:** The use of both the formal and informal learning opportunities throughout individual’s lives to foster continuous development and improvement of the knowledge and skills needed for employment as well as personal fulfilment.

**Literacy:** The ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate and compute, using printed and written materials associated with varying contexts.

**Media Literacy:** The ability to access, analyse, evaluate and create messages across a variety of contexts.

**Digital Literacy:** The ability to use digital technology, communication tools or networks to locate, evaluate, use and create information.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviewed literature based on the specific objectives of the study. The areas addressed were: information literacy practices; objectives of information literacy programmes; evaluation of information literacy programmes and factors influencing efficacy of IL programmes.

2.2 Information Literacy Practices

According to Lloyd et al. (2011), IL practices refer to the different ways of how people learn to identify and engage with information of a new background, how they learn to identify what information is important, how information is shared and accessed, the different sources of information that enables access to the knowledge bases of a society, and more narrowly to their local community. It takes various activities, approaches and practices to ensure effectiveness of IL programmes. Bhattacharyya (2009) pointed out that IL programmes need to be embedded in the regular classroom activities in all types of academic institutions, and that both the teaching faculty and librarians should become essential components of such programmes.

Fidzani (2010) recommends that the best practice for libraries to fulfil their roles in IL education is by means of IL activities for students, such as library orientation, teaching one-to-one searching methods at the reference service section, seminars, integration in various courses, teaching through websites, and teaching IL as a curricular course. Sang (2016) also corresponds that it is through library orientation that students can become
independent when utilizing library information resources. She further cites library
guided tours and bibliographic instructions as other IL practices useful in academic
libraries. However, Huvila (2010) argues that as students progress through their years
of study and academic programmes, they should utilize the library frequently in order
to master the search and retrieval skills necessary for their own dealings without any
help from librarians. Huston et al. (2011) also, opines that Problem Based Learning
(PBL) approach is what is regarded as key in helping students to acquire IL skills
effectively. Their study also revealed that PBL approach provided student-centered
learning with instructional experiences derived from teamwork and critical thinking
while doing hands-on training with information resources.

Other IL practices involve librarians in academic libraries diversifying their roles to be
promoters and educators of IL by conducting orientation programmes for users, and
undertaking other IL initiatives that encourage one on one learning, or classroom based
learning. The aim is to encourage a collaboration between Librarians and University
departments to graduate students who can effectively utilize information to make
strategic decisions at their workplaces posits Dubicki (2013). Fister (2013) however
remarks that it is not about teaching students how to utilize the library and other
information resources, he opines that attention should be paid on how the use of these
information can be of value in the future.

The American Library Association (2000), also outlines three practices of integrating
IL in university libraries as follows: Planning for IL teaching missions using a well-
established course content, defined teaching methods, program structures and
evaluation; the use librarians with vast experience and expertise to train students;
acquisition of teaching facilities, continuous planning and budgeting for the programme and librarians’ knowledge development. Based on this review, the researcher’s view on IL practices is that it is all about how individuals seek and interact with situations that require effective use of information.

2.3 Objectives of Information Literacy Programmes

The word objective describes things that a person may want to achieve. It helps to nail down what must actually be accomplished in order to achieve a certain set goal. In the context of IL programmes, it is about the specific reason as to why an IL programme is set up. IL programme, on the other hand refer to a plan of actions that can result into ensuring acquisition of skills necessary for using information for the intended purpose.

According to Emmanuel (2011), the goal of any given IL programme is to instill the capability of establishing the need for information, organization of information as well as retrieval of information. This understanding is asserted by Shoeb (2011), who explains that the main objective of any library IL programme is to ensure that users are able to access information in a timely manner in order to put it into its intended use. Shoeb (2011) also suggests that Librarians should spearhead various IL programmes in the academic environment, use avenues such as workshops and seminars to continually update their skills if the objectives of IL programmes must be achieved.

In their study analyzing IL practices at selected academic libraries in Zimbabwe, Tshuma and Chigada (2018) found the following to be the general objectives of IL programmes in an academic library environment: equipping researchers with skills that enable them to carry out quality research; improving the academic output of the
students; improving the students’ skills in the use of both print and non-print information resources; supporting teaching and learning; and preparing individuals to be independent learners. This position is further supported by Institute of Development Studies and Information Training and Outreach Centre for Africa (2010) and Hart and Davids (2010) who stated that IL programme is a priority for academic libraries and key in raising institutional standards by improving the quality of research, teaching and learning. According to Kingoril (2011) the objective of IL programmes in institutions of higher learning is to play a critical role in empowering students and academic researchers to effectively and efficiently exploit the diversity of information resources and services in academic libraries. While emphasizing the vital goal of IL programmes, Shenton and Jackson (2007) also noted that IL programmes are fundamental to the success of learners in discharging their academic responsibilities.

According to Baro and Zuokemefa (2011) the ultimate goal of a comprehensive IL programme is to inculcate in the individual the ability to recognize when information is required and to teach them to understand how the information is organized, and how to access it. Mukungu (2011) also notes that the development of IL skills has become an essential curricular goal in university education as these programmes form the background of IL among students. Awe (2017) stated that the advent and application of ICT has changed the whole philosophy of information literacy and that Libraries are now more concerned with IL programmes with the objective of helping their users to develop the ability to identify information needs, seek out resources to meet those needs and analyze, evaluate, synthesize, and communicate the resulting knowledge. Syamalamba (2011) posits that the ultimate goal of any library IL programme is to ensure that students and staff are able to access the information for purposes for which
they require it. This raises the need to teach IL to users with the goal of assisting clients to identify and select relevant information using appropriate search strategies and being able to evaluate, organize and synthesize that information into a meaningful presentation. Jessy and Rao (2016) states that Libraries in the higher educational institutions conduct IL programmes with the aim of adding value to learning and teaching. The programme helps in developing literature search skills among the students in retrieving literature related to their topic of interest from various information resources.

It is also important to understand the key issues to pay attention to when setting objectives of a library IL programme. Lau (2006) outlines them as follows: consistency with the mission, goals, and objectives of the library and the institution; establish measurable outcomes for evaluation of the program; accommodate input from institutional stakeholders; clearly present the integration of information literacy across the curriculum for students’ academic pursuits and effective lifelong learning; accommodate sequential growth of students’ skills and understanding throughout their education; and taking into account all learners served by or connected to the institution, regardless of delivery systems or location.

2.4 Evaluation of Information Literacy Programmes

Programme evaluation is a method of gauging performance that emphasizes on the general efficiency of a programme. According to Bracke, Maybee and Weiner (2016), evaluation usually employs more than one method of assessment and is based on the anticipated outcomes of the programme. It should therefore include measurement of the
progress of meeting the program’s goals and objectives; and assessment of integration with course, curriculum, institutional, and accreditation assessment (ACRL, 2012).

In the context of library IL programmes, Marzal (2010) describes evaluation as a process of improvement and betterment. It must therefore be linked to quality; and must have the necessary tools to measure the process of qualification (Marzal, 2010). He further argues that if an institution develops and implements an IL programme, then there must be a monitoring and evaluation mechanism in order to establish efficacy of the programme. Kendra (2008), also explains that evaluating a library’s information literacy efforts on a programmatic scale provides a vital opportunity to ensure that those engaged in information literacy instruction, as well as the library and university administrators, are best positioned to support the myriad elements that make up a successful information literacy programme.

The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL’s) Institute for Information Literacy (2011), confirms Kendra’s (2008) position on evaluating IL programmes when the Institute highlights that, one of the characteristics of IL programmes that illustrates best practice is the evaluation of the programme itself. The Australian and New Zealand Institute for Information Literacy (2004), also emphasizes that best practice evaluation establishes the process of ongoing improvement of the programme, measures directly progress toward meeting the goals and objectives of the programme, integrates with course and curriculum assessment as well as institutional evaluations, and assumes multiple methods and purposes for evaluation.

ACRL (2016) elaborates on evaluation of IL programmes by looking into other aspects of the IL programme. The Association outlines specific standards and performance
indicators that focus on the student’s needs at all levels higher education. The standards considers one to be information literate if: the student can define and articulate the need for information; the student can access needed information effectively and efficiently; the student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system; the student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose and if the; student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.

These standards are considered the most acceptable standards to effectively evaluate information competencies in institutions of higher education worldwide according to Syamalamba (2011). The standards also highlight varied outcomes for assessing student progress towards IL. The Association argues that these outcomes is a way of providing guidelines for university faculties, librarians, and others in developing local methods for measuring students learning in the context of the university’s mandate, which in essence should be in line with that of the library IL programme. The Association further pinpoints that in addition to assessing all students’ basic IL skills, faculty and librarians should collaborate and develop assessment instruments as well as strategies in line with specific disciplines, as information literacy manifests itself in the specific understanding of the knowledge creation, scholarly activity, and publication processes found in those disciplines (ACRL, 2016). Without this broader perspective, there may be creation of programmes and services that are brilliant on their own but disconnected from a more comprehensive approach (ACRL 2012).
2.5 Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Information Literacy Programmes.

For an information literacy programmes to be effective, it must receive support from the top institutional administration as stated by McGuiness (2007). Where possible, the IL programme must be one of the core values in the institution’s mission and a critical objective of each academic discipline as clarified by McGuiness (2007). Saunders (2012) however suggests that because faculties of any institution have direct interaction with students, they can be pivotal in promoting positive motivation for IL activities for purposes of effectiveness.

As proposed by Shoeb (2011), librarians should develop good understanding with faculty members and invite them to different seminars and workshops in order to develop IL skills among the university community. Tuamsuk (2013), however advocates that IL courses should be designed as one-major-credit-hour courses that can be implemented in all academic and research libraries.

While Munazza et al (2014), opines that IL and well-designed IL programmes can only excel when librarians and teaching faculties collaborate to design, implement and evaluate the programs; Breivik (2004), on the other hand recognizes the following as features of an effective information literacy programmes. First, information literacy is about learning and not necessarily a library issue therefore classroom faculty must be responsible for teaching. Second, collaboration between librarians and faculty is crucial from planning and implementation of such programmes. Finally, an effective information literacy programme must be institutionalized across the curriculum.
Naik and Padmini (2014) on the other hand recommends the following as factors that influence effectiveness of IL programmes: Library professionals should be encouraged by the authorities to attend seminars, workshops, training or library orientation programmes; They should be compensated with the appropriate financial benefits for rendering highly technical and modern library services to the users; introduce IL programmes in the curriculum wherever possible; Collaboration with the college faculty, students, and administrators in promoting IL programmes; The management should stress the need for faculty members to join in teaching IL skills.

According to Reed et al (2007), collaboration between librarians and teaching faculty is very key in ensuring the effectiveness of an IL programme. The collaboration should be cover areas such as: curricular development, assignment development, in-class teaching, and office hours for individual student development and assessment activities. Reeds et al (2007) further established that where such collaboration are embraced, strong results are realized in terms of programme effectiveness because of the collaborative experience. However, collaboration between the library and the faculty is not always easy as observed by West (2013), he noted that the traditional library instruction is often completed with little collaboration between instructor and library staff. Usually, a teacher contacts the librarian and requests a session that will help students complete a particular assignment. The librarian visits the class, teaches the skills that students will use for the particular assignment, and expresses how important it is for students to ask for help with research. These short IL sessions are one way for librarians to reach students with important information about how and why libraries are used. West (2013) notes that while lessons like this can be effective, it is difficult for the librarian to assess whether class activities improve student success.
According to the ALA (2000), incorporating IL across curricula, in all programs and services, and throughout the administrative life of the university, requires the collaborative efforts of faculty, librarians, and administrators. The lecturer’s roles include giving lectures, leading discussions and establish the context for learning. The faculty also inspires students to explore the unknown, offer guidance on how best to fulfill information needs, and monitor students’ progress. Librarians coordinate the evaluation and selection of intellectual resources for programs and services; organize, and maintain collections and many points of access to information; and provide instruction to students and faculty who seek information. The Association further notes that Administrators in institutions of higher learning need to create opportunities for collaboration and staff development among faculty, librarians, and other professionals who initiate information literacy programs, lead in planning and budgeting for those programs, and provide ongoing resources to sustain them.

Jelagat (2015) observed that a variety of learning resources are essential in order to achieve effective information literacy training and learning process as they make teaching and learning processes and activities interesting and joyful. This is made possible with the help of sensory aids, as they make students feel motivated and as a result, they learn faster, remember longer, gain more accurate information and receive and understand delicate concepts and meanings. Jelagat (2015) further states that teaching and learning resources enable the students to develop their powers of imagination, observation and reasoning and describes a learning resource as anything planned, prepared or used to facilitate or reinforce the teaching process in teaching and learning situation. Olubayi (2015) also suggests that teaching and learning resources may include well equipped libraries with recommended textbooks, laboratories, well-
spaced and ventilated classrooms, adequate trained teachers, computers, projectors, good boards, playgrounds, sports equipment, among many others.

Perception of students towards IL programmes is also noted as a factor that influence effectiveness of IL programmes as established by Franklin (2005) when he noted in his study that doctoral students find IL competencies as important in achieving a successful outcome to a research project or course assignment. The instructional methods used to deliver or teach IL programmes are also key in achieving the programmes’s effectiveness as opined by Ogula and Onsong (2009). The duo states that teaching methodologies are intended to impart subject matter to student therefore selection of IL teaching methods must be purposeful and deliberate. They further identify the teaching methods as: lectures, case studies, group discussions, field trips, simulation, use of resource persons, demonstrations, seminars, computer workshops, group work, practicals and tutorials.

2.6 Studies on Effectiveness of IL Programmes

IL provides students with a framework on how to access and use information in order to satisfy their academic and research information needs. Studies have been undertaken on effectiveness of IL programmes by different researchers giving their research findings and recommending what ought to be done based on the findings of their studies. According to Issa et al. (2015), individuals need to be information literate for purposes of effective utilization of information resources. This position is further emphasized by Navalur et al. (2012) who highlighted the importance of IL programmes in maximum utilization of resources in their study _Usage of E-resources by Faculty, Research Scholars and PG Students of Bharathidasan University_. While assessing the perception
of users on effectiveness of user education in facilitating information searches in his study, Chinyere (2014) found that the programme equipped the library users with skills that enabled them carry out searches independently leading to maximum utilization of library information resources.

As stated by Selematsela (2009), IL training is underscored to be important in learning how to learn by many academic libraries. Muhinja (2013) states that even though IL programmes are a universal component of academic libraries across the globe, academic institutions still experience low usage of library information resources. This status is also noted by Horo (2006) who stated in his study that even though academic libraries have massive information resources both in print and non-print formats, utilization of these information resources is low. According to Ameen and Gorman (2009), the use of library resources is still very low because of the inability to use, or ignorance about the available information sources within libraries. The duo recommend that the only way to curb this is to create awareness of such information resources through IL programmes. Kousar and Mahmood (2013) also undertook an evaluation study which revealed that students are not fully familiar with, or cannot effectively utilize library resources because they lack IL skills. Kannapparvar and Swammy (2012) therefore recommend IL training programmes as the only sure way of ensuring that students acquire IL skills that can enable them to utilize library information sources effectively.

2.7 Summary of Research Gap

The information gap noted in this literature review is the fact that academic libraries recognize information literacy to be very significant in ensuring maximum utilization of library information resources, and are even implementing IL programmes in their
institutions for purposes of ensuring that all students are well equipped with adequate skills useful in carrying out information searches in the course of their studies, yet these student’s literacy skills still remain questionable as evidenced by low utilization of information resources. This study therefore sought to address the question why the gap?
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the research design and methodology that was applied for the study. It contains information on the research design and locale, the population, sampling techniques, sample size, research instruments, methods of data collection and analysis, data validity, reliability and ethical considerations observed during the study.

3.2 Research Design

Research design as defined by Creswell (2013) is a plan or a procedure for research that gives decisions from a broad assumption to a detailed method of data collection and analysis. It is therefore the overall strategy that guides research from the beginning to the end. This study employed the use of descriptive research design. The researchers was interested in fact finding hence the choice of the design as it allows for proper gathering of information, analysis and presentation in a manner that makes sense to individuals as stated by Kombo and Tromp (2006).

3.2.1 Variables

This study investigated dependent and independent variables. Dependent variable is a consequence of another variable, while an independent variable is a precursor to the dependent variable. In this study, the dependent variable was information literacy programme and the independent variables were information literacy practices, objectives of information literacy programmes, evaluation of information literacy programmes, and factors influencing the effectiveness of IL programmes.
3.2.2 Location of the Study

The study was carried out at Tangaza University College Library, which is an academic library based in Nairobi County, Kenya; and has an IL programme in place hence the need to study its effectiveness. Its focused was on undergraduate students from Tangaza University, School of Arts and Social Sciences who had undergone the information literacy programme offered by the library in order to enhance their IL skills.

3.3 Population

The target population of the study was 148 in number comprising of 8 staff members at the TUCL, and 140 first year undergraduate students from Tangaza University, School of Arts and Social Sciences.

3.4 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size Determination

3.4.1 Sampling Techniques

The study used simple random sampling technique to select 103 undergraduate students from the school of Arts and Social Sciences as respondents from the 140 students at that school. This technique guarantees the researcher that the sample chosen is representative of the population and that the sample is selected in an unbiased manner. The selection of 103 undergraduate students from the school of Arts and Social Sciences out of the total population of 140 was done using the simple random number generator software; where the researcher entered the start number as 1 and the end number as 140. Then the numbers that were generated, i.e. that of 140 students were later keyed into the software resulting into random numbers without duplication.
The undergraduate students from the School of Arts and Social Sciences were selected for the study because they had undergone the TUCL IL training programme, and had put the skills into use for a period of seven (7) months, hence the need to establish if going through the IL training programme was useful.

3.4.2 Sample Size

The study employed the use of Yamane’s (1967) formula to determine the sample size. However, the researcher did not sample the number of TUCL staff since the number was small at 8 respondents.

Sample size determination was done as follows:

Yamane’s formula is:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \]

Where \( n \) is the sample size, 
\( N \) is the population size, 
\( e \) is the error of 5 percentage point.

Therefore the student’s sample size was calculated as follows:

\[ n = \frac{140}{1 + 140 \times (0.05)^2} \]

\[ n = \frac{140}{1 + 140 \times (0.05)^2} \]

\[ n = \frac{140}{1 + 140 \times (0.0025)} \]
n = \frac{140}{1+0.35}

n = 103

The student’s sample size was therefore 103 in number.

A summary of the sampling work was presented as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 TUCL Library Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 undergraduate students from the</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts and Social Sciences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.5 Research Instruments

Data was gathered through structured questionnaires, interview schedules and supplemented with document analysis. Document analysis was useful in gathering data from institutional documents such as the Library Policy, and the IL programme syllabus. The Library policy was key in providing information on policy provisions available for the TUCL IL programme; and the IL programme syllabus was vital in providing information on the aims and objectives of the IL programme. Questionnaires were also useful in providing a collection of questions which enabled the researcher to determine the extent to which a respondent perceived a particular subject matter. The researcher also employed the use of interview schedules to gather more specific data from library staff to supplement the data collected from students. The interview schedules were prepared as a guide with meaningful questions for the library staff. The questions were developed in a sequence of easy, closed questions considering all the study variables.
3.5.1 Pre-testing/Piloting Study

A pilot study was done at Great Lakes University, Nairobi Campus. The respondents were selected using a simple random technique to pick participants who comprised of twenty (20) students and one (1) Librarian. The pretesting procedure was similar to that which was used during the main study except that the number of participants was small. The purpose of the pilot study was to ensure that the data collection instruments were reliable. The pretest was done one week before the actual study and the data collected was analyzed to establish the suitability of the questionnaires and interviews guides in terms of relevance, and whether the responses received were clear. Corrections were made to the questions that were found to be inappropriate before they were administered to the actual target population of the study.

3.5.2 Validity

The definition of validity as stated by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) is “the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which are based on the research results; it is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the phenomenon under study”. It is also considered useful to critically examine all the selected data collection procedures for purposes of assessing the extent to which they are likely to be reliable and valid. In this study, the researcher was concerned with content validity hence employed the use of applied expert validity method. Validity of the questionnaires was established by presenting it to two (2) lecturers in the Department of Library and Information Science, Kenyatta University with the subject knowledge of the researcher’s area of study. Their views were incorporated before running the data collection process. During pilot study, the researcher also asked
respondents whether the interview questions asked were useful in measuring the content of the study and amendments were made.

3.5.3 Reliability
Reliability refers to the extent to which a test or procedure produces the similar results under constant conditions on all occasions as defined by (Bell, 2010). It is about the consistency with which a measuring instrument yields a certain result when the entity being measured has not changed. To establish the reliability of the instruments, the researcher subjected them to a pilot test after which desirable and necessary corrections were made.

3.6 Data Collection
Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected to respond to the answer the research questions emanating from the objectives of the study. This was done by employing the use of questionnaire, interview guides and document analysis. The researcher distributed the questionnaires and also interviewed respondents with the help of a Research Assistant who was an undergraduate student hence understood the importance of data collection. The researcher and the Research Assistant went to TUC in order to access the students and library staff hence collect data. The Research Assistant ensured that the questionnaires were dully filled and also guided the students who needed assistance to ensure accuracy of the responses. The researcher used a recorder during interview sessions to ensure backup of the data collected for purposes of data security. A checklist with key issues under study was used to act as a guide and ensure consistency of the information discussed. It took the researcher ten (10) days to complete the data collection process.
3.6.1 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

The researcher factored in all the ethical considerations during the research process by maintaining a high standard of integrity. Additionally, the researcher explained the purpose of the study to the respondents to ensure that the respondents gave an informed consent to participate in the study. This was also critical in ensuring that there were no suspicions on the part of the subject under study, and also insisted on adhering to voluntary participation of respondents in the study.

For purposes of adhering to research protocol and itinerary, the researcher obtained a letter of introduction from the Department of Library and Information Science Kenyatta University, which made introduction to the respondents very simple and easy. The researcher then proceeded to obtain a research authorization letter from National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI), for purposes of research regulation and quality assurance. The researcher also obtained research authorization letter from the Regional Coordinator of Education, Nairobi County since the study was conducted in the said County, as well as Tangaza University College (TUC) since TUC’s research policy also requires that the researcher obtains clearance from them before collecting data from their institution.

3.7 Data Analysis

The data gathered was sorted, coded, cleaned and analyzed. Data analysis for both quantitative and qualitative data was done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Description and thematic analysis was used for qualitative data analysis while descriptive and inferential numeric analysis was used for quantitative
data. The data analyzed was then presented in the form of tables, pie charts and graphs. Presented data was interpreted in textual form and thereafter a final report was written.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings, interpretations and discussion according to the objectives and research questions. The findings are presented according to the study objectives namely; to establish the information literacy practices at Tangaza University College Library; to determine whether the Tangaza University College Library is achieving the objectives of its information literacy programme; to find out the mechanisms in place for evaluating the IL programme at Tangaza University College Library and to determine factors influencing efficacy of the information literacy programme at Tangaza University College Library. Tables, graphs and charts are used to present the descriptive and inferential findings.

4.2 General and Demographic Information

4.2.1 General Information

This section provides an understanding of the characteristics of the respondents and the response rate. The research study used a purposive sampling method to select 103 undergraduate students from the School of Arts and Social Sciences and eight TUCL Staff. A structured questionnaire was administered to the participants. From the 103 students invited, 92 questionnaires were completed, giving a return rate of 89%. Two records were omitted owing to the level of incompleteness.
4.2.2. Demographic Data

The participants’ demographic data was disintegrated in terms of age, gender and year of study as summarized in figures 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3.

**Figure 4.1 Respondents’ age**

As figure 4.1 displays, the majority of the respondents were also aged between 15-20 years 34(37.8%) and 21-25 30 (33.3%) while those aged between were 26-30% 11(12.2%), those aged between 36-40 years 4(4.4%) and those over forty years were a minority 2(2.2%).
As the figure 4.2 displays, the majority of the respondents were female 46 (51.1%) while the males were 44(48.9%) of the respondents.
Regarding the respondent’s year of study, the researcher found that the majority were first year students 31(34.4%) while those in their second year made up 21 (23.3%). The respondents in their third year of study were 15(21.6%) while those in their fourth year 19(21.1%). four of the respondents did not indicate their respondents hence the (4.4%) missing value as indicated in the table above.

4.3. Institutional Information Literacy Practices

To understand the various approaches and practices underpinning effectiveness of IL programmes at the institution, the undergraduate students were asked to indicate the activities that defined the IL practices at their institution. The results are summarised in
The respondents were asked to tick all the IL practices that applied to their institution. For analysis purposes, the researcher coded those who chose the activity as ‘yes’ while those who did not choose were labelled ‘no’.

### Table 4.1: Institutional Information Literacy Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information literacy Practices</th>
<th>N=90</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching IL as a curricular course</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library orientation</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Education</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one teaching</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars and Presentations</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table 4.1 indicates, all of the respondents 90(100%) indicated that teaching information literacy was a curricular course in their institution. Library orientation was also indicated to be a part of information literary practices in the institution by 89 (98.9%) of the respondents. User education was indicated to be in use by 89(98.9%) of the respondents while 74 (82.2%) of the respondents indicated that one-on-one teaching of IL in the institution was a common practice. Seminars and presentations was reported to be in use by 80 (88.9%) of the respondents. From the findings above, it can be seen that teaching IL as a curricular course is the most used practice similar to user education and library education.
According to the Interview Schedules, the faculty members were of the opinion that their institutional information literary practices were quite effective. One of them asserted that

‘… we still have a long way to go, but I believe that the current approach of teaching IL as a curriculum course is a move in the right direction. It allows for the integration of the program into every day practice which will improve its effectiveness.’

Another one claimed that

‘the institution has set a number of practices in place including library orientation, seminars and one-on-one teaching all which seek to improve IL programme practice in the college.

From the findings above, it is evident that the institution has put practices in place to promote the effectiveness of IL programs including library orientation, teaching IL as a curriculum course and the move is supported by Sang (2016) who asserts that through library orientation that students can become independent when utilizing library information resources. She further cites library guided tours and bibliographic instructions as other IL practices useful in academic libraries. Further, Bhattacharyya (2009) also claims that IL programmes need to be embedded in the regular classroom activities in all types of academic institutions, and that both the teaching faculty and librarians should become essential components of such programmes and the institution has achieved this by making IL a curricular course.

### 4.3.1 Components of Information Literacy Programme

To deepen the students’ appreciation of the IL programme, the study sought to broaden their knowledge of what comprised an effective IL programme. To achieve that, the
study introduced a set of IL programme components for the students to make a choice of what, in their opinion, was a specific component of the IL program that they could identify in their respective institutions. In table 4.2, respondents who chose a component were coded as ‘yes’ while those did not chose as ‘no’.

Table 4.2: Specific Components of IL Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>N=90</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms for implementation</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program sequencing within the Curriculum</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration among administrators, program staff and teaching staff</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy i.e. advancement of diverse approaches to teaching</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate program staff</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured outreach activities</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program assessment/evaluation framework</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in table 4.2, majority of the respondents didn’t know 72(80%) whether their IL programme has a mission statement. The majority of the respondents 6(76.7%)
agreed that the IL programme has goals and objectives while 17 (18.9%) did not know whether it has goals and objectives. Regarding the mechanism of implementation, majority of the respondents 86 (95.6%) said yes, 3 (3.3%) said no and 1 (1.1%) said they didn’t know whether the IL program has the mechanism for implementation. When asked whether the programme has administrative support, 86 (95.6%) said yes, and 2 (2.2%) said no and they didn’t know respectively. Majority of the respondents 87 (96.7%) said their IL programmes has programme sequencing in the curriculum while 2 (2.2%) said no and 1 (1.1%) said they didn’t know. The majority of respondents 87 (96.7%) said yes, 1 (1.1%) said no and 2 (2.2%) said they didn’t know whether their IL programme received collaboration from the administrators, programme staff and teaching staff. Regarding pedagogy of the IL programme, the majority of respondents 87 (97.7%) said it has a pedagogy, 2 (2.2%) said it had none and 1 (1.1%) said they did know. Further, 83 (92.2%) said their IL programmes has adequate staff while 3 (3.3%) and 4 (4.4%) did not know whether the programme had adequate staff. The researcher also asked the respondents whether the IL programme has structured outreach activities and 78 (86.7%) said it has, 3 (3.3%) stated no and 9 (10%) indicated that they did not know. Last, the majority of the respondents 87 (96.7%) stated yes, 2 (2.2%) stated no and 1 (1.1) stated they did not know whether the programme had and evaluation or assessment framework.

From the interview schedules, the researcher found that the views of the faculty members on the components of IL programme were similar to those of the students. The majority of those interviewed claimed that the goals and objectives of the IL programme was most evident. Others claimed that administrative support was also a key component of the program but some complained that the institution lagged in setting the mechanism for implementing the IL programme. One of them asserted that
‘…I am really proud of how much effort the institution has put to ensure that the IL programme has sufficient staff to implement the program which allows for a diverse pedagogy to advance the program.’

4.4. Achievement of the information literacy programme objectives

Library functions to advance knowledge at institutions of learning by making the process of information seeking, access, and utilization easier for the users. In that sense, it advances the achievement of objectives of the IL programme as well. For that reason, the study introduced a five-point Likert scale to enable the students to rate the extent to which their library achieved the IL programme objectives. Table 4.3 displays the results.
Table 4.3: Extent of Library achieving IL Programme objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Library defines and articulates the need for information.</td>
<td>F 61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 67.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library identifies steps and formats of potential sources of information.</td>
<td>F 23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25.6</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library considers the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information.</td>
<td>F 32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 35.6</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library evaluates the nature and extent of the information needed.</td>
<td>F 24</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 26.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library selects the most appropriative investigative methods or informational retrieval systems for accessing the needed information.</td>
<td>F 24</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 26.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library implements variety of effectively-designed information search methods.</td>
<td>F 21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 23.3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library refines the search method if necessary.</td>
<td>F 31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 34.4</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library extracts, records, evaluates and manages the information and its sources.</td>
<td>F 22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 24.4</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library compares new knowledge with prior knowledge to determine the value added, contradictions, or other unique characteristics of the information.</td>
<td>F 23</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 25.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library understands the academic, legal and ethical, and social issues surrounding access and use of information.</td>
<td>F 36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 40</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study results indicated in the table 4.3 shows that majority of the respondents agreed 61(67.8%) agreed, 28(311%) and 1 (1.1%) were undecided on whether the library defines and articulate the need for information. In regards to the ability of the library to identify steps and formats when selecting possible sources, majority of the respondents...
65(72.2%) agreed, 23(25.6%) strongly agreed and 1(1.1%) were undecided and disagreed respectively with the statement. It was also found that majority of the respondents agreed 54 (60%) and 32(35.6%) strongly agreed that he library considers the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information. Majority of the respondents 61(67.8%) agreed, 24 (26.7%) strongly agreed while the minority 3 (3.3%) were undecided and 1(1.1%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that the library evaluates the nature and extent of the information needed. It was also observed that the majority of the respondents agreed 61 (67.8%) and 24(26.7%) strongly agreed that the library evaluates the nature and extent of the information needed. Similarly, the majority of the respondents 63(70%) agreed and 21(23.3%) strongly agreed, 4(4.4%) were undecided and 2 (2.2%) disagreed that the library selects the most appropriative investigative methods or informational retrieval systems for accessing the needed information. The researcher also found that the majority of the respondents 63(70%) agreed, 21(23.3%) strongly agreed, 4(4.4%) were undecided and 2(2.2%) disagreed that the library implements variety of effectively-designed information search methods. Majority of the respondents agreed 57(63.3%), 31(34.4%) strongly agreed and 2(2.2%) were uncertain if the library refines the search method if necessary. The table also indicates that the majority of the respondents agreed 66(73.3%), 22(24.4%) strongly agreed, 1 (1.1% and 1 (1.1%) were undecided and disagreed that the library extracts, records, evaluates and manages the information and its sources respectively. Last, it was found that the majority of the respondents agreed 52(57.8%), strongly agreed 36(40%), 1 (1.1%) undecided and 1 (1.1%) disagreed that the library understands the academic legal, ethical social issues surrounding access and use of information.
From the findings above, it can be deduced that the library takes into account various factors when implementing the IL programme to ensure that it achieves its objectives. It can be understood that the library understand the importance of the key issues they need to pay attention to when setting objectives of a library IL programme. This view is supported by Lau (2006) who outlines them as follows: consistency with the mission, goals, and objectives of the library and the institution; establish measurable outcomes for evaluation of the program; accommodate input from institutional stakeholders; clearly present the integration of information literacy across the curriculum for students’ academic pursuits and effective lifelong learning; accommodate sequential growth of students’ skills and understanding throughout their education; and taking into account all learners served by or connected to the institution, regardless of delivery systems or location. This is further articulated by Shoeb (2011), who explains that the main objective of any library IL programme is to ensure that users are able to access information in a timely manner in order to put it into its intended use. Shoeb (2011) also suggests that Librarians should spearhead various IL programmes in the academic environment, use avenues such as workshops and seminars to continually update their skills if the objectives of IL programmes must be achieved.

**4.5 Mechanisms for evaluation of the information literacy programme**

Like with every programme at institutions of higher learning, evaluation of the IL programme was mandatory and the study asked students to indicate the mechanisms used to evaluate the information literacy programme at their institution. A summary of the results is given in table 4.4 where the researcher assigned a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ during the analysis on each mechanism to determine which were in use and which weren’t because the respondents could select more than one mechanism.
Table 4.4: Mechanisms for evaluating IL Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>N=90</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Test</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction surveys</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios for students</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Assessment</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 4.4, it can be seen that classroom assessment 83 (92.2%), focus group discussions 85(94.4%) self-assessment 84(93%) and portfolio 58(64.4%) were the most used mechanisms for evaluating IL programme. On the other hand, the least popular ones were case studies 5(5.6%) performance appraisals 9(10%) and oral tests 14(15.6%) and satisfaction surveys/exit interviews 14(15.6%).

The researcher also conducted an interview schedule and asked faculty members their opinion on what mechanism the institution has put in place to evaluate the information literacy programme implemented. According to one of the faculty members, ‘…focus groups are the most used mechanism, but we also have oral tests as a means of IL
programme evaluation because it generates significant enthusiasm among all the undergraduate students.’

Another IL programme instructors claimed that

‘... we set examinations, Continuous Assessment Tests (CATs) and Term Papers to help us evaluate the methods adopted to gauge programme impact on learners...evaluating a library’s IL efforts on a programmatic scale provides a vital opportunity to ensure that those engaged in information literacy instruction, as well as the library and university administrators, were best positioned to support the elements that make up a successful information literacy programme.’

The study results affirmed that the IL programme evaluation mechanisms provided guidelines for university faculties, librarians and others in developing local methods for measuring students learning in the context of the university’s mandate, which in essence should be in line with that of the IL programme. The results also revealed that respondents stressed the need for collaboration between faculty and librarians in the development of IL assessment instruments.

These findings are supported by Syamalamba (2011) who assert that evaluation of IL Programmes is important to determine its effectiveness. According to him setting standards with varied outcomes help in assessing student progress towards IL as these outcomes provide a way of providing guidelines for university faculties, librarians, and others in developing local methods for measuring students learning in the context of the university’s mandate, which in essence should be in line with that of the library IL programme. In addition to assessing all students’ basic IL skills, ACRL (2016) also
assert that the faculty members and librarians should collaborate and develop assessment instruments as well as strategies in line with specific disciplines, as information literacy manifests itself in the specific understanding of the knowledge creation, scholarly activity, and publication processes found in those disciplines (ACRL, 2016).

### 4.6 Factors that influence efficacy of information literacy programme

IL programmes are either popular or unpopular with students depending on various factors that influenced its efficacy. With this in mind, the study provided a list of factors and asked the respondents to pick that which, in their opinion, mostly influenced efficacy of the information literacy programme at their institution. The Table 4.5 presents a summary of the responses.

**Table 4.5: Factors influencing efficacy of IL Programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>N=90</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding IL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching IL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As displayed in the table 4.5 Among factors identified by students as influencing the efficacy of the IL programme, support from the top institutional administration was cited as the most influential factor by 86(95.6%). Regarding teaching IL as a curricular course majority of the respondents 64 (93.3%) asserted that it was a factor while collaboration between librarians and faculties was cited by 83(92.2%) of the
respondents. Last, 82(91.1%) of the respondents selected integration of IL across the curriculum as a factor influencing efficacy of IL programme.

The students had no suggestions for other factors that might influence the delivery of the IL programme but the findings from the interview schedules conducted indicated that the institution’s management were of the view that perception of students towards IL programmes, level of user awareness, and instructional methods used to deliver or teach IL programmes had a strong bearing on the IL programme delivery. One of the faculty members asserted that

‘efficacy of information literacy programmes are influenced by collaboration between the various staff members who work towards achieving the set objectives.’

Another member asserted that

‘teaching methods were lectures, case studies, group discussions, field trips, simulation, use of resource persons, demonstrations, seminars, computer workshops, group work, practical and tutorials.’

From the findings above, it can be seen that various factors influence the efficacy of the IL programmes including collaboration, teaching IL and institutional support. These findings are supported by Franklin (2005) who noted that the instructional methods used to deliver or teach IL programmes are also key in achieving the programmes’s effectiveness as opined by Ogula and Onsongo (2009). Munazza et al (2014), further opines that IL and well-designed IL programmes can only excel when librarians and teaching faculties collaborate to design, implement and evaluate the programs. This view is further supported by Breivik (2004), who recognizes the following as features of an effective information literacy programmes. First, information literacy is about
learning and not necessarily a library issue therefore classroom faculty must be responsible for teaching. Second, collaboration between librarians and faculty is crucial from planning and implementation of such programmes. Finally, an effective information literacy programme must be institutionalized across the curriculum.

The researcher further performed a regression analysis test to determine the factor which has the most influence over efficacy of IL programmes and the tables below displays the findings.

**Table 4.6: Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.711a</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.34416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Embedding IL, Institutional support, Collaboration, teaching IL

From the table 4.6, it can be observed that teaching IL, institutional support, Collaboration and Embedding IL (Independent variables) predicted the effectiveness of the IL programme objectives by 63% an indication that 37% of the achievement of IL programme is predicted by other factors beyond those examined in the current study.

**Table 4.7 ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11.344</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.781</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.02b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>917.040</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>928.384</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Efficacy of IL

b. Predictors: (Constant), Teaching IL, Factors-Embedding IL, Factors-Institutional support, Factors-Collaboration
As displayed in the table 4.7, the independent variables (Teaching, Institutional support, collaboration and embedding IL had a significant effect (0.02<0.05) which had a lower threshold from the set 0.05 set to declare whether the independent variables had a significant effect on the dependent variable. Further, the researcher observed that the findings also show that the model was well defined and the influence of the independent variables on IL programme was not by chance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>44.612</td>
<td>3.880</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching IL</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>3.344</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding IL</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>2.394</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Efficacy of IL

Y = 44.612 + 0.648X1 + 0.333X2 + 0.500X3 + 0.778 + e

The table 4.8 displays the coefficient findings and it can be observed that all the independent variables had a significant influence on the dependent variable as they met the set threshold of (0.05) of predicting the achievement of IL programme objectives. It can be seen that teaching institutional literacy was statistically significant at p value 0.001<0.005 while institutional support was also significant at 0.013<0.05. Similarly, collaboration and embedding IL were also significant at p values 0.05 and 0.00 respectively. All the values were positive which implies that improving a unit of each of these independent factors would result in an improvement of achievement of the IL programme objectives. The findings show that in the college, the main factor influencing achievement of IL programme is Implementation of factors embedding IL followed by teaching IL, then collaboration with institutional support being the least
factor influencing IL. An improvement of one unit of factors embedding IL would result in a 0.148 improvement while improving a unit of teaching IL would lead to a 0.132 of achievement of IL objectives. Improving one unit of collaboration would result in a 0.36 achievement of IL programme objective while a unit improvement of institutional support would result in 0.19 improvement of IL programme.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the findings of the study, giving conclusions and suggested recommendations for implementation to augment effectiveness of information literacy programmes in academic libraries. The aim of the study was to ensure effectiveness of information literacy programme at institutions of higher learning so as to facilitate full utilization of the library by the students.

The study set out to establish the information literacy practices in public universities in Kenya, determine whether the library at the institutions were achieving the objectives of institutions’ information literacy programme, find out the mechanisms in place for evaluating the IL programme at the library, and determine factors influencing efficacy of the information literacy programme at library.

5.2 Summary

The study was summarized based on the research objectives as follows:

5.2.1 Institutional IL Practices

The first objective of the study was to establish the Institutional IL practices. It was found that some major institutional IL practices include teaching of IL programmes a curricular course, library orientation was also selected by the majority of the respondents as well as user education and use of seminars. It was further found that information literacy practices, the study established that institutions have made the IL programme mandatory and teaching it as a curricular course is more the standard practice than any other approach.
Further, it was found that the majority of the respondents agreed that IL programme had several components including the goals and objectives, implementation mechanism, administrative support, programme sequencing, collaboration from administrators, pedagogy, adequate staff, outreach activities and an evaluation and assessment framework. However, it was found that the majority of the respondents did not know whether the IL programme has a mission and vision statement.

5.2.2 Extent of academic Library achieving institutional IL Programme objectives

The study found out that the majority of the respondents agreed that the libraries provide services that adequately meet the objectives of IL programmes at the learning institutions. Academic libraries define and articulate well the need for information by refining the search methods for the students thus greatly improving students’ research literacy skills. Also, the libraries ably identify steps and formats of potential sources of information, and very well understands the academic, legal, ethical and social issues surrounding access and use of information by library users, besides making such information more relevant, meaningful and helpful to the information seekers.

5.2.3 Mechanisms for evaluation of the IL programme

The third objective of the study sought to determine the mechanism in place to evaluate the IL programme. From the findings, it was found there are a number of mechanisms that have been put in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the IL programmes. The majority of the respondents indicated that that focus groups, self-assessments, classroom assignments and student’s work portfolio (papers and assignments) are the most effective mechanisms for evaluating IL programmes. On the other hand, case
studies, performance appraisals, oral tests and satisfaction surveys/exit interviews are not found to be less effective IL evaluation methods in institutions of higher learning. And, to understand impact of IL programme on learners, the study established that Continuous Assessment Tests (CATs) and Term Papers are the most used learner-impact evaluation methods adopted by instructors as found from the interview schedules.

5.2.4 Factors that influence efficacy of IL programme

The fourth and last objective of the study sought to determine the factors that influence the efficacy of the IL programme in the college. The findings indicated that a number of factors come into play to determine the efficacy of the programme. These factors include support from the top institutional administration, teaching of IL as a curricular course, collaboration between librarians and faculties, user awareness, and integration of IL across the curriculum influence the efficacy of the IL programme in institutions of higher learning.

From the inferential statistics, it was found that support from institution administration (0.013<0.05.), teaching of IL as a curricular course (001<0.005), collaboration between librarians and faculties (0.05=0.05), and integration of IL across the curriculum (0.00<0.05) has a significant influence on the IL programme.

5.3 Conclusions

The conclusions to this study are presented as per the study objectives.

First, it is logical to conclude that learning institutions have IL programme practices in place. These practices include the institutions’ management’s decision to make IL programme mandatory and teaching it as a curricular course. The other practice includes
library orientation, one-on-one education and seminars and presentations. It can also be concluded that the IL programme in learning institution also has several components including goals and objectives, implementation mechanism, administrative support, programme sequencing, collaboration from administrators, pedagogy, adequate staff, outreach activities and an evaluation and assessment framework.

Secondly, the study concludes that the academic libraries at institutions of higher learning provide services that adequately meet the objectives of the IL programme at the institutions. It can be concluded that these institutions follow set criteria including focusing on the needs of the students, the costs and benefits, identify steps and formats of potential sources of information, and very well understands the academic, legal, ethical and social issues surrounding access and use of information by library users, besides making such information more relevant, meaningful and helpful to the information seekers. This shows that the institutions are focused on the needs of their students when selecting the IL programmes.

Thirdly, the study established that some mechanisms for evaluating the IL programme work well and others do not work well at all. Some of those identified to be effective include self-assessment, focus groups, and classroom assessment and student portfolio.

Fourthly, the study also concludes that factors that influence the efficacy of the IL programme in most institutions are basically internal and have everything to do with support from the top institutional administration, teaching IL as a curricular course, collaboration between librarians and faculties, user awareness, and integration of IL across the curriculum.
5.4 Recommendations

The study recommends that to make IL programmes in academic libraries in institutions of higher learning effective, the management should:

i. Make the IL programme mandatory and ensure it is taught as a curricular course.

ii. Diversify the current mechanisms in place to encompass performance appraisal and satisfaction surveys/exit interviews to expand the current methods of evaluation in a bid to promote effective evaluation of the IL programme.

iii. Streamline internal institutional processes that have the potential to influence the efficacy of the IL programme.

5.4.1 Policy Recommendations

The study recommends that the Government should ensure that the existing information literacy policy, standards and guidelines are strengthened to help institutions of higher learning introduce, streamline and entrench information literacy programme as a core curricular course.

5.4.2 Recommendations for Further Research

The researcher suggests that due to the fact that this study was confined to only one institution of higher learning, it may not be representative enough for purposes of generalization and therefore, more of such institutions countrywide should be sampled in order to make it more representative.

The study suggests other areas for further research to include:

a) Impact of University Management Decisions on Institutional Information Literacy Programmes.

b) The role of Librarians in the success of Information Literacy in institutions of higher learning.
c) The Need for Evaluating Information Literacy Programmes in institutions of higher learning.

c) Factors Affecting Efficacy of Information Literacy Programmes in institutions of higher learning.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I – Research Instruments

Introduction Letter

Dear Respondent,

My name is Grace Adhiambo Were, a Master student at Kenyatta University. I am carrying out a research on “Effectiveness of Information Literacy Programmes in Academic Libraries: A Case of Tangaza University College Library, Nairobi, Kenya”. The objectives of the study are: to establish the information literacy practices at Tangaza University College Library (TUCL); to determine whether TUCL is achieving the objectives of its information literacy programmes; to find out the mechanisms in place for evaluating the information literacy programmes at TUCL; and to determine factors influencing efficacy of the information literacy programme at TUCL.

The respondents for this research are 8 members of staff at TUCL, as well as 103 students sampled from the 140 first year undergraduate students from the school of Arts and social Sciences totalling to 111 respondents targeted for interview through questionnaire administration. The questionnaire asks a variety of highly confidential questions touching on the thematic areas of this study and it will take you approximately 15 minutes or less to complete.

Kindly assist to fill in this questionnaire by responding to the questions either by ticking [✓] or giving a brief explanation in the spaces provided. All the information you will provide will be treated with confidentiality.

Yours faithfully,

Grace Adhiambo Were.
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS.

Instructions
The questionnaire is divided into FIVE parts and has two distinct sets of questions. One set consists of questions that have options. Please respond to those by ticking (√) against your choice of response. The other set of questions are structured and seek for your detailed opinion. For such questions, kindly use the space provided to write your response.

| 1. | Gender | 1. Male  
|    |        | 2. Female |
| 2. | Age    | 1. 15 – 20 Years |
|    |        | 2. 21 – 25 Years |
|    |        | 3. 26 – 30 Years |
|    |        | 4. 31 – 35 Years |
|    |        | 5. 36 – 40 Years |
|    |        | 6. Above 40 Years |
| 4. | Year of Study | 1. First  
|    |            | 2. Second  
|    |            | 3. Third  
|    |            | 4. Fourth |

A. Background Information

B. Institutional Information Literacy Practices.

5. Which are some of the activities that underpin your institution’s information literacy practices?

   a) Teaching IL as a Curricular Course □

   b) Library Orientation □

   c) User Education □
d) One on one teaching

e) Seminars presentations on IL

Others, Please

Specify…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………


6. Does your institution’s Information Literacy programme have the following components?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>1. Yes</th>
<th>2. No</th>
<th>3. Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Goals and Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mechanism for implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Support for institutional administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Program sequencing within the Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Collaboration among administrators, program staff and teaching staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Pedagogy i.e. advancement of diverse approaches to teaching and leaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Adequate program staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Structured outreach activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Program assessment/evaluation framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Extent to which the library is achieving the objectives of the information literacy programme.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. The Library defines and articulates the need for information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Library identifies steps and formats of potential sources of information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The Library considers the costs and benefits of acquiring the needed information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The Library evaluates the nature and extent of the information needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The Library selects the most appropriate investigative methods or informational retrieval systems for accessing the needed information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The Library implements variety of effectively-designed information search methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The Library refines the search method if necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The Library extracts, records, evaluates and manages the information and its sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The Library compares new knowledge with prior knowledge to determine the value added, contradictions, or other unique characteristics of the information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The Library understands the academic, legal and ethical, and social issues surrounding access and use of information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Mechanisms for evaluation of the information literacy programme.

17. Which of the following mechanisms are used to evaluate the information literacy programme at your institution? (Tick all that apply)

a) Oral tests

b) Performance appraisals

c) Satisfaction surveys and exit interviews

d) Portfolios of student work (papers and assignments)

e) Classroom assessments

f) Focus groups

g) Self-assessments

h) Case studies

Others, Please specify…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………
Factors that influence efficacy of information literacy programme.

18. In your opinion, which of the listed factors could you say MOSTLY influence efficacy of the information literacy programme at your institution? Tick all that apply.

   a) Support from the top institutional administration 

   b) Teaching IL as a curricular course 

   c) Collaboration between Librarians and teaching faculties in planning and implementing the IL programme 

   d) Integrating /Embedding IL across the curriculum 

Other, please specify………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
Thank You.
A. Institutional Information Literacy Practices:

1. What can you say about the information literacy practices at your institution?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. What are some of the MAJOR components of your institution’s Information Literacy Programme?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
B. Extent to which the Library is achieving the objectives of the Information Literacy Programme:

3. In your opinion, which objectives of your institution’s information literacy programme could you say your library has achieved, and to what extent?

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

C. Mechanisms for evaluation of the Information Literacy Programme.

4. How can you describe the mechanisms that your institution has put in place to evaluate the information literacy programme that you implement here?

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
D. Factors that influence efficacy of Information Literacy Programme.

Thank You.
Appendix II – Work Plan

Drawing from the methodology and work plan for the research, the following schedule of activities will be followed. Specific dates to be arranged consultatively with the supervisor, days may not automatically follow one another and immediately sequence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Research Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Paper Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and report Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Research findings and Binding of Copies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III: Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost (Ksh.)</th>
<th>Total Cost (Ksh.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing and Printing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel and Subsistence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Router</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing and Printing of Questionnaires</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy of Questionnaires</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Production</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>@500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>@350</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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