

Information Literacy Instruction in Four Vietnamese University Libraries

KIM CHI DIEP, kimchi@hawaii.edu
Communication and Information Sciences Program, University of Hawaii

DIANE NAHL, nahl@hawaii.edu
Library and Information Science Program, Department of Information and Computer Sciences
University of Hawaii

ABSTRACT

This case study explored the perceptions of academic stakeholders about the development and delivery of information literacy (IL) programs in four universities, and identified elements necessary to establishing IL credit courses in Vietnamese higher education. The following research questions framed this study: 1) How do library administrators, instruction librarians, and faculty perceive the current implementation of information literacy instruction (ILI) programs for undergraduates studies in universities libraries in Vietnam? 2) What are the challenges to including IL as a credit course in the curriculum as perceived by library administrators, instruction librarians, and faculty? Respondents were purposefully recruited from four universities, including library administrators, instruction librarians, and faculty. Three online surveys distributed through Survey Monkey received 133 responses. Interview and focus group data collection included 23 face-to-face interviews and nine focus groups. Findings showed IL is considered the domain of librarians and has not influenced Vietnamese campus culture. IL activities at four university libraries take the form of lectures, workshops, and basic IL skills modules. Few ILI activities are subject discipline-related. Respondents reported challenges to an ILI credit course revolve around the lasting impact of teacher-centered instruction and rote learning, misperceptions about the effect of IL on student learning outcomes, degree of support of IL by academic stakeholders, degree of faculty-librarian collaboration, and scarcity of resources. Recommendations are given for academic librarians in Vietnam implementing ILI programs and considering developing IL credit courses.

Keywords: Information literacy instruction, Vietnam; Developing countries; Vietnamese higher education; Credit course; Academic libraries, Vietnam; Instruction librarians; Active learning, Vietnamese students; Information competency standards.

INTRODUCTION

Information literacy (IL) competencies are defined as “the ability to locate, evaluate, and use information effectively” (ALA, 1989). IL plays an important role in developing critical thinking and problem solving skills, and improving academic achievement through active learning approaches, information problem solving, and evaluating information. The Association for College and Research Libraries (ACRL) *IL Competency Standards* claims IL is “common to all disciplines” and “forms the basis for lifelong learning” (ACRL, 2000, p.2). IL competency extends learning beyond classroom settings by providing individuals with critical thinking skills they can apply in professional positions where information management is central, i.e., “Information literacy has a truly transformative effect, one that makes possible the acquisition of other skills necessary for 21st century life.” (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2007).

However, studies point out that students lack information-seeking skills and are unprepared for lifelong learning (Nahl & Harada, 1996; Rockman, 2004). The Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2007) identified a gap between what young people learn and what schools need to teach to prepare students for class assignments as well as careers in a global economy. Therefore, to prepare students for information demands inherent in personal, academic, and career life, they must acquire the ability to access information efficiently and effectively, evaluate information critically and competently, and use information accurately and creatively to make good decisions. One of the challenges facing libraries is teaching skills that help students keep current with developments in advanced technologies and exponential information growth throughout their lifetime. This may be more critical in emerging economies.

In Vietnam the 1986 *Doi Moi* policy, the reform and renovation period in the economy, established radical changes in socio-economic development, including education (Nguyen, 2006). The Ministry of Education and Training (MoET) has required universities in Vietnam to modernize management, teaching, and learning methods (Nguyen, 2006). The implementation

of a credit system (2006-2020) has been a major step in the instruction reform movement. One of the conditions for a successful credit system is transitioning from lecture and memorization approaches to active learning approaches (Dang, 2006; Lam, 2006). However, in Vietnamese higher education, pedagogy has relied on rote memorization and objective testing rather than problem solving and critical thinking (Kelly, 2000). The shift to a credit system requires critical changes in the curriculum and in teacher roles (Zjhra, 2008).

Research and professional practice show that IL plays a crucial role in improving student achievement, and therefore it is necessary to teach IL in all disciplines (Hollister, 2010; Rockman, 2004). However, recent studies show that little attention has been given to IL and to IL pedagogy for library science students in Southeast Asian countries in general (UNESCO, 2006), and particularly in Vietnam due to lack of leadership to promote IL competency for students (Nguyen, 2008; Pham, 2008). According to the report of a survey of school administrators, teachers, and librarians at a regional workshop, IL was included in extra-curricular activities taught as library orientation sessions; none of the participants reported their institutions had a written IL policy statement; and only one country reported IL was included in assessment (UNESCO, 2006). In Vietnam, teaching IL has not been integrated into university curricula. Pham (2008) emailed a survey to librarians and lecturers in seven educational institutions in Vietnam, and identified some major challenges to delivering IL to student populations, including poor quality IL curriculum, outdated library and information science curriculum, and predominantly passive teaching and learning styles. In addition, administrative support for IL initiatives has been limited, collaboration is uncommon, and librarians lack expertise (Pham, 2008). As yet there have been no empirical studies on IL and student achievement, nor any on the perceptions of various stakeholders about IL programs in the region. Studies of ILI in Vietnam libraries are needed to obtain feedback from stakeholders including library administrators, librarians, and faculty who could play a useful role in the design, adoption, and implementation of ILI.

STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS OF ILI

Objectives

The objectives of this study were twofold. First, it was necessary to obtain the views of Vietnamese library administrators, instruction librarians, and faculty about existing ILI programs. Second, it was important to identify challenges to including IL as a credit course in order to develop useful recommendations.

Research Questions

The following research questions framed this study (Diep, 2011, p. 7):

- How do library administrators, instruction librarians, and faculty perceive the current implementation of information literacy instruction (ILI) programs for undergraduate studies in university libraries in Vietnam?
- What are the challenges to including information literacy (IL) as a credit course as perceived by library administrators, instruction librarians, and faculty?

Method

Four purposefully selected Vietnam university libraries participated in this multiple case study, identified as Learning Resource Center A (LRC A), LRC B, LRC C, and LRC D. Funded by the U.S. non-government organization Atlantic Philanthropies, the LRC projects began in 2000 involving the design, construction, and development of large-scale library facilities in four universities to upgrade information technology infrastructure, enhanced teaching and learning facilities, and online information (Robinson & Huynh, 2006).

Respondents were purposefully recruited from the four universities, including library administrators, instruction librarians, and faculty. Survey instruments were distributed through Survey Monkey with 133 surveys returned, including eight administrators, 40 librarians, and 85 faculty members. Qualitative data were obtained via 23 face-to-face interviews and nine focus

groups. Respondents in the qualitative part consisted of six library administrators, 39 instruction librarians, and 12 faculty members. All of the respondents in the interviews and focus groups also participated in the survey.

Using SPSS software, survey data were coded and analyzed for response frequency. NVivo software (Bazeley, 2009; Lewins & Silver, 2007) was employed for qualitative analysis. All focus group and interview documents were transcribed anonymously into Vietnamese to avoid data loss and ensure the privacy and confidentiality of respondents. Themes for tree nodes (Bazeley, 2009) were created based on constructs from the research questions, the literature review, and the pilot study (Diep, 2011, p. 110). Strategies were used to test the trustworthiness of the researcher's interpretations of findings, including triangulation (Creswell, 2008; Maxwell, 2005), content validity test, and back-translation (Brislin, 1976).

FINDINGS: ILI PROGRAMS IN VIETNAM

The results are presented under broad themes of ILI development and delivery in four libraries including acknowledging IL standards, recognizing the value of IL, teaching content and activities, modes of instruction, assessment, and ILI promotion activities.

Use of IL Standards

While approximately 42% of respondents stated their LRC used the ACRL standards in ILI, qualitative findings revealed that no published IL standards had been applied. One library administrator reported:

The program has not been designed based on a set of IL standards.

Nearly 31% reported they were aware of but had never applied IL standards in ILI, while 12.5% were not aware of published standards. Instruction librarians across four libraries expressed this view:

We did not have a chance to learn about IL standards.

One library administrator concluded that exploring and applying the IL standards in ILI remained a critical issue for the future:

Key instruction librarians are expected to spend time studying more about an appropriate IL standard and how to apply it to our own context.

None of the interviewees mentioned how they would apply IL competency standards in assessing student learning outcomes (SLOs).

Valuing Information Literacy

Campus leadership has not recognized "Information literacy is a learning issue not a library issue and that classroom faculty must be responsible for students acquiring information literacy abilities" (Rockman, 2004, p. xii). Among the four universities IL did not appear in any campus planning documents. Nearly 95% of librarians and library administrators reported that IL was not part of university strategic planning, nor was it a library mandate. While 53% reported their library had a clear definition of IL, only 12.5% said IL was included as an SLO in accreditation standards. However, during interviews the library administrators disagreed that IL was required by accreditation organizations. Four library administrators expressed a similar view:

Vietnamese universities have begun to focus on applying accreditation standards to ensure education quality. Accreditation bodies have not recognized the value of IL to SLOs. IL has not been included in any accreditation documents.

Results also showed that campus leadership, faculty, and students were not aware of the value of IL and its importance in academic achievement. More than half of the interviewees (30 respondents) reported similarly during the interview and focus group discussions:

They [campus leadership] haven't been aware of the importance of the IL program and haven't highly valued it.

Students attending the IL sessions are not very high [...] since they are not aware of how important IL skills are to their study.

One library administrator stressed the importance of having the top management level require IL as an SLO in accreditation standards:

Only if there were a mechanism from the ministerial accreditation bodies that required IL as an SLO in the university mission statement would campus leadership, faculty, and students change their attitudes towards ILI.

In sum, ILI has not been influential. Campus leadership, faculty, and students have not recognized the benefits of adopting IL and assessing it in SLOs.

ILI Development, Delivery and Instructional Content

The four IL programs shared similar characteristics, i.e., focussing on library orientation and bibliographic instruction. The libraries also delivered a series of IL advanced teaching modules that reached a small proportion of students.

The IL program coordinators and core librarians designed and developed the LRC IL programs. IL activities were considered solely a library responsibility. Nearly 98% of librarians reported focusing on teaching how to use library services and the OPAC. Teaching Internet searching was the second highest priority (92.5%). Less than half (42.5%) taught students how to use information legally. Only 15% reported teaching how to design and structure a research paper, and only 12.5% included developing a research topic. Nearly 88% mainly lecture, while 72.5% reported using group work during IL sessions. Librarians described the current state of the IL program in their library:

The library orientation sessions are obligatory to first year students. These sessions cover a brief introduction about the LRC, its function, regulation and policy.

Other contents include the introduction of resources and services offered, how to perform searches on Online Public Access Catalog.

In addition to library orientation sessions, each library designed and delivered advanced IL sessions. One IL coordinator explained:

We also offer an advanced ILI program including three modules taught in three 50-minute periods offered on-demand basis. We examine the curriculum and course syllabi to design sessions relevant to the students' needs.

LRC B was collaborating with the English department to teach IL as a portion in a first-year core course. The head of the English department emphasized its usefulness to student learning:

We collaborated with the LRC since we saw how these information skills help our students in their learning.

Librarians at LRC C collaborated with those at a branch library to provide training workshops to faculty and students on the use of specialized databases.

One significant activity is cooperating with the Medicine Library in database training workshops for faculty and students of the School of Medicine.

However, librarians across the four libraries expressed concerns:

I find the basic IL sessions somewhat unsatisfactory because students show no interest. They attend since the class is compulsory, not because they like it or care about it.

We haven't offered IL classes tailored to students' majors.

Course-integrated IL exists in some universities in several disciplines, but is not common practice.

Perceptions of Student Information Literacy Competency

Faculty and librarians strongly agreed students are not equipped with sufficient information problem solving skills to succeed in academia. Meanwhile, neither was aware of each other's work concerning information competence and student learning. Respondents used a 5-point Likert scale to rate perceptions of student IL skills. Approximately 80% of librarians and 68.2% of faculty agreed or strongly agreed students were comfortable using IT for information gathering. Nearly 89% of faculty believed that students consulted with instructors about their information needs, while 55% of librarians were unsure. These findings show that teaching and learning were recognized as a faculty responsibility. About half of librarians and faculty (55% and 52%) believed students know how to evaluate the quality of information in licensed databases. Teaching source quality evaluation is an advanced part of IL programs available to few students.

When asked whether students knew how to cite resources, 35% of librarians strongly agreed and agreed, 42% were not sure, and 22.5% disagreed. Faculty were also divided on the question, 47.1% reported students knew how to cite resources while 44.7% did not believe students possessed this skill. Regarding copyright, 37.5% of librarians said students were aware of copyright when using information resources, whereas 24.7% of faculty agreed that students understood it, 54% disagreed or strongly disagreed, showing student integrity is a concern for faculty and librarians. Teaching learners how to use information ethically and legally has not been a key issue in the IL programs in the four LRCs.

Although there has been movement towards active learning, the dominant lecture-textbook approach does not require students to use outside materials in assignments. The findings showed that although students were provided with introductory instruction in basic information resource use, those skills did not transfer to assignments. Students are not taught how to or required to do research in secondary school, although students need IL skills early and throughout their academic lives to ensure academic success.

Assessing Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment is conducted to discover what learners know and can perform, to evaluate the effectiveness of ILI, to improve teaching and learning, and to gain support of stakeholders (Grassian & Kaplowitz, 2009). However, as Warner (2003, p.169) notes, libraries "assess student attitude rather than student learning". Data in the current study show that instruction librarians made casual and subjective assumptions about student performance. Surveys conducted after each IL session did not include the assessment of student learning. Predominantly informal assessment techniques were used in a classroom setting, e.g., 74% of librarians utilized observing in-class exercises, hands-on practice, and requesting verbal student feedback to evaluate performance. Librarians across the four libraries reported:

We observe students' performance. After each session, we ask them whether they need further clarification.

At the end of the class we require students to do some hands-on exercises to see if they can understand and apply what we teach. That is the extent we can reach.

The majority of librarians across the libraries agreed that they had not been able to measure the effectiveness of ILI on SLOs due to the lack of formal assessment.

We can only measure the students' immediate learning outcomes after each module. But we have not measured how IL skills influence their learning outcomes in the long term.

Informal evaluation is not equivalent to measuring of SLO's whether at the module level or the discipline level. Instruction librarians expressed a desire to develop a mechanism of assessment to improve teaching and learning, and to gain support for ILI.

Marketing Information Literacy Activities

Since it is crucial for the success of any IL program Grassian and Kaplowitz (2009) argue that librarians should be leaders in promoting IL activities. The best approach would be wasted effort if learners and faculty are unaware of benefits (Grassian & Kaplowitz, 2005). In general, the LRCs used few promotional and marketing strategies to ensure that learners and faculty were aware of ILI, and have not focused on developing and implementing long-term marketing plans to promote IL instructional products and services.

In summary, ILI is recognized as a major responsibility of the library, and librarians have developed and delivered ILI in limited formats. Two LRCs developed IL modules teaching basic to advanced level IL skills. Some librarians reached out to the academic community by offering hands-on database training workshops to faculty and students. However, ILI programs need further development since IL activities mainly take the form of lectures, workshops, and modules on basic IL skills attended at the discretion of students. Few ILI activities are subject discipline-related and target information needs. The libraries have not used published professional IL standards to design IL instruction or measure SLOs. ILI has not had an impact on campus culture. Few librarians have worked with faculty to help students improve performance in particular courses. Due to the lack of formal assessment of IL mastery, libraries cannot demonstrate the value of IL skills in student learning.

DEVELOPING AN INFORMATION LITERACY CREDIT COURSE

Hollister (2010, p. vii) claims “the credit-bearing information literacy course is an increasingly useful, effective and even popular vehicle for integrating libraries into college and university curricula, and for advancing the cause of IL across campus”. In this study, recognizing the drawbacks in the IL programs and the strong need for IL mastery, 67% of library administrators and librarians, and 46% of faculty support a mandatory IL course, whereas 35% of library administrators and librarians and 40% of faculty want an elective course. However, the higher response rate for a mandatory IL course among administrators and librarians (67%) was not supported in interviews and focus groups. Instead, they proposed an elective IL course. Library administrators appeared to understand university culture and were aware of obstacles to proposing required courses, and believed an elective course to be more feasible:

It may be realistic if IL is integrated into the curriculum as an elective course. Education reform is related to reforming services in libraries, more precisely, instructional paradigms in librarianship. However, if this process is not guided from the top-down, it would be hard to succeed. We can implement an institution-wide IL program for students only when the MOET includes it in its criteria and policy.

Library administrators and librarians strongly desire to have a formal voice in the teaching and learning community. They were aware that once IL is a mandatory course, academic constituencies could come to recognize its importance in student learning.

Administrators, librarians, and faculty were presented with a list of nine factors that represent challenges to establishing an IL credit course. Table 1 summarizes responses by library administrators and instruction librarians (N=48), and faculty (N=85).

Table 1: Challenging Factors by Stakeholder Group

Challenging factors	Great challenge		Challenge		Moderate challenge		Light challenge		No challenge	
	Librarian	Faculty	Librarian	Faculty	Librarian	Faculty	Librarian	Faculty	Librarian	Faculty
Support	72.9	38.8	18.7	47.1	4.2	9.4	4.2	2.4	0.0	2.4
Understanding IL value	62.5	40.0	22.9	52.9	8.4	3.5	4.2	3.5	0.0	0.0
Collaboration	41.7	25.9	39.6	63.5	4.2	4.7	10.4	4.7	2.1	1.2
Expertise in librarianship	39.5	25.9	39.5	44.7	0.0	17.6	16.7	11.8	6.3	0.0
Subject knowledge	37.5	20.0	37.5	55.3	4.2	11.8	16.7	9.4	2.1	3.5
Curriculum overload issue	33.3	28.2	37.5	52.9	12.5	3.5	12.5	15.3	4.2	0.0
Expertise in pedagogy	16.7	18.8	54.2	48.2	0.0	20.0	22.9	11.8	4.2	1.2
Budget	18.7	47.1	47.9	41.2	10.4	8.2	18.7	3.5	4.2	0.0
Priority of other courses	12.5	12.9	39.6	27.1	14.6	18.8	16.7	34.1	16.7	7.1

Through qualitative data analysis, the following themes emerged relating to challenging factors: 1) influence of the credit system and teacher-centered approach, 2) challenges inherent in perceptions, 3) lack of collaboration, 4) insufficient support, 5) lack of resources, and 6) limited subject knowledge of librarians. Complementary data from surveys, interviews and focus groups illustrated challenging factors that surround proposing a mandatory IL course.

Influence of the Credit System and Teacher-Centered Approach

The teacher-centered paradigm has long been the primary approach in Vietnam (Dang, 2006), where students use only textbooks and lecture notes, and may find using libraries for independent research odd (Grassian & Kaplovitz, 2009). Dang (2006) reports teaching and learning methods and student learning assessment have not changed. In this study library administrators and librarians concluded passive teaching and learning approaches are obstacles to valuing ILI. More specifically, students learn largely through what is provided in class, do not conduct independent study, and since faculty do not require students to conduct research, students have few information needs. An IL initiative is not likely to be accepted by the

academic community without a shift to resource-based and inquiry-based teaching and active learning.

It is noteworthy that overloading the curriculum was a concern for faculty. While librarians ranked curriculum overload as the seventh most challenging factor, faculty ranked it fifth (81.1%, Table 1). According to MoET policy, universities must reduce the number of credits from 210 to 120 to increase the newly established time allotted for student self-directed learning. As a result, integrating a new mandatory course could be problematic for faculty, as several interviewees explained:

That universities cut down the number of credits per course affects faculty's benefits since they are assigned to teach fixed hours per semester based on their faculty status to get a standard payment. They only get extra payment if they teach extra hours. The addition of a course would be very challenging.

Thus in the new credit system faculty time and compensation are at stake and those are major concerns.

Challenges Inherent in Perceptions

Curzon (2004) states faculty do not think IL requires much attention. As shown in Table 1, communicating the value of IL for academic achievement was ranked by librarians the second most challenging factor (85.4%), and for faculty, understanding IL's value was the most significant challenge (92.4%). For the most part, faculty and university and department administration do not recognize the importance of ILI in student learning, for example:

Faculty have not understood our roles in equipping students with IL skills. They have not been aware of its importance to student performance.

One library administrator stressed misperceptions of the value of IL could be changed only by a mandatory course:

If IL became a mandate course in the curriculum, I think the view of faculty about ILI would be different. If students learn IL skills and use them efficiently, faculty might recognize the value of this course.

Interviewees also addressed the need to communicate the value of ILI to students. One educator emphasized to students that course and assignment requirements were important by encouraging students to spend time learning and expanding information needs beyond course texts.

The academic requirements should entail enough instruction. When giving assignments to students, I show them how to approach useful info sources.

One library administrator reported that campus leadership underestimates the value of IL due to lack of awareness:

The university leadership has not had a clear understanding about our ILI program and that's a big problem when we propose it as a course.

The findings showed misperceptions persist about the critical role of ILI in helping students to become effective learners. Although administrators and librarians were aware of a widespread lack of knowledge of ILI, no action has been taken to improve communication. No meetings on campus have been set up to discuss ILI and related issues, nor have concrete strategies been implemented to create awareness about the need for student mastery of IL competency.

Lack of collaboration

The lack of understanding about ILI was related to other problems, such as minimal collaboration between faculty and librarians in promoting IL initiatives. Findings from the qualitative data show that collaboration where librarians fostered activities with faculty based on personal contact and communication was minimal. In fact, faculty and librarian partnerships were mostly one-sided, where librarians proposed and initiated cooperation for introducing IL activities to students. The survey data supported qualitative findings with 89.4% of faculty and 81.3% of librarians (Table 1) ranking lack of collaboration between faculty and librarians as a great challenge or challenge. Grassian and Kaplowitz (2005, p.89) reveal it takes "time and patience to develop a mutually beneficial relationship that can lead to successful collaboration

for information literacy instruction.” Across four libraries, building this kind of relationship had just begun and no major steps had been taken to enhance communication.

While libraries bear responsibility for providing ILI, librarians need to form partnerships with faculty and administrators since these partnerships are crucial for ILI success (Grassian & Kaplowitz, 2009). According to Grassian and Kaplowitz (2009), the success of an IL program largely depends on finding appropriate partners on campus and promoting the value of IL programs. Librarians expressed the need for such partnerships:

When the ILI is recognized as a mandate course, faculty-librarian collaboration is strongly required to build a solid ILI program.

Montiel-Overall (2005) emphasizes the value of faculty-librarian collaboration in advancing IL on campus. However, it is difficult to find faculty to collaborate with librarians in integrating IL into the curriculum. According to Hardesty (1995), librarians have had challenges working with discipline faculty to establish IL programs. Faculty appreciate support from librarians, but there may not be widespread acceptance of a librarian's role in curriculum planning and course-integrated instruction (Winner, 1998). Hardesty (1995) suggests librarians keep trying to develop and nourish faculty-librarian relationships through informal one-on-one contact. The findings of this study also support those of previous studies. For example, librarians across the LRCs reported that personal relationship played an important role in building a successful partnership. Others were aware that reaching out to faculty to involve them in ILI efforts was a wise idea. They shared similar views as follows: “We should actively approach faculty who don't know much about the ILI program.” One IL program coordinator commented in order to be a successful partner in reforming curricula to incorporate IL, it is necessary to have an understanding of other constituencies on campus:

We have to set up relationships with academic groups by getting to know who the key persons are because they help us convince faculty and leadership.

A librarian recognized that building up this partnership brings mutual benefits.

Faculty master knowledge in specialized disciplines, and information resources useful for students; however, they are not knowledgeable about ILI. Faculty-librarian collaboration for implementing a successful ILI program is needed.

The view that teaching, research and curriculum are solely faculty responsibilities (Rockman, 2004) is gradually changing, however, librarians need to play active roles in building and nourishing partnerships and collaborative efforts.

Insufficient Support and Lack of Resources

Librarians expressed concerns about gaining support from campus constituencies to create an IL credit course. Without consensus and support of constituencies the effort of librarians would be futile. Library administrators and librarians ranked university support as the most challenging factor with 91.6% reporting it as a great challenge or a challenge, and 85.9% for faculty. Libraries in Vietnam rely heavily on upper administration. If libraries do not obtain support for finances, resources, and personnel, they cannot implement enhanced IL activities.

While librarians reported they attempted to gain support through personal relationships with faculty, library administrators considered support from department leaders more critical. One library administrator explained:

Leaders at the departmental level are the primary group that needs convincing most, because they are responsible for curriculum development at departments.

Since the university leadership has not recognized the value of IL programs, it is necessary to convince them to gain support and approval to develop an IL credit course. One Information Services department head explained:

The obstacle is from the campus leaders who haven't given enough support to ILI. It would be harder to ask for its inclusion into the curriculum.

Gaining support from key players for promoting IL courses across the campus was a critical issue for respondents. This requires a shift in perception for university administrators, as well as faculty and students.

Lack of resources included challenges inherent to staffing, financial resources, and information resources for implementing ILI programs. Respondents worried about a budget shortage due to adding services, extending hours, and enhancing instructional methods and materials:

Librarians in Vietnam are not granted faculty status. Those carrying out full responsibilities of a library position must get approval to teach classes outside the library. Compensation for added instructional load is higher. There are financial issues relating to faculty's benefits. If instructional load assignments exceed the accepted responsibilities, a mechanism for additional compensation is required.

Besides the challenges relating to staffing and finance, respondents viewed the imbalance in available information resources as a difficult issue. King and Newmann (2000) found one factor that makes school effective is the extent to which schools use technical resources as tools for learning including materials, equipment, space, time, and access to new ideas. In this study, the poor quality of electronic information resources in Vietnamese, and the scarcity of information resources in English were considered serious obstacles adversely affecting the delivery of IL.

Limited subject knowledge of instruction librarians

Librarians considered limited knowledge in librarianship (79%) and disciplinary subject knowledge (75%) obstacles to ILI program development. Approximately 75% of faculty considered librarians' lack of expertise in a subject discipline a critical issue. Because a majority of librarians in Vietnam do not have a subject graduate degree, faculty consider them support staff rather than partners in teaching and curriculum development. Findings from qualitative data showed few faculty members realized librarians could help with information searching and improving student IL skills. That explained why librarians considered librarianship and subject knowledge two separate factors impeding the integration of IL into the curriculum.

CONCLUSION

This study contributes to the body of literature on IL and ILI in developing countries by providing an overarching view of stakeholder perceptions concerning university ILI programs in Vietnam. Potential challenges to an IL credit course are thought to derive from the influence of the credit system, teacher-centered approach to learning, misperceptions of stakeholders about the value of IL for academic achievement, degree of support from academic groups, degree of faculty-librarian collaboration, scarcity of resources, and librarians' subject-discipline knowledge.

Although these concerns are not resolved, library administrators and librarians were interested in finding ways to improve ILI, and were willing to propose an IL credit course. Some challenging factors could be considered internal such as perceptions, collaboration, support, and resources. Librarians and other constituencies could examine these factors and use the information to improve in the future. Some impeding factors are external, involving many on and off campus stakeholders, including transforming teaching and learning styles and the credit system. Change cannot be effected through the sole effort of librarians and much work needs to be undertaken to integrate IL into academic programs. The analysis of the critical challenges identified by respondents points the way for library administrators and librarians to propose appropriate local solutions.

The following recommendations derived from data will be useful to librarians implementing ILI programs and developing IL credit courses.

- Academic libraries must take the lead in initiating change. Library administrators and librarians need to propose and advance IL initiatives.
- Planning and designing an institution-wide ILI program is crucial for academic libraries in Vietnam. The best approach is to promote IL as an elective course in the short term and as a mandatory course in the long term.
- It is crucial to raise the awareness of academic groups on campus about the impact of ILI on student achievement through formal assessment of SLOs, and to improve faculty attitudes toward ILI.
- Success requires cultivating partnerships with academic groups and involving all constituencies during planning and implementation of IL programs.
- Librarians must be encouraged to obtain subject Master's and Master of Library and Information Science (MLIS) degrees to remain current and communicate effectively with faculty.

These recommendations are derived from a framework of best practices for ILI programs developed in research for this study (Diep, 2011, p. 336).

REFERENCES

- American Library Association (ALA). (1989). *Presidential committee on information literacy: Final report*. Chicago: American Library Association. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/whitepapers/presidential.cfm>
- Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). (2000). *Information literacy competency standards for higher education*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency.cfm>
- Bazeley, P. (2009). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo*. Los Angeles, California: Sage.
- Brislin, R. W. (1976). *Translation: Applications and research*. New York, NY: Gardner Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Curzon, S. C. (2004). Developing faculty-librarian partnerships in information literacy. In I. F. Rockman (Ed.), *Integrating information literacy into the higher education curriculum: Practical models for transformation* (pp. 29-46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dang, X. H. (2006). Đào tạo theo hệ thống tín chỉ ở Việt Nam: Đặc điểm và điều kiện triển khai [The credit-based system in Vietnam: Characteristics and implementation]. *Khoa học Giáo dục*, 13(10), 36-37.
- Diep, K. C. (2011). *A conceptual framework for best practices in information literacy instruction based on stakeholders' perceptions: A case study of four Vietnamese academic libraries* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Hawaii, U.S.
- Grassian, E. S., & Kaplowitz, J. R. (2005). *Learning to lead and manage information literacy instruction*. New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers.
- Grassian, E. S., & Kaplowitz, J. R. (2009). *Information literacy instruction: Theory and practice*. New York: Neal-Schuman.
- Hardesty, L. (1995). Faculty culture and bibliographic instruction: An exploratory analysis. *Library Trends*, 44(2), 339-367.
- Hollister, C. V. (2010). *Best practices for credit-bearing information literacy courses*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.
- Kelly, K. (2000). The higher education system in Vietnam. *World Education News and Reviews*, 13(3).
- King, M. B., & Newmann, F. M. (January 01, 2000). Will teacher learning advance school goals? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81, 576-580.
- Lam, Q. T. (2006). Về việc áp dụng học chế tín chỉ trên thế giới và ở Việt Nam [The implementation of the credit system in the world and in Vietnam]. Retrieved from <http://news.vnu.edu.vn/ttsk/Vietnamese/>
- Lewins, A., & Silver, C. (2007). *Using software in qualitative research: A step-by-step guide*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Montiel-Overall, P. (2005). *Toward a theory of collaboration for teachers and librarians*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume8205/theory.cfm>
- Nahl, D., & Harada, V. H. (1996). Composing Boolean search statements: Self-confidence, concept analysis, search logic, and errors. *School Library Media Quarterly*, 24(4), 199-207.
- Nguyen, L. (2006). *Vietnam's education in the transitional period*. Paper presented at the 28th Human Resources Development, Working Group Meeting in Ho Chi Minh City, May 2006.
- Nguyen, H. S. (2008). *A contextual model for planning continuing education programmes for university library practitioners in Vietnam*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wellington, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10063/821/thesis.pdf?sequence=3>.

- Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2007). *Framework for 21st century learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.p21.org/index.php>
- Pham, X. H. (2008). Challenges facing the implementation of information literacy programs in Vietnamese universities. In IFLA/ALP Indonesian Workshop on Information Literacy (WIL), 07 – 11 July, 2008, Bogor, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Robinson, M., & Huynh, D. C. (2006). *Multi-functional library design and sustainability: Designing multi-functional learning resource centres in Vietnam*. Paper presented at the World Library and Information Congress 2006: 72nd IFLA General Conference and Council.
- Rockman, I. F. (2004). *Integrating information literacy into the higher education curriculum: Practical models for transformation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- UNESCO. (2006). *Development of information literacy through school libraries in South-East Asian countries (IFAP Project 461RAS5027)*: UNESCO Bangkok. Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/>
- Warner, D. A. (2003). Programmatic assessment: Turning process into practice by teaching for learning. *Journal of the Academic Librarianship*, (29)3, 169-176.
- Winner, M. C. (1998). Librarians as partners in the classroom: An increasing imperative. *RSR: Reference Services Review*, 26(1), 25-30.
- Zjhra, M. L. (2008). A shift to a credit-based system: Necessary changes in curriculum and the role of teachers. *Vietnam Educational Review*, 11.