Instruction design collaborations with government information specialists

Opening the conversation

Judith A. Downie

California State University San Marcos, San Marcos, California, USA

Abstract

Purpose - The purpose of this paper is to foster discussion of the role of government information librarians in the design and implementation of information literacy instruction. Increased accessibility to government information through the internet is bringing all librarians into increased contact with government information, thereby becoming *ad hoc* documents librarians. Through collaboration with experts in government information, shared knowledge results in opportunities for richer and more comprehensive information literacy instruction.

Design/methodology/approach - This review examines evidence of commonality and collaboration between librarians through content analysis of both general and specialized library publications. Findings - Collaboration is a common practice in library instruction to share workload and expertise, yet most literature on this practice focuses on librarian-faculty collaborative efforts. Limited evidence exists for collaboration between librarians and a severely limited body of literature exists when examining instructional design collaboration to include government information in information literacy instruction.

Practical implications - Collaborative instruction proactively addresses resolving perceived barriers and expands instruction resource repertoires and shares workloads.

Originality/value - Examination of the collaborative process between librarians is infrequent. This adds to the body of literature and increases awareness of additional resources in the provision of information literacy instruction.

Keywords Government, Information literacy, Instructions, Librarians, Academic staff, Competences

Paper type General review

Introduction

For many years, librarians have provided instruction in a variety of partnerships in order to improve student research skills and library usage. Donham and Green (2004, p. 314) have described these instructional partnerships as collaboration with "mutual goals, mutual respect, advance planning, and substantive contributions by both parties for designing instructional goals and activities". Evidence for collaboration as a means to expand and improve library resource instruction by development into information literacy instruction is well-documented in the library literature, but the discussion has emphasized faculty-librarian partnerships. The scarcity of literature on collaboration between librarians demonstrates a lack of discussion addressing the rationale and roles of librarians collaborating with other librarian in instructional partnership. What evidence that exists I found through content analysis of the literature for authorship, publication venue, and audience, rather than formal analysis.

Information literacy instruction as exemplified by the *Information Literacy*

Competency Standards for Higher Education (Standards) assumes collaboration between the faculty, librarian and student participants in order to be effective. Yet the literature has emphasized course design with faculty partners, both as means to create assignment-relevant instruction and provide the librarian with a collaborative and participatory role in discipline-specific instruction. The limited articles and monographs that provide examples of librarian-librarian collaboration focus on a limited number of disciplines and programs such as English, General Education/First Year, and Business but other disciplines also serve as arenas for collaboration.

Government information is one area that touches all disciplines, yet has been little discussed in the literatures of information literacy theory or practice. Such omission can be due to the common difficulties in library resource instruction including: constraints on the time allowed for instruction, lack of familiarity with a particular type of resource, classroom faculty expectations, or the time needed to address the complexity of varied formats. The material found within the scope of "government information" is wide-ranging in that it includes text and data generated by entities such as national and state governments and legislative bodies as well as non-governmental agencies. Information produced for both operational and informational purpose has influence on every discipline taught in academic environments to some degree as well as importance in its role of contributing to an educated citizenry. Librarians who serve as government information specialists are concerned with collaboration and information literacy as much as their colleagues as they see a useful role for government information in information literacy instruction. This concern has been addressed primarily in the government specialist literature, creating a closed conversation of government specialists "talking amongst themselves". There are benefits in outreach to, and collaboration with, generalist librarians to design their instruction to incorporate government information. The benefits include providing students with the tools to fully understand and locate information and coaching librarians to naturally utilize the increasing amounts of accessible government information.

Purpose

Librarians in any professional specialization collaborate formally through conferences, workshops, and publications, and informally by sharing practices via the internet, hall talk, and an increasing range of electronic communication media. The academic instruction librarian has additional collaboration opportunities through programmatic, discipline, or institutional environments due to the provision of library resource instruction in conjunction with discipline or program-based teaching. Instruction in disciplines or programs naturally drives librarians' attentions to collaboration outside the library science arena, to working with classroom faculty to ensure the maximum instructional impact for the investment of time and effort.

An essential component of instruction preparation is to review literature or discuss with colleagues ideas for additional successful teaching strategies, lesson plans, active learning techniques, or resources. When performing this research, the inclination is to converse with colleagues working within the same discipline as the discussants use the same language and will be familiar with the same tools. This inclination leads the librarian to professional literature that is known to be most appropriate to the discipline

or addresses library resource instruction in general. While efficient in limiting the amount of material to locate and consume, this limits the exposure to different ideas and new techniques or resources that may exist or be developing in other areas.

The literature on instructional collaboration is primarily found in generalist library publications, but if the librarian preparing for instruction examines only that body of work, s/he misses a valuable collection of resources, including those who are willing to collaborate, in the area of government information. Government information specialists rarely publish in the generalist literature, which is an example of specialists conversing amongst themselves. This article examines existing collaborative practice in instructional design and implementation in order to encourage non-government information specialists to expand their instructional repertoire to include government information. The wealth of information and tools made available by government agencies are becoming increasingly available through the internet and can seem overwhelming to the researcher who is not a frequent user. This article seeks to open conversation between the generalist, subject, and government information specialist to enrich instruction, expand resource use and alert those less familiar with government information sources to the increasing availability of government-produced information on the internet.

Methodology

The literature review search focused on materials addressing academic-level information literacy instruction with a collaborative component as found in the library science literature. Library literature was chosen as the source material as the author felt discipline-specific publications such as found in *MLA* or *CINHAL* would be focused on librarian-faculty collaborations in discipline-specific applications if librarians were mentioned at all. Further argument for reviewing only library literature is supported by Still's (1998, p. 226) content analysis of discipline-specific journals in ERIC that revealed less than one-half of 1 percent of the articles mention libraries in any context and resulting in few instances of librarians being included in instructional practice.

The EBSCOhost® version of *Library Literature & Information Science (LL&IS)* was chosen as the primary source for evidence of collaborative information literacy instruction in the academic environment. Selection of this resource as a starting point is due to its broad range of general and specialist titles in the field of library science. This resource does have the common limitation inherent in all indexing/abstracting collections that results rely on a limited amount of terms found in the fields available as opposed to searching full text. Abstracts are not included in *LL&IS* for older items and began appearing with regularity in the mid 1990s. The lack of material published prior to 1980 in *LL&IS* is acceptable for this literature review as the focus is on information literacy instruction, a relatively recent refinement of 'bibliographic instruction' and only widely adopted into use with the publication of the *Standards* in early 2000. Selected earlier publications were analyzed for views of instruction and collaboration to provide a foundation for the collaborative environment.

The scope of a search in any index/abstract collection is limited by the fact that the information is not contained in a full text database, reducing the amount of matchable text to that found in the citation and descriptor fields. A positive aspect of limited text searching is that the most important terminology is expected in the citation and abstract, ensuring higher relevancy ratios in comparison to a full-text search. The author hypothesized a search of a full-text database would be likely to return a greater number of results since there would be an increase in search term matches, but not

necessarily improve relevancy as in the case of "collaboration" which can be used in many aspects besides instruction. To determine the validity of this, searches were conducted in *LL&IS* and Elsevier's *Science Direct* database. *Science Direct* covers a shorter publication period (1994-2005) and fewer library science titles (24 journals and two monograph series) than *LL&IS* (1980-2006 and 390 journal titles, plus assorted monographs[!], but provides full text searching of entries. Results from sample searches run in each source found that even though *Science Direct* had a narrower date range with fewer journal titles than *LL&IS*, the search in *Science Direct's* Social Sciences collection (full text) returned 172 results, while the same search in *LL&IS* (all text) returned 44 results. The results were examined for relevancy to find that *LL&IS* was 61.3 percent relevant, where *Science Direct* was 31.9 percent relevant. Results that were not relevant in *Science Direct* tended to be more general use of the term "collaboration" or bibliographies, while non-relevant results in *LL&IS* focused on non-academic collaborative environments. There was minimal overlap in titles and results unique to the search set in *Science Direct* database were incorporated into the content analysis.

Although there are a number of large, well-established regional library association publications indexed in *LL&IS*, there are a number of smaller publications generated by library associations and organizations concerned with instruction and information literacy that are not included in these databases, such as *Library Instruction Roundtable News*. No attempt was made to review these publications as many offer anecdotal literature directed to very specialized audiences. After duplicates were discarded, the results were further narrowed to institutions and programs in the United States as the bulk of government information is produced by United States (federal) agencies.

Several search strategies were structured using combinations of the following terms:

- Information liter* (to capture literacy and literate).
- Information comptenc* (to retrieve competency and competencies).
- Collaborat* (to retrieve collaboration and collaborate) OR cooperat* (cooperate and cooperation).
- Instruct* (to retrieve instruction and instructor as well as bibliographic instruction).
- Librar* (to retrieve library, librarian, and librarians) was redundant in *LL&IS* since the database focuses on library literature but was used in *Science Direct*.
- "College" was used as a search term in *LL&IS* to eliminate the results discussing K-12 instruction.
- "Government" was used as a further refinement to filter results to those publications addressing government information use.

The remaining items were classified by:

- whether the literature addresses or demonstrates librarian-librarian or faculty-librarian collaboration;
- whether the publication was a generalist, library instruction, regional, or subject-focused publication; and
- The author(s)' position in either library or discipline-based fields at the time of

writing the article.

Literature review

The examination of information literacy literature finds the need for librarian-delivered instruction to vary from the learning objective of students mastering a specific resource that falls within a librarian's expertise (Engle, 2001) to instruction in the entire research skill spectrum in response to external directives such as accreditation-driven assessment (Thompson, 2002). The majority of this literature is based on specific disciplinary examples such as psychology or education instruction with relevant teaching faculty (Carter and Daughtery, 1998; Witt and Dickinson, 2003).

The literature discussing librarian-librarian collaboration in instruction is not plentiful and the collaboration must be deduced through content analysis of the literature and authorial partnerships rather than found in direct discussion within a text. Within the generalist literature addressing librarian-librarian instructional collaboration, the environment may be a reference transaction or a classroom situation, ranging from the one-shot to full semester-length instruction. Recent literature (Jackson *et al.*, 2004; Warner, 2003; Jenkins and Boosinger, 2003; Rockman, 2002) shows increased opportunity for collaboration as a response to external assessment or organizational incentives, generating a need for program start-up or re-design and requiring a range of expertise in product development teams to design and implement such products as assessment tools or web-based tutorials. These discussions can be categorized as describing implementation rather than a philosophical rationale for collaboration.

The lack of discussion about librarians' collaborative rationale may be attributable to the broadly-accepted service image of library culture, as exemplified by the American Library Association's *Core Values of Librarianship* (American Library Association, 2004) and similar documents. The foundation document for information literacy, *The Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education (Standards)* codifies instruction librarians' responsibilities in developing information literate researchers, but only states that information literacy "requires collaborative efforts of faculty, librarians, and administrators" (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2000, p. 4.) There is no prescription in the standards for specific collaboration between librarians as an essential component to achieve desired information literacy goals, demonstrating an assumption that librarians will collaborate without encouragement or directive. Librarians do collaborate in programmatic issues, governance, and other areas. Rockman's (2002) literature review in the three major areas of instruction activity consisting of information literacy, general education, and assessment, emphasized the importance of the roles shared by librarians with faculty and campus administration, as well as inter-campus partnerships. Anecdotal evidence shows that collaboration between librarians is a common practice in library instruction in order to share workload and expertise. Scales *et al.* (2005) discuss the abundance of literature on collaboration, remarking that most is found to examine individual librarian and faculty collaborations.

Within the body of literature discussing librarian-librarian collaboration, a specialized subset is the area of government information. The subset is identified by provenance rather than subject area, which distinguishes this information from traditional information division by subject. The range of subjects covered in government publications applies to every discipline and professional practice, yet the use of this material is found to be

low. Postema and Weech (1991); Caswell (1997); and Hogenboom's (2002) studies of usage and citations support the anecdotal claims by librarians of researcher's comparatively low use. Partially this low use can be attributed to lack of instruction by non-documents specialists (Asher *et al.*, 2002).

Rationale for inclusion

Why should librarians be concerned with government information and its inclusion in their instruction? There are a variety of barriers and incentives to such collaboration.

Barriers

The literature discussing barriers to library instruction, which includes lack of sufficient resources and faculty and administrative attitudes, applies to government information instruction with the added barrier of librarian attitudes. This attitude barrier is frequently attributed to a lack of awareness and inability to use these resources effectively based on unfamiliarity (Downie, 2004a; Downie, 2004b; Tomaiuolo *et al.*, 1998). Promotion to librarians about the availability of documents and how to incorporate while designing instruction has been predominately found in the government information-focused journals and monographs, reaching a limited and already knowledgeable audience rather than raising awareness in the desired target groups.

A second barrier is the Superintendent of Documents (SuDoc) classification system (Asher *et al.*, 2002; Frazer *et al.*, 1997) and the extensive format variety in government information. A component of this barrier is that the government collection is housed separately from the rest of the collection, possibly removing the material to a less-accessible area or separating government information staff from general reference (Frazer *et al.*, 1997). A librarian does not have unlimited time for course design and instruction and soliciting for collaboration with other faculty (McCarthy, 2002) and so must eliminate what is seen as too time-consuming or inaccessible for general library instruction and research success. This almost invariably means any resource needing additional explanation on its use, such as the SuDoc classification system will exclude that category of information from the instruction plan unless a powerful reason exists for inclusion. The format variation in government information, especially as produced by federal agencies that ranges from paper, microform, and CD-ROM, creates another barrier by requiring additional time to teach.

Knowledge of a resources' existence does not mean the user automatically knows how to use it properly and constitutes a third barrier. Students in health and sciences have access to a broad range of needed information through such agencies as the Department of Health and Human Services and National Science Foundation. These agencies provide electronic resources such as PubMed, but users need guidance in learning effective use of this resource as much as they need instruction to fully utilize any scholarly database (Bowden and DiBenedetto, 2001). This adds to the instruction librarian's existing workload which demands prioritization in providing instruction and what is included.

The fourth barrier is the discipline specialization that contributes to the isolation of librarians from their colleagues and hampers collaboration between librarians. Except in the most unusual of circumstances or largest of institutions, a library does not have more than one subject expert to share instructional duties in a specific discipline. Those

rare situations when librarians share a broad discipline divide responsibilities into smaller specialties (e.g., Literature divides between Western European, Asian, Latin American specialists.) This leads to a lack of collaboration, not because of perceived territoriality, but as Donham and Green (2004) discuss, a practical response to workload through division of labor based on specialized resource knowledge for an area of study. This division of responsibility is further enforced through each librarian's development of different instructional styles and relationships with their discipline faculty. This division does not provide fertile ground for collaboration. This specialization follows the discipline faculty instructional model where they are solely responsible for design and delivery of materials as in many cases they are the solo specialist in that discipline. The course objectives may be set by the department or institution, but the instructor has freedom of choice as to course delivery, pacing of the class, course content, and the potential role of collaborators such as librarians (Donham, 2004). If collaboration is discussed in the discipline-based literature, it is normally framed in terms such as "team teaching" or "split contracts" as a division of responsibility where one instructor is present in the classroom and is solely responsible for the instructional delivery, rather than both instructors in the classroom sharing expertise to enrich instruction and utilize lesser-known resources.

Incentives

A librarian's desire to design and implement effective instruction is a powerful incentive for collaboration. But there are incentives in addition to these personal values, such as provided by professional organizations or driven by pedagogical changes and developments in technology.

The Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, (Standards) as promoted by the Association of College and Research Libraries (2000, p. 2-3), discusses in the Introduction that the "sheer abundance of information will not in itself create a more informed citizenry ... " to support development of information literacy skills. The use of the word "citizenry" rather than the broader term "population" denotes the authors' understanding that learners in the academic arena are also part of a larger society with attendant responsibilities for informed participation in that society. In order to contribute effectively and make well-founded choices in discussions and electoral participation requires familiarity with government enabled by the ability to research resources for accurate information. The federal, state and local governments, through both agencies and individuals, provide a wealth of wide-ranging information free of charge to the American people. With the proliferation in access formats, the lack of organization of the internet, and the distortion of the issues discussions (whether intentional or accidental) through the print and electronic media, a citizen must be able to access information in either the original wording or a non-biased analysis to read and decide for themselves. This cannot be easily done without instruction on the specific tools to access such information which instruction librarians provide.

A specific instructional opportunity within the *Standards* is Standard One, Performance Indicator Two, addressing students' need for knowledge of a variety of formats (Outcome 1.2.b). This argues for the inclusion of government information in

information literacy instruction as government information is renowned for its variety of formats which can become teaching tools. Standard Two also states the researcher's need for primary sources (Outcome 1.2.£) for which the statistics and raw data collected and disseminated by governments can be used by researchers for extrapolating new information or verifying the validity of secondary documents. Hogenboom (2005) links government information directly to Standard Three on information evaluation by offering specific means to use government information in source evaluation as examples of bias, currency, and interpretation are easily found within government publications as well as the data to refute or substantiate. There are other applications to the *Standards* that a government specialist can demonstrate and share with colleagues.

Impetus for instruction supporting awareness of, and research skills in, social responsibility is being driven by governmental organizations as well as library professional organizations. An example of government-driven impetus is the 2004 passage of United States Public Law 108-447 declaring September 17 of each year be declared "Constitution Day and Citizenship Day" (popularly referred to as "Constitution Day"). This legislation requires all schools receiving federal monies to provide programs on the US Constitution and its meaning to students on or about that date[2]. The effects of this unfunded instructional mandate can be mitigated by collaboration with the government information specialist to obtain free materials available on the internet as well as develop effective use of existing in-house resources.

The Government Printing Office (GPO) and Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) both are charged with distribution and provision of access to federal government information free of charge. The standards of access and service as outlined in the *Instructions to Depository Libraries (Instructions)* are generally accepted as guidelines for all government information-related service and instruction. The *Instructions* refer to services provided by "knowledgeable librarians" rather than a specific category of government information specialists (Government Printing Office, 2000), a recognition of the reality that not every librarian who has responsibility the provision of reference and instruction for government information is part of the FDLP or holds the title of "government information librarian" (Shill and Stimatz, 1999; Weatherly, 1996). In addition, many libraries obtain re-packaged government information through commercial vendors, rather than the GPO and depository program, providing access to government information in a less obvious fashion. Through commercial acquisitions, the increase of access to government information through the internet, and the support of the *Standards* for information literacy, every librarian is becoming a government information librarian.

Government document specialists have always provided instruction that addresses the differences in the specialized organization of government information. Cheney (2006) argues that government information specialists need to revise their instruction from an organization-based pedagogy to one that addresses the needs of the discipline being taught. She specifically uses the social sciences as an example of a discipline that has not increased its usage of government information in the face of increased access through electronic resources. This argument is effective for all disciplines in light of the increasing availability of web-based information.

Various aspects of the impact of electronic access on government information are discussed by Laskowski (2000), Lopresti and Gorin (2002). Lippincott and Cheverie

(1999) recognize that free access is a double-edged sword in that more is available, but not necessarily more user-friendly and will affect delivery and access options. Librarians are seen as the holders of knowledge to access this information, regardless of the librarian's specialty, placing all librarians in the position of becoming documents librarians. The movement from CD-ROM and its specialized software to server-based access (Aldrich, 1996) eliminates the need for loading and maintaining specialized software at individual workstations. This ease of access through the internet brings more users in contact with resources that will raise questions and requests for assistance for which librarians need to prepare (Shuler, 2002; Machalow, 2001).

Librarians realize the value of constant learning as part of their professional development and find education a necessity in the face of ever -changing technologies and new information. Roselle (2001) predicts the effects of electronic access to government information on librarians and their professional activities. Quinn (1996) and Rawan and Cox (1995) discuss training opportunities for non-document librarians to provide the knowledge and tools to accommodate the increased access to government information. This training can be through formal or informal venues such as a reference log, where difficult questions using document resources can be recorded with their answers (Darby *et al.*, 2003) or through formal training in-house or through off-campus training. Henson and Steffenson (1988) discuss advantages to both generalist and documents specialist in cross-training in documents use through an internship arrangement. Government information librarians are instructors at heart and willing and able to share their knowledge. DeDecker and Forte (2006) discuss teaching the generalist librarian working the reference desk about statistical resources in order to better serve their patrons who can be researching for any number of reasons and disciplinary applications.

Librarians have always shared their experiences and findings with colleagues and government specialists have the same to share in instructional design. Wilhite (2004) assessed the learning and student perception of electronic instruction versus live while providing instruction in government documents. Walker and Engel (2003) discuss their sequenced research exercises using government information in one example. The electronic access has the added benefit of "invisible cost" where the computer to access the internet and the internet itself are perceived as free to the patron. Government information can be cataloged into the library online catalog as other materials are or inserted in online pathfinders and guides with little effort and maintenance.

Evidence of collaboration

Examples of instruction with government documents is scattered throughout the library literature. Collaboration with faculty is common, and as in the generalist collaboration literature, the most extensively addressed facet of government information instruction. Nine articles were found in the generalist literature to include government information librarians or resources, but of those only three focused the discussion on government information (Cheney, 2006; Shill and Stimatz, 1999; Tims, 1988). Two other articles were found to be co-authored by government document librarians, but documents were not discussed as a resource in the articles (Costello *et al.*, 2004; Warner, 2003). In the government specialist literature, four articles were located that discuss both collaboration and government information. Walters (1990), Engle (2001), Engeldinger *et al.* (1988), Judd and Tims (1996), and Ragains (1995) provide

subject-specific examples of integrated instruction using documents, but only Ragains (2001), a business and government documents librarian, has discussed filling a leadership role in a collaborative curriculum design effort.

Instruction to students is seen as a means to increase use of government information (Asher *et al.*, 2002). Sheehy and Cheney (1997) directly attribute successful instruction in government information to collaboration between faculty and librarians and specifically speak to the benefits from working with government information specialists. Neither of these articles addresses collaboration with other librarians in instruction, yet both articles demonstrate collaborative practice in authorship by multiple librarians.

Findings

Limited discussion exists on collaboration between librarians and a smaller body of literature exists when collaborating to include government information in instructional design. In the instruction/collaboration literature published since 2000, only two articles were authored by librarians identifying themselves as having government document responsibilities. In the government information specialist literature during the same time period, six articles were published. That does not mean that there are not more professionals that have such responsibilities embedded in their duties, but that such duties may be considered minor in comparison to other professional responsibilities.

The literature does not demonstrate that librarians pursue opportunities to collaborate with their colleagues to the fullest extent possible in their subject-based instruction. In an analysis of 131 articles on instructional collaboration with evidence of partnerships, it was found that 93 addressed librarian-faculty collaboration, 46 mentioned librarian-librarian collaboration and 29 discussed collaboration between other groups such as teaching or graduate assistants, curricular programs, and systems departments. The percentage of non-librarian collaboration would skew even more heavily if teaching and graduate assistants were grouped with full faculty. Seventeen of the articles focused on collaboration discussed both librarian-faculty and librarian-librarian collaboration. Government information specialists were identified as authors or co-authors in 18 of these 131 articles, one article was authored by a librarian whose position title included government documents but the article did not mention government information.

The examples provided for librarian-librarian collaboration are usually through references in the text to collaborative behaviors such as a "team approach" to program design or the use of "we" in referring to the participants in instructional design and implementation. Many partnerships are inferred through co-authorship of the article rather than through discussion in the text. This deductive analysis technique was used in both the general collaboration literature and the more specialized literature regarding government information resources.

The incentives to include government information through collaboration with a government specialist while designing instruction outweigh the barriers. The barriers do argue against adding more to an individual's workload and the perception of loss of decision autonomy, but librarians can either lead the way to information literacy by learning about and incorporating government resources or be forced to follow by the increasing access which will generate user questions and needs for help and

instruction. Government-produced and disseminated information such as statistical data is used by not only social science researchers, but also researchers in business, communication, health, and other disciplines. As librarians help educate an information literate population, this information will see increased usage. Librarians can collaborate with government information specialists in user instruction as well as professional training to gain expertise that can be added in small increments as needed, rather than attempting to learn all the aspects of a new body of information.

All instruction involves selection and evaluation of the applicability and appropriateness of resources, but there are means to add a small number of government information resources. Use of government internet sites during discussion of internet searching, validation of information, examples of bias or selectivity in information dissemination can all use government-created sites. Supporting documentation, whether handouts or web-based can provide a few key websites or print sources.

Conclusion

Librarians need to overcome the barriers to collaboration with their government information colleagues. Instructional collaboration is a basic tenet in the *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* and needs to be more formally recognized with the librarian-librarian collaborative rationale given voice. Librarians are part of a collaborative professional culture and find instructional design to benefit from the partnerships they form. They collaborate from personal belief as well, seeing time and again the advantages of sharing expertise and experience in classrooms, on the reference desk and via myriad other functions. Many of those collaborations are between librarian and faculty that serve as models for successful librarian-librarian collaboration. Government information librarians have an extensive range of skills and knowledge to bring to instruction, but to date, the generalist and specialist have rarely worked together.

All discipline areas are seeing increased opportunities for collaboration and with the increased accessibility of government information on the internet, librarians of all subject specializations will be in contact with these resources and asked to provide service and instruction for them. Working with government information specialist colleagues while designing library resource instruction strengthens experience in both reference transactions and classroom instruction. Such collaboration responds to both Federal mandate and the common need to educate an informed citizenry capable of finding the information they need to make decisions affecting the society in which they live.

Librarians recognize the benefits of collaboration for themselves and their instructional classroom colleagues. As librarians share the same purpose with classroom faculty, they share common purpose with their fellow professionals such as the government information specialist. This provides an opportunity for librarian-librarian collaboration. With increasing workloads due to new technologies, course-integrated information literacy instruction and other responsibilities, the most effective means to achieve instruction is through collaborative effort to leverage each librarian's strengths in instruction and subject matter.

Notes

1. Holdings information as of March 17, 2006 for *Library Literature & Information Science* in EBSCOhost database, available at: www.epnet.com (accessed March 25, 2006).
2. United States, "Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005" (Public Law 108-447), available at: http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=108_cong_public_laws&docid=f:publ447.108 (accessed September 23, 2006).

References

- Aldrich, D.M. (1996), "Depository libraries, the Internet, and the 21st century?", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 23 No.4, pp. 381-91.
- American Library Association (2004), "Core values of librarianship" available at: www.ala.org/ala/oif/statementspols/corevaluesstatement/corevalues.htm (accessed March 29, 2006).
- Asher, C., Yi, H. and Knapp, S. (2002), "Effective instruction needed to improve students' use of government documents", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 29 No.5, pp. 293-301.
- Association of College and Research Libraries (2000), *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*, Association of College and Research Libraries, Chicago, IL.
- Bowden, T.S. and DiBenedetto, A. (2001), "Information literacy in a biology laboratory session: an example of librarian-faculty collaboration", *Research Strategies*, Vol. 18 No.2, pp. 143-9.
- Carter, E.W. and Daugherty, T.K. (1998), "Library instruction and psychology - a cooperative effort", *Technical Services Quarterly*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 33-41.
- Caswell, T.R. (1997), "Studies on government publications' use: 1990-1996", *Government Information Quarterly*, Vol. 14 No.4, pp. 363-71.
- Cheney, D. (2006), "Government information collections and services in the social sciences: the subject specialist integration model", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 303-12.
- Costello, B., Lenholt, R. and Stryker, J. (2004), "Using Blackboard in library instruction: addressing the learning styles of Generations X and Y", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 452-60.
- Darby, D.H., Northrup, L.A., Waddel, C.T. and Watters, H.F. (2003), "Cooperation in a multi-faceted reference department: blending resources, personnel, and services of reference, instruction, interlibrary loan, and government documents", *The Reference Librarian*, Vol. 83/84, pp. 119-30.
- DeDecker, S. and Forte, E. (2006), "Statistical information from the government: teaching the general reference librarian", *DttP: Documents to the People*, Vol. 34 No.2, pp. 15-17.

- Donham, J. (2004), "Information literacy: integrating into the institution's academic culture- one course at a time", *Advances in Library Administration and Organization*, Vol. 21, pp. 213-35.
- Donham, J. and Green, C.W. (2004), "Developing a culture of collaboration: librarian as consultant", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 30 No.4, pp. 314-21.
- Downie, J.A. (2004a), "The current information literacy instruction environment for government documents (Part 1)", *DttP: Documents to the People*, Vol. 32 No.2, pp. 36-9.
- Downie, J.A. (2004b), "Integrating government documents into information literacy instruction, Part 2", *DttP: Documents to the People*, Vol. 32 No.4, pp. 17,20-22.
- Engeldinger, E., Stuart, P. and Gibbs, L.E. (1988), "Bibliographic instruction for social work students", *Research Strategies*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 118-26.
- Engle, S. (2001), "Compiling legislative histories: an analysis of a course-integrated instruction unit", *Research Strategies*, Vol. 18 No.3, pp. 239-49.
- Frazer, S.L., Boone, K.W., McCart, V.A., Prince, T.L. and Rees, A.D. (1997), "Merging government information and the reference department: a team-based approach", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 24 No.2, pp. 93-102.
- Government Printing Office (2000), "Instructions to Depository Libraries revised 2000, Chapter 7, Section B, Reference Service" available at: www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/instructionslin_ch7.html (accessed September 23, 2006).
- Henson, S. and Steffenson, M. (1988), "A government documents internship program for reference librarians", *Southeastern Librarian*, Vol. 38, pp. 151-3.
- Hogenboom, K. (2002), "Has government information on the internet affected citation patterns? A case study of population studies journals", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 29 No. 6, pp. 392-401.
- Hogenboom, K. (2005), "Going beyond.gov: using government information to teach evaluation of sources", *portal: Libraries in the Academy*, Vol. 5 No.4, pp. 455-66.
- Jackson, S., Hansen, C. and Fowler, L. (2004), "Using selected assessment data to inform information literacy program planning with campus partners", *Research Strategies*, Vol. 20 Nos 1-2, pp. 44-56.
- Jenkins, J. and Boosinger, M. (2003), "Collaborating with campus administrators and faculty to integrate information literacy and assessment into the core curriculum", *Southeastern Librarian*, Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 29-34.

- Judd, V.C. and Tims, B.J. (1996), "Integrating bibliographic instruction into a marketing curriculum: a hands-on workshop approach using interactive team-teaching", *Reference Services Review*, Vol. 24 No.1, pp. 21-30, 56.
- Laskowski, M.S. (2000), "The impact of electronic access to government information: what users and document specialists think", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 173-85.
- Lippincott, J.K. and Cheverie, J.F. (1999), "The blur of Federal information and services: implications for university libraries", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 25-31.
- Lopresti, R. and Gorin, M. (2002), "The availability of US government depository publications on the World Wide Web", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 29 No.1, pp. 17-29.
- McCarthy, P.J. (2002), "Instruction collaboration: imperative or imperilment?", *Colorado Libraries*, Vol. 28 No.2, pp. 34-5.
- Machalow, R. (2001), "Government information on the Web", *The Reference Librarian*, Vol. 74, pp. 165-75.
- Postema, B. and Weech, T.L. (1991), "The use of government publications: a twelve-year perspective", *Government Publications Review*, Vol. 18, pp. 223-38.
- Quinn, A.B. (1996), "Methods for training library staff members in the use of CD-ROMs in Federal depository libraries in Texas: a survey", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 23 No.2, pp. 151-9.
- Ragains, P. (1995), "The legislative/regulatory process and BI: a course-integrated unit", *Research Strategies*, Vol. 13, pp. 116-21.
- Ragains, P. (2001), "Infusing information literacy into the core curriculum: a pilot project at the University of Nevada, Reno", *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, Vol. 1 No.4, pp. 391-407.
- Rawan, A.R. and Cox, J. (1995), "Government publications integration and training", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 22 No.3, pp. 253-66.
- Rockman, I.F. (2002), "Strengthening connections between information literacy, general education and assessment efforts", *Library Trends*, Vol. 51 No.2, pp. 185-98.
- Roselle, A. (2001), "The effects of electronic communication and the World Wide Web on US academic documents librarians' relationships", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 149-69.

- Scales, J., Matthews, G. and Johnson, CM. (2005), "Compliance, cooperation, collaboration and information literacy", *Journal of Academic Librarians/zip*, Vol. 31 No.3, pp. 229-35.
- Sheehy, H.M. and Cheney, D. (1997), "Government information and library instruction: a means to an end", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 24 No.4, pp. 313-30.
- Shill, H.B. and Stimatz, L.R. (1999), "Government information in academic libraries: new options for the electronic age", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 25 No.2, pp. 94-104.
- Shuler, J.A. (2002), "Libraries and government information: the past Is not necessarily prologue", *Government Information Quarterly*, Vol. 19 No.1, pp. 1-7.
- Still, J. (1998), "The role and image of the library and librarians in discipline-specific pedagogical journals", *Journal of Academic Librarians/zip*, Vol. 24 No.3, pp. 225-31.
- Thompson, G.B. (2002), "Information literacy accreditation mandates: what they mean for faculty and librarians", *Library Trends*, Vol. 51 No.2, pp. 218-41.
- Tims, B.J. (1988), "Interactive team teaching of government document data sources: a case study", *Reference Services Review*, Vol. 16 No.3, pp. 69-72.
- Tomaiuolo, N.G., Churchill, R. and Packer, J.G. (1998), "Access to government publications and library instruction: views of faculty and librarians", *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 127-38.
- Walker, H.M. and Engel, K.R. (2003), "Research exercises: a sequenced approach to just-in-time information literacy instruction", *Research Strategies*, Vol. 19 No.2, pp. 135-47.
- Walters, J.S. (1990), "Federal documents for undergraduate students in public administration", *Research Strategies*, Vol. 8, pp. 197-9.
- Warner, D.A. (2003), "Programmatic assessment: turning process into practice by teaching for learning", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 29 No.3, pp. 169-76.
- Weatherly, C.D. (1996), "A U.S. government publications collection in a non-depository research library: a case study", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 23 No.4, pp. 471-89.
- Wilhite, J.M. (2004), "Internet versus live: assessment of government documents bibliographic instruction", *Journal of Government Information*, Vol. 30 Nos 5-6, pp. 561-74.
- Witt, S.W. and Dickinson, J.B. (2003), "Teaching teachers to teach: collaborating with a University education department to teach skills in information literacy pedagogy", *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, Vol. 22 No.1, pp. 75-95.

About the author

Judith A. Downie is Humanities Librarian for instruction, collection development, and reference services in the History, Visual and Performing Arts, and Literature and Writing programs at California State University San Marcos with a concurrent appointment as Government Documents Coordinator. Previous positions include participation in management teams for information literacy projects for both the Association of College and Research Libraries and Institute of Museum and Library Services. She is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: jdownie@csusm.edu