

**ASSESSING INFORMATION LITERACY SKILLS:
A RUBRIC APPROACH**

Megan J. Oakleaf

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Information and Library Science.

Chapel Hill
2006

Approved by
Advisor: Helen Tibbo
Reader: Marilee Bresciani
Reader: Evelyn Daniel
Reader: Barbara Moran
Reader: Paul Solomon

© 2006
Megan J. Oakleaf
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Megan J. Oakleaf

Assessing Information Literacy Skills: A Rubric Approach

(Under the direction of Dr. Helen Tibbo)

Academic librarians should explore new approaches to the assessment of information literacy skills. Satisfaction surveys and input/output measures do not provide librarians with adequate information about what students know and can do. Standardized multiple-choice tests and large-scale performance assessments also fail to provide the data librarians need to improve instruction locally. Librarians, facing accountability issues and possessing the desire to improve student learning, require a new approach to library instruction assessment.

This study investigated the viability of a rubric approach to information literacy assessment and examined an analytic information literacy rubric designed to assess students' ability to evaluate website authority. The study addressed these questions: (1) To what degree can different groups of raters provide consistent scoring of student learning artifacts using a rubric? (2) To what degree can raters provide scores consistent with those assigned by the researcher? (3) To what degree can students use authority as a criterion to evaluate websites?

This study revealed that multiple raters can use rubrics to produce consistent scoring of information literacy artifacts of student learning; however, different groups of raters in this study arrived at varying levels of agreement. For example, ENG 101 instructors produced significantly higher reliabilities than NCSU librarians and ENG 101 students, and NCSU librarians produced remarkably higher levels of agreement than external instruction and reference librarians.

In addition to providing important findings regarding the five original rater groups, this study documented the emergence of an “expert” rater group, identified through kappa statistics and a “gold standard” approach to the examination of validity. These raters not only approximated the researcher’s scores, they also achieved higher levels of agreement than any of the five original groups. This study suggests that librarians may require substantial training to overcome barriers blocking expert rater status.

Finally, this study found that most students can cite specific indicators of authority when evaluating a website. Nearly all students can locate and identify these authority indicators in a website. However, many students have difficulty choosing an appropriate website for a specific assignment and providing a rationale for their choice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the contributions of my colleagues, the support of my friends, and the love of my family, this dissertation would not exist. While only one name is included in the byline of this work, a number of people deserve credit for the contributions it makes to the literature of academic libraries and higher education assessment.

Among my colleagues, I must credit the LOBO tutorial team, especially Josh Boyer, who asks the right questions at the right times, and Cindy Levine, who supported my early work as an instruction librarian and shared her wisdom so that I might not run too far amuck. I wish also to thank Steve McCann for participating in the pilot test, Katherine Dexter Willis for slaying the EndNote dragon, and Herman Berkhoff for his friendship and a million favors, both large and small. For his statistical support, I thank Paul Biemer of the Odum Institute. Two members of my dissertation committee were also instrumental in this research, Dr. Evelyn Daniel, whose office door is always open, and Dr. Marilee Bresciani, who has been in all ways a friend, a mentor, and an inspiration—in the practice of assessment and in life.

Of my friends and family, I wish to thank Amy VanScoy and Patti Owen. Amy's contributions to this dissertation range from the cerebral work of editing drafts and double-checking data to the work only a friend knows to do...like

promising a mall trip as a reward for a task accomplished or supplying a steady stream of chocolate or caffeine as the situation merits.

Finally, I thank my mother, Patti Owen, for her countless contributions to my life and work that have made this research possible. I thank her for reviewing every word of this dissertation...and all her help with the papers and projects leading up to it since kindergarten. I thank her for setting an example to follow as an educator and for all the lessons I have learned about librarianship at her side. I thank her for being a true friend, for knowing me better than I know myself, and for using that knowledge to push and praise me into being a better teacher, a better librarian, and—most importantly—a better person. Perhaps most of all, I thank her for reading books as a child, drawing from them a vision of how families should be, and loving me enough to make my life a fairy tale.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
Chapter	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
The Local Problem.....	3
Purpose	5
Research Questions	6
Definition of Terms.....	7
Assumptions, Delimitations, and Limitations.....	10
Significance	11
2 LIBRARY INSTRUCTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION	13
The Role of Library Instruction in Higher Education.....	13
The Content of Library Instruction.....	15
Information Literacy Standards	16
Methods of Library Instruction.....	20
Instruction at the Reference Desk.....	21
Course Integrated Instruction.....	24

	For-Credit Classes	27
	Tutorials	28
3	ASSESSMENT OF LIBRARY INSTRUCTION	32
	Definitions of Assessment.....	32
	Purposes of Assessment	35
	Responding to Calls for Accountability.....	36
	Participating in Accreditation Processes	37
	Improving Program Performance	44
	Improving Program Structures	46
	Improving Student Learning and Teaching Skills.....	48
	Closing the Loop	51
	Selecting a Method of Assessment.....	52
	Utility and Relevance	53
	Stakeholder Needs.....	55
	Measurability and Cost.....	56
	Best Practices.....	59
	Assessment of Library Instruction: The Past.....	63
	Inputs and Outputs.....	65
	Satisfaction Surveys	69
	Anecdotal Reports.....	79
	The Call for Change in Assessment	80
	Increased Attention in Library Literature	83
	Current Methods of Assessing Library Instruction	85

	Focus on Learning Outcomes.....	86
	Outcomes-Based Education	90
	Outcomes-Based Assessment.....	92
	Benefits of Outcomes-Based Assessment.....	94
	Outcomes-Based Surveys and Standardized Tests	96
	Theoretical Background	98
	Benefits	103
	Limitations.....	105
	Multiple-Choice Items.....	117
	Standards-Based Tests.....	119
	Surveys and Tests of Information Literacy Skills	122
	Outcomes-Based Performance Assessments	134
	Constructed-Response Items.....	139
	Theoretical Background: Education	145
	Theoretical Background: Motivation.....	153
	Theoretical Background: Assessment.....	160
	Benefits	165
	Limitations.....	169
	Large-Scale Accountability Testing and Classroom Assessment	171
	Performance Assessments of Information Literacy Skills	175
4	RUBRICS AND INFORMATION LITERACY ASSESSMENT.	183
	Definitions of Rubrics.....	183

	Components of a Full Model Rubric.....	186
	General and Task-Specific Rubrics	189
	Holistic and Analytic Rubrics.....	190
	Benefits of Rubric Assessment	195
	Limitations of Rubric Assessment.....	207
	Rubric Development	212
	Documentation of Rubric Assessment Results	224
	Reporting of Rubric Assessment Results.....	229
	Rubrics of Information Literacy Skills.....	230
5	METHODOLOGY	265
	Study Participants.....	265
	Providers of Artifacts of Student Learning.....	266
	Raters	267
	The Rubric.....	271
	The Pilot Test.....	273
	Study Procedure	274
	Preparation of Study Materials.....	275
	The Internal Rater Experience	279
	The External Rater Experience	282
	Preparation for Statistical Analysis.....	283
	Statistical Analysis of Reliability.....	284
	Interrater Reliability	285
	Consensus Estimates	291

	Analysis of Validity	297
	Content-Related Validity	298
	Construct-Related Validity.....	300
	A “Gold Standard” Test for Validity.....	302
	Funding.....	303
6	RESULTS	304
	Reliability of Rubric Assessment.....	304
	Reliability Within Rater Groups	306
	Significant Differences Among Rater Groups....	315
	Reliability Differences Throughout the Scoring Process	320
	Expert Raters	320
	Validity of Rubric Assessment	325
	Student Use of Authority as a Criterion for Website Evaluation	327
	“Articulates Criteria”	328
	“Cites Indicators of Criteria”	329
	“Links Indicators to Examples from Source”	331
	“Judges Whether or Not to Use Source”	331
	Summary of Results	333
7	DISCUSSION	341
	Purpose of the Study	341

Research Questions and Answers.....	342
Consistent Scoring of Artifacts of Student Learning.....	343
Agreement Between Raters and the Researcher	348
Students' Use of Authority to Evaluate Websites.....	350
Limitations of the Study	351
Implications of the Study.....	352
Not All Raters Are Experts	353
A Method for Identifying Expert Raters	354
Characteristics of Expert Raters	354
Barrier 1: Difficulty Understanding Outcomes-Based Assessment.....	356
Barrier 2: Tension Between Holistic and Analytic Rubrics	359
Barrier 3: Failure to Comprehend the Rubric ...	363
Barrier 4: Disagreement with Assumptions of the Rubric.....	365
Barrier 5: Difficulties with Artifacts of Student Learning.....	370
Barrier 6: Difficulties Understanding Campus Context and Culture.....	371
The Need for Training.....	373
The Value of Rubrics	377
Recommendations for Future Research	381
 APPENDIX A: LOBO Information Literacy Objectives and Outcomes	 384
APPENDIX B: Study Rubric.....	389

APPENDIX C: Sample Score Sheet	390
APPENDIX D: Internal Rater Training Power Point	391
APPENDIX E: Selected External Rater Materials	401
APPENDIX F: Student Version of Study Rubric.....	409
APPENDIX G: UNC Consent Form.....	410
APPENDIX H: UNC IRB Approval	413
APPENDIX I: NCSU Consent Form.....	414
APPENDIX J: NCSU IRB Approval.....	416
WORKS CITED.....	417

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
3.1 Educational Paradigms	100
3.2 Educational Theories	101
3.3 Teaching for Knowledge, Not the Test	113
3.4 Sample SAILS Test Question.....	133
3.5 Educational Theory and Assessment	152
3.6 Assessment and Motivation	158
3.7 Thinking Required for Successful Learning.....	164
3.8 ICT Literacy Framework.....	177
4.1 D'Angelo's Information Literacy Rubric	231
4.2 Merz and Mark's Information Literacy Rubric #1	234
4.3 Merz and Mark's Information Literacy Rubric #2	235
4.4 Merz and Mark's Information Literacy Rubric #3	236
4.5 Merz and Mark's Information Literacy Rubric #4	237
4.6 Rockman's Information Literacy Rubric.....	239
4.7 Emmons and Martin's Information Literacy Rubric.....	242
4.8 Buchanan's Information Literacy Rubric.....	246
4.9 Frank's Information Literacy Rubric.....	249
4.10 Gauss and Kinkema's Information Literacy Rubric.....	250
4.11 Kivel's Information Literacy Rubric	253
4.12 Knight's Information Literacy Rubric.....	255
4.13 Kobritz's Information Literacy Rubric.....	257

4.14	Bay Area Community Colleges' Information Literacy Rubric #1	260
4.15	Bay Area Community Colleges' Information Literacy Rubric #2	262
5.1	LOBO Tutorial Before Pilot Testing	275
5.2	LOBO Tutorial After Pilot Testing	276
5.3	Kappa Statistics and Strength of Agreement	295
5.4	Process to Ensure Content-Related Validity.....	299
6.1	Total Score to Letter Grade Conversion	305
6.2	Kappa Statistics and Strength of Agreement Color Codes	306
6.3	Kappa Statistics for NCSU Librarians	307
6.4	Kappa Statistics for ENG 101 Instructors.....	308
6.5	Kappa Statistics for ENG 101 Students	309
6.6	Kappa Statistics for External Instruction Librarians.....	311
6.7	Kappa Statistics for External Reference Librarians.....	311
6.8	Kappa Statistics for Internal Raters.....	312
6.9	Kappa Statistics for External Raters	313
6.10	Kappa Statistics for All Raters.....	314
6.11	Rank Order of Raters	321
6.12	Kappa Statistics for Expert Raters	322
6.13	Kappa Statistics for Non-Expert Raters.....	323
6.14	Validity Rank and Minutes Spent Scoring	327
6.15	Distribution of Students' Scores for "Articulates Criteria.....	329
6.16	Distribution of Students' Scores for "Cites Indicators of Criteria.....	330
6.17	Distribution of Students' Scores for "Links Indicators to Examples from Source	332

6.18	Distribution of Students' Scores for "Judges Whether or Not to Use the Source	333
------	--	-----