

Journal of Information Literacy

ISSN 1750-5968

Volume 11 Issue 2

December 2017

Project report

Barton, C. 2017. Exploring the experience of undergraduate students attending a library induction during Welcome Week at the University of Surrey. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 11(2), pp.105–117.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11645/11.2.2180>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Copyright for the article content resides with the authors, and copyright for the publication layout resides with the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, Information Literacy Group. These Copyright holders have agreed that this article should be available on Open Access and licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike licence.

"By 'open access' to this literature, we mean its free availability on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. The only constraint on reproduction and distribution, and the only role for copyright in this domain, should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited."

Chan, L. et al. 2002. Budapest Open Access Initiative. New York: Open Society Institute. Available at: <http://www.soros.org/openaccess/read.shtml> [Accessed: 18 November 2015].

Exploring the experience of undergraduate students attending a library induction during Welcome Week at the University of Surrey

Charlotte Barton, Information Skills Librarian, University of Surrey.
Email: c.barton@surrey.ac.uk

1. Introduction

During 2016 librarians at the University of Surrey reviewed the design and delivery of library induction sessions for undergraduate students. This was in response to two main factors. Firstly, student numbers were increasing, meaning that the current model of delivering 50-minute inductions sessions to each course cohort during Welcome Week, the university's induction week for new students, was not sustainable. Secondly, there was a concern amongst librarians at the University of Surrey that students are preoccupied with other concerns during Welcome Week, such as making friends and finding their way around campus, and are not ready to fully engage with, and retain information from induction sessions which cover information skills. In previous years, this concern became evident later in the semester as students who have attended induction sessions sought help with basic information skills covered in the induction session. It is essential to improve library induction sessions in light of these concerns in order to provide a quality student experience. The aim of this study was to understand the experiences and perceptions of University of Surrey students with regard to library induction sessions. The findings provide a foundation upon which to develop improvements to induction sessions. In particular this study will help the University of Surrey to better understand 'how students learn, both generally and within their discipline' and how best to design 'appropriate methods for teaching, learning and assessing' (Higher Education Academy, 2011).

2. Review of the literature

Induction has long been a topic of great interest and debate in the academic library community. It is revealing to note that in 1992 Carpmael, Morgan and Nichols discussed problems with induction sessions pointing to issues such as relevance of content, appropriate timing, and student engagement; issues which librarians are still facing a quarter of a century later.

Many papers have been published describing alternative models of induction (Baker, 2014; Boss, Angell & Tewell, 2015; Carpmael et al. 1992; Essex & Watts, 2015; Margolin & Hayden, 2015; Thompson, Kardos & Knapp, 2008). However not all of them sufficiently consider the context of the library induction. Reviewed here are papers relating to the period of transition to university, alongside discussion of various alternative induction models with the aim that links made between the two may inform an approach to further research into effective library inductions.

2.1 What is the student experience of transition to university?

Maunder, Cunliffe, Glavin, Mjali & Rogers' (2013) investigation reveals that students come to university with a range of preconceptions and ideas about what university will be like, and what their experience will be. Regardless of what these preconceptions may be, Maunder et al. describe transition as a process of 'expectations versus reality' (2013, p.143). The students in the study were able to look back on the transition period and recognise the changes that occurred in themselves and draw links between the transition process and their changed identity. The establishment of positive social relationships was found to be key for the successful transition of the students.

Hughes & Smail's (2014) larger study also found that students considered social support to be one of the most helpful aspects of transition. Academic concerns were notably absent from most student responses in the Hughes & Smail study. This finding will be of no real surprise to subscribers to Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1987). Before students are ready to focus on academic concerns, which may be said to fall into Maslow's 'esteem' category, they must satisfy their physiological and social needs.

Fraser, Shaw & Ruston (2013) also recognise that social integration is a key element of successful transition, but add that being academically prepared for university study is also essential. In an attempt to improve the academic preparedness of students Fraser et al. (2013) designed and delivered an innovative pre-induction online module focused on information literacy. They report high levels of engagement and positive feedback from students. It is worth noting that the module was credit bearing which was potentially a key driver of student engagement.

Generally engagement with 'study skills' learning is considered to be low (Burnett & Collins, 2007; Thompson et al., 2008; Verlander & Scutt, 2009; Wingate, 2006) despite the fact that this is an area in which most undergraduate students are likely to be lacking (Latham & Gross, 2013; McKeever, 2013). Librarians may be aware that new students do not have the information literacy skills necessary to successfully complete academic assignments, but it seems that many students themselves are not. McKeever (2013) found that school-leaving pupils significantly overestimated their information skills, and Latham & Gross (2013) identified the same phenomenon in students with below-proficient information skills.

The tendency of individuals to overestimate their skills in an area in which they in fact lack competence is referred to as the Dunning-Kruger effect. Kruger & Dunning (1999) also found that the opposite is true; the higher your level of competence the more you are likely to *underestimate* it. So if McKeever (2013) is correct in that most school-leavers do not have the information skills necessary for university level study, then librarians teaching new students are likely to be faced with a group of mostly disengaged learners because the students believe they are already competent. Those few students who are engaged are in fact likely to be the most competent in the group, but underestimate their skills.

2.2 Are students engaged in library induction sessions?

Student engagement in library induction sessions seems to be a primary concern for librarians. Carpmael et al. (1992) refer to groups of students with 'glazed looks' not paying attention in sessions (p.17) and cite the passive nature of the induction tours as a possible contributing factor. Much of the recent literature deals with the problem of engaging large groups in lecture theatre settings so it's interesting to note that in 1992 Carpmael et al. considered the relatively active and dynamic activity of a tour too passive. Indeed, there is a great emphasis in the literature of getting students to become actively engaged by doing things. In 2002, librarians at Cardiff University developed the Cephalonian method (Morgan, 2004). Morgan notes that the main driver in developing this method, in which students read out questions previously prepared by library staff, was to incorporate interaction in induction sessions. However, it must be considered how authentic the interactive element is, as students passively read questions from cards, without having the opportunity to share their own thoughts. Humour was also an important factor in the Cephalonian sessions. Morgan reports that student feedback was positive, but it is not clear whether the 'interactivity', or the humour was the main success factor.

Verlander & Scutt (2009), while not focusing on induction sessions exclusively but information sessions in general, report on their experiments using the Cephalonian method, personal response systems and group tasks. While acknowledging positive feedback from students and staff (albeit via rather anecdotal research methods), Verlander & Scutt (2009) are careful to explain that these approaches may minimise the disadvantages of a lecture format, but are not able to replicate the benefits of a truly interactive, 'hands-on' information skills session. Increasing student numbers

may be a factor in induction sessions moving to a lecture theatre format, from previously more interactive sessions. For example, Burnett & Collins (2007) describe how inductions at Kingston University took the form of a tour followed by a short worksheet, but this had become impractical due to increasing numbers of students. They also mentioned concerns over the effectiveness of the format, suggesting the worksheet element had become a passive activity. Burnett and Collins' (2007) experience of using a personal response system was that it increased student engagement, although how this was measured is not explained. These accounts of attempts to increase student engagement suggest that librarians tend to measure engagement by whether the student is doing something, be it reading from a question card, holding up a coloured cube, or pressing a button on a handset. By using these methods in our teaching, we may be able to measure how far students are engaging at a surface-level with the activities, but they do not necessarily allow us to understand how deeply students engage with the content and ideas being taught.

Students may be less likely to be engaged in an induction session if they believe they already possess the library skills being taught. Gross & Latham (2012) applied Kruger & Dunning's (1999) findings about overestimation of competence to an information literacy context and found that the phenomenon held. Students who performed poorly in an information literacy test were more likely to overestimate their skills than students who performed better. The vast majority of students tested scored as 'below-proficient' on the test, exposing the extent of the challenge facing librarians. Students who do not have the information literacy skills necessary at university may well be willing to participate in 'interactive' sessions at a superficial level, but if they do not believe the content to be relevant to them they may be unlikely to learn anything of value as a result of their participation.

2.3 How important is relevance?

Relevance is also a key theme in the literature around induction sessions, and information skills sessions more generally. Most authors writing in this field agree that subject-specific relevance is important. For example Thompson et al. (2008) explain that they designed an orientation programme for an oral health degree course to align with the learning expectations of the course. Similarly Essex & Watts (2011) linked an induction programme for a chemistry education course to assessed work. Some research has been carried out to determine how important relevance is to students. Latham & Gross (2013) found that students reported that recognising a direct link between their course and information skills session made them more motivated to attend it. Students participating in the study also reported that they preferred relevant examples to be used in sessions. Wingate (2006) advocates abandoning generic information skills sessions completely and only delivering sessions embedded in, and directly related to, specific courses.

Some researchers claim that it is also important to consider what is relevant to students at a particular time. Hughes & Smail (2014) highlight that although academic concerns are relevant to new students, they are not as relevant as practical and social needs. When asked about what was unhelpful during the induction period one student responded:

The long induction in the first few days was a drawn out experience, especially for those of us who had travelled a long way and wanted a day or two to settle in. (p.473).

'Settling in' may involve students satisfying physiological and social needs, before being ready to engage with academic induction sessions. Hughes & Smail (2014) believe that universities should acknowledge these needs and support students to satisfy them. They suggest that, with further research, universities could design an induction programme, and a first-year teaching strategy that more effectively links student learning with student life beyond the lecture theatre.

Margolin & Hayden (2015) point out that the value students place on learning information skills is a key element of whether they will engage with sessions. If we subscribe to the findings of Gross & Latham (2012) and McKeever (2013) that new university students tend to overestimate their skills,

and the claim from Hughes & Smail (2014) that academic concerns are not an immediate priority for new students, we must consider how relevant students will consider information skills sessions delivered early in the first semester. However, convincing academics that information skills should be taught at a time when the skills will be perceived as relevant (for example when students are assigned a research task), poses its own challenges. McGuinness (2006) reports that academics in her study believed that information skills naturally develop in students without any external intervention. Facing attitudes such as this, it would be difficult for librarians to gain access to time with students at relevant points in a course. Some librarians have attempted to overcome this by developing online resources (Baker, 2014; Essex & Watts, 2011; Margolin & Hayden 2015). They aim to provide students with learning opportunities at the point of need, without the need for academics to allow librarians teaching time during semester, although there is little convincing evidence so far as to how far online resources may replace the need for face-to-face teaching altogether.

2. 4 Creating a positive induction experience

Although there is much agreement among librarians that induction sessions, and information skills teaching more generally, should be engaging and relevant for students, there is less agreement about how this should be achieved. For example Carpmael et al. (1992) designed a workbook to replace library tours which were thought to be too passive, whereas Burnett & Collins (2007) report replacing a 'passive' worksheet with using personal response systems in a lecture theatre setting. Many authors report success with alternative models, but it is not always possible to determine whether the key success factor was the method used (personal response system, worksheet etc.), or the surrounding circumstances of delivery (timetabled support sessions, use of humour, engagement of academic staff etc.). Some alternative models appear to provide evidence of student engagement (Burnett & Collins, 2007; Morgan, 2004; Verlander & Scutt, 2009) but this engagement may be surface-level only, without accompanying deeper learning. However some researchers have begun to investigate the perceptions, attitudes and needs of students beginning university (Boger et al., 2015; Gross & Latham, 2012; Hughes & Smail, 2014; Maunder et al., 2013; McKeever, 2013) and it is upon this research, and it is hoped the research project reported here, that a clear understanding of what may make an effective library induction can be built.

3. Methods

3.1 Methodology

The exploratory nature of the research question lent itself naturally to a qualitative study design. More specifically, I took a phenomenological approach in order to explore the student experience of library induction, using Cohen, Manion & Morrison (2011) as a guide. Phenomenology foregrounds an individual's perception of an event rather than attempting to describe the event independently of the person. More specifically, Budd (2005) provides an overview of how phenomenology has been used in the field of information studies; all examples have in common the aim of more closely understanding the experience of the subject, whether they are library user, student, or librarian. As this study aims to examine the lived experience of the student attending a library induction, a phenomenological approach was an appropriate choice.

Budd (2005) also notes that phenomenology is less of a method and more of an attitude. This broad view of phenomenology allows a wide variety of methods to be used in conjunction with it without restricting researchers to specific methods, while the principles of phenomenology provide a strong foundation for research design. It was important that the chosen research method allowed for exploratory questions to be asked, while being practical to deliver in a limited time-frame and with limited resources.

3.2 Questionnaire design

A quantitative questionnaire was designed with the aim of gathering insights into the student experience of attending a library induction. The questionnaire is attached as Appendix 1. The questionnaire was designed to include only three questions to encourage respondents to write fuller answers than they might have if presented with a longer list. The three questions were open-ended in order to allow for a broad range of responses, and to allow the gathering of rich data. Each question was purposefully fairly broad, to encourage respondents to write about whatever particular aspect of the question topic was foremost in their mind.

I carefully considered the arrangement of the questions on the questionnaire. I used the funnelling technique (as documented in Wengraf, 2001) of asking surface level questions first to ease the respondent into answering the final deeper, more involved question. The questionnaire was designed to resemble a worksheet rather than a list of questions so that completing it appeared easily achievable. It was important that the questionnaire seemed achievable to increase the likelihood that the participant would agree to complete it, and to encourage them to answer each question fully, without being tempted to rush or skip questions. Text boxes rather than lines were provided allowing respondents to present their answers in whatever way they wished without being restricted. A lack of restriction was key to this research to ensure that the true student experience could be examined. If respondents felt at any time restricted to a particular type of response, the data would be skewed. The layout of the questionnaire suggested a sequence, but the questions were left unnumbered to make respondents feel permitted to answer questions in whatever order they wished. It was important that respondents felt comfortable and in control while taking the questionnaire to facilitate the elicitation of full, honest responses.

3.3 Delivery

The method of delivery of the questionnaire was a key consideration to ensure a maximum return rate and high quality responses. The questionnaire was not delivered online due to the risk of a low return rate. The questionnaires were printed and offered to students in the university library. Tables and chairs were provided for students to use while completing the questionnaire to discourage students from taking the questionnaire away with them, therefore reducing the risk of non-completion. An immediate reward of a Krispy Kreme doughnut was provided as an incentive for students to complete the questionnaire.

3.4 Recruitment

The Krispy Kreme doughnuts were openly displayed in the main entrance area of the library to attract the attention of passing students and encourage participation. Two members of staff actively approached students and asked if they would be willing to participate in the research. The opportunity to participate in the research was promoted via an email to course representatives, and via the university library's Twitter account.

3.5 Participants

Specific inclusion and exclusion criteria was designed to ensure appropriate data was gathered for addressing the research question. The first criterion was that all respondents were in their first-year of study at the University of Surrey. This was to ensure that respondents had the freshest possible memories of their experience of Welcome Week. It was also essential that respondents were undergraduate students as the undergraduate experience is the focus of this research. The final requirement was that students had attended a library induction. Some students do not attend library inductions, and the reasons for this may be interesting to investigate, but were not relevant to this study. Twenty-four students met the criteria and completed the questionnaire.

3.6 Analysis

Coding was employed as an analysis tool for the 24 completed questionnaires. Cohen et al.'s (2011) text was used as a general guide to the process of coding and a data-driven coding (Gibbs, 2007) approach was used to categorise recurring themes in the responses to each question, designating an appropriate code for each response as the data was analysed, rather than determining codes prior to looking at the data. This approach reduced any existing bias the researcher may have had as a result of expecting certain themes to arise in the responses. Categorising the responses in this way allowed for an understanding of some key features of how the participating students experienced Welcome Week, which are discussed in the 'Findings' section of this paper.

3.7 Ethics

The proposal for this study was submitted to the University of Surrey's Self-assessment Form: Ethics (SAFE) and was confirmed as not requiring further ethical review. Participants in the study were provided with an information sheet (Appendix 2) which made clear how their responses may be used, and assuring them of anonymity.

3.8 Limitations

The design of this research has some limitations, which have the potential to affect the validity of the findings. A major limitation is the setting in which the research was carried out. Students were asked to complete the questionnaire while in the library, under the supervision of library staff, which may have resulted in biased responses. While in the library setting, students may have felt unable to write negative comments about their experience of library induction. In addition, students were recruited as they entered the library. This means that participants were all existing library users, therefore the experiences of students who do not use the library building are not represented in this study. An effort was made to recruit non-library users by promoting the opportunity to participate in the study via course representatives. However, no students responded to this promotion, and all participants were recruited as they entered the library.

The design of the questionnaire may also have resulted in biased results. The text at the top of the questionnaire sheet prompts the participant to think back to their library induction. One of the questions focuses on the library in general, one on the library induction specifically, and one on Welcome Week as a whole. On reflection the introductory text, the two library questions, and the library setting of the delivery are likely to have led to the majority of the responses to the question about Welcome Week being focused on library related matters. To avoid this bias it may have been more effective to arrange the questions differently on the page, encouraging students to complete the Welcome Week question first, removing the mention of library induction in the introductory text, and/or using interviews rather than questionnaires, so the researcher could guide the participants where necessary.

4. Findings

4.1 Question 1: What can you remember about your expectations of the university library?

The overriding theme evident in responses to this question was about space. Twenty-one out of the 24 completed questionnaires mentioned the physical library space in some way. Of these, ten responses indicated that the student expected to find space to study in the library. Thirteen respondents focused on their expectation that the library would be large, with some suggesting that this is a positive feature: *I expected it to be spacious* and others indicating that the size of the building caused anxiety for them: *big and confusing / difficult to navigate / too many levels so will be easy to get lost in*.

The second most common response theme was library stock. Nineteen out of the 24 completed questionnaires included mention that the student expected to find many books or other sources of information in the library. The responses of two students focused on the expectation that the library would stock the books specified for their course: *Having a copy of the coursebooks available for reference / Adequate supply of textbooks on reading list* whereas three students demonstrated an awareness of the library as a source of materials beyond course textbooks: *Books and other resources to help with research / Large supply of books and research material / access to journals*. The remaining respondents wrote about their expectations of library stock in a more general way, using terms such as books, resources, information and literature.

Only two respondents mentioned online library services and resources in response to this question. One student, rather than comment directly about their expectations of the library, took the opportunity to remark that they were *impressed with the amount of resources available online*. This suggests that perhaps the student did not expect so many resources to be available online. By contrast, one student commented *I expected good library service (online as well)*.

Four students out of the 24 who completed questionnaires mentioned IT provision, including two who expected to find computers in the library, one who expected to be able to print in the library, and one student who expected to find *technology*.

4.2 Question 2: Describe what you remember doing/happening in the library induction

The striking feature of the responses to this question is the number of references to some kind of talk or lecture. Nineteen out of the 24 responses indicated that they had received a talk, presentation, lecture or similar, or they had been shown or told something, or had something explained to them during the library induction. These responses all suggest that the students played a fairly passive part in the library induction. Just two students suggested they had taken a more active role with one commenting *I remember learning about referencing* and another noting *we learnt how to take out books*.

An additional key theme of the responses to these questions was tools and systems. Seventeen respondents reported being shown a tool or system of some sort, including Surrey's discovery tool SurreySearch, or more generally, the online library.

Seven respondents remembered their library induction including information about the help and support library staff could offer. Comments included: *They showed...where you could find help in case you need that* and *We were told about SPLASH* [the University's learning development service].

4.3 Question 3: What thoughts and feelings do you remember experiencing during Welcome Week?

The most commonly reported emotions reported in response to this question were nervousness, anxiety and fear. Fourteen out of the 24 completed questionnaires mentioned this kind of feeling. Some anxiety was connected to moving away from home: *Nervous to be away from home / Homesick*. Others felt nervous about meeting expectations at university: *Slightly nervous about what was expected of me in the first year / Quite nervous about the level of work that would be expected of me*, while others' concerns were related to integrating socially: *Nervous about making friends / Anxious about meeting my flatmates*. One student reported being *too shy to attend some of the welcome week talks*. Two students mentioned plagiarism in their response to this question with one commenting: *[Plagiarism] shouldn't be made to sound as if students will deliberately cheat and copy other people's work but the uni should understand people can do it by accident and make it clear how they can avoid this*.

However, many participants also reported experiencing positive feelings during Welcome Week, with 11 mentioning excitement, fun or curiosity: *Welcome Week was fun, exciting and enjoyable / Excited to move away from home for the first time / Excited to start my study year.*

Despite many feeling nervous, some participants indicated that they felt reassured during Welcome Week: *I was quite anxious at first, however the university offers a lot of support / Was good to hear about how to get everywhere, so was relieved, I met with other first years and interacted with department staff which increased my confidence.*

Just one respondent noted that they felt overwhelmed during Welcome Week, listing: *lots of information, feeling a bit overwhelmed, not entirely understanding how it all fitted together.*

Similarly, just one student specifically mentioned the effect of induction sessions taking place in the same week as social activities: *9ams hungover were an experience.* Another student alluded to the timing of the library induction in particular: *Confused by library induction – at the time I didn't understand the induction as I hadn't used it myself yet.* Two students expressed some frustration over the planning of Welcome Week, with two suggesting that much of the information could have been delivered in a different format: *Sometimes the talks were repetitive. I have done induction online [sic] / Some of the presentations had essential information, however others could have been shorter or made into a leaflet.*

5. Discussion

The aim of this research was to explore and elucidate the experience of students attending a library induction during Welcome Week at the University of Surrey, in the hope that the findings could be used to inform development of the induction. As discussed in the section 'Limitations', some responses may have been biased and therefore no firm conclusions can be drawn. However, the results gathered do raise questions around librarians' current practice and the University's learning environments, and point to areas which merit further research. Some of these questions and areas for research are discussed in this section.

It is well documented that academic librarians are concerned that learners face information overload during their studies (Blummer & Kenton, 2014; Bridle & Carritt, 2014; Sales, 2013). However just one student identified feeling overwhelmed with information during Welcome Week. Perhaps others may have identified with this feeling had they been probed, but almost none chose to disclose it on the questionnaire. Perhaps an interview would be a more appropriate choice for delving deeper into potentially sensitive subjects such as feeling overwhelmed. This is an opportunity for further research.

Another area in which librarians may have expected students to comment is balancing participating in social activities with attending and concentrating in academic sessions during Welcome Week. However just one student alluded to this issue claiming that *9ams hungover were an experience.* The student adopts a light-hearted tone here, but if students genuinely struggle to concentrate in early sessions during Welcome Week then the issue demands serious consideration. Again, it is possible that more than one student would have identified with this issue had they been asked in an interview setting. It may be that students did not feel comfortable mentioning the impact of their social exploits on the questionnaire. It is also possible that some students do not feel that the co-existence of academic sessions and late-night socialising is an issue for concern. Further investigation is warranted in this area to reach firm conclusions.

Feelings of nervousness, fear and anxiety feature strongly in the responses. Although on the surface not in the remit of the library, there is an implication for practice in that librarians may wish to consider whether there is a place for addressing these feelings in a library induction. The student responses also indicate that many experience a sense of reassurance during Welcome Week, so it is likely that the University is already alleviating the initial concerns of students through

Welcome Week activities. Librarians at the University of Surrey could consider how they can contribute to reassuring students at an early stage. Possibilities include re-thinking the learning environment by providing resources for students to engage with before Welcome Week begins in an attempt to allay fears before starting University. In addition, library inductions could perhaps include activities which facilitate social integration, with a view to reducing feelings of anxiety about making friends at university.

It was interesting, although perhaps not surprising, to note that the vast majority of completed questionnaires included mention of the physical library: both the stock and the space. While not necessarily a problem in itself, this issue is worth some attention if it is possible that the library's online services and resources are not fully understood by students. To be successful in their studies students must find and access information online so it is essential that they have the skills and awareness to do this. However, a small minority of students mentioned online services or resources in their responses to the questionnaire, which may indicate that few students consider online material as a key part of the library. To address this issue perhaps library inductions could move away from delivering basic information which relates to the physical library e.g. book borrowing, locating items on the shelves (this information is readily available on the library website), and focus on supporting students to develop skills in using online services and resources. To totally re-think the learning environment at Surrey, this issue may also be addressed by moving part, or all, of the library induction online, which could set a precedent that students' main interactions with the library will be virtual rather than physical.

The findings of this research highlight the perception amongst students of the library induction as a talk, lecture, presentation or other passive mode of learning. It was not evident in the responses that any student viewed this negatively, or thought it unusual, but equally there was no particular enthusiasm for this method of delivery. It may be desirable for librarians at the University of Surrey to alter their practice and design more interactive induction sessions. Interactive learning could take place online, for example via a quiz, or online task. Alternatively a face-to-face interactive session could replace the existing lecture-style session; with much information being available online, the interactive session could focus on group discussion rather than didactic information transmission.

6. Recommendations for further research

The findings of this research, although in no way conclusive, have highlighted several areas of practice for librarians at the University of Surrey to consider reviewing. To gain more conclusive insights into the experience of a student attending Welcome Week at the University of Surrey further research is recommended into students' thoughts about, and experiences of, the timing of the library induction, methods of delivery of information, their perceptions of the online library, and their feelings of nervousness, fear and anxiety in their first week at university.

References

Baker, A. (2014). Students' preferences regarding four characteristics of information literacy screencasts. *Journal of Library and Information Services in Distance Learning*, 8(1–2), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1533290X.2014.916247>

Blummer, B. & Kenton, J. (2014). Reducing patron information overload in academic libraries. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 21(2), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2014.906786>

Boger, T. S., Dybvik, H., Eng, A., & Norheim, E. H. (2015). The impact of library information literacy classes on first-year undergraduate students' search behaviour. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 9(1), 34–46. <https://doi.org/10.11645/9.1.1979>

Boss, K., Angell, K. & Tewell, E. (2015). The Amazing Library Race: Tracking student engagement and learning comprehension in library orientations. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 9(1), 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.11645/9.1.1885>

Bridle, O. & Carritt, A. (2014). Library Assistant – Improving the student experience of Oxford libraries through a mobile library induction. *Proceedings of the IATUL Conferences. Paper 1*. Available at: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/iatul/2014/dlspace/1> [Accessed: 23 November 2017].

Budd, J. M. (2005). Phenomenology and information studies. *Journal of Documentation*, 61(1), 44–59. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410510578005>

Burnett, S. & Collins, S. (2007). Ask the audience! Using a personal response system to enhance information literacy and induction sessions at Kingston University. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 1(2), 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.11645/1.2.15>

Carpmael, C., Morgan, S. & Nichols, J. (1992). Library orientation: A workable alternative? *Library Review*, 41(4), 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00242539210017680>

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed). Abingdon: Routledge.

Essex, J. & Watts, J. (2011). Trialling an indicator of the impact of two library induction models. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 17(2), 222–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2011.593856>

Fraser, J., Shaw, K. & Ruston, S. (2013). Academic library collaboration in supporting students pre-induction: The Head Start Project. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 19(2), 125–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2013.800755>

Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analyzing qualitative data*. London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208574>

Gross, M. & Latham, D. (2012). What's skill got to do with it?: Information literacy skills and self-views of ability among first-year college students. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(3), 574–583. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21681>

Higher Education Academy (2011). *The UK Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning in higher education*. Available at: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/downloads/ukpsf_2011_english.pdf [Accessed: 23 November 2017].

Hughes, G. & Smail, O. (2014). Which aspects of university life are most and least helpful in the transition to HE? A qualitative snapshot of student perceptions. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 39(4), 466–480. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2014.971109>

Kruger, J. & Dunning, D. (1999). Unskilled and unaware of it: how difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(6), 1121–1134. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1121>

- Latham, D. & Gross, M. (2013). Instructional preferences of first-year college students with below-proficient information literacy skills: A focus group study. *College and Research Libraries*, 74(5), 430–449. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-343>
- Margolin, S. & Hayden, W. (2015). Beyond mechanics: Reframing the pedagogy and development of information literacy teaching tools. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41(5), 602–612. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.07.001>
- Maslow, A. H. (1987). *Motivation and personality* (3rd ed). New York: Harper and Row.
- Maunder, R. E., Cunliffe, M., Glavin, J., Mjali, S., & Rogers, J. (2013). Listening to student voices: Student researchers exploring undergraduate experiences of university transition. *Higher Education*, 66(2), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9595-3>
- McGuinness, C. (2006). What faculty think – exploring the barriers to information literacy development in undergraduate education. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(6), 573–582. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2006.06.002>
- McKeever, C. M. (2013). Information literacy skills in Year 14 school leaving pupils – are they ready for third level study? *Journal of Information Literacy*, 7(1), 99–106. <https://doi.org/10.11645/7.1.1784>
- Morgan, N. (2004). Innovative library induction – introducing the “Cephalonian Method”. *SCONUL Focus*, 32, 4–8. Available at: <https://www.sconul.ac.uk/publication/sconul-focus-32> [Accessed: 23 November 2017].
- Sales, N. (2013). Flipping the classroom: Revolutionising legal research training. *Legal Information Management*, 13(4), 231–235. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1472669613000534>
- Thompson, K., Kardos, R. & Knapp, L. (2008). From tourist to treasure hunter: A self-guided orientation programme for first-year students. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 25(1), 69–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2007.00760.x>
- Verlander, P. & Scutt, C. (2009). Teaching information skills to large groups with limited time and resources. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 3(1), 31–42. <https://doi.org/10.11645/3.1.220>
- Wengraf, T. (2001). *Qualitative research interviewing: Biographic narratives and semi-structured methods*. Sage: London.
- Wingate, U. (2006). Doing away with “study skills”. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(4), 457–469. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600874268>

Appendix 1: Student worksheet

Please think back to your library induction, which took place during Welcome Week, and respond to the questions in the boxes below. Write whatever comes to mind. Grammar and spelling are not important here.

What can you remember about your expectations of the university library?

Describe what you remember doing/happening in the library induction

What thoughts and feelings do you remember experiencing during Welcome Week?

Appendix 2: Student information sheet

What is the undergraduate student's experience of library induction at the University of Surrey?

Information for participants

The library team are currently working on improving induction sessions for first-year undergraduate students. To inform our developments, we need an insight into the actual experience of students attending inductions as they currently are. Your comments, experiences and opinions will be used to inform induction improvements. This proposal has been approved via the University's 'self-assessment form: ethics' (SAFE).

Your contributions to this research may be used and shared in the following ways:

1. The research will be used within the library at the University of Surrey to inform induction improvements.
2. The research will be written up as a report and submitted for module 4 of the Graduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching, run by the Department for Higher Education.
3. The wider academic library community is interested in the general student experience of library inductions so your contributions may be shared more widely through the publication of this research in a relevant academic journal.

Your personal details will not be included in the research.

If you agree to participate in this research please print and sign your name below.

Name:.....

Signature:.....

Date:.....