ABSTRACT
As information literacy is a key competence of the information society, information literacy instruction in public as well as academic libraries is crucial. Today, librarians do not only act as providers of information but also as educators of the information society’s citizens. This study aims to assess the perceived quality of information literacy instruction in libraries of Canada’s informational cities: Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. Therefore, librarians were interviewed by means of a questionnaire inspired by the SERVQUAL diagnostic tool. The questionnaire comprises of two parts: The first part consists of questions regarding information literacy instruction, in the second part the focus is on the seven competence areas of information literacy. Based on the difference between the librarians’ “Expectation” and “Experience” scores, gap scores for all questionnaire items were calculated and are now being presented and discussed. At the same time, results of public and academic libraries are compared to show the differences in information literacy instruction and the perceived value of the different information literacy competence areas.
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INTRODUCTION
Information Literacy: Key Competence of the Information Society
The most significant aspect of the information society is not only the availability and rapid development of information and communications technologies (ICTs), but the people utilizing those and the movement of information between them. It is the information literate individual who creates and uses information to convey knowledge, and thus stimulates innovation (Stock, 2000; Webster, 2006). In a modern society, knowledge is essential for progress and economic success (Mainka, 2011). Organisational knowledge cannot exist without the knowledge of individuals who form ideas, who “share and develop knowledge” (Nonaka, 1994, p. 15). Creation of knowledge in turn is only possible through the information flow between individuals, communities and organisations. Since information influences every economic sector, and affects every individual in all stages of life (Stock, 2000), there is no doubt that information literacy is one of the key competencies of the information society. Information literacy is not only defined as an essential skill set for every individual living in the information society, but also as a tool of empowerment and a catalyst for equality (IFLA, 2014). But how does one acquire information literacy skills?

Librarians: Educators of the Information Society
In the past “the practice of teaching information literacy skills has been largely restricted to the context of higher education” (Campbell, 2008, p.18). However, in the information society, instruction may not be restricted to individuals who have the privilege of higher education – it is to be made available for all individuals equally. The nature and purpose of the modern library meets these requirements precisely:

Library and information services are key actors in providing unhindered access to essential resources for economic and cultural advance. In doing so, they contribute effectively to the development and maintenance of intellectual freedom, safeguarding democratic values and universal civil rights. They encourage social inclusion, by striving to serve all those in their user communities regardless of age, gender, economic or employment status, literacy or technical skills, cultural or ethnic origin, religious or political beliefs, sexual orientation, and physical or mental ability. (IFLA, 2003, p. 2)
Today, both public and academic libraries all over the world contribute to promoting information literacy among the people. Librarians take the role of the “experienced, focused guides” supporting individuals at becoming “a more intelligent consumer in this supermarket of information” (Boyer, 1998, p. 27), acting as educators of the information society. This has not always been an objective of the library: “Librarians have a long tradition of offering bibliographic instruction but more recently have expanded their instructional repertoire to include more generalizable information literacy skills” (Julien & Pecoskie, 2009, p. 149). As the information and knowledge-based economy evolves and technology advances, librarians need to address the changes laid out before them, reposition themselves as well as their institutions (Foo et al., 2002), and transition from “transmitter[s] of knowledge to (...) facilitator[s] of learning” (Woodard, 2003, p. 190). It is now our goal to investigate how far and well this transition has progressed, both in public and academic facilities.

Research in Informational Cities

While literature on information literacy instruction is not, actual research on its implementation in libraries is scarce:

The literature relating to information literacy instruction is vast, demonstrating the considerable attention devoted to this area of service, but generalizable empirical research into the practices of instruction in libraries, and the challenges associated with those practices, is very limited. (Julien & Genuis, 2011, p. 103)

Following the lead of Heidi Julien and her colleagues (Julien, 2000; Julien & Boon, 2002; Julien & Boon, 2004; Julien & Breu, 2005; Julien & Hoffman, 2008; Julien & Pecoskie, 2009; Julien & Genuis, 2011; Julien et al., 2013), we aim to investigate information literacy instruction in public and academic libraries of Canada.

Within the scope of the project “Informational World Cities” of Heinrich-Heine University in Düsseldorf, Germany, 31 informational world cities have been identified and investigated. Among other research, Mainka et al. (2013) evaluated core services of public libraries in all of the 31 informational world cities, resulting in a cumulative ranking. Of particular note are the very high rankings of Canada’s public libraries. In Canada, there are three cities currently being acknowledged as informational world cities by Mainka et al.: Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. As “prototypical cities of the knowledge society” (Stock, 2011, p. 980) informational cities pose a particularly interesting object of investigation for our research.

Our approach is to interview librarians personally, to gain insight into their current practices and challenges of information literacy instruction. The general questions of this survey are: What do librarians of Canadian informational cities expect regarding information literacy instruction? Are their expectations being fulfilled at their own institutions? And if not, what are the reasons? Our priority is to get an overview of the instructional trends in libraries of Canadian informational cities and to identify the greatest deficits and problems of instructional education. Another motivation of the survey, apart from assessing the current developments and tendencies of information literacy instruction, is the investigation of similarities and differences among public and academic institutions, particularly concerning the assessment of the specific competence areas of information literacy.

In the following, the methods of this survey and the structure of the used survey instrument will be described. After a short presentation of the quantitative results, findings will be discussed and compared to results of similar work. Finally, we will summarise the most important points.

METHODS

The Interviews

We approached academic and public libraries in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver to find participants for our study focused on information literacy instruction and programs in libraries of informational cities of Canada. We directed our enquiry to individuals in charge of library programs and information literacy instruction at those libraries to ensure that interviewees had the background and insight necessary for our research. The facilities participating in our survey ranged from small institutions – for instance Westmount Public Library with a total of 8122 members (Westmount Public Library, 2012) – to “the largest public library system in North America, Toronto Public Library, serving a population of 2.3 million” (Toronto Public Library, 2014). We visited both academic (n=7) and public (n=6) facilities personally, to work through our questionnaire and initiate discussions on their current situation and work regarding information literacy instruction. Due to the fact that often more than one person in charge of instruction was interested in participating in our work, not only one-on-one interviews – as originally intended – but also group interviews were made possible. We welcomed this opportunity as it would allow a wider perspective on the topics and generate more input for the qualitative evaluation. The interviews were conducted in March and April 2014. The interview procedure was mainly defined by the questionnaire we created beforehand. After a short introduction and explanation of the tool by the interviewer, topics would be introduced by the questionnaire items. After every question, an explanation by the interviewee or even a short discussion of their opinions and experiences would follow to eventually decide on a rating from 1 to 7. This way, quantitative data as well as qualitative information was generated. After the questionnaire there was time for an open discussion or further questions. Questions occurring before or during the interview were clarified directly.

The Questionnaire

The Questionnaire
quantitative data, enabling a data-based comparison
model “developed in the business world” to “the academic
instrument to measure service quality and what customers
Later, in 1996, Nitecki described the SERVQUAL “as an
retailing organizations” (Parasuraman et al., 1988, p. 12).

The questionnaire was added to the interviews to generate
quantitative data, enabling a data-based comparison
between academic and public libraries. Its structure was
derived from the SERVQUAL diagnostic tool. Introduced
in 1988 by Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry, SERVQUAL
is a model and tool originally intended “for assessing
customer perceptions of service quality in service and
retailing organizations” (Parasuraman et al., 1988, p. 12).
Later, in 1996, Nitecki described the SERVQUAL “as an
instrument to measure service quality and what customers
value as important” (p. 181). He suggests transferring the
model “developed in the business world” to “the academic
library setting” (p.188). Here, it can be applied to measure
the perceived service quality of academic library services
(Nitecki, 1996). We want to go a step further and apply the
SERVQUAL to library work in a different way. We applied
the SERVQUAL tool to the library setting and used a
modified version as an instrument to measure the quality of
information literacy instruction based on what librarians
themselves value as important. The objective of this survey
was a juxtaposition of the participant’s “Expectation” and
“Perception” (here: “Experience”, see Figure 1), as
presented in the concept of Parasuraman et al. – but the
system of 22 items spread over the five dimensions
“Tangibles”, “Reliability”, “Responsiveness”, “Assurance”
and “Empathy” (Parasuraman et al., 1988, p. 23) did not
seem applicable to our research. Instead we introduced a
questionnaire with 18 pairs of questions specifically
composed for our interest. Items are numbered from 1 to 18
and always consist of two questions – one for the
“Expectation” column (left side) and one for the
“Experience” column (right side) of the questionnaire. All
questions are formulated in the same manner (see Figure 1):
“How important do you consider _____, in general?” and
“What value does _____ have at your library?” are the
templates for all items. All items were to be rated by a
seven-point Likert-type scale (Likert, 1932) ranging from
“Not at all important” (1) to “Extremely important” (7)
(Vagias, 2006). Participants were allowed to rate their own
expectation and experience, according to these importance
levels, by marking the corresponding number below each
question.

The questionnaire comprises of two parts: Part I (items 1-
11) consists of questions regarding information literacy
instruction, in Part II (items 12-18) the seven competence
areas of information literacy are being thematised directly
(see Table 1).

The first part of the questionnaire includes 11 items,
foocing on seven different topics connected to library
instruction. More precisely, it covers the following topics:
qualification and continuing training of library staff (item 1),
assessment of instruction outcomes (item 2), focus of
instruction (i.e. beginners or advanced learners, items 3 and
4), contents of instruction (i.e. databases, information
technology, online safety, items 9-11), importance of
technical-spatial infrastructure (item 5) and methods of
instruction for information literacy (items 6-8).

Item 1 was inspired by the principle of life-long learning.
This principle applies to library staff as well as to everyone
else living in the information society. It includes “regular
and continuing education” (Woolls, 1991, p. 109). The
rapid development of new information technologies and
media as well as the changing expectations require a large
range of competencies and a continuing education of
librarians (Kaegbein, 1989). With the help of item 2,
assessment of instruction outcomes is being discussed. This
has become more and more important as libraries “are
increasingly called upon to demonstrate student learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pt</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualification and continuing training of library staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of instruction outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus of instruction: Beginners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus of instruction: Advanced Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of technical-spatial infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction method: Face-to-face courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction method: eLearning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction method: Problem-oriented support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contents of instruction: Specialised databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contents of instruction: Online safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contents of instruction: Information technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Realising and phrasing an information demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Locating and exploiting information that is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Critically evaluating information and its sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Using information efficiently and constructively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Managing and organising information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generating, quoting and presenting information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Considering the rights and obligations regarding the use and distribution of information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Questionnaire Content and Segmentation
outcomes and the tangible benefits of library educational programs” (Schilling & Applegate, 2012, p. 258). Public libraries are experiencing the pressure to “prove and improve institutional effectiveness as part of an increased demand for accountability” as well as academic libraries (Hernon & Dugan, 2002, p. 56). Classes and workshops at libraries often are classified into proficiency-levels. An example is the distribution into “Beginner”, “Intermediate” and “Advanced” groups (e.g. language courses, Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006). Academic libraries commonly divide into courses for beginners, and advanced courses (e.g. Hahn et al., 2012), which is thematised in items 3 and 4. Courses for beginners cover basics as for example operating a personal computer while courses for advanced learners require prior knowledge in the respective field. Items 9 to 11 focus on instruction content. There is a large number of different courses available when it comes to instruction in libraries. We chose three topics that we were particularly interested in – especially but not exclusively because we expected responses from academic and public libraries to differ. We wanted to consult librarians on the instruction regarding specialised databases, information technology and online safety. Another piece in the puzzle of information literacy instruction is the technical-spatial infrastructure of the library (item 5). This includes the provision of working spaces as well as access to different technologies and the internet. Libraries are multi-functional social institutions – supplying learning, working and communication spaces (Eigenbrodt, 2011). We believe, that – even in the digital age – the physical library offers a very important added value for the information society. In the questionnaire there are three items contributed to assessing the importance of different methods of information literacy instructions in a library: courses, e-learning and assistance at the point of need (Hütte et al., 2009).

The second part of the questionnaire is based on Beutelspacher’s (2014) seven competence areas of information literacy. Beutelspacher evaluated contemporary definitions, models and standards of information literacy to develop a generic list of 62 indicators. The aim of this work was to define a set of abilities individuals should have to assert themselves in the knowledge society. The information literacy indicators are partitioned into seven competence areas which we furthermore centralised into seven ability descriptions:

1. realising and phrasing an information demand;
2. locating and exploiting information that is needed;
3. critically evaluating information and its sources;
4. using information efficiently and constructively;
5. managing and organising information;
6. generating, quoting and presenting information;
7. considering the rights and obligations regarding the use and distribution of information.

Question pairs 12-18 of the questionnaire match these descriptions. This way, librarians are to rate the importance and also their experience of instructing each information literacy competence area (1-7) separately. This part was designed to determine whether library instruction in public
and academic libraries of Canada emphasises different aspects of information literacy and if certain competences are deemed more important than others in general.

RESULTS
Based on the difference between Expectation score ($E_1$) and Experience score ($E_2$), the gap score ($G$) could be calculated ($G = E_2 - E_1$). The gap score $G$ describes the discrepancy between expectation and experience of the current situation as it is perceived by librarians. We use the gap scores to identify deficits in library instruction: High expectation scores reflect high expectations of the participants, while a corresponding low experience score will result in an equally high gap score, indicating deficits in that respective area. For group interviews the results of the standardised questions and answers of the questionnaire were combined to one rating for each library. Figure 2 shows the overall expectation and experience scores for all surveyed libraries in Canada. Expectation scores ranged from 5.42 (question 11) to 6.85 (question 13) with an average expectation score of 6.09. In comparison, experience scores ranged from 3.9 (question 2) to 6.14 (question 6) with an average experience score of 5.21, resulting in an average difference of 0.88 (absolute value of the average gap score). The absolute deviation of ratings per item is shown in Figure 2 as well. It ranges from 0.1 to 1.38 for expectation values and from 0.25 to 2.0 for experience values on the municipal level. The overall gap scores for all surveyed libraries are shown in Figure 3. Gap scores ranged from 0.02 (question 6) to -2.12 (question 2) with an average gap score of -0.88. The top three deficits recorded are the assessment of instruction outcomes as examined by question 2, online safety awareness ($G_{10} = -1.63$; question 10) and promotion of the ability to use information efficiently and constructively ($G_{15} = -1.37$; question 15). Significance of gap scores could be verified in 11 of 18 cases – but not for questions 1, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14 and 18 (see Figure 3). We divided the collected data set into two parts. Subset $S_A$ consisting of data from academic libraries and subset $S_P$ composed of the data collected from public libraries. A difference between the gap scores of the two subsets $S_A$ and $S_P$ became noticeable (see Figure 4). Significance (t-test) for this difference, however, was exclusively verified for the p-value of question 9 ($P_9 = 0.006$). Marginal significance could be verified for items 14 and 17 ($P_{14} = 0.063; P_{17} = 0.078$). The top three highest gap scores for academic libraries were calculated for question 2 ($S_A; G_2 = -2.17$), question 10 ($S_A; G_{10} = -1.93$) and question 15 ($S_A; G_{15} = -1.91$). The top two deficits regarding public libraries were recorded for question 2 ($S_P; G_2 = -2.0$) and question 12 ($S_P; G_2 = -1.33$). Questions 10 and 13 share the same gap score ($G_{10,13} = -1.17$) which is the third highest for all public libraries surveyed. The average gap score for academic libraries is -0.96, while the average gap score for public libraries amounts to -0.75. Taking a closer look at Part II of the questionnaire (see Figure 5), expectation scores for subset $S_A$ range from 6.57 to 7 whereas the score for subset $S_P$ range from 5.0 to 6.67. In this part of the questionnaire, the average expectation score for $S_A$ is 6.81 and the average expectation score for $S_P$ is 5.81, resulting in
a rating difference of 1.03 between average expectation scores of academic and public libraries, for an evaluation limited to the items concerning information literacy competence areas. In this field, question 13 (Sₐ,E₁₃ = 7; Sₐ,E₁₃ = 6.67) reached the highest expectation score for both subsets, followed by question 14 (Sₐ,E₁₄ = 7) for academic libraries and question 18 (Sₚ,E₁₈ = 6.34) for public libraries.

DISCUSSION

Findings

The results of this study indicate that the majority of librarians surveyed have high expectations of information literacy instruction and the library services which were discussed throughout this survey. Average expectation scores for all topics covered in the questionnaire were higher than 5, meaning they were considered above "moderately important". Furthermore, eleven out of 18 items were considered to be "very important" or more. Expectations were not always fulfilled, resulting in the origination of gaps. Negative gap scores, indicating deficits ranging from moderate to large, were calculated in units where significance could be verified (see Figure 3). Out of these units, ten are to be rated as moderate deficits (Q₃ - Q₅, Q₇, Q₁₀, Q₁₂, Q₁₃, Q₁₅ - Q₁₇) and one as a large deficit (Q₂). Therefore we can assume that library instruction of the institutions surveyed, in its current state, still leaves room for improvement.

According to our results, librarians were concerned about the assessment of instruction outcomes the most. Although the value of information gained through assessing learning outcomes is being understood, most libraries were still lacking the necessary methods or resources to implement this procedure. Research findings of other parties confirm this concern. Julien and Boon (2002, p. 145) found that "little evaluation of instructional outcomes is apparent" in Canadian academic libraries. In their study, librarians remarked having the impression that instruction evaluation was ineffective or not useful enough. In a later study, they noted that "evaluation or quantitative measures of institutionally significant outcomes of information literacy instruction" were not available at any institution they visited (Julien & Boon, 2004). Hovde (2000, p. 4) reasons that, "unlike education or psychology, the library profession lacks standardized test instruments and the associated body of accrued statistical data for comparative analysis." She further explains that it is difficult to create these test instruments, due to the fast-paced changes library work is remarkably influenced by:

Library instruction is also subject to a more accelerated evolution of purpose and design than equivalent instruction in the standard academic disciplines. Where change is speedy and reactive (responding, for example, to the acquisition of new computer platforms or products), it is more difficult to build in evaluation measures (...). (Hovde, 2000, p. 4)

Not only change but also the "hybrid nature" and the "multi-faceted" content of library instruction (Hovde, 2000, p. 4) make it considerably more difficult for librarians to properly assess instruction outcomes. Apart from the fact that the assessment of instruction outcomes is difficult, it is clearly an important issue that has to be taken care of in the near future:

A professional approach to instruction, as to any activity, requires that the allocation of resources to that activity is justified by evaluating its outcomes. Evaluation may be qualitative and/or quantitative, but must be done in a systematic, reliable, and valid manner, to ensure that intentions are matched by results. Specific advice on evaluation abounds; it is incumbent on instructors to apply it. (Julien & Boon, 2002, p. 148)

Another gap resulted from the question about online safety and security instruction (question 10). While some librarians were planning to implement "e-safety" elements in the future, many participants did not consider this as a task for libraries at all. Indeed, information on e-safety instruction in libraries is scarce. But as new technologies are being developed and "used increasingly in teaching and learning contexts", e-safety becomes more and more important (Becta, 2006a, p. 1). The list of possible risks and dangers is endless: "commercial exploitation", cyber-bullying, "exposure to age-inappropriate material", "exposure to inaccurate or misleading information", "exposure to illegal material", "disclosure of personal information", "physical danger" and "[computer] viruses" are just a few of them (Becta, 2006b, p.11; Cranmer et al., 2009, p. 128; Chou & Peng, 2011, p. 44). The majority of
Most institutions were still working at establishing workshops, they experienced a gap regarding e-learning. Librarians were confident in their face-to-face courses and learning and new technologies as we speak. While Library instruction is heading into the direction of e-learning, there is a clear need to raise awareness for the importance of information literacy. Many libraries focus on beginner instruction rather than advanced courses – yet we hope that the gap of funding issues, budget cuts and the lack of resources, it is understandable that libraries focus on beginner instruction rather than advanced courses – yet we hope that the gap scores for both target groups will decrease with the growing awareness for the importance of information literacy instruction.

studies concerning online safety and security are focused on the protection of children and students – but awareness should be raised among members of every target group. Age does not protect from internet scams, spam mails or accidental copyright violation. We hereby address the need for online safety and security education in libraries of the information society and hope to find more efforts towards this issue in the coming years.

We questioned librarians about their institution’s technical-spatial infrastructure. The facilities provided were experienced as not sufficient, resulting in an average gap score of -1.22. Also, a national survey in 2005 found that only a “minority of respondents” from public libraries had “physical space dedicated to [information literacy] training” available in their institutions (Julien & Breu, p. 295). Although the quantity of institutions with this problem seems to have declined (Julien et al., 2013), it is nevertheless still an issue, as indicated by the results of this survey. Not only space for instruction, but also space for recreational activities, social gatherings and other purposes is necessary in a modern library (Weise, 2004). A positive example we had the opportunity to visit was the Bibliothèque Marc-Favreau in Montreal (Bibliothèques Montréal, 2014). The architecturally appealing library building with its modern, light-filled and comfortable spaces as well as multi-medial facilities was designed for library users of all ages and sets a good example for the physical aspects a library of the information society should have.

Library instruction is heading into the direction of e-learning and new technologies as we speak. While librarians were confident in their face-to-face courses and workshops, they experienced a gap regarding e-learning services. Most institutions were still working at establishing online courses and tutorials, videos and other e-learning elements at their library. E-learning was highlighted as an important instructional tool of the future. Academic libraries considered this even more important than public libraries and not without reason: Apart from the “cost-effectiveness” of new media and technologies, Reeves (1998, p. 4) praised their “many other advantages in terms of repeatability, transportability, and increased equity of access.” Julien and Genuis (2011, p. 108) also found that “the focus, tools and methods of teaching [in libraries]” are being influenced by “the impact of changing technology”. One of their participants said: “The increased use of technology has made the work an ongoing learning experience, challenging and fun. I’m always learning new technology. Wonderful but sometimes exhausting.” (p. 108)

Librarians are not only blessed by the advantages of new technologies, but also feel challenged by the high expectations and “the sheer size of the information universe and its complexity” (Julien & Genuis, 2011, p.108). In this context, it is necessary to, again, point out the important aspect of life-long learning for librarians. New technologies are placing “increased demands on teachers’ own information literacy skills, their ability to facilitate learning, their capacity to teach critical thinking and inquiry, their determination to empower students to be responsible for their own learning, and their own technological skills” (Goldfarb, 1999, p. 114). The readiness to embrace technological change and to continually learn, will be of great benefit for the modern librarian – for information literacy instruction online and offline, as well as the assistance at the point of need. The latter was still considered to be a reliable and valued service of the library. Some participants preferred to teach information literacy at those occasions, some were convinced that library users just want a quick answer. In the end, many details – be it the decision between teaching the way and just returning the solution, or tackling the never-ending task of continuous training – often depend on the individual librarian.

At the beginning of this study, the question aroused as to whether information literacy instruction should focus on beginners or rather on advanced learners. The results of the questionnaire indicate that beginners are deemed to be slightly more important as a target group. Public libraries clearly put more emphasis on their education whereas librarians from academic institutions are still arguing why one of the target groups would be more suitable for information literacy instruction than the other. According to Hanke et al. (2012), programs are not to be restricted to just one target group. Instruction should be equally available for beginners and advanced learners. Against the background of funding issues, budget cuts and the lack of resources, it is understandable that libraries focus on beginner instruction rather than advanced courses – yet we hope that the gap scores for both target groups will decrease with the growing awareness for the importance of information literacy instruction.
Participants from both public and academic libraries understood the value of the information literacy competence areas, although academic librarians deemed them more important than their colleagues from public institutions. The highest gap score for this part of the questionnaire was recorded for the promotion of an efficient and constructive use of information. Both public and academic librarians put their highest expectations into the promotion of the ability to locate and exploit needed information. Yet, in this second part of the questionnaire, expectation scores of public libraries were always below academic library expectation scores – 1.03 points on average (see Figure 5). Interviewees indicated not considering certain areas of information literacy instruction as a responsibility of the public library. They rather tried to cater to people’s every day needs, such as how to use the phone. A survey from 2005 came to the same conclusion: That “[information literacy] training is not a priority in public libraries” (Julien & Breu, 2005, p. 297). Even through academic libraries certainly work on promoting information literacy skills among students and staff, public libraries have to be aware of their responsibility towards the rest of the community:

People who do not attend postsecondary educational institutions, which typically are mandated to provide at least a minimum level of IL skills training for students, have few places to turn for training in this increasingly important skill set. If citizens are to participate fully in the digital age, in order to efficiently access, effectively evaluate, and appropriately use information to inform their decision making in all aspects of their lives, then these citizens require training in IL skills. (Julien & Hoffman, 2008, p. 39)

In our quantitative and qualitative results, we exclusively rely on the participants’ assessment of the optimal and current situation in Canadian libraries. Experience and expectation ratings were not determined by substantive evidence but on the basis of the interviewees’ beliefs. There is no valid evidence for these insufficiencies brought to light in the form of gap scores. Yet we place a great degree of trust in the opinion of the information professionals we spoke to and feel confirmed in that due to the occurrence of agreement between most interview participants. As we preferred to conduct interviews personally, we were able to answer questions and clarify any ambiguities directly. However, the validity of results rendered by Likert-type scales can be compromised due to social desirability bias (Rosenthal et al., 1962). Last but not least, the absolute deviations on the institutional level were high. This originates from the fact that public and academic libraries had different priorities regarding information literacy instruction. However, on the municipal level, deviations decrease considerably. We tried to get an overview of the issues concerning library instruction in public and academic libraries, but the topics mentioned here have not been examined in detail yet. The qualitative results of this study, which will soon be published, will support this task and give more insight into the current situation and challenges of information literacy instruction as well as future developments as planned by the library staff. The next steps are to get a deeper insight into the matters relevant to improve the situation, and to find sustainable solutions for the problems stated. We need to further raise awareness of the challenges librarians are confronted with, in their struggle to provide instruction whereas limited resources and further budget cuts complicate the process significantly. The importance and beneficial impact of information literacy instruction for the information society has to be recognised.

CONCLUSION
Educating citizens of the information society has become a very important duty of public and academic libraries. By providing access to information and offering instruction, librarians can support us in becoming empowered, successful, information literate individuals. To get a better understanding of the current instruction practices in public and academic libraries we interviewed librarians in 13 institutions in the three Canadian informational cities: Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. We investigated different aspects regarding information literacy instruction and the value of the seven information literacy competence areas (Table 1). Inspired by the SERVQUAL diagnostic tool (Parasuraman et al., 1988), a questionnaire consisting of 18 question pairs was used. In the interviews, participants rated their own expectation and experience according to seven importance levels allowing us to calculate a gap score for each topic respectively. Librarians had high expectations for information literacy instruction in their institutions which were not always met. The largest deficits, indicated by high gap scores, were found in the...
assessment of instruction outcomes, online safety instruction and the promotion of the ability to use information efficiently and constructively (Figure 3). Librarians of public libraries had different priorities regarding instruction than librarians from academic libraries. Especially in regards to the information literacy competence areas where the cumulative expectation scores from public libraries are considerably lower than those of academic libraries (Figure 5). Public libraries play an important role in teaching information literacy skills to those who are not being provided any information literacy instruction otherwise. Therefore the question arises whether they should value the promotion of information literacy competencies as much as their colleagues from academic libraries.
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