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ABSTRACT
This study investigates how school librarians perceive their readiness in implementing information literacy (IL) education in schools. It addresses the concern that school librarians may not be adequately prepared in delivering the IL programmes in schools. This study uses a quantitative research approach with two data collection techniques; i.e. semi-structured interviews with eight school librarians and district officers, and a survey involving 710 school librarians from secondary schools in Malaysia. The school librarians’ readiness construct is derived from the cognitive, functional and technical sub-scales of IL education implementation readiness. It was found that school librarians’ professional qualification has an impact on their cognitive, functional and technical readiness. However, their experience as a school librarian had an impact on technical readiness only. The study emphasizes school librarians’ readiness as a factor in the successful implementation of information literacy education in Malaysian schools.
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INTRODUCTION
This paper discusses findings of a study on the self-perceived readiness of secondary school librarians in Malaysia, with a focus on implementation of information literacy (IL) education in schools. The motivation for this study was the first researcher’s experiences as a school librarian and the vast literature in information literacy that lacked studies to understand the implementers of IL in schools i.e. the school librarians.

Information literacy (IL) is a term used to describe the ability to find and use information effectively in relation to need and purpose. In 2012, the Moscow Declaration on Media and Information Literacy (UNESCO 2012), appealed to the relevant authorities to integrate media and information literacy in all national educational policies. It also urged support for necessary structural and pedagogical reforms in the education system and to integrate media and information literacy in the curricula, including systems of assessment at all levels of education, teacher training and workplace learning. These proposals further emphasized the importance of IL in the national education systems. The main purpose is to
improve student success in the classroom. However to do so, the policy makers must first understand that well-prepared teachers play an important role in achieving this. This would include well-trained school librarians to impart IL instruction to students. However, there remains an ideological divide on how to prepare school librarians, what the role of school librarians is, and how to ensure successful and effective implementation of IL in the school curricula.

The American Association of School Librarians (AASL 2013) proposes the school librarian as cadre of school specialists - reading specialists, technology integration specialists, curriculum specialists, or any other specialists with a whole-school mission. These roles require school librarians to be knowledgeable in IL and constantly update their personal skills in order to work effectively with teachers, administrators, and other staff to assist them in their information issues. To date much of the research on IL implementation has focussed mainly on pedagogical approaches in delivering and assessing effective IL instruction (Bruce 2004; Mokhtar and Majid 2006; Williams and Wavell 2006; Mokhtar, Majid and Foo 2008; Horton 2008; Halida et al. 2011; Rehman and AlAwadhi 2013) or the instructional role of the library media specialist (Drake 2007; Dotan and Aharony 2008). There have also been several studies on the perceptions of school media specialist or school librarians of their role in IL education (McCracken 2001; Miller 2002; Martin 2011; Smith 2013; Subramaniam et al. 2015). These studies have individually focussed on diverse issues affecting IL implementation, without much emphasis on the implementers themselves.

School librarians are at the forefront of successful IL education implementation in schools, yet little is known about their preparedness or readiness to successfully execute this responsibility. To date the extent of school librarians’ readiness in the IL education implementation in Malaysian secondary schools is relatively unknown. The literature suggests that school librarians may not be prepared to teach IL (Diao and Chandrawati 2005; Duke and Ward 2009; Norhayati 2009) as they appear to be lacking in IL skills and competencies (Tan and Singh 2008; 2010). This study therefore aims to address this void and tests a conceptual model of school librarians’ readiness towards IL education implementation in schools.

LITERATURE REVIEW

School Librarians in Malaysia

In Malaysia, school librarians are teachers who are academically qualified and professionally trained in the discipline of education. They are subject teachers and familiar with the school curriculum (Lee et al. 2003; Norhashimah 2007). Once their services are confirmed with at least three years of teaching experience, they are eligible to be appointed as school librarians (Ketua Pengarah Pelajaran Malaysia 2005). Their responsibilities include managing the school libraries in terms of budgeting, collection building and execution of the school library programme. They are expected to collaborate with teachers, the school management, the Teachers’ Activities Centre, the respective State Education Technology Departments, as well as the Federal Education Technology Division, to plan and implement information skills programme, carry out simple research, and provide in-house training to teachers in their respective schools. In addition, they may
have full-time teaching responsibilities (Abdullah 1999), which more recently has been revised to a reduced teaching workload. However, many of them have little or limited library and information science (LIS) qualifications (Raja Abdullah and Saidina Omar 2003). The general practice is for them to attend a Basic 35-hour School Resource Centre (SRC) Management course, followed by an Advanced 45-hour SRC Management Course prior to or after their appointment as school librarians (Abrizah 1999). The highest qualification may be a Master’s degree in LIS or Education Technology or Information Studies.

School Librarians and Information Literacy

The school librarians’ capability in their IL skills is empirically unknown. The school librarians may need better IL skills to provide services and perform their tasks in the school libraries (Combes 2008; Tan, Gorman and Singh 2012). Merchant and Hepworth (2002) observed the use of information resources by teachers and concluded that teachers are information literate but their skills were not transferred to their pupils, which they conclude could have been influenced by their attitude towards IL. In 2006, Williams and Wavell (2006) delved further into understanding the relationship between IL and learning. Their investigation into curriculum-based information activities led them to conclude that many teachers regard IL skills as cross-curriculum skills formation or a separate subject rather than a way of learning and teaching. Later Williams and Wavell (2007) found that teachers’ conception of IL is influenced by individual experiences and curriculum priorities. School librarians also face the dilemma of decreased support from their colleagues.

Two interesting studies focusing on the school librarians were conducted by Ritchie (2011) and Nelson (2011). Both studies investigated school librarians’ perception about their status and professional identity. Ritchie (2011) used the survey method to obtain a wider response, while Nelson (2011) used the semi-structured interview method to solicit in-depth perceptions of school librarians about their professional identity. Nelson found that school librarians often lacked current job descriptions, though they understood their professional role. The study by Kamal and Normah (2012a) found that schools in Malaysia do not employ full-time adequately trained professional school librarians. The school librarians were without proper professional library or information science training. Furthermore, Kamal and Normah, (2012b) also found that there was no formally instituted school librarian training policy and as such standard practices were not evident. They stressed that there was a clear lack of commitment in developing human resource for school libraries in Malaysia. Several researchers have found that school librarians need professional development relating to IL, particularly the information skills teaching programme, a framework of skills for students and practical help for teaching and evaluating information skills (Slyfield 2001; Clyde 2005; Probert 2006).

Smith (2013) found that secondary teachers were confused about the phrase of information literacy and were ill-prepared to instruct IL effectively. They need experience in IL instruction. This is an old and basic issue which is still facing neglect. In 1990, Buckley and Caple clarified training as a planned and systematic effort to modify or develop knowledge or skills or attitudes through learning experience and to achieve effective performance in an activity or range of activities. The training was to improve the school librarians’ performance to ensure that they achieved the best possible results in their job (Carliner 2003).
Experiential Learning Theory
The notion of “experiential learning” originated from the work of Dewey, Lewin and Piaget (Miettinen 2000). Kolb’s (1984) experiential learning theory describes learning as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience”. Based on the theory, it is assumed that experience plays a fundamental role in the school librarians’ learning process that combines experience, perception, cognition and behaviour. Thus, the school librarians’ experience may be the foundation for the creation of knowledge on IL. Therefore, Kolb’s experiential learning theory provides a link between theory and practice, between abstract generalisations and concrete experiences, as well as between the affective and cognitive domains. It provides linkages among school librarians’ education, work and personal development. Thus, the researchers adapted and utilized Kolb’s experiential learning theory (Kolb 1984; Kolb and Kolb 2008) to illustrate and justify that school librarians’ experience may have an impact on their knowledge, skills, and competencies relating to IL.

OBJECTIVES AND METHOD

The main objective of this study was to gauge school librarians’ perception about their readiness in the implementation of IL education. This study aimed to answer the following questions in relation to the stated objective:

1. What is the general perception of school librarians’ about information literacy education implementation in Malaysian secondary schools?
2. What is the level of school librarians’ readiness for information literacy education implementation in Malaysian secondary schools?
3. How do experience and professional qualifications influence school librarians’ readiness?

This study adopted a quantitative research methodology, specifically the descriptive research design. Since the objective was to investigate the perception of school librarians about IL education implementation and to assess the readiness of Malaysian school librarians in implementing IL, the target population was school librarians from all states in Malaysia. Thus, the survey method was used in two sequential phases: phase one employed interviews with selected school librarians to explore their perceptions of IL implementation, and this is followed by phase two in which a survey questionnaire was used to assess school librarian’s readiness (Appendix A).

The target population for this study was school librarians from all thirteen states and three federal territories in Malaysia. The samples were generated from a total of 2,189 secondary schools (based on data from Ministry of Education [Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia] 2009). Using the Krejcie and Morgan’s (1970) sample size table determination for research activity, a total of 326 responses were necessary. The number of questionnaires sent to each state was based on a 50.0% expected response rate. A total of 710 school librarians participated in the survey. This represents 32.4% of the school librarians’ population in Malaysia.
This study utilized a self-administered questionnaire resulting from an analysis of the literature pertaining to IL and school librarians. The measures for IL implementation readiness were confirmed via interview sessions with six school librarians and two Education Technology Division officers from the Ministry of Education. Based on data from nine hours of interview, the emerging themes were similar to those from the literature: understanding information literacy, information literacy skills, information literacy attributes, school librarians’ role as the information literacy educators, and school librarians’ qualifications and experience. These themes formed the basis of a proposed framework into the investigation of school librarians’ readiness for IL implementation and the survey instrument. The questionnaire was prepared in dual languages, English and Bahasa Malaysia (the national language of Malaysia). There were 6 items of demographic nature, while school librarians’ readiness for IL implementation was measured with 12 items on cognitive readiness, 6 items on functional readiness and 14 items on technical readiness, all of which employed a five point Likert-type response (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = Strongly agree). The reliability was ascertained with a Cronbach’s Alpha value of 0.961.

RESULTS

The respondents were school librarians with teaching experience ranging from 3 months to 35 years, whereas their experience as a school librarian ranged from 3 months to 28 years (Table 1). About 72.3% of these school librarians had less than 5 years of experience as school librarians. The school librarians’ qualification included the In-service School Resource Centre Management (SRCM) courses and LIS qualifications at Diploma, Bachelors and Masters level. The LIS qualifications can be summarized into 4 levels as depicted in Table 2. The data reveal that a substantive number (36.5%) of school librarians in this study had no formal qualification in LIS or school library management.

Table 1: School librarians experience (n=710)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of School librarians experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 0 - 5 years</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>72.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 6 - 10 years</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>19.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 11-30 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: LIS-related Qualifications (n = 710)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses in LIS</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. None</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. In-service SRCM courses less than one semester</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. In-service SRCM courses one semester or more</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Tertiary levels in LIS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perception of IL Education Implementation

In the interviews, school librarians and education officers discussed the various issues that plagued IL education implementation in schools. Generally they were of varying opinion about what constitutes IL. Discussions were focussed on attributes and skills of an information literate person. The participants also questioned their role in IL education implementation and there was a clear distinction between the more experienced teachers as compared with the younger ones in verbalising their understanding of IL. Thus, it was evident that school librarians are experiencing uncertainty in their role as IL implementers. Their readiness to implement IL education could play a major role in the successful inculcation of IL skills among the school community.

McCain and Tobey (2004) described the presence of readiness when adults are able to face the situations that require them to use the new knowledge, skills, or abilities. They are to accomplish a specific work task and their readiness relate to their abilities and willingness as well as to requisite knowledge and skills to perform the tasks which leads to the accomplishment of the educational organization’s goals (Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson 2001; Strohschen and Elazier 2009). Analysis of the interview data revealed 3 major issues which were repeatedly mentioned by the teachers. These 3 issues form the three sub scale of the larger construct of readiness. The 3 sub-scales which were derived are: (a) **Cognitive Readiness** is conceptualised as pertaining to the act or process of knowing, perceiving, understanding IL concepts and attributes of an information literate person; (b) **Functional Readiness** is conceptualised as the act of functioning as an IL educators, in other words it is about how school librarians perceive their roles in the implementation of IL in education; and (c) **Technical Readiness** is conceptualised as the capability to perform the task, in this case the ability among school librarians to impart IL skills. These results were used to formulate a preliminary framework for IL education implementation in schools focusing on school librarians’ readiness (Figure 1).

Owing to the fact that no school librarian would be totally not ready for IL, the mean score of each construct is interpreted as shown in Table 3. A mean score ranging from 4.00 to 5.00 is interpreted as school librarians as being ‘Ready’; a mean score 3.00 - 3.99 is interpreted as they are ‘Approaching readiness’, whereas a mean score of below 3.00...
infers that school librarians are ‘Developing Readiness’ for the IL education implementation.

Table 3: Information Literacy Education Implementation Readiness Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale/ Mean score</th>
<th>Readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4.00-4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3.00-3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Librarians’ Readiness

The mean score of each construct is used to interpret the each sub-scale of school librarians’ readiness, specifically cognitive readiness, technical readiness and functional readiness. Table 4 depicts the mean scores for items on the cognitive readiness. Most items measuring cognitive readiness are above the mean of 4.0. School librarians scored better in their knowledge about IL but lower in recognising the attributes of an information literate person.

Table 4: Mean and Standard Deviation of Cognitive Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension: Cognitive Readiness</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information literacy enables you to access, evaluate, and use information from a variety of sources</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information-literate person recognizes the need for information</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information literacy is a set of skills that can be learned</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information-literate person recognizes accurately the information needed</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information-literate person accesses sources of information through computer-based and other technologies</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information-literate person identifies potential sources of information</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information-literate person integrates information found with existing knowledge</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information-literate person develops successful search strategies</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information-literate person uses information in problem solving</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information-literate person formulates questions based on information needs</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information-literate person organizes information for practical applications</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information-literate person uses information in critical thinking</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Cognitive Readiness</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean score of each item measuring functional readiness ranges from 4.20 to 3.77 (Table 5). Though school librarians agreed that they had a role to play in providing reference, supporting teachers and being leaders in IL education, they were less confident about being the information specialist and training others in IL.

Table 5: Mean and Standard Deviation of Functional Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension: Functional Readiness</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School librarians provide reference services in school libraries.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School librarians view their role as supporting teachers and students.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School librarians view their role as providing information.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School librarians play a leadership role in educating students on the importance of IL skills.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School librarians perform as information specialists.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School librarians train teachers during in-house training programs to incorporate IL knowledge.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall functional readiness</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for technical readiness, all items scored below 4 (Table 6). Clearly school librarians do not perceive themselves as having high level of IL skills. They scored better in selecting, organising and synthesizing the information, but rated themselves lower in the basic skills of identifying the need for information and carrying out a search, especially using Boolean operators.

Table 6: Mean and Standard Deviation of Technical Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension: Technical Readiness</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select the best sources of information.</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extract relevant information from information source.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate sources intellectually and physically.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize information from multiple sources.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesize information found in the sources.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present the information found.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find information within sources.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify information needed (to solve the information problem)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge the effectiveness of the information found to carry out the task.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine all possible sources of information.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define the information task (define the information needed).</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge the efficiency of the information process.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for information using the keyword search and alternative keyword search.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for information using Booleans operators (AND, OR, NOT).</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Technical readiness</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The school librarians’ readiness is measured by the mean score of each construct as in Table 7. The highest mean score of school librarians’ readiness was cognitive readiness with the mean score of 4.30 (sd=0.48) followed by functional readiness with a mean score of 4.05 (sd=0.57). This indicates that they are only “Ready” in their cognitive readiness and functional readiness. The technical readiness mean score was 3.61 (sd=0.60), which indicates that they are “Approaching Readiness” in this aspect. Therefore, using the overall mean score of the three sub-scales, the overall mean score of school librarians readiness was 3.95 (sd=0.45). The result shows that school librarians were “Approaching Readiness” for IL implementation.

### Relationship between Experience and Qualifications and School librarians’ Readiness

The study further explored the influence of years of experience as a school librarian and LIS-related qualifications on school librarians’ readiness for IL education implementation in secondary schools. The school librarians’ qualifications and experiences have been presented in Tables 2 and 3 earlier. One-way ANOVA was used to explore relationships between the dimensions of readiness and variables of qualifications and experience. The results are seen in Table 8.

### Table 7: School Librarians Information Literacy Education Implementation Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Librarians Readiness</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Readiness</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>Ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Readiness</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>Ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Readiness</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Approaching Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall School Librarians Readiness</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Approaching Readiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: One way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>SL experience</th>
<th>SL professional qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive readiness</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional readiness</td>
<td>2.789</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical readiness</td>
<td>8.136</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05 ; ** p < 0.01

The results suggest that school librarians’ cognitive readiness and functional readiness are not significantly different across the three levels of school librarians’ experience, but there is a significant difference across the four levels of school librarians’ professional qualifications. This implies that school librarians with LIS related professional qualifications portray higher levels of cognitive and functional readiness. They better understand the concept and attributes of IL and better recognize their role in IL education.

With regard to technical readiness, it is found that there was a statistical significant mean difference across the three levels of school librarians’ experience and also across the four levels of school librarians’ professional qualifications. School librarians’ self-perceived IL
skills are influenced by their years of experience as a school librarian and also the LIS-related qualifications they possess.

DISCUSSION

This section discusses the findings of the study based on three major research objectives.

School librarians’ Perceptions about Information Literacy Education Implementation

School librarians’ perceptions about IL education implementation in Malaysian secondary schools were gauged through face to face interviews. It was found that school librarians were concerned about two main issues. Firstly, their own understanding about the concept of information literacy and the attributes of an information literate person, their role as information literacy educator and the information literacy skills they themselves have. This finding supports previous studies (Diao and Chandrawati 2005; Norhayati, Nor Azilah and Mona 2006; Norhayati 2009) that revealed school librarians often do not fully understand the concept and sometimes even confuse IL with ICT skills. This further causes them to perceive themselves to have low level of IL skills (Tan and Singh 2008; Kamal and Normah 2012a). School librarians experience uncertainty in their role as IL implementers. School librarians’ opinions differed based on their experience and qualifications. Secondly, they expressed concern about external factors, mainly IL related policies, standards, curriculum, professional development and infrastructure to support, facilitate and strengthen IL education implementation. Concerns by previous researchers (Edzan and Mohd Sharif 2005; Saidatul Akmar, Dorner and Oliver 2011) that school librarians are unable to teach information literacy concepts and research strategies to their students, and they have to be put into practice in schools (Raja Abdullah, Raja Ahmad and Kamaruzaman 2011) are supported.

Generally it is concluded that school librarians’ readiness was an issue worth examining on a larger scale. Their understanding of the concepts and attributes related to IL were considered cognitive readiness. Their recognition of their role as IL educators was conceptualized as functional readiness and their IL competencies are conceptualized as technical readiness. The findings revealed an issue that needed further examination was the school librarians’ readiness in implementing information literacy in school. The readiness is measured on the school librarian’s self-perception on three scales; cognitive readiness, functional readiness and technical readiness.

School librarians’ Readiness for Information Literacy Education Implementation

This research provides an insight of school librarians’ readiness to IL implementation. The finding suggested that overall they are only ‘approaching readiness’ for IL implementation. They are ready in cognitive and functional readiness, but only approaching readiness in technical readiness.

The school librarians’ cognitive readiness is a measure of their self-perceived knowledge about IL and information literate attributes. They need to be clear that IL is a set of skills that can be learned to enable them to access, evaluate and use information from a variety of sources. They have to know that as an information literate person, they must have the
necessary attributes. The information literate attributes require them to recognize accurately the information needed as well as recognize the need for information. They need to formulate questions based on information needs. They need to identify potential sources of information and develop successful search strategies to search for information. They are able to access sources of information through computer-based and other technologies. Once they obtain the information, they need to organize information for practical applications. They can integrate the information through the knowledge they have and use the information in critical thinking and in problem solving.

The findings indicate that they are ready in their cognitive readiness. This is different from the findings of Norhayati (2009) which indicates that school librarians appear not to understand the IL concept. They often misunderstand it as information communication technology. They assume that IL is the skill to look for information online and presume that this skill as being information literate.

The school librarians’ functional readiness is based on perceiving school librarians’ role as IL educator. In order to be functionally ready, school librarians need to fulfill these characteristics: able to train teachers during in-house training programs to incorporate IL knowledge; play a leadership role in educating students on the importance of IL skills; perform as information specialists; provide reference services in school resource centers. They view their role as supporting teachers and students and also view it is their role to provide information. The findings indicate that Malaysian school librarians are ready in their functional readiness.

Thus, school librarians are the instructional partner to foster IL education by providing resources not only for the students but also for professional resources and support for teachers (Wang 2006; Abdullah and Zainab 2008; Church 2008). They are resource managers (Hockersmith 2010) as well as multi-tasking as teachers, collaborators, curriculum leaders, instructional leaders, information specialists, instructional technologist, programme managers and advocates. They are also the facilitators to student learning to the greatest possible extent (Church, 2008; Novo and Calixto 2009; Reed 2009).

The school librarians’ technical readiness is based on the self-assessed IL skills. The findings indicate that they are partially ready. In order to be technically ready, school librarians need to be able to know and possess the Big Six IL skills. The school librarians’ technical skills are a fundamental factor, as they need better IL skills to provide services and to perform their tasks in the school libraries (Combes 2008; Tan, Gorman and Singh 2012). The need for IL is essential, so they are required to acquire and comprehend the IL skills as well as knowledge in order to assist, provide and teach IL in schools (Morizio and Henri 2003). Thus, school librarians have to develop their technical competency in acquiring new skills and competencies notwithstanding disparities in technological and intellectual disciplines in this new learning paradigm (Sit 2003).
Influence of Experience and Professional Qualifications on School Librarians’ Readiness

The influence of professional qualifications on school librarian’s readiness is significant in cognitive, functional and technical readiness. School librarians who qualify in the In-service SRCM courses of one semester or more, or at tertiary level in LIS are equipped with their cognitive, functional and technical readiness. Thus, professional qualifications are needed to facilitate their cognitive, functional and technical readiness. This findings bear similarity to Farmer’s (2007) research where she indicated that school librarians who have high regards for continuing education and pursuing a Master’s degree have a deeper understanding of the profession as they hold a longer-term perspective.

The influence of experience on school librarians’ readiness is significant in leading to technical readiness. Experience facilitates technical readiness for the school librarians to learn and comprehend IL skills. The literature confirms that their experiences are a dominant factor of IL knowledge that is considered as a means and strategy to learning opportunities for the teachers. Their prior learning, teaching combined with school librarians’ experiences are the main principles for the new IL knowledge (Zepeda 2008). School librarians’ experience influences their technical readiness in their professional IL learning (Williams and Coles 2007). The school librarians’ experience highlighted in the Kolb’s experiential learning theory shows that their IL skills knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. Their experience is the foundation for the creation of knowledge as they transform their experience into knowledge. In this respect, their knowledge represents their self-assessed IL skills as their technical readiness.

CONCLUSION

This research investigated school librarians’ perceptions about their self-readiness in the implementation of IL in schools. It found that school librarians were indeed very concerned about their readiness in implementing IL education. Their concern is related to their cognitive readiness, that is, their firm understanding of IL and the attributes of an information-literate person. They understood what IL is and they could also identify several attributes that defies an information literate person.

Based on their role as implementers of IL education, school librarians were also concerned about their functional readiness. Becoming a specialist entrusted with the authority to train other teachers is a role school librarians were not keen on. They have to be ready to embrace their role as IL champions in order to lead the other teachers in implementing it successfully across the curriculum. Malaysian school librarians are ready for their role as ILE implementers; however they are less ready in providing in house training and confident in their role as information specialists.

An important aspect of the school librarians’ readiness is their own IL skills level. It is found that in terms of technical readiness, that is, their own IL skills, Malaysian school librarians are only partially ready. This in turn could affect their perception of their functional role as well. When asked to self-assess their IL skills, school librarians indicated a low level of readiness. This indicates that there is a need for further training to enhance their skills before they can be expected to implement IL initiatives in schools involving teachers and
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students. School librarians’ personal readiness in cognitive, functional and technical aspects enables them to be skilled and confident performers as IL educators. Their experience and professional qualifications help to consolidate their readiness in the IL education implementation.

Future studies should explore qualitatively the level of school librarians’ readiness for IL education implementation in relation to their attitude towards IL in the curriculum. Their perception that they are not fully ready for IL education implementation can be investigated based on their perception of their professional identity. One can further investigate how experiences influence their knowledge about IL and how they are able to better comprehend their function as an IL implementer over the years of service as a school librarian.

The researchers acknowledge several limitations in this study. The study is based solely on the perceptions of the participating school librarians. It is also limited to the school librarians’ self-assessed IL skills, and did not test or evaluate the school librarians’ actual IL skills. Furthermore, in terms of IL education implementation, the research focused only on school librarians’ perceptions and did not attempt to explore or report on actual implementation as in the classroom activities or library activities. The researchers acknowledge that Klob’s experiential learning theory is comprehensive, but in this study only two constructs were examined, viz., professional qualification and experience, as measures of experiential learning.
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APPENDIX A

Interview questions for school librarians

Interview semi-structured questions

1. Can you tell me about yourself? Your experiences? Qualifications, etc?
2. How long have you been in charge of the school library?
3. What are your main responsibilities as the school librarian?
4. What do you know about information literacy?
5. Would you consider yourself as an information literate person? Why?
6. What do you know about information literacy implementation in schools?
7. Have you had any formal training in information literacy education?
8. How do you think IL can be taught in schools?
9. What support do you need to have to teach information literacy in schools?
10. What are the setbacks in implementing information literacy in schools?

Survey Instrument

I. Perceptions of School Librarians about Information Literacy.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these elements of information literacy? Please tick (✓) the number that best describes the extent of your opinion, ranging from 1 for Strongly disagree to 5 for Strongly agree.

1. Information literacy is a set of skills that can be learned. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
2. Information literacy enables you to access, evaluate, and use information from a variety of sources. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
3. The information literate person recognizes accurately the information needed. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
4. The information literate person recognizes the need for information. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
5. The information literate person formulates questions based on information needs. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
6. The information literate person identifies potential sources of information. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
7. The information literate person develops successful search strategies. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
8. The information literate person accesses sources of information through computer-based and other technologies. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
9. The information literate person organizes information for practical applications. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
10. The information literate person integrates information found with existing knowledge. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
11. The information literate person uses information in critical thinking. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
12. The information literate person uses information in problem solving. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
13. A skilled school librarian with information literacy expertise has knowledge of resources. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
14. School librarians train teachers during in-house training programs to incorporate information literacy knowledge. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
15. School librarians play a leadership role in educating students on the importance of information literacy skills. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
16. School librarians perform as information specialists. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
17. School librarians provide reference services in school resource centres. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
18. School librarians view their role as supporting teachers and students. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
19. School librarians view their role as providing information. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤
II. Self-Assessment of Information Literacy Competencies.

Please indicate your level of your information literacy abilities of the following skills. Please tick (✓) the number that best describe your abilities, ranging from 1 for Do not know at all to 5 for Excellent.

20. Define the information task (define the information needed).
   1 2 3 4 5
21. Identify information needed (to solve the information problem).
   1 2 3 4 5
22. Determine all possible sources of information. 1 2 3 4 5
23. Select the best sources of information.
   1 2 3 4 5
24. Locate sources intellectually and physically. 1 2 3 4 5
25. Search for information using Booleans operators (AND, OR, NOT).
   1 2 3 4 5
26. Search for information using the keyword search and alternative keyword search.
   1 2 3 4 5
27. Find information within sources.
   1 2 3 4 5
28. Extract relevant information from information source. 1 2 3 4 5
29. Synthesize information found in the sources. 1 2 3 4 5
30. Organize information from multiple sources. 1 2 3 4 5
31. Present the information found.
   1 2 3 4 5
32. Judge the effectiveness of the information found to carry out the task.
   1 2 3 4 5
33. Judge the efficiency of the information process. 1 2 3 4 5