
Assessing Core Competencies: Results of Threshold Assessment for Information Literacy

Graduating Seniors
2022 Fañomnåkan (Spring)

Module 3: Research and Scholarship

Academic and Student Affairs
Office of Institutional Effectiveness
303 University Drive
UOG Station, Mangilao, GU 96923
671-735-2646
www.uog.edu/oie
oie@triton.uog.edu



Assessing Core Competencies: Results of Threshold Achievement Test for Information Literacy (TATIL)

Module 3: Research and Scholarship

2022 Fañomnåkan (Spring)

Table of Contents

Background.....	1
About the Test: Module 3.....	1
Scoring the Test: Module 3.....	1
Moving Forward	1
Highlights: Overall Knowledge, Outcomes, and Dispositions.....	2
Outcomes 3.1-3.2 Results.....	3
Disposition 3.1-3.3 Results	4
TATIL Average Scores by College	5
College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS).....	6
College of Natural and Applied Sciences (CNAS).....	7
School of Business and Public Administration (SBPA)	8
School of Education (SOE)	9
School of Engineering (SOEG).....	10
School of Health (SOH)	11
Appendices	
A: TATIL Module Descriptions.....	12
B: TATIL Research and Scholarship.....	21

Threshold Achievement Test for Information Literacy (TATIL)

2022 Fañomnåkan (Spring) - Module 3: Research and Scholarship

Background

Following a recommendation by UOG's Gen Ed consultant in 2015 to utilize Carrick Enterprises' Threshold Achievement Test for Information Literacy (TATIL), Assistant Professor Dr. Chris Garcia, English & Applied Linguistics, and Assistant Professor Mr. Roland San Nicolas, University Libraries, examined the instrument and volunteered to participate in Carrick's institutional pilot.

The pilot began in Fañomnåkan (Spring) 2016 with a number of EN-111 faculty administering Modules 1 & 2 in their courses, which then continued into Fanuchånan (Fall) 2017 with Modules 3 & 4. After the pilot concluded and Carrick released TATIL for institutional use, preparations to administer TATIL to graduating seniors in Fañomnåkan 2019 began. For information about TATIL see Appendices A & B or visit www.thresholdachievement.com.

About the Test

The TATIL instrument is comprised of four testing modules which the Office of Institutional Effectiveness administers to graduating seniors over the course of four semesters. The four modules include: 1) Evaluating Process & Authority, 2) Strategic Searching, 3) Research & Scholarship, and 4) The Value of Information. Module 3 was administered during the 2022 Fañomnåkan semester. More details of each module can be found in Appendix A.

Module 3 measures two outcomes:

Outcome 3.1) Understand the processes of scholarly communication and knowledge building

Outcome 3.2) Understand stages of the research process

Scoring the Test

For this test, scores are presented on a 1,000-point scale with 1,000 being a perfect score. For uniformity with the Carrick generated report, Appendix B, this report used standard error as opposed to standard deviation. "The standard error indicates the likely range of scores if the test were given again to the same students" (Carrick 2020). For example, a mean score of 532 ± 7 indicates a true score for a student will fall between 525 and 539. Dispositions are scored on a scale of 0-100, with 100 having the highest disposition on a particular topic.

To align with reporting practices used to assess Critical Thinking and Quantitative Literacy, test takers who spent less than 15 minutes to complete their assessment were removed from the aggregated results. 19 students are removed from analysis, but included in Appendix B.


Moving Forward

Starting in Fanuchånan 2022, Module 1 will be administered to graduating seniors. Module 1 has been identified as the most used module by other institutions that utilize the TATIL instrument. Using one module will allow us to track and report trends moving forward.



Overall Knowledge, Outcomes, Dispositions Highlights

Overall Knowledge Results 2022 Fañomnåkan



Overall Knowledge

Knowledge items are based on information literacy outcomes and performance indicators (found in Appendix A). Items assess an array of cognitive processes that college students develop as they transition from pre-college to college-ready to research-ready.

A student's overall score is the mean of their item scores, where the UOG Overall Knowledge score is the mean of all student scores.



Graduating seniors scored a **526** for Overall Knowledge, **539** for Outcome 3.1, and **514** for Outcome 3.2. For each of these average scores, students fall under the “College Ready” performance level, which is considered the moderate category.

Students in the College Ready category are able to do the following:


- Recognize that scholars who study a problem might arrive at different conclusions because knowledge changes over time as new information is discovered and analyzed
- Understand that expertise in a field comes not from merely knowing things but through using established methods to perform research
- Identify the value of applying a systematic research process for deepening their understanding of the subjects they study
- Approach college-level research with a goal of developing meaningful research questions and proposing credible interpretations or answers.

Dispositions Score Summary

Seniors scored a **55** for productive persistence, **78** for mindful self-reflection, and **48** for responsibility to community. For each disposition, scores fall in the “Moderate” Category. Students who fall in this category might experience strain when other dispositions clash with their information literacy dispositions. These students are more easily guided to apply their dispositions; however, they may not be consistent when faced with new challenges (Carrick 2020). Detailed example behaviors of each disposition can be found on page 7 of Appendix A.




2022 Fañomnåkan Graduating Seniors TATIL Scores: Outcomes




Outcome 3.1
Understand the processes of scholarly communication and knowledge building.

Performance Indicators 3.1.1 through 3.1.14 can be found on page 6 in Appendix A.



Outcome 3.2
Understand stages of the research process


Performance Indicators 3.2.1 through 3.2.12 can be found on page 6 of Appendix A.





2022 Fañomnåkan Graduating Seniors TATIL Scores: Dispositions

Disposition 3.1 Results
2022 Fañomnåkan



Disposition 3.1 - Productive Persistence

Learners who are disposed to demonstrate productive persistence throughout the research process approach inquiry as iterative, adjusting their research questions as they learn more.

Our seniors' mean score for productive persistence fall in the moderately-disposed range. Scores in this range suggest that students have begun to recognize that the research process often involves setbacks and requires changing direction.





Disposition 3.2 - Mindful Self-Reflection


Learners who are disposed to demonstrate self-reflection in the context of research and scholarship consistently question their own assumptions as they are challenged by new knowledge.

Our seniors' mean score for Disposition 3.2 fall in the moderately-disposed range. Scores in this range suggest that students are able to recognize that research may challenge their assumptions and are willing to consider views outside of their own.

Disposition 3.2 Results
2022 Fañomnåkan




Disposition 3.3 Results
2022 Fañomnåkan



Disposition 3.3 - Responsibility to community

Learners who are disposed to demonstrate a sense of responsibility to the scholarly community recognize and conform to academic norms of knowledge building.

Our seniors' mean score for Disposition 3.3 fall in the moderately-disposed range. This suggests that students are likely to have an appreciation for how the research process is informed by disciplinary practices within the scholarly community.






2022 Fañomnåkan TATIL Average Scores by College

College/School	Overall Knowledge		Outcome 3.1		Outcome 3.2		Disposition 3.1		Disposition 3.2		Disposition 3.3	
	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error
CLASS (n=36)	562	±10	606	±12	523	±10	53	±1	80	±1	51	±0
CNAS (n=55)	561	±9	570	±10	553	±10	56	±1	78	±1	48	±0
SBPA (n=79)	468	±9	484	±10	453	±10	55	±1	78	±1	47	±1
SOE (n=27)	477	±10	467	±10	486	±11	54	±1	78	±1	53	±1
SOEG (n=7)	483	±6	517	±6	453	±7	51	±1	71	±1	50	±0
SOH (n=50)	586	±9	586	±10	586	±10	54	±1	78	±1	47	±0
UOG (n=254)	526	±10	539	±11	514	±10	55	±1	78	±1	48	±0

Scores are presented on a 1,000-point scale, where a perfect score is 1,000






2022 Fañomnåkan TATIL Average Scores - College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS)

MAJOR by College	Overall Knowledge		Outcome 3.1		Outcome 3.2		Disposition 3.1		Disposition 3.2		Disposition 3.3	
	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error
Communication Studies (n=7)	595	±12	597	±15	594	±10	54	±1	83	±0	52	±0
English (n=7)	511	±10	540	±10	485	±11	57	±0	76	±0	50	±0
Fine Arts/Art (n=5)	418	±12	471	±14	371	±12	49	±1	73	±1	51	±0
Political Science (n=7)	635	±7	685	±10	590	±6	52	±1	81	±1	54	±0
Psychology (n=5)	614	±8	706	±11	531	±6	56	±1	86	±1	46	±0
CLASS (n=36)	562	±10	606	±12	523	±10	53	±1	80	±1	51	±0
UOG TOTAL (n=254)	526	±10	539	±11	514	±10	55	±1	78	±1	48	±0

Scores are presented on a 1,000-point scale, where a perfect score is 1,000




The Fine Arts/Theater, History and Philosophy programs did not have enough results to report.



2022 Fañomnåkan TATIL Average Scores - College of Natural and Applied Sciences (CNAS)

MAJOR by College	Overall Knowledge		Outcome 3.1		Outcome 3.2		Disposition 3.1		Disposition 3.2		Disposition 3.3	
	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error
Biology (n=27)	586	±8	606	±10	569	±9	59	±1	79	±1	48	±0
Chemistry (n=8)	587	±8	541	±8	630	±10	51	±0	82	±1	48	±0
Computer Info System (n=3)	448	±9	509	±9	392	±9	67	±1	71	±1	50	±0
Computer Science (n=11)	553	±7	580	±10	529	±6	53	±1	78	±1	49	±0
Mathematics (n=4)	528	±11	496	±9	558	±14	58	±1	81	±1	42	±0
CNAS (n=55)	561	±9	570	±10	553	±10	56	±1	78	±1	48	±0
UOG TOTAL (n=254)	526	±10	539	±11	514	±10	55	±1	78	±1	48	±0

Scores are presented on a 1,000-point scale, where a perfect score is 1,000




The Agriculture and Life Sciences program did not have enough results to report.



2022 Fañomnåkan TATIL Average Scores - School of Business and Public Administration (SBPA)

MAJOR by College	Overall Knowledge		Outcome 3.1		Outcome 3.2		Disposition 3.1		Disposition 3.2		Disposition 3.3	
	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error
Accounting (n=16)	596	±10	606	±10	586	±10	53	±1	84	±1	50	±1
Business Administration (n=41)	455	±8	477	±9	435	±9	55	±1	76	±1	47	±1
Criminal Justice (n=18)	420	±8	434	±10	407	±8	58	±1	80	±1	44	±0
Public Admin (n=4)	305	±11	297	±9	311	±12	52	±0	72	±1	52	±0
SBPA (n=79)	468	±9	484	±10	453	±10	55	±1	78	±1	47	±1
UOG TOTAL (n=254)	526	±10	539	±11	514	±10	55	±1	78	±1	48	±0

Scores are presented on a 1,000-point scale, where a perfect score is 1,000






2022 Fañomnåkan TATIL Average Scores - School of Education (SOE)

MAJOR by College	Overall Knowledge		Outcome 3.1		Outcome 3.2		Disposition 3.1		Disposition 3.2		Disposition 3.3	
	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error
Elementary Education (n=13)	492	±9	448	±9	532	±9	58	±1	80	±1	49	±0
Secondary Education (n=9)	525	±11	532	±11	519	±12	52	±0	81	±0	56	±1
Physical Education (n=5)	351	±10	399	±10	308	±10	50	±1	69	±1	55	±1
SOE (n=27)	477	±10	467	±10	486	±11	54	±1	78	±1	53	±1
UOG TOTAL (n=254)	526	±10	539	±11	514	±10	55	±1	78	±1	48	±0

Scores are presented on a 1,000-point scale, where a perfect score is 1,000






2022 Fañomnåkan TATIL Average Scores - School of Engineering (SOEG)

MAJOR by College	Overall Knowledge		Outcome 3.1		Outcome 3.2		Disposition 3.1		Disposition 3.2		Disposition 3.3	
	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error
Civil Engineering (n=7)	483	±6	517	±6	453	±7	51	±1	71	±1	50	±0
SOEG (n=7)	483	±6	517	±6	453	±7	51	±1	71	±1	50	±0
UOG TOTAL (n=254)	526	±10	539	±11	514	±10	55	±1	78	±1	48	±0

Scores are presented on a 1,000-point scale, where a perfect score is 1,000






2022 Fañomnåkan TATIL Average Scores - School of Health (SOH)

MAJOR by College	Overall Knowledge		Outcome 3.1		Outcome 3.2		Disposition 3.1		Disposition 3.2		Disposition 3.3	
	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error	Average	Standard Error
Health Science (n=10)	596	±8	619	±10	575	±8	59	±1	80	±1	48	±0
Nursing (n=31)	587	±10	587	±10	588	±11	51	±1	75	±1	47	±0
Social Work (n=9)	569	±7	545	±10	592	±8	56	±1	82	±1	49	±0
SOH (n=50)	586	±9	586	±10	586	±10	54	±1	78	±1	47	±0
UOG TOTAL (n=254)	526	±10	539	±11	514	±10	55	±1	78	±1	48	±0

Scores are presented on a 1,000-point scale, where a perfect score is 1,000





THRESHOLD ACHIEVEMENT TEST FOR INFORMATION LITERACY

Module Descriptions



CarrickEnterprises.com

This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

How to cite this document:

Carrick Enterprises. Threshold Achievement Test for Information Literacy: Module descriptions.
Retrieved [date] from Threshold Achievement Test for Information Literacy website:
<https://thresholdachievement.com/files/Module-Descriptions.pdf>

Module 1: Evaluating Process & Authority

This module focuses on the process of information creation and the constructed and contextual nature of source authority. There are two knowledge outcomes and three dispositions that make up this module.

Outcome 1.1: Apply knowledge of source creation processes and context to evaluate the authority of a source.

Performance Indicators:

- 1.1.1: Match a description of a creation process to the source type it describes.
- 1.1.2: Match the source type with the amount of time it usually takes to publish it.
- 1.1.3: Match the elements of a source record to what they reveal about the process used to create the source (e.g., publisher name, authors' names, date, subject terms, source type).
- 1.1.4: Match a description of a review process, such as editorial and peer review, to the source type it describes.
- 1.1.5: Arrange a sample set of sources into their appropriate positions on the information cycle.
- 1.1.6: Match an information need to the most authoritative source types (e.g., news agency, government website, scholarly article) for fulfilling that need.
- 1.1.7: Identify the audience for whom a source was created.
- 1.1.8: Identify types of scholarly products and communication modes that fall outside of the typical publication processes but are still worthy of use (e.g., conference presentations, contributed papers, discussions on association websites).
- 1.1.9: Identify relevant questions to ask about sources' origins and context when considering them as support for a claim.
- 1.1.10: Identify factors that would compromise the authority of the peer review process.
- 1.1.11: Match descriptions of popular, polemic, and primary documents to scenarios where it would be appropriate to use them.
- 1.1.12: Recognize that information is created to serve varying interests of information consumers.

Outcome 1.2: Apply knowledge of authority to analyze others' claims and to support one's own claims

Performance Indicators:

- 1.2.1: Identify the sponsor, organization, or institution that provides support for a site.
- 1.2.2: Identify relevant elements of an author's expertise.
- 1.2.3: Know the importance of determining the author when evaluating the authority of a source.
- 1.2.4: Recognize that polished, visually appealing presentation of web content does not equate to authoritative, high-quality content.
- 1.2.5: Recognize that expertise is contextual and positional (e.g., credentials alone are not a per se indicator of author's expertise).
- 1.2.6: Identify relevant questions to ask about the suitability of a source when considering it as support for a claim.
- 1.2.7: Identify information directly relevant to an argument.
- 1.2.8: Recognize the pitfalls of using the superficial indicator "peer review" when evaluating sources for authority.
- 1.2.9: Recognize when a quote from a well-known author or recognized expert is being used by an author to gain authority.
- 1.2.10: Evaluate the effectiveness of an author's use of different source types (e.g., news, research articles, blogs) to support arguments.
- 1.2.11: Determine the reason why a quote is used in a given passage (e.g., show significance, give authoritative support, provide context, emphasize, summarize).
- 1.2.12: Distinguish the key works cited in a passage from the peripheral works.

Disposition 1.1: Mindful self-reflection

Learners who are disposed to demonstrate self-reflection when they are evaluating sources of information consistently question their assumptions about what makes a source authoritative.

Example behaviors:

- Looking for features that challenge one's assumptions about the trustworthiness of one's preferred sources.
- Questioning one's own assumptions about the reliability of traditional forms of scholarly authority.
- Recognizing when there are good reasons to change one's position on an issue.

Disposition 1.2: Toleration of ambiguity

Learners who are disposed to demonstrate toleration for ambiguity when they are evaluating sources of information treat authority as subjective because it is based on the context of the information need.

Example behaviors:

- Deciding what to do when authorities disagree.
- Flexibly using traditional and non-traditional information sources at appropriate points in the research process.
- Treating authority as a flexible concept when information needs can only be met with less traditional sources.

Disposition 1.3: Responsibility to community

Learners who are disposed to demonstrate a sense of responsibility to their community when they are evaluating sources of information are conscientious about how they invoke authority in order to gain credibility with their audiences.

Example behaviors:

- Fulfilling one's responsibility to one's discourse community by using sources carefully.
- Recognizing that the sources one is permitted to use will depend on one's discourse community.
- Taking responsibility for critically evaluating and explaining sources' authority to one's audience when stating and standing by their claims.

Module 2: Strategic Searching

This module focuses on the process of planning, evaluating, and revising searches during strategic exploration. There are two knowledge outcomes and one disposition that make up this module.

Outcome 2.1: Plan, conduct, evaluate, and revise searches to achieve relevant results.

Performance Indicators:

- 2.1.1: Select appropriate basic and advanced search options to satisfy different needs.
- 2.1.2: Identify keyword searching as an appropriate basic search strategy when beginning research.
- 2.1.3: Apply basic search limiters or filters to increase the relevance of results (e.g., checking a "peer-reviewed" or "scholarly journals" box).
- 2.1.4: Given a topic, identify terms and concepts to use in a search for basic background information.
- 2.1.5: Given a description of a research topic, identify keywords.
- 2.1.6: Scan search results for synonyms to use for additional searches.
- 2.1.7: Decide when the number of results makes it worthwhile to read through the individual results.
- 2.1.8: Given a list of results, select titles relevant to the topic.
- 2.1.9: Given a set of results that is too large, select keywords that will effectively narrow search results.
- 2.1.10: Use advanced search syntax such as synonyms and truncation to increase the number of relevant results
- 2.1.11: Apply nested logic structures, Boolean operators, and truncation to successfully construct an advanced search.
- 2.1.12: Use sophisticated search limiters and modifiers to improve search results.

Outcome 2.2: Compare and contrast a range of search tools.

Performance Indicators:

- 2.2.1: Identify differences between search tools such as those on the open web, in a database, and in a library catalog.
- 2.2.2: Understand when it is appropriate to use a web search engine to find information.
- 2.2.3: Compare the types of sources found in different search tools.
- 2.2.4: Identify a range of possible sources, such as scholars, industries, and organizations, that would likely have created or collected useful information on a topic.
- 2.2.5: Match descriptions of scope, content, and limitations to the search tools they describe.

Disposition 2.1: Productive persistence

Learners who are disposed to demonstrate productive persistence during their searches for information approach searching as iterative and not linear by employing alternative strategies and learning from mistakes.

Example behaviors:

- Adapting and evolving new strategies rather than clinging to familiar search techniques.
- Handling feelings of frustration that commonly surface during the search process.
- Recovering from a failed search in order to continue searching until the information need is satisfied.
- Taking constructive assignment feedback from instructors as an impetus to continue searching for better sources.

Module 3: Research & Scholarship

This module focuses on the knowledge-building process and how scholars build knowledge. There are two knowledge outcomes and three dispositions that make up this module.

Outcome 3.1: Understand the processes of scholarly communication and knowledge building.

Performance Indicators:

- 3.1.1: Given a literature review, identify the established knowledge that is summarized or synthesized.
- 3.1.2: Given a literature review, identify the gap that the authors have identified in the existing research.
- 3.1.4: Recognize that scholars bring their own perspectives to the study of a research topic.
- 3.1.5: Categorize common types of sources by whether the authors are expected to list their cited sources.
- 3.1.6: Identify social consequences of scientific falsification.
- 3.1.7: Recognize how interpretations can change based on new research and findings.
- 3.1.8: Identify reasons why scholars track down influential works.
- 3.1.9: Identify venues for scholarly communication, such as books, journals, conventions, blogs.
- 3.1.10: Recognize that research methods change over time.
- 3.1.11: Recognize the value of emerging communication technology for strengthening scholarly communication.
- 3.1.12: Evaluate an emerging scholar's likelihood of being accepted into the scholarly conversation.
- 3.1.13: Given a description of scholarly disagreement, select the interpretation that acknowledges the value of disagreement for moving knowledge forward.
- 3.1.14: Given a set of research needs, match them to appropriate research methods.

Outcome 3.2: Understand stages of the research process.

Performance Indicators:

- 3.2.1: Recognize various ways that high quality research questions can be generated.
- 3.2.2: Identify reasons to begin reading on a subject before solidifying an argument or thesis.
- 3.2.3: Distinguish between goal-oriented and exploratory searching during the research process.
- 3.2.4: Identify the appropriate relationship between a research question and a thesis statement.
- 3.2.5: Order the stages of the research process when writing a research paper.
- 3.2.6: Explain why research inquiry can be appropriate for personal information needs in addition to academic needs.
- 3.2.7: Given text with conflicting perspectives, formulate suitable research questions.
- 3.2.8: Analyze multifaceted research questions to identify component parts for systematic investigation.
- 3.2.9: Given a purpose statement from a research assignment, identify the research question that has an appropriate level of complexity for the information need.
- 3.2.10: Analyze the consequences of disregarding previous research in the early stages of the information creation process.
- 3.2.11: Match problems in specific stages of the research paper process with problems they are likely to cause in the research paper product.
- 3.2.12: Classify descriptions of specific actions taken during the research process by the stage in the research process when they are most likely to happen.

Disposition 3.1: Productive persistence

Learners who are disposed to demonstrate productive persistence throughout the research process approach inquiry as iterative, adjusting their research question as they learn more.

Example behaviors:

- Applying appropriate methods/practices of inquiry regardless of their complexity or negative emotional associations (e.g., frustration).
- Committing to building a knowledge base through background research when exploring an unfamiliar topic.

Disposition 3.2: Mindful self-reflection

Learners who are disposed to demonstrate self-reflection in the context of research and scholarship consistently question their own assumptions as they are challenged by new knowledge.

Example behaviors:

- Spending time exploring a topic with openness and curiosity before committing to a thesis or claim.
- Using critiques from professors, librarians, and peers to improve the quality of their inquiry.

Disposition 3.3: Responsibility to community

Learners who are disposed to demonstrate a sense of responsibility to the scholarly community recognize and conform to academic norms of knowledge building.

Example behaviors:

- Identifying and pursuing appropriate ways to enter the scholarly conversation while still an undergraduate.
- Seeking out and following established models of scholarship and inquiry.

Module 4: Value of Information

This module focuses on about information ethics and the value of information. There are two knowledge outcomes and two dispositions that make up this module.

Outcome 4.1: Recognize the rights and responsibilities of information creation.

Performance Indicators:

- 4.1.1: Identify reasons why plagiarism is prohibited.
- 4.1.2: Determine whether or not a passage is plagiarized.
- 4.1.3: Identify appropriate citation options when using material from a source that is cited within the source at hand.
- 4.1.4: Identify the type of plagiarism when presented with a plagiarized passage.
- 4.1.5: Recognize the benefits of copyright protections.
- 4.1.6: Given a list, select the purposes of citation.
- 4.1.7: Recognize the rights and interests of human subjects participating in research studies.
- 4.1.8: Recognize that where a source is found has no bearing on whether or not the source should be cited.

Outcome 4.2: Recognize social, legal, and economic factors affecting access to information.

Performance Indicators:

- 4.2.1: Recognize how reporting on the same event offers disparate levels of coverage when the sources are written to be disseminated in different venues.
- 4.2.2: Identify the relationship between individuals' organizational affiliations and their access to information.
- 4.2.3: Identify reasons that some people's views are not disseminated to the larger community.
- 4.2.5: Identify the meaning and scope of the concept of intellectual property.
- 4.2.6: Identify the circumstances in which one's personal information may be used by other individuals, groups, and organizations.
- 4.2.7: Identify reasons that access to information may be restricted, including copyright, licensing, and other practices.
- 4.2.8: Distinguish among the common reasons that information may be freely available, including open access, public domain, and other practices.

Disposition 4.1: Mindful self-reflection

Learners who are disposed to demonstrate self-reflection in the context of the information ecosystem recognize and challenge information privilege.

Example behaviors:

- Considering how to use existing intellectual property to spur creative work without violating the creators' rights.
- Participating in informal networks to reduce disparities caused by the commodification of information.
- Recognizing and suggesting ways to reduce the negative effects of the unequal distribution of information.

Disposition 4.2: Responsibility to community

Learners who are disposed to demonstrate a sense of responsibility to the scholarly community recognize and conform to academic norms of knowledge building.

Example behaviors:

- Accessing scholarly sources through formal channels.
- Avoiding plagiarism in their own work and discouraging plagiarism by others.
- Recognizing the value of their own original contributions to the scholarly conversation.



THRESHOLD ACHIEVEMENT TEST FOR INFORMATION LITERACY

Research & Scholarship
2022 Fanomnakan - Prospective Graduating Seniors Module 3
University of Guam
July 8, 2022



Copyright © 2022 Carrick Enterprises, Inc. All rights reserved.
CarrickEnterprises.com

Table of Contents

Section 1: About the Test	1
Section 2: About this Report	3
Section 3: Summary of Results	6
Section 4: Overall Knowledge Results	9
Section 5: Individual Knowledge Outcome Results	10
Section 6: Individual Disposition Results	15
Section 7: Targeted Reading Recommendations	19
Appendix A. Student Profile	22
Appendix B. Institutions	23

Section 1: About the Test

The Threshold Achievement Test for Information Literacy is a tool for measuring student knowledge and dispositions regarding information literacy. The test is inspired by the Association of College and Research Libraries' Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education and by expectations set by the nation's accrediting agencies. The Research & Scholarship module focuses on the knowledge-building process and how scholars build knowledge. It tests students' ability to recall and apply their knowledge of the scholarly research process and it tests their metacognition about core information literacy dispositions that underlie their behaviors.

Information Literacy Knowledge

The knowledge items are based on information literacy outcomes and performance indicators created by the test developers and advisory board of librarians and other educators. Items assess an array of cognitive processes that college students develop as they transition from pre-college to college ready to research ready. The items are presented in a variety of structured response formats to assess students' information literacy knowledge, skills, and abilities ranging from understanding to critical thinking to problem solving.

Figure 1.1 Knowledge Outcomes for Research & Scholarship

Outcome 3.1 Understand the processes of scholarly communication and knowledge building.

Outcome 3.2 Understand stages of the research process.

Information Literacy Dispositions

Dispositions play an important role in learning transfer, indicating students' willingness to consistently apply the skills they have learned in one setting to novel problems in new settings. The ACRL Framework highlights dispositions, which constitute affective facets of information literacy, because they are essential to students' information literacy outcomes. Dispositions interact with a student's process of defining ill-structured information problems within a new environment so that the student can transfer this learning to new problems. Dispositions are latent traits that function at an unconscious level and determine whether or not a student can transfer learning and move beyond a superficial understanding of material.

Dispositions are at the heart of a student's temperament. While some dispositions can be seen as natural tendencies, they may also be cultivated over time through intentionally-designed instruction and through exposure to tacit expectations for student behavior.

To address dispositions in the test, we use scenario-based problem solving items. Students are presented with a scenario describing an ill-defined information literacy challenge related to the content of the module. Following the scenario, students are presented with strategies for addressing the challenge. Students evaluate the usefulness of each strategy.

Information Literacy Dispositions for Research and Scholarship

Students who value the role of the research process in building knowledge are more likely to embrace all challenges of the research process, particularly the difficulties of conflicting information and contingent answers because they see research as a process of asking new and better questions as their research progresses. Since research is an iterative process with uncertain outcomes, students must be (1) mindful about the temptation to have their biases confirmed, (2) persistent through the setbacks inherent within the research process, and (3) responsible to their academic community in honoring scholarly ways of knowing and communicating..

The test assesses how students understand and value their role within the scholarly community.

Figure 1.2 Dispositions for Research & Scholarship

Disposition 3.1 Productive persistence

Disposition 3.2 Mindful self-reflection

Disposition 3.3 Responsibility to community

Section 2: About this Report

The report that follows is designed to help educators identify areas of strength and areas that need improvement in their students' ability to understand the stages of the research process and their value for building scholarly knowledge. The report will support evidence-based decision-making and inform actions for strengthening student outcomes.

How the Report is Organized

The report presents overall and detailed results for your students. The high-level summary of results on both the knowledge and disposition dimensions for students at your institution is provided in Section 3, along with cross-institutional comparisons. Your local results are compared to other institutions in order to give an indication of how your students performed relative to other students who may have similar exposure to information literacy instruction.

Sections 4 and 5 offer details about knowledge performance. Section 4 shows the overall mean score for all students and subgroup breakouts for the standard questions you selected and your custom questions. Section 4 also gives cross-institutional comparisons.

Section 5 provides more detail on the knowledge results by presenting data on each knowledge outcome, along with breakouts and cross-institutional comparisons. Section 5 also explores the performance indicators that make up each knowledge outcome by listing performance indicator rankings that identify your students' relative strengths and weaknesses.

Section 6 presents details about dispositional performance. Your disposition results are presented with level descriptions that align with your students' mean scores.

Section 7 offers suggestions for targeted readings that can assist you in following up on these results.

Knowledge Performance Levels

Three performance levels are used to describe student achievement on the knowledge section of the test. Students are assigned to one of the levels based on their mean score on the knowledge items. Levels are shown in Sections 4 and 5 and indicated by color.

Conditionally ready. Students who are conditionally ready recognize that important scholars and thinkers have influence on those who come after them. They are able to understand that different genres of writing they are assigned to do may require different research approaches. They are able to identify issues related to bias in scholarly and other information sources. Conditionally ready students approach scholarly reading and writing with a goal of finding the correct answer. The conditionally ready color in the charts is yellow.

College ready. Students who are college ready recognize that scholars who study a problem might arrive at different conclusions because knowledge changes over time as new information is discovered and analyzed. They are able to understand that expertise in a field comes not from merely knowing things but through using established methods to perform research. They are able to identify the value of applying a systematic research process for deepening their understanding of the subjects they study. College ready students approach college-level research with a goal of developing meaningful research

questions and proposing credible interpretations or answers. The college ready color in the charts is green.

Research ready. Students who are research ready recognize that research is a complex activity and can be done using many different approaches. They are able to understand that these different approaches may lead to equally credible findings even if the results are contradictory. They are able to understand that scholarly conclusions, while grounded in appropriate research methods, are contingent and necessarily limited. Research ready students recognize their role within the scholarly community as a member who is learning to construct and deepen disciplinary knowledge. The research ready color in the charts is blue.

Disposition Levels

Students who are weakly-disposed toward the dispositions in this module are unlikely to spontaneously demonstrate these traits without guided instruction and scaffolding to support their development. They may demonstrate strong dispositions in other areas not associated with information literacy, but these are not covered by this test. The weakly-disposed color in the charts is orange.

Students who are moderately-disposed toward the traits assessed by this test are more easily guided to apply them but may not consistently demonstrate these strengths when they are faced with new challenges. They may experience strain when there is a conflict between their information literacy dispositions and other strong dispositions. The moderately-disposed color in the charts is pink.

Students with strong dispositions toward the values and behaviors associated with information literacy are most likely to consistently react to new situations by drawing upon these underlying traits. The strongly-disposed color in the charts is blue.

Mean Scores and Standard Errors

Scoring on the knowledge portion is based on a partial credit model and on difficulty level. Students can achieve full, partial, or no credit on an item. Imagine a test item that has 4 possible answers, A, B, C, and D, with A and B being the correct responses. To achieve full credit, a student must select A and B and must not select C or D. A student who chooses A and B and C will receive less credit than someone who chooses just A and B.

The score a student achieves on an item is based on the difficulty of receiving a particular amount of credit for that item. Difficulties are calibrated based on a database of student scores from all participating institutions. Items have different levels of difficulty and therefore different maximum scores. Scores are presented on a 1,000-point scale, where a perfect score is 1,000.

A student's overall score is the mean of their item scores. The overall score for a group or institution is the mean of the students' scores.

The standard error indicates the likely range of scores if the test were given again to the same students. For example, a mean score of 500 ± 10 for freshmen indicates that the true score for freshmen falls between 490 and 510. To determine if mean scores of groups are meaningfully different, it is important to take the standard error into account. For example, if the mean score for sophomores is 505 ± 10 , then it is accurate to say that the freshmen and sophomores who were tested did not score differently. Sample

size effects the standard error. An increase in sample size can result in a smaller standard error.


Note that a subgroup must consist of at least three students in order for a score to be generated. We do not recommend making results for subgroups public if they include fewer than 10 students because of concerns about identifiability and privacy.

Scoring for disposition items is based on a student's judgments regarding strategies. Students earn high scores on these items if they judge behaviors associated with the disposition to be useful and behaviors not associated with the disposition to be not useful. A student's score for a disposition is the sum of the points they score on each of the strategies. Scores with their standard errors are presented on a 100-point scale.



Performance Bars, Histograms, and Pie Charts

Performance bars display where the mean score, shown in orange,  500 ±10 for a group or subgroup falls within the three performance levels. The standard error associated with the mean is shown in black. Each performance level has a different background color: Conditionally ready is yellow, college ready is green, and research ready is blue.

Histograms are used to visually represent the relative distribution of scores in a group or subgroup. These graphs allow you to have an overall sense of how the scores fall around the mean.



Pie charts in the knowledge sections show the number and percentage of students who scored in each of the three performance levels for a group or subgroup. Each performance level has a different background color: Conditionally ready is yellow, college ready is green, and research ready is blue.



Pie charts in the disposition section show the number and percentage of students who scored in each of the three disposition levels for a group or subgroup. Each disposition level has a different background color: Weakly-disposed is orange, moderately-disposed is pink, and strongly-disposed is blue.

Associated Files

In addition to this report, the following files are included in your zip file:

1. Test Item document. A PDF document with a description of each test item.
2. Raw data file. Contains all of the scores presented in this report.
3. Student data file. Contains scores for each of your students.
4. Student data codebook. Describes the demographic options that you configured for your test.
5. Student Report zip file. Contains a directory of PDF documents with an analysis of each student's performance.

Section 3: Summary of Results


This section provides an overview of how your students performed on the Threshold Achievement Test for Information Literacy: Research & Scholarship. For detailed knowledge results organized by subgroups, including standard and custom questions, refer to Section 4 and Section 5. For detailed disposition results, refer to Section 6. For additional analysis, you may wish to collaborate with your institution's research office. Consultants are also available through Carrick Enterprises.

Knowledge Results

Students who attain knowledge of information literacy concepts and practices are well-positioned to effectively address their information needs and contribute meaningfully to the information ecosystem. The knowledge dimension measured by this module specifically addresses students' ability to apply the research process to their college work in order to participate in the scholarly conversation.

Figure 3.1 shows the average score for your students and the averages for institutional groups. The average score for your students, 506, falls within the performance level of college ready. The blue histograms show how scores were distributed.

Figure 3.1 Knowledge Results



Disposition Results

Dispositions are the qualities students cultivate that underlie and shape their actions. Strong dispositions in the information literacy areas covered by the Threshold Achievement Test for Information Literacy are associated with lifelong learning and critical thinking. Students' dispositions also contribute to the climate of the institution. They can be strengthened through high-impact pedagogical practices and social learning.


Your students earned the following mean scores:

- 55 for Productive persistence
- 76 for Mindful self-reflection
- 48 for Responsibility to community

Figure 3.2 shows your institution's mean scores plus the means for institutional groups. Mean scores reflect a weak, moderate, or strong inclination toward the corresponding disposition. For information about disposition levels as well as details about scoring and reading the figures, please see Section 2 of this report.


Figure 3.2 Disposition Results

Disposition 3.1 Productive persistence



Disposition levels: 0 - 44 is weak; 45 - 67 is moderate; 68 - 100 is strong.

Disposition 3.2 Mindful self-reflection



Disposition levels: 0 - 67 is weak; 68 - 88 is moderate; 89 - 100 is strong.

Disposition 3.3 Responsibility to community

Your Institution		Your Peer Institutions		Your Institution Types		All Institutions	
Mean	Std Err	Mean	Std Err	Mean	Std Err	Mean	Std Err
48	±0	53	±0	51	±0	52	±0



Disposition levels: 0 - 44 is weak; 45 - 61 is moderate; 62 - 100 is strong.

Section 4: Overall Knowledge Results

Your students answered 24 knowledge items in the Research & Scholarship module. The knowledge items are based on the outcomes listed in Figure 1.1. Figure 4.1 shows the mean score and standard error for your students.

The number and percentage of students in the three performance levels is displayed in the corresponding pie chart, with the legend underneath. Also shown are your selected peer institutions, your selected institution types, and all institutions. See Section 2 for descriptions of performance levels. Students are assigned to performance levels based on their mean scores as follows:

Score of 1-234: conditionally ready (in yellow)


Score of 235-647: college ready (in green)

Over 647: research ready (in blue)

Figure 4.2 presents mean scores and standard errors for breakouts based on the standard questions you selected and your custom questions.

'n/a' is used when there is no score for the group. A subgroup must consist of at least three students in order for a score to be generated.

Figure 4.1 Knowledge Results



Section 5: Individual Knowledge Outcome Results

This section provides details for the individual knowledge outcomes in this module. Under each outcome, the first figure presents the mean score and standard error for your students. The number and percentage of students in the three performance levels is displayed in the corresponding pie chart, with the legend underneath. Also shown are your selected peer institutions, your selected institution types, and all institutions. See Section 2 for descriptions of performance levels. Students are assigned to performance levels based on their mean scores as follows:

Outcome 3.1

Score of 1-260: conditionally ready (in yellow)

Score of 261-755: college ready (in green)

Over 755: research ready (in blue)

Outcome 3.2

Score of 1-216: conditionally ready (in yellow)

Score of 217-546: college ready (in green)

Over 546: research ready (in blue)

The second figure shows mean scores and standard errors for breakouts based on the standard questions you selected and your custom questions.

The third figure is a listing of the performance indicators for each outcome ranked by your students' overall performance from the strongest to the weakest. The ranking is a relative ordering and does not indicate how well your students performed on a particular performance indicator. Through the use of color bars, these figures also compare your students' performance with your peer institutions on each performance indicator. A blue bar indicates that your students' mean score is higher than or equal to the mean score of your peer institutions. A red bar indicates that your students' mean score is lower than the mean score of your peer institutions.

Outcome 3.1: Understand the processes of scholarly communication and knowledge building.

Figure 5.1 Overall Results






Figure 5.2 Performance Indicators Ranked

Performance indicators are ranked by your students' overall performance from strongest to weakest. The ranking is a relative ordering and does not indicate how well your students performed on a particular performance indicator. A blue bar indicates that your students' mean score is higher than or equal to the mean score of your peer institutions. A red bar indicates that your students' mean score is lower than the mean score of your peer institutions.

-  Categorize common types of sources by whether the authors are expected to list their cited sources. (3.1.5)
-  Evaluate an emerging scholar's likelihood of being accepted into the scholarly conversation. (3.1.12)
-  Identify venues for scholarly communication, such as books, journals, conventions, blogs. (3.1.9)
-  Recognize how interpretations can change based on new research and findings. (3.1.7)
-  Given a literature review, identify the gap that the authors have identified in the existing research. (3.1.2)
-  Identify reasons why scholars track down influential works. (3.1.8)
-  Given a set of research needs, match them to appropriate research methods. (3.1.14)
-  Identify social consequences of scientific falsification. (3.1.6)
-  Recognize that scholars bring their own perspectives to the study of a research topic. (3.1.4)
-  Recognize that research methods change over time. (3.1.10)
-  Given a literature review, identify the established knowledge that is summarized or synthesized. (3.1.1)
-  Given a description of scholarly disagreement, select the interpretation that acknowledges the value of disagreement for moving knowledge forward. (3.1.13)

Outcome 3.2: Understand stages of the research process.

Figure 5.3 Overall Results







Figure 5.4 Performance Indicators Ranked

Performance indicators are ranked by your students' overall performance from strongest to weakest. The ranking is a relative ordering and does not indicate how well your students performed on a particular performance indicator. A blue bar indicates that your students' mean score is higher than or equal to the mean score of your peer institutions. A red bar indicates that your students' mean score is lower than the mean score of your peer institutions.

-  Order the stages of the research process when writing a research paper. (3.2.5)
-  Classify descriptions of specific actions taken during the research process by the stage in the research process when they are most likely to happen. (3.2.12)
-  Given a purpose statement from a research assignment, identify the research question that has an appropriate level of complexity for the information need. (3.2.9)
-  Distinguish between goal-oriented and exploratory searching during the research process. (3.2.3)
-  Identify reasons to begin reading on a subject before solidifying an argument or thesis. (3.2.2)
-  Analyze the consequences of disregarding previous research in the early stages of the information creation process. (3.2.10)
-  Match problems in specific stages of the research paper process with problems they are likely to cause in the research paper product. (3.2.11)
-  Recognize various ways that high quality research questions can be generated. (3.2.1)
-  Analyze multifaceted research questions to identify component parts for systematic investigation. (3.2.8)
-  Given text with conflicting perspectives, formulate suitable research questions. (3.2.7)
-  Explain why research inquiry can be appropriate for personal information needs in addition to academic needs. (3.2.6)
-  Identify the appropriate relationship between a research question and a thesis statement. (3.2.4)

Section 6: Individual Disposition Results

This test measures the strength of students' information literacy dispositions. See Section 1, About the Test, for more information about dispositions and Section 2 for details about disposition performance levels. In the pie charts below, each disposition level has a different background color: Weakly-disposed is orange, moderately-disposed is pink, and strongly-disposed is blue.

Although dispositions related to personality are generally thought to be relatively stable over time, the situational dispositions assessed in this module should be expected to strengthen as students have sustained exposure to an academic community that cultivates these approaches to problem solving.

Each results section below is introduced with an explanation of your students' mean score on the items associated with that disposition, followed by students' overall and subgroup results.

Unlike the overall knowledge results detailed in Section 4, there is no overall dispositional score for this module because each disposition is distinct and some dispositions may work in opposition to one another. For example, feeling responsible to conform to the norms and values of the academic community may sometimes be at odds with mindfully reflecting on one's own assumptions and actions. Higher-scored dispositions should represent an area of relative strength for your students while lower-scored dispositions should represent an area of relative weakness. Areas of strength can be built upon by intensifying the challenges presented to students. Areas of weakness can be directly targeted for improvement through assignments that strengthen metacognition about associated information literacy behaviors.

Disposition 3.1: Productive persistence


Learners who are disposed to demonstrate productive persistence throughout the research process approach inquiry as iterative, adjusting their research question as they learn more.

Example behaviors:

- Applying appropriate methods/practices of inquiry regardless of their complexity or negative emotional associations (e.g., frustration).
- Committing to building a knowledge base through background research when exploring an unfamiliar topic.

Your students' mean score for the set of problem-solving items about productive persistence fell in the moderately-disposed range. Scores in this range suggest that students have begun to recognize that the research process often involves setbacks and requires changing direction. These students are likely to do some background research, even if only through general internet searching. When they get stuck during the research process, they seek out professors, librarians, or classmates to help them find sources, even if those sources mean a shift in direction. Despite their willingness to go through the difficulty of iterative research, students moderately disposed to productive persistence are not yet ready to rely on their own, internal iterative processes of discovery, preferring instead definitive answers to the preferring instead to seek definitive answers from experts.

Figure 6.1 Overall Results



Disposition 3.2: Mindful self-reflection


Learners who are disposed to demonstrate self-reflection in the context of research and scholarship consistently question their own assumptions as they are challenged by new knowledge.

Example behaviors:

- Spending time exploring a topic with openness and curiosity before committing to a thesis or claim.
- Using critiques from professors, librarians, and peers to improve the quality of their inquiry.

Your students' mean score for the set of problem-solving items about mindful self-reflection fell in the moderately-disposed range. Scores in this range suggest that students are able to recognize that research may challenge their assumptions and are willing to consider views outside of their own. They are less likely to keep their inquiry open to the possibility of discovery throughout the research process, even if they are willing to see ideas from a new perspective. They are unlikely to see the research process as a way to test their own assumptions and build their knowledge base.

Figure 6.2 Overall Results



Disposition 3.3: Responsibility to community


Learners who are disposed to demonstrate a sense of responsibility to the scholarly community recognize and conform to academic norms of knowledge building.

Example behaviors:

- Identifying and pursuing appropriate ways to enter the scholarly conversation while still an undergraduate.
- Seeking out and following established models of scholarship and inquiry.

Your students' mean score for the set of problem-solving items about internalizing the norms and values of the academic community fell in the moderately-disposed range. Scores in this range suggest that students are likely to have an appreciation for how the research process is informed by disciplinary practices within the scholarly community. Students who are moderately disposed to feel responsible to the academic community understand the purpose of using a scholarly approach to research, but have not yet internalized how their own research practices are part of a bigger system of knowledge building.

Figure 6.3 Overall Results



Section 7: Targeted Reading Recommendations

Following up on assessment results is the most important step in the assessment cycle. Below are some articles and reports that may help you to formulate a plan for next steps based on the results of your Threshold Achievement assessment.

Corrall, S. (2017). Crossing the threshold: Reflective practice in information literacy development. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 11(1), 23-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11645/11.1.2241>

Graf, A. J., & Harris, B. R. (2016). Reflective assessment: Opportunities and challenges. *Reference Services Review*, 44(1), 38-47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-06-2015-0027>

Hinchliffe, L. J. (2015). Professional development for assessment: Lessons from reflective practice. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41(6), 850-852. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2015.10.004

Markless, S., & Streatfield, D. (2017). How can you tell if it's working? Recent developments in impact evaluation and their implications for information literacy practice. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 11(1), 106-119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11645/11.1.2201>

Tewell, E. (2016). Putting critical information literacy into context: How and why librarians adopt critical practices in their teaching. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*. <http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2016/10/>

You assessed students as part of an effort to measure information literacy at the institution-level. Your TATIL results may provide evidence for your accreditation self-study report. The following resources may help you to draft an ongoing assessment plan as you think about how to contribute to a culture of assessment on your campus:

Baker, G. R., Jankowski, N., Provezis, S. & Kinzie, J. (2012). *Using assessment results: Promising practices of institutions that do it well.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA).

Blank, J. M., McGaughey, K. J., Keeling, E. L., Thorp, K. L., Shannon, C. C., & Scaramozzino, J. M. (2016). A novel assessment tool for quantitative evaluation of science literature search performance: Application to first-year and senior undergraduate biology majors. *College & Research Libraries*, 77(6), 682-702. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.77.6.16551>

Gross, M., Latham, D., & Armstrong, B. (2012). Improving below-proficient information literacy skills: Designing an evidence-based educational intervention. *College Teaching*, 60(3), 104-111. doi:10.1080/87567555.2011.645257

Squibb, S. D., & Mikkelsen, S. (2016). Assessing the value of course-embedded information literacy on student learning and achievement. *College & Research Libraries*, 77(2), 164-183. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.77.2.164>

Suskie, L. A. (2018). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide*. 3d ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wakimoto, D. K., Alexander, S., Bussman, J. D., Winkelman, P. & Jiansheng, G. (2016). Campus-wide information literacy assessment: An opportunity for library leadership through understanding faculty perspectives. *Library Leadership & Management*, 31(1), 1-19.

Whitlock, B. & Ebrahimi, N. (2016). Beyond the library: Using multiple, mixed measures simultaneously in a college-wide assessment of information literacy. *College & Research Libraries*, 77, 236-262. doi:10.5860/crl.77.2.236

If you have not already completed a curriculum map at University of Guam, curriculum analysis may be an important next step for identifying courses or milestones where information literacy instruction could significantly affect student outcomes. Your TATIL results could provide you with the foundational findings you need to get faculty interested in helping you map their curriculum. The following resources explain the process and provide case studies:

Buchanan, H., Webb, K. K., Houk, A. H., & Tingelstad, C. (2015). Curriculum mapping in academic libraries. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 21(1), 94-111. doi:10.1080/13614533.2014.1001413

Franzen, S., & Bannon, C. M. (2016). Merging information literacy and evidence-based practice in an undergraduate health sciences curriculum map. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 10(2), 245-263.

Moselen, C., & Wang, L. (2014). Integrating information literacy into academic curricula: A professional development programme for librarians at the University of Auckland. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40, 116-123. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2014.02.002

If your results suggest a need to develop new curriculum or create a college-wide dialogue about students' information literacy among faculty, the following resources suggest possible models:

Bowles-Terry, M., & Donovan, C. (2016). Serving notice on the one-shot: Changing roles for instruction librarians. *International Information & Library Review*, 48(2), 137-142.

Cowan, S. & Eva, N. (2016). Changing our aim: Infiltrating faculty with information literacy. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 10(2), 163-177.

Hoffmann, D., & Wallace, A. (2013). Intentional informationists: Re-envisioning information literacy and re-designing instructional programs around faculty librarians' strengths as campus connectors, information professionals, and course designers. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 39, 546-551. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2013.06.004

Johnson-Grau, G., Archambault, S. G., Acosta, E. S., & McLean, L. (2016). Patience, persistence, and process: Embedding a campus-wide information literacy program across the curriculum. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 42(6), 750-756. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2016.10.013

Jumonville, A. (2014). The role of faculty autonomy in a course-integrated information literacy program. *Reference Services Review*, 42, 536-551. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/RSR-07-2014-0020

Junisbai, B., Lowe, M. S., & Tagge, N. (2016). A pragmatic and flexible approach to information literacy: Findings from a three-year study of faculty-librarian collaboration. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 42(5), 604-611. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2016.07.001

Smith, P. A. (2016). Integrate and assess: Information literacy as quality enhancement of undergraduate curriculum. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 10(2), 214-244.

If you are interested in the disposition portion of the test, you may want to learn more about the connection between dispositions and learning. Consider how understanding of dispositions can be used to promote training transfer, as described in the following sources:

Bereiter, C. (1995). A dispositional view of transfer. In A. McKeough, J. Lupart, & A. Marini (Eds.), *Teaching for transfer: Fostering generalization in learning* (pp. 21-34). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Bonnet, J. L., Cordell, S. A., Cordell, J., Duque, G. J., MacKintosh, P. J., & Peters, A. J. (2013). The apprentice researcher: Using undergraduate researchers' personal essays to shape instruction and services. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 13, 37-59. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2013.0007>
- Dempsey, P. R., & Jagman, H. (2016). "I felt like such a freshman": First-year students crossing the library threshold. *portal: Libraries & the Academy*, 16(1), 89-107. doi:10.1353/pla.2016.0011
- Duckworth, A. L., & Yeager, D. S. (2015). Measurement matters: Assessing personal qualities other than cognitive ability for educational purposes. *Educational Researcher*, 44, 237-251. doi:10.3102/0013189X15584327
- Farrington, C. A., Roderick, M., Allensworth, E., Nagaoka, J., Keyes, T. S., Johnson, D. W., & Beechum, N. O. (2012). *Teaching Adolescents to Become Learners: The Role of Noncognitive Factors in Shaping School Performance: A Critical Literature Review*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research.
- Folk, A. L. (2016). Academic reference and instruction librarians and Dweck's theories of intelligence. *College & Research Libraries*, 77(3), 302-313. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.77.3.302>
- Leichner, N., Peter, J., Mayer, A. K., & Krampen, G. (2014). Assessing information literacy programmes using information search tasks. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 8(1), 3-20.
- Lenker, M. (2016). Motivated reasoning, political information, and information literacy education. *portal: Libraries & the Academy*, 16(3), 511-528. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2016.0030>
- Perkins, D. N., & Salomon, G. (2012). Knowledge to go: A motivational and dispositional view of transfer. *Educational Psychologist*, 47(3), 248-258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.693354>
- Ross, M., Perkins, H., & Bodey, K. (2016). Academic motivation and information literacy self-efficacy: The importance of a simple desire to know. *Library & Information Science Research*, 38(1), 2-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2016.01.002>

Appendix A. Student Profile

The figure below reports the available demographic data; not all elements of demographic data were reported for all students.

Figure A.1 Student Profile

Subgroups	Your Institution		Your Peer Institutions		Your Institution Types		All Institutions	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL	273	100	4,563	100	785	100	17,763	100

Appendix B. Institutions

Your Peer Institutions

Auburn University
The University of Arizona Global Campus
Wheaton College

Members of Your Institution Types

Longwood University
University of Guam
University of Montevallo

All Institutions

Auburn University
Brigham Young University
California State University Dominguez Hills
California State University, Fresno
Central Connecticut State University
Columbia Basin College
Longwood University
Montana State University
Palomar College
Texas A&M University
Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi
The Harker School
The Ohio State University
The University of Arizona Global Campus
University of Guam
University of Lethbridge
University of Montevallo
University of Northern Colorado
University of Utah
Valencia College
Wheaton College