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How Academic Librarians’ Years of Teaching Experience Impact Their Perceptions of Themselves as Educators
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Abstract

As academic librarians’ instructional responsibilities evolve, it is useful to consider what factors influence how they consider their teacher identities. In this research, the author used a survey instrument grounded in transformative learning theory to explore whether librarians with varying years of experience in instruction held different beliefs about how their teaching identities had developed. She found that individuals’ years of teaching experience impacted whether fellow librarians or those outside of librarianship influenced how they thought of themselves as educators. Moreover, academic librarians who had more experience indicated that changes in their job responsibilities impacted their instructional identities at greater rates than their less experienced counterparts. Understanding these influences can help library leaders to design, provide, and facilitate meaningful learning opportunities for instruction librarians.
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Instructional Experience and Teaching Identities: How Academic Librarians’ Years of Teaching Experience Impact Their Perceptions of Themselves as Educators

As academic librarians across diverse institutions engage in a range of information literacy instructional responsibilities, they may find it relevant to consider how they think of their roles in such instructional interactions. If librarians can better understand what it means to be a librarian-educator and, more specifically, whether certain factors influence librarians with different levels of teaching experience, library leaders and the profession more broadly can better support teaching librarians and information literacy instruction. In this research, the author examined whether academic librarians’ years of instructional experiences influenced how they thought of themselves as educators. The relationships identified may help librarians to more effectively develop their own instructional self-concepts as they design and provide meaningful 21st century learning opportunities.

Literature Review

The first piece in understanding what factors influence instruction librarians’ senses of themselves as educators is to acknowledge how adults develop beliefs about themselves and the world around them. From that starting point, librarians can then use these theoretical underpinnings to explore a particular self-perception—a teaching identity—in the specific context of academic libraries. Additionally, the profession can build on this foundation by examining research on how librarians with different years of teaching experience have developed their self-concept as educators. These three distinct research areas form a scholarly scaffold that frames this article’s research.

While andragogy has identified how adults learn (Knowles, 1980), other theoretical frameworks have considered how adults’ mindsets shift. Mezirow (1978) established the concept of transformative learning. This approach focuses on how individuals use life events and personal observations to develop their views, beliefs, and opinions (Mezirow, 1978, 1981, 1994, 2000). By changing mental patterns to more accurately reflect their viewpoints, adults can establish external identities that are truer to themselves and how they see the world. Transformation as a learning approach emerged from theories focused on communication and conscientization (Freire, 1968/1970; Habermas, 1968/1972), which
helped Mezirow (1978) ground adults’ metacognitive abilities to intentionally reconsider preconceived notions and reframe their beliefs and actions. He called this process *perspective transformation* and asserted that adults experienced phases of:

1. Disorienting dilemma,
2. Self-examination,
3. Critical assessment of roles,
4. Recognition that others experience similar issues,
5. Exploration of options for behavior or action,
6. Development of a plan of action,
7. Acquisition of the necessary knowledge and skills,
8. Trying on of new roles and integration of feedback into practices/actions,
9. Development of competence and confidence in new roles/relationships, and

Although these phases are ordered, Mezirow (1981) believed they could be recursive or that individuals could stop along the process. Since its inception, Mezirow and others (see, for example, Cranton & Carusetta, 2004; Cranton & Roy, 2003; Taylor, 1997) have honed this theory to apply across professional, academic, and personal situations. Its ongoing development and practical stages offer a way to frame academic librarians’ shifts in how they think of themselves as educators.

Academic librarians can make transformative learning and perspective transformation more concrete by defining their own teaching identities; then, they can frame these professional self-concepts as focused situations where perspective transformation can occur. Teaching or teacher identity connotes how individuals think about themselves as educators and their instructional practices (Walter, 2008), and researchers have established that academic librarians can develop teaching identities (Austin & Bhandol, 2013; Mattson et al., 2017; Nichols Hess, 2018; Walter, 2006). This self-concept serves as a starting point to consider how librarians’ demographics differently influence their teacher identities. Post (2011) established that disciplinary faculty at different career phases may find different types of
professional learning, relationships, or work responsibilities to influence their transformative processes. Librarians can use this scholarship as a basis to consider academic librarians’ professional identities.

Mentorship is frequently used as a professional learning structure for academic librarians, especially early in their careers. The research on this topic has explored mentorship from the perspectives of both mentees and mentors (Freedman, 2009; Fyn, 2013; Neyer & Yelinek, 2011; Ross, 2013). While such programs—especially more formal ones—focus on professional responsibilities, other mentoring initiatives have taken “whole person” approaches to encourage expertise- and interest-sharing from new and veteran librarians (Colosimo, Desmeules, & McKinnon, 2017). Professional guidance from a colleague is a targeted approach that can support instruction librarians as they take on new teaching responsibilities or hone their educational identities.

Researchers have explored how different experience-based constructs impact academic librarians’ teaching preparation. For example, Bryan (2016) explored the differences in professional preparation of first- and second-career instruction librarians and found that those with additional working experience outside of librarianship felt more prepared to teach. Moreover, those with other careers found ways to apply their prior work to instructional duties in ways that first-career librarians could not. Similarly, Neville and Henry (2017) considered senior librarians’ experiences to determine the factors that contributed to job growth and satisfaction. In this research, respondents indicated that professional validation, increasing work responsibilities, and engaging interactions with patrons contributed to their continued professional growth. Other research on librarians’ years of experience in the profession has established that this factor may also influence the incidence of workplace bullying (Freedman & Vreven, 2016), the attainment of affective career outcomes (Phillips, Carson, & Carson, 1994), and the need to address organizational change (Lewis & Orr, 2018). Such components, then, may impact librarians differently depending on their years of teaching experience.

This extant scholarship highlights that adults’ perceptions can, and do, change, and that a teaching identity can be a piece of librarians’ professional self-concepts. Although some research has considered programs, constructs, or support systems that assist librarians with different levels of teaching experience to develop instructional practices and personas, this research will further the scholarship by helping the profession to understand how to foster academic librarians’ teacher identity development processes.
Methods

The author employed an exploratory approach in this research and used a survey instrument to generate information from a large respondent group. This data set provided wide-ranging information on many teaching-related topics; as such, other result sets have been shared in different venues (Nichols Hess 2018, 2019a, 2019b, 2020). While the findings presented here are unique, this article’s data collection and cleaning processes contains considerable methodological overlap with the earlier studies. Therefore, the author provides only high-level considerations in this section.

In seeking to make this large data set meaningful, the author selected relationships between variables that would be of interest to librarians with different perspectives. This article, then, focuses on a piece that would be relevant to academic librarians engaged in information literacy instruction. The analytical methods the author used to examine the relationships between the variables presented in this article are unique and are, therefore, explained in more detail in this section.

Survey Instrument, Distribution, and Participants

The author used King’s (2009) Learning Activities Survey to collect data on academic librarians’ perspective transformation around their instructional responsibilities and identities (see Appendix). Changes were made per King’s (2009) specifications to maintain the instrument’s validity and reliability while relating it to academic librarians’ work. The author used Qualtrics to design and distribute the instrument, sending it via email to the American Library Association’s acrlframe-l, ili-l, and infolit-l discussion lists in February to April 2017. A total of 501 people responded to this instrument, but only individuals who believed they had undergone a mental shift were included in data analysis. The author reviewed participants’ responses to survey items about their perspective transformation experiences and identified 353 participants (n = 353) who believed they had experienced transformation around how they thought of themselves as educators (as discussed at length in Nichols Hess, 2018, 2019a, 2019b, 2020). The author excluded all other individuals from subsequent analyses.

Data Preparation Processes

The author used responses from participants who believed they had experienced perspective transformation around their teaching identities (n = 353) to focus on the factors that had influenced these processes. Items 17-19 asked participants to identify all relational,
experiential, and professional inputs they felt had influenced their teaching identity development. These three items contained 41 options, which was not feasible for meaningful analysis. The author used a principal component analysis and a subsequent confirmatory factor analysis to identify broader transformative constructs for each item. These analytical procedures helped the author determine where participants had selected common variables in response to each item; 12 broader constructs emerged that reflected librarians’ experiences. The author combined participants’ \( n = 353 \) individual responses for each construct category into one composite score for each individual; these scores were represented as Z-scores, and the author used them to examine the relationships between the composite categories and participants’ years of teaching experience. One input in item 18 (teaching face-to-face) did not align with a single specific transformative construct. The author maintained this input as a categorical variable (i.e., Yes/No) in subsequent data analysis (as discussed at length in Nichols Hess 2019a, 2019b, 2020).

These 12 transformative constructs were divided between relational, experiential, and professional inputs; the author created thematic titles for each construct based on its respective component parts. The author identified four relational-focused constructs:

- **Supportive interpersonal relationships**: made up of six inputs related to positive lateral relationships with colleagues and disciplinary faculty as well as interactions with students
- **Motivating leaders**: made up of four inputs related to top-down relationships with work mentors, supervisors, and administrators
- **Challenging colleagues**: made up of three inputs related to negative interactions (e.g., criticism, negative feedback, comments on issues with instruction) with colleagues, other librarians, and disciplinary faculty
- **Other important relationships**: relationship-centric inputs participants identified

The author identified five experiential constructs:

- **Professional learning**: made up of seven inputs related to engaging with diverse readings on teaching, attending professional development workshops, and observing another librarian’s instruction
- **Writing and technology-rich teaching**: made up of four inputs related to teaching online or in hybrid environments and writing about teaching practices for publication
- **External feedback:** made up of three inputs related to observing disciplinary faculty's teaching, receiving comments from students, and getting feedback from disciplinary faculty

- **Library-centric input:** made up of three inputs related to library school coursework, experiences engaging in discussion with other librarians about instructional practices, and completing teaching self-reflections

- **Self-reflection and other experiences:** made up of two inputs related to using reflection journals and other experience-centric inputs participants identified

Finally, the author identified three professional constructs:

- **Completing graduate education:** made up of two inputs related to library and non-library program completion

- **Changing job statuses:** made up of three inputs related to individuals' first professional jobs, changing jobs, or losing jobs

- **Other shifting responsibilities:** made up of two inputs related to changing work duties and other work-centric inputs participants identified (as discussed in Nichols Hess, 2018, 2019a, 2019b, 2020)

The author used this cleaned-up data to examine participants' experiences with teaching-based perspective transformation and whether differences existed between librarians with different levels of teaching experience.

**Data Analysis: One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Crosstab**

The author used SPSS to explore whether statistically significant relationships existed between participants' years of teaching experience and the 12 transformative constructs. This analysis involved a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests, which compared means in relation to a single variable. Specifically, ANOVA tests determine whether statistically significant relationships existed between categorical independent variables and continuous dependent variables. Participants' responses to the question about years of teaching experience (the independent variable) were categorical while the compiled data for the 12 transformative constructs as Z-scores were continuous variables. The author used Fisher's Least Significant Distance (LSD) post-hoc comparison tests to better understand where differences existed between groups since one-way ANOVA can only identify whether
differences exist between groups. The standard alpha level of .05 was used to argue for significance.

The author used SPSS to run cross-tabulation analysis with a chi-square test statistic to consider its relationship to librarians’ teaching identity development because the experiential input of teaching face-to-face did not align with any construct. This type of analysis determines whether statistically significant relationships exist between categorical independent and dependent variables. As aforementioned, participants’ years of teaching experience was categorical, and their responses for this input remained categorical, as well. The author used the standard alpha level of .05 to argue for significance.

Findings

Participants' self-identified years of teaching experience is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Years of Teaching Experience \( (n = 353) \)

In this respondent group \( (n = 353) \), 26 had been teaching for less than one year. Seventy-five participants had been teaching for between one and three years, and another 75 respondents reported teaching between four and six years. Fifty-two participants had been teaching for between seven and nine years, and 125 individuals had been teaching for at least ten years.
Based on librarians’ reported years of teaching experience, the author observed differences in the role that the following constructs played in their perspective transformation around their teaching identities:

- supportive interpersonal relationships ($F[4, 352] = 3.66, p = .01$)
- professional learning ($F[4, 352] = 3.62, p = .01$)
- writing and technology-rich teaching ($F[4, 352] = 4.15, p = .02$)
- library-centric input ($F[4, 352] = 6.38, p = .001$)
- changing job statuses ($F[4, 352] = 5.12, p = .004$)
- other shifting responsibilities ($F[4, 352] = 6.24, p < .001$)

Tables 1 through 6 illustrate the differences observed for these constructs. The first column lists participants’ years of teaching experience in ascending order. In the second column, each group’s means are represented as Z-scores, and the third column contains standard deviations. The fourth column lists the groups in which differences occurred and the associated $p$ values between those groups.

For participants with varied years of teaching experience, the supportive interpersonal relationships construct impacted librarians with less teaching experience differently than their more experienced peers (see Table 1). Those with less than 1 year of teaching experience cited this construct as a component in their teaching identity transformation 0.92 standard deviations below the mean. In contrast, those respondents with 4-6 years, 7-9 years, and 10+ years with instruction as a work responsibility cited supportive interpersonal relationships 1.10, 1.02, and 1.03 standard deviations above the mean, respectively. These data suggest that those participants who were newer to teaching did not believe that supportive interpersonal relationships had influenced their teaching identities in the same ways as experienced instruction librarians.

For the professional learning construct, participants with 10+ years with instruction indicated that this construct influenced their teaching 1.05 standard deviations above the mean (see Table 2). Participants with less teaching experience cited this construct as influential at lower rates. For instance, those respondents with less than 1 year indicated this construct had influenced them 0.96 standard deviations below the mean. These data suggest that those participants for whom teaching had been a more long-
standing job responsibility believed that professional learning had influenced their teaching identities in different ways than those with less teaching experience.

### Table 1: Comparison of Supportive Interpersonal Relationships Construct Across Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Mean as a Z-score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Significantly Different From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year (n = 26)</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4-6 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>10+ years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>10+ years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years (n = 52)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Less than 1 year*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years (n = 125)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>No other group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

### Table 2: Comparison of Professional Learning Construct Across Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Mean as a Z-score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Significantly Different From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year (n = 26)</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>10+ years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>No other group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>10+ years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years (n = 52)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>10+ years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years (n = 125)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Less than 1 year*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

In considering how the writing and technology-rich teaching construct had influenced their teaching identities, participants with different levels of teaching experience indicated that this construct had differing effects (see Table 3).
Table 3: Comparison of Writing and Technology-Rich Teaching Construct Across Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Mean as a Z-score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Significantly Different From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year (n = 26)</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>No other group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4-6 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10+ years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1-3 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years (n = 52)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>No other group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years (n = 125)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1-3 years*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Librarians with 1-3 years instructional experience reported this construct as an influence 0.68 standard deviations below the mean; in contrast, participants with 4-6 years and 10+ years cited these influences 1.19 and 1.34 standard deviations above the mean. Again, then, these data suggest that those participants who had some teaching experience found that writing about their teaching practices or engaging in technology-rich instruction had influenced their teaching identities in different ways than those who were newer to instruction.

The library-centric input construct also had diverse impacts on participants’ teaching identities (see Table 4). Those with more teaching experience believed this construct had less of an effect on their teaching identities than those who were newer to instruction. Librarians with 7-9 and 10+ years instructional experience reported this construct as an influence 0.68 and 1.05 standard deviations below the mean, respectively. In contrast, participants with 1-3 years and 4-6 years in teaching indicated this construct as influential 1.30 and 1.37 standard deviations above the mean, respectively. These data suggest that those participants who are newer to teaching believed that feedback from those within librarianship—co-workers, external colleagues, library school faculty—was influential to their teaching identities; conversely, those librarians with more instructional experience believed this construct to be less influential to their senses of themselves as educators.
### Table 4: Comparison of Library-Centric Input Construct Across Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Mean as a Z-score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Significantly Different From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year (n = 26)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>No other group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>10+ years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>7-9 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10+ years**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years (n = 52)</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4-6 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years (n = 125)</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1-3 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 years**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .001

For the changing job statuses construct, those who had been working in instruction for less than 1 year believed this construct had a greater effect on their teaching identities than any other group (see Table 5).

### Table 5: Comparison of Changing Job Statuses Construct Across Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Mean as a Z-score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Significantly Different From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year (n = 26)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1-3 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-9 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10+ years**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Less than 1 year*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Less than 1 year*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years (n = 52)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Less than 1 year*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years (n = 125)</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Less than 1 year**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .001
Librarians with less than 1 year of teaching experience reported this construct as an influence 2.92 standard deviations above the mean. In contrast, participants with 1-3 years, 4-6 years, and 7-9 years in teaching indicated this construct as influential 0.90, 1.03, and 0.74 standard deviations above the mean, respectively; those with 10+ years in teaching indicated this construct as influential 0.79 standard deviations below the mean. These data suggest that for librarians with new instruction responsibilities, a change in job status (e.g., a new position) has an outsized influence on their teaching identities. Those who were more established in their work found this construct to be less influential to their senses of themselves as educators.

Finally, for the other shifting responsibilities construct, participants with varying years of teaching experience saw this construct as having varied impacts on their teaching identities (see Table 6).

**Table 6: Comparison of Other Shifting Responsibilities Construct Across Years of Teaching Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Mean as a Z-score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Significantly Different From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year (n = 26)</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4-6 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-9 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10+ years**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>10+ years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years (n = 75)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>Less than 1 year*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10+ years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years (n = 52)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>Less than 1 year*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years (n = 125)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Less than 1 year**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 years*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

The author also used a chi-square test of independence to examine whether teaching face-to-face impacted participants’ teaching identity transformation in relation to their years of teaching experience. The author did not find a statistically significant relationship between
these variables, $X^2(4, n = 353) = 2.94, p = .57$. These data suggest that teaching face-to-face does not differently influence librarians’ teaching identity transformation depending on their level of teaching experience.

Discussion

Based on these analyses, academic librarians’ years of teaching experience seemed to impact how several transformative constructs influenced their teaching identities. This section includes the general takeaways about these factors, along with practical implications that academic librarians can consider for their own instructional self-concepts.

First, different interpersonal relationships impacted academic librarians’ senses of themselves as educators depending on their level of teaching experience. Newer librarians indicated that library-based interactions and feedback (e.g., from colleagues, peers at other institutions) were more instructive in informing their teaching identities. Practically, then, academic librarians who are newer to information literacy instruction may want to seek out these experiences—through formal mentorship, as previously discussed—but also in informal collegial relationships or even social media-based interactions focused on teaching. Conversely, librarians who had accrued more time as instructors cited relationships outside of the profession as having larger influences on fostering their teaching identity development. More experienced instructional librarians, then, may find it beneficial to focus on building connections with disciplinary faculty, institutional administrators, and even students to foster more meaningful instructional identity development. Liaison responsibilities, institutional centers for teaching and learning, or teaching-centric conferences and workshops may help librarians build these relationships. Such targeted approaches can help academic librarians with different years of teaching experience to develop interpersonal connections for perspective transformation around their teaching identities.

Second, certain experiences held different meaning for academic librarians with different levels of teaching experience. This research validates academic librarians’ ongoing need for professional development: Instruction librarians with ten or more years of experience indicated that they still found value for their teaching identities in such learning experience. Specifically, academic librarians with more instructional experience found self-directed professional learning opportunities to be more relevant than their more junior colleagues; they may want to seek such experiences more intentionally. Moreover, those with more
teaching experience believed that writing about their teaching and providing online or hybrid instruction influenced how they thought about their instructional identities in ways that their less-experienced colleagues did not. More experienced instructional librarians, then, may benefit from branching into technology-rich instruction or intentionally writing about their instructional work as these experiences may help facilitate the perspective transformation phases (Mezirow, 1981). Additionally, librarians may find it beneficial to devote time to pursuing innovative instructional modes or publishing their practices as they become more experienced teachers.

Third, academic librarians with different levels of teaching experience believed that different professional constructs had influenced their teaching identities. Librarians newer to instruction indicated that their new positions shaped their senses of themselves as educators; librarians with more instructional experience felt that additional responsibilities within pre-existing jobs changed their instructional self-concepts. While perhaps these dynamics are not surprising, these findings can help librarians and library leaders be more aware of the impact that new instructional positions or responsibilities can have on academic librarians. Both individual librarians and library supervisors can leverage the relationship and experiential components at these times to encourage teaching identity development in intentional, meaningful ways.

Overall, then, academic librarians’ relationships, experiences, and professional roles around teaching shaped their views of themselves as educators as they gain more experience. Librarians should identify opportunities to engage in new, different, or challenging hands-on practices and reflect on those experiences to further grow and develop. At organizational levels, academic library administrators can support instruction librarians in any such efforts. Such backing may motivate librarians to pursue more teaching-centric relationships and professional development while innovating their instructional practices.

Limitations

Although this research can inform academic librarians’ perspectives and practices, it has several limitations. First, the statistically significant relationships reported are suggestive in nature. Moreover, the data represent individuals’ perceptions rather than concrete actions, and their responses did not require evidence. And finally, these findings are part of a broader picture about academic librarians’ teaching identities. They should be considered with the other statistically significant relationships from this research (Nichols Hess, 2018,
2019a, 2019b, 2020) to understand how academic librarians believe their senses of themselves as educators develop.

Conclusion and Future Research

The author's exploratory study highlighted that academic librarians with varied years of teaching experience believed that different relational, experiential, and professional constructs influence their teaching identities. This research offers several directions for future inquiry, and more in-depth research can provide additional guidance on how to best support academic librarians at different career phases. For instance, understanding why librarians with more years of teaching experience find external feedback to be more instructive about their teaching identities can help instruction librarians to develop strategies that foster connection-making across disciplines. Additionally, recognizing what components of a new position or work responsibility encourage instruction librarians to rethink their senses of self as educators can allow academic librarians to capitalize on those opportunities. By more holistically understanding academic librarians' teaching identities, academic librarianship as a profession can more fully support its education-centric professionals and ensure that information literacy instruction is effective and meaningful for learners across environments.
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Appendix: Modified Version of King’s (2009) Learning Activities Survey

1. Do you agree to participate in this study?
   - Yes, I agree to participate in this study.
   - No, I do not agree to participate in this study.

2. Is information literacy instruction part of your current work responsibilities?
   - Yes
   - No

3. Gender
   - Prefer not to say
   - Male
   - Female

4. Ethnicity
   - White / Caucasian
   - Hispanic or Latinx
   - Black or African American
   - Native American or American Indian
   - Asian / Pacific Islander
   - Other
   - Multiracial
   - Prefer not to answer

5. Age group
   - Under 25
   - 25-34
   - 35-44
   - 45-54
6. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   - Bachelor's degree
   - Master's degree
   - Professional degree
   - Doctorate degree
   - Other

7. Have you completed a graduate degree in addition to a Master's degree in library/information science?
   - No
   - No, but I am in the process of completing an additional Master's degree
   - No, but I am in the process of completing a professional degree
   - No, but I am in the process of completing a doctoral degree
   - Yes, I have an additional Master's degree
   - Yes, I have a professional degree
   - Yes, I have a doctoral degree
   - Other

8. When did you graduate from library school?
   - I did not attend library school
   - I am currently in library school
   - Within the last year
   - 1-3 years ago
   - 4-6 years ago
9. At what kind of institution do you work?
   - I am not currently employed
   - Community or junior college
   - Four-year college
   - Master's-granting university
   - Doctoral/research university
   - Other

10. How long have you worked at your current institution?
   - Less than one year
   - 1-3 years
   - 4-6 years
   - 7-9 years
   - 10+ years

11. How long has instruction been a part of your work responsibilities?
   - Less than one year
   - 1-3 years
   - 4-6 years
   - 7-9 years
   - 10+ years
12. What kinds of instruction are part of your work responsibilities? Select all that apply.

- Face-to-face instruction
- Online instruction
- Blended / hybrid instruction

13. On average, how frequently do you engage in classroom instruction?

- Once a year
- 1-3 times a semester
- 4-6 times a semester
- 7-9 times a semester
- 10+ times a semester

14. Think about your professional experiences in teaching—check off any of the following statements that apply.

- I had an experience that caused me to question the way I normally teach.
- I had an experience that caused me to question my ideas about professional roles (Examples of professional roles include the kinds of instructional responsibilities an academic librarian should take on.)
- As I questioned my ideas, I realized I no longer agreed with some or all of my previous beliefs or role expectations.
- As I questioned my ideas, I realized I still agreed with some or all of my beliefs or role expectations.
- I realized that other people also questioned their beliefs about their instructional roles or responsibilities.
- I thought about acting in a different way from my usual teaching beliefs and roles.
- I felt uncomfortable with professional expectations (for example, what my job responsibilities or work roles were) around teaching and instruction.
I tried out new teaching roles so I would become more comfortable and confident in them.

I tried to figure out a way to adopt these new ways of acting.

I gathered the information I needed to adopt these new ways of acting.

I began to think about the reactions and feedback from my new professional behavior.

I took action and adopted these new ways of acting.

I do not identify with any of the statements above.

15. Since you have been providing information literacy instruction, do you believe you experienced a time when you realized that your values, beliefs, opinions, or expectations (for example, how you viewed your work responsibilities or roles as an academic librarian) changed?

- Yes
- No
- I'm not sure

16. Describe what happened when you realized your values, beliefs, opinions, or expectations about your instructional responsibilities had changed. [Free response]

17. Did any of the following individuals influence this change? Check all that apply.

- Interaction with a student or students
- Support from a colleague
- A challenge from a colleague
- Support from another librarian
- A challenge from another librarian
- Support from a subject area faculty member
- A challenge from a subject area faculty member
- Support from a mentor
- A challenge from a mentor
18. Did any specific learning experience or resource influence this change? If so, check all that apply.

- Taking a class or classes in library school
- Taking a class or classes in another graduate program
- Teaching in a face-to-face course
- Teaching in an online course
- Teaching in a blended/hybrid course
- Observing other academic librarians' instructional practices
- Receiving feedback from other academic librarians on your teaching practices
- Observing subject area faculty's instructional practices
- Receiving feedback from subject area faculty on your teaching practices
- Receiving feedback from students who participated in your instruction
- Completing a self-assessment of your teaching practices
- Writing about your teaching practices in a reflection journal or other personal format
- Writing about your teaching practices for publication
- Attending meetings, workshops, or trainings within your normal working environment
- Attending professional meetings, conferences, or workshops outside of your normal working environment
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19. Did any significant professional event influence the change? If so, check all that apply.

- Completion of library graduate program
- Completion of other graduate program
- First professional job after graduate school
- Change of job
- Loss of job
- Change in job responsibility or duties
- Other ________________________________

20. Think back to when you first realized that your views or perspective had changed. What did your professional life have to do with the experience of change? [Free response]

21. Would you characterize yourself as someone who usually thinks back over previous decisions or past behavior?

- Yes
- No
22. Would you characterize yourself as someone who reflects upon the meaning of your professional experiences for your own purposes?
   o Yes
   o No

23. Which of the following factors have been a part of your instructional work as an academic librarian? Please select all that apply.
   o Interaction with a student or students
   o Support from a colleague
   o A challenge from a colleague
   o Support from another librarian
   o A challenge from another librarian
   o Support from a subject area faculty member
   o A challenge from a faculty member
   o Support from a mentor
   o A challenge from a mentor
   o Support from a supervisor
   o A challenge from a supervisor
   o Taking a class or classes in library school
   o Taking a class or classes in another graduate program
   o Teaching a face-to-face class session
   o Teaching or providing instruction for an online course
   o Observing other academic librarians’ instructional practices
   o Receiving feedback from other academic librarians on your teaching practices
   o Observing subject area faculty’s instructional practices
   o Receiving feedback from subject area faculty on your teaching practices
Receiving feedback from students who participated in your instruction
Completing a self-assessment of your teaching practices
Writing about your teaching practices in a reflection journal or other personal format
Writing about your teaching practices for publication
Attending professional meetings, conferences, or workshops outside of your normal working environment
Attending meetings, workshops, or trainings within your normal working environment
Participating in online webinars or seminars
Reviewing guidelines, standards, or other documents from professional organizations
Reading the scholarly literature on information literacy instruction
Reading the scholarly literature on the scholarship of teaching and learning
Other ________________________________________________
None of these have been factors of my instructional work as a librarian

[Submit survey]

Thank you for completing this survey! Would you be willing to participate in a virtual follow-up interview? If so, please include your first and last name as well as an email address where you can be reached during the summer months.

Name ________________________________________________

Email address ________________________________________________

Individuals who qualify to participate in the follow-up interviews will be selected at random.

Kathleen P. King retains the copyright to the Learning Activities Survey. Adapted with permission.