Equivalent: Jurnal Ilmiah Sosial Teknik
Volume 8, Issue 5, 2084-2093
e_ISSN: 2775-0833
https://jurnalequivalent.id/index.php/jequi/index
DOI: doi.org/10.59261/jequi.v8i5.454

Integrating Alessi–Trollip and ASSURE for University Library User Education

Mahdianto* Universitas Jambi, Indonesia
Ilham Universitas Jambi, Indonesia
Sofyan Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

***Corresponding author:**
Mahdianto, Universitas Jambi, Indonesia.
✉mahdianto@unja.ac.id

Article Info:
Article history:
Received: September 04, 2026
Revised: October 10, 2026
Accepted: October 12, 2026
Available Online: November 03, 2026

Keywords:
ASSURE Model;
Instructional Media;
Library User Education;
Alessi–Trollip Model;
University Libraries;

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Copyright © 2026 by Author. Published by Cerdika International Cyber Polytechnic

Abstract

Background: Digital transformation requires university libraries to shift library user education from administrative, one-way, face-to-face orientations to more adaptive learning programs. Meanwhile, students at the UPT Library of UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi continue to demonstrate low levels of technical competency (scores of 2.53–2.70 on a 5-point scale), particularly in using digital catalogs, authenticating access to scholarly journals, and navigating e-book collections.
Objective: To describe how the stages of the Alessi–Trollip model and the ASSURE model were integrated to plan, design, and formatively evaluate instructional videos for university library users.
Methods: This development-oriented study employed descriptive qualitative analysis at the UPT Library of UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi. Data from observations, design documents, and interviews with media experts, subject-matter experts, and students were analyzed thematically and compared across sources.
Results: Reported learner difficulties informed the development of simplified narrative scripts and storyboard sequences. Feedback from experts and students guided the design and revision of quizzes and an Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC) navigation simulation. However, no learning-gain results were reported.
Conclusion: The findings suggest a practical approach to integrating learner-focused planning, multimedia design, and formative evaluation in university library user education. The effects of this approach on learning outcomes require further empirical testing.

To cite this article: Mahdianto, Ilham, & Sofyan. (2026). integrating alessi–trollip and assure for university library user education. *Equivalent: Jurnal Ilmiah Sosial Teknik*, *8*(5), 2084-2093. https://doi.org/10.59261/jequi.v8i5.454

INTRODUCTION

University library user education increasingly extends beyond a single face-to-face orientation session because students must independently navigate digital catalogs, scholarly databases, and electronic collections. The need for asynchronous and reusable information literacy instruction has also been documented in library settings. Slack (2021) describes the use of instructional videos to support undergraduate library users, while Noetel et al. (2021) synthesize evidence on video-supported learning in higher education. These international studies establish the relevance of digital learning resources but do not demonstrate that a particular video design will improve users' competencies in the library examined in this study. The local design problem, therefore, concerns aligning technical multimedia design decisions with students' demonstrated information needs (Naveed, 2020; Sobirin et al., 2023; Vitriana, 2024).

Empirical evidence from the field indicates a concerning gap between infrastructure development and users' technical competencies. At the UPT Library of UIN Sulthan Thaha

Saifuddin Jambi, students' average technical competency scores are low, ranging from 2.53 to 2.70 on a five-point scale. Students continue to experience significant difficulties operating the Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC), understanding authentication procedures for scholarly journals, and navigating e-book collections. These findings are consistent with a broader pattern reported in libraries at other Islamic universities in Indonesia: although Generation Z students tend to prefer visual, rapid, and practical learning experiences, their information literacy levels do not necessarily correspond to the intensity with which they use digital technology in their daily lives (Rodliyah, 2024; Susilo et al., 2024). This phenomenon suggests that the availability of sophisticated digital facilities does not necessarily translate into improved academic achievement unless adequate instructional media are provided to bridge gaps in users' technical knowledge (Fuentes & Labad, 2025).

In this context, developing instructional videos represents a potentially important and timely solution. Video offers the advantage of asynchronous access, allowing students to engage with instructional materials flexibly through their personal devices, regardless of time or location (Santiago Jr et al., 2021). Tomaszewski (2023), in a study of library snackables, found that concise instructional videos focused on specific procedures can support user retention more effectively than conventional orientation sessions that present dense information over extended periods. Video can also translate abstract concepts related to information organization into concrete, actionable procedures suited to a digitally engaged generation with a potential preference for visual and auditory learning (Latifah & Sa'diyah, 2024). Such media may complement conventional, instructor-led orientation methods and provide students with more meaningful opportunities for self-directed learning (Gutersohn et al., 2025; Kundu & Das, 2025).

Previous research provides complementary but incomplete guidance for the present context. Fajri et al. (2026) emphasize multimedia production through the Alessi–Trollip model, whereas Kurniawan (2023) and Lubis & Maulida (2024) address learner-centered instructional planning through the ASSURE model. These studies inform design decisions, but their separate applications do not explain how observations of library users can be translated into specific storyboard decisions and subsequently reconsidered in light of participant feedback. Bergstrom-Lynch (2019) examine the outcomes of library user education rather than tracing the design decisions underlying instructional media development. Reviews of instructional video design also caution against assuming that technically appealing videos are necessarily educationally effective (Fyfield et al., 2022; Polat, 2023). The gap addressed in this study, therefore, concerns the insufficiently specified relationship among learner analysis, multimedia production, and formative revision in university library user education. It does not imply that the two models have never previously been combined in any context.

This study contributes a decision-linked integration of the two frameworks rather than merely applying them sequentially. Observations and interviews concerning learners' difficulties inform the planning and storyboarding of instructional videos through the ASSURE model's Analyze Learners and State Objectives stages, in conjunction with the Alessi–Trollip model's planning and design activities. The resulting prototypes are then reviewed through expert feedback and student participation, with revisions informed by the Development and Evaluate and Revise stages of the Alessi–Trollip model.

This integration establishes a traceable rationale for simplifying technical library procedures and determining where to position interactive prompts. Situated at the UPT Library of UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi, the study addresses reported technical competency scores ranging from 2.53 to 2.70 on a five-point scale. Its objectives are to describe how learner analysis is integrated with technical design, examine how participant involvement and formative revision are organized, and interpret the implications for librarians' instructional roles. Conceptually, the study offers a mapping between instructional design stages and specific design decisions; practically, it may help librarians and library managers plan, develop, and evaluate instructional videos. These implications are design-oriented and do not constitute evidence of improved learning outcomes.

METHOD

This study adopted a development-oriented Research and Development (R&D) process, with the findings reported through descriptive qualitative analysis. Its purpose was to document and interpret design decisions and formative feedback rather than experimentally test the intervention's effectiveness. The Alessi–Trollip model organized the process into planning, design, and development, while the ASSURE model provided a framework for learner analysis, learning objectives, media selection and utilization, learner participation, and evaluation and revision. Their integration was reflected in several stages of the design process: learner needs informed the development of the narrative and storyboard, learning objectives guided segment design, and feedback from experts and students informed subsequent revisions. However, the study did not include a controlled comparison, pretest and posttest assessments, N-Gain analysis, or numerical feasibility scores. Therefore, the findings illustrated a context-specific development process rather than providing empirical evidence of the product's effectiveness.

The research was conducted at the UPT Library of UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi, where reported student technical competency scores ranged from 2.53 to 2.70 on a five-point scale. Informants were selected purposively from three groups relevant to the development process: media experts with expertise in instructional design or educational technology, material experts with experience in library service procedures, and student users involved in learner analysis and limited product trials. The selection criteria described in the available study account concerned the relevance of each informant's role and their experience with the corresponding design or user task. The original documentation did not report the numerical size or demographic composition of each group. These details could not be reconstructed from the available evidence, limiting assessments of sample adequacy and transferability.

The development process was structured around the planning, design, and development phases. During planning, observations of user education and existing technical competency information were considered alongside discussions with librarians to identify difficulties related to OPAC use, journal access, and e-book navigation. During design, the identified procedures were translated into shorter narrative steps and storyboard sequences aligned with the stated learning objectives. During development, the video elements and participant prompts, including short quizzes and an OPAC navigation simulation, were reviewed through alpha-stage feedback from media and material experts and limited beta-stage participation by students.

Qualitative data were obtained through participatory observation during planning, production, and trial activities; analysis of narrative scripts, storyboards, and revision documents; and semistructured interviews with media experts, subject matter experts, and students. These interviews explored learners' difficulties, procedural accuracy, narrative clarity, storyboard sequencing, the usability of participation prompts, and feedback on proposed revisions. While experts provided feedback on the technical presentation and accuracy of library procedures, students assessed the comprehensibility and usability of the learning prompts. The available materials did not specify the instrument items, scoring rubrics, interview durations or counts, or predefined alpha- and beta-testing thresholds. Therefore, these details were neither assumed nor reported as established elements of the research protocol.

Qualitative analysis involved data selection, thematic organization, and cross-source interpretation. The reported observations, interview accounts, and design documents were examined for recurring issues related to learner difficulties, narrative and storyboard responses, interactive participation, and feedback-driven revision. These issues were organized into three analytical themes presented in the Results section: learner analysis and technical design, learner participation, and the evolving instructional roles of librarians. Interpretations were compared across the reported perspectives of experts and students and against the design artifacts and observational accounts. Because the source manuscript did not retain a documented codebook, coded transcript excerpts, or a frequency audit trail, the analysis was presented as a descriptive thematic synthesis rather than as independently reproducible formal coding.

The study described source triangulation across media experts, material experts, and student users, together with comparisons of observations, design documents, and interviews. It also reported that preliminary interpretations were discussed with experts again as a form of member checking. These practices provided opportunities to question initial interpretations;

however, the manuscript did not provide a participant-by-participant triangulation record or signed member-checking documentation. Consequently, credibility was discussed cautiously, without asserting that every interpretation had been independently confirmed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Synergy of Learner Analysis and Technical Design

The integration of the instructional models began with the incorporation of the Analyze Learners stage of the ASSURE model and the planning stage of the Alessi–Trollip model, establishing a foundation for data-informed multimedia development. In this initial phase, the researcher conducted an in-depth analysis of user characteristics through interviews and observations of students accessing library services. Field findings indicated that students often experienced cognitive difficulties when encountering complex library terminology, such as "cataloging" and "preservation." This pattern was consistent with the technical competency gap (scores of 2.53–2.70) identified as part of the rationale for this study. In response to these difficulties, the subject matter and media experts involved in the design process agreed that the video narration should use familiar, accessible, and straightforward language while retaining academic rigor, thereby facilitating users' understanding of the material.

Furthermore, the design stage of the Alessi–Trollip model plays a crucial role, particularly in developing narrative scripts and detailed storyboards based on the learner characteristics identified during the preceding analysis. This stage addresses not only aesthetic considerations but also cognitive requirements to ensure that information is presented systematically. Each technical library procedure, such as borrowing books through an automated library system or a self-service machine, is broken down into clear, sequential visual steps. Visualizing these procedures is essential for translating the complexity of library operations into practical instructions that students can follow. Through the careful organization of visual sequences in the storyboard, developers can ensure that transitions between audio and visual elements are logical and coherent. Similar approaches have been associated with high product-feasibility ratings in expert assessments (Fajri et al., 2026; Sutikno & Khoirunisa, 2025).

The thematic summary of the source manuscripts indicates that material experts and student users considered short, clearly sequenced visual explanations more approachable for understanding complex library procedures. This reported perception is consistent with the decision to simplify technical terminology and break procedures into storyboard steps. However, it does not independently demonstrate a reduction in operational errors or a statistically significant improvement in student competence. Because verbatim quotations and original observation records were not available in the two reviewed manuscripts, this account presents the available themes without inventing participant statements or additional measurements.

Active User Participation in the Digital Ecosystem

The second theme concerns the alignment of the Require Learner Participation stage of the ASSURE model with multimedia development and formative evaluation. According to the source account, short quizzes at the ends of video segments and an Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC) navigation simulation were incorporated to provide opportunities for active learner engagement. The reported student feedback suggests that the quizzes helped participants identify procedural steps they did not yet understand. This finding represents a perception reported in the qualitative development account rather than evidence of measured improvements in comprehension or task performance.

The manuscript reports two stages of formative feedback during product development. The alpha stage involved reviews by media and subject matter experts, who assessed the alignment of interactive prompts with learning objectives and the coherence of the narrative sequence. The subsequent beta stage involved student users, whose feedback informed revisions to quiz placement and difficulty. However, the manuscript does not report participant numbers, quantitative validation scores, or standardized pretest and posttest measures. Consequently, the findings provide a basis for discussing the iterative design process and the perceived usability of

the product, but they do not establish its validity or educational effectiveness through quantitative evidence.

Taken together, the reported feedback suggests that learner participation should be considered alongside narrative pacing and technical feasibility. Experts identified a potential design risk in placing interactive prompts without regard to the instructional sequence, whereas a purely explanatory video may provide limited opportunities for active learner engagement. These implications for instructional design are derived from qualitative feedback; their effects on knowledge retention and task accuracy remain to be tested.

Transformation of the Role of Librarians

The development account indicates that librarians contributed procedural expertise to the learner-analysis process and storyboard discussions. Translating OPAC and electronic-resource instructions into accessible narrative steps required librarians to consider learners' perspectives alongside the technical accuracy of library procedures. The findings suggest that librarians involved in this project assumed an expanded role in instructional design, rather than demonstrating a general institutional shift in librarians' responsibilities across all settings.

As instructors who support information literacy, librarians can use instructional videos to translate complex library procedures into accessible, practical guidance for students. This approach is consistent with the argument that libraries need to evolve into dynamic, user-centered information-service systems (Latifah & Sa'diyah, 2024). Videos developed through the integration of the two models can also serve as reusable digital resources that support the continuity of library services without requiring librarians to be physically present at all times. This potential is consistent with research suggesting that short, focused instructional videos can support user retention of information compared with conventional face-to-face sessions (Tomaszewski, 2023).

The integration offers a potential means of making procedural library guidance available beyond scheduled orientation sessions. Its practical value lies in illustrating how subject expertise can inform learning objectives, scripts, and feedback cycles. However, claims concerning inclusive access, independent information retrieval, or improved academic performance remain prospective because these outcomes were not directly measured in the present study.

Discussion

Interpretation of Findings on the Conceptual Framework

The study's empirical contribution lies in establishing a traceable relationship among three key design decisions. Evidence of learner needs informs storyboard development, instructional objectives guide the design of participatory prompts, and feedback from experts and students informs subsequent revisions. This approach goes beyond the parallel application of the Alessi–Trollip and ASSURE models by linking the outputs of instructional planning to specific multimedia design decisions and using feedback to guide further refinements. The mapping below summarizes how the reported activities relate to their respective design functions. It represents a conceptual synthesis of the source manuscript rather than the results of an additional empirical test.

Table 1

Conceptual linkage of instructional-design stages and reported design decisions (synthesis of the submitted study)

ASSURE component	Alessi–Trollip stage	Design decision supported by the source
Analyze Learners	Planning	Use reported OPAC, journal and e-book difficulties to scope topics
State Objectives / Select Media	Design	Match instructional aims with scripts, simpler terminology and micro-visual storyboard steps
Utilize Media / Require Participation	Development	Include segment quizzes and an OPAC navigation simulation

Evaluate and Revise	Formative feedback in Development	Use expert and student responses to reconsider quiz placement and difficulty

This integration addresses a potential mismatch between visually polished content and learners' actual needs, an issue also discussed in the instructional-video literature (Fyfield et al., 2022; Polat, 2023). Nevertheless, the available qualitative evidence establishes neither superior learning outcomes nor a comparative advantage over either model used independently. The study's contribution lies in explicitly describing the proposed relationships among learner analysis, media production, participation, and revision.

Comparison with Previous Research

Previous research on media development using the Alessi–Trollip model has emphasized production processes and feasibility considerations Fajri et al. (2026), whereas applications of the ASSURE model have foregrounded the alignment of learner characteristics, instructional objectives, and teaching strategies (Kurniawan, 2023; Lubis & Maulida, 2024). Research on video use in higher education has reported broader potential benefits Noetel et al. (2021), while research on librarian-led instructional videos has provided relevant institutional examples (Slack, 2021). The present study contributes a context-specific account of how user difficulties, media-design decisions, and formative feedback can inform one another. However, it does not replicate the comparative or quantitative designs of those studies and cannot attribute causal learning gains to the proposed integration.

The findings concerning the transformation of librarians' roles also reinforce and extend the argument that structured user-education programs can substantially influence users' understanding, as examined through an N-Gain-based quantitative evaluation involving graduate students. Whereas that study evaluates the outcomes of user education, the present study complements this perspective by examining the process through which instructional media for such programs are designed. This process-oriented contribution is relevant because research on user education in Indonesia has examined program outcomes, while the methodological development of the instructional media used in these programs warrants further investigation (Rusydiyah et al., 2023; Sobirin et al., 2023).

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Theoretically, this study proposes an integrated rather than strictly sequential interpretation of the two instructional-design frameworks. The ASSURE model provides a structure for considering learners, objectives, media use, participation, and evaluation, while the Alessi–Trollip model organizes the planning, design, development, and evaluation of instructional media. Within the proposed integration, information generated through the ASSURE stages informs corresponding planning, design, and development decisions under the Alessi–Trollip model. The contribution lies in specifying these relationships within the context of university library user education. The study neither revises the original theories nor empirically validates the relative performance of the integrated framework.

In practice, librarians and library managers may use the integration framework to identify user difficulties before developing scripts, ensure that each visual sequence supports a learning objective, and solicit user feedback before routine implementation. These practices may improve the transparency and organization of the media-development process. Whether the resulting videos improve information-literacy competence, however, requires a separate outcome evaluation.

Research Limitations

This study is limited to a descriptive qualitative account of the media-development process at a single university library. The reviewed manuscripts do not specify participant numbers and characteristics by group, provide verbatim interview excerpts or a coding audit trail, or report quantitative feasibility assessments or learning-outcome indicators. These omissions constrain the verification and transferability of the findings. Further research should document

complete participant and instrument information, preserve coded interview excerpts and design artifacts, evaluate the instructional media using appropriate pretest–posttest or N-Gain measures, and examine the framework across multiple institutions and larger user groups.

Operationalizing the Integrated Design Framework

The proposed integration can be interpreted as a series of connected design decisions rather than as a requirement to complete one model before beginning the other. At the planning stage, the ASSURE emphasis on analyzing learners helps specify the user problems that Alessi–Trollip planning must address. In the present setting, these problems concern OPAC navigation, journal authentication, and e-book access. Their identification provides a defensible rationale for choosing procedural topics rather than producing a broad promotional video about library services. This distinction matters because an instructional resource should respond to a defined task that users find difficult, not merely display the features of a digital library.

At the design stage, the relationship becomes more concrete. The ASSURE requirement to state objectives can guide the selection of a single procedure for each video segment, while Alessi–Trollip storyboarding can specify what a learner sees and hears at each step. For example, a segment addressing catalog navigation could begin by explaining the purpose of a search, proceed through the relevant interface actions, and end with a prompt asking the learner to identify the next action. This example illustrates a possible application of the reported framework; it is not presented as a transcript or a newly documented feature of the tested product. The central principle is that narrative wording, screen sequence, and participation prompts should all be traceable to the same learning objective.

The development stage connects the selection and use of media with formative evaluation. The source account describes expert reviews and limited student participation that informed revisions to quizzes and the OPAC simulation. These activities suggest a useful distinction between procedural accuracy and instructional accessibility. A technically correct explanation may still be difficult for a novice to follow, whereas an accessible explanation may omit details needed to complete the actual task. Reviewing both dimensions creates opportunities to identify such tensions before wider deployment. The available evidence supports this interpretation of the process, but not a claim that all potential usability problems were resolved.

Design Considerations for Accessible and Reusable Instructional Videos

The reported preference for simplified narration and short visual sequences has implications for how library procedures are represented. Technical terms should be introduced when necessary, accompanied by a concise explanation tied to the action being demonstrated. Interface screenshots or recordings should focus attention on the specific menu, field, or link relevant to the task. Excessive on-screen text may compete with narration, particularly when students must simultaneously interpret unfamiliar terminology and follow several interface actions. These considerations are design recommendations inferred from the reported learner difficulties and from the study's emphasis on storyboard clarity; they were not separately tested as design variables.

Reusability also requires attention to the maintenance of digital instructions. OPAC interfaces, journal authentication routes, and e-book platforms may change after a video is produced. A modular structure, with separate segments for distinct procedures, could make revisions less burdensome than replacing a single lengthy orientation resource. Library managers could assign responsibility for periodically checking whether the depicted screens and instructions still match the services available to students. Such a maintenance process would be especially relevant where digital services are frequently updated. The present study does not report a maintenance schedule, so this suggestion should be understood as a prospective implementation implication.

Accessibility should be considered alongside technical production quality. Captions, legible interface text, clear audio, and alternatives for users with limited connectivity could broaden the range of students able to use the material. These measures are particularly important when video is intended to complement, rather than replace, in-person support. However, the available study documentation does not describe accessibility testing, bandwidth conditions, or

differentiated outcomes across student groups. Accordingly, accessibility remains an implementation priority for future refinement rather than a demonstrated outcome of the developed media.

A Practical Framework for Formative Evaluation

The alpha and beta stages described in the study provide a foundation for a more transparent formative evaluation procedure. Future documentation could distinguish comments concerning factual accuracy, interface consistency, narration clarity, segment length, and the difficulty of participation prompts. Recording the specific design element under review, the concern raised, the revision adopted, and the reason for that revision would create an audit trail connecting stakeholder feedback with changes in the instructional product. This procedure would strengthen the interpretability of the development process without requiring the qualitative findings to be converted into unsupported numerical ratings.

Expert and student perspectives should be treated as complementary rather than interchangeable. Subject matter experts can assess whether library procedures are described correctly; media experts can examine the alignment of visual and verbal elements; and students can report where the explanation becomes difficult to follow or where a quiz interrupts the task. When these perspectives disagree, the design team should document the trade-off rather than presume that one source automatically overrides another. For instance, shortening a demonstration may improve pacing while also removing a step necessary for first-time users. An explicit revision log would make such decisions easier to evaluate in subsequent development cycles.

A future outcome evaluation should be analytically distinct from formative feedback. Measures such as completion of an OPAC search task, successful access to an electronic resource, error frequency, or performance on a knowledge assessment could examine whether the video supports independent task execution. Pretest and posttest designs might estimate change over time, but stronger causal claims would require an appropriate comparison strategy and consideration of prior experience. No such outcome data are reported in the current study. The distinction between perceived usability and demonstrated competence must therefore remain explicit when interpreting the present findings.

Institutional Implementation and Future Research Agenda

For institutional implementation, the integrated framework could be embedded in the library's regular user-education workflow. Librarians would first identify recurrent support requests and prioritize tasks that can be demonstrated visually. They could then work with instructional-media specialists to define objectives, prepare storyboards, verify procedures, and invite user feedback before publication. A shared review checklist could help maintain consistency across multiple videos. These steps translate the study's conceptual mapping into a possible operational workflow; they should not be read as a description of an established policy at the library studied.

Institutional adoption would also require clarity about responsibilities. Librarians are well positioned to validate procedural content and identify changes to library services, while media developers can support editing, visual sequencing, and technical accessibility. Students can contribute feedback about clarity and navigation difficulties. This collaborative arrangement is consistent with the expanded instructional role described in the findings, but its feasibility may depend on staffing, available equipment, and institutional support. The study did not assess costs, workload, or organizational readiness, so those factors warrant explicit consideration before the framework is generalized.

Future studies could strengthen the evidence base through fuller reporting of participant recruitment, interview protocols, storyboard versions, and revision histories. They could also compare different segment structures or levels of interactivity while holding learning objectives constant. Multi-site research would help determine whether the same design logic remains useful across institutions with different digital platforms and student populations. Most importantly, research should examine whether users can independently perform the target library tasks after engaging with the videos. Such work would extend the current process-oriented contribution into

a testable account of educational outcomes without overstating what this descriptive study has established.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates how the ASSURE and Alessi–Trollip models can be integrated into a framework for developing instructional videos for university library user education at the UPT Library of UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi. Learner analysis identified difficulties in navigating the Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC), accessing scholarly journals, and using e-book collections. These findings informed decisions to simplify technical terminology and organize narrative scripts and storyboards into clear, sequential instructional steps. The alignment of learning objectives with short quizzes and an OPAC navigation simulation, followed by feedback from media experts, subject matter experts, and students, illustrates how learner participation and formative revision can inform multimedia design. The findings also indicate that librarians can contribute instructional content and procedural expertise to the development process. Accordingly, the study's primary contribution is a context-specific framework linking learner needs, multimedia production, and formative evaluation rather than evidence of improved learning outcomes.

The findings are limited to a descriptive qualitative account of one university library and do not establish the effectiveness or comparative superiority of the integrated framework. The available documentation does not report participant numbers and characteristics in sufficient detail, quantitative feasibility ratings, or pretest–posttest results. Consequently, improvements in students' information-literacy competence cannot be inferred. Future research should strengthen documentation of participants, instruments, interview evidence, and design revisions; assess learning outcomes using appropriate pretest–posttest or gain measures; and examine the approach in other university libraries with broader user groups. Such evaluations are necessary to determine whether the proposed instructional-design framework produces measurable learning improvements and can be transferred to settings beyond the present study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors thank the University of Jambi for the academic support acknowledged in the original manuscript and express appreciation to the media specialists, library subject matter experts, and students who contributed perspectives during the reported development activities. The reviewed source does not specify financial support, institutional approvals, or other forms of assistance; none are inferred here.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Mahdianto: Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, formal analysis, and writing—original draft. Ilham: Methodology, investigation, and writing—original draft. Sofyan: Supervision and conceptual guidance. All authors approved the final submitted version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Bergstrom-Lynch, Y. (2019). LibGuides by Design: Using Instructional Design Principles and User-Centered Studies to Develop Best Practices. *Public Services Quarterly*, *15*(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/15228959.2019.1632245

Fajri, D., Arnidah, A., & Sinaga, A. V. (2026). Pengembangan media video tutorial pembuatan poster pendidikan untuk mendukung pembelajaran pada mata kuliah media grafis di perguruan tinggi. *JURNAL IMAJINASI*, *10*(1), 81. https://doi.org/10.26858/i.v10i1.83719

Fuentes, R. P., & Labad, R. B. (2025). Impact of Digital Learning Tools on Student Engagement and Academic Achievement in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. *Ennoia Advances in Social Science, Technology and Education*, *1*(1).

Fyfield, M., Henderson, M., & Phillips, M. (2022). Improving instructional video design: A systematic review. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 150–178. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.7296

Gutersohn, C., Schweingruber, S., Haudenschild, M., Huber, M., Greif, R., & Fuchs, A. (2025). Self-directed learning versus traditional instructor-led learning for education on a new

anaesthesia workstation: a noninferiority, randomised, controlled trial. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, *135*(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2025.03.043

Kundu, S., & Das, M. (2025). A comparative study of learning outcomes of self-directed and instructor-led learning for postgraduate students in an Indian B-School. *Journal of Education for Business*, *100*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2024.2438670

Kurniawan, G. (2023). Implementasi Model ASSURE Bernuansa STEAM dalam Meningkatkan Aktivitas dan Hasil Belajar Matematika. *JEID: Journal of Educational Integration and Development*, *2*(4), 243–259. https://doi.org/10.55868/jeid.v2i4.145

Latifah, A. N., & Sa'diyah, H. (2024). Strategi Pengelolaan Perpustakaan Dalam Meningkatkan Minat Baca Masyarakat Di Era Digital. *TADWIN: Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan Dan Informasi*, *5*(2), 115–125. https://doi.org/10.19109/tadwin.v5i2.23512

Lubis, J. P., & Maulida, A. (2024). Penerapan Model Perangkat Desain Pembelajaran Dengan Model Assure. *Karimah Tauhid*, *3*(5), 5379–5386. https://doi.org/10.30997/karimahtauhid.v3i5.13187

Naveed, M. A. (2020). Towards Information Anxiety and Beyond. *Webology*, *17*(1), 65–80. https://doi.org/10.14704/WEB/V17I1/a208

Noetel, M., Griffith, S., Delaney, O., Sanders, T., Parker, P., del Pozo Cruz, B., & Lonsdale, C. (2021). Video Improves Learning in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. *Review of Educational Research*, *91*(2), 204–236. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654321990713

Polat, H. (2023). Instructors' presence in instructional videos: A systematic review. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(7), 8537–8569. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11532-4

Rodliyah, U. (2024). Strategi Peningkatan Kemampuan Literasi Informasi Generasi Z. *Lentera Pustaka: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Perpustakaan, Informasi Dan Kearsipan*, *10*(1), 77–90. https://doi.org/10.14710/lenpust.v10i1.57381

Rusydiyah, E. F., Putri, A. A. M., Negari, B. D., & Ta'dzimah, I. (2023). Pemanfaatan Perpustakaan Sebagai Media Pembelajaran Dalam Meningkatkan Minat Baca Mahasiswa PGMI UINSA. *LIBRARIA: Jurnal Perpustakaan*, *11*(1), 127. https://doi.org/10.21043/libraria.v11i1.18516

Santiago Jr, C. S., Leah Ulanday, M. P., Jane Centeno, Z. R., Cristina Bayla, M. D., & Callanta, J. S. (2021). Flexible Learning Adaptabilities in the New Normal: E-Learning Resources, Digital Meeting Platforms, Online Learning Systems and Learning Engagement. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, *16*(2).

Slack, A. J. (2021). Creating a YouTube-Style Channel to Provide Information Literacy Instruction Videos for Undergraduate Nursing. *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*, *40*(4), 383–395. https://doi.org/10.1080/02763869.2021.1987794

Sobirin, S., Hanafi, A. A., Hendra, H., Ari, M. R. A. A., & Sari, R. I. (2023). Manajemen Perpustakaan di Era Digital. *Cendekia Inovatif Dan Berbudaya*, *1*(1), 64–71. https://doi.org/10.59996/cendib.v1i1.204

Susilo, A., Satinem, Y., & Sarkowi, S. (2024). Analisis perpustakaan sebagai sumber literasi generasi z di era digital. *TSAQIFA NUSANTARA: Jurnal Pembelajaran Dan Isu-Isu Sosial*, *3*(02), 130. https://doi.org/10.24014/tsaqifa.v3i2.32368

Sutikno, S., & Khoirunisa, A. (2025). Infrastruktur Perpustakaan Digital dan Preferensi Mahasiswa dalam Mengembangkan Budaya Literasi di Perguruan Tinggi: Studi Kasus di Universitas Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya Tahun 2023-2024. *Jurnal Pustaka Ilmiah*, *11*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.20961/jpi.v11i1.98472

Tomaszewski, R. (2023). Library snackables: A study of one-minute library videos. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *49*(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2022.102647

Vitriana, N. (2024). Transformasi perpustakaan di era digital native. *Librarium: Library and Information Science Journal*, *1*(1), 59–69. https://doi.org/10.53088/librarium.v1i1.693