



---

**Gwendolynne Reid**

**Updating the FYC-Library Partnership: Recent Work on Information  
Literacy and Writing Classrooms  
(WPA-CompPile Research Bibliographies, No. 25)**

**September 2014**

While the specific forms research-based writing takes in U.S. writing programs vary, few compositionists would disagree that “[w]riting from sources is a staple of academic inquiry” (Howard, Serviss, and Rodrigue, p. 178), or that such writing can teach students “to engage deeply with complex texts and diverse ideas” (Brent, p. 50). Indeed, Carra Leah Hood’s 2009 survey of 166 U.S. writing programs suggests that most writing programs do in fact embrace research as relevant to writing instruction, with 73% of surveyed schools (N=121) assigning some form of research-based writing, though with the majority of those explicitly rejecting the traditional “research paper” assignment. Regardless of whether a writing program orients its objectives toward academic writing, public writing, or other types of writing, then, it is likely that its curriculum will include some form of secondary research as well.

With that reality in view, this bibliography seeks to facilitate WPAs’ coordination and partnership with the other important unit concerned with students’ development as researchers: the library. As a number of articles in this bibliography point out, the separation of research and writing into distinct disciplines and institutional units is artificial (e.g. Artman, Friscaro-Pawlowski, and Monge; Bowles-Terry, Davis, and Holliday; Elmborg, “Locating”; Jacobs and Jacobs; Norgaard, “Contributions”). James Elmborg (a librarian), for example, posits that “by recognizing that writing and research are one single activity, we might reinvigorate the discussion about writing process and how the search for information is shaped by that process” (“Locating,” p. 7). Others point out common causes and experiences shared by the two fields. Rolf Norgaard, for instance, observes that both face cultural misunderstandings that reduce their work to a discrete “skill” that “Johnny” doesn’t have (“Contributions,” p. 125). Both also face metonymic reductions of their work to the end products of complex processes: texts and sources, respectively.

Both fields have also embraced more complex understandings of their work focused on process, inquiry, and (socially-constructed) meaning-making. In Norgaard’s words, rhetoric and composition sees writing “as a vehicle for inquiry and as a process of making and mediating meaning” (“Contributions,” p. 127), an understanding that resonates with his description of information literacy as: “an intellectual process driven by engaged inquiry” (128). Despite these shared values, at most institutions writing programs and libraries remain separated and face numerous factors related to budgets, enrollment, and staffing that can make it difficult to integrate them. The entries included in this bibliography reflect the recent work relevant to

---

\*Cite as: Reid, Gwendolynne, (September 2014). Updating the FYC-Library Partnership: Recent Work on Information Literacy and Writing Classrooms, WPA-CompPile Research Bibliographies, No. 25. *WPA-CompPile Research Bibliographies*. [http://comppile.org/wpa/bibliographies/Bib25/FYC-Library\\_Partnership.pdf](http://comppile.org/wpa/bibliographies/Bib25/FYC-Library_Partnership.pdf). Date of access.

coordinating with this institutional partner in order to provide instruction that better reflects the close relationship between writing and research.

This bibliography's focus on recent work is not meant to deny the fact that this conversation about student source-based writing extends back many decades. Writing in the 1952 volume of *College English*, for example, Haskell Block and Sidney Mattis recount their own efforts at collaboration between composition instructors and librarians at Queens College, an initiative that began in 1938 (p. 213). In 1961, Ambrose Manning released the results of a national survey on the status of the research paper in first-year composition, exclaiming that "We might as well face it: the research paper in Freshman English is here to stay!" (p. 73). Despite his finding that 83% of the institutions of higher education surveyed assigned some form of researched writing in their FYC curricula (p. 73), numerous articles in the 1960s debated whether research papers ought to be assigned, and if so, whether the research ought to be "controlled" by instructors or not. Two decades after Manning's article, *College English* published James E. Ford and Dennis R. Perry's study following up on his results, which found only a slight decline in the still pervasive "research paper." The same volume includes Richard Larson's still-cited "The 'Research Paper' in the Writing Course: A Non-Form of Writing," which argued for assignments more closely resembling research-based genres outside the classroom.

This bibliography also does not describe the rich exchanges between librarians and compositionists from the 1980s and 1990s, though some notable works from this period are included in the addendum on related works (e.g. Barbara Fister's work on finding "common ground" between composition and bibliographic instruction and Dennis Isbell and Dorothy Broaddus's article on "Teaching Writing and Research as Inseparable," both still periodically cited). Instead, its focus is on the more recent scholarship in this area, particularly that of the last ten years. While this work continues the themes of earlier scholarship, it is marked by an attempt to understand and negotiate changes attributed to the network society—changes affecting everything from how information circulates, to how libraries define their roles, and to how researchers research, writers write, and teachers teach. This narrower focus on recent scholarship drives the distinction between the annotated portion of the bibliography and the addendum: annotated entries are those likely to be immediately useful to WPAs in the current context, while those in the addendum are most useful for gaining historical perspective on the conversation or filling in the picture on a particular strand of it (like the concept of "critical information literacy"). Because connections between entries may not be immediately apparent, this introduction first points out some of the main themes and groupings emerging in this literature.

The first theme centers on the term "information literacy" (IL). Compositionists may be wary of the way the term "literacy" evokes a reductive, potentially deficit-oriented, skills-based approach (Norgaard, "Contributions," p. 127). In addition, Jeff Purdue rightly points out that some suspicion may well center on the term "information." Regardless, it is important to realize that information literacy is its own branch of library science, with a growing body of scholarship and a definition laid out by the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL), part of the American Library Association (ALA). The fact that information literacy has a disciplinary identity and a sizeable related body of scholarship makes it a useful term for conducting searches and discussing student research with librarians. Numerous librarians, however, have critiqued the term themselves, calling for more dynamic understandings of research and knowledge creation

(Elmborg, “Critical”; Kapitzke; Luke and Kapitzke; Purdue). Norgaard, in fact, urges both librarians and compositionists to treat information literacy in the same dynamic, critical way we understand other literacies—as “embedded or situated cultural practice conditioned by ideology, power, and social context” (“Contributions,” p. 126). As this debate over the term suggests, then, the best collaborations between composition and information literacy will engage each other’s theories and values.

An important part of the research coming out of information literacy, and the second theme of this bibliography, focuses on understanding how students navigate contemporary information ecologies and how they conduct the research assigned to them in school. This is the focus of *Project Information Literacy*, an ongoing, large-scale, cross-institutional project generating empirical data on this set of questions (Head, “Beyond”; Head, “Learning”; Head and Eisenberg, “Assigning”; Head and Eisenberg, “Truth”). Many of their initial findings problematize instructors’ assumptions about what students growing up with the Internet know how to do (Head, “Learning”; see also Kennedy & Judd, p. 132). Both sets of researchers find students employing strategies associated with surface learning—and advocate strong faculty and librarian roles in helping students develop research approaches conducive to academic inquiry. Head’s report on first-year students, in fact, stresses this transitional moment as particularly important to help students avoid “flatlining” beyond that year (“Learning,” p. 30), an especially relevant finding for FYC and one that complements the work of *The Citation Project*, a research study based in rhetoric and composition with a focus on how students use the sources they have found in their writing (see Howard, Serviss and Rodrigue; the LILAC Project).

A third theme centers on coordination between writing programs and libraries. Artman, Frisicaro-Pawlowski, and Monge describe a number of possible configurations for this relationship, favoring options involving a closer relationship than “one shot” instructional sessions (see also Bowles-Terry, Davis, and Holliday; Head, “Learning”; Holliday and Fagerheim; Jacobs and Jacobs). Most scholars argue against electronic library instruction without face-to-face instruction as either not engaging students sufficiently (Sult and Mills), or worse, contributing to the sort of “algorithmic approach” to research that short-changes critical thinking and recursivity (Bowles-Terry, Davis, and Holliday, p. 229). Instead, a number of articles recount efforts at closer instructional collaboration, including some variation of team teaching (Brady, Singh-Corcoran, Dadisman, and Diamond; Deitering and Jameson; Holliday and Fagerheim). Others offer insight on intellectual and pedagogical exchange between librarians and composition faculty via learning communities (Jacobs and Jacobs), scalable, multi-pronged approaches to collaboration and mentorship (Sult and Mills), connections with writing-across-the-curriculum or standalone writing programs (D’Angelo and Maid), or cooperation and shared physical spaces between libraries and writing centers (Elmborg, “Libraries”; Elmborg, “Locating”).

As a final note, WPAs may find it useful to observe that at the same time the Council of Writing Program Administrators has been revising the *WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition*, the Association of College & Research Libraries has been drafting the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*, a replacement for their current guiding document on information literacy instruction, a process which should be finalized in 2015. Leslie Sult and Vicki Mills had previously pointed out the similarities and affinities evident in the 2000 versions

of the *WPA Outcomes* and the *ACRL Standards*, a fact they claim has led to many institutions incorporating elements of both in their writing program learning outcomes (p. 369). WPAs are likely to find even more in common with the *ACRL Framework*, which will avoid fixed standards in favor of threshold concepts the organization feels better represent the complex, interconnected nature of contemporary information ecologies. The six threshold concepts in the June 2014 version of the draft include “Scholarship is a Conversation” and “Authority is Contextual and Constructed,” concepts that could just as easily come out of rhetoric and composition. The June 2014 draft of the *ACRL Framework* also takes a more varied, comprehensive approach to the activity of asking and seeking answers to questions, including the process of creating new knowledge. Most importantly, it links these activities to participating in *communities*, an emphasis that resonates with our own scholarship and values. The advent of these two new guiding documents might provide writing programs and institutions of higher learning with a kairotic moment for reexamining their own learning outcomes, or at the very least an exigence for initiating further exchange with our intellectual and institutional partners: librarians.

## National Framing Statements

ACRL and ALA: *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* (2000), <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>

ACRL and ALA: *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* (Draft, June 14, 2014), <http://acrl.ala.org/ilstandards/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Framework-for-IL-for-HE-Draft-2.pdf>

WPA: *WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition* (July 17, 2014), <http://wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html>

## Ongoing Research Studies

*Project Information Literacy*, <http://projectinfolit.org/>

*The Citation Project*, <http://site.citationproject.net/>

*The LILAC Project*, <http://lilac-group.blogspot.com/>

**Artman, Margaret; Erica Frisicaro-Pawlowski; Robert Monge**

Not just one shot: Extending the dialogues about information literacy in composition classes

*Composition Studies* 38.2 (2010), 93-110

Argues that the separation of writing and information literacy instruction undermines more rhetorical, recursive, open approaches to research for students, instead reinforcing a skills mindset and reductive view of information. Reviews recent work on the relationship between composition and information literacy, noting that before 2009, much of that work appeared in journals outside composition, even when written by compositionists (95). Describes configurations for partnerships between libraries and writing programs, ultimately favoring those that involve a deeper relationship than “one shot” sessions provide: course-related instruction, course-integrated library instruction, credit-bearing IL courses, hybrid courses, linked courses, etc. Advocates that WPAs lead the process of forming library partnerships, in part because librarians, are rarely institutionally recognized as faculty and therefore have less curricular influence in institutions of higher learning (105).

KEYWORDS: information literacy, information retrieval, library science, faculty-librarian, FYC-library, student research, research pedagogy, research instruction, WPA

**Bowles-Terry, Melissa; Erin Davis; Wendy Holliday**

“Writing information literacy” revisited: Application of theory to practice in the classroom

*Reference and User Services Quarterly* 49.3 (2010), 225-230

Responds to Rolf Norgaard’s two *Reference & User Services Quarterly* articles on “Writing Information Literacy” from the perspective of librarians. Claims that writing and information literacy “draw from the same intellectual well” and that cultivating this relationship more deliberately can result in “a ‘rhetorized’ IL” and “an ‘informed’ rhetoric” (225). Links many of the reductive approaches to research instruction to a behaviorist framework: “the one-shot instructional session, tool-based library demonstration, the Web evaluation checklist, and writing textbooks that provide linear, step-by-step procedures for proper information retrieval” (228). Warns against an “algorithmic approach” in writing assignments that encourage students to focus more on finding the right type and number of sources than on thinking critically about answering their research questions (229). Recommends continued collaboration between faculty and librarians, but with attention to some of the legacies and “thorny problems” that may limit the effectiveness of these initiatives (229-230).

KEYWORDS: information literacy, information retrieval, library science, faculty-librarian, FYC-library, student research, research pedagogy, research instruction, research process, source evaluation, behaviorism, constructivism, assignment design

**Brady, Laura; Nathalie Singh-Corcoran; Jo Ann Dadisman; Kelly Diamond**

A collaborative approach to information literacy: First-year composition, writing center, and library partnerships at West Virginia University

*Composition Forum* 19 (2009) <http://compositionforum.com/issue/19/west-virginia.php>

Describes the process of designing and implementing a pilot for a team-based approach to information literacy instruction with collaboration between FYC, the library, and the writing center. Outlines the curricular and instructional design of the pilot writing course and the parameters of the collaboration, which included shared classroom time, required research logs, tutor training, and teaching logs. Includes the prompts for the research logs as appendices. Concludes that productive collaboration between these units takes careful communication and coordination, but can lead to a more comprehensive approach to teaching research, reading, and writing.

**KEYWORDS:** information literacy, information retrieval, library science, faculty-librarian, FYC-library, student research, research pedagogy, research instruction, source evaluation, WPA, wcenter, course-integrated, collaboration, cooperation, wcenter-library, wcenter-FYC, writing tutor, research log

**Brent, Doug**

The research paper and why we should still care

*Writing Program Administration* 37.1 (2013), 33-53

Argues for the centrality of source-based writing to writing instruction and the academic project more broadly, calling it a “master genre” (50). Draws on genre theory, activity theory, transfer theory, situated learning, and information literacy to examine the challenges and importance of learning to write from sources. Rebuts arguments that “the research paper doesn’t exist” (37). Recommends that research and reading are complex and important enough to be the central focus of writing programs, even if other aspects of writing instruction must be deferred to the disciplines through WAC/WID programs (48).

**KEYWORDS:** research paper, genre, WPA, information literacy, information retrieval, source use, reading, source-based writing, student research, research pedagogy, research instruction, activity theory, transfer, situated learning

**D'Angelo, Barbara J.; Barry M. Maid**

Moving beyond definitions: Implementing information literacy across the curriculum

*Journal of Academic Librarianship* 30.3 (2004), 212-217

Describes collaboration between Arizona State University's library and its Multimedia Writing and Technical Communication Program, a partnership the authors posit lays the groundwork for expansion of information literacy instruction throughout the curriculum. Traces the commonalities between WAC and information literacy, particularly in that both "teach skills that have their own disciplinary homes yet are used throughout the disciplines" (213). Describes IL-related courses and projects that created increased interest in IL on ASU's campus. Posits that a successful IL program should resemble a successful WAC program in that responsibility for IL should be distributed across campus, but with the recognition that expertise lies with the library (216).

KEYWORDS: information literacy, information retrieval, library science, faculty-librarian, library, research instruction, WAC, technical writing

**Deitering, Anne-Marie; Sara Jameson**

Step by step through the scholarly conversation: A collaborative library/writing faculty project to embed information literacy and promote critical thinking in first year composition at Oregon State University

*College and Undergraduate Libraries* 15.1-2 (2008), 57-79

Reports on the results of linking an information literacy portfolio (ILP) with a FYC course in a curriculum focused on cultivating research and writing as acts of joining on-going conversations. Describes benefits and challenges of having librarians and GTAs teach research and writing collaboratively. Links this approach and curriculum to critical thinking, transfer, constructivism, and recursivity. Argues in favor of *They Say/I Say's* templates as useful tools for fostering information literacy and academic habits of mind. Explores limitations of the linked course, including some areas of discomfort for GTAs and librarians that can impact student learning: GTA and librarian inexperience with FYC, GTA information overload, lack of GTA ownership over IL curriculum, librarian inexperience with grading, GTA difficulties with explaining IL concepts, etc.

KEYWORDS: *They Say/I Say*, habits of mind, dispositions, wicked problems, constructivism, critical thinking, linked course, GTA, information literacy, information retrieval, library science, faculty-librarian, FYC-library, student research, research pedagogy, research instruction, WPA

**Elmborg, James K.**

Critical information literacy: Implications for instructional practice

*The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32.2 (2006), 192-199

Traces the library's role in maintaining dominant literacies and epistemologies, linking the ACRL *Standards* for information literacy to an uncritical avoidance of this issue. Urges librarians to redefine information "as the product of socially negotiated epistemological processes and the raw material for the further making of new knowledge," and their roles as critical literacy educators, helping students develop a "critical consciousness about information" (198). Draws on literature from critical pedagogy, literacy, and genre theory to ask questions reminiscent of those compositionists ask about their own roles in perpetuating or challenging dominant ideologies and social structures.

KEYWORDS: critical literacy theory, critical consciousness, critical pedagogy, Freire, critical thinking, critical information literacy, literacy, multiliteracy, New London Group, multimodality, genre theory, academic genre, academic literacy, information literacy, information retrieval, library science, constructivism, Cartesian, research methods, social inequality, democracy, Dewey

**Elmborg, James K.**

Locating the center: Libraries, writing centers, and information literacy

*Writing Lab Newsletter* 30.6 (2006), 7-11

Problematizes the separation of writing from research. Draws parallels between the institutional positioning of libraries and writing centers, both mediating between faculty and students (8). Describes results from editing a collection of case studies on relationships between writing centers and libraries. Productive partnership models include sharing spaces, developing writing & research labs/clinics, co-leading faculty development workshops, team teaching, cross-referring students, creating archives of student writing on campus, and collaborating on scholarship.

KEYWORDS: wcenter, library, wcenter-library, collaboration, cooperation, information literacy, information retrieval, library science, faculty-librarian, library, research instruction, WAC, librarian, writing tutor



**Head, Alison J.**

*Learning the ropes: How freshmen conduct course research once they enter college* (Research report)

Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Information School, Project Information Literacy (2013). 48 pages

Reports results focused on first-year college students from *Project Information Literacy*, an ongoing large-scale, cross-institutional study of college student information literacy. Finds that most freshmen tend to be “overwhelmed, but excited” about the scale of research resources available in college (11), as well as the combined openness and rigor of college assignments. Highlights that most first-year students are in process of shifting their research strategies, though a portion of students still rely on habits from high school. Describes a series of research myths uncovered during the study, as well as specific process-related points of trouble, such as developing productive search terms, keeping track of sources and notes, or selecting meaningful textual evidence (16-17). Emphasizes the diversity of experience and development among first-year students, as well as the fact that growing up with the Internet does not translate to knowing how to make productive use of scholarly information resources. Recommends a focus on first-year students with more coordination between faculty and librarians, “so that information is taught in a progressive and contextual manner” (30). Advocates “embedded librarianship” over one-shot library sessions and an approach of “apprentic[ing] the research process” (32-33).

KEYWORDS: information literacy, Project Information Literacy, information retrieval, library science, student research, research pedagogy, research process, research instruction, research, digital, first-year student, freshmen, transition to college, digital native, faculty-librarian, FYC-library, embedded librarian

**Head, Alison J.; Michael B. Eisenberg**

*Truth be told: How college students evaluate and use information in the digital age* (Progress report)

Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Information School, Project Information Literacy (2010). 72 pages

Reports select results from *Project Information Literacy*, an ongoing large-scale, cross-institutional study of college student information literacy. Finds that students use a repertoire of situation-specific strategies that approach research for personal and academic use, but report students have difficulty in starting research projects. Highlights results indicating that students prioritize predictability and efficiency in choosing research strategies and evaluating sources. Concludes that some student research behaviors may be attempts at limiting and controlling information perceived as overwhelmingly complex (39). Suggests that results may indicate that students are choosing lower-order thinking over higher-order cognitive processes like synthesis or interpretation, but emphasizes that both are important for

information literacy (37). Recommends instruction emphasizing research as a process over emphasis on locating specific sources (39).

**KEYWORDS:** information literacy, Project Information Literacy, information retrieval, library science, student research, research pedagogy, research process, research instruction, research, digital, source evaluation, source location

**Holliday, Wendy; Britt Fagerheim**

Integrating information literacy with a sequenced English composition curriculum

*portal: Libraries and the Academy* 6.2 (2006), 169-184

Reports on the process of developing and implementing a course-integrated approach to information literacy in a FYC curriculum as an alternative to one-shot library sessions focused too narrowly on information retrieval. Describes the process of needs assessment and curriculum development, as well as initial assessment of the new approach. Addresses some of the institutional and disciplinary aspects of implementing this type of collaborative, comprehensive information literacy instruction.

**KEYWORDS:** information literacy, information retrieval, library science, faculty-librarian, FYC-library, student research, research pedagogy, research instruction, WPA, course-integrated, critical-thinking

**Howard, Rebecca Moore; Tricia Serviss; Tanya K. Rodrigue**

Writing from sources, writing from sentences

*Writing and Pedagogy* 2.2 (2010), 177-192

Reports the preliminary results of a study of student source use in research texts as part of what is now known as The Citation Project. Finds that none of the student papers included in their corpus included summary, while all included paraphrasing and most included patchwriting, quoting, unmarked quoting, uncited information, and misattributed/misrepresented information (182). Posits that students are “writing from sentences selected from sources,” rather than from sources at a more global level (187), suggesting students may not be reading or understanding their sources. Emphasizes that this is consistent with other research and with an understanding of patchwriting as a normal part of a writer’s development, but that this puts students in danger of inadvertent plagiarism (187).

**KEYWORDS:** patchwriting, summarizing, paraphrasing, quoting, citation, Citation Project, information literacy, student research, research pedagogy, research instruction, research process, plagiarism, documentation, reading, source use, source misuse

**Jacobs, Heidi L. M.; Dale Jacobs**

Transforming the one-shot library session into pedagogical collaboration: Information literacy and the English composition class

*Reference and User Services Quarterly* 49.1 (2009), 72-82

Describes collaboration between librarians and FYC at the University of Windsor to integrate information literacy into writing instruction in a manner more consonant with an understanding of research as a process. Reflects on the benefits of putting these two disciplines in conversation with one another. Draws parallels between how FYC is sometimes seen as way to “inoculate” students against “bad writing” and how one-shot library sessions are seen as a means to inoculate students against “bad research habits” (75). Details the learning community between librarians and the FYC developed as part of this initiative, and the assignments crafted through this process. Recommends deliberate and sustained collaboration to enact and contribute to knowledge in both disciplines.

KEYWORDS: information literacy, information retrieval, library science, faculty-librarian, FYC-library, student research, research pedagogy, research instruction, WPA, library, GTA, assignment design

**Kennedy, Gregor E.; Terry S. Judd**

Beyond Google and the “satisficing” searching of digital natives

In Thomas, Michael (Ed.), *Deconstructing digital natives: Young people, technology and the new literacies*; New York: Routledge (2011), 119-136

Reviews empirical research on “digital natives” and information literacy. Problematizes the notion of the digital native with evidence that few students fit that stereotype (133). Finds that “while students are strategic in their information seeking for study, their behavior is marked by satisficing strategies” associated with surface learners focused primarily on passing courses (132). Determines that greater access to information “places more not less onus on faculty” to help students develop the information literacy required for deeper learning and academic inquiry (132).

KEYWORDS: digital native, information literacy, technological literacy, satisficing, information retrieval, digital wisdom

**Norgaard, Rolf**

Writing information literacy [Part 1]: Contributions to a concept

*Reference and User Services Quarterly* 43.2 (2003), 124-130

Examines what information literacy and writing theory have to gain from a sustained intellectual partnership, “with writing informing information literacy and information literacy informing work in rhetoric and composition” (125). Addresses some of the reasons why compositionists might be wary of the term “information literacy.” Argues that writing studies can help information literacy toward the goal of moving away from trivialized and reductive approaches focusing exclusively on skills. Suggests that a “rhetorized” information literacy could “yield a distinctive literacy, perhaps more situated, more process-oriented, and more relevant to a broad range of rhetorical and intellectual activities” (125). Links the reductive bibliographic view of information literacy to the current-traditional view of writing and the truncation of the five canons to the first three (128). Posits that a partnership between information literacy and writing can continue reinvigorating our understanding of the canons and can serve as “means for recuperating and making relevant the full social and cultural range of rhetorical practice” (129).

KEYWORDS: information literacy, faculty-librarian, rhetoric, information retrieval, library science, FYC-library, current-traditional, canons, writing theory

**Norgaard, Rolf**

Writing information literacy in the classroom [Part 2]: Pedagogical enactments and implications

*Reference and User Services Quarterly* 43.3 (2004), 220-226

Follows up on Norgaard’s 2003 article, here examining the implications of an intellectual partnership between writing studies and information literacy for pedagogy and curriculum. Finds that efforts at reform in both fields can operate synergistically, yet, to “make good on this promise, we must confront both old ghosts and new specters—the research paper and current fears of plagiarism” (221). Advocates for course-integrated information literacy instruction as the most effective way help students develop a rhetorical, situated view of information and research (224). Provokes us to “not just write to and about” information literacy, but for each to “write” and “inscribe itself on” the other to develop a richer theory and practice (225).

KEYWORDS: information literacy, information retrieval, library science, faculty-librarian, FYC-library, pedagogy, student research, research pedagogy

### **Sult, Leslie; Vicki Mills**

A blended method for integrating information literacy instruction into English composition classes

*Reference Services Review* 34.3 (2006), 368-388

Describes the University of Arizona's shift to a blended approach to information literacy instruction, with faculty leading instruction and librarians collaborating with and mentoring instructors. Compares the WPA *Outcomes* with the Association of College & Research Libraries *Standards* to highlight the commonalities between the two disciplines. Outlines the budgetary and enrollment challenges leading the organizations to move away from librarian-led instructional sessions, as well as the engagement problems leading them to abandon a computer-based approach. Describes and assesses their multi-pronged solution: collaboratively-written learning outcomes, embedded librarians, resource pages for instructors, librarian-led instruction sessions for new GTAs' classes, a research syllabus for all instructors, a Research Mentors program, and librarian-faculty consultations for any level of faculty. Assesses the new approach using survey data, finding that it serves the needs of faculty and students in a scalable way, and promotes productive collaboration between FYC and the library.

**KEYWORDS:** information literacy, information retrieval, library science, faculty-librarian, FYC-library, student research, research pedagogy, research instruction, source evaluation, WPA, blended learning, blended method, ACRL Standards, WPA Outcomes, GTA, library, mentor

### **Addendum: Related Works**

Badke, William. "Why Information Literacy Is Invisible." *Communications in Information Literacy* 4.2 (2010): 129–141. Print.

Barratt, Caroline Cason et al. "Collaboration Is Key: Librarians and Composition Instructors Analyze Student Research and Writing." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 9.1 (2009): 37–56.

Block, Haskell M., and Sidney Mattis. "The Research Paper: A Co-Operative Approach." *College English* 13.4 (1952): 212–215. Print.

Davis, Robert L., and Mark Shadle. "Building a Mystery: Alternative Research Writing and the Academic Act of Seeking." *College Composition and Communication* 51.3 (2000): 417-47. Print.

Eisenberg, Michael B. "Information Literacy: Essential Skills for the Information Age." *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology* 28.2 (2008): 39–47. Print.

Elmborg, James K. "Libraries and Writing Centers in Collaboration: A Basis in Theory." *Centers for Learning: Writing Centers and Libraries in Collaboration*. Ed. James K. Elmborg and Sheril Hook. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2005. 1-20. Print.

Fister, Barbara. "Common Ground: The Composition/Bibliographic Instruction Connection." *Academic Libraries: Achieving Excellence in Higher Education*. Ed. Thomas G. Kirk and

- Donna Lakes. Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, Salt Lake City, Utah, April 12-14 1992. 154–158. Print.
- Fister, Barbara. “Connected Communities: Encouraging Dialogue between Composition and Bibliographic Instruction.” *Writing across-the-Curriculum and the Academic Library: A Guide for Librarians, Instructors, and Writing Program Directors*, Ed. Jean Sheridan. Westport, CT: Greenwood, P, 1995. 33-51. Print.
- Fister, Barbara. “Teaching the Rhetorical Dimensions of Research.” *Research Strategies* 11.4 (1993): 211-219. Print.
- Fister, Barbara. “The Research Processes of Undergraduate Students.” *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 18.3 (1992): 163-169. Print.
- Ford, James E., and Dennis R. Perry. “Research Paper Instruction in the Undergraduate Writing Program.” *College English* 44.8 (1982): 825-831. Print.
- Haller, Cynthia R. “Toward Rhetorical Source Use: Three Student Journeys.” *Writing Program Administration* 34.1 (2010): 33–59. Print.
- Head, Alison J. “Beyond Google: How Do Students Conduct Academic Research?” *First Monday* 12.8 (2007): n. pag. journals.uic.edu. Web. 19 Apr. 2014.
- Head, Alison J., and Michael B. Eisenberg. “Assigning Inquiry: How Handouts for Research Assignments Guide Today’s College Students.” *Project Information Literacy Progress Report* (2010): 1-41. Print.
- Head, Alison J., and Michael B. Eisenberg. “How Today’s College Students Use Wikipedia for Course-Related Research.” *First Monday* 15.3 (2010): n. pag.
- Hearn, Michael R. “Embedding a Librarian in the Classroom: An Intensive Information Literacy Model.” *Reference Services Review* 33.2 (2005): 219–227.
- Holliday, Wendy, and Jim Rogers. “Talking About Information Literacy: The Mediating Role of Discourse in a College Writing Classroom.” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 13.3 (2013): 257–271. Print.
- Hood, Carra Leah. “Ways of Research: The Status of the Traditional Research Paper Assignment in First-Year Writing/Composition Courses.” *Composition Forum* 22 (2010): n.pag. Web. 19 Aug. 2014.
- Isbell, Dennis, and Dorothy Broaddus. “Teaching Writing and Research as Inseparable: A Faculty-Librarian Teaching Team.” *Reference Services Review* 23.4 (1995): 51–62. Print.
- Kapitzke, Cushla. “Information Literacy: A Positivist Epistemology and a Politics of Outformation.” *Educational Theory* 53.1 (2003): 37–53. Print.
- Larson, Richard L. “The ‘Research Paper’ in the Writing Course: A Non-Form of Writing.” *College English* 44.8 (1982): 811–816. Print.
- Luke, Allan, and Cushla Kapitzke. “Literacies and Libraries: Archives and Cybraries.” *Curriculum Studies* 7.3 (1999): 467–491. Print.
- Maid, Barry M. and Barbara J. D’Angelo. “The WPA Outcomes, Information Literacy, and the Challenges of Outcomes-Based Curricular Design.” *Writing Assessment in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Essays in Honor of Edward M. White*, Ed. Norbert Elliot and Les Perelman. New York: Hampton P, 2012. 101-114. Print.
- Manning, Ambrose N. “The Present Status of the Research Paper in Freshman English: A National Survey.” *College Composition and Communication* 12.2 (1961): 73–78. Print.
- McClure, Randall. “Examining the Presence of Advocacy and Commercial Websites in Research Essays of First-Year Composition Students.” *Writing Program Administration* 32.3 (2009): 49–74. Print.

- McClure, Randall, and Kellian Clink. "How Do You Know That?: An Investigation of Student Research Practices in the Digital Age." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 9.1 (2009): 115–132. Print.
- Melzer, Daniel, and Pavel Zemliansky. "Research Writing in First-Year Composition and across the Disciplines: Assignments, Attitudes, and Student Performance." *Kairos* 8.1 (2003): n.pag. Web. 19 Aug. 2014.
- Mery, Yvonne, Jill Newby, and Ke Peng. "Why One-Shot Information Literacy Sessions Are Not the Future of Instruction: A Case for Online Credit Courses." *College & Research Libraries* 73.4 (2012): 366–377. Print.
- Purdue, Jeff. "Stories, Not Information: Transforming Information Literacy." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 3.4 (2003): 653–662. Print.
- Rabinowitz, Celia. "Working in a Vacuum: A Study of the Literature of Student Research and Writing." *Research Strategies* 17.4 (2000): 337–346. Print.