The theory outlined in chapter 1 provides a basis from which teaching librarians and writing center professionals can understand each other's work and discuss it on their campuses. Several such discussions are illustrated in the case studies section of this book. In this chapter, we move from examining the underlying theories that frame the work of writing professionals (including both writing tutors and teachers of composition courses) and teaching librarians (including both academic librarians with instructional responsibilities and those working at the reference desk) to describing and comparing their daily practices and to considering their combined potential to enhance student learning.

Writing center professionals and teaching librarians need to work more closely together because they are working with integrally related processes. Current writing professionals tend to assume that the research process is subordinate to the writing process itself and that students, in the process of creating writing, will demonstrate the necessary knowledge to understand the writing process as subsequent teaching. Therefore, writing professionals are more likely to consider teaching as a substitute for research, which often requires more emphasis on reading and writing than on teaching. In contrast, teaching librarians have tended to understand teaching as a process that should be integrated into each stage of the writing process. To promote this model of writing as a process, librarians and writing professionals should encourage students to reflect on the choices they have made. By investigating and writing and teaching together, the fully integrated model of teaching, librarians and writing professionals can enable students to generalize what they learn to new situations.

Others have addressed this disconnect by moving it to the commonality in the process: the teaching of writing. The fully integrated professional model advocated here will not only help to improve students' writing but also to improve their learning. More recently, as a guest columnist in "Reference and Writing," Zimmermann and others have expanded the model to include the roles of librarians and writing professionals in the teaching of writing.
& User Services Quarterly, rhetorician Rolf Norgaard urged us to “be in
closer intellectual conversation.” Librarian Barbara Fister summarized
how both groups have treated research and presses them to move
beyond discrete approaches to doing research: “Librarians generally
focus on the significance of information retrieval and evaluation.
Course instructors [and writing center tutors by extension] are
similarly more interested in how information is interpreted and how the
student works out that interpretation in a written or oral presentation.”
Allan Luke and Chushka Kapitza push us to help students in the
“use of information technology in dialogic, agentive ways that enable
them to critique and create knowledge.”
If writing professionals and teaching librarians model inquiry by co-investigating
these ideas, they will have begun a dialogue that can only take
them further than either group could go alone in helping students develop critical
thinking. Where do they start?

Pedagogical Intersections
Perhaps one way to learn from each other is to better understand
the study of rhetoric and its relevance to the current pedagogical
practices of writing and researching. While working with students,
both writing professionals and teaching librarians model behaviors
of invention (brainstorming or more significantly topical reasoning),
inquiry (seeking information, reading), and reinvention (through
discovery, discussion, writing, and collaboration) that are not always
reiterated or reinforced in a traditional classroom, even in a compositional
classroom. We can understand the complementary nature of
their activities (and by extension their processes) by developing our
understanding of the Canons of Rhetoric. The Canons of Rhetoric are
invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. Reinventing
memory as a dynamic art of invention exemplifies the significance
of the research process and its relatedness to the writing process. Invention
is not simply brainstorming; memory is not simply stored
knowledge. Memory is “the ‘treasury of things invented,’ thus linking
Memory with the first canon of rhetoric, invention.” Although there
are other relationships among the canons that are useful in developing
an understanding of shared practices, here we will elaborate on
only invention and memory.

Memory is significant to invention. Without considerable attention
given to research instruction during writing instruction, most students
are limited in their ability to invent. As Phyllis Reich has noted, “No
one imagines for a moment that, on the basis of abstract reflection,
someone decided to invent the wheel. Invention, like research, is related
to observation and experience.” Observations or experiences can reside
in our memories and be readily recalled when needed while writing
or speaking, but they also are the stored memories that are physically
housed in, or virtually accessed through, our academic libraries
(or other gateways) in a variety of formats, including audio, video,
electronic, and print. Access to and retrieval of such stored memory
is essential to invention. Thus, when students do not know how (1)
to access stored memory because they are unaware of the wide range
of tertiary sources (fee-based or free indexes, databases, encyclopedia,
etc.) or (2) to retrieve relevant information efficiently and effectively
because they do not possess the skills to do so, they are limited in their
ability to invent.

When teaching librarians or writing professionals teach writing
or research as independent of the other, processes that were once part
of shared canon and learned holistically become bifurcated and thus
offer a fractured learning activity. In the early twenty-first century,
memory is primarily stored information (research, data, images,
etc.). It is stored in complex information systems that require par-
ticular skills to locate relevant materials but also require knowledge
of the arrangement of information (librarians use the term orga-
nization). The arrangement itself leads to discovery (invention).
It is not surprising that we are seeing, once again, the importance of
understanding the Canons of Rhetoric. However, teaching students
to do research, although important to the development of an idea,
is usually subordinate to the teaching of writing in composition
classrooms and in tutoring sessions. Bringing as much attention to
memory as it deserves means that teaching librarians will need to
work with writing professionals to ensure that research and writing
are both given considerable attention in curricula. To include
memory or arrangement in any significant way in the composing
process requires the exchange of skills and knowledge of conven-
tions of writing and research held by teaching librarians and writing
professionals.

Another way that writing centers and libraries might collaborate
is through an understanding of shared processes. Teaching writing as
a process is a well-developed idea and an accepted pedagogical strategy
among writing professionals. On the other hand, teaching research
as a process is a fairly recent concept for librarians. A proponent for
teaching research as a process and a pioneer in conducting empiri-
cal research to understand the search process, Carol Kuhlthau in
In Seeking Meaning: A Process Approach to Library and Information Services
identifies six stages of the search process, which she has described
as the information search process (ISP). These are task initiation,
topic selection, prefocus exploration, focus formulation, information
selection, and search closure. With each of these stages, she describes the
students’ tasks and their associated thoughts, feelings, actions,
and strategies when trying to complete them. A problem with her model (discussed more fully in chapter 1) is that she ignores the role of the writing process and its impact on the research process. In Kuhlthau’s model, the ISP precedes the writing process: “The research process occurs prior to the writing process, essentially in preparation for writing and presenting ideas.”10 She does, however, acknowledge that students in the formative stages of task initiation and prefocus exploration should employ “exploratory strategies, such as listing important facts and interesting ideas or finding a few sources and settling in to read and reflect” before continuing to seek information.11 Kuhlthau recognized that although the steps she outlines are sequential, they are not linear, but recursive. In fact, students not only read and reflect, but they also engage in the development stage of writing at this point in the research process. It is through writing and the articulation of an idea, argument, or theory that a writer clarifies his or her thoughts and begins to narrow or broaden the scope of the paper and thus will more naturally broaden or narrow the research needed to inform his or her thinking and support or challenge his or her ideas.

Even upon brief analysis, it can be seen that the writing process and the research process are inextricably linked such that each process enables the other in order for a student to construct new knowledge. Kuhlthau’s model, as useful as it may be, particularly in describing the high anxiety levels that students face during the prefocus exploration stage, fails to represent the practical experiences of students who revisit information sources continually throughout the writing process. Indeed, in the revision stage of the writing process, students research intensively as they attempt to shape their arguments and support their positions. The research process is interwoven with the writing process, and information needs are driven by the needs of the writer. In practice, writing tutors typically focus on helping students in the following areas: invention, outlining, organization, development, revision, integration of sources, and documentation. These areas comprise the writing process, and although they may be sequential in nature, they are not linear. Students arrange as they invent; invent as they revise; integrate sources as they develop.

In practice, teaching librarians describe the research process using terms similar to those used by writing professionals and encourage some of the same activities as those used in the writing process. They especially emphasize the recursive nature of research. The research process involves brainstorming; narrowing or broadening the focus of the topic; searching for, evaluating, and synthesizing information; revising (i.e., finding more information as the topic changes) through writing, reading, and reflection. These practices are discussed in more detail later, but for now to develop an understanding of how these processes intersect, we can focus on a discussion of the practice of narrowing a topic. Choosing a topic and exploring it, whether through traditional brainstorming techniques taught in writing centers or topic exploration through library resources, is an essential step in both writing and research. Assistance from a librarian can help a student who does not have a research topic. Fister explained the work of a reference librarian as follows:

Brainstorming and invention techniques can be described; students can be shown how to search for possible topics as bibliographic tools are explored; strategies for “mapping out” the literature of a discipline or field can be discussed, including ways to locate controversial or cutting-edge issues by scanning annual reviews or current indexes, abstracts, or databases to find out what other scholars are exploring.12

Fister described both the strategies and the tools that teaching librarians use. These are often different from the tools and strategies used by writing professionals—clustering, mind-mapping, listing, asking the who, what, where, when, and how questions. Although the respective strategies serve similar purposes, they have different outcomes. In the writing process, they serve as an exercise in critical thinking and reflection before being exposed to published research; in the research process, they serve as an exercise in exploration of stored memory and some reinvention of that.

Although any attempt to separate writing from research fractures the learning experience, it also is equally important that both processes be recognized, rather than one being subsumed by the other. It is not useful to segregate the research process from the writing process, which would be simplistically following the model dictated by our respective academic units—the composition and rhetoric department on the one hand, and the library on the other (i.e., writing professionals understand the “writing process” whereas librarians understand the “research process”). This bifurcated theorizing fails to explain the integrated, holistic experience of the student using information in the writing process. Striking a balance between respecting the different processes and understanding their holistic nature allows them to pave the way for true collaboration. By working in collaboration, these two units can treat the research process and the writing process as a seamless whole, recognizing the commonalities in both and their respective differences.

Because librarians and writing professionals have integrally related processes, it should not be surprising that they also share terminology. The terminology used by each unit is similar, although under different circumstances for different processes. For example,
they both consider audience, authority, and language use as important to their processes. Writing professionals teach students to consider their audience when writing. Is it a general audience, or an audience of professionals or scholars? Are the sources and evidence being used appropriate to the field of study and thus considered credible by the audience? Are sources located written by experts in the field and published in scholarly journals, by generalists writing for popular magazines such as Time or Psychology Today, or by professionals writing for trade publications? Librarians ask the same kinds of questions, but within the context of the secondary or tertiary sources being used. Librarians discuss the audience to whom a database is geared. Is it geared to a general, multidiscipline audience? Does the database index a mix of sources, including popular, scholarly, and nonmainstream? Students learn through researching and writing to evaluate sources for authority and credibility, so considering who the audience is for a particular database or journal can help them determine the credibility of the types of sources they locate.

As for authority, students are learning how to engage in discourse communities and are encouraged by writing professionals to write like an authority in a selected field. To “try on” that authority, they are taught to use a research methodology appropriate to a discipline and learn what kinds of evidence or reasons are acceptable in supporting claims. To do so, they have to be able to locate acceptable evidence. During the research process, librarians teach students to evaluate the sources they find, not in the way that writing professionals, who are aware of the “rhetorical dimensions of texts—the implied audience, the argument, and above all the evidence used to support the argument” do, but in a different way. Librarians bring to the evaluation process their experience with publishers (i.e., the quality of content in books and journals and determining whether to add titles to the collection). They understand the structure of databases, the importance of specificity in subject indexing, and how journals are selected for indexing in those databases. From this understanding, librarians determine which subject databases to use for each field of study. Additionally, they work with faculty to determine reputable journals and have access to a variety of tools that provide information on issues related to authority, such as the impact factor (level of circulation) of journals in each discipline. This experience plays a significant role in the way they teach students to evaluate information. Once again, we see that teaching librarians and writing professionals bring different, but complementary, approaches to the same concept.

Finally, both writing professionals and librarians are interested in seeing that students are capable of variations in their use of language. Writing professionals encourage students to consider how language is used to convey authority or to appeal to a particular audience and then to apply that to their own writing. For example, considering her audience, a student might choose to use the word adolescents rather than teenagers, or vice versa. If she is writing as a scholar and her intended audience is sociologists, she probably will choose adolescents, but if her audience is a group of high school students, she might be more effective using teenagers. Similarly, when searching for information, students need to be able to think flexibly about language and make sophisticated choices about the terms they use when searching databases. They need to be able to generate keywords and synonyms for use in databases and other reference resources or they will significantly reduce the number of both primary and secondary sources they retrieve. The decisions students make about word choice are important in efficiently and effectively locating relevant materials. For example, if the majority of sociologists use the term adolescents in their published writing, but the student only searches for the word teenagers, she will severely limit her search results. Fister contends that students need to know “that search terms are contingent on who is speaking and that researchers, therefore, need to be flexible and creative in their use of language and aware of the clues offered in cross-references and subject tracings.” If students are guided to understand and use a variety of terminology when searching, and thus ultimately to develop a facility for language, one can imagine that this would also help them become more cognizant of “choosing” terms in their own writing (i.e., choosing terms appropriate to their audiences and that best present their positions).

Goal of Engaging Students
Detailing how and why writing professionals and teaching librarians use certain terms—audience, authority, and language—demonstrates that there is an overlap in the writing and research processes; by recognizing these shared terms and developing an understanding of how they are being used during these processes, teaching librarians and writing professionals have more potential to provide codeveloped learning activities for students. The case studies in this collection demonstrate the potential for such activities. By using similar terms when working independently with students and by having an ability to discuss both processes with them, teaching librarians and writing professionals reinforce writing and research as shared processes. Approaching the situation in such a way encourages students to construct knowledge about writing and research in a holistic way and view the two processes as interdependent.

The work that teaching librarians and writing professionals do
with students has enough in common that one wonders why they do not collaborate more frequently. Their individual work could be the result of the artificial academic boundaries that have developed over time, perhaps resulting in each believing certain processes to be their turf, an attitude that is consistent with academic culture: Teaching librarians think of the research process as their territory; writing professionals think of the writing process as theirs with the research process subordinate to it and thus often overlook or do not understand the difficulties students have engaging in research. As librarian Craig Gibson noted,

Writing teachers sometimes assume that learning to use the library is only a matter of hands-on practice, emphasizing narrow procedural skills, with on-line catalogs, CD-ROMs, and other tools. Although hands-on work with tools is essential for students to gain confidence with information systems, an overemphasis on this particular kind of skill, removed from a larger rhetorical or critical-thinking context, shortchanges real learning of the type many librarians have been espousing in recent years.\textsuperscript{15}

This notion also may have been perpetuated by librarians who take a tool-based approach in their instructional sessions.

In recent years, there has been a transition in library instruction from a tool-based approach to a problem-solving and learning approach, which necessitates working closely with the writing center, as discussed in chapter 1. As Jennie Nelson pointed out, "while college freshman may need to learn how to take advantage of the range of resources available in university libraries, it seems that unless we change the limited goals that students bring to the research process in the first place, they may continue to be satisfied with a few easily located sources."\textsuperscript{16} The need for teaching librarians to work with writing professionals emanates from the idea that students will only learn how to learn on their own if they are encouraged to "seek meaning, rather than a right answer, and view information as a way of learning and finding meaning or as a process of construction."\textsuperscript{17} In order to seek meaning, they will have to develop higher-order thinking skills and locate, evaluate, synthesize, and analyze information. Writing professionals are in positions to see students' efforts in these areas. However, if writing professionals are focusing on the writing and not questioning the research, students are likely missing a crucial process that has the potential to develop their ability to think critically about their topic. Writing professionals could examine bibliographies, ask about research conducted for the paper, facilitate the search process, and make referrals to the library. These efforts would help students develop some of the critical competencies of writing, reading, and researching that are important to academic success.

Peer Instruction
Clearly, peer writing tutors are at the heart of any collaboration between libraries and writing centers and are key to brokering any relationship the two may develop. Because they are models for writing as a mode of learning, insofar as they are not experts and are themselves engaged in a learning process, they challenge us to think creatively about expertise and inquiry. How peer writing tutors function at the intersection of writing and research will determine in large part the nature of the collaboration that takes place. Librarians will have to let go of territory, encouraging others to be lifelong learners (i.e., competent researchers such as writing tutors) who can teach others the process of research. In the most aggressive scenario, peer tutors would be extensively co-trained to provide both writing support and research support. They would be able to discuss with their peers both the way their writing is evolving and the way their research choices are shaping that writing. This is an intriguing model, but it puts a heavy burden on the tutors and on the training they receive, perhaps too heavy a burden. It also calls the entire expert–novice relationship into question. If writing tutors are trained to provide expert writing support, by extension, they also should be trained to provide expert research support. On the other hand, if the philosophy of a writing center emphasizes the peer relationship between tutor and tutee, that philosophy should extend to all aspects of the tutoring relationship.

Ideally, a peer writing tutor would be able to assist a writer in locating more relevant sources in a manner similar to library reference provision (usually based on a teaching model rather than a service model), rather than make a referral to a librarian who may be housed in another building. This type of assistance takes considerable training and knowledge because the tutors could encounter complex topics from a wide range of subject areas. The most useful sort of collaboration is one in which students encounter a seamless experience during the research writing process by providing peer writing tutors with the necessary skills to be successful in assisting students with both the writing process and the research process (and online searching) when research is needed before the writing can continue or before it can begin. Ideally, this would become a learning environment for students that refocuses our instruction (both library and writing center instruction) to provide both writing and research assistance with the goal of
developing higher-order thinking skills in students in a collaborative learning environment that demonstrates a convergence of facilities, instruction, and philosophies.

This is a two-way collaboration, however, and teaching librarians, too, would have to expect some changes in their provision of reference by supporting and training peer writing tutors to be successful in their research tutoring. This may be a difficult transition for some teaching librarians, but necessary if libraries are to move toward creating a learner-centered environment, either in their current facilities or a space elsewhere on campus, and if they are to become more actively involved in student learning. Librarians have to trust that tutors can provide adequate (and even excellent) reference instruction and also will know when a referral to a librarian with subject expertise is warranted. Such a collaboration between writing centers and libraries is inherent in the concept of information literacy that “speaks to fundamental processes of inquiry, and the expression of that inquiry in communicative endeavors.” When writing professionals and teaching librarians explore the concept of research and writing as intertwined and acknowledge that perhaps both processes require similar (and substantial) attention, they can open up avenues of conversation, sharing their practices in order to move beyond the artificial boundaries (budgets, departments, etc) they have maintained for too long and which have nothing to do with engaging students in critical thinking.

Although librarians and writing professionals work with integrally related processes, they have ignored the overlap and thereby weakened students' ability to think strategically about researched writing as a mode of inquiry. The collaborative model advocated in this book encourages teaching librarians and writing professionals to create a holistic experience for students. In such a model, the writing center and the library would think creatively about students’ writing and research processes. If each unit shares its instruction and training and reference staff into a hybrid model, the line between resources and writing can be made ambiguous. This model more accurately reflects the natural, recursive flow between reading, thinking, and writing within the five-canon rhetorical framework mentioned earlier. It does not encourage gathering information in a single sitting, as research is so often described in writing handbooks or as Inman illustrated by commenting that writing tutors “send students upstairs for database searching.” A fully collaborative model anticipates that research writers will benefit from an experience with writing tutors and librarians and that, as a result, the research process will become entwined with the writing process such that they appear seamless. Students would be encouraged to refine topics, find additional sources to investigate and further their thinking at many different times during the writing process, grapple with difficult scholarly material and a wide range of sources, and consider the social or political impact of their work. Revised thinking results in revised writing and revised research.

Libraries and writing centers have many practical reasons for collaboration. First, simply understanding each other’s pedagogical practices and processes can encourage referrals at appropriate times. An online writing center can become a conduit to a library's online gateway to resources as a starting point for finding materials for research projects. A library’s gateway can link to the writing center site and post hours, locations, and tutoring sessions. Although this is the least desirable sort of collaboration, at least it is a beginning. Additionally, each unit offers online tutorials (e.g., OWLS, SearchPath, TILT, Colorado State OWCC) and online assistance in the form of both e-mail and live-chat. These services could be combined to demonstrate the interdependent relationship between the two processes. Writing center Web sites could be developed that show the interweaving of both processes.

Role of Course Instructors
Whatever combined efforts we make toward engaging students in learning, however, will be affected by the demands of the course instructors. Each unit has concerns about how assignments are written and given to students and how students interpret them. The way that instructors write assignments is at times in conflict with the professional work of teaching librarians and writing center professionals. Typically, writing centers offer help in developing both lower-order skills and higher-order skills, with more emphasis on the latter. Higher-order skills include evaluating, synthesizing, and analyzing information sources. The table below provides examples of these skills. The Writing Center at the University of Maryland articulates concerns over assignments, which seems indicative of writing center professionals’ expectations of their work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-order</td>
<td>Reading, analyzing, recalling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-order</td>
<td>Synthesizing, evaluating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A great deal of the writing that students are asked to do invites them simply to demonstrate knowledge. On exams and quizzes and in many out-of-class writing assignments, they are asked merely to recall and report what they know or have collected in research. In Bloom's Taxonomy, the acts of recalling and reporting knowledge are seen as less sophisticated than the alternatives of translating information into new forms, applying it to new contexts, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating it.
The chart below arranges Bloom’s levels of cognitive activity in a grid moving (left to right) from simple to complex, and it lists a number of verbs describing its activities for each mode of thinking. The chart may thus offer suggestions to teachers for varying the level of sophistication in what they ask students to do in writing assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Synthesis</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>Summarize</td>
<td>Solve</td>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>Illustrate</td>
<td>Organize</td>
<td>Hypothesize</td>
<td>Choose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>Interpret</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>Deduce</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show</td>
<td>Describe</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>Schemaize</td>
<td>Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define</td>
<td>Compare</td>
<td>Interpret</td>
<td>Compare</td>
<td>Write</td>
<td>Defend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize</td>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>Relate</td>
<td>Distinguish</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Criticize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>Differentiate</td>
<td>Manipulate</td>
<td>Discuss</td>
<td>Justify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Demonstrate</td>
<td>Apply</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualize</td>
<td>Classify</td>
<td>Modify</td>
<td>Device</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Effective Writing Program, University of Maryland University College, http://www.umuc.edu/ugp/ewp/bloommax.html

Traditionally, librarians have been invited into courses to present a lecture (demonstration) on search tools to students, an activity that has likely contributed to this tool-based focus. However, as librarians begin to see the result of students not really understanding the high level of complexity in doing research, they are beginning to work more intensely across campus to create assignments that encourage students in more sophisticated research. Although teaching librarians’ concerns have more to do with the implied activities, skills, and knowledge in assignments and making them explicit, they, like writing centers, must work with instructors to create assignments that reduce barriers to student learning and increase successful completion of assignments.

Librarians and writing tutors acknowledge that instructors currently have the responsibility of assessing a student’s final work and will be assessing a student’s ability to “translate information into new forms.” However, librarians and tutors have the opportunity to encourage students “not to report on topics, but to engage in reflective thinking.” As they encourage, librarians and writing tutors become mediators in student learning and, as such, have the opportunity to shape the learning environment such that it facilitates higher-order thinking and encourages recursivity rather than linearity.

Libraries and writing centers have a long history of instructing students. Now this teaching is frequently available online as well as face-to-face. Staff from these units assist students in negotiating the practical, theoretical, and contextual aspects of assignments, “consciously unpack[ing] the institutional culture and its enigmas and inviting students to learn the ropes of academic inquiry by participating as active members in a community of inquiry.” An example of such practical negotiation is when an instructor discourages students from using Internet sources and those students come to the reference desk for help in finding research. Reference librarians often interpret such a statement as meaning Internet information sources found through search engines, such as Google™, that have not gone through a vetting process. They assume that it does not rule out the use of peer-reviewed, online scholarly journals that are available through subscription databases. When students insist that they cannot use anything that is on the Internet for fear of failing the assignment, librarians encourage them to seek clarification from instructors about the use of scholarly, online material. We need to move beyond these practical issues that sometimes become barriers to assisting students in becoming “active agents in the production of knowledge.” The more intellectually challenging work of librarians and writing tutors is to encourage students to situate their work within the academy by discussing conventions, selecting secondary and primary sources, understanding the arrangement (or organiza-
tion) of information, evaluating sources, considering audience, and encouraging revision.

We need to take a more active role on our campuses in the “critical practices of mentoring, teaching, and apprenticing others into engagements with technology, knowledge, and power.” The faculty development workshop has been a longtime mainstay of writing programs and libraries. Readers of this chapter will no doubt recognize the ways both units have worked to construct experiences for faculty to explore more effective ways to integrate research instruction, and an extensive literature exists in both fields to indicate points of emphasis. Sharing workshops has significant advantages. It broadens the base of advocacy, with libraries and writing centers able to lend credibility to each other’s agenda, and by placing their work under a larger umbrella, librarians and writing centers are forced to think larger, be less provincial, and appear less self-interested. Sharing faculty workshops also lessens the demand on faculty time.

Among the most vexing issues librarians and writing center professionals face is their relationship with faculty. In providing support for students trying to do the assignments given by faculty, teaching librarians and writing tutors navigate the sometimes-incomprehensible tasks students are given by faculty. Sometimes such assignments display a troubling lack of awareness about the demands they place on the support system, and, more troubling, sometimes they display a lack of awareness about the educational methods they encourage. As librarian Larry Hardesty noted, “faculty members’ academic background and training work against an understanding of the proper role of the college library. He has been trained as a scholar-researcher and is not really interested in how his students use the library; he, after all, learned to use it in his discipline and assumes students can also.” Indeed, librarians and writing centers share a number of concerns that need to be addressed to teaching faculty: “Both attempt to infuse the curriculum with basic academic and life-long learning skills and to embed those skills meaningfully in the disciplines.” These include concerns about plagiarism, assignment construction, and course development and curriculum design. Because they deal with the efforts of students who are doing the work assigned by faculty, librarians and writing professionals are in a position to report to faculty what works and what does not. Unfortunately, due in large part to differences in academic status and the tendency of faculty to see themselves as autonomous in the classroom, it can be difficult to find effective ways to communicate to faculty. It is important to find those ways of communication or we are left working with frustrated students who do not have the skills necessary to complete an assignment successfully. As Fister points out that faculty frequently fail to clearly state their goals for research assignments, “assuming that students are familiar with the nature of academic writing” while librarians fill that void “with the notion that finding and presenting information is the goal of research. If librarians fail to place their advice to students in the rhetorical context of research, they may reinforce the misconception that the main point of research is to report on knowledge found elsewhere.” Both libraries and writing centers have developed a tradition of workshops for faculty to address these concerns. On campuses where both units offer workshops, they might well find themselves competing for faculty participation. One of the most promising trends in the collaboration of writing centers and libraries appears to be in the area of faculty development. Including faculty as active co-creators of learning situations, teaching librarians and writing professionals can help students develop the reflective modes of inquiry needed with new literacies by creating learning communities.

When students receive a writing assignment that involves research, they typically have much to interpret. The various tasks or skills students need to complete assignments successfully are not usually identified explicitly. Moreover, faculty often assume that their students have a more advanced level of knowledge, skills, and abilities than the students actually possess. Sometimes language itself is a barrier. For example, when the words article, citation, or bibliography are used, there is a good chance a student does not understand those terms. In a recent study by librarian Norman Hutchinson, 47 percent of freshman and sophomore survey respondents understood article, 51.7 percent understood citation, and 49.9 percent understood bibliography. Students have more than terminology to understand, though, before they can complete an assignment. A scan through various writing guides, such as The Craft of Research, shows that students will need to understand claims, reasons, and evidence. Students will have to understand their audiences and choose terminology and research methodologies that will situate them in a particular academic community (i.e., among scientists, social scientists, or humanists). Indeed, one of the many outcomes expected by faculty is that students will “Use conventions of format and structure appropriate to the rhetorical situation.” All of these, when unknown to the student, are potential barriers to successful completion of a research project. Students have to negotiate immediately when given an assignment. Their “task interpretations and choices—whether solitary or collaborative, reflective or unexamined—will help to determine whether their research assignments become valuable opportunities to extend their knowledge through critical inquiry or unchallenging exercises in gathering and reproducing information.” Writing tutors and librarians help students reflect on their work and develop the critical competencies they need to complete their assignments successfully.
Ultimately, if research and writing processes were taught simultaneously, students would be working in a learning environment that is more conducive to constructing knowledge than the current educational environment with its continued emphasis on lecture over active learning techniques that engage students in dialogue and inquiry and encourage independent thinking. Paulo Freire has maintained that “Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other.” Working collaboratively, the writing center and the library could provide students a physical and virtual space in which the research process and the writing process are understood as shared constructive processes from which knowledge can emerge. Some of this discussion would likely strike Freire as oppressive, such as the emphasis on conventions and genres and expectations of scholars in their respective fields. However, the intent in reaching out to the writing and library communities is to help cultivate an academic culture that is less oppressive and to take on more active roles in student development and learning on our campuses. Why? Because daily librarians and writing tutors are faced with assisting students who are not engaged with the curriculum—students not engaged in their research and writing assignments, or why and how they are learning. The banking method of which Freire has written is alive and well in our campus classrooms, but students find their ways to oft-underfunded, oft-understaffed writing centers and libraries whose staff spend time engaging them in inquiry. Such a claim is not only supported by anecdotal evidence, however. Lack of student engagement with learning is supported by the Boyer Report, the low retention rates among all, but the elite institutions of higher education; the persistent discussions of engaging students in their learning through dialog, peer learning, and collaboration; and publications such as Learning Outside the Lines by students who have graduated by learning how to work a system that did not work for them and who advocate more active student engagement in learning.

By engaging in such collaborations, we can rediscover the value of collaborative spaces or contact zones and model more engaged forms of active learning. A merged center is the logical place for that collaboration to occur. Teaching research and writing as shared processes will require a shared space in which teaching librarians and writing professionals continue to share their knowledge with each other and provide a space for students that allows both processes to be practiced simultaneously.

Sharing Facilities and Resources

Carol Severino has argued that the writing center is a “contact zone.” He described the writing center in terms that apply equally well to libraries. Writing centers are places “where diverse cultures, languages, literacies, and discourses meet, clash, and grapple with each other.” The center is a ‘disciplinary borderland’ where the rhetorics of the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences meet—to both intersect and conflict. Tutors and tutees work in a dynamic educational environment. Although not all writing centers employ undergraduate students as their tutors, some hire only undergraduates. These tutors are students with their own educational challenges, and as they work with other students on their writing, both students’ identities and language practices are forming. In either situation, it is contact among writers of different backgrounds, different skill levels, and different attitudes that makes the tutoring relationship so dynamic. Libraries are quite accustomed to managing space, but they have only recently begun to think of it as a dynamic “learning space.”

Awareness of the library as a “contact zone” has been limited. In fact, the creation of learning space requires a conscious effort. In order to co-manage a space that would facilitate holistic learning, both units must share a vision for engaging students in learning and with that be able to discuss the theoretical as well as the practical commonalities that unite their practices. Both units also must have a general respect for their differences. When shared goals around student learning or shared understanding of each other’s theory and practice are lacking, the result is simply the sharing of space. We can see these difficulties in the work of James Inman who manages a collaboration between a writing center and a library. He notes that in planning the Center for Collaborative Learning and Communication (CCLC) at Furman University, the group learned that “specific architecture could make a profound difference on the engaged learning activity that could take place in the space,” so they designed their space with the idea that peer consultants would be able to move around comfortably in shared, flexible spaces that could meet a variety of consulting needs. Inman recognizes the potential for learning in such a space and, in fact, in his description of the center, he collapses the writing and research processes into what he calls a process approach for engaged learning. He explains that:

the current CCLC features a process approach for engaged learning much like the process approach writing studies scholars have developed, but also more general. We imagine that clients can begin their work in the Informal Gathering Areas, chatting with each other about ideas and helping to generate collaboratively the initial shape for whatever project they are developing. With this dialogic foundation, the project teams could then move to the Collaborative Workstations, where they could begin to shape the ideas collaboratively into a project draft.
Although he does not specifically mention research as a process, it seems that he has embedded it in the engaged learning process that he describes. In fact, he later describes the student experiences as being holistic, but here we also begin to see that he has, in fact, separated the CCLC from the library by distinguishing the clients:

Our collaboration with various library departments has been most often in terms of offering clients the best possible holistic experience, whether library clients or CCLC clients. We’ve held several workshops with library personnel, and each time we’ve emphasized ways we can support each other’s work.51

Such a statement about clients indicates that in Inman’s model, CCLC clients are distinguished from library clients. He also appears to have his own reservations about the arrangement of services:

If someone comes to CCLC and asks about database searching, for instance, we explain that they may want to venture upstairs to the reference desk to ask one of the librarians for help, just as those librarians refer questions about writing, communication, and technology to us. I would be naïve to suggest such collaboration is always in the democratic spirit [John] Dewey sought, but I do believe the relationship is in good faith and that we all have good intentions.52

The tension between the goal for students to have a “holistic experience” described by Inman and the relatively bifurcated practice he later describes (i.e., sending students somewhere else to do the research) severely limits real educational collaboration.

Inman’s efforts and similar ones across the country, however, have multiple advantages and do provide benefits to students. The benefits include a referral system that may not have been in place before the collaboration; a space in which the two elements of instruction (i.e., writing and research instruction) are in the same facility and relatively close to each other, making it easier for students to get the help they need; and consolidated technology that can be used for multiple purposes. Plus, the writing center can take advantage of the late hours that libraries typically provide without fearing for tutors’ security and a move to the library usually entails a significant upgrade in writing center facilities. Inman and similar library-writing center collaborators have, in a sense, facilitated the work flow of students to create a seamless information/writing experience, allowing librarians and writing tutors to be experts in part of the larger process, co-referring students back and forth between research and writing, creating spaces for creative, yet disciplined, work and co-training each other, as Inman noted, in ways that each can support the other.53 This is a better model than when a library and a writing center simply cohabitate in the spaces provided and no real educational collaboration occurs.

Conclusion
In establishing a collaborative relationship, both units must be open-minded and willing to look for the practical commonalities that unite them but also must acknowledge any differences that make them unique. How do students engage in learning and in creating new knowledge? What is our role in that? Library staff must be willing to work with trained student tutors who will question practices and need explanations in terms they can understand and convey to their peers. As collaborators, units will need to be able to answer questions such as the following in order to prepare librarians and writing staff to work in wider capacities: Is there a line between research and writing? What kind of resource is useful to a freshman writer? What is an authoritative source, and what confers authority? What constitutes successful research and writing within the various academic disciplines?

Above all, we will need participatory, shared training and activities that can help answer the questions that are posed above, and we need to teach a model of collaboration (i.e., no clear line between research and writing). This is very engaged, intellectual work that supports inquiry-based learning and is valuable to our campuses. Rolf Norgaard observed that we need to “spur and support the impulses for pedagogical reform already implicit in [our] initiatives.”54 We will need to pursue ongoing discussion among ourselves, but also with campus administrators and disciplinary faculty to solicit campuswide understanding, support, and resources for our efforts.
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