CHAPTER 12.

EMBRACE THE MESSINESS: LIBRARIES, WRITING CENTERS, AND ENCOURAGING RESEARCH AS INQUIRY ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

Jaena Alabi
Auburn University

James C. W. Truman
Auburn University

Bridget Farrell
University of Denver

Jennifer Price Mahoney
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

As educators, how do we clarify the concept of research into a manageable form so it's communicated effectively while still creating space for the complexity inherent across different academic disciplines, different classroom settings, at different levels from first-year students to graduate students? How do we look at this work of meaning-making appropriately so we can build an engaged pedagogy that can move across disciplines? This chapter will explore and attempt to define the challenging "mess" that comes with teaching research and writing in the disciplines; it will provide strategies for and examples of embracing the complexity of information literacy, scholarly inquiry and research writing. Finally, it will articulate the experiences of writing center staff and librarians who collaborate to embrace the messiness of research and writing to empower students.

Helping students become better writers, researchers, and thinkers across all disciplines is hard. This isn't news to anyone in higher education, but it's the

everyday work of writing centers and libraries across institutions as we work with students in different disciplines outside the classroom. For educators, these challenges can seem overwhelming; how do we clarify the concept of "research" into a manageable form so it's communicated effectively, while still creating space for the complexity inherent across different academic disciplines, different classroom settings, at different levels from first-year students to graduate students? How do we look at this work of meaning-making appropriately so we can build an engaged pedagogy that can move across disciplines? This is a question not of abstract theory or institutional restructuring, but of building a culture of collaborative praxis. Such collaborations only operate if individuals—librarians and writing administrators who work with disciplinary faculty—have the freedom to collaborate creatively in their everyday work; as the authors of "English Across the Curriculum Collaborative Projects: A Flexible Community of Practice Model at the Chinese University of Hong Kong" (this volume) work toward broad cross-disciplinary communities of practice, we likewise emphasize not a fixed structure of implementation, but an engagement of student learners in the messy process of library research.

One challenge that writing center staff, librarians, and disciplinary faculty face is how to creatively engage with the static, fixed assumptions behind the generic research paper, elegantly deconstructed by scholars such as Jackie Grutsch McKinney (2002), Robert Davis and Mark Shadle (2000), Sarah Marshall (2015), and Rebecca Moore Howard and Sandra Jamieson (2014). Writing centers and libraries have been on the front lines of this struggle and in the past 10 years have been working to collaborate in "Learning Commons" to do this work, both with institutional changes and attempts at cross-training between staffs (Elmborg & Hook, 2005).

But despite some institutional shifts that recognize the complexity of disciplinary research and writing, institutions are not inherently equipped to tackle the intense complexity and fundamental "messiness" of scholarly research across disciplines in a collaborative way. To encourage the necessary adaptability to engage with this messiness, you need individuals—administrators, reference librarians, and writing consultants—willing to collaborate creatively to maintain a culture of flexibility that creates a space where students can develop creative research skills across disciplines. This chapter will explore and attempt to define the challenging "mess" that comes with teaching research and writing in the disciplines; it will provide strategies for and examples of embracing the complexity of information literacy, scholarly inquiry and research writing. Finally, it will articulate the experiences of writing center staff and librarians who collaborate to embrace the messiness of research and writing to empower students.

LIMITATIONS OF THE LINEAR

Imagine that a first-year composition student working on a research project has two plastic storage bins that she uses to organize her knowledge and skills related to research and writing. She's labeled one bin *Research* and the other *Writing*. Within the bins, she has divided her knowledge further with the use of folders. For instance, within her research bin, she has folders marked *Step 2: search for articles* and *Step 6: cite sources*; in her writing bin, folder three is labeled *revise*. Her teacher has asked her to co-mingle the contents of the bins and folders. This would require her to disrupt her nice, neat structure in order to experience a more authentic research and writing experience; she grows frustrated with the messiness of this process. Students do this not only in their composition courses, but also with any writing project in any discipline, be it their history paper on the Civil Rights Movement, their literature review for a biology lab report, or their economics paper on the Great Recession.

This student's actions mirror the conventional habits of educational institutions, which also make use of labeled bins; in the research bin, libraries support scholarly research, while writing programs and writing centers exist in the writing bin to support writers. When students work on assignments, they often employ this compartmentalized, linear approach; they access the research bin first, then return it to storage, even though the writing and research processes are intertwined and cannot be fully detached from one another. Even Wayne Booth, Gregory Colomb, and Joseph Williams' (2008) nuanced and complicated *The Craft of Research* can't avoid this sequenced approach. The authors title an early section of their book "Asking Questions, Finding Answers" (2008, p. 29). This section, like most of the first half, focuses on finding sources. It takes more than 140 pages before the authors arrive at "Planning, Drafting, and Revision" (2008, p. 173). This structure is repeated in writer's guides, composition textbooks, and syllabi across academia. For example, the University of Wisconsin–Madison Writing Center's (2018) online *Writer's Handbook* breaks "Writing a Research Paper" into eight steps—the first three on the research process and the next five on the writing process.

Despite these linear models, research and writing thrive as one recursive process. The teleology that focuses on the product (the current traditional rhetoric model, for example) has been displaced in writing studies by a recognition of the creative and recursive process, popularized by scholars like Elbow (1973) and Murray (1972) throughout the 1960s and 1970s (see Hairston, 1982); that is, to become a more effective writer, you need to work on developing an effective writing process that is recursive and embraces discovery. This paradigm shift paralleled both the emergence of WAC programs, which embraced a similarly

fluid and contextual understanding of meaning making, and the emergence of the modern, collaborative writing center with its student-centered approach to learning (Mullin, 2001). Likewise, librarians recognize that research is a process of inquiry that—similar to writing—requires a nonlinear, iterative and creative process (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2015). For librarians, information literacy (the process of finding, evaluating, and using information effectively) cannot be the sole responsibility of libraries, but requires engagement from stakeholders across campus (Grafstein, 2002).

Librarians wrestle with the problem of how to introduce information literacy to novice learners in a way that embraces complexity, but acknowledges that there also exists a dimension of information literacy that focuses on acquiring rote skills. As with writing, information literacy as a concept can be approached from a multitude of perspectives (Hall et al., 2018). Mandy Lupton and Christine Bruce (2010) detailed three distinct windows through which practitioners can examine information literacy as a literacy: generic, situated, and transformative perspectives. These lenses approach information literacy with increasing degrees of complexity, from the rote skills mindset of the generic window to the critical perspective of the transformative window.

Through the lens of the generic window, information literacy is approached from a skills-based mindset where students are taught the processes necessary to find information through the use of tools and the evaluation of information is carried out through checklists, such as the CRAAP test (Blakeslee, 2004), with limited discussion of disciplinary differences in evaluation. With a situated perspective on information literacy, the context through which information items are produced becomes inseparable from the teaching of information literacy, as students are asked to think about information as a practice that varies by discipline, community, occupation, or level of expertise (from first-year students to graduate students and beyond). There is a movement from the linear to a more complex and nuanced focus on evaluation, where students do not consider a text independent of other works, and information itself is more broadly defined to include, "opinions, ideas, text, images and aural, visual, affective, kinesthetic, and embodied stimuli" (Lupton & Bruce, 2010, p. 15).

This complexity increases when approaching information literacy with a transformative lens. In the transformative window, information is no longer viewed as static or unchangeable, but instead as an empowering force that is capable of provoking change in oneself and society, including questioning structures and institutions that contribute to the creation and dissemination of information. With this lens, students are no longer seen as simple consumers of information, but creators in their own right who are complicit in supporting oppressive systems and empowered to provoke change.

Librarians are often called upon only to speak about information from a generic perspective, which may be taught linearly with a discussion of how to search and evaluate in tidy, bullet-pointed lists. Teaching information literacy from situated and transformative perspectives, however, defies this orderly approach. When information is viewed in context, it is impossible to ignore the messiness of authentic evaluation practices and the non-linearity of the publication process. To have the opportunity to cover information literacy topics from a situated or transformative perspective requires work, collaboration with disciplinary faculty, and time—all things that can often be in short supply.

As librarians and writing center/writing program faculty, we are aware of the complexity of the subject we teach. Underlying both disciplines is the goal that students will develop as deep critical thinkers, to think actively as they process, examine, employ, and engage with knowledge in their field (Bruffee, 1993; Detmering & Johnson, 2011; Weiler, 2005). Why then, do we discuss the writing process and information literacy in linear and generic ways? There's clearly a practical reason for this reductiveness—clear communication of complex practices often requires tactical simplification. (The University of Wisconsin-Madison Writing Center includes a disclaimer that "the actual process of writing a research paper is often a messy and recursive one, so please use this outline as a flexible guide.") The scale of the messiness is too large. So how do we "scale down" the messiness of the process to make it manageable, while introducing students to complexity in a manner that will not overwhelm or discourage them? This requires partnerships, reflective thought, and a commitment to rejecting the oversimplification of these processes and embracing the messiness.

THE RIGHT WAY IS THE HARD WAY: RESEARCH AS INQUIRY

How do we embrace messiness in the real world, where students want to put things in clearly labeled, carefully collated bins? Of course, this is hard. Many writing assignments, such as lab reports, policy papers, and business plans, ask students to locate, evaluate, and synthesize a variety of outside sources in order to support their arguments. To many students' chagrin, these types of assignments do not equate to a linear process and require students to tolerate ambiguity. It involves locating sources, reading and evaluating them, saving the relevant ones, identifying new questions from their reading, searching again, and so on.

To muddy the waters, different disciplines have different expectations, and the instructors within those disciplines will have their own idiosyncratic experiences that produce a wide range of conceptions of how to teach research and writing. Librarians and writing center consultants help students navigate this com-

plex terrain, working across disciplinary differences and with disciplinary faculty to clarify expectations. For example, in a business course, peer-reviewed sources might not be the only sources students are asked to use. They might need to look at demographic data, analyze market research, and cite industry reports. Using these sources requires creative thinking with citations and evaluation. Because of the messiness of source evaluation and the broad pedagogical interpretations, librarians and instructors have tended toward simplifying the process for students.

Over the past few years, the academic library profession has undergone a shift away from a generic, product-based approach to teaching. This shift, to balance the different perspectives on information literacy, is reflected in the evolution of the disciplinary documents that define what information literacy is and methods through which it can be taught. In 2015, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) adopted the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* as a new guiding document for information literacy instructors. A year after its adoption, the ACRL announced the sunsetting of the previous guiding document, the *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* (ACRL, 2000), leaving the *Framework* as the document of record for librarians. The adoption of the *Framework* and the sunsetting of the *Standards* has led to an increased focus on teaching the context that surrounds the creation and dissemination of information. Considerable thought has been given to the reality of research within our current state of information production and dissemination. Perhaps students don't leave the classroom knowing how to search a specific database but instead leave with a new or different way of thinking about searching.

COMING TOGETHER

In 2003, Rolf Norgaard recommended that the fields of information literacy and writing form a partnership of "intellectual engagement" (p. 124). He argued that writing's transformation from the current traditional model to a process-based approach could be replicated in the information literacy field; in particular, this shift in thinking could promote research as a process, rather than merely a mastery of skills (Norgaard, 2003).

With the publication of *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and National Writing Project (NWP) in 2011, the field of writing signaled its embrace of the process in its most dynamic and pluralistic form. The document contains a section titled "Developing Flexible Writing Processes," in which the first sentence of the second paragraph states that "writing processes are not linear" (CWPA et al., 2011, p. 8). About five

years later, when the academic library profession adopted its own "framework," the authors used the word "process" 30 times (ACRL, 2015).

Barry Maid and Barbara D'Angelo (2016) discussed similarities between the two documents, including parallels in how each addresses the affective aspects of learning. The writing document refers to the affective qualities of a writer as "habits of mind," and describes specific habits using one word and a statement (CWPA et al., 2011). Written broadly, the habits refer to all parts of the writing process. The information literacy document, on the other hand, focuses its affective learning—or, "dispositions"—on specific parts of the research process. When displayed side-by-side, the similarities are difficult to miss (ACRL, 2015; see Figure 12.1).

ACRL Research as Inquiry Dispositions	WPA Habits of Mind
"Learners value *intellectual curiosity* in developing questions and learning new investigative methods"	*Curiosity*: "The desire to know more about the world"
"Learners value *persistence*, adaptability, and flexibility and recognize that ambiguity can benefit the research process"	*Persistence*: "The ability to sustain interest in and attention to short- and long-term projects"
"Learners maintain an *open mind* and a critical stance"	*Openness*: "The willingness to consider new ways of being and thinking in the world"
"Learners consider research as open-ended exploration and *engagement* with information"	*Engagement*: "A sense of investment and involvement in learning"
"Learners value persistence, adaptability, and *flexibility* and recognize that ambiguity can benefit the research process"	*Flexibility*: "The ability to adapt to situations, expectations, or demands."

Figure 12.1. Comparison of the ACRL (2015) and WPA (Council of WPA et al., 2011) frameworks.

Why does this matter? The congruent and overarching goals that writing and information literacy share form the theoretical underpinnings for a partnership of "intellectual engagement" (Norgaard, 2003, p. 124), which could result in strategies to address the messiness of the combined processes rather than going it alone.

HARD THINGS ARE HARD: PRACTICAL STRATEGIES FOR COLLABORATION

Writing programs, like libraries and writing centers, have tried a number of ways to help undergraduates navigate this messy process. At Indiana University—

Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) one of the strategies involves scaling down the research/writing mess into two smaller messes, "closed" research and "open" research.[1] Beginning in the 1990s, some writing programs in the United States introduced a two-semester writing course sequence (Hood, 2010). The first semester uses a "closed" research approach; faculty provide sources for the students to incorporate into their writing projects. Collaborating with librarians, faculty use articles and non-fiction readers. For example, a student might be able to choose between curated articles on current topics as diverse as Bitcoin, marijuana legalization, or rising healthcare costs from nonscholarly sources, like *Vanity Fair*, *Newsweek*, or *The Atlantic*. Since the students do not have to find their own articles, they can focus on the *why* of scholarly inquiry: Why do students need to read critically? Why do they need to integrate source materials into their arguments? Why do they need to worry about attribution and citation?

In the second semester, students progress to an open research approach. They start getting into the *how* of scholarly inquiry. How do students formulate good research questions? How do students find authoritative sources? How do they practice information literacy? Students are asked to identify a real-world problem (for example, an issue in the local business community) and their writing is scaffolded from developing their question, to finding keywords for database searches, to evaluating the resources they find, to using their sources to develop and build support for their proposal. As they draft and revise, students are encouraged to revisit their sources and consider their individual contributions to an ongoing conversation, as Kenneth Burke (1974) posited in his parlor metaphor.

This approach (sequenced research writing) could also be applied in disciplinary gateway courses. For instance, in a history course, maybe the first assignments would focus on analyzing and writing about primary sources provided by the instructor, while later assignments might require students to find their own primary sources. In a statistics class, perhaps students would initially be given datasets to analyze and then later would need to find their own datasets. In the latter part of a chemistry course, students might be expected to incorporate a limited literature review into their lab report to frame the experiment. As students grow and become more experienced with these complex processes, the instructors can begin to remove the scaffolding, encouraging the students to develop their own strategies for tackling the research-writing relationship.

By breaking the big, messy process of research into two smaller messes, stu-

---

1   Several faculty at IUPUI have tried to track down their notes from the late 1980s/early 1990s when the program made its shift to the closed-open research model, but no one can find a clear genesis. The model is mentioned in the Allyn and Bacon Guide to Writing (Ramage & Bean, 1997), but it was not the first textbook to do it.

dents may start to appreciate the messy, but symbiotic relationship between research and writing. Ideally, librarians, writing center consultants, and writing faculty can model the types of collaboration needed to navigate these processes and to develop a worthy final product.

COLLABORATION OF LIBRARY AND WRITING CENTER

Partnerships between writing centers and libraries have been a goal for the last 15 years; many institutions have moved their writing center to the library to become part of a "learning commons"—open space that fosters collaborative learning between students while bringing together a variety of campus centers to support student learning. Because of the "complementary practices" of writing centers and libraries, this collaboration seems natural (Hook, 2005). In our experience at Auburn University, however, proximity does not necessarily result in productive collaborations; simply having similar practices and goals does not guarantee that separate units coordinate their activities. Rather, an increased intentionality is necessary to connect and integrate the practices of writing center consultants and librarians.

Several librarians with different disciplinary responsibilities worked with the writing center director to "scale down" the messiness of the research and writing processes by highlighting the similarities of everyday practice by both groups, similar to what Lea Currie and Michele Eodice (2005) described in "Roots Entwined: Growing a Sustainable Collaboration" (2005). Of particular emphasis was the classic non-directive premises of Stephen North's (1982) "better writers, not just better writing" (p. 439) and the active listening strategies of the librarian's "reference interview" (North, 1982, p. 439; Ross et al., 2009). Both of these practices embrace the messy collaborative learning in Lev Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development, in which writers or researchers work to build upon already developed skills, with support. It is in their messy, interpersonal character that the power of these moments emerges (Elmborg, 2002; Nordlof, 2014). This interpersonal approach has been part of Auburn's writing center training for years, as it is a fundamental principle of writing center pedagogy following the work of Elizabeth Boquet, Anne Ellen Geller, Michele Eodice, Frankie Condon, and Meg Carroll (Boquet, 2002; Geller et al., 2007).

At Auburn, our more focused, intentional collaboration between the library and the writing center began with the writing center consultants' first training sessions and continued throughout their monthly professional development series. The training's goals included (a) to illuminate the parallels in practice between the reference interview and the writing consultation, (b) to have consultants connect their thinking about the writing process to the research process,

(c) to integrate scholarly readings into the consultants' ongoing professional development practicum, and most important, (d) to build a culture of collaboration between consultants and librarians. The training also had an underlying, broader goal of developing consultants' confidence in their own research skills.

To achieve these goals, librarians were invited to a training session for the consultants, where they demonstrated the reference interview. For librarians, the reference interview is a particular kind of conversation—one in which the librarian must gather from the user what they're looking for and why. This must be done in a non-threatening way so that the user does not feel that they're being interrogated or judged, lest they withdraw from the interaction without receiving the support they need. Open-ended questions and reflective listening are often employed in the reference interview to ensure that the librarian understands the user's need so they can direct them appropriately (American Library Association, 2008).

After watching a re-enactment of a typical reference interview, writing consultants were asked to connect the tactics and strategies they saw in the skit to their own practice in one-on-one consultations. Consultants were invited to share their observations with the group. In particular, consultants noted that they, like the librarians, attempted to show the writer that they were interested and invested in the exchange by adopting an open body posture and asking reflective questions. Additionally, the writing consultants resisted the impulse to be directive, and instead let the writer take the lead.

In a subsequent semester, consultants were introduced to a scholarly article that connected research and writing in a more substantive way—the first year the article was Joseph Bizup's (2008) "BEAM: A Rhetorical Vocabulary for Teaching Research-Based Writing;" the second year the reading was Rebecca Moore Howard and Sandra Jamieson's (2014) "Researched Writing." The librarians returned to discuss the article with the consultants, who had discussed the articles in smaller groups, focusing on how the readings could enrich their practice. This allowed for more reflective discussion regarding the similarities between the work of librarians and consultants. The consultants responded very positively to Bizup's call to disrupt the oversimplified vision of sources as simply "primary" and "secondary," and to see the source assessment as a fundamental to the construction of meaning, rather than the mere gathering of information. This discussion shed light on the nebulous nature of classifying sources as primary or secondary, as disciplines define these terms differently.

This squared very well with the consultants' writer-centered approach, where the core question "what are you trying to say?" would drive discussions with clients, rather than a simplistic categorizing of "what kind of sources are you supposed to use?" In fact, the consultants were initially somewhat resistant to

Bizup's new model because they first saw it as a new set of "rules" that they'd have to impose on writers—an approach they have been trained to resist. The discussions with the librarians helped to refocus the consultants to see Bizup's approach as a new tool to use to help writers make more active choices about how they utilize sources in their writing.

From a librarian's perspective, the writing center consultant is in a unique position to ensure a smooth, anxiety-free introduction between the writer-researcher and the librarian because they have already established a connection and built rapport with the writer-researcher. At Auburn University, although our writing center has no walls around it, we saw that our consultants were often stopped from approaching the librarians by an invisible barrier. Our joint training sessions sought to remove this barrier. But we also want more than for consultants to merely handoff a writer to the librarian. We want the consultants, when research questions emerge in their discussions, to feel confident in beginning a conversation about how to find sources, and when a consultant feels the conversation has moved beyond her comfort level, we want her to feel confident moving to the reference desk and continuing that session with the reference librarian, "dovetailing" the reference interview and writing consultation. Focusing on these shared practices in the everyday experience of writers, consultants, and librarians, helps refocus away from a linear narrative to the productive and empowering messiness of the individual writer's choices as they work on a project and build their skills through collaboration.

We've seen many moments when this empowerment emerges in a session; consultants, again and again, see students (especially from introductory courses in disciplines from Human Development and Family Studies to Crop, Soil, and Environmental Sciences) looking to find sources to support a point they've already established, or (even more dramatically) completely at a loss for what to say about a complex issue which they've read extensively about and on which they need to take a position. Embracing the messiness of this moment, for those students, is about finding their voice within a broad conversation. For example, one student came to a consultant with a project for their introductory Crop Soils class, in which they had to take a position on a current controversy—the student had chosen to write on the weed killer Roundup and recent revelations that it is a significant carcinogen. The student had read multiple sources, but they were struggling to find a position—they were looking for the "right answer," and were uncomfortable with the messiness of their indeterminate research. At that moment, the consultant reassured them that it was okay that what they saw was messy, and that they should feel empowered to find their own understanding within that messiness—that recognition of indeterminacy let that writer find a clarity from which they could build their meaning, based on their reading and research.

Sometimes, that empowerment can come from much smaller gestures. For example, a student came looking for help with her English composition paper on her chosen topic, the hip-hop artist Gucci Mane, but had run into a road-block as she attempted to find sources. At this moment, it was gratifying to see the creative, process-oriented thinking of the consultant kick in, as she wasn't looking for the "right way" to look for sources—she was not intimidated, but saw working creatively with library resources as fun, internalizing the work we'd done in the training to empower her as a researcher, and in turn help her share that knowledge with other students. It turned out, the writer had been in the wrong search box on the library's website——she'd been searching the library's catalog instead of an article database. She went from not being able to find any sources on her topic to retrieving over 100 sources, including Gucci Mane's autobiography.

This is a powerful moment because it illustrates the liberation of an emerging writer from a rigid, linear process to engage in a scaled down version of a messier research/writing process, which reflects a more authentic research and writing experience. What resonates most is the positive energy the consultant and writer brought to this creative moment, an array of over 100 different sources became an opportunity not a challenge. The consultant was confident enough in her research skills to help the writer navigate the stumbling block they faced in identifying where to search for their topic, but it was also clear that, following our training, had the issues become more complicated, the consultant could move the discussion to the reference desk to continue the conversation. In the past several years, the reference librarians at Auburn have seen an increase in these kinds of conversations where writing center consultants have introduced writer-researchers to the reference desk for help in finding sources related to accounting (comparison of U.S. and international accounting standards), ed-ucation (impact of school dress codes), psychology (test anxiety and academic outcomes for homeschooled adolescents), and biology (the population effect of warfare on men's life expectancy in the nineteenth century South).

This positive energy, finally, is the power of the interpersonal engagement of the writing consultation and the reference interview. The empowerment of the student to find their creative place in an ongoing conversation. The writer-researcher can discover the affirmation to navigate the messiness, to make choices and build their thinking (and writing) skills. Those moves can be as simple as using a different search box—or searching in a different bin. But without an active and engaged perspective on the empowering messiness of research, writing consultants will be less likely to create moments like this for writers—so we want to continue to build environments that will empower students in these moments.

CONCLUSION

The research process and the writing process are not mutually exclusive, and the overlaps between them are fraught and messy. However, in trying to simplify the complex processes of research and writing, painting them as linear or sequential does our students no favors. If they embrace this simplistic approach, students will think they have mastered research and writing when they are, in fact, merely performing at a superficial level; when they do encounter a complex research writing situation, they will be frustrated and overwhelmed. This is increasingly more likely as students move into their disciplinary courses, and begin to unpack what research and writing looks like in different disciplines.

Disciplinary faculty, writing center staff, and librarians can use the messy overlaps between research and writing to our advantage. Through collaboration among our disciplines, we can model best practices for students who are struggling. Just as we encourage students to engage in a creative, recursive process that transfers beyond the composition classroom and library into their courses across campus, so must faculty, librarians and writing center consultants be willing to cede some "turf." Such collaborations can be uncomfortable; they are unpredictable, non-linear, and iterative, just like the writing and research processes themselves. It is in our students' best interests, and ultimately our own, to partner with our colleagues across campus and across disciplines to pursue the many shared skills and experiences we value and want students to develop in their research and writing throughout their academic careers. By embracing the messiness of collaboration, research, and writing, we will help our students recognize the tremendous value in all three processes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

American Library Association (ALA). (2008). *Guidelines for behavioral performance of reference and information service providers*. http://www.ala.org/rusa/resources/guidelines/guidelinesbehavioral

Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). (2000). *Information literacy competency standards for higher education: Standards, performance indicators and outcomes*. https://alair.ala.org/handle/11213/7668

Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). (2015). *Framework for information literacy for higher education*. http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework

Bizup, J. (2008). BEAM: A rhetorical vocabulary for teaching research-based writing. *Rhetoric Review*, *27*(1), 72-86. https://doi.org/10.1080/07350190701738858

Blakeslee, S. (2004). The CRAAP test. *LOEX Quarterly, 31*(3), 4.

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2008). *The craft of research*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226062648.001.0001

Boquet, E. H. (2002). *Noise from the writing center*. Utah State University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt46nwjt

Bruffee, K. A. (1993). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Burke, K. (1974). *The philosophy of literary form: Studies in symbolic action*. University of California Press.

Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), & National Writing Project (NWP). (2011). *Framework for success in postsecondary writing*. https://ncte.org/statement/collwritingframework/

Currie, L., & Eodice, M. (2005). Roots entwined: Growing a sustainable collaboration. In J. K. Elmborg & S. Hook (Eds.), *Centers for learning: Writing centers and libraries in collaboration* (pp. 42-60). Association of College and Research Libraries.

Davis, R., & Shadle, M. (2000). "Building a mystery": Alternative research writing and the academic act of seeking. *College Composition and Communication, 51*(3), 417-446. https://doi.org/10.2307/358743

Detmering, R., & Johnson, A. M. (2011). Focusing on the thinking, not the tools: Incorporating critical thinking into an information literacy module for an introduction to business course. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, *16*(2), 101-107. https://doi.org/10.1080/08963568.2011.554771

Elbow, P. (1973). *Writing without teachers*. Oxford University Press.

Elmborg, J. K. (2002). Teaching at the desk: Toward a reference pedagogy. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *2*, 455-464. https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2002.0050

Elmborg, J. K., & Hook, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Centers for learning: Writing centers and libraries in collaboration* (No. 58). Association of College & Research Libraries.

Geller, A. E., Eodice, M., Condon, F., Carroll, M., & Boquet, E. (2007). *Everyday writing center: A community of practice*. Utah State University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt4cgmkj

Grafstein, A. (2002). A discipline-based approach to information literacy. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *28*(4), 197-204. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(02)00283-5

Hairston, M. (1982). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, *33*(1), 76-88. https://doi.org/10.2307/357846

Hall, R. M., Romo, M., & Wardle, E. (2018). Teaching and learning threshold concepts in a writing major: Liminality, Dispositions, and Program Design. *Composition Forum, 38*.

Hood, C. L. (2010). Ways of research: The status of the traditional research paper assignment in first-year writing/composition courses. *Composition Forum, 22*. http://compositionforum.com/issue/22/ways-of-research.php

Hook, S. (2005). Teaching librarians and writing center professionals in collaboration: Complementary practices. In J. K. Elmborg & S. Hook (Eds.), *Centers for learning: Writing centers and libraries in collaboration* (pp. 21-41). Association of College and Research Libraries.

Howard, R. M., & Jamieson, S. (2014). Researched writing. In G. Tate, A. Rupiper, & K. Schick (Eds.), *A guide to composition pedagogies* (pp. 231-247). Oxford University Press.

Lupton, M., & Bruce, C. (2010). Windows on information literacy worlds: Generic, situated and transformative perspectives. In A. Lloyd & S. Talja (Eds.), *Practising information literacy: Bringing theories of learning, practice and information literacy together* (pp. 3-27). Centre for Information Studies. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-1-876938-79-6.50001-7

Maid, B. M., & D'Angelo, B. J. (2016). Threshold concepts: Integrating and applying information literacy and writing instruction. In B. J. D'Angelo, S. Jamieson, B. M. Maid, & J. Walker, (Eds.), *Information literacy: Research and collaboration across disciplines*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/infolit/

Marshall, S. (2015). *Negotiating genre: Emergence and development of "the research paper" in first-year composition, 1912–1962* [Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University]. Proquest Dissertations & Theses Global (1600065).

McKinney, J. G. (2002). The American scholar writes the "new" research essay. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, *20*(1 & 2), 71-86.

Mullin, J. (2001). Response: We will find a way to work together. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, *31*, 244-250. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2001.10850119

Murray, D. (1972). Teach writing as a process not product. *The Leaflet*, *71*(3), 11-14.

Nordlof, J. (2014). Vygotsky, scaffolding, and the role of theory in writing center work. *The Writing Center Journal*, *34*(1), 45-64.

Norgaard, R. (2003). "Writing information literacy: Contributions to a concept." *Reference and User Services Quarterly, 43*, 124-130.

North, S. M. (1982). "Training tutors to talk about writing." *College Composition and Communication, 33*, 434-441. https://doi.org/10.2307/357958

Ramage, J. D., & Bean, J. C. (1997). *The Allyn and Bacon guide to writing*. Allyn and Bacon.

Ross, C. S., Radford, M. L., & Nilsen, K. (2009). *Conducting the reference interview: A how-to-do-it-manual for librarians*. Neal-Schuman.

University of Wisconsin-Madison Writing Center. (n.d.). "Writing a research paper." https://writing.wisc.edu/handbook/assignments/planresearchpaper/

Weiler, A. (2005). Information-seeking behavior in Generation Y students: Motivation, critical thinking, and learning theory. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 31*(1), 46-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2004.09.009