



EMORY
LIBRARIES &
INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY

OpenEmory

A “Rhetorized” IL and an “Informed” Rhetoric: Mapping the Conversation Between Rhet/Comp and Information Literacy at CCCC 2014

[Gwendolynne Reid](#), *Emory University*

Proceedings Title: Pearson Emerging Pedagogies Project, CCCC 2014

Conference Name: Conference on English Leadership 2014

Publisher: Gwendolyn Reid

Conference Place: North Carolina State University

Publication Date: 2014-05-31

Type of Work: Conference | Final Publisher PDF

Permanent URL: <https://pid.emory.edu/ark:/25593/vgwc1>

Final published version: <http://144.202.19.197/gcr/projects/pearson/>

Copyright information:

Reid 2014

Accessed April 22, 2025 4:20 PM EDT

**A “Rhetoricized” IL and an “Informed” Rhetoric: Mapping the Conversation
Between Rhet/Comp and Information Literacy at CCCC 2014**

Pearson Emerging Pedagogies Project, CCCC 2014

**Gwendolynne Reid
N.C. State University**

May 30, 2014

The Project

A recurring theme in both the composition and information literacy literature is that writing faculty and librarians need to collaborate more frequently and deeply. Our work is relevant to and should inform each other's. We need to engage with each other's theories, findings, and values. And we need to work with each other as institutional and pedagogical partners.

As the recipient of a Pearson Emerging Pedagogies Research and Travel Grant, I used the 2014 CCCC, the major conference for compositionists, as an artifact for exploring and documenting the state of the conversation between composition and information literacy. While doing the same with a conference for academic and instructional librarians would also be useful for this type of inquiry, first-year composition tends to be the curricular location for teaching research and information literacy in addition to writing, and is therefore a productive site of inquiry. To explore this relationship, then, I identified the sessions most explicitly connected to information literacy and partnership with academic librarians, arriving at a total of eight to attend and summarize here (disclaimer: I presented at one of these eight).

What I discovered from this focused view of CCCC is that student research and source use is a significant concern for composition faculty. Many of the sessions I attended were full or close to it. I also started recognizing several faces, who were clearly attuned to the same keywords and themes. Striking up a conversation with one of these attendees, I discovered that she was an instructional librarian visiting CCCC for the first time, an encouraging sign of exchange. Some of the main themes that recurred during the sessions I attended included the notion of research as a process, the importance of engaging students in authentic inquiry, and the question of how certain information technologies may actually shortchange critical thinking. Explore my session summaries to find out more about information literacy at CCCC 2014.

The Broader Conversation

In a recent *Writing Program Administration* article, Doug Brent makes a strong case for source-based writing assignments, pointing out that, “[a]n important, and frequently overlooked, source of information on writing from sources can be found in the literature of our colleagues, the academic librarians who often must help our students navigate the tasks which we have assigned them” (42). This reminder of the importance of exchange and collaboration between librarians and compositionists is not a solitary call, and, in fact, is one that has recurred periodically for many decades.

Currently, several ongoing projects in composition engage with the field of information literacy in significant ways, most notably, *The Citation Project* and the more recent *LILAC Project* (Learning Information Literacy Across the Curriculum). While *The Citation Project* has focused on how students use sources in their writing, the *LILAC Project* aims to understand how they find those sources, using what they're calling Research-Aloud-Protocols (like Think-Aloud-Protocols) to gain some insight into

how students are making research decisions. Both of these projects engage with library science, often citing *Project Information Literacy*, an ongoing, large-scale study in the field of library science, in their own presentations and publications.

Another area where compositionists and information literacy frequently engage and collaborate is in working out the logistical aspects of cooperating locally on instruction. A recent article by Artman, Frisicaro-Pawlowski, and Monge, for example, critiques what librarians call the “one shot” library session, describing a number of other options for collaboration between libraries and first-year composition programs that are more likely to lead to more complex understandings of the relationship between research and writing for students.

A number of articles have also made calls for the fields to engage at the level of theory and values. For example, *Reference & User Services Quarterly* has featured a multi-article dialogue between compositionists and librarians that both exemplifies this type of exchange, and calls for more. In his 2004 article, Rolf Norgaard (a compositionist) called that, rather than “just writ[ing] to and about the other,” the fields should “write” or “inscribe” one another in what he calls “writing information literacy” (225). Continuing this conversation in 2010, Melissa Bowles-Terry, Erin Davis, and Wendy Holliday (librarians) explored how the fields’ “shared intellectual history can enliven the practice of both disciplines, creating a ‘rhetorized’ IL and an ‘informed’ rhetoric” (225), a concept informing this project (and its title).

Reading this ongoing conversation, which Artman, Frisicaro-Pawlowski, and Monge point out has often occurred outside composition journals (95), underscores what a number of scholars from both library science and composition have recently pointed out: the artificiality of separating research and writing into separate processes and institutional units. In an article on the relationship between writing centers and libraries, for example, librarian James Elmborg argues that, “by recognizing that writing and research are one single activity, we might reinvigorate the discussion about writing process and how the search for information is shaped by that process” (“Locating,” 7). In addition, several scholars in composition have concluded that many of the issues we identify and try to improve in students’ writing can be traced back to earlier stages in their process, such as research or reading. In their preliminary report on *The Citation Project*, for example, Howard, Serviss, and Rodrigue examine students’ source use in their writing, arriving at the disturbing conclusion that all the student essays included in the study misused sources in some way (182). While they point out that this may be due to a number of possible factors, one they explore is students’ reading practices.

Clearly, all these processes are interrelated in important ways. They might even be best conceived of as a single process. Since, however, it seems unlikely that the institutional and disciplinary separations that have grown up over so many years will disappear any time soon, perhaps the best we can do is to deliberately and consistently seek out opportunities for meaningful exchange, something this project has sought to do.

The Sessions

C.19: Reframing Open Access as a Ground for Embedded Information Literacy Instruction

Co-Chair: Nancy DeJoy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Dept. of Writing, Rhetoric, and American Cultures

Co-Chair: Joyce Meier, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Dept. of Writing, Rhetoric, and American Cultures

Speaker: Brian Holcomb, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Dept. of Writing, Rhetoric, and American Cultures

Speaker: Sara Miller, Michigan State University, Libraries
Speaker: Rachel Minkin, Michigan State University, Libraries
Speaker: Jill Morningstar, Michigan State University, Libraries
Speaker: Benjamin Oberdick, Michigan State University, Libraries

Unfortunately tucked away in the Downtown Marriott (rather than the main JW Marriott), this session had a lot to offer those interested in how writing programs and libraries might work together, though attendance was slim. The panel consisted of three members of Michigan State University's Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and American Cultures and four members of its Libraries, together sharing their experiences collaborating to develop and implement inquiry-based library sessions in context of a common assignment on disciplinary writing: "Analysis of an Academic Discipline as a Culture." While the instruction consisted of a "one shot" session, which many librarians find insufficient for providing meaningful information literacy instruction, the session used an inquiry-based approach and the collaboration between writing faculty and librarians was fairly extensive.

In her opening to the session, Nancy DeJoy explained that their approach was inspired by Bruce Ballenger's work on encouraging curiosity and inquiry in students. After implementing this philosophy in their approach to library instruction, the panelists were interested in how an inquiry approach affected students' research practices and thinking. To study this, they collected web history data on students' searches, as well as data from a questionnaire administered before and after the library session in question. Additionally, they had access to final drafts of students' research projects and to reflections on their process.

Sharing some context on MSU's curriculum and assignment sequence, Brian Holcomb described the "Analysis of an Academic Discipline as a Culture," emphasizing that it is not only a valuable assignment for learning about disciplinary writing, but also a valuable assignment for developing information literacy. In particular, by looking at disciplines as cultures and conversations, the assignment helps students move beyond the "research retrieval missions" that often encourage them to ignore information on their topics that doesn't fit their position toward an understanding of knowledge-making as (messy) conversations with opportunities for new contributions.

Benjamin Oberdick next provided context on the library sessions themselves, describing how they began with student inquiry on a librarian-provided source—particularly, forming questions about both its topic and the article as a source—and then moved to developing keywords from that activity. The emphasis during the following discussion was on having a conversation about how the information presented in the sources was generated, with the goal of helping students move from "consumers" to potential participants in generating knowledge. Finally, students were split into groups, each with a separate mission for finding a certain type of source. After asking questions about those sources, the class then starting developing evaluative criteria they could use for selecting sources for their writing projects.

Among their results, one that the panel highlighted was that students focused a great deal on the textual qualities of sources in choosing sources (e.g. language, appearance, format, publication), as well as relevancy to their topics. While they seemed to find their approach successful for moving students toward critical thinking about where information comes from and how (and by whom) it is created, they particularly emphasized how productive their collaboration was, with librarians and writing faculty both learning from each other. Although at times they found they were speaking slightly different languages, ultimately their conclusion was that library science and composition are moving toward each other, with both emphasizing knowledge creation in similar ways. The new framework for information literacy that the ACRL is in process of developing (with vote on the draft in summer 2014) provides good evidence of this newly shifted emphasis, with language and values quite congenial to composition.

D.01: The LILAC Project: Opening and Furthering Faculty and Student Dialogues About Information Literacy

Speaker: Janice Walker, Georgia Southern University - Opening Findings: Updated LILAC Findings and Open Access Resources

Speaker: Leigh Ann Williams, Georgia Southern University - Opening Classroom Dialogues: LILAC Videos and the Teaching of Research

Speaker: Katt Blackwell-Starnes, Georgia Southern University - Opening Research Dialogues: LILAC and the Multi-Institutional Study

The description of this session explains that the *LILAC Project* (Learning Information Literacy Across the Curriculum), begun in 2011, is partially funded by a CCCC Research Initiative Grant and “seeks to provide further insight into the difference between what students think they know and what they actually do when conducting research.” In her introduction to the session, Janice Walker put their work in contrast with that of *The Citation Project*, explaining that it examines what students do with the sources they find, but not how they find those sources. Some of *The Citation Project’s* findings, including that many students are “quote mining” point to a need to better understand students’ research processes. The *LILAC Project* seeks to understand what students are doing and thinking as they research, using what the panelists called a Research-Aloud-Protocol (RAP).

So far, Phase I of the project has included videoed RAP sessions with 20 students, which have revealed that many students both begin and end with Google and either avoid or use *Wikipedia* in fairly extreme, lockstep ways. Students’ verbalizations of their processes suggest that, in Walker’s words, “Students are hearing what we’re telling them, but perhaps we’re not telling them the whole story.” Part of the exigence for this presentation was to foster collaboration with scholars at other institutions to begin Phase II of the project, which will compare information literacy instruction at different institutions and compare findings about students across these contexts.

Partially to share and garner interest in their findings, the *LILAC Project* has made some of their RAP videos available online (with IRB approval). Leigh Ann Williams, however, shared an interesting use of those videos in class, using them to start conversations with students about their own research practices. While students are sometimes critical of the students in the videos—one student stated that, “This student needs to learn basic research skills!”—Williams has found the videos provoke useful classroom conversations on research. She also pointed out that their research shows there is often a discrepancy between what students say they do and what they actually do. While many students may have experience with various technologies, this does not necessarily translate to information literacy.

In response to an audience member’s question about whether we should eliminate “the research paper,” Walker ended the session with the provocative proposal that we “get rid of first-year composition, instead teaching IL 1 and IL 2 and treating finding, using, and producing “information” as a single process. As their project name implies, she also emphasized that, as compositionists have long explained in regard to writing, we cannot “inoculate” students against “bad research,” but instead need information-literacy-across-the-curriculum.

Resource

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

E.21 Opening Textbooks, Opening Possibilities: A Writing Program-Academic Library Collaboration, University of Utah

Chair: Casey Boyle, University of Utah

Speaker: Darby Fanning, University of Utah - Supporting Research in First-Year Writing: Library Coordination and Student Access

Speaker: Fiona Harris-Ramsby, University of Utah - Beyond the Textbook: Writing Program-Library Connections and Possibilities (absent)

Speaker: Jay Jordan, University of Utah - Administration to Authorship: Leveraging Local Program Resources for an In-House Textbook

This session described the panelists' work on Open2010, a Creative Commons-licensed writing textbook, in a process that included extensive collaboration between their writing program and their library. Opening the session, Jay Jordan outlined a number of reasons for this choice, including the rising cost of textbooks and the vulnerability of depending on a single publisher to supply a common textbook for new teaching assistants. In addition, Jordan felt the project gave them an exigence for working with their librarians, since the textbook emphasized research and ultimately integrated library resources in the text. Recognizing the growing number of alternatives available, including WikiBooks, Writing Spaces, and Writing Commons, Jordan emphasized their preference for a textbook specific to their local context.

In her portion of the presentation, Darby Fanning, a librarian, described how the project gave their Libraries a more consistent presence in classrooms, eliminating their "soul crushing" one-shot library sessions. Because the textbook integrates their online instructional resources, Fanning feels they are now offering a more "embedded" type of information literacy instruction and that writing instructors tend to be more receptive to and eager for collaboration. Interestingly, Fanning also explained that the Libraries ended up developing online modules to "teach the teachers," because many of them were new graduate students who didn't know how to research, much less teach it. This approach may also potentially explain the closer relationship between the two units in instructing undergraduates.

Unfortunately, the final speaker, Fiona Harris-Ramsby, could not attend, and so her paper was read. A doctoral student at the University of Utah, Harris-Ramsby was given a role as liaison with the library and tasked especially with examining the role of the library in supporting visual literacies. Her work in that role yielded support materials for writing instructors, as well as a chapter in their textbook. Ultimately, her experience reinforced the idea, in Jordan's words, of the textbook as an effort at "friend-raising," rather than "fund-raising." While the textbook may have potential as an alternative textbook for other programs (Jordan offered to email the files to those who requested it), the take-away in terms of information literacy seems to be that working on a collaborative project between writing programs and libraries may enhance instruction in this area.

F.31 Breaking the Cycle of Ineffective Research Instruction

Chair: Cruz Medina, Santa Clara University, CA

Speaker: Beth Daniell, Kennesaw State University (absent)

Speaker: Sandra Jamieson, Drew University

Speaker: Tricia Serviss, Auburn University

This session presented some of the latest findings from the ongoing *Citation Project*, which has now expanded to also consider the role of teacher preparation in information literacy instruction. Sandra Jamieson started off the session describing some of her previous beliefs and approaches to teaching research, sharing that she thought participation in the *Citation Project* would confirm that her approach worked. What she found, however, was that her approach, which I suspect resembles many composition

instructors' approaches, did not yield the sort of deep engagement with ideas and sources she thought it would yield. Instead, her method—which moved students through topic selection, reflecting on previous knowledge, question generation, drafting a proposal, visiting the library, exploring relevant resources, creating a bibliography, and meeting with a librarian—yielded the same type of information “dumping” and superficial engagement with sources that other approaches to the research paper seemed to yield.

Jamieson went on to describe the *Citation Project*'s data set: 12,000 pages of source-based writing from 174 students at 16 institutions, with 50 pages coded per institution. In total, the project has 800 pages coded. While this initial analysis reveals that students are using “pretty good” sources, Jamieson explained that they found students are doing a lot of “hyper-citation” and “quote bombing.” In fact, very little of the coded writing was from the students themselves, and most sources (56% of the 930 sources cited) were only cited once. In sum, Jamieson argued, “Our research pedagogy fails to produce papers in which students work with sources beyond the sentence-level or in which the sources are placed in dialogue with each other.” Aligning these findings with those from *Project Information Literacy*, Jamieson reflected that, a) students seem to be managing potential overload by focusing on meeting basic requirements (like the number and type of sources required), b) instructors may be encouraging this with assignments also focused on logistical details (like page length and citation style), and c) we may be representing information literacy as “a set of discrete skills” by rewarding students for correctness. Instead, Jamieson encouraged instructors to treat information literacy as a process, just like writing, and to help students develop the right “habits of mind” to engage deeply with sources by sharing our own (and librarians’) enthusiasm for writing and research. Stressing the importance of involving librarians in instruction, she advised that they abandon the “here’s how to” model as well, instead also sharing their passion for research to inspire students to connect more deeply with the process.

In the second half of the session, Tricia Serviss reported on a new *Citation Project* study following 20 graduate teaching assistant instructors through their practicum and into the classroom. The goal of the study is to shed light on how we might better prepare new teachers to think about citation practices and information literacy. In particular, Serviss stressed that we have difficulty moving beyond the discourse on plagiarism to more productive ways to think about research and citation. Citing work by Diane Pecorari (2003), Serviss shared that many graduate students’ citations are “opaque” rather than “transparent,” meriting greater examination of their citation practices and beliefs. In the practicum course in question, Serviss had the students self-code their own writing using codes similar to those used in the larger *Citation Project* (exact copying, paraphrase, summary, and patchwriting). Two peers then coded each student’s writing, with everyone then comparing how they coded and why. Serviss also incorporated several reflections. These sorts of activities, she argued, are conducive to greater self-awareness and may be what she called, “consequential transfer activities.” Ultimately, she urged that we incorporate these sorts of analyses of graduate students’ own citation practices as part of their teaching preparation, speculating that this approach, enacted on a large scale, could change how writing instructors teach researched writing more broadly.

Resource

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

H.16 Places of Arrival: Literacy Acquisition In and Out of School

Speaker: Laura Rutland, Gannon University - Collaboration and the Shaping of Information Literacy in the Composition Classroom

This session included four individual papers about a variety of literacies, with only one of these directly related to information literacy. Quoting Artman, Friscaro-Pawlowski, and Monge on how writing

courses tend to “farm out” research instruction through one-shot library sessions, Laura Rutland shared her experience working with a librarian at Gannon University to flip their information literacy instruction. In Rutland’s estimation, the digital resources they developed in this way made better, more consistent use of their librarians’ expertise than the one-shot model typically does. Rutland also stressed, however, that part of what made the collaboration work so well was the good relationship between her program and the librarian in question, who had an M.A. in English and had taught in their writing program. This existing history lent itself particularly well to this project and potentially contributed to how deeply this librarian involved himself in the life of the program, coming to their teaching assistant preparation course, for example, to develop a relationship with new instructors. Ultimately, Rutland reported a positive experience with this approach to information literacy instruction, especially in comparison with more cursory approaches like one-shot sessions.

J.24 Researching to Write, Writing to Research: Teaching Information Literacy to First-Year Writing Students

Speaker: Anne Burke, North Carolina State University, Libraries - Early & Often: Teaching Source Evaluation to Undergraduates

Speaker: Laura Giovanelli, North Carolina State University, First-Year Writing Program - “You kind of wonder how credible it might be”: Using Rhetorical Analysis to Teach Source Assessment in the First-Year Writing Classroom

Speaker: Gwendolynne Reid, North Carolina State University, First-Year Writing Program - Welcoming *Wikipedia* into the Classroom: Using *Wikipedia* to Teach Critical Information Literacy in the First-Year Writing Classroom

My own panel came out of an ongoing relationship between our undergraduate instruction librarian, Anne Burke, and Laura Giovanelli and myself, both composition instructors. Having known and worked with each other for several years, we knew some of our mutual concerns about teaching students research and writing, and decided developing a presentation would create the perfect exigence for engaging more deeply with each other’s work. We were also aware of the ongoing calls for deepening the relationship between composition and information literacy, and saw CCCC as an opportunity to enact that sort of deeper collaboration between our fields. Laura and I were quite excited about bringing a librarian to CCCC, and Anne was equally excited about venturing into “writing teacher” territory to see if we really spoke the same language. Ultimately, our presentation ended up centering on strategies for deepening students’ critical thinking about research and sources, and about becoming sources themselves.

Anne Burke’s talk emphasized research as a process, much like the writing process, and questioned how some of the tools we use in information literacy instruction might actually be shortchanging critical thinking. For example, as handy as the “peer review” button in databases might be, it also has the potential to stop students’ deeper thinking about specific sources’ rhetorical situations and the sort of research needs they are likely to be able to meet. Likewise, instructors’ logistical stipulations for required numbers and types of sources often mean students stop when they find those, without thinking more critically about whether they really have what they need, and without engaging in a deeper, more recursive and reflective research process.

Laura Giovanelli asked whether rhetorical analysis assignments might, beyond fostering rhetorical thinking, also be a way to promote critical thinking about sources. Her talk reported on her small-scale study of how students evaluated sources after a unit on rhetorical analysis of popular and scholarly scientific writing. Using videoed think-aloud-protocols, she found that students in her study rarely moved beyond the text of the immediate researcher-provided source when evaluating it for potential use. She also

found that they thought most about citations, design features, digital features, publication, and use value when evaluating a source. Students who had earned an A-level grade on their rhetorical analyses considered a much wider range of factors than did students who had earned a C-level grade. One major implication for first-year writing was that we ought to pay attention to digital features (e.g. Facebook “like” buttons) when discussing sources with students, since students mistakenly assumed that only popular sources would have some of these. We need to do a better job of discussing scholarly research ecosystems and how scholars share and talk about research with each other.

My talk explored how *Wikipedia* might be used to foster critical information literacy, which emphasizes moving beyond developing the skills associated with finding and using information to developing more critical awareness of the processes and contexts of knowledge construction. Toward this goal, *Wikipedia* offers potential in the first-year classroom both because its taboo nature engages students, and because its interface affords a more visible view of the process of knowledge construction and of connections between sources of information. To test this potential, I assigned 37 students in two FYW classrooms a formal writing assignment asking them to analyze and evaluate a *Wikipedia* entry. I then coded students’ work from the beginning and end of the unit for the criteria they used to evaluate *Wikipedia* as a potential source. My results suggested that critical analysis of *Wikipedia* encourages students to consider a wider range of evaluation criteria, and to pay closer attention to both the process behind the source’s writing and research, and the students’ own context for writing. Students also reduced the importance they placed on convenience in their evaluations. Interestingly, in contrast with Laura Giovannelli’s findings, my students paid less attention to design features by the end of our unit on *Wikipedia*, potentially because of the site’s standardized format. Some of the implications for first-year writing include a) that rather than forbidding *Wikipedia* outright, instructors and librarians might consider it an opportunity to help students develop greater critical thinking and meta-awareness about potential sources, and b) that we need to engage with a variety of digital sources and assignments to deepen students’ critical information literacy—no one site or approach is sufficient on its own for this sort of important development.

Resource

N.C. State Libraries Tutorial Videos: <http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/tutorials/>

K10: Technological Interventions, Pedagogical Reinterpretation: Teaching Peer Review, Genre-based Writing, and Critical Information Literacy in Online/Hybrid Education

Speaker: Charlyne Sarmiento, University of California, Santa Barbara - Critical Literacy in our Information Age: Remediating Plagiarism

This session included several papers examining technology use in writing courses and how this use intersects with our understanding of writing as socially situated. Charlyne Sarmiento presented specifically on the subject of online plagiarism modules and critical information literacy. Invoking what we have come to understand about plagiarism as a field—primarily that much of what we consider plagiarism is developmental and what Rebecca Moore Howard calls patchwriting—Sarmiento examined plagiarism modules from a number of North American universities to shed light on how they conceptualize student plagiarism and what they teach the students who use them. Her analysis found that most of these tools reflected a reductive understanding of literacy, not acknowledging how source use is cultural and social, and likewise oversimplified students’ development as writers. The view of plagiarism inscribed in these tools tended to be moralistic and punitive. One of Sarmiento’s most interesting arguments was that many of the interactive features and game elements in the tools implied that students’ answers “don’t really matter,” potentially undermining students’ sense of agency. She posited that these tools do not teach students to understand themselves as producers as well as consumers and do not help students understand the social dimension of academic writing (and the conventions that support this). As her session description put it, these tools “risk perpetuating the notion that knowledge production is

reserved for experts, which leaves students as passive consumers of information.” Ultimately, the take-away seemed to be that we ought to pay close attention to the lessons inscribed in the tools we use to teach information literacy, and that we ought to have conversations about this with institutional partners like librarians.

M.35 This Ain't Your Father's Formalism: The "Neo-Formalist" Approach to Reading and Research Assignments

Speaker: Edward Comstock, American University - Foucault's Kairos and the Rhetorical Subject

Speaker: Alison Thomas, American University - The "Taking an Approach" Approach: Assignments that Rethink Reading and Research

Speaker: Alex Hodges, American University - The Practice of Information Literacy Instruction: Connecting Pedagogy to the Lenses

The panelists in this session invoked what they see as a “neo-formalist” turn in composition, evidenced by an increasing attention to form in popular texts like *They Say/I Say*, arguing that the new formalism’s decentering of the student-as-subject is actually consonant with postmodern understandings of texts and subjects, as well as classical approaches to learning through imitation. As their title puts it, “This ain’t your father’s formalism.” Beginning the session with the panel’s theoretical grounding, Edward Comstock drew on Michel Foucault’s work to put the concept of research assignments and essays in context of Western culture’s epistemological history, tracing historical relations of the self, knowledge, and discourse. Alison Thomas then described a specific assignment they have used in their writing program to encourage critical thinking, reading, and writing: the “Taking an Approach” assignment, which asks students to explicitly “take an approach” to or choose a “lens” for a subject as an inventional tool for developing something original to say. Part of what the panel seemed to be arguing here, is that not only do academic writers have discursive “moves,” but they also have “moves” when they read and research. A goal of the assignment, then, is to make one of these moves—how we often make our “original” contributions by applying new lenses to old problems and topics—more visible. Another method Thomas recommended for encouraging students to grow as researchers is to encourage students to consciously take a “searching attitude” when doing research, and to keep a research log both listing and reflecting on their research choices, as a means to developing metacognitive awareness of their own research “moves” and attitudes.

This suggestion meshed quite well with what Alex Hodges, a librarian at American University, had to say about the direction information literacy as a field is moving in. According to Hodges, the ACRL (the Association of College & Research Libraries) is voting on a new definition of and approach to information literacy at their summer 2014 convention. The new *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* integrates network concepts into our understanding of information literacy, as well as emphasizing literacy as a range of attitudes and strategies rather than a set of discrete skills. For example, the *Framework* includes “dispositions” as an important part of information literacy, a concept that fits well with the “searching attitude” Thomas described. Hodges went on to outline multiple concepts from the *Framework* that fit particularly well with composition’s values, but that he also sees as expanding the “terrain of inquiry and responsibility” for writing faculty and librarians. For example, the new *Framework* emphasizes “metaliteracies” and Meyer and Land’s (2003) notion of “threshold concepts,” as well as concepts like “Scholarship is a conversation” that are familiar to compositionists. Ultimately, Hodges painted this development as a particularly exciting time for both librarians and compositionists. He, and the panel as a whole, reinforced the richness of the theoretical and pedagogical exchange that can come out of collaboration between these two fields.

References

Works Cited

- Artman, Margaret, Erica Frisicaro-Pawlowski, and Robert Monge. "Not Just One Shot: Extending the Dialogues about Information Literacy in Composition Classes." *Composition Studies* 38.2 (2010): 93–110. Print.
- Bowles-Terry, Melissa, Erin Davis, and Wendy Holliday. "'Writing Information Literacy' Revisited: Application of Theory to Practice in the Classroom." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 49.3 (2010): 225–230. Print.
- Brent, Doug. "The Research Paper and Why We Should Still Care." *Writing Program Administration* 37.1 (2013): 33–53. Print.
- Elmborg, James K. "Locating the Center: Libraries, Writing Centers and Information Literacy." *Writing Lab Newsletter* 30.6 (2006): 7–11. Print.
- Howard, Rebecca Moore, Tricia Serviss, and Tanya K. Rodrigue. "Writing from Sources, Writing from Sentences." *Writing & Pedagogy* 2.2 (2010): 177–192. Print.
- Norgaard, Rolf. "Writing Information Literacy." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 43.2 (2003): 124–130. Print.
- . "Writing Information Literacy in the Classroom." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 43.3 (2004): 220–226. Print.

Resources:

- ACRL and ALA: *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* (2000), <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>
- ACRL and ALA: *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* (Draft, 2014), <http://acrl.ala.org/ilstandards/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Framework-for-IL-for-HE-Draft-1-Part-1.pdf>
- Project Information Literacy*, <http://projectinfolit.org/>
- The Citation Project*, <http://site.citationproject.net/>
- The LILAC Project*, <http://lilac-group.blogspot.com/>

Credits

Design and coding assistance: JL Reid at Bent Pin.