

Speaking the Same Language: A Phenomenological Study Investigating Librarian and Writing Instructor Shared Frameworks in First-Year Writing Courses

Amy C. Rice, Dennis D. Cartwright, Lauren Hays, and Grace Veach

First-year college writing is often a venue for librarians and writing instructors to collaborate in teaching information literacy; however, they must navigate differences in their disciplinary languages. One method to help librarians and writing instructors bridge the gap is sharing disciplinary frameworks, such as the ACRL Framework, WPA Framework, and WPA Outcomes. In this qualitative, phenomenological study, the researchers interviewed seven librarians and seven writing instructors. Some writing instructors were unfamiliar with the WPA frameworks; however, when they reviewed the frameworks side by side, they observed common themes that could help them collaborate with librarians in teaching information literacy.

Introduction

Student performance in first-year college writing has been found to be a predictor of student persistence and success throughout the student's undergraduate career (Garrett et al., 2017). Because many first-year college writing courses include information literacy components taught by librarians (Nicholes & Reimer, 2020), collaboration between librarians and writing instructors is a necessary element to promote student success. Although writing instructors and librarians have overlapping goals and strategies, they represent separate disciplines with different priorities and languages (Carter & Aldridge, 2016; Veach, 2012b).

One way to improve collaboration may be to enhance communication and understanding using complementary disciplinary frameworks: The Association of College and Research Libraries Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education (ACRL Framework), the Writing Program Administrators Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing (WPA Framework), and the Writing Program Administrators Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (WPA Outcomes). These frameworks contain overlapping values such as critical thinking, careful

* Amy C. Rice is Library Director in the John E. Riley Library, at Northwest Nazarene University, email: arice@nnu.edu; Dennis D. Cartwright is at the College of Education, Northwest Nazarene University, email: dcartwright46@gmail.com; Lauren Hays is in the Department of Educational Technology and Library Science at the University of Central Missouri, email: lauhays@ucmo.edu; Grace Veach is at Southeastern University, email: gveach@seu.edu. ©2025 Amy C. Rice, Dennis D. Cartwright, Lauren Hays, and Grace Veach, Attribution-NonCommercial (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) CC BY-NC.

reading and understanding of texts, inquiry or source research, and communication (American Library Association, 2015; Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2014; Council of Writing Program Administrators et al., 2011; Grettano & Witek, 2016; Kazan et al., 2021).

Literature Review

This study explored writing and information literacy instructor collaborations to understand how instructors in two related disciplines found better communication methods and opportunities for collaboration through shared frameworks and vocabularies. Jackson (2017) conducted a quantitative survey that explored library and writing center partnerships in which participants identified a gap in communication between the two disciplines. Jackson (2017) provided a benchmark for further studies on collaboration and communication. More prevalent types of research about collaboration were articles, presentations, and book chapters describing the results of collaborative efforts, such as lesson plans, student perceptions, or pre- and post-test results (Belzowski & Robison, 2019; D'Angelo et al., 2017; Murphy, 2019; Saunders & Corning, 2020). Studies also attempted to demonstrate how information literacy and writing connected to student success measures, retention, and persistence; few of these focused on both information literacy and writing (Croxtton & Moore, 2020; Garrett et al., 2017; O'Kelly et al., 2023; Onyango, 2023). In other book chapters, librarians and writing instructors participated in dialogue about their collaboration (Anderson et al., 2018; Gregory & McCall, 2016; Johnson & McCracken, 2018). Calls for mutual understanding of each discipline's language and frameworks have been a consistent aspect of the literature (Artman & Frisicaro-Pawlowski, 2018; Friedman & Miller, 2018; Grettano & Witek, 2016; Guth et al., 2018; Hensley, 2015; Insua et al., 2018a; Murphy, 2019; Napier et al., 2018).

A review of the literature demonstrated collaborations have been happening. Some writing instructors and librarians used one or more of their disciplinary frameworks to inform their teaching (Friedman & Miller, 2018; McClure, 2016; Veach, 2018). Few comparable qualitative studies outside the case study genre addressed writing instructors and librarians using shared frameworks (Díaz & Mandernach, 2017; Matacio & Closser, 2017; Simons, 2017). Although some authors described librarian and writing instructors' common goals in general terms such as student learning or preparation for academic and post-graduation life (Anderson et al., 2018; Baer, 2016; Refaei & Wahman, 2016), other researchers' goals fell into categories related to students finding, critically evaluating, and using information (Baer, 2016; Napier et al., 2018; Rapchak & Stinnett, 2018; Scheidt et al., 2018; Walsh et al., 2018).

A Need for Common Goals and Language

Although common goals often begin a collaborative conversation, full collaboration requires more than a common aim; at minimum, a shared document is necessary (Norgaard & Sinkinson, 2016), and shared training and understanding of each other's curriculum are useful practices (Grettano & Witek, 2016; Napier et al., 2018). However, if the goal is deep collaboration, librarians and writing instructors need to do more than share goals, documents, and training (Junisbai et al., 2016). They need a shared understanding of their disciplinary terms, particularly when the terms are so similar that students cannot distinguish their meaning (Carter & Aldridge, 2016; Refaei et al., 2017). For instance, in one study, librarians used the term *attributive tag*, and writing instructors used the term *signal phrase* to describe the way a writer introduced a source in their writing (Refaei et al., 2017). Schaub et al. (2017) found a

single information literacy concept could be described in five different ways. Other vocabulary differences involved the ways in which instructors in different disciplines describe the types of sources required for assignments, including what they consider to be a primary source (Pickard & Sterling, 2020; Refaei et al., 2017; Scheidt et al., 2018). When a course instructor uses the term academic source, librarians need to inquire about instructors' definition of academic sources. An academic source could mean anything that was published in a professional journal or by a university press; however, the course instructor may have something more specific in mind, such as a peer-reviewed article (Pickard & Sterling, 2020). A common vocabulary may help students transfer knowledge from a first-year writing course to their second-year courses and to make connections between writing and information literacy (Lancaster et al., 2016; Refaei et al., 2017). Although many researchers suggested a shared vocabulary was appropriate, others argued that a shared vocabulary was not necessary if librarians and writing instructors understood and appreciated each other's disciplinary perspectives and could help students understand the commonalities and differences between them (Carter & Aldridge, 2016; Veach, 2012a).

Complementary Frameworks

Since the ratification of the Association of College and Research Libraries Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education (ACRL Framework) (American Library Association, 2015), librarians and writing instructors have focused on shared frameworks (Artman & Friscaro-Pawłowski, 2018; Auten & Thomas, 2016), in part because the ACRL Framework shares similarities with the Writing Program Administrators Framework for Success in Post-secondary Writing (WPA Framework) (Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2014), the Writing Program Administrators Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (WPA Outcomes) (Council of Writing Program Administrators, 2014), and with *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies* (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015). These frameworks and guiding texts are not exactly the same, but they have complementary elements (Anderson et al., 2018; D'Angelo et al., 2017). The overlapping concepts in the frameworks could be especially useful for new writing instructors (Murphy, 2019; Norgaard, 2003; Norgaard et al., 2004). Two researchers observed that complementary language reduced the amount of *code switching* (i.e., navigating between librarian and writing instructor vocabularies) instructors in each discipline had to engage in, which reduced friction in the collaborative process (Anders & Hemstrom, 2016, p. 80).

Some researchers discussed the ways writing and information literacy documents complement each other (Johnson & McCracken, 2016; Refaei & Wahman, 2016). Anderson et al. (2018) suggested one way to facilitate a collaborative process was to ask what writers do and what researchers do, then find elements of the frameworks that matched those concepts.

The Research Study

Researchers found effective collaboration led to improved teaching and assignment design, which in turn promoted student success (Insua et al., 2018a, 2018b; Margolin & Hayden, 2015; Whearty et al., 2017). Therefore, the purpose of this qualitative phenomenological study was to explore the lived experiences of librarians and writing instructors using shared language or frameworks to facilitate collaboration in first-year college writing courses at four-year institutions (Creswell, 2016; Marshall & Rossman, 2016; *Size & Setting Classification*, n.d.).

Sample and Research Context

The study's sample included seven librarians and seven writing instructors from seven different four-year institutions across the United States (American Council on Education, n.d.). Eligibility criteria for these individuals included being employed as a librarian or writing instructor at four-year institutions, teaching in first-year college writing courses in some capacity, and having worked with their institutional counterpart (e.g., a librarian and writing instructor from same institution have collaborated together). Participants reported collaborations that were still beginning, collaborations in one-shot sessions, and collaborations that included two or more sessions and expanded into other content areas. Table 1 shows the participant pseudonyms, roles, and experience categories.

| TABLE 1 | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Participant Names, Roles, and Experience Length | | |
| Pseudonym | Role | Experience Length |
| Librarians | | |
| Alex | Non-faculty librarian | 1-5 years |
| Chris | Faculty librarian | 1-5 years |
| Ellis | Library administrator | 11-20 years |
| Leslie | Faculty librarian | 11-20 years |
| Quinn | Faculty librarian | 11-20 years |
| Riley | Faculty librarian | 6-10 years |
| Sam | Faculty librarian | 11-20 years |
| Writing Instructors | | |
| Blake | Writing instructor | 1-5 years |
| Brook | Writing instructor | 11-20 years |
| Gracen | Writing program administrator | 20+ years |
| Jordan | Writing instructor | 11-20 years |
| Kai | Writing instructor* | 6-10 years |
| Peyton | Writing instructor | 6-10 years |
| Taylor | Writing instructor | 20+ years |
| *Participant is a graduate student who is also the instructor of record in a first-year college writing course | | |

Recruitment

Before beginning data collection, the researcher received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The researcher used purposive criterion sampling (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019) to recruit participants for this study. The researcher posted an invitation with a screening survey to three different listservs (one for librarians, one for library directors, and one for writing studies). The screening survey asked prospective participants to identify and provide information for a collaborative partner from their institution whom the researcher could invite as a participant. To ensure variation of experiences in participants, the sample size was fourteen participants consisting of seven librarians and seven writing instructors. Eligibility criteria for participants included employment as a librarian or writing instructor at a four-year institution, teaching in some capacity in first-year college writing courses, and

working with their institutional counterpart (e.g., a librarian and writing instructor from the same institution who have collaborated).

Data Collection

The researcher conducted two sixty-minute semi-structured, video-recorded interviews with each participant (fourteen first-round interviews and fourteen second-round interviews) (see Appendix A for interview protocol). The informed consent document included permission for video recording. Participants were assured that interview transcripts would not be shared with their institutional collaborator, although the researcher cautioned that participants might be able to deduce which participant was from their institution. After the first interview, the researcher sent participants a composite list of the themes that emerged from the first round of interviews and sought member-checking feedback. The researcher also sent information literacy and writing framework documents (i.e., ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education, WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition, WPA Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing) and asked participants to review the documents as a frame of reference during the second interview. The second interview allowed participants and the researcher to build upon rapport, for participants to reflect on the first interview—including thoughts on the frameworks—and to add any clarifying thoughts based on their reflection (Josselson, 2013). Finally, the researcher sent final composite theme document to participants for member checking after all data had been collected and interpreted. Because the researcher is reporting findings from a larger study, only one theme pertains to the content of this article.

Data Interpretation

Van Manen (1990) provided a general “methodical structure” (pp. 30-31) for phenomenological investigations consisting of six principles: determining a phenomenon to study, focusing on lived experience, discovering the essential themes, *iterative writing*—“writing and rewriting”—to describe the phenomenon, and maintaining the Heideggerian practice of “balancing the research context by considering parts and whole,” often referenced as the hermeneutic circle (van Manen, 1990, p. 31). Keeping in mind the methodical structure of van Manen (1990), the researcher also used four of the five phases of analysis suggested by Ajjawi and Higgs (2007)—immersion, understanding, abstraction, and synthesis—to develop codes and themes. After the interviews had been transcribed verbatim and read several times while making general notes (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019), the researcher conducted first stage in vivo coding to capture the exact words of the participants (Saldaña, 2015). After in vivo coding, the investigator began determining “first order constructs” (Ajjawi & Higgs, 2007, p. 624). The researcher used first order constructs and initial themes to develop second order constructs and secondary themes. Keeping in mind the hermeneutic circle, the researcher switched back and forth between individual participant statements and the themes they illustrated. The researcher investigated differences in participant constructs based on their disciplines to take note of experiences that did not fit with the themes.

All phases of research required the researcher to be aware of biases and presuppositions that hindered an appropriate interpretation of the participants’ lived experiences and the essential themes. Therefore, the researcher wrote journal entries describing the ways the data connected with the researcher’s own experience of the phenomenon.

Limitations

One limitation of this study is its intentional focus on first-year research writing in four-year institutions. Although community colleges may also have first-year writing programs, community college participants were not included in the study. Additionally, participant eligibility was limited to librarians and writing instructors teaching in first-year college writing courses. Prospective participants who served dual librarian and writing instructor roles were ineligible. Other curricular models, such as second-year research writing courses, were not included in this study. When recruiting volunteers, those most likely to volunteer to participate were also likely to be supportive of the topic and may have been less candid about negative or unsuccessful aspects of the topic. Further, the recruitment process may have deterred prospective participants who were still developing their collaborations and did not yet have a formal program. The focus on a phenomenological qualitative methodology entailed both a small sample size and an intentional emphasis on lived experiences of participants. Therefore, findings were not generalizable to a population or type of institution.

Findings

The overarching theme that emerged from data interpretation was “The Potential of Shared Frameworks.” The researcher discovered that sharing of frameworks was less common than assumed or expected. Additionally, organic sharing of disciplinary frameworks often occurred in small increments and on a “need to know” basis. Participants from two institutions reported exploring each other’s frameworks as part of an application process for a grant or award. These participants demonstrated how sharing frameworks enriched their approaches to teaching students in first-year college writing courses. Regardless of their prior knowledge of either the librarian framework (ACRL Framework) or the writing frameworks (WPA Framework and WPA Outcomes), participants noticed the common elements among them when they had a chance to review the documents. Before the second interview, the researcher emailed three documents for each participant to review: The Association of College & Research Libraries Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education (ACRL Framework), the Writing Program Administrators Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing (WPA Framework) and the Writing Program Administrators Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (WPA Outcomes). Participants who reviewed the ACRL Framework and the WPA Framework and WPA Outcomes found common themes to use for discussion about information literacy and writing in the first-year college writing classroom. Table 2 shows a cross-referenced list of the concepts among the three documents that participants identified as connected or overlapping. Grettano and Witek (2016) created a similar comparison chart.

Participants from two institutions demonstrated a clear understanding of each other’s frameworks and vocabularies. In each of these cases, participants sought opportunities to share knowledge, one through an internal grant application process and the other through a professional organization.

Sam (L), in reviewing the Writing Program Administrators Framework (WPA Framework) and Writing Program Administrators Outcomes (WPA Outcomes), noted the common elements and shared goals of writing instructors and librarians, saying: “that whole middle section—the critical thinking, reading, and composing—just feel like [librarians and writing instructors are] completely on the same page there of learning objectives for students.” Sam (L) also observed that librarian knowledge of writing instructor frameworks enabled librarians to

TABLE 2
Comparison of Common Elements of Frameworks and Participant References

| ACRL Framework | WPA Framework | WPA Outcomes | Participant references/roles |
|--|--|---|--|
| Research as inquiry | Reading, Writing, Critical Analysis | Critical Thinking, Reading, Composing | Ellis (L), Jordan (WI), Quinn (L) |
| Information creation as a process | Curiosity; Openness; Creativity; Persistence; Flexibility; Developing flexible writing processes | Processes | Jordan (WI), Kai (WI), Leslie (L), Quinn (L) |
| Scholarship as conversation | Rhetorical; Critical thinking | Critical thinking, Reading, Composing (not explicit) | Alex (L), Ellis (L), Jordan (WI), Kai (WI), Leslie (L) |
| | Critical thinking; Knowledge of conventions (genre & context) | Critical thinking; Knowledge of conventions (genre & context) | Jordan (WI), Leslie (L), Peyton (WI), Sam (L) |
| Authority is constructed & contextual (rhetorical influences) | Credibility (under Critical thinking); Rhetorical | Credibility (under Critical thinking); Rhetorical | Ellis (L), Jordan (WI), Kai (WI), Leslie (L) |
| Introduction | Metacognition | Metacognition | Jordan (WI) |
| Searching as strategic exploration | | | Kai (WI), Brook (WI) |
| Note: Participant mentions and role (L for librarian, WI for Writing Instructor) | | | |

“speak their language and address them in terms that they’re already familiar with.” Similarly, Blake (WI) noticed common goals and purpose when reviewing the ACRL Framework: “At least looking at the ACRL Framework... Oh my gosh, they’re all like, this is all relevant for what we’re talking about.” Blake (WI) also commented about the content of first-year college writing classes and its relationship to librarians and information literacy:

Mostly what I do is the research and writing process...and when [the librarian] comes in [and says]... “Research is recursive, and it’s cyclical and...you start here and you go back,” I mean, it’s the exact same thing I’m telling them about the writing process.

Kai (WI) noted improved student work as a benefit of framing writing and research as a recursive approach, saying, “[students] are automatically doing both processes [writing and finding sources] better, more nuanced, when they’re more integrated.”

Working on a grant-funded information literacy project also helped Kai fully understand the overlapping goals of librarians and writing instructors: “When we were doing this info literacy project, we found that many of the sort of goals that the libraries had around information literacy were also really good articulations of... what we’re trying to teach in our classes.” Kai further described those overlapping goals:

I think the whole idea of ... writing as a conversation ... comes up all the time [as a] metaphor in comp as a field. But it's also one that I think is really compatible with information literacy in terms of, you know, thinking about who gets a seat at the table or ... who we want to have in a conversation. Lately, I've been thinking a little bit more about ... asking my students to ... curate the conversation or think about what voices they want to privilege, things like that as we're trying to think about ... what types of knowledge we value, what things we might overlook, whether there are certain perspectives that we might actually actively make a choice to exclude from the conversation for different reasons.

More important than merely recognizing the connections between what librarians do and what writing instructors do, Kai (WI) discussed how this might help improve teaching:

And when I first saw this, I was like, "Wow, these—especially the big questions and frames—were really valuable and that they helped give me as a teacher language for some things that I'd been ... working on in my classes with my students around information literacy. But because ... I don't read as much scholarship about information literacy, I don't think I had [a] link for it because more of the scholarship that I read is around writing pedagogy. But this was like, really intuitive feeling language that it could adopt, which was really cool.

Kai (WI) went on to describe how understanding of ACRL Framework changed the way Kai (WI) thought about developing assignments:

[The ACRL frames are] really useful to me in thinking about ... how to craft an assignment or ... even what to do in an individual ... class period. So, if my goal is for my students to exhibit curiosity, then that says some things about how I'm gonna lay out their research project, right? Or if my goal is for them to view research as a process, then I'd better not just have one research day and expect all their research to be done after that, right? ... There needs to be multiple stages, just like I would for writing.

In a similar theme, Brook (WI) reflected on the value of a librarian demonstrating a database search strategy that was complicated, noting that if students only saw the librarian conducting a carefully constructed search, they became frustrated when their own searches were more complicated. Though Brook (WI) did not explicitly reference the ACRL Frame of Searching as Strategic Exploration, the anecdote was a good example of the iterative nature of searching for information. A librarian conducting a database search in which there is some degree of trial and error could connect this concept to the ACRL frame as well as the concepts of process in the WPA documents. The researcher talked about the ways she used unsuccessful searches to help illustrate the ways similar search terms can produce different results, along with tips on how to find better sources.

Kai (WI) also discussed the work the writing instructors and librarians did together during the grant-funded project:

We clustered around ... outcomes which were hybrids of the [ACRL and WPA] frameworks. One was the idea of like, authority being constructed and contextual [from the ACRL Framework] and I think we tied that a little bit into ideas of like social justice and whose voices are heard things like that in different communities or ... who might have the right to speak on certain issues [ACRL Framework, WPA Framework, WPA Outcomes]. And then the other one, we looked at was the citing as communication [ACRL Framework] and ... citation as a conversation too [ACRL Framework].

Leslie (L) listed the goals librarians and writing instructors have in common: developing critical/savvy information users and citizens [ACRL Framework, WPA Framework, WPA Outcomes], developing curiosity [WPA Framework], and scholarship as conversation [ACRL Framework, WPA Framework, WPA Outcomes]. Despite these common goals, the language of writing and the language of librarians is still different. Leslie (L) described a scenario in which a writing instructor helped Leslie (L) relate better to students through language:

[I] had the language of ... Authority is Constructed and Contextual [from the ACRL Framework] in my mind, I think, so I kept referring in class, as I was talking with students ... to authority, authority, authority ... and the writing instructor was like, "I think, you know, try credibility," like she was sensing that ... [the concept of authority] was just not resonating with students and so I was like, "Okay, that's interesting." ... So yeah trying to ... pay attention ... and to learn from [writing instructors] on the language that they're using ... with their students that they think resonates the most ... is something that I think about, too.

At two institutions, knowledge of a framework was mostly one-sided. Brook (WI) and Alex (L) both referenced the BEAM method (Background, Evidence, Argument, Method) (Bizup, 2008) of teaching research writing. Alex (L) noted a common element in writing instruction and information literacy instruction, which BEAM helps illustrate: "different types of sources can accomplish different things," and added that "the skills [librarians] were trying to pass on to students are in line with ... [writing instructors'] priorities." Brook (WI) said, "BEAM works nicely, particularly in terms of ... situating yourself in the conversation and then with the application of the disciplinary lens" to help students understand that sources may be used for different purposes, and sources vary from discipline to discipline. The researcher and Brook (WI) talked about the benefit of BEAM as a bridge between writing and information literacy. The researcher has also been part of conversations between a writing instructor and her librarian colleagues to consider using BEAM as part of an assignment in the first-year college writing course to help students better understand and evaluate sources. Riley (L) focused primarily on the ACRL Framework and on making the ACRL frames more understandable and memorable for both students and course instructors:

Basically what I did was I just rewrote the [ACRL Framework] in the sense of ... I just gave each one of the frames and a new title and it's a custom word ... All that was based on the fact that if I really want to make sure that this is ... what I

base everything on and this is what I'm telling other teaching faculty, that this is what we're doing, I need them to be able to have it stuck in their head.

Librarian participants were more likely than their writing instructor counterparts to be familiar with their disciplinary framework (the ACRL Framework) prior to the second interview, and in many cases they incorporated elements of the ACRL Framework into their documents and practice. Riley (L) and Ellis (L) noted that the ACRL Framework is the “national standard” for information literacy. Ellis (L) said the ACRL Framework concepts were written into the institution’s internal guiding documents for the first-year writing program, and Ellis (L) “[brought] portions of the [ACRL Framework] to some of [the first-year writing program meetings] to just talk to the faculty about [the ACRL Frameworks]” and their meaning. Ellis (L) believed talking about the ACRL Framework was important “just to be sure that people know something about where things are going in this field, and where some of the suggestions that we in the library are making, are coming from.” Ellis (L) also advocated for continued conversation between librarians and writing instructors: “I mean, not just informal conversation and collaboration, which is always wonderful, but conversation about actual national standards and documents and outcomes and sharing those across the fields, just that it’s reinforced that it’s important and valuable, right?” Although the guiding documents are influenced by the ACRL Framework and available for anyone to read, Quinn (L) viewed the documents as “more for [librarians] on our end.” Similarly, Chris (L) used concepts from the ACRL Framework, such as Scholarship as Conversation and Research as Inquiry, but reworded them because the ACRL Framework was “very narrow disciplinary verbiage” that could impede both student understanding and collaboration with course instructors. Jordan (WI) said, “I was introduced to [the ACRL Framework] before by our librarians. So just an understanding of [the ACRL Framework] was really interesting because there’s a definite overlap between the disciplines.”

Writing instructors also referenced information literacy concepts without necessarily identifying them as information literacy, and Chris (L), Ellis (L), and Riley (L) talked about the varied definitions and interpretations of information literacy. The researcher has encountered various course instructors who said they did not really understand the concept, even as they may have been teaching the basic principles in their courses. Riley (L) said of a writing instructor: “the [writing instructor] might not have used [information literacy], but that was certainly evident in how [the writing instructor] spoke to our students and what she wanted to see from them.” Jordan (WI) described information literacy as “critical thinking ... in action.” The varying perspectives and comfort regarding the term information literacy has been discussed in the literature (Baird & Soares, 2020; Becker et al., 2022; Whearty et al., 2017).

Writing instructors were likely to relate to the general concepts of the Writing Program Administrators Framework and Outcomes (WPA Framework and WPA Outcomes), even if they had not used the WPA Framework or WPA Outcomes before. Taylor (WI) and Gracen (WI) discussed using the latest scholarship and learning writing concepts at conferences, though neither referenced any sort of framework or standard. Two participants named specific textbooks they use in writing courses. Gracen (WI) said, “We mainly have used the *St. Martin’s Handbook*.” Kai (WI) said, “We were teaching off of *They Say / I Say* ... a pretty common comp textbook.” Although neither mentioning a standard nor a textbook, Taylor (WI) summarized the goals of a first-year writing class in this way: “[students] argue their own

thesis and engage with the scholars, be able to represent them fairly and be able to put them in conversation with one another," concepts that are used in both ACRL and WPA Frameworks. Other writing instructors who have 11-20 or 20+ years of experience in the field started their careers as writing instructors before the WPA Framework and Outcomes were released, so they were less likely to be aware of them. However, the principles in the WPA Framework and Outcomes are not unique; similar principles may be found in other writing instruction texts. Therefore, writing instructors with 11-20 and 20+ years of experience recognized and often used the same principles as the WPA documents in their teaching.

Librarians noted the ways the disciplinary language must be translated for others outside the discipline to understand and embrace it. Ellis (L) suggested that, instead of starting by talking about the ACRL Framework, librarians should start by referring to the WPA Framework and WPA Outcomes, saying, "[The ACRL Framework is] another slightly different way of framing ... [information literacy and writing] concept[s]. So maybe borrowing some of that language from the composition documents to help talk to [writing instructors], to give some context" would help bridge that disciplinary gap. Quinn (L) said the librarians developed a guiding document with the ACRL Framework in mind, "But at the same time, we wanted things that were kind of more tangibly taught than some of the [ACRL] Framework, how they're written." Alex (L) said, "I was just talking to somebody and they were like, basically [librarians] need the actual [ACRL] Framework," whereas faculty needed a translated version of the ACRL Framework, adding:

[an ACRL frame] I feel that people can grab onto really quickly is the Scholarship as Conversation ... So I use that one more than anything just because ... it's a quick grab and you can make that connection and they'll be like, "Oh yeah, we do the same thing."

Alex (L) also expressed frustration that the ACRL Framework must be translated: "I think that's what's frustrating for me is like any time I feel like I have to translate something for someone else, I wish it had been that way in the first place."

Jordan (WI) noted the connections between skills librarians teach and the habits of mind that the WPA Framework lists:

reading the [WPA Framework] habits of mind and I really liked it. ... I put down the topic selection and creativity with keywords, persistence with researching ... [for example] go past the first page of Google results. But when you're researching, [you have] got to be a bit more patient.

Jordan (WI) further explained how the librarians and writing instructors made these connections:

So, the Research as Inquiry framework, you know, Scholarship as Conversation, those couple, I think, were referenced in the session that the librarians put, and that was part of our professional development series that I ... facilitate ... it's interesting to see if that sort of overlap, I mean, the dispositions in the framework

for post-secondary writing especially. I was kind of curious to see because I hadn't seen those before. But there are a lot of those habits of mind dispositions that really align with what I was just saying ... curiosity, openness ... metacognition.

Jordan (WI) connected the concept of critical thinking present in both the WPA Framework and Outcomes, to the ACRL Framework. Although the ACRL Framework does not specifically mention critical thinking in its primary frames, there is a footnote that links critical thinking to metaliteracy. Jordan (WI) noted that 'a big part of that critical thinking involves searching, searching for things ... to develop your own ideas and then to be able to evaluate those kinds of things.' Jordan (WI) continued, "I see those parts [information literacy and critical thinking] very much overlapping because I know that our instructional librarians are interested in those things, too."

Jordan (WI) went on to say:

I was introduced to [the ACRL Framework] because ... one of the key information literacy objectives for the first course in our first-year writing class is about ... [students] using sources not to confirm what [they] already have concluded, but to try to come to a new understanding and to gain some sort of new alternative ways of thinking about [a topic].

Jordan (WI) also made the connection between the ACRL Framework and the rhetorical language in both WPA documents: "I think the rhetorical emphasis in the writing side is really reflected in the ... Authority is Constructed and Contextual framework."

As they reviewed and compared the ACRL Framework, the WPA Framework, and the WPA Outcomes, participants demonstrated the potential of understanding each other's disciplinary motivations, negotiating vocabulary differences, and asking for clarification when something in one of the documents was confusing. The researcher was familiar with the ACRL Framework but learned about the WPA Framework and Outcomes from a writing instructor colleague. The researcher's librarian colleague and the writing instructor learned from each other when they reviewed the frameworks. Each party better understood the other's perspective after reviewing their disciplinary documents. Because of this experience, the researcher was surprised that fewer writing instructors were familiar with the WPA Framework and WPA Outcomes. However, disciplinary differences and the varied paths that lead to writing instruction, may help provide some context. The researcher chose the WPA Framework and Outcomes because writing and information literacy articles and books have referenced them and demonstrated their compatibility with the ACRL Frameworks. However, based on participant responses and the researcher's experience, sharing these frameworks would entail conversation between instructors in the two disciplines to negotiate and contextualize the nuances of vocabulary in the ACRL Framework, the WPA Framework, and the WPA Outcomes.

Discussion

One surprising result emerging from participant responses was the wide variety in how much or how little they shared disciplinary frameworks. Although librarians were familiar enough with the ACRL Framework, writing instructors did not have the same universal familiarity with either the WPA Framework or the WPA Outcomes. Factors in this disparity between the two

disciplines' familiarity with frameworks may have to do with the varied pathways one might take to become a writing instructor and the number of professional associations writing instructors can join. There is no single accrediting body that governs writing instructor education. Writing instructors can go several different directions in their careers, including earning a doctorate in literature, although it may not include writing instruction training. Some participants noted their degree in literature necessitated teaching writing. Another direction is earning a degree that is more focused on writing centers or writing tutoring. Each of these sub-specialties have their own professional organizations, which may issue their own guidance on best practices, standards, frameworks, or positions. Therefore, there is no single framework that writing instructors share. In contrast, Dodson (2020) found there were only 62 library science programs accredited by the American Library Association, and an ALA-accredited degree (or equivalent) is the minimum requirement for academic librarians. The ACRL Framework was developed by the higher education arm of the ALA. There are very few other competing frameworks for librarians.

Although writing instructors had less familiarity with the WPA Framework and Outcomes, participants at two institutions reported learning about the common elements of the ACRL and WPA documents because doing so was a required element of an application process (i.e., a grant and an award). Sharing at these institutions was intentional and participants described the benefits of shared frameworks in their teaching and collaboration.

Recommendations for practice

Literature, researcher experience, and participant responses suggest that writing instructors and librarians might benefit from expanding their reading and learning base to include their collaborative partner's disciplinary conversations. The researcher has benefited from a practice of sharing relevant information with a writing instructor, and the writing instructor has done the same. However, the researcher could also look for disciplinary journals that each partner could read to foster understanding and conversation. Librarians could ask about or look for other frameworks that writing instructors are using to guide their teaching and look for connections between them and the ACRL Framework. When an opportunity arises, librarians will be able to use the writing documents to find common ground with the writing instructor. When deciding where to present and publish, librarians and writing instructors should attempt to disseminate their scholarship in the other discipline's venues (e.g., a librarian and writing instructor publish in a writing journal, or vice versa).

Recommendations for further research

An expanded qualitative study involving more investigators and participants may enable researchers to draw more conclusions. Another direction to take the research could be focusing on a specific type of institution characteristic, such as size or location. One of the limitations of the researcher's choice of methodology is its small sample size, not uncommon in the area of qualitative phenomenological research involving in-depth interviews. The small size allowed for rich descriptions and rich data about participants' lived experiences in specific settings. Findings suggest general characteristics that could apply to collaborations in a variety of different settings. However, the data limits how extensively the researcher can generalize across all collaborations and institutions.

The researcher suggests that further research could be done in the following areas. Some of the participants did not have experience with the WPA documents before the interview,

limiting their ability to talk about complementary frameworks. Because the researcher found the WPA documents had not been universally adopted by writing instructors, another study could explore writing instructors' use of other types of documents, either specific to writing instruction or documents addressing general education as a whole, to guide their philosophy and pedagogy.

Some participants mentioned internal documents of various types; discourse analysis may be an appropriate method to investigate the documents as artifacts. Researchers could also request documents and interview participants about their documents.

References

- Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. A. (Eds.). (2015). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies*. Utah State University Press.
- Ajjawi, R., & Higgs, J. (2007). Using hermeneutic phenomenology to investigate how experienced practitioners learn to communicate clinical reasoning. *The Qualitative Report*, 12(4), 612–638. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2007.1616>
- American Council on Education. (n.d.). *Size and setting classification*. The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education. Retrieved March 26, 2023, from <https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/carnegie-classification/classification-methodology/size-setting-classification/>
- American Library Association. (2015, February 9). *Framework for information literacy for higher education*. Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL). <https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>
- Anders, K. C., & Hemstrom, C. (2016). In a research-writing frame of mind. In R. McClure (Ed.), *Rewired: Research-writing partnerships within the frameworks* (pp. 65–82). American Library Association.
- Anderson, J., Blalock, G., Louis, L., & Murphy, S. W. (2018). Collaborations as conversations: When writing studies and the library use the same conceptual lenses. In G. Veach (Ed.), *Teaching information literacy and writing studies: Volume 1, first-year composition courses* (pp. 3–18). Purdue University Press.
- Artman, M., & Frisicaro-Pawlowski, E. (2018). Knowledge processes and program practices: Using the WPA Outcomes Statement and the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for curricular renewal. In G. Veach (Ed.), *Teaching information literacy and writing studies: Volume 1, first-year composition courses* (pp. 19–29). Purdue University Press.
- Auten, J. G., & Thomas, A. B. (2016). Impacting information literacy through alignment, resources, and assessment. In R. McClure & J. P. Purdy (Eds.), *The future scholar: Researching and teaching the frameworks for writing and information literacy* (pp. 131–153). Information Today.
- Baer, A. (2016). *Information literacy and writing studies in conversation: Reenvisioning library-writing program connections*. Library Juice Press.
- Baird, C., & Soares, T. (2020). Faculty perceptions of students' IL learning in first-year writing. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 20(3), 509–532. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2020.0028>
- Becker, J., Simmons, S. B., Fox, N., Back, A., & Reyes, B. (2022). Incentivizing information literacy integration: A case study on faculty–librarian collaboration. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 16(2), 167–181. <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2022.16.2.5>
- Belzowski, N., & Robison, M. (2019). Kill the one-shot: Using a collaborative rubric to liberate the librarian–instructor partnership. *Journal of Library Administration*, 59(3), 282–297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2019.1583018>
- Bizup, J. (2008). BEAM: A rhetorical vocabulary for teaching research-based writing. *Rhetoric Review*, 27(1), 72–86.
- Carter, T., & Aldridge, T. (2016). The collision of two lexicons: Librarians, composition instructors and the vocabulary of source evaluation. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 11(1), 23–39. <https://doi.org/10.18438/B89K8F>
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2014, July 17). *WPA outcomes statement for first-year composition*. https://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/243055/ PARENT/layout_details/false
- Council of Writing Program Administrators, National Council of Teachers of English, & National Writing Project. (2011, January). *Framework for success in postsecondary writing*. https://www.wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/242845/ PARENT/layout_details/false
- Creswell, J. W. (2016). *30 essential skills for the qualitative researcher*. SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Croxton, R. A., & Moore, A. C. (2020). Quantifying library engagement: Aligning library, institutional, and stu-

- dent success data. *College & Research Libraries*, 81(3), 399–434. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.81.3.399>
- D'Angelo, B., Grettano, T., Albert, M., & Sinkinson, C. (2017, March 16). *Cultivating collaboration between information literacy & writing instruction*. Conference on College Composition & Communication Convention, Portland, OR. <https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1Ce8gkdrzWqGg1lf2ixUr0ONwPy4o9AqJuoDF4hY63Jw>
- Díaz, J. O., & Mandernach, M. A. (2017). Relationship building one step at a time: Case studies of successful faculty-librarian partnerships. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 17(2), 273–282. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2017.0016>
- Dodson, M. (2020). On target or missing the mark? Instruction courses in LIS graduate programs. *Public Services Quarterly*, 16(2), 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228959.2020.1745131>
- Friedman, S., & Miller, R. (2018). “Give all thoughts a chance”: Writing about writing and the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy. *WPA: Writing Program Administration—Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators*, 42(1), 72–88.
- Garrett, N., Bridgewater, M., & Feinstein, B. (2017). How student performance in first-year composition predicts retention and overall student success. In T. Ruecker, D. Shepherd, H. Estrem, & B. Brunk-Chavez (Eds.), *Retention, Persistence, and Writing Programs* (1st ed., pp. 93–113). Utah State University Press.
- Gregory, A. S., & McCall, B. L. (2016). Building critical researchers and writers incrementally: Vital partnerships between faculty and librarians. In B. J. D'Angelo, S. Jamieson, B. Maid, & J. R. Walker (Eds.), *Information literacy: Research and collaboration across disciplines* (pp. 371–386). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2016.0834.2.18>
- Grettano, T., & Witek, D. (2016). The frameworks, comparative analyses, and sharing responsibility for learning and assessment. In R. McClure (Ed.), *Rewired: Research-writing partnerships within the frameworks* (pp. 188–219). American Library Association.
- Guth, L. F., Arnold, J. M., Bielat, V. E., Perez-Stable, M. A., & Meer, P. F. V. (2018). Faculty voices on the Framework: Implications for instruction and dialogue. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 18(4), 693–718. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2018.0041>
- Hensley, M. K. (2015). Improving LIS education in teaching librarians to teach. In *Creating sustainable communities: ACRL 2015 conference proceedings* (pp. 315–322). Association of College and Research Libraries. <https://alair.ala.org/handle/11213/17864>
- Inua, G. M., Lantz, C., & Armstrong, A. (2018a). In their own words: Using first-year student research journals to guide information literacy instruction. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 18(1), 141–161. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2018.0007>
- Inua, G. M., Lantz, C., & Armstrong, A. (2018b). Navigating roadblocks: First-year writing challenges through the lens of the ACRL Framework. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 12(2), 86–106. <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2018.12.2.3>
- Jackson, H. A. (2017). Collaborating for student success: An e-mail survey of U.S. libraries and writing centers. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 43(4), 281–296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2017.04.005>
- Johnson, B., & McCracken, I. M. (2018). Writing with the library: Using threshold concepts to collaboratively teach multisession information literacy experiences in first-year writing. In G. Veach (Ed.), *Teaching information literacy and writing studies: Volume 1, first-year composition courses* (pp. 31–46). Purdue University Press.
- Josselson, R. (2013). *Interviewing for qualitative inquiry: A relational approach* (1st edition). The Guilford Press.
- Junisbai, B., Lowe, M., & Tagge, N. (2016). A pragmatic and flexible approach to information literacy: Findings from a three-year study of faculty-librarian collaboration. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 42(5), 604–611. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2016.07.001>
- Kazan, T. S., Behm, N. N., & Cook, P. (2021). Writing faculty and librarians collaborate: Mapping successful writing, reading, and information literacy practices for students in a post-truth era. *Pedagogy*, 21(2), 311–328. <https://doi.org/10.1215/15314200-8811500>
- Lancaster, A., Callender, D., & Heinz, L. (2016). Bridging the gap: New thresholds and opportunities for collaboration. In R. McClure (Ed.), *Rewired: Research-writing partnerships within the frameworks* (pp. 85–101). American Library Association.
- Margolin, S., & Hayden, W. (2015). Beyond mechanics: Reframing the pedagogy and development of information literacy teaching tools. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41(5), 602–612. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.07.001>
- Marshall, A., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.). SAGE.
- Matacio, L., & Closser, B. (2017). Transforming information literacy through librarian/course instructor collaboration: A case study. *Journal of Adventist Libraries and Archives*, 2(1). <https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/jala/vol2/iss1/1>
- McClure, R. (Ed.). (2016). *Rewired: Research-writing partnerships within the frameworks*. American Library Association.
- Murphy, M. (2019). On the same page: Collaborative research assignment design with graduate teaching assistants. *Reference Services Review*, 47(3), 343–358. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-04-2019-0027>

- Napier, T., Parrott, J., Presley, E., & Valley, L. (2018). A collaborative, trilateral approach to bridging the information literacy gap in student writing. *College & Research Libraries*, 79(1), 120–145. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.79.1.120>
- Nicholes, J., & Reimer, C. (2020). Evaluating the impact of first-year writing course grades on college-student persistence. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 64, 100841. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100841>
- Norgaard, R. (2003). Writing information literacy: Contributions to a concept. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 43(2), 124–130.
- Norgaard, R., Arp, L., & Woodard, B. S. (2004). Writing information literacy in the classroom. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 43(3), 220–226.
- Norgaard, R., & Sinkinson, C. (2016). Writing information literacy: A retrospective and a look ahead. In B. J. D'Angelo, S. Jamieson, B. Maid, & J. R. Walker (Eds.), *Information literacy: Research and collaboration across disciplines* (pp. 15–36). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2016.0834.2.01>
- O'Kelly, M. K., Jeffryes, J., Hobscheid, M., & Passarelli, R. (2023). Correlation between library instruction and student retention: Methods and implications. *College & Research Libraries*, 84(1), 85–99. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.84.1.85>
- Onyango, P. A. (2023). Enabler factors for the successful adjustment of first-year students. In P. J. Aloka & K. R. Mukuna (Eds.), *Handbook of research on coping mechanisms for first-year students transitioning to higher education*. IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-6961-3.ch007>
- Pickard, E., & Sterling, S. (2020). What we talk about when we talk about quality: A librarian and instructor compare how they assess students' sources. *Collaborative Librarianship*, 12(1), 80–101.
- Rapchak, M., & Stinnett, J. (2018). Teaching for transfer? Nonexperts teaching linked information literacy and writing classes. In G. Veach (Ed.), *Teaching information literacy and writing studies: Volume 1, first-year composition courses* (pp. 281–291). Purdue University Press.
- Refaei, B., Kumar, R., Wahman, M. L., & Peplow, A. B. (2017). Supporting source integration in student writing. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*, 29(3), 534–544.
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd edition). SAGE.
- Saunders, L., & Corning, S. (2020). From cooperation to collaboration: Toward a framework for deepening library partnerships. *Journal of Library Administration*, 60(5), 453–469. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2020.1729623>
- Schaub, G., Cadena, C., Bravender, P., & Kierkus, C. (2017). The language of information literacy: Do students understand? *College & Research Libraries*, 78(3), 283–296. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.78.3.283>
- Scheidt, D., Carpenter, W., Middleton, H., & Shields, K. (2018). Addressing the symptoms: Deep collaboration for interrogating differences in professional assumptions. In G. Veach (Ed.), *Teaching information literacy and writing studies: Volume 1, first-year composition courses* (pp. 293–302). Purdue University Press.
- Simons, A. C. (2017). Librarians, faculty, and the writing center partnering to build an interdisciplinary course: A case study at the University of Houston, USA. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 23(1), 28–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2016.1185020>
- van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. State University of New York Press.
- Veach, G. (2012a). At the intersection: Librarianship, writing studies, and sources as topoi. *Journal of Literacy and Technology*, 13(1), 102–129.
- Veach, G. (2012b). *Tracing boundaries, effacing boundaries: Information literacy as an academic discipline* [Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida]. <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/4413>
- Veach, G. (Ed.). (2018). *Teaching information literacy and writing studies: Volume 1, first-year composition courses*. Purdue University Press.
- Walsh, L., Zytkoskee, A. M., Ragains, P., Slater, H., & Rachal, M. (2018). The Burkean Parlor as boundary object: A collaboration between first-year writing and the library. *Composition Studies*, 46(1), 102–123, 193–194.
- Whearty, B., Brunner, M., Johnston, C., & Turnator, E. (2017). Creating contact zones in a “post-truth” era: Perspectives on librarian–faculty collaboration in information literacy instruction. *A Splendid Torch: Learning and Teaching in Today's Academic Libraries*. <https://www.clir.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2017/10/pub174.pdf>

Appendix A. Interview Protocol

Introduction

To facilitate note-taking and accurate representation of what you discuss today, I am going to record our interview. For your information, only I and my dissertation chair will be privy to the recordings. In compliance with the Federalwide Assurance Code, the recordings will be destroyed after three years. In addition, you signed a form devised to meet our human subject requirements. Permission to be videorecorded was a separate signed line in the Informed Consent that you signed. The informed consent also highlighted the following: (1) all information will be confidential. The dissertation will use a pseudonym in place of your name and a number in place of the name of your institution, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study.

The interview is scheduled for a duration of 60 minutes. During this time, I have several questions I would like to cover. If we run out of time, we may resume any unfinished questions during the second 60-minute interview.

You have been selected as participants in this study because you meet the criteria of the study: you are a librarian or writing instructor involved in first-year college research writing and you have experience collaborating with your librarian/writing instructor partner. This research project focuses on the ways librarians and writing instructors collaborate in the first-year college research writing context. I am particularly interested in the use of librarian and writing frameworks that include but are not limited to, the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education and the WPA Frameworks/Outcomes for writing.

A. Interviewee Background

1. What is your name? (This is for the researcher's records only; you will be assigned a pseudonym)
2. Where do you work?
3. What is your current job title?
4. How long have you been at this institution?
5. How long have you been in your discipline?
6. Tell me about how you came to choose your career path

B. Main Interview Questions

7. Think back to your first experience as an academic librarian/writing instructor. What shaped your experiences with instruction/teaching?
 - Follow-up: please describe a moment in which you began to feel comfortable in your instruction/teaching.
8. **For librarians:** please describe your approach to collaborating with writing instructors in a teaching setting
For writing instructors: please describe your approach to collaborating with librarians in a teaching setting
9. Possible follow-up: how did this collaboration [from previous question] originally develop? (e.g., organically? Strategically/structurally?)
 - Follow-up: thinking about where your discipline is situated within your institution,

- what are the boundaries? Can you describe a situation in which the boundaries helped or hindered collaboration?
10. Please describe how your collaborations changed over time
 11. Thinking back to the first time you had an interaction with another instructor (librarian or writing instructor) in the context of first-year research writing, what do you recall about that experience?
 12. Tell me about an experience of collaboration [with your interview counterpart] in the first-year college research writing context that was particularly successful.
 13. How long did it take to get to the level of “successful”?
 14. Tell me about an experience of collaboration in the first-year college research writing context that seemed less successful or didn’t go as planned.
 - Follow-up: what actions did you or your collaboration partner take to salvage the unsuccessful collaboration?
 15. In what ways has your education or professional development contributed to or improved collaboration with your partner?
 16. In what ways have your education/professional development hindered your understanding of how to/ways of collaborating with other disciplines?
 17. Please describe an experience in which you learned from a colleague about improving teaching in the first-year research writing context
 18. Please describe a situation in which you have shared your disciplinary knowledge with your collaboration partner. And vice versa?
 19. Describe a situation in which you and your collaborative partner (in first-year college research writing) dialogued about disciplinary frameworks (e.g. ACRL Framework, WPA Framework/Outcomes) to foster mutual understanding about each other’s discipline.
 20. What are some common elements of your discipline’s framework and your partner’s discipline’s framework?
 21. What elements [of the frameworks?] make collaboration more difficult?
 22. How have you tried to overcome that barrier?
 23. Any additional comments/things we missed?