



Education Quarterly Reviews

Pun, Raymond. (2020), Aligning ACRL's Framework for Information Literacy with Communication Studies' Learning Outcomes for Library Instruction: An Exploratory Study. In: Education Quarterly Reviews, Vol.3, No.3, 386-397.

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.03.03.147

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Education Quarterly Reviews* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research, and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide



Aligning ACRL's Framework for Information Literacy with Communication Studies' Learning Outcomes for Library Instruction: An Exploratory Study

Raymond Pun¹

¹ Alder Graduate School of Education, USA

Abstract

Integrating the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy in a library instruction class can be challenging. In addition, some disciplines such as communication studies have their own learning outcomes with similar connections to the framework to consider. This study explored how the framework can be positioned with learning outcomes from the National Communication Association (NCA). This study was guided by two research questions: 1. what are the intersections and shared values between ACRL's Framework for Information Literacy and NCA's Learning Outcomes, and how can these outcomes and frames be integrated into a library instruction workshop for undergraduate students in communication studies? To address these questions, the study identified, synthesized, and presented learning outcomes from two disciplines to communication studies faculty and academic instruction librarians in focus groups and interviews. Based on the interviews and focus groups, two themes emerged in this study: concept to practice and communicating information in society. These themes illuminate the connections between the two disciplines in the context of library instruction. By gathering their perceptions, the study explored a synthesized guideline to support future library instruction for communication studies courses at the undergraduate level.

Keywords: Information Literacy, Communication Studies, Faculty Collaboration, Library Instruction and Research Skills

Introduction

In higher education, students may often take a first-year communication studies course as part of their general education requirements (National Communication Association, 2019a). In such courses, students develop basic communication skills and an understanding of communication theories. What role does information literacy play in this discipline? This study explores the perceptions of faculty and academic librarians on students' information literacy needs in communication studies by drawing on the shared values, goals and visions from the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Framework on Information Literacy for Higher Education and the National Communication Association's (NCA) Learning Outcomes. The purpose of this paper is to identify and

synthesize key frames and outcomes, and to present a new guideline to potentially support students' information literacy skill in the field of communication studies.

Launched in 2016, the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education “[grew] out of a belief that information literacy as an educational reform movement will realize its potential only through a richer, more complex set of core ideas” (ACRL, 2015, para 1). The six frames were developed as “interconnected core concepts with flexible options for implementation, rather than on a set of standards or learning outcomes, or any prescriptive enumeration of skills” (ACRL, 2015, para. 2). These frames focus on core values and ideas about information literacy that can be adapted into a library instruction session (see Table 1). Kuglitsch (2015) wrote, “like the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education (the Standards), the Framework is intended as a broad, generalizable statement on information literacy” (p. 458). The framework emphasizes the research processes, and skills to critically evaluate information and how information is accessed, presented, preserved, processed, and created while adapting to disciplinary approaches and needs.

Table 1: ACRL Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education: Frames

-
1. Authority is constructed and contextual
 2. Information creation as a process
 3. Information has value
 4. Research as inquiry
 5. Scholarship as conversation
 6. Searching as strategic exploration
-

The National Communication Association (NCA), a nonprofit membership based scholarly society, created the Learning Outcomes in the field of communication studies to focus on what students should know, what should they understand and what should they be able to do with a communication degree (NCA, 2019c). By developing the outcomes through a collaborative tuning process with faculty leaders in communication studies, the field aims to create a better understanding of the “discipline’s core, career pathways for students and feedback from stakeholders” (Marshall, 2017; NCA, 2019c). Table 2 lists the nine outcomes that came out from such discussions.

Table 2: NCA’s Learning Outcomes

-
1. Describe the communication discipline and its central questions
 2. Employ communication theories, perspectives, principles, and concepts
 3. Engage in communication inquiry
 4. Create messages appropriate to the audience, purpose, and context
 5. Critically analyze messages
 6. Demonstrate the ability to accomplish communicative goals (self-efficacy)
 7. Apply ethical communication principles and practices
 8. Utilize communication to embrace difference
 9. Influence public discourse
-

These learning outcomes and their goals resonate with the ACRL’s frames but there is a lack of research in the intersections or integrations of these two areas from the perspectives of teaching faculty and librarians. This study addresses the shared learning outcomes and designs a synthesized guideline from the two disciplines. Gathering and utilizing the perceptions and feedback from faculty and librarians, the study tested the feasibility and acceptability of the synthesized guideline through interviews and focus groups. Feasibility testing is defined as how operational this synthesized guideline is: do faculty and librarians feel that these outcomes can be useful and possible to incorporate in a library instruction workshop? The study also evaluated the acceptability of this guideline: are these key components of the guideline representing both disciplines and/or are they limiting other objectives from either discipline. Can communication studies faculty apply this new document in their teaching approach to information literacy as well? To assess the potential effectiveness, feasibility and accessibility of this

synthesized guideline, focus groups and in-depth interviews with instruction librarians and communication studies faculty were conducted.

This case study contributes to the current literature on mapping appropriate frames to learning outcomes of a specific discipline. The research questions for this study are 1. What are the intersections and shared values between ACRL's Framework for Information Literacy and the NCA's Learning Outcomes? 2. How can these outcomes and frames be integrated into a library instruction workshop for undergraduate students in communication studies?

By understanding the intersections in both disciplines, faculty and librarians can create appropriate and meaningful assignments, lesson plans and activities to enrich communication students' learning experiences. By exemplifying how to adapt the framework into communication studies and its own standards coming from NCA, universities and colleges that require students to take a communication class may utilize this study as a potential guide to integrate information literacy into their program and expand conversations about the framework in other disciplines as well. Assessing how faculty and academic instruction librarians perceive the synthesized guideline from both areas can provide useful feedback to demonstrate the key frames and learning outcomes that can be effectively applied. Interviews and focus groups were conducted to gather qualitative feedback from teaching faculty and librarians in developing useful approaches to measure students' information literacy needs in communication studies at the undergraduate level.

Literature review

There is a growing number of studies concerning the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy, and there are several articles that cover disciplinary standards particularly for writing, business, agricultural sciences, nursing and journalism (Albert & Sinkinson, 2015; Boss, De Voe, Gilbert, Hernandez, Heuer, Hines, Knapp, Tokarz, Tucker, & Williams, 2019; Gilman, Sagàs, Camper, & Norton, 2017; Jefferson, 2017; Willson & Angell, 2017). One gap in the literature is the research concerning the NCA's Learning Outcomes in relations to the framework and information literacy (IL). To understand the role of the framework in disciplinary studies, it is helpful to explore articles that examine the framework conceptually.

Kuglitsch (2015) described the challenge that exists between IL as a skill to be generalized and IL as discipline-specific by emphasizing "teaching for transfer," which helps students apply knowledge and skills learned in one setting to other situations, which "offers a way to resolve the tension" (p. 458). Threshold concepts are "core ideas and processes that define the ways of thinking and practicing for a discipline" (Townsend, Brunetti, & Hofer, 2011). Kuglitsch (2015) argued that threshold concepts in the "teaching for transfer" idea can support librarians to draw on connections and develop transferable skills for their students (p. 467). Jacobson and Gibson (2015) introduced the conceptualization of the framework, threshold concepts and how they are part of the framework. Jacobson and Gibson (2015) asked "how can students themselves contribute most effectively to research projects based on the framework?" The authors highlighted the values of the framework in IL. Albert and Sinkinson (2015) acknowledged IL and rhetoric as "complex information landscape" and addressed the value of each framework that can be applied to composition in a presentation. This study exemplified the integration of both learning outcomes from two disciplines by applying selected frames into research assignments. However, the study does not elaborate on assessment and outcomes, which would be helpful to develop assignments that could be evaluated for learning purposes.

Lindstrom and Shonrock (2006) emphasized faculty-librarian collaboration in designing learning outcomes and shared goals through several case studies. Other areas included first year learning communities and interest groups in implementing collaborative programs involving librarians. Lindstrom and Shonrock (2016) explored how to apply information literacy in different contexts and discuss assessments from such partnerships. A faculty-librarian partnership is key in developing IL assignments and assessments as described in a research paper by Junisbai, Lowe and Tagge (2016). Their paper demonstrated the value of collaboration: "when faculty collaborate with librarians to foster IL competencies, the result is a statistically significant improvement in students' demonstrated research skills" (p. 604). Furthermore, to understand faculty perception in IL, Guth, Arnold, Bielat, Perez-Stable

and Vander Meer (2018) conducted a study and found that “faculty’s ranking of the importance of information literacy for students’ academic success was high across disciplines” (p. 707). The authors launched an online survey in the Spring 2016 semester to gather input from 237 faculty regarding their thoughts on information literacy and the framework. Based on such responses, the authors studied the faculty perception on IL and created ten themes that were coded from such faculty responses. The findings from communication studies faculty from this study found that there is an interest in visual and digital literacy, and on the “authority of the author/speaker (types of authority) as well as the research versus research/evidence theme” (p. 707). The study by Guth et al., served as a helpful example of understanding faculty perception of IL.

Studies that focus on communication studies assignments that utilized information literacy skills include Mottet (2004) and Koltay (2011). Mottet (2004) presented an assessment overview for communication studies by exploring the values and competencies in the field. Mottet (2004) recommended various assignments that can be applied to a first-year communication class. Some of these assignments may utilize information research skills and the article explains how to assess communication assignments through selected learning objectives. Koltay (2011) addressed the similarities and differences between media and information literacies by presenting the developments, discussions, and discourse for each literacy. Koltay’s (2011) research is useful in identifying different kinds of literacies in the research contexts. The paper examined the interdisciplinary nature of information literacy in the field of communication studies. References to the framework were limited in such studies but they highlighted the importance of assessing research assignments that utilize information literacy skills and the collaboration between faculty and instruction librarians.

Method

By reviewing literature in these two fields and identifying the shared learning goals from both disciplines, the paper explored the perceptions of communication studies faculty and librarians on this synthesized guideline and evaluated its feasibility and acceptability. In the first phase of the study, an analysis of the ACRL framework and NCA documents was conducted to draw on the similarities of languages and outcomes. The researcher identified three learning outcomes from NCA and four frames from ACRL by mapping the common languages used by both documents. The researcher examined the documents and proposed a new guideline that integrated components from these two areas. These were the suggested outcomes:

1. Formulate research questions and find debates in the communication discipline (from 1. engage in communication inquiry and 4. research as inquiry, 5. scholarship as conversation and 6. searching as a strategic exploration).
2. Searching for and creating messages for specific audiences, purposes, and contexts (from 4. create messages appropriate to the audience, purpose, and context and 6. searching as strategic exploration).
3. Understand how information and communication are created and utilized in diverse contexts (from 8. utilize communication to embrace difference and 2. information creation as a process).

In the second part of this research study, in depth interviews and focus groups with academic instruction librarians and communication studies faculty in the United States were conducted to explore and gather perceptions, feedback and ideas on such documents and outcomes. The focus groups and interviews took place before and after the U.S. Presidential Election on November 8, 2016. The researcher found that some responses after the election focused on the fake news phenomenon. For the sampling of these two groups, the researcher recruited communication studies faculty from California State University, Fresno and academic librarians who teach information literacy workshops from various universities in the United States.

The rationale of this sampling approach was to gather participants to identify potential gaps and alignments between the two documents presented in communication studies and the framework. The responses from both groups generated codes that were grouped into themes. The responses provided qualitative data in reaction to the synthesized guideline from both disciplines. The limitation of this approach was that it is unbalanced with the lack of communication studies faculty. However, responses from both groups provided helpful responses on how the synthesized guideline from both documents are perceived.

Table 3: List of participants

Participant/Group	Number of Participants	Status
A	1	Communication studies faculty
B	1	Communication studies faculty
C	1	Communication studies faculty
D	2	Academic librarians
E	4	Academic librarians
F	5	Academic librarians

Each participant was given documents from both disciplines in advance prior to the interview. They received documents on the ACRL Framework and NCA's Learning Outcomes. Seven questions were asked during the semi-structured interview and focus group sessions (see Appendix A). The questions were seeking descriptive responses from participants. These responses provided feedback on the synthesized guideline. How do teaching faculty and instruction librarians react to new outcomes? There were three communication studies faculty members and 11 academic instruction librarians who participated in the interview study. Each interview and focus group was held between 45 minutes to 1 hour. All the meetings were audio recorded and transcribed. All the communication studies faculty participants were interviewed while librarian participants were part of a focus groups (see Table 3). All participants signed a consent form which indicated that their names would be anonymized in the study. This form also showed that the research received approval from the institutional review board (IRB) at California State University, Fresno.

Findings and Analyses

Based on the findings from the interviews and focus groups, the following two themes emerged:

1. Concept to practice: NCA's Learning Outcomes are practical and reflects on the ACRL Framework's conceptual features. This theme focuses on the application of concepts in real world examples.
2. Communicating information in society: the frames focus on information process, the creation, and development whereas the NCA's Learning Outcomes address the importance of communication in information. This theme highlights the inquiries on how information is disseminated, communicated, and presented.

Drawing on theme one, the responses from questions 1-3 highlighted the need to apply concept to practice (see Appendix A for questions). When asked what participants thought of when they first look at the ACRL information literacy framework, participants felt and agreed that the frames were "very conceptual," "theoretical" or "nebulous." There were mixed responses for the framework's audience. All the communication studies faculty participants A, B and C felt that the framework was written for librarians who taught information literacy. Based on the jargons presented in the document, they viewed this document as an important source for librarians. They understood the concepts of "authority" and "information" in the context of research.

For librarian participants, the responses to this question included faculty, administrators, students, and other educators. One librarian in group D thought the framework would be helpful for administrators who lead assessment or curriculum development work to see the value of IL in higher education. The participant shared that it would be more like "looking at larger curricular issues in a cross-disciplinary way." Another librarian participant from group E mentioned how the framework might be written for "library directors" because of the language in the document and the emphasis on assessment. In addition, librarian participant from group E mentioned it could broad for all educators, to "customize is for themselves in whichever way they want to make it for their environment." These responses revealed how both groups perceive the framework and its audience.

For question two, the researcher asked, "when you look at the communication's learning outcomes, what are your general impressions and who is the audience?" The responses also varied for general impressions and audience

members. A librarian from group E described the learning outcomes as a “check box strategy to explain the origins of the communication discipline and the students’ career of communication.” This librarian saw how this document can be used by degree planners, faculty, and advisors. Both librarians from group D found the learning outcomes to be for practitioners, and that “it was a lot easier and straight forward” to understand compared to the framework. One librarian felt that the learning outcomes did not give the impression as “corporate” or “out of touch” since the one outcome focused on the “public discourse” and the need to explain real world application as described in learning outcomes number 9: create messages appropriate to the audience, purpose, and context (NCA, 2019b). Communication studies faculty participants’ responses were consistent on this question: the NCA’s Learning Outcomes were designed for faculty and students in communication studies. However, faculty participants shared different responses on the learning outcomes. Faculty participant B described the outcomes as being “narrow” while faculty participant C described them as “good learning outcomes for anybody who’s wanting to know about communication in general.” These responses illustrate how communication studies faculty interpreted their disciplines’ outcomes differently, yet librarians found them to be consistently simple to follow.

For the third question, the researcher asked, “based on these learning objectives, do you see any correlation between the two?” All participants agreed that there is correlation between the two documents. Librarians from group F felt that they were overlapping between the two, and that “one can fit within one of the frames for the most part.” The librarians emphasized the “scholarly conversation,” “purpose of inquiry” and “critical reflection” as key features from the framework and the learning outcomes. Faculty participant B’s response was also consistent that there were overlaps involving “research and inquiry.” This participant mentioned the “broadness of the framework” and that the learning outcomes could also fit into the framework. These initial perceptions from faculty and librarians can potentially support how educators can adapt a new guideline or outcomes from different disciplinary standpoints. Certainly, there are possibilities for these learning outcomes and framework to be synthesized. Based on the conversations with teaching faculty, they described as conceptual whereas they stated that the learning outcomes were applicable but narrow.

By thinking on how to apply a “concept into practice,” the frames can be aligned with a specific learning outcome. This first emerging theme on concept to practice has appeared in the responses from faculty and librarians. The open codes included common feelings and responses towards the documents. They included “conceptual, unclear, fuzzy, theory, narrow, broad, prescriptive, practical and encompassing.” The framework is perceived as more conceptual than the learning outcomes. However, the learning outcomes may be perceived as narrow and practical and focused on communication issues. By applying information literacy frames or theories into practices, this theme focuses on the application of concepts in real world examples.

The second theme, “communicating information in society,” emerged based on responses related to audience members for the framework and learning outcomes, and the concept of information creators. The open codes that came up included “persuasive speech, intent, intention, authority, construct, strategy, communicating, talk, share, discuss, goals, claims, target, aim, create, and design.” Most of these verbs as codes are all ways to communicate information to individuals, groups, and society at large. Individuals can communicate information differently based on their intent and strategy. This theme focuses on how information is disseminated, communicated and presented in society.

When discussing the relationship between information and authority, librarian participant E made references to the United States President Donald Trump perceived as an “authority” while alluding to his tweets. Another faculty participant B reflected, “I think Trump is one of those people that we saw that really kind of tapered his message for an audience.” Information creators can be viewed as a type of authority. Their work can focus on a specific audience. Both groups recognized the importance and power of communicating information to society. Responses from the participants focused on how information is being created and communicated; how is information being perceived and understood; and who is creating or communicating the information and who is the consumer/audience for such information? Participants’ responses highlighted these inquiries for questions 4-7 (see Appendix A).

Table 4: List of potential learning outcomes from the new synthesized guideline

-
1. Formulate research questions and find debates in the communication discipline
 2. Searching for and creating messages for specific audiences, purposes, and contexts
 3. Understand how information and communication are created and utilized in diverse contexts
-

For question 4, the researcher presented the synthesized guideline to participants and asked them to share their reactions to these new learning outcomes (see Table 4). All faculty participants had different responses to these outcomes. For faculty participant A, number 1 is important for students to develop these skills, particularly in an argumentation class where they must write persuasive speeches for public speaking. This fits into that kind of area and the use of “critical skills to have those evidence and reasoning” are important components. For number 2, this faculty participant emphasized the role of an effective communicator, and how they must understand how the research/search process works, and to find such information. As remarked by this faculty participant, “If you have more knowledge then you can use that to influence others.” Information is processed and communicated differently by the person and so it has value to understand these messages in context. Faculty participant B highlighted how it is important to understand how to influence public discourse and the value of information. This participant emphasized the “value of information and ethical communication practices”, which may fall under number 3. Faculty participant C also echoed that number 1 advances the thesis/argument component of an assignment in an undergraduate communication studies class. Numbers 2 and 3 are connected to some of the advanced public speaking classes that are focused on understanding how “messages are crafted and directed” at specific groups.

For librarian participants in group E, they reacted and described how the three outcomes used languages from the framework and learning outcomes. One librarian commented that “diverse contexts can also mean diverse medium”, which may include “online,” “social media,” or “print” formats. This librarian stated, “for example, some context mattered, it doesn’t carry as much as print or vice versa on that matter.” Another librarian participant found that the “searching for messages” is very much connected to information literacy” based on the scholarly production cycle and “how information is created in different ways than news versus journals.” Participants were drawing on connections between the framework and outcomes based on this new document. Librarian participants found relevancy and value in these three outcomes as a potential guideline to inform the practice of teaching information literacy skills to an undergraduate communication studies class.

As described earlier, this study was conducted during and after the U.S. Presidential Election on November 8, 2016. References to fake news were mentioned by a few participants. The prevalent of fake news in information literacy and communication studies discourse was discussed briefly for the interviews that took place after November 8, 2016. One communication studies faculty A mentioned how assignments that focus on creating messages to share on social media may require an understanding of the fake news phenomenon, “tying into the discourse of today’s fake news era and connecting that, would perpetuate in some ways, require some kind of self-analysis to understand fake news, and using the memes … it’s a great activity but then you have students doing it without realizing [that they are] perpetuating these kinds of issues.” Teaching how to create messages can be challenging based on the national discourse on fake news during the U.S. Presidential Election of 2016. National discourse can influence public discussion on how information can be understood or taught as seen with the fake news phenomenon.

For question 5, the researcher asked, “Is this new set of outcomes limiting the focus from both disciplines? Any other framework or learning outcome that is not included that you would like to see it be included?” Participants shared additional ideas that could fit into the new guideline. Faculty participant A remarked how these are overlapping outcomes from both disciplines but focuses on specific areas. Faculty participant C described how number 2 and 3 can be shaped differently since it is important to understand how messages are crafted for specific audiences and how to search for such messages is important and central to the discipline since students would need to do research applying methods from this discipline. Faculty participant B responded that “scholarship as conversation” sounded better than “debate” since debate felt more competitive and “it means something very specific for communication scholar and so scholarly conversation works better in this context.” This is an important note since the new guideline may contain jargons from the other disciplines.

For librarians, it was important for students to formulate research questions based on the literature as described by a librarian participant in group F. Another librarian participant from group F described the three learning outcomes to be “broad enough” to cover the library instruction section and yet it is “narrow of communication for the department, it is still about the process of information literacy.” A librarian participant from group E emphasized how important it is for students to understand how to search and create messages for specific audiences, purposes, and context which relates to search strategies, thinking about messages and how they are created, and who is in authority. For number 3 in the synthesized guideline, “understand how information and communication are created and utilized in diverse contexts,” it was mentioned by a librarian participant in group D as timely as it related to U.S President Donald Trump’s communication strategy, “Donald Trump now going to be in authority U.S. President, standing in the right, absolutely.” Information communication can be connected to the national discourse. The varying opinions and thoughts on this synthesized guideline in table 4 can strengthen and enhance such resource for future use or provide a new opportunity to engage with librarians and faculty to develop a common core set of ideas or notions relating to IL in disciplinary standards. The synthesized guideline generated positive sentiment from all participants based on initial feedback.

For question 6, the researcher asked, “in your experience, what would be the best way to measure the learning outcomes for this new synthesized guideline?” Participants shared various potential ways to assess the learning outcomes. Librarian participants from group D emphasized how helpful it is to measure students’ learning through a long-term study. The new guideline can be helpful to measure a year-long course rather than a single “one shot” session. Librarian participants from group E emphasized how partnership is critical for assessment as one participant remarked, “it would be difficult to assess for us if we didn’t have a really close relationship with the instructor. I think if your only communication with the class was teaching that one shot and then having some kind of in class assessment, I don’t see how you could make it work with this.” Assessing such a document requires partnership and long-term range to see how students develop such skills from this new guideline as revealed in Lindstrom and Shonrock’s study (2006).

Communication faculty participant A recommended pre- and post-tests, for formative assessment, that utilizes a dependent t-test to measure students’ learning on the first and last day of class. The survey questions can focus on “how comfortable they are formulating research questions,” or understanding “communication skills” or “information being communicated” and measure from their experiences before and after. This assessment would be more for the instructor to understand the progress of students’ learning developments. The feedback on assessment practices can be viewed as a form of feasibility of the document itself. The feedback on assessment also provided an opportunity to measure students’ learning under this new set of learning outcomes.

Participants also described a few assignments that they thought connected to the synthesized guideline. These assignments could be used to teach information literacy and communication studies skills. This paper highlights two examples based on responses for question 7, “are there any activities or assignments that you can think of that can meet the synthesized guideline?” A librarian participant from group F described a social media or public relations (PR) assignment where students can go to a community and create a “campaign message.” Students would identify the types of resources, software, or media needed for this communication project. Students would research on the company or organization, the techniques that such group have employed previously and a design campaign or PR message for such group. This project may focus on specific demographic groups. The assignment can fulfill the synthesized guideline by underscoring the need to formulate research questions, search and create specific messages, and understand how information and communication are created and utilized in diverse contexts for a public relations and communication project.

On a different assignment, faculty participant B shared how “students can create memes to share.” Memes are viewed as humorous, satirical, or ironic texts that are shared on the Internet. This faculty participant emphasized how students can do research on memes, create and share their memes to see how they can get “recirculated” and “how far did this spread, how popular were they able to get this video or meme to go online.” This assignment could take account on the specific audiences that students are trying to reach and “were they able to get it move beyond that particular audience, like it is a message always contain only to the audience you have in mind.” The

images and memes could get picked up by people that they did not intend to, and what responses would that generate. This meme assignment will instruct students to understand how information is created, shared, and responded to by the Internet audience. It becomes a useful exercise that fosters a different way of thinking about communicating information for students. However, it can also be problematic if students did not realize about the consequences of creating and spreading falsified viral content as described by faculty participant A.

Fister (2019) wrote about “information gerrymandering” based on a research article by Bergstrom and Bak-Coleman (2019) published by *Nature* to examine what group can be effective in influencing the greatest number of people who are in the center. The significance of this research and Fister’s (2019) comments directly connect to this activity. Fister explained that “the systems we so often use for keeping up with current events are optimized both for persuasion and for attention” (Fister, 2019, para 8.). This type of assignment can help students think about the challenges posed by misinformation and disinformation, and the power of persuasion in information sharing context, and how “messaging can be influenced at a scale” (Fister, 2019, para. 8). The faculty participant felt that these assignments connected to the learning outcomes and framework because it focused on searching and creating messages for specific audiences, purposes or contexts, and understanding how information and communication are created and utilized in diverse contexts.

Summary

This study identified and integrated the potential shared goals, visions, and outcomes between two areas: information literacy and communication studies by mapping and aligning the frames to appropriate learning outcomes for communication studies. The study was guided by two research questions: what are the intersections and shared values between ACRL’s Framework for Information Literacy and the NCA’s Learning Outcomes, and how can these outcomes and frames be integrated into a library instruction workshop? This study presented a synthesized guideline with shared learning outcomes and sought input from faculty and librarians and found that the guideline is feasible and acceptable to be considered for communication studies courses, particularly in the first year where information literacy skills are emphasized. By gathering faculty feedback and perspectives on the synthesized guideline and providing examples from their own pedagogies, the study highlighted two themes: concept to practice and communicating information in society.

These themes reveal how participants perceive both documents from ACRL and NCA and the opportunity to explore the intersections between the two: framework and learning outcomes. They provide useful consideration for future researchers in these overlapping areas to explore the role of information literacy in communication studies. The themes also responded to the research questions. “Concept to practice” addressed how there is a need for application of concepts in real world examples when it comes to information literacy frames and communication studies. The intersections and shared values between the two groups should focus on concept to practice approaches. The second theme on “communicating information in society” highlights the importance of how information is disseminated, communicated and presented. The outcomes and frames can be integrated into a library instruction workshop for undergraduate students in communication studies by addressing, examining and understanding the role of communicating information in society. In addition, the different approaches of communicating, disseminating and presenting information should be considered as well. The frames and outcomes need to be focused on concept to practice approaches in supporting, addressing and teaching information in communication studies. The synthesized guideline can be used in an information literacy workshop by fostering a more collaborative approach between communication studies faculty and academic instruction librarians. Both can work together to create and assess assignments and activities that require students to formulate research questions and find debates in the field, to search for and create messages for specific audiences, purposes, and contexts and to understand how information and communication are created and utilized in diverse contexts.

Communication studies and information literacy can be viewed as a bridge based on this synthesized guideline to support communication studies’ students in the undergraduate level. Based on the interviews and focus group discussions with communication studies faculty and academic instruction librarians, the synthesized guideline can be viewed as potentially feasible and acceptable for communication studies courses. Since this was an exploratory study, more interviews and focus groups would be needed to confirm the applicability and usage of the synthesized

guideline. This exploratory study introduced a possibility of integrating learning outcomes from both disciplines to support library instruction.

Future studies should include more communication studies faculty in a focus group or interview to collect their perspectives on the ACRL Framework and NCA's Learning Outcomes. In addition, communication studies faculty can belong to any subfield such as rhetoric, media studies, and communication studies. It may be important to focus on a subfield in communication studies. By obtaining more faculty input, perspective understanding of IL and the framework, librarians can build on meaningful resources and services that support teaching and learning needs, particularly during critical moments where information is constantly ever flowing in the digital space. This exploratory study aimed to capture and analyze preliminary qualitative data. The findings can guide other educators and librarians' future research and teaching practices concerning information literacy and communication studies. By sharing perspectives from both groups in understanding how to synthesize disciplinary outcomes with the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy, academic instruction librarians can develop new ways in supporting students' learning and faculty's teaching needs.

Acknowledgments

The researcher would like to thank all the participants in the study. The researcher would like to acknowledge the California State University, Fresno's Provost Research Award (2017) for funding this project. In addition, the researcher would like to thank Jimmy Xiong for research support and transcription help. This project was initially developed in the Institute of Research Design Librarianship (IRDL). The researcher would like to thank the feedback received from IRDL in 2016.

References

- ACRL framework for information literacy for higher education (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>
- Albert, M. A., & Sinkinson, C. (2015). Composing information literacy: a pedagogical partnership between rhet/comp and library faculty. *Georgia International Conference on Information Literacy, Paper 24*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/gaintlit/2015/2015/24>
- Bergstrom, C. T., & Bak-Coleman, J. B. (2019). Information gerrymandering in social networks skews collective decision-making. *Nature*. Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-02562-z?fbclid=IwAR113_w4gAOYtI7c60JxxYGVNkhUGGpoYh7q-r3QH1UCXwJQZyU-vPCSwf4
- Boss, K. E., De Voe, K. M., Gilbert, S. R., Hernandez, C., Heuer, M., Hines, A., Knapp, J. A., Tokarz, R. E., Tucker, C. T., & Williams, K. E. (2015). Reporting in the "post-truth" era: Uncovering the research behaviors of journalism students, practitioners, and faculty." *Recasting the narrative: The proceedings of the ACRL 2019 conference*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/conferences/confandspreconfs/2019/ReportinginthePost-TruthEra.pdf>
- Fister, B. (2019, September 12). That's sorted: Information gerrymandering makes us all less likely to compromise and that's not good for democracy. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/library-babel-fish/%E2%80%99s-sorted>
- Gilman, N. V., Sagas, J., Camper, M., & Norton, A. P. (2017). A faculty-librarian collaboration success story: Implementing a teach-the-teacher library and information literacy instruction model in a first-year agricultural science course. *Library Trends*, 65(3), 339-358.
- Guth, L. F., Arnold, J. M., Bielat, V. E., Perez-Stable, M. A., & Vander Meer, P. F. (2018). Faculty Voices on the Framework: Implications for Instruction and Dialogue. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 18(4), 693-718.
- Jacobson, T. E. & Gibson, C. (2015). First thoughts on implementing the framework for information literacy. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 9(2), 102-110.
- Jefferson, C. O. (2017). Good for Business: Applying the ACRL framework threshold concepts to teach a learner-centered business research course. *Ticker*, 2(1), 1-17.
- Junisbai, B., Lowe, M. S., & 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.
- Koltay, T. (2011). The media and the literacies: media literacy, information literacy, digital literacy. *Media, Culture & Society*, 33(2), 211-221.

- Kuglitsch, R. Z. (2015). Teaching for transfer: Reconciling the framework with disciplinary information literacy. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 15(3), 457-470.
- Lindstrom, J., & Shonrock, D. D. (2006). Faculty-librarian collaboration to achieve integration of information literacy. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 46(1), 18-23.
- Marshall, D. W. (2017, April). Tuning: A guide for creating discipline-specific frameworks to foster meaningful change. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA).
- Mottet, T. P. (2004). Seminar in communication assessment. *Communication Teacher*, 18(4), 116-119.
- National Communication Association (2019a). Basic course and general education. National Communication Association. Retrieved from <https://www.natcom.org/academic-professional-resources/teaching-and-learning/basic-course-general-education>
- National Communication Association (2019b). Learning outcomes in communication. National Communication Association. Retrieved from <https://www.natcom.org/LOC/>
- National Communication Association (2019c). NCA's learning outcomes in communication project. National Communication Association. Retrieved from <https://www.natcom.org/learning-outcomes-communication>
- Townsend, L., Brunetti, K., & Hofer, A. R. (2011). Threshold concepts and information literacy. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 11(3), 853-869.
- Willson, G., & Angell, K. (2017). Mapping the Association of College and Research Libraries information literacy framework and nursing professional standards onto an assessment rubric. *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA*, 105(2). Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5370606/>

Appendix A: Interview and Focus Group Questions

1. When you look at the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy, what comes to mind? Who is the audience?
2. When you look at the communication's learning outcomes, what are your general impressions? Who is the audience?
3. Based on these learning objectives, do you see any correlation between the two?
4. I am going to present three new outcomes. Please tell me what you think they mean. You are also welcomed to use some of the language from the two learning objectives to describe what they mean as well:
 1. Formulate Research Questions and Find Debates in the Communication Discipline.
 2. Searching for and Creating Messages for Specific Audiences, Purposes, and Contexts.
 3. Understand How Information and Communication Are Created and Utilized in Diverse Contexts
5. Is this new set of outcomes limiting the focus from both disciplines? Any other framework or learning outcome that is not included that you would like to see it be included?
6. In your experience, what would be the best way to measure the learning outcomes for this new synthesized guideline?
7. Are there any activities or assignments that you can think of that can meet the synthesized guideline?