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This article proposes the coresearch engagement model (CoRE), which addresses how the academic research librarian can become a coresearch partner with any patron. The CoRE model is an interpersonal process and is founded upon the concepts of mutual respect, collaboration, reciprocity, and empowerment. Grounded in Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligences theory, Malcolm Knowles’ andragogical model, and guidelines from the Reference and User Services Association, CoRE has the potential to result in engagement for the librarian and patron. The CoRE model can be utilized in many ways including self-awareness and development for those who need and want to expand their abilities as a research librarian. It provides a theoretical framework and a knowledge base, in addition to giving a context for further development by expanding, comparing the related theories for further research, and implementing various applications suggested by this article.
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INTRODUCTION

The academic library has changed. What hasn’t changed is the way librarians view themselves, knowing there are potential barriers in disseminating knowledge and yet desiring to fulfill a robust professional role. If change is desired, a full understanding of the environment that perpetuates the past roles of librarians requires examination. This article is built upon the assumption that academia underutilizes the vast wealth of skills, services, expertise, and knowledge that librarians possess. All too often, librarians are not effectively included in the research process or seen as an equal participant and desire to change the organizational culture and climate in which they are cloaked.

Organizational change is a constant element that affects all organizations. In terms of the rate of occurrence, change can be divided into continuous incremental change and discontinuous transformational change. When characterized by how change comes about, it encompasses planned, emergent and contingency change. (Kin & Kareem, 2015, p. 135)

Change is constant in any organization, including change within the academic library. To facilitate change, the research librarian must acknowledge the need to manage change and as stated by Kin and Kareem (2015) the “wisdom to recognize the need for change and the ability to lead change” (p. 135) are assets the academic librarian brings to the research process.

Potential contributions that a research librarian can make during the research process are minimized due to perceptions or images that have been established through past involvement and experiences for the librarian and the patron. These preconceptions set the stage for a positive or negative experience in the research process and the ability of the librarian to facilitate change, effectively. Starting fresh, with no inhibitions or influences that affect and inform the initial encounter, void of history, is impossible to achieve without changing the expectations of the initial encounter prior to the occurrence. This model presents a shift in how librarians perceive themselves and their desire to influence how others perceive them in their role. Empowering the librarian to transform the experience for the patron creates a successful relationship through collaboration, mutual respect, reciprocity, and empowerment.

The purpose of the article is to present a coresearch engagement model that connects the librarian and the patron through mutual understanding, sharing of intellectual resources, and trustworthiness that leads to mutual respect where each are accepted as an equal. Academia fosters the image of the library as a place for sedate gathering, reflective silence, and independent inquiry. However, today’s librarian practitioners offer a magnitude of expertise, one of which is research. The intent of the model is to dispel the potential of the stereotypical perspective of the librarian, recalling a timid, shy, introvert,
when indeed, research librarian roles require interactive, involved, and socially engaged characteristics. Presented is a challenge to rethink the stereotypical perspective of librarianship in a manner that captures the multidimensional assets possessed by the librarian. Perhaps because of this inaccurate historical view, the library patron fears appearing incompetent or unintelligent and is hesitant to approach the librarian with his or her need. This premise may also hold true for the research librarian who may not have confidence to enter a reciprocal academic partnership. This disconnect hinders opportunities for the patron and librarian to become equal contributors in the research process.

In this article the authors create the process of experiencing the way academic librarians interact with library patrons to partner, come alongside, and join them on their research journey to embrace the co-research engagement model (CoRE). The CoRE model is grounded in key theoretical components of Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligences theory (1999), Malcolm Knowles’ andragogical model (1973), and guidelines from the Reference and User Services Association (2004).

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

“... it would certainly be desirable to have an algorithm for the selection of an intelligence, such that any trained researcher could determine whether a candidate intelligence met the appropriate criteria” (Gardner, 2011, p. 67)

Gardner’s Multiple Intelligence Theory

Gardner’s (2011) theory of multiple intelligences encompasses a spectrum of nine intelligences that cover distinct intellectual strands within a cultural context. These intelligences are (1) naturalistic, (2) musical, (3) logical-mathematical, (4) existential, (5) spatial, (6) bodily-kinesthetic, (7) linguistic, (8) intrapersonal, and (9) interpersonal. Naturalistic intelligence is seeing one’s place in the natural environment that is sometimes referred to as ecological intelligence. Musical intelligence is a high level of understanding of the rhythms, tonalities, and harmonies of life. In fact, even doctors have some sort of musical intelligence when they are listening to the rhythm of the heart. Logical-mathematical is an understanding of everything in life from numbers to patterns to problems. This intelligence involves the capacity to analyze problems logically, carry out mathematical operations, and investigate issues scientifically. Existential intelligence is found in people who deeply examine the meaning of life and death and ponder philosophical questions. Spatial intelligence is an ability to understand one’s mental awareness of the 3D world in time and space. Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence is having a sense of
body–mind coordination and timing. “Linguistic competence is, in fact, the intelligence—the intellectual competence—that seems most widely and most democratically shared across the human species” (Gardner, 2011, p. 77) and “involves sensitivity to spoken and written language, the ability to learn languages, and the capacity to use language to accomplish certain goals” (Gardner, 1999, p. 41). For the purposes of this article, three of Gardner’s (1999) multiple intelligences are examined in depth and applied to the actions of the research librarian.

According to Gardner (1999), “intrapersonal intelligence involves the capacity to understand oneself, to have an effective working model of oneself—including one’s own desires, fears, and capacities—and to use such information effectively in regulating one’s own life” (p. 43). A librarian who has a high level of intrapersonal intelligence makes an interior journey of self-analysis, which supports working autonomously in a self-directed environment. Linguistic and intrapersonal intelligence reflect the stereotypical librarian often recalled when thinking of someone who works with sources, rather than people; working autonomously, gathering facts, checking out books, and working in an academic silo.

Logical-mathematical intelligence highlights strengths that follow a sequence from numbers to patterns to problems. This intelligence enhances one’s ability to gather, organize, and synthesize information presenting facts in a logical way. These abilities connect the librarian to the information literacy process by “recogniz[ing] when information is needed and hav[ing] the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information” (American Library Association [ALA], 2015, p. 1). The logical-mathematical intelligence allows the research librarian to analyze a “sheer abundance of information [which] will not in itself create a more informed citizenry without a complementary cluster of abilities necessary to use information effectively” (ALA, 2015, p. 1). For this reason, logical-mathematical intelligence would be high in any successful researcher whether one researches independently or collaboratively.

Interpersonal intelligence “denotes a person’s capacity to understand the intentions, motivations, and desires of other people and, consequently, to work effectively with others” (Gardner, 1999, p. 43). Literature on the role of the research librarian confirms the necessity of good communications skills and is supported by the following quote:

I have come to believe that librarians frequently take the interpersonal communication aspects of their work for granted. They work extremely hard to keep up with rapid changes in information sources and electronic information retrieval systems, and to make information accessible to users … [and] may not realize that the day-to-day, moment-to-moment interpersonal interactions with user’s are also critically important (Radford, 1999, p. ix).
The research librarian demonstrates Gardner’s interpersonal intelligence when collaborating with fellow research librarians, nonresearch librarians, or when serving as an academic liaison for campus colleges or departments (Gardner, 2011). Examples of these encounters might be collaborating with colleagues to develop an information literacy research assignment for students, engaging in cross-departmental partnerships to order new monographs and serials, and instructing research classes for student groups (see Table 1).

Andragogical Model

In a truly democratic organization there is a spirit of mutual trust, an openness of communications, a general attitude of helpfulness and cooperation, and a willingness to accept responsibility, in contrast to paternalism, regimentation, restriction of information, suspicion, and enforced dependency on authority. (Knowles, 1973, p. 84)

Malcolm Knowles’ theory of andragogy (the study of teaching adults) has six assumptions related to motivation (2012). These assumptions set a climate for learning, inquiry and mutual respect. The six assumptions are (1) the need to know (2) experience, (3) learners’ self-concept (4) relevancy (5) problem or life centered, and (6) internal motivation (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2012). According to Knowles (2012), it is vital for adults to know why they are learning, are problem centered, and are internally motivated, therefore possessing the “need-to-know” aspect for motivation depicted in Table 2. Adults bring a vast amount of experience to the table that demands to be heard from all parties involved. In fact, if that experience is not acknowledged adults will disengage. Self-concept incorporates adults in the planning and evaluation of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nine Multiple Intelligences</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naturalistic</td>
<td>Seeing one’s place in the natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>Understanding of the rhythms, tonalities and harmonies of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Examining the meaning of life &amp; death and ponder philosophical questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>Understanding one’s mental awareness of the 3D world in time and space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily–Kinesthetic</td>
<td>Sensing body–mind coordination and timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic</td>
<td>Understanding written and oral words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td>Seeking understanding of one’s self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Understanding the inner workings of relationships with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical—Mathematical</td>
<td>Understanding of everything in life from numbers to patterns to problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gardner (2011).
the decision-making process. Learning must be relevant and relate to the personal or professional life (see Table 2).

Knowles presented these six assumptions but a quarter century later elaborated on these assumptions by saying “andragogical approaches require a psychological climate of mutual respect, collaboration, trust, support, openness, authenticity, pleasure, and humane treatment” (1973, p. 19). Merriam and Kee (2014) built upon Knowles’ (1973) elaboration by adding an inter-generational aspect stating “intergenerational learning activities are characterized by mutual benefits, reciprocity, and empowerment” (p. 137). According to Merriam (2001):

Some eighty years after Knowles’ establishment of the andragogical model, we have no single answer, no one theory or model of adult learning that explains all that we know about adult learners, the various contexts where learning takes place, and the process of learning itself. What we do have is a mosaic of theories, models, sets of principles, and explanations that, combined, compose the knowledge base of adult learning. (p. 3)

By intertwining these elements, a supportive, safe environment for an exchange of ideas for adult learners occur.

Reference and User Services Association Guidelines for Behavioral Performance

The librarian’s initial response in any reference situation sets the tone for the entire communication process, and influences the depth and level of interaction. (Reference and User Services Association [RUSA], 2004, para. 10).

According to the RUSA (2004) guidelines for behavioral performance of reference and information service providers, “connections between people and the information sources, services, and collection materials” are vital to the development of the research librarian/patron relationship. The five guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Malcolm Knowles’ Six Assumptions Related to Motivation When Working with Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to know</td>
<td>Know why they are learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Bring a vast amount of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners’ self-concept</td>
<td>Part of the decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevancy</td>
<td>Learning must be relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem or life centered</td>
<td>Help perform tasks in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal motivation</td>
<td>Internally driven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Knowles et al. (2012).
outlined by RUSA are (1) visibility/approachability—the way a librarian is receptive through visible disposition and demeanor when working with others; (2) interest—active engagement with the needs of the patron; (3) listening/inquiring—an objective and agenda-free method of communication; (4) searching—seeking information, guiding patrons, and locating appropriate resources; (5) follow-up—concurrent and ongoing communication that ensures the patrons’ needs are met (see Table 3).

The research librarian uses RUSA’s (2004) guidelines when conducting a patron reference interview. The reference interview, a standard informational interaction, walks the research librarian and patron through a series of standardized interactions to support the gathering of facts that allows the development of the research process. Trott and Schwartz (2014) supported these guidelines through their research stating that approachability is a key to “ensure a successful reference interview” (p. 2) and how the reference librarian’s role in helping define the researcher’s topic is to help the patron identify objectives and clarify meaning of any unfamiliar words or terms. Research librarians must be effective in identifying the patrons’ needs and must be receptive, have strong listening skills, and be encouraging (Trott & Schwartz, 2014). Taylor (as cited in Gothberg, 1976) highlights the need for librarians to communicate actively in a reference interview further supporting RUSA’s fifth guideline of concurrent and ongoing communication. Vavreck (as cited in Gothberg, 1976) envisions the reference librarian as a “specialist able not only to instruct users in the ‘how to’ approach in an information search, but also able to bring about meaningful dialog between the librarian and the patron” (p. 129).

Application of RUSA’s (2004) guidelines for behavioral performance of reference and information service providers dispel the stereotypical perspective of librarians and their relationships with patrons that can detrimental to the perception of the 21st-century librarian. The authors propose a model that presents an alternative to the stereotypical perspective, whether this viewpoint is acknowledged or present. The co-research engagement model (CoRE model) creates an equally-participative effort shared by the librarian and the patron, identifying the most cooperative and therefore most productive path that incorporates equal participation and synergy, embodying academic
respect, and establishing a growth model for interpersonal relationships. Whether librarians possess natural, intuitive communication skills, the CoRE model provides a framework that when applied provides the tools necessary to create the interpersonal bridge between the research librarian and patron.

CORESEARCH ENGAGEMENT MODEL (CoRE MODEL)

Introduction to the CoRE Model

Gardner’s (1999) multiple intelligences, Knowles’ (2012) andragogical model, and the RUSA (2004) Guidelines for behavioral performance independently are reliable and valid theories that support learning, yet standing alone typically have three separate audiences, that is, educators, adult learners, librarians. However, when connected, they support immersive learning and the relationship between people and sources. Delving deeper into the key areas of the theories in which they overlap one sees how powerful the theories become as a unit. Integrating the areas of Gardner’s (1999) interpersonal and logical-mathematical intelligences, Knowles’ (2012) six assumptions, and RUSA’s (2004) librarian guidelines incorporating listening, receptiveness, and encouragement creates a model of library/patron engagement known as the CoRE model (see Figure 1).

**Theoretical Model**

Integrating Gardner’s Interpersonal and Logical-Mathematical Intelligences, Knowles’ Six Assumptions & Reference and User Services Association (RUSA) guidelines for behavioral performance

**FIGURE 1** Theoretical model of the CoRE model.
Description of the CoRE Model

The CoRE model presents two paths, the proverbial fork in the road, in which the librarian has to make a cognitive decision to either work autonomously or collaboratively. Working autonomously for the research librarian might mean self-directed projects or roles, or independently with library resources. Working collaboratively builds upon the autonomous role by adding the patron to the research process. This path selection requires an interpersonal, logical-mathematical cognitive shift in the librarian, and once that shift occurs, the choice is to pursue the path of collaboration and the CoRE model engages. Once the interpersonal cognitive shift begins, the librarian and the patron enter into a delicate negotiation of mutual planning and mutual decision making, where each individual brings experience, making the moment immediately relevant, and thus establishing common ground where balance is achieved. Sometimes when two people are interpersonally connected, the negotiation process may appear invisible to the onlooker, however, the outcome is a product of the interpersonal connection. Ones’ position of power could influence the interpersonal relationship (Drake & Roe, 2003) whether it should and can almost appear as a false negotiation.

The delicate negotiation between the librarian and the patron is vital to the success of the CoRE model and is based upon mutual planning and participatory decision making. Visually, the negotiation process acts as a lever and can be elaborated upon using the law of equilibrium. Here, there is an understanding that the librarian (A) and patron (B) reach a point of negotiation and equal understanding, where A = B. Such a balance in the negotiation process creates the fulcrum of the CoRE model that is mutual respect, collaboration, reciprocity, and empowerment. Once the fulcrum is established, the outcome is effective engagement in the coresearch process between the librarian and the patron (see Figure 2).

![CoResearch engagement model (CoRE model).](Fig2.png)
The process of negotiation is initiated when the librarian and patron are at the juncture of the lever situated on top of the fulcrum depicted in the model, where the parties involved can reach a level playing field. There is a precarious balance that can make this a fragile process. The balance hinges on the pinnacle of the fulcrum where attitudes, misconceptions, or preconceived ideas are presented and may influence the possibility of regression. At any time, regression may cause the lever to shift and result in a loss of balance or where teetering may occur. The margin for error is huge, where achieving this balance is pivotal in the negotiation process. The commitment to the process of negotiation is vital to the interpersonal, logical-mathematical cognitive shift. Knowing that collaboration may not be ideal, there could be times when the coresearch process is not going to be achieved. One point to emphasize is that the CoRE model is based upon an assumption that common ground can be achieved in the negotiation process. At any given time the librarian could be faced with a situation that requires an immediate adaptation and based on a particular situation, a reevaluation might take place. Sometimes more information is needed, gathered, or clarified to establish the patron’s needs. The librarian and the patron must remain diligent and continually engaged to maintain balance throughout the entire encounter. This working relationship is continually evolving.

Application of the CoRE Model

There are numerous factors that may have an impact on the described negotiation process in the CoRE model. Think of these factors as they may relate to the work environment. For example, what is the organizational climate, culture, history, or ideological barriers to cooperation within the library? Is the librarian seen as a leader or expert in the interview research process, and if so, what steps or processes have been undertaken to build the reputation? If not, how might a favorable climate for cooperation be created? Mutual respect, understanding, and trust require that each party share or have a stake in the process and outcome. Central to the CoRE Model is the need to understand that there are multiple layers within the decision-making process that include flexibility, adaptability and a genuine commitment to the negotiation process. Redesigning through reinventing how librarians are perceived and conduct business greatly increases the probability that patrons will see the results they desire.

The negotiation process within the CoRE model is supported by Barbara Gray’s collaborative process. In her book, *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems* (1989), Gray describes the collaboration process as a three-phase continuum (see Table 4): (1) problem setting, (2) direction setting, and (3) implementation. These phases may vary according to differences in individuals. Therefore
the three phase model of collaboration … is predicated on the assumption that although certain phases may be more significant for some collaboration than for others, there remains a fundamental set of issues that must be addressed in the course of any collaboration. (p. 56)

Gray (1989) described Phase 1 as a problem-setting phase. In the CoRE model, the librarian embarks on a journey with the patron toward mutual understanding by beginning a conversation. This conversation allows the librarian to set expectations as to how the negotiations will move forward, identifying to what level each participant is involved. The conversation, following Gray’s process can be initiated in the following six steps: common definition of the problem, commitment to collaborate, identification of the stakeholders, legitimacy of the stakeholders, convener of characteristics, and identification of resources (p. 57). If not followed, there is no commitment. The problem-setting phase is built on the establishment of dialogue and ideally occurs in a face-to-face setting. Although best accomplished during the face-to-face encounter, most often the coresearch process begins online or over the phone, with mutual acceptance of outcomes or results initiated. The “explore, reach and implement” (p. 56) components of the model entails understanding that a joint construction initiative will yield agreed-upon outcomes.

Once commitment has been established in Phase 1, direction setting of Phase 2 begins. During direction setting the librarian and the patron are
traversing the lever whereby establishing ground rules, agenda setting, organizing subgroups, joint information search, exploring options and reaching agreement, and closing the deal occur. Key to representation of the delicate negotiation between the librarian and patron in the CoRE model, is the joint information search. Thus, the librarian and the patron embark on a dual information quest by brainstorming new search strategies, asking detailed questions of one another, and listening and comprehending what is said, or may be implied.

During Gray’s (1989) third phase of the collaborative process, the implementation phase deals with constituencies, building external support, structuring, monitoring the agreement, and ensuring compliance. In the CoRE model collaboration, mutual respect, reciprocity, and empowerment embody these components as the culmination of negotiation between the librarian and the patron. Gray’s collaborative process illustrates the pinnacle component in the CoRE model and provides structure for collaboration.

Knowles (1973), on the other hand, builds on Gray’s (1989) model of collaboration by including mutual respect, reciprocity, and empowerment. Through the covalence of Knowles’ (1973) and Gray’s (1989) models the bond forms a new practice of effective engagement for the librarian. The result of this bond leads to the CoRE model and forms the structural elements of the fulcrum.

Based on the first RUSA (2004) guideline of approachability, the mutual first impression formed by librarian and patron only occurs once and sets the tone for the entire research experience. Armed with an insider’s perspective, the librarian transitions theory to practice and knowledge of the CoRE model allows the librarian to assess this initial encounter as a meaningful moment in time. When equipped with application knowledge of the CoRE model, the moment becomes empowering. The ability to assess a situation is reinforced and allows progress and advancement with patrons in the diagnosis of situations. The theory-to-practice application causes the librarian practitioner to reflect on his or her practice and digest the proposed theoretical aspects into a real-life application setting. Equipped with navigational tools, the librarian is able to take a proactive posture rather than a reactive posture, steering the collaborative negotiation with assurance. An intentional strategy and strategic approach becomes the formula that benefits the librarian and serves as a guide for the patron toward a shared collaborative outcome. Based on the CoRE model and an alignment with the RUSA (2004) guidelines, this prescriptive, collaborative venture must be initiated immediately and nurtured. Once past practice is replaced, the described sequence utilizing the CoRE model allows the librarian to be viewed as an information professional, which is the conceptual framework of the CoRE model.
CONCLUSION

The fulcrum represents the pulling together of theories presented by Knowles (1973) and Gray (1989), which uniquely support the CoRE model. Knowles’ (1973) andragogical model comprises mutual respect, reciprocity, and empowerment. These three components represent necessary ingredients in the negotiation experience between a librarian and patron to implement a robust CoRE model. In the event the patron doesn’t fully embrace the process, the librarian has grown and now can appreciate how past experiences, preconceived notions, role and power, and hierarchy in institutions influence the negotiation process. Throughout the process the librarian has more work environment maneuverability due to the exposure to the model. Through the CoRE model the passion for lifelong learning is enhanced which is an added professional attribute. The work of the librarian continues on, the personal lens has changed and becomes clearer, even if the patron’s experiences haven’t been elevated to the same level as that of the librarian. The CoRE model may not work in the moment, but the librarian’s knowledge base related to the negotiation process has changed because of the experienced personal and professional growth through the exploration of the model. The CoRE model helps the librarian understand the importance of the peripheral components of the fulcrum necessary to form common ground that expand beyond the traditional approach and create an impact on the librarian–patron relationship. Initially the librarian may take a more active role to foster and cultivate an opportunity for trustworthiness to be established. As evidenced in the CoRE model lever, at times the ratio of collaboration may not always reach the median. When the ratio changes and the librarian takes on more responsibility, the outcome may still not be successful for the patron. Therefore, each subsequent patron encounter only serves to advance the librarian’s professional skills and interpersonal dispositions. Dispositions, being qualitative in nature, might be difficult to assess immediately, but are long range aspirations and accomplishments based on consistent application of the CoRE model.

The traditional Chinese proverb “one hand cannot applaud itself” creates a visual of the negotiation process within the CoRE model clarifying the delicate balance and the importance of the collaboration, mutual respect, reciprocity and empowerment between the librarian and patron. With this proverb in mind, “one hand” is still able achieve a proverbial pat on the back for achieving personal and professional change. However, when both hands are unified in purpose, the librarian and patron share common ground creating opportunity for a harmonious juncture in librarian–patron relationships.

Clearly, in this article, a key point of the negotiation process is raised between the librarian and the patron in the CoRE model. Bringing together diverse stakeholders to share a common strategy requires mutual understanding, sharing of intellectual resources, and trustworthiness that leads to mutual
respect where each are accepted as an equal, resulting in research that is shared. At one point in the process, the negotiations provide an opportunity and a challenge for each individual to work together in new ways. The interpersonal cognitive shift is very similar to what Peter Senge (2014) describes in his book *The Fifth Discipline*,

in all areas of our lives, our orientations may constantly shift. Herein lies the need for intrapersonal mastery—if you can understand how you see yourself, you can more deliberately shift from one orientation to another. In the long run, this could have a dramatic effect—not so much on your ability to achieve results, as on the type of results you seek to achieve. (p. 227)

The experience ultimately, requires both parties to be able to change and adapt to the new environment. A common understanding must occur, and this journey requires long-term thinking and understanding that the negotiation is ever present. Such transitional collaborations initiate a synergistic moment resulting in an internal transformation for the research librarian.

Independently, Gardner’s (1999) multiple intelligences, Knowles’ (1973) andragogy, and RUSA’s (2004) Guidelines are applicable to learning but when combined create an opportunity through the CoRE model to build a collaborative relationship, through which, working together on any joint project requires an appreciation of assets and experiences each partner brings to the table. When mutual respect, collaboration, reciprocity, and empowerment are reached, as seen in the fulcrum of the CoRE model, the opportunity for engagement occurs between the librarian and the patron.
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