

Which Formal and Informal Structures Constrain and Enable Collaboration Between School Librarians and Teachers?

Idunn Bøyum

Department of Archivistics, Library and Information Science
Oslo Metropolitan University
idunbo@oslomet.no

Abstract: *Collaboration between teachers and librarians is necessary to fulfil the intention of the regulations of the Norwegian Education Act. In-depth semi-structured interviews with 12 school librarians in upper secondary school (with students aged 15-19), reveal that library tasks, and especially collaboration with teachers, are not embedded in formal documents. The librarians' teaching activities are to a small extent dependent on formal collaboration, but are often based on familiarity and acquaintance, and therefore person-dependent. Organizational placement varied among the librarians, and they were pragmatic about who they should report to. To be organized in sections together with teachers was considered to be a good position for collaboration, but on the other hand might hinder collaboration with teachers in other sections. The librarians appreciated the freedom they had to run the library, however many of them missed support from their leaders. Information channels like Teams and timetables are important sources for librarians to stay updated and enable them to target requests to teachers.*

Keywords: *Collaboration; School libraries, Organizational structures, Decision-making*

Introduction

Successful school libraries have been perceived as instruments for improved learning outcomes (e.g. Gross, 2022; Schultz-Jones & Oberg, 2022). However, research indicates that school libraries are underutilized (Loh, 2021) and do not have a central role in schools' infrastructure for learning (see e.g. Centerwall & Nolin, 2019; Eri, 2018). Although both teachers and librarians share the same goal for students' learning, reading skills, critical literacy skills and democratic citizenship, teacher-librarian collaboration seems to have low priority in schools, educational policy and educational research (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014).

In his thesis, Eri (2018) claims that collaboration must be expressed in the school's strategic documents, but also in national guidelines, to become a reality in schools. In Norway, the recently updated Education Act (1998, Section 9-2) includes a short paragraph on requirements regarding school libraries: "The pupils must have access to a school library. The Ministry may issue further regulations." The regulation gives a few more directions: "The library can be actively used in the education at the school. The library should be specially designed and tailored for the school." To fulfil the intention of the regulation linked to Section 9-2, collaboration between teacher and librarian, as well as a well-run library, are required.

The Norwegian National Curriculum (LK20) describes goals, knowledge, and skills that students should achieve during 13 years at school. Libraries in upper secondary schools are not mentioned as an active party in supporting these goals. Fredwall (2023, p. 39) explains this with a principle in LK20, concerning the teacher's autonomy in choosing pedagogical or didactic methods, "but it can also be interpreted as part of a story where the school library has ended up in the blind spot of the school's governance documents in recent years," she says. [my translation].

Research on collaboration between teachers and librarians is scarce, especially outside the US, the UK, and Australia (Eri, 2018). In the present study I aim to uncover which formal and informal structures constrain and enable collaboration between teacher and librarians, and the role of the headteacher or school management in these matters. I address the following two research questions:

1. To what extent does the school librarian perceive that inclusion in the school's infrastructure for learning depends on organizational structure or formalized collaboration in policy documents?
2. How do school librarians perceive support from the top management in school?

Organizational Communication and Decision Making as Theoretical Perspectives

Identifying where the school library is placed in the school organization can help us understand why collaboration may be challenging for librarians. The organizational structure makes visible the formal division of an organization, where decisions are made and, not least,

how this affects information and communication flows – vertically and horizontally within the organization (Hussey, 2019). Vertical communication can be challenging, both upward and downward, for example between leader and subordinates, because subordinates, like librarians, can be afraid of reprisal (Hussey, 2019). Horizontal communication and information between colleagues at the same level or in the same section of the organization flows easier. Common language, tasks, and educational background strengthen the teachers’ professional community in a school. This professional learning community among teachers might also build a subculture within the school that is not necessarily easy for librarians to enter. Hussey (2019, p. 98) claims that to a great extent horizontal communication is informal. This might be meetings in the hallway, or by the coffee machine, and “conversations as part of social functions, or quick comments before meetings”.

Decision-Making

Wilkinson-Jordan and Hussey (2019, pp. 87-88) make a distinction between programmed or nonprogrammed decisions. *Programmed* decisions are based on rules, policies, and procedure. When the headteacher ensures that the intention of the law is fulfilled, namely, to give students access to a library, this is a programmed decision. On the other hand, nonprogrammed decisions are based on unique situations that rules, policies, procedures, and guidance do not cover and are therefore often based on past experiences and interests (Wilkinson-Jordan & Hussey, 2019).

Since the Education Act does not claim how the library service should be run, and which competences the librarian should have, it is up to the headteacher to decide how many resources the library should be allocated. If the headteacher has never used a library service in their own teaching or learning process, they might be inclined to think that it is not so important.

Literature Review

The motivation for librarians to engage in collaboration is to ensure that all students have the opportunity to develop information literacy, reading skills, and reading for pleasure

(Centerwall, 2022; Eri & Pihl, 2017). However, the school library often has minimal staffing, making it challenging to effectively serve all the students.

Although library tasks are not explicitly defined in the Norwegian National Curriculum (LK20) for upper secondary schools, or in the Education Act, Fredwall (2023, p. 56) highlights several competence goals in LK20 that are a joint mission of schools and the school libraries. Information seeking and evaluation, learning about reference management systems, reading skills, and reading for pleasure etc. are knowledge and skills that are typical areas for collaboration. However, much research indicates that collaboration is challenging. Important factors for achieving improved learning outcomes are formal collaboration and partnership with teachers or school leaders, integrated libraries' learning activities in strategic policy documents and curricula, and finally, full-time librarians (see for example Eri, 2018; Gärdén, 2017; Montiel-Overall, 2008; Montiel-Overall & Hernández, 2012).

In a Position to Collaborate

Based on interviews with 22 Swedish school librarians, Centerwall and Nolin (2019) discuss the school librarian's role in school. They identify several infrastructures that appear in schools, using infrastructure theory defined by Guribye and Lindström (2009, p. 105): "An infrastructure for learning can be seen as a set of resources and arrangements – social, institutional, technical – that are designed to and/or assigned to support a certain learning practice." Centerwall and Nolin (2019) argue that the school library is an invisible part of the infrastructure of learning, while the classroom represents the visible and consequently prioritized aspect. When there is a lack of insight into the role and tasks of the school librarian, collaboration between teacher and librarian can be very difficult to achieve. In her thesis Centerwall (2022) claims that the librarian has an unclear position between the pedagogical staff and the technical-administrative functions, and therefore has a secondary role in the school. However, the school librarians identify themselves strongly with the teachers, share the same goals, and thereby contribute to and are part of the infrastructure for student learning in schools. The school librarians feel more connected to the teaching staff than to the janitor or IT manager.

Since the headteacher is the key to establishing a partnership for learning (Eri & Pihl, 2017; Centerwall & Nolin, 2019), it has been seen as a gold standard to be organized directly under the headteacher. However, Centerwall & Nolin (2019) claim that the headteacher might

also be an impediment to collaboration. In Sweden, the Education Act requires school librarians to report to the headteacher. In Norway, there are no such requirements, so the school library's position in the organization differs from school to school. Since the librarian is often the only employee in the school library, it is difficult to place the library in the organization chart.

Research indicates that school leaders and teachers have limited knowledge of librarians' competences and tasks (Centerwall, 2022; Gross, 2022). Their knowledge may be based on their own experience, and not on what the librarian actually does, which might affect which resources are allocated to the library.

Eri and Pihl (2017) observed meetings between school leaders, teachers, local education authorities, and librarians, who experienced tension and conflict, as was apparent from a reading project in two schools they were collaborating on. To avoid such conflicts in the future the group members agreed on developing an annual collaboration plan.

If the school library's tasks are made visible in strategic plans, the school librarian and the library can become more visible in the infrastructure for learning (Centerwall & Nolin, 2019; Eri & Pihl, 2017). This might ensure stable and predictable use of the library service, while collaboration and teaching activities will be less dependent on personal relationships.

Regular meetings and workshops are formal infrastructures for information and knowledge sharing (Kammer et al., 2021; Montiel-Overall & Hernandez, 2012). This makes them good venues for highlighting how the library can contribute to the infrastructure for learning.

Informal relationships and informal communication can replace the need for formal plans and formalized relationships. Meeting colleagues by the coffee machine, eating lunch together, participating in social events like joining payday beer, and participating in informal working groups etc. are valuable arenas for developing networks and informal relationships (Kammer et al., 2021; Rimstad et al., 2021). Such informal relationships are important for establishing partnership and collaboration. Although this is exhausting, challenging, and dependent on the librarians' initiative, engagement, and strong voices (Eri, 2018; Montiel-Overall & Hernandez, 2012), it is paramount for librarians to identify social networks and join them (Rinio, 2019).

Libraries' role in Norwegian upper secondary schools

In an annual Norwegian survey, school managers and school owners were asked to report on activities and resources in their schools. In 2019, questions regarding libraries were included (Rogde et al., 2020). School managers from upper secondary schools stated that 87 percent had a school library. 38 percent of these school leaders reported that they had “included in their plans how the school library should be used in teaching” (p. 155). 83 percent reported that they had “included in their plans how the school library service should be developed.”

Methodology

To answer these two research questions I employed an in-depth, semi-structured interview¹, a method that ensures rich and detailed answers (Bryman, 2016). The interview guide consisted of some open-ended questions regarding strategic plans, collaboration, organizational structures, networking information artefacts, and teaching activities.

The interviews were conducted during December 2021 and January 2022, lasted for 60-90 minutes, and were recorded and transcribed. NVIVO was used to analyze and categorize the empirical data. Quotes are translated from Norwegian.

Due to Covid-10 restrictions all but one interview was conducted via Zoom. This made it possible to interview librarians from all parts of Norway. To recruit informants, I invited members of different Facebook groups for school librarians and sent information to county municipalities, which are responsible for school libraries in upper secondary schools (age 15 to 19). A purposive sample (Bryman, 2016) of 12 librarians (11 female and one male) from upper secondary schools, with at least one librarian in 100 percent positions were recruited. To ensure anonymity I coded the librarians from I-1 to I-12.

The informants represented large and small municipalities and schools. Nine of the school librarians had colleagues. Nine of the informants were trained librarians² and three

¹ The Norwegian Centre for Research Data has approved the handling of personal data.

² In Norway a trained librarian has a bachelor's degree in library and information science.

were a literary scholar, journalist, and master's graduate in digital humanities, respectively. Three had qualifications at master's level and a couple were in a master's program in reading science. Seven had additional qualifications in pedagogy or school library knowledge. Three had worked for over 20 years, and the librarians with the shortest seniority had worked 1.5 years and six months, respectively.

Preliminary Findings & Discussion

Organizational placement

Who school librarians report to might give an idea of to the extent to which the school leaders prioritize the school library, but also from where they receive information, and whether the librarians are in a position to engage in the infrastructure for learning. Six of the informants reported to the top management (two to the headteacher, and four to the assistant headteacher), four reported to technical-administrative leaders such as the head of IT or the pedagogical department, and two were organized together with teachers in different subject sections.

The two librarians who reported directly to their headteacher reported that they experienced immediate access to decision-making, like I-12: "If I intend to make a slightly bigger purchase or require something else, all I need to do is approach the headteacher, and I'll promptly receive the necessary clarification." Although she found the freedom to run the library inspiring, she also felt frustrated because the headteacher left decisions to her. She cited the headteacher: "I know nothing about the library; you do. You run the show." But headteachers are busy, so "it can also result in somewhat mediocre follow-ups due to her [headteacher's] busy schedule" [I-2].

However, there was no clear feedback from the six who reported to the top leader that they were better off than others. Some of the informants experienced interest from headteachers who actively supported the library and were proud of the library service – regardless of whether they reported to the headteacher or not. And many of the informants perceived a headteacher or assistant headteacher who expressed high trust in how the librarians managed the school libraries' resources for the benefit of the school.

I-11 had just changed from reporting to the headteacher to the head of a subject section, and confirmed the freedom of running the library, but also a certain lack of leadership: “There's no one leading me, and no one seems to care, or there's no one who really tells me what I should do. So, it's very free.”

Several of the informants said that they had to fight to get attention from the headteacher, and some even had headteachers who avoided or opposed them. A few mentioned a management that almost undermined the librarian, such as reducing the budget for purchases without negotiation, and so on. None of the librarians reported that the headteacher required their educational staff to collaborate with the school librarian to fulfill the intention of the regulations in the Education Act.

Four of the informants were organized in departments between the top management and subject sections, for example leader of an IT department, pedagogical leader or leader of administrative staff. Those informants discussed the pro and cons of being organized in these departments:

I'm used to having a significant degree of autonomy, but it's actually my manager who takes the initiative to arrange events like this writing day. So, in that sense, it's probably the right place to be, I think. Because if I had been under Norwegian, it would perhaps have been a bit wrong and, because I have other subjects and, in a way, I am a multi-person. [I-9]

Although I-9 appreciated collaborating with her leader in a writing project for students she felt left alone: “I miss a certain enthusiasm from all managers and the headteacher, not least.”

Being organized with the teachers in the Norwegian language or science department, for example, provided unique access to information about activities and yearly plans within this section, but also activities which concerned the entire school. Besides one informant, who was never invited to meetings in her department, librarians who were organized in this way reported having very good collaboration with teachers within the section. However, it turned out that this might also hinder collaboration with other sections. They missed out on opportunities to collaborate with, for example, the science and social science sections, where we know the librarian should have a central role in information literacy teaching.

I-3 reported to the assistant headteacher. However, she and her colleague were additionally associated with two different subject sections. They were happy with this, but

also saw it as a disadvantage that hindered collaboration with other sections. A few years before, she emphasized the significance of being formally placed under the headteacher's authority. However, she later had a change of mind and decided that the formal aspect was less crucial:

Gradually, I have moderated myself and see that it can also depend on the person to whom you report. It can work just as well to report to the assistant headteacher, who is more involved in the administrative aspects. However, it doesn't matter as long as we are closely connected to the educational side; that's how it is with us.

Another informant confirmed this and said one should not be so concerned about the formal hierarchy because there was still an opportunity to be heard. I-10 discusses the challenges of positioning the library on the organizational chart.:

It is difficult to place us somewhere because we collaborate with everyone. Placing us solely under one department, whether it's social studies or the Norwegian language department, wouldn't be right either. We're here to assist and support everyone, not just a single department.

Inclusion in formal plans

None of the informants experienced that collaboration with the educational staff was outlined in the schools' strategic documents. Only I-12 told me that the phrase "The library can be actively used in the education at the school" was included in her school's strategic document. But "when it's not followed up, it won't be very valuable," she said.

Two librarians told me that the library's task linked to reading and information literacy was mentioned in subject-specific plans. However, most of the informants were unsure of how formalized their teaching activities were. On further reflection it turned out that collaboration in teaching activities was something they had agreed on with individual teachers and not formalized in written plans. So most of the informants were pragmatic regarding inclusion in the school's formal plans, like I-2:

I haven't seen the need [for formal agreements or plans] as being very significant, probably because things are still running smoothly anyway [...] the lack of plans doesn't prevent us from being present in almost all classes.

Although I-10 was unsure whether she needed formalized plans, she thought it: “would have been easier if the teaching had been formalized. Then you would have ensured progression – and that all students get the same.”

I-8 said her school's headteacher was surprised to find that not all students in their grade had received instruction in the reference tool, APA, as planned in the curriculum. However, the librarian did not know about this, and only a few teachers invited her to teach APA.

Most of my informants had extensive experience and had built good relationships with different teachers and groups. They felt that the collaboration was “strolling along”. Inclusion in formal plans might also be challenging, because librarians are often alone, or in larger schools two together, as I-10 reflected on:

And the problem is that if all the teachers took advantage of the opportunity, there wouldn't be enough capacity. So, it becomes a bit of a difficult situation, and that's probably what holds us back a bit, that if we were to go for a formalized collaboration, very few would actually be offered the opportunity. There are only two of us, and we have a lot of additional tasks.

Meetings

Regardless of where the librarian is placed in the organization, they all participated in meetings in their own sections. They were all invited to joint professional development seminars, where some of them had speaking slots where they could promote library services. However, at these meetings the librarian might feel left out, and their somewhat ambiguous position in the school became very apparent. “Who should I sit with during group work [in these joint meetings]?” as one of them asked. The level of interest in participating in regular meetings varied among librarians – two attended everything, while others were more selective.

Many of the librarians were also engaged in project groups, like environmental teams at the school, or in trade union work. These are also important arenas for networking and collaboration later. Participation in such meetings and groups was based on the librarians' interests and skills, and, for example, the librarian with a master's in digital culture participated in a group that outlined a digital plan for the school.

Information channels and sources as substitutes for formal meeting places

The librarians did not experience leaders who requested reports and statistics on library activities or how resources were used. But some of the librarians made annual reports for their own interest.

Fortunately, school librarians had access to different information sources and channels such as lesson plans and digital platforms such as Teams. This made some of the work easier for the informants, since they had the opportunity to approach the teachers with more targeted requests and proposals for collaboration. Two were members of all Teams and read everything they came across. Others were more selective, focusing on areas where the utility was highest.

We have access to all the Teams rooms we want. We are part of the educational team; we participate in planning days – as long as there is something common. I usually keep an eye out and see if there is any group work or such things, and then I'll let them know that we should be part of that too – if I see it's relevant.
[I-6]

Informal meetings and networking

Librarians build networks, meet teachers and school leaders by the coffee machine, and join social events like pub crawls, hiking, exercise, book clubs, and more. Personal contact is important, and many of the informants talked about how librarians must be extroverted at work. "Library services are a commodity that we sell – in a way," I-1 told me.

One example of an important decision made at an informal meeting was a librarian who met the headteacher in the hallway. The headteacher learned about a terminated successful reading project for vocational students, and, based on this informal meeting, decided to continue the project.

Where to eat lunch was a hot topic for the informants. Some were unsure of how to prioritize: Building relationships with the teachers or being available to the students when they preferred to be in the library? A couple prioritized staying the library with students, whereas I-6 prioritized networking:

The most important thing I do is to go and have lunch [laughs] with teachers and management and talk to people. It's really important to catch up on things, you know. [I-6]

All informants have full-time positions and are well-educated school librarians. Gärden (2017) regards these as important factors in developing good library services. The informants worked in upper secondary schools with a school library. Giving students access to school libraries is a legally mandated service. A decision to have a library is a programmed decision based on policies and rules and is easier to fulfil than nonprogrammed decisions (Wilkinson-Jordan & Hussey, 2019). Decisions on whether the school library should have a qualified librarian, what the opening hours should be, and in what way the library should be included in the school's infrastructure for learning, are nonprogrammed decisions that are often based on the headteacher's own experience and interest (Wilkinson-Jordan & Hussey, 2019).

To collaborate, librarians must be in a position where they have access to information and negotiations about pedagogical issues, but also people. The informants were organized in different departments, which can be explained by Centerwall's (2022) claim that the librarian has an unclear role in the school. Reporting to the headteacher or top management is often regarded as a gold standard for school librarians and should ensure good access to decisions and information (Centerwall, 2022; Hussey, 2019). However, for my informants, being organized under the headteacher/assistant headteacher did not necessarily provide better access to the educational staff.

Supportive management is an important factor for successful collaboration (Montiel-Overall, 2008), but the informants' experience with their school management and leaders varied considerably. Regardless of where they were organized, some of the informants experienced headteachers who expressed great trust in how the librarians managed the school libraries' resources for the benefit of the school. Although the librarians valued the freedom, they had to manage their day-to-day work, and missed a leader who was interested in their professional work. Many of my informants expressed how their leader also left professional decisions to the librarian. Much research claims that headteachers and teachers have little knowledge of the library's tasks and the librarian's competence

(Centerwall, 2022; Eri & Pihl, 2017; Gross, 2022). This makes it easier to reduce budgets and make decisions without negotiations, as some the informants experienced. This lack of knowledge and engagement might prevent the headteacher from helping librarians to formalize collaboration and be a visible part of the infrastructure for learning (Centerwall & Nolin, 2019).

According to the requirements in the Education Act (1998), the school library should be “used actively in teaching”. Despite being a vague wording, I understand this as a programmed decision (Wilkinson-Jordan & Hussey, 2019). Only one informant confirmed that such statements were integrated in the school’s strategic documents, and another informant commented that APA instructions were included in a subject plan. However, these requirements were not activated or used for formalizing collaboration with teachers. Formal collaboration with teachers or school leaders is also considered an important factor for achieving improved learning outcomes (see for example Eri, 2018; Gärdén, 2017; Montiel-Overall, 2008; Montiel-Overall & Hernández, 2012). Although Eri (2018) claims that collaboration with teachers is necessary to fulfill the intention of the law, none of the informants reported that it was outlined in the schools’ formal plans. This represents a significant gap between the school owner’s intentions, documented by Rogde et al. (2020), and what my informants experienced. This might confirm the low priority given to school libraries in schools (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014; Fredwall, 2023).

Formal meetings are also an important arena for librarians to attend (Kammer et al., 2021) and two of the informants attended all the meetings they were allowed to join. However, most of the informants were selective and attended when they saw there were relevant subjects on the agenda.

Statistics and annual reports can be central, formal information on which managers can base their decisions (Wilkinson-Jordan & Hussey, 2019). In Norway, school libraries do not report any activities to the headteacher or school-owner (Svåsand, 2022), so that none of the librarians in my study formally reported activities to their leaders. Nor did the headteachers request any information from the school librarian to ensure that the intention of the law was fulfilled. This shows that there is a lack of a formal control mechanism to ensure which resources are allocated to the school library. Such a control mechanism could also make the library a visible part of the infrastructure for learning (Centerwall & Nolin, 2019).

Despite a lack of formal descriptions of collaboration in strategic documents, all librarians collaborated with some teachers in different subjects and engaged in reading, information literacy, and source criticism. According to Centerwall & Nolin (2019), they were included in the infrastructure for learning. However, collaboration was person-dependent and also dependent on the librarians' engagement and initiatives, as Eri (2018) and Montiel-Overall & Hernandez (2012) demonstrate. Being a school librarian, you need to be extroverted and sell the library as a commodity, according to one of the informants.

When the school's organizational structure only to a little degree helps librarians to actively support teaching and learning in schools, information channels and sources such as Teams and timetables are valuable tools for librarians to monitor and stay informed about what happens in school. By doing so, they could present teachers with more specific requests and collaboration proposals. Hussey & Velasquez (2019) describe how the informal communication between colleagues at the same level flows easier than vertical communication. The school librarians in my study spent a lot of energy on participating in both formal working groups and social activities to build networks and relationships, which is in line with what Rinio (2019) considers just as important as formal meeting places.

Finally, I want to address two dilemmas that clearly emerged during the interviews. The librarians have a strongly developed sense of fairness, as Eri and Pihl (2017) and Centerwall (2022) describe. One of the aims of formalizing collaboration is to ensure that all students receive instruction from the librarian. Many of the informants felt it was wrong to collaborate closely with one teacher, but not with another, which means that some students receive a lot of library instructions and services, and some nothing. However, even if it is stipulated as a requirement in the school's strategic or subject plans that librarians should teach and guide all classes and students, this is not possible in practice, because there would not be enough librarians to teach all students in schools. Besides a lack of formalized strategic plans for collaboration, this dilemma also highlights one element that may constrain formalized collaboration with teachers.

The second dilemma was whether they should participate in open meetings or eat lunch with teachers and other colleagues. Although these were considered important arenas for information exchange, network building, and promoting library services, and enabled

building networks with teachers (Centerwall & Nolin, 2019; Kammer et al., 2021), this was perceived as a dilemma by many of the informants as they had to leave the library at a time when their main users had the opportunity to visit the library.

Implications and Conclusions

The findings in this study identify both formal and informal structures that constrain and enable collaboration between school librarians and teachers.

The interviews indicate that the librarians are pragmatic about where the ideal organizational placement for libraries lies. Their relationship with the teachers or top managers was not dependent on formal organizations. Despite some disadvantages, being organized together with teachers is considered very positive and seems to include the librarians more strongly in the learning infrastructure and the professional learning community than in other types of organization.

Allocation of resources to the library is primarily a nonprogrammed decision and dependent on the school management's interests and engagements. This makes it very important that the librarian works to make the library visible as a central element of the school's learning infrastructure.

As can be seen, neither the Education Act, nor the National Curriculum or local plans strengthen the librarians' role in schools or help librarians to ensure collaboration with teachers. However, the informants were pragmatic about how important collaboration embedded in strategic documents was. Teaching activities do not seem to depend on formal collaboration, but to a great extent depend on the librarians' own initiative. They perform their everyday tasks, and are busy with teaching, guiding, and building a good learning arena for the students. Information channels and sources such as Teams and timetables enable school librarians to monitor school activities. They could thus more purposefully make proposals for collaborative projects.

Collaboration seems to be person-dependent and based on familiarity and friendship among leaders, teachers, and librarians. All informants participated in project groups or social activities in schools, which gave them access to information, but also inspiration. This shows

how important informal networking is. I am not sure that formal requirements would help them, due to the possible “collaboration overload” that many of the informants experienced from time to time. However, formal legislation and regulations may legitimize the resources devoted to library services and could reduce the risk that decisions are based on school leaders’ own engagement and priorities.

References

- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods* (5th ed.). University Press.
- Carlsten, T. C., & Sjaastad, J. (2014). *Evaluering av Program for skolebibliotekutvikling 2009-2013 [Evaluation of the Program for School Library Development 2009-2013]*. NIFU. <http://hdl.handle.net/11250/280077>

- Centerwall, U. (2022). *Att ta plats och göra skillnad: Skolbibliotekariepraktiker i framgångsrika verksamheter [Claiming Space and Making a Difference: a Study of the School Librarian Practices that Enable Successful School Libraries]* [Doctoral thesis, University of Borås]. <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:hb:diva-27634>
- Centerwall, U., & Nolin, J. (2019). Using an Infrastructure Perspective to Conceptualise the Visibility of School Libraries in Sweden. *Information Research: An International Electronic Journal*, 24(3). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1229380>
- Education Act. (1998). *Act Relating to Primary and Secondary Education and Training*. Lovdata. <https://lovdata.no/NLE/lov/1998-07-17-61>
- Eri, T. (2018). *Teacher and Librarian Partnerships in Literacy Education: Contradictions, Barriers and Opportunities* [Doctoral thesis, University of Oslo]. <https://www.duo.uio.no/handle/10852/65466>
- Eri, T., & Pihl, J. (2017). The challenge of sustaining change: Contradictions within the development of teacher and librarian collaboration. *Educational Action Research*, 25(2), 239–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2016.1147366>
- Fredwall, I. E. (2023). Skolebibliotekets betydning i fagfornyelsen [The School Library in the Curriculum Renewal]. In I. Bøyum & Å. K. Tveit (Eds.), *Rom for lesing og utforskning: Skolebibliotekets muligheter [Space for Reading and Exploration]* (pp. 39-59). ABM Media.
- Gärdén, C. (2017). *Skolbibliotekets roll för elevers lärande: En forsknings-och kunskapsöversikt år 2010-2015 [The Role of the School Library for Students' Learning: a Research and Knowledge Overview 2010-2015]*. Kungliga biblioteket.
- Gross, E. A. (2022, July 11). It Doesn't Mean What You Think It Means: Perceptions of the School Librarian and Their Work. *IASL Annual Conference Proceedings*. 25th International Forum on Research on School Librarianship, Colombia, South Carolina.
- Guribye, F., & Lindström, B. (2009). Infrastructures For Learning and Networked Tools: The Introduction of a New Tool in an Inter-Organisational Network. In L. Dirinck-Holmfeld, C. Jones, & B. Lindström (Eds.), *Analysing Networked Learning Practices in Higher Education and Continuing Professional Development* (pp. 103-115). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789460910074_007
- Hussey, L. K. (2019). Organizational Communication. In L. K. Hussey & D. L. Velasquez (Eds.), *Library Management 101: A Practical Guide* (pp. 93-102). American Library Association.
- Kammer, J., King, M., Donahay, A., & Koeberl, H. (2021). Strategies for Successful School Librarian and Teacher Collaboration. *School Library Research*, 24. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1292862>
- Montiel-Overall, P. (2008). Teacher and Librarian Collaboration: A Qualitative Study. *Library & Information Science Research*, 30(2), 145-155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2007.06.008>

- Montiel-Overall, P., & Hernandez, A. C. R. (2012). The Effect of Professional Development on Teacher and Librarian Collaboration: Preliminary Findings Using a Revised Instrument, TLC-III. *School Library Research*, 15. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ994326>
- Rimstad, S. L., Sagvaag, H., & Robertson, I. E. (2021). The Pub: An Expanded Office. A Qualitative Study on Norwegian Female Employees' Experiences with English Work-related Drinking Culture. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 0(0), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687637.2021.2010657>
- Rinio, D. (2019). Social Network Analysis for School Librarians to Evaluate and Improve Teacher Collaboration. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 25(1), 57-86. <https://doi.org/10.29173/slww8235>
- Rogde, K., Federici, R. A., Vika, K. S., Bergene, A. C., Pedersen, C., Denisova, E., & Wollscheid, S. (2020). Spørsmål til Skole-Norge [Questions regarding Norwegian Schools] (NIFU Report 2020:14). Nordisk institutt for studier av innovasjon, forskning og utdanning. <https://nifu.brage.unit.no/nifu-xmlui/handle/11250/2660412>
- Schultz-Jones, B., & Oberg, D. (Eds.). (2022). *Global Action for School Libraries: Models of Inquiry*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- Svåsand, M. P. (2022). Skolebibliotek uten statistikk [School Libraries without Statistics]. *Bok og Bibliotek*. <https://bokogbibliotek.no/nyheter/skolebibliotek-uten-statistikk-4885/>
- Wilkinson-Jordan, M., & Hussey, L. K. (2019). Decision Making. In L. K. Hussey & D. L. Velasquez (Eds.), *Library Management 101: A Practical Guide* (pp. 85–92). American Library Association.

Biography

Idunn Bøyum is an associate professor at [Department of Archivists, Library and Information Science](#) at Oslo Metropolitan University (Norway). Her research is related to information literacy, information practice and collaboration in higher education and upper secondary schools.

Special Notes:

Some findings from the study are also published in Norwegian by: Bøyum, I. (2023). Samarbeid mellom skolebibliotekar og lærer: Formelt eller uformelt? [Collaboration between school librarian and teacher: Formal or informal?]. In I. Bøyum & Å. K. Tveit (Eds.), *Rom for lesing og utforsking: Skolebibliotekets muligheter* [Space for Reading and Exploration: The possibilities of the school library] (pp. 99-124). ABM Media