

Journal of Information Literacy

ISSN 1750-5968

Volume 17 Issue 2

December 2023

Editorial

Hicks, A. 2023. Stay in our lane? No, thanks! *Journal of Information Literacy*, 17(2), pp. 1–3.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11645/17.2.551>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Copyright for the article content resides with the authors, and copyright for the publication layout resides with the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, Information Literacy Group. These Copyright holders have agreed that this article should be available on Open Access and licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike licence.

"By 'open access' to this literature, we mean its free availability on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. The only constraint on reproduction and distribution, and the only role for copyright in this domain, should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited."

Chan, L. et al. 2002. Budapest Open Access Initiative. New York: Open Society Institute. Available at: <http://www.soros.org/openaccess/read.shtml> [Accessed: 18 November 2015]

Stay in our lane? No, thanks!

For the first time in a while, we have an eclectic mix of articles and project reports in this issue of JIL—ranging from art to health, and from Zurkowski to Artificial Intelligence. It's brilliant to see the field (not a discipline, sorry!) continue to develop in new directions as well as picking up on and challenging existing theoretical narratives, which is what we have always been about at JIL. As information literacy (IL) nears its 50th anniversary (more on that in JIL next year), it feels like we are entering a far more mature stage of our existence, one in which researchers and practitioners feel more confident in trying new approaches. Anniversaries are often when we might be tempted to focus on the past or to revisit old arguments, but I hope that these forthcoming celebrations provide an opportunity to continue pushing forwards, too, and to recognise the strides that we have made in more recent years.

I was reminded of this at a recent conference when I found myself to be on the receiving end of questions that appeared to, sigh, challenge the entire premise and scope of IL. I was surprised, not least because the last time I checked it wasn't 1985 again, but also because of the hostility that seemed to accompany these queries. It felt like one of the strongest warnings that I have encountered yet that we need to Stay in Our Lane or avoid encroaching on and introducing our ideas into other people's territory. I am all about critique, and I do maintain a long list of issues that continue to bug me about IL. However, completely sweeping the concept off the table seems dramatic, to say the least, as well as ignorant of the very many theoretical, empirical and methodological developments that have happened since our field first started to show its head.

When I've come across arguments challenging the point of IL in the past, I've often wondered where the aggression comes from—is it the focus on learning that people fear? With its sage on the stage model, academia has not traditionally been known for its interest in (or skill related to) teaching, and I wonder if IL has been seen as some sort of Trojan Horse, poised to take the field of LIS in new (and challenging) directions. Or is the antagonism linked to some sort of enduring snobbishness about IL's practical focus, which seems to make it somehow unworthy of academic attention? To which I would reply that people need to get over themselves; LIS is a vocational, praxis-focused area of study and I see this as an underexplored strength to celebrate rather than a shameful secret to hide. It is also interesting to think about the ongoing resentment of IL in light of Andrew Dillon's ASIST Award of Merit acceptance speech, in which he warned that the broader discipline of Information Studies/Science was in danger of becoming Computer Science-lite. At least IL maintains a strong informative focus, something that, as a quick browse of a conference programme will tell you, is not always the case within our wider parent field.

Considerable focus has been paid to establishing IL within the wider social consciousness within recent years, particularly given political and governmental impetus. It is disappointing, therefore, to learn that our very intellectual home may not always have our back either. However, I am also heartened to think that if we are annoying people, we must be doing something right. To this end, I encourage every IL researcher, practitioner, and stakeholder out there to continue to be bold, to interrogate, to challenge and to purposefully and consciously try to break out of our lane. JIL has your back, and we look forward to publishing research and practice that isn't afraid to engage with the status quo for volumes and issues to come, too.

Closer to home, this issue marks a long-awaited development at JIL, which is that our back issues are, err, back! While we transitioned to our shiny new hosting platform just in time for the June 2023 issue, we ran into a few more problems with the archives and it wasn't possible to port them over at the same time. After a lot of hard work from our hosting provider, Edinburgh Diamond, and Managing Editor, Meg Westbury, we are back in business, so please get downloading. All your old favourites from the early days are there as well as more recent volumes so, please, do have a browse.

And now on to the content of the final issue of 2023.

Our first mini theme within this issue is formed of work that continues to challenge the importance of context, and how IL is shaped by the cultural, social, and historical practices of particular communities. A growing IL theme since the 2010s, the papers in this issue push at the boundaries of context by continuing to challenge what we think we understand by effective information practice.

First up is a hugely important article by Sandra Littletree, Nicola Andrews, and Jessie Loyer, which explores, sets out and defines how IL is understood from an Indigenous perspective. Drawing on findings from interviews with Indigenous librarians, this paper argues for the need to integrate Indigenous concepts of relationality, reciprocity, and respect into any consideration of source evaluation, research, and data analysis, amongst other terms. Highlighting how Indigenous IL must be understood as driven by the need to remain accountable to ancestors and lands, Littletree, Andrews and Loyer provide a vivid illustration of the need to think beyond merely delivering IL instruction. This paper was copyedited by new copyeditor, Nimisha Bhat.

A very different focus on context is found in the next article, which explores the work of emerging artists and how this group of recent graduates use information to navigate the transition from education to the workplace. Centring on the idea of failure, which the author, Maud Cooper, argues is a vital aspect of these artists' transition to professional practice, the paper draws upon interviews with artists to outline the challenges and opportunities of artistic work outside the confines of university, and the implications for the development of knowing. Ending with recommendations for art librarians interested in what lies beyond graduation, this paper extends thinking related to transition, while also bringing a much-needed focus on creative practice to workplace studies. This paper was copyedited by Amber Edwards.

From emerging artists, we move to Brazilian community democracy, which forms the topic of the third article in this December issue. Written by Peter Cruickshank and Bruce Ryan, the paper draws upon the SCONUL IL framework to explore the challenges that local representatives find in learning about the role that they play in participatory budgeting as well as how they balance local and governmental information needs. Based upon findings from a focus group held with community representatives in Sao Paulo, this paper links information use to citizen empowerment while recognising the challenges of timely information when working with governmental bodies. The paper ends with suggestions for improving the CILIP definition of IL, particularly related to the citizenship lens. This paper was copyedited by Andrea Brooks.

Margrethe Sovik and Kari Røykenes also draw upon a document that will be familiar to JIL readers in their exploration of IL instruction in a clinical practice setting. Seeking to explore how trainee nursing students worked on an evidence-based practice (EBP) IL assessment, the authors analysed student reflections on their assessment through the lens of Bloom's taxonomy to ascertain whether learners reached the desired for higher-levels of reasoning and reflection. Discovering mixed engagement, with some learners making strong connections between their research topic and their placements, they found that other students needed more support to develop the levels of reflexivity required for health practitioners. The paper ends by calling for a more overt integration of IL into EBP as well as outlining recommendations for the design of more responsive IL assessments for this context. This paper was copyedited by Harriet David.

Our final paper in this theme returns to the concept of transition, and more specifically, the experiences of First-Generation Students (FGS) as they start their undergraduate studies. Tracing students' journeys from high school to first year undergraduates, which is no mean methodological feat, the author, Leslin H. Charles, further draws on the concept of social capital to draw out how school libraries help to prepare students for further study. Centring on the

results of questionnaires with School Librarians as well as students themselves, the author argues that high school IL preparation supports the development of social capital that is needed to be successful in college. In further highlighting issues of inequity, in which certain FGS do not have access to school librarians or libraries, this paper also makes a strong case for increased programming and support for learners before they arrive on campus. This paper was copyedited by Batul Alsaraji.

The second mini theme within this issue relates to the role and professional development of teaching librarians, something that is easy to overlook in the push to embed more classes and sessions and librarians into our schedules. For Karolina Andersdotter, professional development is particularly important when it comes to Artificial Intelligence (AI), the acronym that is at the top of everyone's urgent figuring it out to-do list. In this paper, Andersdotter presents a learning circle approach, in which Swedish library professionals met regularly to discuss how they might address AI within their teaching and professional practice. Demonstrating the success of this approach, this paper also outlines key themes that may provide an interesting basis for discussion. This paper was copyedited by new copyeditor, Waseem Farooq.

For Annette Goodwin and Waseem Afzal, who are the authors of the final research paper of this issue, much work, however, remains to be done on outlining the role of teaching librarians, particularly in regional or rural universities. Employing semi-structured interviews to explore the perspectives of teaching librarians in rural Australia, this paper provides a nuanced overview of the barriers of trying to embed IL more completely into the higher education curriculum. The authors have also provided a model to help explain these issues, and which may help anyone looking to work more closely with institutional goals. This paper was copyedited by Kirsten McCormick.

Lastly, we are pleased to wrap up the issue with a project report from Andrew Shenton, who draws upon the work of Alvin Toffler to provide another challenge to 1974 and Paul Zurkowski's Statement as the origin of IL. Drawing on a close reading of *Future Shock*, Shenton explores whether Toffler's work may have done more to focus attention on the importance of paying attention to information. This project report was copyedited by Amber Edwards.