## Article

# 'Informed', 'active' and 'engaged'? Understanding and enacting information literacy from a UK citizenship perspective.

**Simon Paul Cloudesley, Library Assistant, Reader Services, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford. simon.cloudesley@bodleian.ox.ac.uk.**

## Abstract

Information literacy (IL) has been considered by Library and Information Studies (LIS) research and praxis to be vital in helping citizens be 'informed', 'active' and 'engaged' within society. LIS discourse has explored different conceptions of citizenship and its relationship with IL within the paradigm of liberal democratic societies. Critical IL approaches have in turn promoted a citizenship of personal agency, empowerment, challenging the status quo and the pursuit of social justice, as well as focusing on what has been termed 'political literacy'. However, critical information literacy has also problematised some of the approaches to citizenship found in LIS discourse. Despite the complexity of the subject, empirical study into these issues is still severely lacking. This research moves to start addressing this need by investigating how IL is understood and enacted from the perspective of UK citizenship. Using a qualitative approach of semi-structured interviews with five UK citizens based in Oxford, UK, in the summer of 2019, it set out to establish the relationship between IL and citizenship in a personal context. It was found to be understood and enacted through the development of socially-constructed *personal citizenship information landscapes*, oriented to a personal sense of citizenship, agency, motivation and empowerment. These personal landscapes challenge some of the established IL paradigms of 'informed', 'active' and 'engaged' citizens, as well as related concepts of information 'wealth' and 'poverty'. They also raise questions of the role of personal ethics in decision making as citizens and potential tensions with 'acceptable' norms. These findings help to further problematise the dynamic between IL and citizenship, and challenge LIS research and praxis not just to promote specific values and goals, but also to work towards a greater understanding of the personal contexts shaping that dynamic.

## Keywords

citizenship; democracy; information landscapes; information literacy

---

## 1. Introduction

Library and Information Studies (LIS) discourse and public policy from professional organisations frame the interaction between information literacy (IL) and citizenship within liberal democracies, where all individuals *de jure* have the right and freedom to act as autonomous individuals, achieving not only self-actualization but the ability to effect change on the societies in which they are citizens. Of course, as Francis Fukuyama (2018) has recently written, the opportunity and capacity for such development may not *de facto* exist equally among individuals for any number of reasons. In response, IL has been seen by the profession as vital in helping individuals to fulfil their potential and support the health of the democracies in which they live, through active and engaged participation.

In 1989, The American Library Association (ALA) was influential in outlining the vision of an 'information literate' citizenry. It was one of engagement and participation, of seizing opportunities, especially in the civic and democratic sphere, stating that 'to say that information

literacy is crucial to effective citizenship is simply to say it is central to the practice of democracy' (ALA, 1989, section 5).

Since then, LIS research and public policy have abounded with references to 'informed', 'engaged' and 'active' citizens—either separately or in combination. These terms are often vaguely defined; however, it is clear that 'citizenship' from an IL perspective is centred on the potential and expectation for citizens to act as agents within democratic societies. Within the last twenty years this IL perspective on citizenship has developed as IL theory and praxis have evolved more complex understandings of the information world, especially with the development of critical and radical approaches. In light of global political and social upheavals in the last decade, especially in Western democracies, mediated by the expansion and democratisation of the information world through the internet and social media, IL research and public policy have increasingly focused on the political and civic engagement of citizens, to the extent that IL is being seen by some explicitly as the 'political literacy' of citizens (Buschman, 2019). A recent edited volume on the subject 'deliberately seeks to situate information literacy in the political realm and to demonstrate the political implications of information literacy' (Goldstein, 2020, xxv). On the other hand, some still maintain that neither IL nor citizenship is just about the political and democratic life; rather IL is a path to empowerment and engaged citizenship in *all* areas of life (CILIP, 2018).

This discourse can be greatly informed by delineating definitions and concepts of citizenship as found in political science. In his classic text *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age* (2004), Barber advocates for a citizenship that 'serves to transform interests and to reorient identity'; democracy, in turn, requires 'a form of political consciousness that will enlarge the understandings and sympathies of interest-motivated individuals' and transform them into community-bound citizens (p. 173).

Others have highlighted important distinctions and nuances within citizenship. Kelly (1979) recognises that citizenship can encompass a range of attitudes, from civic-minded active participation and obligation, to the passive expectation of rights and non-political engagement with society. The 'pluralist citizen', as Kelly describes them, may have multiple loyalties and interests, some of which may be non-political and some which may bring them into conflict with the state. Schattle (2018) contrasts the legal definition of citizenship, which bestows rights, protections and obligations within a jurisdiction, with further 'voluntary' aspects, which involve ideas of participation, empowerment, belonging and identity. Within the emerging concept of 'global citizenship' there has developed both a moral-based, 'civic republican' vision (emphasising global awareness, responsibility and participation) and a competency-based, 'libertarian' vision (emphasising global mobility and competitiveness, without a strong sense of community or solidarity). These two visons of citizenship are by no means mutually exclusive, but can often coexist and interact within the outlook of the citizen (Schattle 2005; 2008).

IL discourse, both in theory and practice, has interacted with many, if not all, of these different aspects of modern-day citizenship as identified within political science. It is essential for research to understand that concepts of citizenship are complex and nuanced; the implications being that information literate citizens will see themselves and their roles within society in different ways. However, empirical studies into the dynamic between IL and citizenship are often lacking. The importance of IL to citizenship in the contemporary context, and the recognition of the complex connection between them, demonstrates a powerful need for more empirical study to further delineate that relationship.

This study aims to make a step in this direction by posing the question: *How is IL understood and enacted from the perspective of UK citizenship?* It will explore UK citizens' conception(s) of citizenship and how these same citizens engage with information in relation to these personal conceptions, with IL being broadly defined as how people find and use information in their daily lives. The research took place in the summer of 2019, as the UK was in the process of negotiating its departure from the European Union. This provided a timely context within which to explore these themes as the country's political, civic and social landscapes were—and continue to be—in a state of flux, with citizens (re)visiting ideas surrounding identity, citizenship and democratic participation. Empirical investigation can help us understand how IL is being employed by individuals to help with their navigation through these issues in their personal lives and within their communities. It can help highlight and inform future developments in research and praxis, as well as validate or disrupt current discourse. Recent political events in the United States surrounding the contested results of the 2020 Presidential Election and the subsequent civil unrest in Washington D.C. have emphasised more acutely than ever the interaction between information and personal understandings of what it means to be an 'informed', 'active' and 'engaged' citizen. Research into the dynamic between IL and citizenship is more important now than ever.

## 2. Literature Review

By exploring the different trends within LIS research and organisational public policy regarding IL and citizenship, it is possible to situate this discourse within contemporary definitions of citizenship from political science. As will be seen, the relationship between IL and citizenship (and, in relation, the functioning of democracy) has been increasingly examined from a critical perspective and problematised. As a result, LIS research has opened up avenues for more nuanced and complex discussion regarding these issues.

As already noted, the public policy statements of The American Library Association (ALA, 1989) and The Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP, 2018) have expressed the belief in a vital link between IL and citizenship, with its role in shaping an informed and engaged citizenry. These statements, past and present, highlight the ongoing importance of this issue to professional bodies over the last thirty years, leading to policies that guide much institutional practice both domestically and abroad, and seek to influence the policies of other related organisations, including governments. The contemporary goal of 'engaged citizens, able to play a full part in democratic life and society' and who are enabled to 'reach and express informed views' about the world around them (CILIP, 2018, pp. 4, 3) connect with contemporary political and social concerns, as well as sharing in Barber's (2004) vision of participatory democracy: IL can be seen as a way of developing the engaged political 'talk' that helps reorient the citizen toward the public good.

International bodies have expressed the relationship between IL and citizenship in similar terms. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation highlights the importance of IL in tackling 'inequities' and 'promoting tolerance and mutual understanding through information', even considering IL as 'part of the basic human right of lifelong learning' (UNESCO, 2003, paras. 4, 3). The International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA, 2005; 2012) has further developed these ideas by highlighting the potential of attainment and competitive advantage for individuals, communities and nations within a global environment of opportunity, as well as the development of open, pluralistic societies.

These organisations advocate for citizens who are tolerant, liberal, civic-minded and engaged, and economically capable and competitive, situating the individual within communities that are both local and global. This enterprise of developing both social and human capital as citizens combines elements of 'communal and consensual' participatory democracies at a national level (Barber, 2004), as well as the liberal multicultural and neoliberal economic concerns of global citizenship (Schattle, 2005; 2008). However, the 'scaling up' of IL and citizenship policy to a global context only serves to highlight aspiration and idealism. Such hopes may risk overlooking the wide social and economic inequities across the globe, the political diversity of nations and wide-ranging disparity in human rights and agency, failing to recognise as a result that the dynamic between IL and citizenship may in reality look very different from place to place, with limited scope for change or development. With this global vision also comes the tension between citizenship 'power' and influence (and indeed governmental power and influence) that is confined to the legal framework of individual nation states, and contemporary issues and forces that are global in nature and often outside of local control (Schattle, 2018).

LIS research on IL has aligned in many ways with the content of these policy statements, focusing on the 'voluntary' aspects of citizenship, as outlined by Schattle (2018). It has also tried to articulate a supporting praxis, such as Correia (2002), who examined within a framework of citizenship rights and responsibilities how IL can, in practical ways, support engagement in communal civic life, and the supporting role played by libraries and other educational institutions.

However, LIS conceptions of IL and citizenship have evolved beyond ideas of specific rights, obligations and 'competencies', to a more complex sense of 'informed', 'active' and 'engaged' citizens. Underpinning this change is the shift within IL research and praxis away from a behaviourist model of IL 'standards' to the development of critical literacy (Tewell, 2015; Thornton, 2012). From critiquing the skills-based, functionalist approach, with its sense of knowledge deficit (Jacobs, 2008; Jacobs & Berg, 2011; Kapitzke, 2003), research has moved towards understanding and engaging with socially constructed and enacted information landscapes (Lloyd, 2005; 2006; 2012), as well as critical reflection on information structures and production, incorporating critical theory and pedagogy (Elmborg, 2006). The critical and contextual-based approach to the information world, which 'acknowledges and emboldens the learner's agency in the educational process' and 'positions education as a catalyst for social justice' (Tewell, 2015, pp. 25-26), has brought a new focus to IL and citizenship by emphasising the personal agency of empowered citizens to challenge power structures within democratic societies and work actively towards a fairer society for all. Critical literacy, then, proposes a far more sophisticated view of citizenship beyond ideas of rights, obligations and competencies, neatly expressed by the conceptualisation of IL as a 'liberal art' as well as a technical one (Shapiro and Hughes, 1996).

Following the lead of UNESCO and IFLA, these emerging approaches demonstrate an expanded sense of 'active' and 'engaged' citizen, highlighting that twenty-first century citizenship requires building human and social capital in a global context (Gacel-Avila, 2005). In this way, as 'higher education is being re-conceptualised to prepare students to become productive global citizens' (Kutner & Armstrong, 2012, p. 31), IL is seen as playing a supporting role in raising levels of awareness and participation, as well as supporting the development of a global citizen identity (Stevens & Campbell, 2006). Information literate citizens who successfully engage in an increasingly globalised world and a competitive, technology-driven economy align with the dimensions of global citizenship described by Schattle (2005; 2008).

Along with the global dimension, the development of the political dimension—termed 'political literacy' (Buschman, 2019)—has been an important focus of IL and citizenship research. As Jacobs states: 'As a form of literacy, information literacy also operates within a socio-political context and is thus politically charged' (Jacobs, 2008, p. 258). Smith has also noted that IL, especially its critical form, can help 'meaningfully engage with the democratic social goals of LIS' through fostering 'political agency and increasing meaningful and active involvement in democratic processes' (Smith, 2013, p. 15). Subsequent studies focusing on the political participation of young people (Smith, 2016a; 2016b; Smith & McMenemy, 2016; 2017) are important for providing rare examples of empirical study that explore specific information needs and behaviours relating to citizenship. This research highlights work within communication studies (Loader et al., 2014a; 2014b; 2016) that has delineated the changing face of political and civic engagement, especially among young people, and challenges normative conceptions of citizenship which view individuals as 'inadequate.' This challenge is similarly developing within LIS discourse relating to concepts of information 'poverty' (as discussed below). Using a multidisciplinary approach, IL research is being informed by different perspectives of what it means to be an 'informed' and 'engaged' citizen, highlighting that traditional definitions and conceptions of citizenship are proving increasingly unhelpful for understanding citizens in contemporary society.

Elsewhere, the relationship between IL and citizenship as found in LIS discourse has been problematised, suggesting a more complex understanding of how information functions in democracy (Dervin, 1994) and questioning the connection between 'informed' and 'involved' citizens (Lievrouw, 1994). Building on this work, Buschman (2018; 2019) has emphasised the need for a better understanding of the workings of modern democracy, much of which takes place outside of formal politics and is centred instead on the 'democratic self-government' of community space, interaction and discourse. This connects once again to the insights gained from political science and communication studies that theorise community-bound citizenship (Barber, 2004) and explore democratic participation outside societal norms (Loader et al., 2014a; 2014b; 2016). In relation Buschman (2018) notes that libraries as physical spaces can promote democratic and liberal values, and foster inclusive conversation among citizens; by extension, IL can provide a similar intellectual space.

Through critical literacy and its awareness of hidden power structures in the information world, other problems have been identified within IL and citizenship discourse, notably the influence of neoliberalism as found within wider LIS research and praxis. Economic neoliberalism has been identified in the 'corporatization' of higher education and libraries (Buschman, 2017; Lawson et al., 2015), which has in turn focused IL discourse towards developing human capital rather than its social counterpart (Nicholson, 2014; Seale, 2013). As a result, some have criticised a conception of citizenship which is too focused on 'skilling for the workplace' (Stevens & Campbell, 2006, p. 538) and instead advocate for, especially in the post-financial crash era, 'information citizens' who do more than just 'contribute to generating economic growth' (Webber & Johnston, 2013, p. 25).

Neoliberal influence has also been identified within the information flow of social and political discourse, where citizens are treated as consumers, resulting in 'compromised democratic agency' (Buschman, 2016, p. 45; Lievrouw, 1994). In addition, IL discourse often assumes and reinforces neoliberal conceptions of democracy and citizenship, premised on the obligations of citizens to inform themselves in order to make 'right' choices and behave 'correctly' (Eckerdal, 2017; Elmborg, 2010;). As a challenge, Eckerdal (2017) proposes an alternative model based on *agonistic pluralism*, which recognises the need for pluralism and conflict at the heart of

democratic society, and where critical IL enables citizens to challenge the status quo, engage in legitimate adversarial debate and dialogue and act for the common good. Once again, these ideas promote the 'common and consensual' political talk as theorised by Barber (2004).

Finally, IL and citizenship discourse has touched on concepts of information 'wealth' and 'poverty'. The importance of information wealth and lifelong learning for social, civic and political engagement, and the overall health of democratic society, have been recognised and described (Griffin, 1999; Jones & Symon, 2001). By contrast, information poverty can be seen to lead to social exclusion and disengagement, the opposite of 'informed' and 'engaged' citizens (Lloyd et al., 2010; Murdock & Golding, 1989; Thompson, 2007); indeed, 'those who do not engage are seen as inactive citizens and problematic … By not engaging they are immediately at a disadvantage as learners as well as citizens' (Antonesa, 2007, p. 29). However, critical approaches to the nature of literacy itself, and concepts of information wealth and poverty, have questioned the power dynamics behind these definitions, even positing that 'illiteracy' can be seen as an act of resistance as groups 'consciously or unconsciously refuse to learn the specific cultural codes and competencies authorised by the dominant culture's view of literacy' (Giroux, 1988, p. 67). Gibson and Martin (2019) in a recent ethnographic study have problematised the deficit approach to information poverty and argue that it is the 'uncritical assumptions about the superiority of institutionally sanctioned information values' (p. 478)—including those of LIS—that are the source of the problem rather than the individual. As examples, Hackett (2018) has identified a tendency in public discourse to simplistically equate IL with digital access, especially digital access to government information; and Hicks and Lloyd (2016) have shown how normative values of literacy and information wealth can also manifest themselves as a form of cultural imperialism when applied across cultural boundaries. Such approaches cut both ways: defining people as 'illiterate' or 'uninformed' when they are not, and vice versa. These ideas are important to IL and citizenship research, inviting critical reassessment of the concept of an 'informed' citizen.

Reviewing the literature has demonstrated the deeply held view that IL has the potential to help citizens become informed and engaged with democratic society in a way that promotes values of democracy, diversity, tolerance and social justice. Such views have developed most strongly within the critical IL paradigm of personal agency and empowerment. IL is perceived in terms of developing both the human and social capital of individuals in order to be socially included and successful in an increasingly globalised world. However, critical approaches have highlighted the complex relationship between IL, citizenship and democracy, and have uncovered and challenged the power dynamics and unexamined assumptions within some elements of research and praxis. Such complexity only serves to make IL and citizenship more in need of further study—and the more engaging for it.

Despite this, there has been a noticeable lack of empirical study of IL as enacted in everyday settings relating to citizenship, as are approaches that seek out the voices of citizens in understanding contemporary citizenship and its relationship to IL. As Jeff Lilburn has best expressed it: 'LIS champions the development of informed citizens, or of global citizens, but little consideration is given to what an informed citizen might actually aspire to do, change or contribute' (2013, p. 63). Instead of solely promoting a particular kind of citizen ethic, empirical study will help LIS scholars and practitioners make firmer connections between IL and citizenship, aiding the evaluation of current approaches and potentially helping to develop IL practice that can be more meaningful for the individual. It can help find fuller answers to the question: what *does* an informed citizen actually aspire to do?

# 3. Methodology

The research took a qualitative approach through the use of semi-structured interviews to allow a proper exploration of and reflection on the ideas and experiences of the participants, recognising that reality is socially constructed by the individual and that knowledge and meaning are co-constructed by the researcher and participant during the interview process (Brinkman, 2014; Pickard et al., 2013). An interview guide was developed consisting of general questions asked of all the participants. These covered the issues considered most relevant to the research question, while still allowing the flexibility to explore answers in more detail with follow-up dialogue (Luo & Wildemuth, 2017; Pickard et al., 2013):

a) **Citizenship:** Defining personal conceptions of citizenship and personal citizenship 'goals';

b) **Information needs and behaviour:** How information is being used in a citizenship context to explore personal ideas of citizenship and meet personal citizenship goals;

c) **Information wealth and poverty:** What enables and constrains interaction with information within a personal citizenship context and whether information needs are being met;

d) **Information and identity:** How information has interacted with citizen identity and conceptions of citizenship over time.

The interview guide also made use of *timeline interviewing* and *critical incident technique* (Luo & Wildemuth, 2017), asking participants to identify and recall both discrete incidents and processes over time. A *constant comparison method* was also used in which interview questions were adjusted between interviews, and emerging themes presented to the next interviewee so that they could position themselves in relation to those themes. The recorded interviews were manually transcribed and coded through an *open coding* technique in which key words or concepts were identified, recognising that the coding process can be seen as 'the product of deliberate interpretation by the researcher(s)' (Bryant, 2014, p. 124; Charmaz, 2006). The coding across all five interviews was then condensed into twenty codes and grouped into major themes, which provided the basis for the following discussion.

This study involved recruiting and interviewing five UK citizens in Oxford, UK, centred on the Oxford Brookes University Library, an academic library open to the public and an important social hub within the local community. Five participants were found through a combination of recruitment posters, information flyers and volunteer recommendations:

|  | Age | Gender | Occupation |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Participant A** | 54 | F | Student |
| **Participant B** | 32 | F | Librarian |
| **Participant C** | 50 | F | Librarian |
| **Participant D** | 62 | F | Librarian |
| **Participant E** | 50 | M | Retail/Self-employed entertainer |

The sample for this study was highly limited in its sample size; and in terms of transferability, it is recognised that the data collected is not representative and is tied to context, as indicated by the focus on Oxford and by the similar demographics and professional backgrounds of most of the participants. However, being *'time- and context-bound'* (Pickard et al., 2013, p. 12), it

provides a valuable snapshot of lived scenarios and experiences which can elucidate avenues for more detailed and comprehensive further study. As seen above, critical approaches have demonstrated that IL is highly contextualised, with concepts of citizenship varied and changing in the twenty-first century. Although limited in scope, the approach taken by this study offers a powerful way to explore personal contexts, meanings and realities.

# 4. Findings

The following discussion will focus on the five main themes that emerged through the research coding: *ideas of citizenship; community; information bias and subjectivity; information management and disengagement*; and *information barriers.*

## 4.1 Ideas of citizenship

Citizenship was understood by participants to be a form of social construct that represented an outside 'system' requiring some level of engagement. The idea of being a 'good citizen' was seen as adherence to socially and culturally defined norms of behaviour, which carried certain expectations, obligations and responsibilities, such as obeying the law, voting and participating in work and the economy. It was also seen in some ways as providing a 'legal' structure which introduced protections and boundaries:

> 'For me citizenship means contributing to that social whole. So I don't think in terms of nationhood or belonging to this; I think in terms of a social contribution. I think to be a citizen you have to participate in some way … Citizenship is about participating in that society and proactively doing certain things to contribute to that society' (Participant B).

Although they acknowledged a 'system' with certain expectations of citizen behaviour, all the participants questioned in different ways the concept of citizenship within the United Kingdom as they personally experience it. Firstly, even the terminology of 'citizenship' or 'citizen' was problematic for some, either because they felt they did not fully understand the legal definition, or they were terms without personal resonance. Secondly, the idea of social and cultural norms of expected behaviour led to various expressions of a conformity-nonconformity paradigm, such as questioning the expectation to work, resisting the 'pressure' to vote, or 'bend[ing] the notion of being a good citizen' (Participant B) by considering some expectations (including obeying some laws) as being more important than others:

> 'So we talk a lot about society as well as opposed to citizens. So you have to do things like uphold the law and be law-abiding or whatever. But it doesn't mean to me any specific set of behaviours … So being a citizen doesn't mean that you have to vote, or you have to have a job, or you have to do whatever' (Participant C).

Within these understandings of citizenship, information was seen as playing a mixed role in supporting decisions regarding engagement or conflict; but was also seen as peripheral in other situations:

> 'If I felt that there was a conflict and I was going to have to make a decision that wasn't going to be the mainstream … or wasn't going to be acceptable or wasn't going to be legal … then I guess the more information I could get around that situation and that idea then the more confident I would feel about my decision or my place' (Participant A).

## 4.2 Community

Personal conceptions of citizenship and citizenship goals were expressed most strongly through the paradigm of community. Acting within a wider social space, citizenship was described as a community-bound phenomenon, located on a continuum which ranged from a passive sense of 'belonging' to a community (or communities), to more active engagement through political, social and cultural participation. Participants desired to interact with the community in a responsible way by promoting tolerance and respect in various contexts:

> 'I'm thinking that maybe there is a much more lighter side to [citizenship] whereas in your everyday life there is this feeling of being a good citizen—although I wouldn't phrase it like that—you'd be doing things, for example, you go litter picking, or you see someone fall over and you go and help them … So I think that there is a lighter way in which you work with citizenship, the very fact that you acknowledge other people as human beings…' (Participant D).

Personal citizenship goals included fostering everyday community-bound social interactions, as well as specific activities, such as volunteering and supporting charities, local events and businesses. The important of environmental awareness and recycling was also a common focus. Despite the 'boundaries' of legally-defined citizenship, personal citizenship sometimes transcended such legal or geographical communities to encompass ideas of 'global citizenship' or 'citizen of the world.' A more humanitarian approach to citizenship, this was focused on people and not country.

Although constructed norms of behaviour were challenged, a strong conception of citizen engagement was described, motivated and directed by a *personal* or *moral* sense of responsibility and obligation. This manifested itself in different participatory ways, whether social, cultural or political. However, all avenues of expression were governed by a belief that citizens should be trying to make their society a better place:

> 'I'm a very grateful individual, so I feel that I have to contribute—well I don't have to, I *want* to contribute something to that … I think that being political shouldn't be obligatory, but I do think you should be an active citizen' (Participant E).

The community-bound view of citizenship impacted greatly on the sources of information that were emphasised. The internet, social media and print and broadcast news were all mentioned as ways in which individuals as citizens informed themselves. However, the centrality of social interactions and the community-based nature of many citizenship activities placed a high value on socially-embodied information sources and information exchange. Talking to others within professional or social contexts, exchanging and disseminating information within the community, and information seeking on behalf of others, were all considered essential in pursuing personal citizenship goals of building community and solidarity.

## 4.3 Information bias and subjectivity

Bias and subjectivity were identified as major forces that shaped the information landscape and affected participants' lives as citizens. They were seen as sources of frustration or distraction that disrupted a personal sense of community and solidarity with others. Participants recognised not only the biases and subjectivity in the world around them, but also those within themselves and how this affected their relationship to information. Mis/disinformation on the internet, media

bias (especially within newspapers) and the polarisation of social media were highlighted, as well as the positive spins or emotional glosses often placed on information:

> 'It's pointless going onto Twitter because you'll get people who disagree, violently disagree and you think, well, I violently disagree with you. So it sets up a tension before you have even started … People think their opinions are right and there is no sense of compromise … it's a dirty word nowadays, but just listening; listening seems to have gone out of the window' (Participant C)

The polarisation and tribalism of social media and other sources of information were seen as working against participants' ideas of community and the fostering of positive social relations that were expressed as central to ideas of citizenship. The prominence of Brexit in public discourse, in particular, was seen as detrimental to engagement with information sources, as the highly divisive debate led to 'switching off' when encountering views from the opposing side—or even a switching off in general.

However, participants also recognised their own information 'bubble' as they aligned with information sources that agreed with their own worldview and ideas of citizenship. Emotion was also highlighted as a driving force, not only in making decisions and judgments (such as Brexit), but also in helping to preserve the personal 'bubble' by limiting the ability to be objective:

> 'If I discuss Brexit with people that I disagree with I find it very, very difficult because I just can't understand their mentality. But at the same time I feel it's very important to be liberal and to accept people hold different views. I just can't accept the logic behind it … The problem is my feelings get the better of my thoughts … I start to get frustrated, and there's probably not enough give in me to really try to understand that information … I don't necessarily listen properly … I'm too dismissive' (Participant B).

In relation, information seeking and use were described as sometimes guided by a need to justify decisions taken largely according to pre-existing personal values, such as which election candidate to vote for. In this way information 'success' was seen as finding enough information to feel validated.

Despite the difficulties of bias, polarisation and emotional responses, the value of seeking a range of views from various information sources was considered important to being informed citizens, particularly on political issues. 'Valid' information was seen as a way to potentially form or change personal views. Participants showed a range of responses from feeling that they needed to do more to hear differing views (even though they might struggle emotionally), to actively seeking challenges to their views or considering themselves 'happy' to be persuaded:

> 'I like actually to have challenging views coming back in, things that I don't necessarily agree with … I tend to be curious what people are saying. So I go in and make my own opinion … I try not to have a set view. I try and form [my own views] by as many opinions as possible. And I do like people who challenge and come up with other views' (Participant D).

## 4.4 Information management and disengagement

The participants described different practices in managing the information they interacted with in their lives. As seen, various levels of avoidance and disengagement came in reaction to bias

and subjectivity and its negative impact on a sense of community and solidarity. The qualitative nature of the information encountered or provided by others was also highlighted as an issue:

'So what I really believe is that every time the news comes on or there is a newspaper, that headline should be someone has died, or someone is being tortured, or somebody is hungry—that should be the headline every day on every paper until that stops. But it's not. But it should be. I know that … So because I know that I disengage completely with the news' (Participant E).

One participant felt strongly about the importance of managing information as a way of promoting mental wellbeing, and as such paid close attention to the information she was exposed to:

'There is so much information and I also have to kind of do a bit of sieving and a bit of trusting that if it's important it will jump out at me … You know, I'm really aware that we as human beings we do get drawn in really quickly; so I try and remain as conscious as possible so that I don't get caught up in it' (Participant A).

Another showed an even stronger strategy of managing information by disengaging from any kind of information that doesn't support his personal citizenship goals of pursuing hobbies and building relationships with others. Through general disengagement—what he termed 'unlearning'—he felt he was avoiding distractions, taking more control, allowing his instinct to flourish and was more empowered to make a difference as a citizen of his community. This connected to his wider uneasiness with 'authoritative stances' which tend to close down debate rather than leading to more questions:

'I'm at the point now where I almost feel that information is a distraction … and I think that is a purposeful distraction … You've gotta watch this! You gotta buy that! Didn't you know that? Don't you watch that? … It's almost self-simplification … and it's left me thinking you can do your own thing … I wouldn't want anyone to say I was ignorant; but I made myself ignorant. It's enforced ignorance. And by enforcing my own ignorance I feel I have achieved enlightenment' (Participant E).

## 4.5 Information barriers

Despite some of the challenges already outlined, participants often described showing persistence in seeking out information as it related to their personal citizenship goals, whether it was using a variety of resources to decide who to vote for, or seeking out a human contact when online information proved inadequate. However, different barriers were identified as hindering IL in a citizenship context. An underlying issue for some was a feeling of political disempowerment and scepticism of the democratic system, which affected how they interacted with information and with democracy as citizens:

'I'd quite like to be more active in a way … Sometimes I feel I am voicing that, feeling that you have got a voice. And yet when I look at the things which are going on in our government … and you just feel that you are not going to be getting anywhere' (Participant D).

Related to this was the sense of a system that was not easily or willingly providing all the information needed by citizens—or even deliberately withholding information. There was an expectation that others should do more to help inform and engage citizens:

> 'What I haven't done is be able to effectively chase down proper information about whether we need the amount of houses we need, where we need them … I still don't understand whether that is correct, where that information is coming from. So I am against [the houses] but perhaps I need to be better informed … So you just feel that you are just battling against people who are better informed' (Participant C).

On the other hand, it was felt that the public needed to be better at understanding information, to overcome the 'disconnect' between where information has come from and how it is presented. In this way, more systemic barriers concerning the actions of others engaged with personal responsibility and motivation:

> 'People who are interested are going to seek that information out; but if you are not interested then you will just rely on the stuff coming through the door … And people get distracted, quite rightly … you know we all work and we've got friends to see, and pubs to go to, and the cinema to go to. So you think well actually I'll do that instead of inform myself' (Participant C).

These findings show a variety of approaches to citizenship as expressed through the voices of the participants, all of which centred on a strong sense of community. They show citizens driven by a strong personal motivation of doing what was right for them. They also showed citizens being thoughtful and aware of the issues surrounding the meaning of citizenship what they felt was expected of them, and how, in return, they responded and why. In addition, the participants recognised the complexities and potential difficulties in the information world surrounding them and their relationship to it, and how this impacted on them as citizens. As a consequence, they actively developed strategies for navigating this environment. This complex picture immediately opens up spaces for exploration and discussion within the dynamic between IL and citizenship.

## 5. Discussion

This discussion will situate the themes that emerged in the findings into the wider body of current LIS IL and citizenship discourse, as well as conceptions of citizenship from political science. It will first give an overview of the information landscape of citizenship and then explore in more detail aspects of this landscape, helping to highlight areas of future development.

### 5.1 The information landscape of citizenship

IL has been conceptualised and promoted as a set of discrete, generic 'skills' that meet information needs, as well as a critical approach to the information world that emphasises personal agency to self-actualise through challenge and disruption. By extension, citizenship within LIS discourse has been viewed both as 'skills-based,' in which citizens inform themselves about their duties and obligations, and develop human capital to contribute and succeed economically, and as a critical approach that empowers citizens to engage, critique and challenge their societies, and work actively towards social justice. However, IL has also been conceptualised as the 'socialised activity' of engaging with information landscapes which are situated in and constructed by different socio-cultural contexts and are socially embodied and

enacted (Lloyd, 2005; 2006; 2012; Johnston & Webber, 2005). In this way, citizenship can be seen as an information landscape that is socially constructed and tied to context.

This study showed that citizenship was viewed as an outside socially-constructed information landscape with its own social and cultural norms; as a result participants described sometimes feeling a lack of connection or even conflict with what society 'expected' from them as citizens. This highlighted that conceptions of citizenship are nuanced and the potential problems that can arise with normative definitions. The participants desired to be agents; in response they described constructing their own *personal citizenship information landscapes* rooted in a sense of community, and expressed through the importance of socially-embodied information sources associated with their professional and personal connections with others. The passive and active engagement with information in an 'immersive' information world led to the development of personal citizenship identities and goals and related information needs. As the wider information landscape around them shifted, changed and developed, so too did their personal citizenship information landscape, as they sought to find their social location and relationship with a developing sense of 'citizenship'. Through finding their 'place' they described finding meaning and a sense of validation in the contribution they were making.

All socially and culturally constructed information landscapes carry with them inherent and accepted ways of knowing and doing. Likewise, these personal citizenship information landscapes carried with them certain expected norms. Tensions and conflict could occur upon interaction with other information landscapes, or the encountering of information barriers, that acted as disruptive elements. Conducting research with refugees, Lloyd (2017) has articulated the idea of 'fractured' information landscapes

> characterised by disjunction between the familiar and unfamiliar. Where people become disconnected from the normative and non-normative contexts and reference points … associated with their established communities, institutions, organisations and practices, their new experiences may be underscored by uncertainty. (p. 40)

Personal citizenship information landscapes were also seen to experience disruptive forces that 'fractured' the landscape and made it more difficult for participants to feel the sense of community that was so important to their idea of citizenship. As a result, they described personal responses to 'repair' or 'restore' that sense of community and connection. Different dimensions of these themes will now be discussed in more detail.

## 5.2 The 'personal' and the 'system'

Lilburn (2008; 2013) has articulated a choice in which IL can either promote informed and engaged citizens who maintain the societal status quo, or citizens who are empowered to challenge the very assumptions on which society is based. This study has shown the situation for the participants to be far more nuanced. They described not actively seeking to learn the citizenship information landscape of wider society as they perceived it; rather, they were motivated by their own sense of personal ethics, developing personal information landscapes rooted strongly in building community, everyday social interactions and commonality with others. These landscapes largely rejected neoliberal and libertarian citizenship concepts of human capital and competitiveness (Schattle, 2005; 2008) and ideas of 'right' behaviour, as often found in IL and citizenship discourse (Eckerdal, 2017; Elmborg, 2010; Stevens & Campbell, 2006; Webber & Johnson, 2013). Instead, they described developing what can be viewed as social capital citizenship that aligns with a community-bound citizenship, with

'democratic self-government' centred on the local community (Barber, 2004; Buschman, 2018; 2019).

Frequent tension emerged between the 'personal' and what was conceptualised as the expected norms of an outside 'system.' Fukuyama (2018) has noted this conflict between these inner and outer worlds:

> All human societies socialize their members to live by common rules … All societies have had rebellious teenagers and misfits who didn't want to accept those rules, but in the struggle, society almost always wins out by forcing inner selves to conform to external norms. (p. 35)

As participants described challenging the status quo, they may in fact have been 'socialised' more than they realised; still the *perception* of agency in shaping personal citizenship ideas and their associated information landscape can be considered an important motivating factor. Even decisions to 'conform' were seen by one participant as an active choice informed by practical considerations. The rejection of certain aspects of what was expected of a 'good citizen' shows a voluntary citizenship developed through choice (Schattle, 2015), even if some of their personal goals aligned with social and cultural norms—like a Venn Diagram of differing citizenship models. This is a citizenship based on personal motivation and guiding ethos rather than driven by socialised expectation, but which may contain elements both of maintaining and challenging the status quo. It is exactly this individuality that allowed the participants to gain a sense of empowerment through agency—and empowerment is a central objective of IL. Lilburn's (2008; 2013) IL dichotomy, therefore, is by no means clear cut.

Using agency in this way strongly follows the critical literacy approach to citizenship, as advocated by Lilburn and others, in that participants felt empowered to engage with, critique, reject or modify societal expectations, and follow a path most meaningful to them. However, there were also differences. Sentiments expressed like 'I question it but don't go further' or 'I know enough to be turned off', along with the effect of information 'bubbles', go against the promoted notion of 'critically' informed citizens. Similarly, the approach taken toward political engagement was nuanced. IL discourse has focused on developing the 'political literacy' of political knowledge and engagement (Buschman, 2019; Smith, 2013); but as Smith and McMenemy (2017) have shown, political literacy and political engagement are wide-ranging and involve many forms that often go unrecognised by normative paradigms. In this sense the participants may not have described strong political engagement as it is traditionally understood, but found other avenues of expression which they themselves may not have considered to be inherently 'political'. In addition, although the participants' views may not be as disruptive to the status quo as critical IL advocates may envisage, there is still a recognised challenge through withdrawal from norms in order to pursue a personal sense of citizenship. Just as 'slacktivism' has been unfairly applied to young people who disengage from norms of political participation to pursue emerging avenues of engagement (Loader et al, 2014a; 2014b; 2016), so too would it be unfair to use the critical IL paradigm of 'active' and 'engaged' citizenship to negatively judge those who make conscious decisions to disengage from 'formal' politics to varying degrees to pursue their own ways of engaging with their community as citizens.

In highlighting the tension between the 'personal' and the 'system' regarding citizenship, this study has raised a question that is underexplored and underdeveloped in both IL theory and praxis: the ethics of information use. In critiquing The Association of College and Research

Libraries' Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, Lilburn (2008) states:

> Absent from the Standards … is any mention of political issues of how the information literate citizen uses information in a socially responsible manner … [They] appear to place greater emphasis on compliance with economic, legal and social issues, rather than critical understanding of these issues. (p.3)

Critical IL invites the challenging of these issues, rather than passive acceptance of them. Kelly (1979) theorized the 'pluralist citizen' whose multiple loyalties may bring them into conflict with the state. Two participants explicitly mentioned the possibility of breaking the law if they felt it was the right thing to do or if they perceived doing so to be inconsequential; one mentioned that information would be used in order to inform their decision. In addition, even if actions remain legal, they may not be considered socially or culturally 'acceptable'. IL discourse that promotes using information in a legal, ethical and socially responsible manner as citizens, while also advocating challenge and resistance, is full of potential difficulties, especially when 'active' and 'engaged' citizenship crosses over into the area of activism and protest. The development of personal citizenship information landscapes, shaped and motivated by personal ethics, as seen in this study, highlights the need for more critical reflection on these issues by the LIS community.

## 5.3 Empowerment and disempowerment

Personal citizenship information landscapes come with their own expectations of information access, use and intended results. Feelings of empowerment and disempowerment were described as being linked with the perceived ability to meet personal citizenship goals. Tensions and conflict with societal norms or the views and practices of others were all seen as disruptive forces or barriers that constrained and 'fractured' (Lloyd, 2017) personal citizenship information landscapes. They took forms that included disillusionment with the democratic system, difficulty in accessing information from outside agents and disconcerting bias and polarisation. On the other hand, participants recognised that they could do more to 'question', to be more politically engaged and to understand opposing views; these can be seen as internal barriers over which there is some degree of personal control. All of these disruptive forces were considered to some extent to frustrate their main citizenship goals of building community, strengthening social relations and demonstrating 'liberal' values of tolerance and respect.

Participants described enacting various information behaviours in response to disempowering, disruptive forces in their information landscapes, most noticeably by creating personal information 'bubbles' guided by emotional responses to information and differing levels of (dis)engagement. The influence of emotions, confirmation bias and motivated reasoning in the information seeking process has been highlighted (Cooke, 2017; Lenker, 2016); and in this way, participants were acting more like 'consumers' in an information world of various and often conflicting choices, where the competitive values of economic neoliberalism shape public democratic discourse (Buschman, 2016). As one participant succinctly put it: '*You choose your own bias.*' On the other hand, it was recognised by some that these barriers could be overcome—such as seeking out opposing views and developing a spirit of compromise—in order to once again work towards the goal of communality with others.

From an IL perspective, the participants described practising critical self-reflection and identified ways in which, in this particular area, their personal citizenship information landscape could be

'repaired' or 'reformed' to take into account new information. Some developed IL to tackle distorting and opposing views, rather than eliminate them, and to engage in legitimate adversarial debate (Buschman, 2019; Eckerdal, 2017). On the other hand, others described taking more radical action in order to restore their information landscape and feelings of empowerment, strongly managing or disengaging from information deemed a distracting barrier to the pursuit of their citizenship goals. Empowerment through information disengagement should be seen as another challenge to the IL paradigm of 'active' and 'engaged' citizens, and supports Giroux's (1988) idea of empowerment through actively pursued 'illiteracy.'

In rethinking the concepts of information 'wealth' and 'poverty,' Gibson and Martin (2019) advocate for a theory of 'information marginalisation' which moves away from a deficit model of the individual to one that recognises structural and systemic barriers to IL. Similarly, participants described being cognizant of the information barriers they faced, many of which they felt to be systemic—within a theory of information 'marginalisation' they should not therefore be considered as being 'lacking' as citizens. Some of the information behaviours discussed above are those that IL theory and praxis seeks to avoid; but it must be appreciated that these behaviours were driven by a desire to feel empowered to pursue personal concepts of citizenship. In this way, *choosing* to disengage should not necessarily be seen as leading to information poverty and marginalisation. Once again, IL and citizenship discourse must remain open to challenge over conceptions of 'active', 'engaged' and 'informed' citizens, a challenge that can be driven by the concepts of personal citizenship information landscapes and personal citizenship goals.

## 6. Conclusion

Using the context of citizenship in the UK in 2019, this empirical research has enabled listening to the voices of citizens to see how IL is understood and enacted from a citizenship perspective. By developing the concept of *personal citizenship information landscapes* that are socially constructed by the individual from the information world that they encounter, closely oriented towards personal conceptions of citizenship and citizenship goals, this study has highlighted and centred the role of a personal sense of agency, motivation and empowerment. Citizen identity emerges from a personal worldview and a whole set of beliefs, desires and actions; the constructed information landscape helps to support this identity. When engaged with wider society, this individually-defined approach often showed resistance to certain ideas of what IL and citizenship should look like, as advocated by some sections of LIS discourse, as well as pushing back in differing ways against social and cultural norms of what was expected of a 'good citizen'. In addition, the process of 'fracturing' and 'repairing/reforming' these landscapes, driven by a desire for empowerment and personal fulfilment, demonstrated behaviours that challenged how IL research and praxis have come to understand 'informed', 'active' and 'engaged' citizens. This study has demonstrated that these terms are socially-constructed and highly subjective, and therefore potentially limitless in variety. It has shown that empowerment as citizens can come from 'disengagement' with information just as much as it can from active 'engagement', inviting a rethink of what it actually means to be an empowered agent. The traditional deficit paradigm of information wealth and poverty, with its related concepts of empowerment/disempowerment and social inclusion/exclusion, is found to be lacking. This shows how important it is, therefore, for LIS research to not just promote specific values and goals, but to continue to build on this and other studies that demonstrate IL and citizenship to be personally defined and motivated, and to also recognise possible tensions between what is considered socially, culturally or legally acceptable by society (or LIS practitioners) at large, and what is acceptable to the personal ethics of the informed, active and engaged citizen.

Moving forward, work is needed to develop the issues highlighted by these findings. The sample size used here was small, and the findings and discussion must be seen as tentative. By using a larger and more diverse sample, it will be possible to develop a more detailed (and likely nuanced) picture of the relationship between IL and citizenship. Further qualitative work will also give the opportunity to properly develop *personal citizenship information landscapes* as a concept and to fully problematise it, to gain a greater understanding of the factors that motivate and shape information use in personal citizenship contexts. Connections between IL and citizenship need to be better understood, and personal motivations and goals are key to this understanding, as this study has shown. It will be a fruitful endeavour to see how—or indeed if—the promotion of a particular citizenship ethic and associated values can interact meaningfully and positively with a potentially limitless variety of citizen perspectives; and how current research and praxis can be adapted to better appreciate this variety. This understanding will help IL practitioners and advocates to better connect to and enable the very citizens they seek to empower and celebrate, and to ensure that IL remains relevant to the needs of citizens in contemporary societies.

# References

ALA (1989). *Presidential committee on information literacy: Final report*.

Antonesa, M. (2007). Can information literacy motivate students to become global citizens? *SCONUL Focus, 42*, 28-30.

Barber, B. (2004). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. University of California Press.

Brinkman, S. (2014). Unstructured and semi-structured interviewing. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research* (pp.277-99). Oxford University Press.

Bryant, A. (2014). The grounded theory method. In P. Leavy (Ed.), T*he Oxford handbook of qualitative research* (pp.116-136). Oxford University Press.

Buschman, J. (2016). Citizenship and agency under neoliberal global consumerism: A search for informed democratic practices. *Journal of Information Ethics, 25*(1), 38-53.

Buschman, J. (2017). Doing neoliberal things with words in libraries: Toward emending a discourse fashion in LIS. *Journal of Documentation, 73*(4), 595-617.

Buschman, J. (2018). Everyday life, everyday democracy in libraries: Toward articulating the relationship. *The Political Librarian, 4*(1), 18-28.

Buschman, J. (2019). Good news, bad news, and fake news: Going beyond political literacy to democracy and libraries. *Journal of Documentation, 75*(1), 213-28.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* Sage.

CILIP (2018). *CILIP definition of information literacy 2018*.

Cooke, N. (2017). Posttruth, truthiness, and alternative facts: Information behavior and critical information consumption for a new age. *Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy, 87(*3), 211-221.

Correia, A. (2002). *Information literacy for an active and effective citizenship* [White Paper]. UNESCO, the U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and the National Forum on Information Literacy.

Dervin, B. (1994). Information↔Democracy: An examination of underlying assumptions. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 45*(6), 369-85.

Eckerdal, J. (2017). Libraries, democracy, information literacy, and citizenship. *Journal of Documentation, 73*(5), 1010-33.

Elmborg, J. (2006). Critical information literacy: Implications for instructional practice. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship. 32*(2), 192-199.

Elmborg, J. (2010). Literacies, narratives, and adult learning in libraries. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 127*, 67-76.

Fanon, F. (2001). *The wretched of the earth*. Penguin Books.

Fukuyama, F. (2018). *Identity: The demand for dignity and the politics of resentment.* Profile Books.

Gacel-Avila, J. (2005). The internationalisation of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(2), 121-36.

Gibson, A., & Martin, J. (2019). Re-situating information poverty: Information marginalisation and parents of individuals with disabilities. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 70*(5), 476-87.

Giroux, H. (1988). Literacy and the pedagogy of voice and political empowerment. *Educational Theory*, *38*(1), 61-75.

Goldstein, S. (Ed.) (2020). *Informed societies: Why information literacy matters for citizenship, participation and democracy*. Facet Publishing.

Griffin, C. (1999). Lifelong learning and social democracy. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 18*(5), 329-342.

Hackett, D. (2018). An elephant in the room? Information literacy in the narrative of UK public libraries. *Journal of Information Literacy, 12*(1), 4-26.

Hicks, A., & Lloyd, A. (2016). It takes a community to build a framework: Information literacy within intercultural settings. *Journal of Information Science*, *42*(3), 334-343.

IFLA (2005). *Beacons of the information society: The Alexandria proclamation on information literacy and lifelong learning.*

IFLA (2012). *Moscow declaration on media and information literacy*.

Jacobs, H. (2008). Information literacy and reflective pedagogical praxis. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *34*(3), 256-62.

Jacobs, H., & Berg, S. (2011). Reconnecting information literacy policy with the core values of librarianship. *Library Trends, 60*(2), 383–94.

Johnson, B., & Webber, S. (2005). As we may think: Information literacy as a discipline for the information age. *Research Strategies, 20*(3), 108-21.

Jones, J., & Symon, G. (2001). Lifelong learning as serious leisure: Policy, practice and potential. *Leisure Studies, 20*(4), 269-83.

Kapitzke, C. (2003). *Information literacy: A positivist epistemology and a politics of out*formation. *Educational Theory, 53*(1), 37-53.

Kelly, G. (1979). Who Needs a Theory of Citizenship? *Daedalus, 108*(4), 21-36.

Kutner, L., & Armstrong, A. (2012). Rethinking information literacy in a globalized world. *Communications in information literacy*, *6*(1), 24-33.

Lawson, S., Sanders, K., & Smith, L. (2015). Commodification of the information profession: A critique of higher education under neoliberalism. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 3*(1), Article eP1182.

Lenker, M. (2016). Motivated reasoning, political information, and information literacy education. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *16*(3), 511-528.

Lievrouw, L. (1994). Information resources and democracy: Understanding the paradox. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 45(*6), 350-57.

Lilburn, J. (2008). Challenging the conditions that make alternative possible: librarians, the news media and the information literate citizen. *Progressive Librarian, 30*, 3-17.

Lilburn, J. (2013). 'You've got to know properly': Citizenship in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go* and the aims of information literacy instruction. In L. Gregory, & S. Higgins (Eds.), *Information literacy and social justice* (pp.63-78). Library Juice Press.

Lloyd, A. (2005). Information literacy: Different contexts, different concepts, different truths? *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 37*(2), 82-88.

Lloyd, A. (2006). Information literacy landscapes: An emerging picture. *Journal of Documentation, 62*(5), 570-83.

Lloyd, A. (2012). Information literacy as a socially enacted practice. J*ournal of Documentation, 68*(6), 772-83.

Lloyd, A. (2017). Researching fractured (information) landscapes: Implications for library and information science researchers undertaking research with refugees and forced migration studies. *Journal of Documentation, 73*(1), 35-47.

Lloyd, A., Lipu, S., & Keenan, M. (2010). On becoming citizens: Examining social inclusion from an information perspective. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries, 41*(1), 42-53.

Loader, B., Vromen, A., & Xenos, M. (2014a). The networked young citizen: Social media, political participation and civic engagement. *Information, Communication & Society, 17*(2), 143-50.

Loader, B., Vromen, A., & Xenos, M. (Eds.) (2014b). *The networked young citizen: Social media, political participation and civic engagement*. Routledge.

Loader, B., Vromen, A., & Xenos, M. (2016). Performing for the young networked citizen? Celebrity politics, social networking and the political engagement of young people. *Media, Culture & Society, 38*(3), 400-19.

Luo, L., & Wildemuth, B. (2017). Semistructured interviews. In B. Wildemuth (Ed.), *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science* (2nd ed., pp. 248-257). Libraries Unlimited.

Murdoch, G., & Golding, P. (1989). Information poverty and political inequality: Citizenship in the age of private communications. *Journal of Communication, 39*(3), 180-95.

Nicholson, K. (2014). Information literacy as a situated practice in the neoliberal university. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for Information Science.*

Pickard, A., Childs, S., Lomas, E., McLeod, J., & Shenton, A. (2013). *Research Methods in Information. (2nd ed.)*. Facet Publishing.

Schattle, H. (2005). Communicating global citizenship: Multiple discourses beyond the academy. *Citizenship Studies, 9*(2), 119-133.

Schattle, H. (2008). Education for global citizenship: Illustrations of ideological pluralism and adaptation. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 13*(1), 73-94.

Schattle, H. (2018). Citizenship. In M. Juergensmeyer, S. Sassen, M. Steger, & V. Faessel (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of global studies* (pp. 697-714). Oxford University Press.

Seale, M. (2013). The neoliberal library. In L. Gregory, & S. Higgins (Eds.), *Information literacy and social justice* (pp.39-62). Library Juice Press.

Shapiro, J., & Hughes, S. (1996). Information literacy as a liberal art: Enlightenment proposals for a new curriculum. *Educom Review, 31*(2).

Shenton, A. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information, 22*(2), 63-75.

Smith, L. (2013). Towards a model of critical information literacy instruction for the development of political agency. *Journal of Information Literacy, 7*(2), 15-32.

Smith, L. (2016a). Information literacy as a tool to support political participation. *Library and Information Research, 40*(123), 14-23.

Smith, L. (2016b). School libraries, political information and information literacy provision: Findings from a Scottish study. *Journal of Information Literacy, 10*(2), 3-25.

Smith, L., & McMenemy, D. (2016). Enhancing agency through information: A phenomenographic exploration of young people's political information experiences. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology.*

Smith, L., & McMenemy, D. (2017). Young people's conception of political information: Insights into information experiences and implications for intervention. *Journal of Documentation*, *73*(5), 877-902.

Stevens, C., & Campbell, P. (2006). Collaborating to connect global citizenship, information literacy, and lifelong learning in the global studies classroom. *Reference Services Review, 34*(4), 536-56.

Tewell, E. (2015). A decade of critical information literacy: A review of the literature. *Communications in information literacy, 9*(1), 24-43.

Thompson, K. (2007). Furthering understanding of information literacy through the social study of information poverty. *The Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science, 31*(1), 87-115.

Thornton, S. (2012). Trying to learn (politics) in a data-drenched society: Can information literacy save us? *European Political Science, 11*(2), 213-23.

UNESCO (2003). *The Prague declaration: Towards an information literate society*.

Webber, S., & Johnston, B. (2013). Transforming information literacy for higher education in the 21st century: A lifelong learning approach. In M. Hepworth & G. Walton (Eds.), *Developing people's information capabilities: fostering information literacy in educational, workplace and community contexts* (Library and Information Science Series, pp.15-30). Emerald Publishing.