2010

Information Literacy and Social Power

Jonathan Cope
College of Staten Island, CUNY

Information Literacy and Social Power

Jonathan Cope

A cursory glance at much of the Library and Information Science (LIS) literature written about Information Literacy (IL) reveals its importance to LIS as a discipline. It also illuminates the role that IL plays in creating citizens who are capable of applying learned information skills in their day-to-day lives and in developing an informed, reasoning public capable of participation in a democratic society. However, the acquisition of knowledge is often presented as a linear process in which new knowledge is obtained—or deposited—and tied to a specific task (Elmborg, 2006). LIS commentators tend to shy away from more complicated discussions of social and political power: how it is wielded, maintained, and replicated, and how this affects social actors' search for knowledge. The twentieth century produced many social theorists for whom the issue of social power is central. The work of these thinkers has irrevocably altered the social sciences and the humanities. This has prompted Wayne Wiegand (1999) to suggest that LIS researchers undertake the challenge of integrating the work of these theorists into LIS.

A central tenet of critical pedagogy is the concept that extant social power relationships act to construct social reality in particular ways that limit the parameters of debate and prevent certain questions from being raised. A critical theory of IL—informed by the insights of critical pedagogy—maintains that the development of students' capacity to pose thoughtful questions (as opposed to clear answers) is as important as their ability to locate, access, organize, evaluate, and apply information in the research process. As IL programs become increasingly entrenched in a wide variety of academic institutions, it becomes vital to examine the discursive assumptions of the LIS discourse that has arisen around IL. The development of a theory of critical IL requires that LIS practitioners grapple with the questions raised by theorists of social power. Not only can the work of these thinkers reveal a great deal about how the LIS discipline has approached IL in the past, their work also provides the discipline with a critical lens through which to examine the IL discourse as it develops. Therefore, if LIS is to formulate a coherent critical theory of IL it must ask the following question: How has the LIS literature of IL viewed social

power? What do we find when we examine this literature against the concepts and categories established by key theorists of social power?

This work examines a sample of key writings on IL through the lens of social power research as articulated by John Scott (2001) and his differentiation between "mainstream" and "second stream" social power research. Critical pedagogy arose out of and has been heavily informed by some of the key thinkers of the second stream tradition of social power research (Fischman & McLaren, 2005). The presence of second-stream concepts would suggest that information literacy theorists have considered the questions that this tradition poses and are developing a robust and critical theory of IL. Selected LIS literature on IL will be analyzed and placed into one of these categories using the method of discourse analysis.

If, as Buschman (2003) contends, librarianship has been propelled into a "crisis culture" by such disparate phenomena as the decline of the social welfare state and the devaluation of publicly funded institutions in favor of private, market-driven ones—what he describes as a "new public philosophy—these abstract discussions may seem to many LIS practitioners like pointless intellectual exercises ungrounded in the day-to-day realities of library work. However, the prevalence of new technologies and public philosophies, along with the increasing centrality of information literacy in many libraries' missions, elevates the importance discussions about how LIS views IL. If libraries and educational institutions are to be places of critical questioning and intellectual exploration a critical theory of IL must be a part of this conversation.

Historically, much LIS research has utilized the narrowly defined empirical methods of positivist social science (Wiegand 1999). While these methods can be of great use when exploring particular topics and questions, they are less useful in posing larger social questions and analysis. Instrumentalist logic—an interest in the strictly practical and measurable as opposed to the "true" or "universal," or, as Max Horkheimer puts it in *Eclipse of Reason* (1985), a reduction of reason to that which is strictly useful—has tended to dominate LIS research since its inception as an academic discipline (Wiegand). In trying to comprehend the place of the profession in society, this narrow focus on the strictly useful in specific cases diminishes the ability of the LIS practitioner to construct a broad theoretical and intellectual framework in which to situate their labor. The plying of one's intellectual and pedagogical craft requires an intellectual engagement in the social world—and the various theories of what constitutes that world—beyond one's own narrow and specific experience. The craftsperson who builds a chair must have an idea of the whole chair in relation to its

constituent parts (e.g., the arm, the legs, etc.). Similarly, the critical information literacy pedagogue must have a broader understanding of the whole social environment in which they teach the particulars of IL. The wrenching forces that continue to transform the ways in which social subjects consume, produce, and analyze information necessitates forms of critique that allow LIS practitioners to pose large and sometimes difficult questions which often lack positivist, empirical answers. In order to do so, the LIS discipline must take a more expansive view of social power and its role in IL if it is to develop a critical theory of its practice. Theory and practice are both vital parts of a critical whole.

Social Power

Scott defines social power as being the relation between two agents. One of these agents can be described as the "principal" and the other as the "subaltern." The principal is the agent that wields power and the subaltern is the agent that is affected by this power. Power is also understood as the capacity to influence; a principal may not have to act in order to get a subaltern to behave in a particular manner. Consider the example of the librarian who is trying to decide whether or not to add to the collection a book that is critical of a large donor to their library. The donor may not actually withdraw their funding, and the librarian may still decide to add that book to the collection regardless of the risk, but the donor constrains the actions of the subaltern agent (in this case the librarian) because of the principal's *perceived* power. According to Scott, "acts of power occur when principals are able to restrict the choices that subalterns are able to make" (p. 3).

Focusing on power relationships between social actors represents a fundamental shift in thinking about IL. Most discussions of IL stress the development of applied skills that assume a rational, unconstrained information-seeking agent operating in an environment free of social hierarchies. A critical IL will see information-seeking as situated within particular contexts (relationships to power determined by social characteristics such as class, ethnicity, gender, etc.) and in particular societies with their attendant constraints, pressures, and structures. Commentators such as Pawley (1998) and Harris (1986) have observed that pluralism—the strain of social power research that Scott labels "mainstream"— influences many of the assumptions in LIS research and commentary.

The Mainstream Tradition

The mainstream—or pluralist—strain of social power research arose in the early part of the twentieth century. In this view, social institutions in Western liberal democracies are neutral terrain in which different groups, interests, and blocs vie for power through conflict and dialogue. This view sees "the sovereign power of the state as its exemplar" (Scott, p. 6) and social actors as rational subjects that are able to choose between various courses of action (Lukes, 1974). In pluralist thought, individual subjects align themselves with particular groups. Power is exercised by group pressure, although the state may play an important role in a particular conflict. Pluralists see the state as an actor with capacities similar to those of other groups that exercise power in political systems (Bailey & Braybrooke, 2003). Social subjects choose between competing groups and coalesce to exert pressure in order to achieve particular outcomes. For pluralists, constant interplay of groups and alliances is the essence of democratic decision making. What makes a society democratic as opposed to totalitarian is that it allows for this process of negotiation. In this theory, liberal democracies are governed by the action of dispersed blocs that compete and form temporary alliances to influence political outcomes. For this system to operate effectively, the various blocs must see the institutions and frameworks in which they operate as legitimate and the "rules of the game" as fair and transparent. Postwar American pluralist thinkers celebrated the United States' liberal and moderate character when compared to the totalitarianism of the right (e.g., Nazism) and left (e.g., Stalinism).

A theory of IL that focuses on the application of acquired skills reflects a mainstream/pluralist conception of social power. If pluralism sees social institutions in liberal democracies as being a neutral, open space in which all social actors may freely participate in debate, then it follows that those structures will not be as closely scrutinized in conceptions of IL informed by the tradition of pluralistic inquiry. Students are asked by educators to use "authoritative" sources without critically examining the systems in which that "authority" is established and articulated. In order for the pluralist/mainstream view of power to be practiced effectively, citizens must view social institutions as neutral. Large, abstract social questions are addressed as dichotomous choices (e.g., should one vote for a Republican or a Democrat?), because the heart of democratic expression is found in alliances that coalesce within a framework everyone agrees upon. To question the nature of such a framework would threaten the stability of such a social system and view of social power.

Additionally, such a world view—like much IL literature—stresses the acquisition of specific workplace skills, especially for non-elites. The development of such skills is one of the key functions of pluralist educational systems. As information technology continues to transform the ways in which workers labor, IL has often taken on this vocational, applied character. Pawley finds that the "Simple possession of computer skills still confers status. Just as mid-nineteenth-century clerks obtained better paying jobs because of their clear handwriting skills, so late twentieth-century clerks still enjoy a slight premium by virtue of their facility with word-processing, database, and spreadsheet manipulation" (p. 137). Teaching these kinds of skills is the focus of most of IL literature and practice.

Pawley finds that an LIS curriculum that centers on the acquisition of vocational IL skills—and does not question the world views from which they are born—will not enhance the lot of the historically subaltern. This approach to IL fails to create avenues that allow students to explore questions that address the causes of subalternity. This conception of IL acts as a hegemonic force in that it subtly reinforces a framework that primarily serves the interests of the middle class and wealthy by presenting extant social institutions as being neutral. Pawley argues that LIS has shied away from utilizing a class analysis and has continually used mainstream/pluralist perspectives as a way to understand its historical role. Pawley identifies LIS's links with the corporate world, its interest in professionalization, and its aspiration to a scientific status as the key components of a perspective that fits well within the mainstream/pluralist tradition of social power research. Using E. P. Thompson's concept of social class as "defined in terms of how people actively make sense of their experiences, values, and traditions and how groups of people act to create and maintain a sense of identity" (p. 126), Pawley finds that a class analysis would lead to a critical IL that encourages students to explore broad social issues such as the lack of good paying, fulfilling jobs instead of simply developing vocational skills for the few jobs that do exist. If the mainstream tradition of social power research offers a problematic framework for those who wish to develop a critical theory of IL what does the second-stream tradition offer?

The Second Stream

It is impossible to speak of the second-stream of social power research without discussing the work of two key figures: Antonio Gramsci and Michel Foucault. Gramsci's "Hegemony" and Foucault's "Governmentality" can be viewed as the two key divergent paths that second-stream power research

has taken. Although there have been many other articulations of social power that would fit within the category of the second-stream tradition of research, these two concepts have been hugely influential. Therefore, if we are to observe the presence of the second-stream of power research in the IL literature, the appearance—or absence—of these concepts should serve as a benchmark by which to determine if such considerations exist.

The writing of Antonio Gramsci has cast a long shadow over the work of subsequent social theorists working within the second-stream of power research. As mentioned earlier, the second stream of power research is primarily concerned with the capacity of principals to influence and constrain the choices of the subaltern. In his *Prison Notebooks* (1971), Gramsci argues against the traditional Marxian tendency to reduce class power to solely economic factors. When the "inevitable" socialist revolution predicted by orthodox Marxism failed to materialize in the early twentieth century in Western Europe, Gramsci examined the role that culture played in securing the power of the ruling class. He argued that principals monopolize the field of options that subalterns have to choose from. He saw that the dominant ideas of a society are not only embedded in its political institutions, but also in its social institutions, or "civil society"—institutions such as the church, school, factory, trade union, or library. Through the consistent reiteration of dominant concepts and narratives, the principals naturalize certain concepts and ideas. Subalterns then assume that the options presented to them are the only options possible. It is through this iterative process that principals—in Gramsci's argument the ruling class—secure the consent of subalterns—in this case the working class. For Gramsci, the interests of the subaltern lie in organizing collectively in opposition to the power of capital. However, hegemony restricts individuals from the working class to a set of paths (or perceived paths) that better their individual lot only within the framework of the capitalist order. For Gramsci, the "organic intellectual," the social actor that is able to consider its own situation and act autonomously, is the key vehicle for disrupting this hegemonic framework. For Gramsci, the mass political party and the organic intellectual can create an alternative—or counter-hegemony—through collective mobilization (Day, 2005).

Gramsci's concept of hegemony contributed heavily to the development of Lukes's (1974) "three-dimensions of power." Lukes developed these concepts as a way to critique the shortcomings that he found in the mainstream of power research. These dimensions may be categorized thusly:

The First Dimension: The principal exerts power over the subaltern through the use of superior resources in a terrain of open conflict over articulated issues.

The Second Dimension: Principals act to exclude certain actors and issues and they act to confine the terms of debate.

The Third Dimension: The power of the principal is exercised over the subaltern through the creation of myths and beliefs that serve the interests of the principals resulting in the "internalization of the values, beliefs, or rules of the game of the powerful as a further adaptive response" (Gaventa, 1980, p. 17) on the part of the subalterns.

Although Lukes borrows from Gramsci, this multidimensional approach to the study of power was a major development in the discourse surrounding social power and created the context for a great deal of subsequent research.

If the domination of one group is secured through the production of ideology in the civil society of liberal democracy, it presents LIS and information literacy practitioners with many issues to consider. Raber (2003) posits that, by using Gramscian methods of analysis, librarians may be seen as organic intellectuals and participants in what Gramsci called a war of position. For Raber, libraries and librarians have the ability to act in counter-hegemonic ways. Gramsci's "work suggests that librarians might manifest a contradictory theoretical consciousness. On one hand, their activity implies a progressive transformation of the world. On the other hand, they uncritically absorb a theoretical consciousness from the past" (p. 50). Raber notes that "Even within a single library it is likely that one will discover some professional practices that represent capitalist hegemony at work and others that challenge that hegemony" (p. 49). A critical IL informed by Gramscian concepts will seek to develop students' capacity for social questioning and act to denaturalize the social structures and world views that they inhabit. In this context, strict "neutrality" is an illusory position for an educator to take, because to be neutral within the context of a specific hegemonic historic bloc is to lend support to that structure. A failure to foster students' capacity to question the dominant values and beliefs of a given society is akin to an endorsement of those concepts.

Unquestionably, the other key figure in second-stream power research is Michel Foucault (Scott, 2001). For Foucault, power is a pervasive, yet amorphous, fundamental aspect of the human condition. It exists everywhere, and yet it is difficult to isolate with any precision. Foucault

conceives of power as something that exists beyond the formal structures of the state, economy, and civil society. Foucault's response to an interviewer's question about the use of the metaphor of war to explain power in society is revealing of his general view of power:

> Isn't power simply a form of warlike domination? Shouldn't one therefore conceive all problems of power in terms of relations of war? Isn't power a sort of generalized war which assumes at particular moments the forms of peace and the state? (1984, p. 65)

However, for Foucault, power relationships are in a constant state of flux. When power relations are altered they are transformed as individuals become social subjects through discourse. To use Foucault's metaphor of battle, discourse is one of power's key weapons. Individuals become discursively incorporated into power relationships as hierarchies based on expertise and discipline are continually created, contested, and then reinforced. This is fundamentally different from the Gramscian notion of hegemony—Foucault does not view this action through the lens of Marxian class struggle. Gramsci sought to establish a new hegemony, or historic bloc, in which socialism would serve as the hegemonic formation. Foucault's examinations of psychiatry, sexuality, and discipline took place in very a different paradigm. According to Foucault, "the eighteenth century [The Enlightenment] invented, so to speak, a synaptic regime of power, a regime of its exercise *within* the social body, rather than *from above* it" (1972, p. 39). He saw all discourse as being thoroughly entwined with the exercise of, and the resistance to, power.

Assessments of Foucault's work have been as numerous as they have been contentious. Many have seen Foucault, and the postmodern and post-structuralist thinkers with whom he is associated (Jacques Derrida, among others), as advocates of a nihilistic form of politics that sees every action as the product of an internalized power relationship. One of the most notable debates has been between Foucault and Jurgen Habermas about the notion of public participation and the possibilities of a public sphere (Buschman, 2003; Day, 2005). In his review of Foucaultian ideas in LIS, John Buschman (2007) finds that the application of Foucaultian theory to LIS theory has led to a kind of stasis. Foucault's work is a "conceptual import with its own discursive agenda that rules out all or most of the end purposes of such a critique" (p. 40). In other words, Foucault's form of analysis only leads to more analysis. The instrumentalist focus of most LIS scholarship resists such a divergence from practice.

If discourse frames the ways in which social actors conceptualize relationships within society, then it might be fruitful for IL pedagogues to ask themselves how they participate in particular discourses. If a critical theory of IL is interested in developing within students an ability to question common sense notions of society, then a Foucaultian unpacking of a particular discourse can help analyze the ways in which society examines a certain topic or question. By seeking to understand how social subjects have been prevented from asking particular kinds of questions in certain discourses, critical IL can generate new types of social analysis that serve to situate its practice within a broader social context. Using some of Foucault's critical techniques in the particular contexts where they might be useful does not necessitate a wholesale adoption of his methodology or thinking. Surely, the use of some of his concepts does not require librarians to abandon the rational classification and organization of information in order to make it publicly accessible. As with any thinker, Foucault's methods and ideas can be used as a conceptual toolkit to address specific issues and questions in specific contexts. There are occasions when critical IL calls more for the asking of new questions than it does for the provision of clear, instrumental answers.

As this brief discussion of thinkers from the second-stream tradition of social power research indicates, this tradition provides LIS with concepts that can facilitate the development of a critical theory of IL. This is because critical IL—and critical pedagogy—sees the instructor as a part of the social and cultural context in which they practice. The second stream of social power research problematizes social subjects' relationships to social and educational institutions; the mainstream tradition does not. The mainstream/pluralist tradition places a greater emphasis on the importance of consensus building and the importance of subjects choosing from available options. The second stream is interested in opening new avenues for critique and analysis. Examining some of the major LIS writings about IL against the divergent traditions of social power research unpacks some of the ideological underpinnings of IL research and helps LIS determine how it views social power.

The Study

As of 2002, more than 5,000 articles related to IL had been published in scholarly LIS journals. More than 300 publications about IL were printed in both 2001 and 2002 (Rader, 2002). Due to the sheer volume of IL publications, I selected the ten most cited LIS articles in the *ISI Social Science*

Citation Index that contained the term "information literacy" in their title or abstract. Results from journals that did not conform to this author's understanding of what constitutes an LIS journal (e.g., *The Journal of the Medical Informatics Association*) were excluded. These ten articles cannot serve as a representative sample; the purpose of this inquiry is simply to examine how a small selection of the most discussed IL-related LIS articles approach theoretical frameworks of social power. The method employed is that of discourse analysis. In this case, the discourse analysis examines how the LIS literature discusses social power. This examination does not suggest that every LIS or IL research inquiry necessarily need engage questions posed by theorists of social power in order to be methodologically sound or informative. The purpose of this inquiry is simply to see if the second-stream concepts that have stirred so much debate in other disciplines appear in the IL literature. By scrutinizing the most cited articles, a general understanding of how information literacy researchers approach social power emerges.

The literature examined displayed several general tendencies. First, several of the works struggled with the issue of simply defining the term IL (Bawden, 2001; Behrens, 1994; Grafstein, 2002; Marcum, 2002; Webber & Johnston, 2000). Although the term was first used in the 1970s, it did not gain widespread currency until the early 1990s (Rader). Several of the works examined offered a thorough historical analysis of the term (Bawden; Behrens; Webber & Johnston) and sought to clarify its precise meaning. This suggests that the term is highly contested and still subject to redefinition. Bawden—noting the large amount of ink spilled over defining terms such as "information" and "computer literacy"—advocates a "Popperian position of explaining, rather than defining, terms" (p. 251) as a parse of the often-conflicting underlying meanings attached to these labels. The sample examined reflects this tendency in that five of the ten articles spent a considerable amount of energy reviewing the various definitions of IL and their various histories. Although official library organizations have adopted IL as a central professional goal in need of promotion (e.g., the Association of College and Research Libraries's IL standards), the contentious definitional debate in the literature suggests that LIS has yet to develop a rigorous and multifaceted understanding of the concept. It should be noted that the increase in LIS literature on IL is concomitant with the development and widespread adoption of the Internet (Rader, 2002). This suggests that efforts to codify and define IL are reactions to the external forces of a changing information environment.

Second, any discussion of social power played an incredibly small role in the literature. A great deal of the literature reflected an instrumentalist

approach to the acquisition of knowledge. Although several of the examined writings discuss the importance of life-long learning, much of the discussion focuses on the development of specific skills and is tied to specific tasks for application in specific contexts. For example, Webber and Johnston (2000) described literature that discussed how the perspectives of students and teachers differ when it comes to the importance of IL. Additionally, in Dunn's (2002) report on California State University's assessment program, a component of the institutional information competency aimed to develop within students "the ethical, legal and sociopolitical issues surrounding information" (p. 27). However, none of these writers engage in social power as something that would play a role in the construction of students' world view. With a few notable exceptions, there was practically no mention of social structure. These articles reflect a conception of social power that consistently fails to address the questions posed by both the mainstream and second stream of power research.

Several exceptions in this sample approach social power in a slightly more multifaceted manner and suggest a small measure of engagement in issues raised by the second stream of power research. Of the ten articles examined, only two explicitly explored questions of social power. Fisher, Durrance & Hinton's (2004) work on needs-based services for subaltern immigrants in Queens, New York, presents the development of IL in these library users based on a building-block and personal gains model. The building-block outcomes approach is a linear model that begins with the discovery of the library and ends with trust in the library's staff. Fisher, Durrance & Hinton define an immigrant's success primarily in terms of "personal gains outcomes" as opposed to more collective or social gains. The authors claim that because "outcomes accrue to and belong to individuals, as such, their fairest articulation comes from the users themselves" (p. 758). One of the outcomes described by the authors is "immigrants prepare to become citizens," a section that included an anecdote about the immigrant's participation in a lobbying trip to the state capital in support of library services. Yet, there is no mention of the immigrants lobbying on behalf of immigrants as a social group. The authors explicitly describe how library services better prepare immigrants for employment, provide immigrants with technological skills, and build self-confidence, among other things. While allowing the subjects to speak for themselves is sound methodology, the authors' reluctance to examine the subaltern political role of immigrants suggests a lack of engagement in the issues raised by the second-stream tradition. While the article soundly evaluates particular important services offered by a particular library to

particular immigrants, it lacks an interest in developing programs and services that the subaltern immigrants could use to examine and question their social position.

Grafstein's (2002) call to situate IL within the other academic disciplines is the second work in the sample that addresses questions of social power. Grafstein discusses the role of "unacknowledged bias" (p. 201) in the development of generic critical thinking skills. The concept of unacknowledged bias suggests some engagement in second-stream issues. Grafstein suggests that "prejudices or bigotry" (p. 201) can be presented as fact and that there are occasions when research that is presented as unbiased and neutral can be influenced by the "financial, career, or personal interests" (p. 201) of the author. This suggests that social institutions play a role in how information and knowledge are socially constructed, reflecting the concerns raised by the second stream of social power research. However, without a more thorough explanation of what is meant by unacknowledged bias it is difficult to classify this work in the mainstream/second-stream schema.

Discussion

It is important to note that in recent years a small body of literature has emerged that seeks to develop a critical theory of information literacy. Writers such as Elmborg (2006) and Simmons (2005) have addressed questions of social power and discourse as they relate to information literacy. Elmborg specifically proposes a critical IL based on the insights of theorists such as Paulo Freire, Peter McLaren, and Henry Giroux, whereas Simmons suggests that librarians can act as mediators between different communities of discourse. However, these writings remain on the margins of LIS's IL discourse. This examination of ten of the most cited LIS articles on IL revealed practically no engagement in the debates from the second stream of social power research. Nine of the ten articles reviewed in this inquiry did not address conceptions of social power developed in Scott's second stream, and one held an ambiguous perspective.

One of the key insights of critical pedagogy is that there is no such a thing as an "apolitical" educational exchange. The decision of an educator to present "neutral" content as facts to be deposited into the heads of students is a political decision. A critical theory of IL does not seek to indoctrinate students with an educator's particular viewpoints. Instead, it entails a deep and fundamental embrace of the centrality of questioning in any educative process. To confine one's perspective to that which is strictly

measurable diminishes the ability to conceptualize the social whole and the role of specific IL practices within it. A critical theory of IL seeks to engage students as active social subjects charged with interrogating the social world and developing their own capacity for informed questioning. In the classroom, a critical IL would entail a move away from the demonstration of technical search processes and simplistic claims that certain sources are "authoritative" because authorities have decided that they are. It would embrace a collective questioning of how information is constructed, disseminated, and understood. It would view the library instructor more as a facilitator of collectively generated insight and knowledge than as a sagacious depositor of facts and inherited wisdom. As more institutions embrace IL as a part of their institutional mission, it is vital that IL practitioners advocate for an IL that values the role of this questioning as much as it values a set of fixed IL competencies.

References

Bailey, M. & Braybrooke, D. (2003). Robert A. Dahl's philosophy of democracy, exhibited in his essays. *Annual Review of Political Science, 6*, 99-118.

Buschman, J. (2003). *Dismantling the public sphere: Situating and sustaining librarianship in the age of the new public philosophy.* Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Buschman, J. (2007). "Transgression or Stasis? Challenging Foucault in LIS Theory." *Library Quarterly 77*(1), 21-44.

Dahl, R. (1961). *Who governs? Democracy and power in an American city.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Day, R. J. F. (2005). *Gramsci is dead: Anarchist currents in the newest social movements*. London: Pluto Press.

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

Fishman, G. & McLaren, P. (2005). Rethinking critical pedagogy and the Gramscian and Freirean legacies: From organic to committed intellectuals or critical pedagogy, commitment, and praxis. *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies, 5*(4), 425-447.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline & punish: The birth of the prison.* New York: Random House.

Foucault, M., & Gordon, C. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M., & Rabinow, P. (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Gaventa, J. (1980). *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and rebellion in an Appalachian valley.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.* New York: International Publishers.

Harris, M. (1986). State, class and cultural reproduction: Toward a theory of library service in the United States. *Advances in Librarianship, 14,* 211-252.

Horkheimer, M. (1985). *Eclipse of reason.* New York: Continuum.

Lukes, S. (1974). *Power.* London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Pawley, C. (1998). Hegemony's handmaid? The library and information studies curriculum from a class perspective. *Library Quarterly, 68*(2), 123-144.

Rader, H. B. (2002). Information literacy 1973-2002: A selected literature review. *Library Trends, 51*(2), 242-259.

Raber, D. (2003). Librarians as organic intellectuals: A Gramscian approach to blind spots and tunnel vision. *Library Quarterly, 73*(1), 33-53.

Scott, J. (2001). *Power.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Simmons, M. H. (2005). Librarians as disciplinary discourse mediators: Using genre theory to move toward critical information literacy. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 5*(3), 297-311.

Wiegand, W. (1999). Tunnel vision and blind spots: What the past tells us about the present; reflection on the twentieth-century history of American librarianship. *Library Quarterly, 69*(1), 1-32.

Articles examined in discourse analysis.

Bawden, D. (2001). Information and digital literacies: A review of concepts. *The Journal of Documentation, 57*(2), 218-259.

Behrens, S. J. (1994).A conceptual analysis and historical overview of information literacy. *College and Research Libraries. 55*(4), 309-322.

Dunn, K. (2002). Assessing information literacy skills in the California State University: A progress report. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship.28*(1) 26-35.

Edmunds, A. & Morris, A. (2000). The problem of information overload in business organisations: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Information Management, 20*, 17-28.

Fisher, K. E., Durrance, J. C., & Hinton, M. B. (2004). Information grounds and the use of need-based services by immigrants in Queens,

New York: A context-based, outcome evaluation approach. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 55*(8), 754-766.

Foster, A. (2003). A nonlinear model of information-seeking behavior. *Journal of the American Society for Information and Technology. 55*(3) 228-237.

Grafstein, A. (2002). A discipline-based approach to information literacy. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 28*(4), 197-204.

Hirsh, S. (1999). Children's relevance criteria and information seeking on electronic resources. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 50*(14), 1265-1283.

Marcum, J. W. (2002). Rethinking information literacy. Library Quarterly, 72(1), 1-26

Webber, S. & Johnston, B. (2000). Conceptions of information literacy: New perspectives and implications. *Journal of Information Science, 26*(6). 381-39