

# **Making the shoe fit: how relevant is the Professional Development Framework to library staff?**

**Jamie Ward**

## **Affiliation**

Jamie Ward  
Systems Librarian  
Dundalk Institute of Technology

## **Abstract**

This is a reflection on the National Forum's Professional Development Framework's suitability as a professional development tool for library staff. The framework's language and approach is examined against the experience and personal reality of someone who worked in an academic library and was heavily involved in developing and delivering information literacy classes over 16 years. The conclusion of this piece is that the framework may work well for some parts of library staff's professional development, if we fully embrace its inclusive idea of what teaching is and refuse to allow our profession to be re-cast as occasional teachers.

## **Introduction**

This is a personal reflection on the National Forum's Professional Development Framework (PDF) from the perspective of a librarian who has worked in academic libraries for over 16 years and been involved in the development and delivery of Information Literacy instruction for most of that time. The L2L project is also the first time that I have engaged with continuous professional development on any formal basis and to this end I am very grateful for the opportunity that this project afforded me. This reflection piece is a critique of one of the major concerns I have about the PDF, and also an exploration of how we may be able to adapt it to fit the needs of library staff who teach. To accomplish this I believe we must meet head-on the significant challenges of our professional identity as librarians. These challenges not only come from without in the form of ICT developments, but also

emerge from within through the re-alignment of library staff roles, values and duties that require the profession to define what we mean by teaching and learning facilitation within the library context. The PDF is very timely for the library profession as we take stock of what it means to be librarians who teach and to be guided as we have always been by the needs of our users in this increasingly fractured 'information landscape' (Lloyd, 2017). Specifically, I will be examining if this particular professional development framework fits the needs of the multi-functional librarian profession and examine if the implicit definition of teaching within the PDF accords with what libraries do and our understanding of facilitating learning.

The PDF aims to provide guidance for the professional development of individuals who teach in higher education. It is intended for *all staff* who teach and includes a broader definition of teaching as facilitating student learning: "Teach' used in this document is inclusive of all the activities involving teaching and the facilitation of student learning. The term incorporates the principles of student engagement in the learning process." This is the definition (in a footnote of the introduction to the PDF) that allowed library staff an opportunity to engage with this framework, as we certainly view ourselves as facilitators of student learning. But when I examined the framework closer I began to see that the terminology and intent of its language focused on what may be considered a particular idea of formalised teaching, and this causes problems for me in my multi-functional role in academic librarianship. Perhaps more saliently a misreading of the action of one of libraries' functions as in the verb teach translated into the noun pedagogy as put forward in one of the PDF's aims: "...develop the pedagogy of individual disciplines" (National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning, 2016., p.1) requires the library sector to approach the instruction of our users in a particular *teacherly* way. Pedagogy is "the art, science, or profession of teaching", which is related to but still not our librarian profession.

Many library staff cannot afford a singular focus on pedagogy. The "facilitation of learning" in librarianship means more than pedagogy; it involves the curation, description and provision of access to information that had traditionally been our central roles. It is true that the emergence of more formal teaching classes or instructional duties to aid library

users in the use of information has evolved as one of the central roles that library staff fulfil – but it is not, nor can it be, our sole function. The evolution of bibliographic instruction into a more formal teaching role has been acknowledged by the developments in Information Literacy (IL) principally in academic libraries. Indeed a higher level of engagement with pedagogy can be witnessed in the more recent concepts of IL as an 'education reform movement' (ACRL, 2016). This concept of IL as an 'education reform movement' can be interpreted as an expression in librarianship of the need to be disruptive of any pre-conceived ideas of what we do as library staff being aligned with the more formal teaching practices. But even within the community of information theorists, and perhaps even more so within library professionals, there is no single accepted definition of what it is that we teach in IL. It is also important to remember for any professional development activities that we may engage in as library staff, that we are not primarily a teaching department; we are an information department that also teaches.

That being said, the PDF affords librarians an opportunity to engage with professional development in a systematic and accessible way, which is a real novelty for many in the library community. Having the concepts and tools to undertake professional development is something that is also the goal of CILIP's Professional Knowledge and Skill Base (PKSB), but unlike the PDF the PKSB embraces "the broad range of skills that are required by workers across the library, information and knowledge profession" (CILIP, n.d., p.3), and does not focus on pedagogy. The PDF concentration on facilitation of learning may resonate with many librarians who believe in the idea of a profession dedicated to interactions with users. I would advocate putting users and our interaction with users at the heart of our profession, but I am also cognisant that without the collection of skills that the PKSB outlines we actually offer users very little except theories of information in these teaching moments. So perhaps it is not a case of accepting one or the other of the PKSB or the PDF; rather that there is something in both frameworks that we as library staff who also teach can use for our own development. The practical skills we as library staff use in our everyday role of information specialists, and our working knowledge of our client groups, informs and guides what and how we instruct our users. And users' needs in an academic context were for IL interventions to help

them with their own chosen course of study, and not a prescribed IL curriculum divorced from their immediate needs. If IL should be curriculum based, then it should be student focused and appropriate to the various stages of the student learning trajectory. Also, if we accept that Information Literacy theory is a type of Meta theory (as many do), then having mastered IL concepts in relation to their studies, users/students can then transfer these skills into their future careers. We have to believe that if they become discerning users of information in one context then those facilities will not desert them in future.

Becoming more attuned to our students' actual needs and connecting with the academic process that they were involved with actually requires academic library staff to themselves become involved with academia and processes of research. This involvement with the research process helps form my identity as someone who is part of the academic process, not simply that I teach some classes every year. This aligns with the PDF's Domain 3 Professional Communication and Dialogue in Teaching and Learning: "Development of academic and other forms of writing and enquiry skills to enhance both one's own and students' learning" (National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning, 2016,, p. 5). I also accept that in regards to the more formal teaching and development of class room interactions I became more aware of and used pedagogical techniques and thinking. So for me it became a case of not one without the other, but one skillset being complemented and augmented by another. That is why I see my teaching role as something akin to our professional lecturers in the practical sciences who were first practicing professional architects, lawyers or doctors etc. before becoming teachers. The pure study of pedagogy here is getting the cart before the horse in some respects. The PDF respects this in Domain 4 where it "...emphasises the importance of both disciplinary knowledge and disciplinary approaches to teaching (disciplinary pedagogies)" (National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning, 2016,, p. 6).

### **Standardisation and a teaching philosophy**

Professional identity is one of the PDF's key areas of interest. That is why the emphasis on teaching becomes so important when contemplating using this professional development tool. A professional's identity is usually defined by an adherence to quality; whereas

organisations and administrators are “usually seen as promoting profitability at the expense of profession-defined quality” (Hekman, Steensma, Bigley & Hereford, 2009, p. 1326).

Profitability in the academic sense can be read as reputational value. So wanting to identify as a teacher, I feel, is another manifestation of the professional angst that has assailed the library profession. This identity anxiety is almost built into our professional description because we are fulfilling so many differing roles and we must evolve with the ever changing information environment to remain relevant. Having a common professional development framework for library staff that is focused on teaching (in the sense of formal classroom instruction), is simply not workable in an environment where we as teaching librarians may only teach in front of a few dozen classes per academic year. We are not contracted as teachers, nor are we expected to produce and mark exam papers, so identifying as teachers is more about acknowledgment of what we do as a teaching or learning facilitation role amongst our peers and for our own personal esteem. But if we concentrate on the students' needs and are confident enough in our provision of these learning moments, then what people choose to call me professionally is a moot point (personally speaking). Not all librarians feel they are teachers in any formal sense and simply saying that we all have a role as facilitating learning is only bending the definition of our roles to accommodate an existing framework. And I would argue that the facilitation of learning for library professionals would be wise to avoid the managerial and administrative quagmires that are besetting the modern teaching environment.

Even within the community of library staff who do a lot of formal teaching, there is no single accepted definition of what it is that we teach. There have been efforts to standardise a curriculum for Information Literacy (IL) in academic libraries (most recently by the ACRL), but universal adoption and methods of delivery of the IL learning outcome has been patchy across the sector. This may be because IL, in academic libraries, cannot be a disembodied discrete set of skills divorced from the actual modules and courses of the students and staff that these libraries exist for. IL has sought to accommodate the variation in courses and student types within our Higher Education (HE) institutions. This fluidity of approach is essential for different HE institutions; and indeed, even

within particular institutions, different approaches to IL exist for different departments. This is because of the very nature of what it is that we are teaching. We are not teaching something called information; rather we are attempting to impart an understanding of how to become proficient in the information environment in which the student has chosen to study. Efforts to identify larger learning outcomes at a macro level, e.g. creating an information literate citizen and all that entails, is almost impossibly difficult because by and large libraries are not perceived as teaching departments with a specific curriculum that is recognised within the structure of student awards system, i.e. typically no modular credits are awarded for attendance at Library facilitated IL sessions. At its best IL is a meta-competency (Lloyd, 2006) or a set of skills that assists students to become proficient subject-specialist scholars. For many in the library community this non-formal structure is not only sufficient but also vital to ground IL in subject domains. But even within the various interpretations of IL it should be possible to use the PDF as a template for professional development – right? Only if we define teaching as learning facilitation, I believe, and also put in place professional development (PD) for other aspects of our professional roles.

### **Managerialism manifest in the PD framework**

One of the duties of advising the use of such a standardised framework is to interpret its intentions. For a profession encumbered by various attempts at evaluation, both our value within the academic process and of our contribution to learning, it is important to remain critical of the purpose of any standardised framework. “Librarianship is not defined by how we do things - a functional view - but why we do things - a worldview” (Lankes, 2011, p. 137). One of the traditional strengths of libraries is to provide a neutral environment for patrons so that learning occurs at their own pace. The temporal nature of being a student (meeting modular timelines) means that library staff needed to be more structured in their classroom interventions for students. Measuring the impact of this has always been a major issue. Formal teaching as I have discussed is only one aspect of facilitating learning within libraries and we must be mindful not to allow the adoption of pedagogical frameworks for this one aspect of our duties to mechanise our other values out of existence. Formally I accept that IL classes should be evaluated and assessed – to improve content for the students – but this should not be an open invitation to impose metrics of a nascent managerial culture in

education onto our modus operandi. One of the main components of 'managerialism' is: "...the close monitoring of employee performance and the encouragement of self-monitoring through the widespread use of performance indicators, rankings, league tables and performance management" (Lynch, 2014). At worst the PDF could become a tool for the management of teaching staff translated badly into a tool for self-evaluation of a completely different profession.

The PDF in Domain 2 (National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning, 2016, p. 5) describes a "...commitment to reflective and evidence-based practice and citizenship (contributing to the institution/society's ethical and civic purpose)" and talks of "Development and monitoring of an evidence-based, reflective professional development learning plan for their context". If the ethical and civic purpose is neo-liberal in essence then the monitoring of evidence-based professional development could be viewed as managerialism's way of controlling staff.

Given its alignment with neoliberal values, managerialism also implicitly endorses a concept of the citizen that is market-led. All forms of education, for example, but especially higher education, are defined in terms of human capital acquisition. The purpose of education is increasingly limited to developing the neo-liberal citizen, the competitive economic actor and cosmopolitan worker built around a calculating, entrepreneurial and detached self. A narcissistic actuarialism is encouraged and new educational subjectivities are created. Education itself becomes a way of managing market risks in a highly de-regulated world. The concept of working in or for the public service (or the community and voluntary sectors) is diminished (Lynch, 2014).

The facilitation of learning is about more than evaluating effectiveness or even accuracy of the information we provide, it is about matching the right information with the particular people we are dealing with. That is why we are at the heart of meaning making for students, because we interpret and empathise with people and their information needs. To successfully do this we need to maintain the neutral, non-judgmental space for students and staff, and make spaces and information fit people, not the other way around.

Librarians try to provide information in a neutral, non-judgmental way purely for the reward of assisting someone. This is key. When we do our job, users perceive us as helping them altruistically. Giving assistance with 'no strings attached' in an information environment involves empathy. We do what we do because we believe in helping people, love knowledge, and want to bring them together. No matter how things change, people will always need to trust someone and feel that they are being cared about.

“The framework provides guidance for the professional development (PD) of individuals and gives direction to other stakeholders (e.g. institutions, higher education networks, educational/academic developers, policy makers and student body representatives) for planning, developing and engaging in professional development activities” (National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning, 2016., p. 1) Here we see that the framework is intended for academic developers and policy makers of our institutions, to formulate strategies of PD for their teaching staff, which seems fine, except that we as librarians also have other “stuff” to do that may not be defined as teaching by the institution and therefore our other roles may become denigrated. Another of the PDF’s aims (National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning, 2016, p. 1) is to: “Assist staff to reflect on, plan and contribute to the evidence-based enhancement and transformation of their teaching and learning approaches.” This evidence based approach is further defined: “‘Evidence-based’ refers to any concept or strategy that is derived from or informed by trustworthy evidence - most commonly, educational research or metrics of school, teacher, and student performance”. The metrics here presumably measure learning outcomes of teaching interventions, that for libraries may not in the first instance be as tangible as other lecturers’ class content and also in the most common delivery platform (‘one shot’ classes) may not be measurable at all. If we align ourselves with a mechanised framework of pedagogical development we may lose the trust of our users, and more worryingly we may be frozen out of the meaning making process, that involves trust and empathy between people in a dialogical process.

Even if we overlook the issues around formal IL sessions/classes and say that we are using teachers in its broadest sense (facilitation of

learning), we must preserve those very particular library learning moments, like reference queries, and remember that patrons are often looking for more than exactness in information need (if such a thing exists). “Particularly in academic libraries, where often reference questions are not of a strictly factual nature, users’ satisfaction with the service may depend as much or more on librarians’ attitudes and behaviour than on whether or not the librarian answered the question successfully” (Jardine, 1995, p. 478). How do we measure giving people what they or we did not expect at the outset of the intervention i.e. making meaning with them in that learning instant?

### **Intentionality**

We must examine the intentionality of the language used in the PDF. What is the PDF about and how are we as academic librarians to interpret a PD framework that is for people who teach (and the term teach is included 94 times in the PDF)? Although we have always been part of the pedagogical conversation, we in academic libraries deal with “interrelationship between the individual and the text” (Bruce et al., 2017, p. 13), there is a multiplicity of roles that almost don’t allow for a singular progression pathway for our profession. Among other tasks we deal with something called information in that we “...acquire; organize and give access; preserve and conserve; assist library users; instruct library users; administer and manage the library and its personnel, services, and programs” (Gorman, 2000, pp. 11-14). All of these tasks can be construed as facilitating learning in the broader sense, but handling, managing and interpreting information environments for users can involve quite a different set of skills that are not included within a PD framework focused on pedagogy.

This is best explained when we look at the typology of Professional Development Activities of the PDF. Most of what we “teach” falls within the Non-Accredited typology, albeit at the Structured Non-accredited (non-formal) end of the scale, i.e. “Non-formal learning is always organised, structured and engaged in consciously. There may be a learning objective but there is no judgement or evaluation” (National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning, 2016,, p. 2). We as professionals then look at the PDF for our own development and recognise the value of non-accredited (non-formal) learning. Indeed incidentally there is evidence that most of what was counted as

professional development for librarians heretofore was non-accredited but collaborative, informal/non-formal, and driven by the internal drives of the individuals in the profession. A new managerial culture may not value this (it cannot be tabulated and presented as a linear professional progression), but it was the norm, and evolved with the expectations of our users in their changing information environment.

So what are the intentions of the PDF? The language of the framework conveys its intentions and an awareness of the language being used is vital before undertaking any involvement with a professional development framework. I see language and the meaning of language not in formal truth-conditional accounts of meaning as espoused by philosophers such as like Gottlob Frege (Mai, 2013), Bertrand Russell (1905), Peter Strawson (1950); rather, Wittgenstein's (1953, p.43) account of language gives a satisfactory account of the probabilistic character of what listeners infer from what is spoken or written: "For a large class of cases-though not for all-in which we employ the word 'meaning' it can be explained thus: the meaning of a word is its use in the language". Using words like teach implies that we are professionals involved in formal teaching as understood by the discourse community of teachers. We are not and therefore setting the term 'teach' front-and-center actually detracts from what it is we do more often, i.e. deal with information. Even when we are interacting with users or facilitating learning for users, this is done more often than not in informal instructional encounters rather than scheduled in-class teaching.

Wittgenstein's ideas on meaning and language have a philosophical purpose in so far as they clarify our ways of thinking and stop us being muddled by our misunderstandings of language: "Philosophy is a battle against the bewitchment of our intelligence by means of language" (Wittgenstein, 1953, p. 109); "following Wittgenstein's exhortation not to think but to look, we will not reason a priori about a role such statements ought to play; rather we will find out what circumstances actually license such assertions and what role this license actually plays" (Kripke, 1982, p. 86). But what does the language of teaching in the PDF actually mean and is it relevant to what libraries understand as facilitating learning: "what circumstances actually license such assertions and what role this license actually plays?" If we are to understand the PDF as something primarily meant for teachers and emerging from within the professional

concerns and circumstances of teaching then the language and meaning of the verb to teach, or its licence, is framed by a pedagogical discourse community, rather than an information science community. Teachers in formal settings such as Higher Education establishments are ‘those who are employed, as their main role, to teach others in a formal education context’. I, as a librarian, am not employed as my main role to teach in a formal educational context.

There is a probabilistic character of the term ‘teaching’ within the PDF that philosophers like Grice (1969) sought to explain about conversations, i.e. listeners often draw inference from the words based on what would “more than likely be the case” in the particular case of the utterance (Schiffer, 1982). One of the central aims or intentions of the PDF is to “Enhance and develop the pedagogy of individual disciplines for relevance and authenticity and enable learning from other disciplines” (National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning, 2016., p. 1). The probabilistic character of pedagogy and teaching is expanded in the footnotes (p. 1): “‘Teach’ used here in this document is inclusive of all the activities involved in the teaching and the facilitation of student learning. The term incorporates the principles of student engagement in the learning process.” However, I have already argued that we, as library staff, also value the non-formal and non-structured aspects of learning and should not readily transpose evaluative techniques from formal pedagogy to our profession. Indeed reflective practice, which is a powerful tool of the teaching profession, can be subverted in the wrong contexts. How do we ensure that library staff – who have little actual teaching in practice to reflect upon – will not subvert reflective practice into a destructive fulmination on some quasi-political or intra-institutional turf wars of their administrative roles that they do more of?

Grice subsequently added his notion of ‘Implicatures’ to intentional based meaning in which he attempted to write the listener’s participation back into his theory. Implicatures are based on a listener’s assumption that the speaker is following certain conversational maxims and cooperative principles. The *implicature* (in Gricean terms), of the PDF use of ‘teach’ is interpreted from the community that devised it, namely the teaching community and that the ‘facilitation of student learning’ is similar to formal teaching within a classroom and the formal examination

processes that higher level teachers are subject to. After all we are within the formal setting of a higher education establishment, so it is safe to assume that the PDF's use of the word 'teaching' is from this perspective. As for library users, they may not want formal interventions from their librarians, and survey after survey of user-satisfaction often stress the "attitude, behaviour, interest, and enthusiasm" (Jardine, 1995, p. 477) of the librarian they are interacting with and the value users place on non-mediated quiet places to interact with texts and increasingly multimedia platforms of learning. Indeed one of the values of traditional librarianship was to remain as neutral as possible between the learners and the texts, and at the same time provide as much as is possible for discoverability of texts by seekers after knowledge.

Some of the confusion in translating teaching and information science is the misinterpretation of information itself: We suggest that focusing on the concept of information may have misdirected our field, and that closer attention to concepts such as signs, texts, and knowledge may provide more satisfactory conceptual frameworks for the kind of problems that IS [Information Science] is trying to answer. When we use the term *information* in IS, we should always keep in mind that information is what is informative for a given person. What is informative depends on the interpretative needs and skills of the individual (although these are often shared with members of a discourse community). (Capurro & Hjørland, 2003, p. 350).

In many ways the stuff of what we teach in IL is anti-teaching: "ultimately, information literacy is a subversive activity which challenges received notions of the construction, communication and exchange of information and knowledge" (Walton, 2017 p. 137). IL deconstructs what is information and suggests that what is informative is contingent on what the learner/library user's actual needs are at that moment. So even within formal teaching environments like IL classes we may not be best served in looking at suggested elements within this framework of "Evaluation of teaching and impact on student learning, based on self/peer review/ peer observation, student feedback and/or other

evidence” (National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning, 2016,, p. 5). What we can demonstrate and what we embody in our library work is this interpretative openness of information, not to be bounded by the more summative and evaluative aspects of pedagogy that is implied in the framework. Information is nothing to teach, we cannot teach it, we can only convey the process involved in what perhaps makes it relevant to the student’s discourse community. That is, we are involved in a dialogic meaning making process, between learners, their contexts and texts, and we can only say we contribute to this meaning-making process rather than insisting that users’ learning is attributable to our interventions.

### **Conclusion**

As I indicated at the start of this critique, I believe that the PDF for all staff who teach in Irish higher education does in parts offer a development framework for aspects of our profession; but only if we as a profession and as individual library staff who teach fully understand what it is that we are teaching. I believe that this framework will resonate more with library staff who do quite a lot of formal classroom teaching and if and when we become fully embedded into student’s curriculum. But again we must keep an eye on why we are teaching and the way we teach to maintain our inclusive and non-judgmental roles for all our users. Other professional development tools such as CILIP’s Professional Knowledge and Skill Base (PKSB) may be required also to address more practical aspects of information professionals’ development, but having a number of different options to work with is important for a profession as diverse as ours.

## References

- ACRL. (2016). Framework for information literacy for higher education. Chicago: American Library Association. Retrieved from [http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/infolit/Framework\\_ILHE.pdf](http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/infolit/Framework_ILHE.pdf).
- Bamber, E. M., & Iyer, V. M. (2002). Big 5 auditors' professional and organizational identification: Consistency or conflict? *Auditing*, 21(2), 21–38. doi:10.2308/aud.2002.21.2.21.
- Bruce, C., Demasson, A., Hughes, H., Lupton, M., Abdi, E.S., Maybee, C., ... Mirjamdotter, A. (2017). Information literacy and informed learning : Conceptual innovations for IL research and practice futures. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 11(1), 4–22. doi:10.11645/11.1.2184. Retrieved from <https://ojs.lboro.ac.uk/JIL/article/view/PRA-V11-11-1>
- Capurro, R., & Hjørland, B. (2003). The concept of information. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, 37, 343-411. doi:10.1002/aris.1440370109.
- CILIP (n.d.). Your Professional Skills and Knowledge Base. Retrieved from <https://archive.cilip.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Your%20PKSB%20WEB.pdf>
- Crane, T. (1998). Intentionality as the mark of the mental. *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement*. 43, 229-251. doi:10.1017/S1358246100004380.
- Furner, J. (2004). Information studies without information. *Library Trends*, 52(3), 427–446. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/1684>.
- Gorman, M. (2000). *Our enduring values: Librarianship in the 21st century*. Chicago; London: American Library Association.
- Grice, H. P. (1957). Meaning. *The Philosophical Review*, 66(3), 377–388. doi:10.2307/2182440. Retrieved from <http://www.princeton.edu/~harman/Courses/PHI534-2012-13/Nov19/Grice-meaning.pdf>
- Grice, H. P. (1969). Utterer's meaning and intentions. *The Philosophical Review*, 78(2), 147–177. doi:10.2307/2184179.
- Hekman, D. R., Steensma, H. K., Bigley, G. A., & Hereford, J. F. (2009). Effects of organizational and professional identification on the relationship between administrators' social influence

- and professional employees' adoption of new work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1325-1335. doi:10.1037/a0015315.
- Hjørland, B. (2004). Domain analysis in information science. In M. A. Drake (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of library and information science, volume 2* (2nd ed.) (pp.1–7). New York: Marcel Dekker. doi:10.1081/E-ELIS-120024990.
- Jardine, C. W. (1995). Maybe the 55 percent rule doesn't tell the whole story: A user-satisfaction survey. *College & Research Libraries*, 56(6), 477–485. doi:10.5860/crl\_56\_06\_477. Retrieved from: <https://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/article/view/15006>.
- Kripke, S. A. (1982). *Wittgenstein on rules and private language*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lankes, R. D. (2011). *The atlas of new librarianship*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Retrieved from <https://davidlankes.org/new-librarianship/the-atlas-of-new-librarianship-online/>
- Lloyd, A. (2006). Information literacy landscapes: An emerging picture. *Journal of Documentation*, 62(5), 570–583. doi:10.1108/00220410610688723
- 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. doi:10.1108/JD-03-2016-0032
- Lynch, K. (2014). New managerialism: The impact on education. *Concept*, 5(3), 1–11. Retrieved from <http://lac-php-live5.is.ed.ac.uk/Concept/article/view/271>
- Mai, J. E. (2013). The quality and qualities of information. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 64(4), 675–688. doi:10.1002/asi.22783
- National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. (2016, September 8). National Professional Development Framework for all Staff Who Teach in Higher Education. Retrieved from <https://www.teachingandlearning.ie/publication/national-professional-development-framework-for-all-staff-who-teach-in-higher-education/>
- Ramsey, W. (2007). *Representation reconsidered*. Cambridge:

- Cambridge University Press.
- Russell, B. (1905). On denoting. *Mind*, 14(56), 479–493. Retrieved from [https://www.uvm.edu/~ldeRosse/courses/lang/Russell\(1905\).pdf](https://www.uvm.edu/~ldeRosse/courses/lang/Russell(1905).pdf).
- Schiffer, S. (1982). Intention-based semantics. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 23(2), 119–156. doi:10.1305/ndjfl/1093883624
- Searle, J. R. (1983). *Intentionality: An essay in the philosophy of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strawson, P. (1950). On referring. *Mind*, 59(235), 320–344. Retrieved from <http://semantics.uchicago.edu/kennedy/classes/f09/semprag1/strawson50.pdf>
- Walton, G. (2017). Information literacy is a subversive activity: Developing a research-based theory of information discernment. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 11(1), 137–155. doi:10.11645/11.1.2188. Retrieved from <https://ojs.lboro.ac.uk/JIL/article/view/PRA-V11-11-8>
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophische Untersuchungen = Philosophical Investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe, P. M. S. Hacker, & J. Schulte, J., Trans.) (Revised 4th. ed., 2009) Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.