Reflections on Adopting a Critical Media and Information Literacy Pedagogy

Spencer Brayton and Natasha Casey

CRITICAL INFORMATION LITERACY (CIL) and critical media literacy (CML) are sub-areas within the broader fields of information literacy and media literacy. The latter two are typically (though not exclusively) located within the disciplines of library and information science (LIS) and communications respectively. Similar to appeals made by Marcus Leaning (2014) to combine media and information literacy, we strongly advocate that the critical wings of information literacy and media literacy have much in common and should be allied. To that end, we introduce the term "critical media and information literacy" or CMIL. In this chapter, we provide an overview of the critical traditions in media and information literacy, a rationale for combining CIL and CML, alongside practical classroom examples for a credit-bearing IL course, and identify challenges including assessment as well as student responses to our critical media and information literacy (CMIL) course.

Critical Traditions: Media Literacy and Critical Media Literacy

To contextualize CML's emergence and to understand how it differs from the dominant mainstream media literacy landscape, a brief snapshot of that landscape is necessary. Although five global approaches to media literacy

education have been identified,[1] in the US, broadly speaking, media literacy still falls into two main camps, commonly labeled protectionist and empowerment.[2] The former is part of a much longer historical "moral panic" tradition that stresses the dangers of new media and particularly the ways in which it negatively impacts "youth." The empowerment strand emphasizes media technology and production and teaches children primarily how to make their own media, often emulating existing media conventions and practices. Renee Hobbs memorably characterized some in the empowerment camp as "gee-whizzers" due to their blind exuberance of new technologies.[3]

CML, like communications or media studies in general, is interdisciplinary, shaped by influences and theories from many fields including critical pedagogy, cultural studies, and feminist theory. Kellner and Share (2005) note that CML "builds on these approaches, analysing media culture as products of social production and struggle and teaching students to be critical of media representations and discourses, but also stressing the importance of learning to use the media as modes of self-expression and social activism."[4] This approach in part accounts for CML's somewhat marginalized position in relation to mainstream media literacy, where critical pedagogy, cultural studies, and feminist theory are often shunned and neoliberal assumptions unquestioned.

In contrast to CML, some media literacy educators argue that the field is (or should be) "apolitical"; some strive to have students simply mimic the instructor's ideologies, while others see media literacy as a prescriptive skills-based enterprise. There has been a worrying rise of the latter in the wake of the 2016 presidential election and the emergence of "news literacy" checklists to counter so-called "fake news." There is no magical checklist to fight misinformation in all its many forms or to understand the enormity of the role media plays in our lives. Unlike this approach, CML challenges students to think holistically about a wide range of issues, including the ways in which media ownership impacts content, how various groups are represented, as well as broader topics, including understanding the ways in which we learn and the purpose of education. CML disrupts traditional banking models of education and eschews individualistic, competitive approaches to learning and replaces them with collaborative, creative, and problem-posing strategies. Unlike protectionist or empowerment camps, Kellner and Share (2005) argue that teaching CML involves "…occupation of a site above the dichotomy of fandom and censor."[5]

The critical tradition in media literacy has a much longer history outside the US where it is uncommon to even use the term "critical" as it is generally implied in the phrase "media education" (equivalent to "media literacy" in the US).[6] This difference is partially due to the influence of critical and cultural studies works on the early development of the field.[7] In the US, references to CML can be traced back to the late 1980s.[8] In the mid to late 2000s, in a series of influential articles, Kellner and Share clearly defined and highlighted its emergent place in the US media literacy field (in 2005, they characterized CML as "still in its infancy").[9] In addition to Kellner and Share, research by scholars including Julie Frechette, Steven Funk, Rhonda Hammer, and various organizations, including Project Censored, Action Coalition for Media Education (ACME), the Media Education Foundation (MEF), and many others have all advanced CML, though not always using this title. Despite these efforts, the concept has struggled to win wide attention within both media literacy (although some view CML as a critique of media literacy rather than being an arm or branch of the latter) and communications generally. Nevertheless, the concept and its practical classroom application has gained considerable traction over the last decade as evidenced by the growing number of articles, books, and conferences dedicated to it.

Critical Traditions: Information Literacy and Critical Information Literacy

Information literacy was—and still is, to an extent—taught as a set of skills that must be attained. Two areas of thought have developed in the last decade that challenge this outdated practice. First, information literacy instruction should not only teach students skills with an outcome of defining their literacy. For example, students must see themselves as creators of information and question the peer-review process as opposed to more traditional information literacy that reflects the student being a more passive consumer of information. Second, information literacy instruction should be cross-disciplinary and faculty should be empowered to incorporate such ideas into their courses. This, despite that some in the LIS discipline have held onto information literacy instruction as something the profession "owns."

Critical information literacy continues as an emerging area in the wider field of information literacy, although like CML, many see CIL emerging

as a critique of IL rather than an arm or branch of it. CIL questions traditional definitions of what it means to be information literate and allows librarians to question professional practice (i.e., the MLIS and pedagogy) and respond to social justice issues such as diversity and inclusion.[10] Critical theory applied to information literacy gives librarians and students an opportunity to explore teaching and learning beyond databases, to question the costs of academic publishing, the possibilities of open access, and who is being excluded from the literature.[11] This is not to say that basic research skills are irrelevant or unimportant; they certainly have their place. But librarians recognize they have more to offer, and this has in part been facilitated by the influence of various CIL approaches.

Compared to the longstanding tradition of critical analysis in the media literacy field, a similar approach to information literacy within the LIS field has only been gaining traction for little more than a decade, as Tewell (2015) notes.[12] There has been a shift in the definition of IL in the more recent *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* (2016), although the Framework is highly debated within the field. Although not synonymous with CIL, it could be argued that the Framework leaves opportunity for critical approaches to IL. This is different from the earlier standards, which defines IL as more of a prescriptive, skills-based model.

Similar to CML, it's not entirely clear where critical information literacy was first mentioned. In communication with Eamon Tewell, he noted some key works, including Cushla Kapitzke (2001),[13] Troy Swanson (2004),[14] and Michelle Holschuh Simmons (2005).[15] CIL was brought to the forefront by Elmborg's 2006 influential article, and for this reason, he is often credited as the "first."[16] Since then, CIL has been slowly cultivated among a minority of academic librarians and made more widely known in the US and Canada. Despite its brief history, the LIS profession has certainly seen growth in discussion, writing, and application of CIL in the classroom in recent years.

Critical Media and Information Literacy

Critical media and information literacy calls for the integration of the usually siloed areas of critical media literacy and critical information literacy. There is a natural alliance between the two, evidenced by common theoretical influences, research, and teaching priorities. Moreover, as many others, including Marcus Leaning (2014)[17] and Sonia Livingstone (2008),[18]

have argued, media and information are now synonymous in the contemporary digital landscape. Critical information literacy and critical media literacy represent a small but significant group of scholars who critique "mainstream" information literacy and media literacy philosophies and practices. By combining the two areas, CMIL can have a greater impact in both while also helping to build alliances.

There have been attempts to bring information literacy and media literacy together: transliteracy, some versions of digital literacy, as well as Mackey and Jacobson's metaliteracy concept, although a critical theory/pedagogy component has been absent in most of these iterations. Mackey and Jacobson (2011)[19] first introduced their metaliteracy concept by arguing in light of new internet practices and particularly the ability of users to produce and share via social media, information literacy needed to evolve from its traditional skills-based roots. Metaliteracy was conceptualized as a "framework" in which other literacies, including media, digital, visual, and more, could be connected and aid in this evolution. Mackey and Jacobson contend there are many misunderstandings about their metaliteracy concept; one of the most notable is that it is often misconstrued as an attempt to combine various literacies (information, digital, media).[20] However, more relevant to this chapter, Mackey and Jacobson acknowledge that early iterations of metaliteracy lacked the critical component that is central to the CMIL model offered here, although their most recent work starts to address this.[21]

In the contemporary digital landscape, media and information are indistinguishable from one another. Sonia Livingstone (2008)[22] has convincingly argued this point while Marcus Leaning (2014)[23] and UNESCO (2011)[24] have forcefully appealed for a media and information literacy alliance, though fewer calls have emanated from LIS. Leaning notes, "…the experience of being a user of information resources and a consumer of media is so similar that the two cannot be separated."[25] CMIL is an attempt to put into practice what many others have called for. It is one way to approach and integrate two fields that have much in common but are routinely siloed.[26] CIL and CML share concerns (ideology, representation), influences (Gramsci, Stuart Hall, Freire, hooks, Giroux), and approaches from critical theory, critical pedagogy, and feminist theory. It is important to note CMIL is not about incorporating CML to enhance CIL or vice versa. We propose an equitable collaboration that borrows from two fields to enhance both. It is less about subsuming one field under the other and

more about the strengths and depths possible through an alliance. For each of us, understanding the others field has opened up additional research, resources, and perhaps more important, fresh theoretical perspectives on the role of media/information in our culture. There is no one "correct" or optimal model or way to bring CIL and CML together. We offer one case study in the hopes of facilitating further collaborative discussions and practices. CIL and CML are two sides of the same coin. Failure to see the ways in which they connect and can help inform one another is to borrow Leaning's (2014) provocative phrase, "pedagogically wasteful."[27]

Despite different histories and trajectories, media literacy and information literacy have much in common, including shared language and areas of interest. For example, ACRL (2015) states, "Information literacy is the set of integrated abilities encompassing the reflective discovery of information, the understanding of how information is produced and valued, and the use of information in creating new knowledge and participating ethically in communities of learning."[28] Similarly, the National Association for Media Literacy Education (2001) defines media literacy as "the ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and communicate information in a variety of forms, including print and non-print messages. Media literacy empowers people to be both critical thinkers and creative producers of an increasingly wide range of messages using image, language, and sound. It is the skillful application of literacy skills to media and technology messages."[29] One could easily change media to information in either of these definitions and achieve the same meaning. Common to both are ideas of discovery, production, value, use, creation, analysis, and evaluation.

CMIL in Practice

We developed and co-taught a three-credit-hour, face-to-face media and information literacy course aimed at second-year undergraduates at a small midwestern liberal arts college (piloted in spring 2016 with thirty-three students). Housed in the department of English and communications, this standalone course is required for communications majors and minors, professional writing majors and minors, secondary English education majors, and an elective option for marketing communication minors. It has also become a popular class with students beyond these disciplines, as anyone can enroll. Moreover, since fall 2017, the class also counts toward required

general education credits. Each class period is eighty minutes, meets twice a week, and in 2016 was moved from spring to fall semester to coincide with national media literacy week. Fifteen students enrolled in fall 2016 and sixteen in fall 2017. The average class size at the institution is twelve. A more traditional media literacy course, using a well-known textbook in the field, was taught annually by one of the instructors at the same institution for four years prior to this collaboration.

However, in the media and information pilot course, we replaced the textbook with a variety of readings, videos, and podcasts and covered a wider range of topics, including propaganda, participatory culture, media ownership, digital humanities, reality television, issues of representation, advertising/native advertising, privacy, filter bubbles, surveillance, data mining, piracy, copyright, fair use, open access, remix, authorship and Wikipedia, the value of Twitter/social media, and information overload. We also attempted to incorporate some key critical pedagogy tenets. As noted earlier, critical pedagogy is an important common denominator between CIL and CML and helps fuel the CMIL collaboration outlined here. Critical pedagogy, as Darder, Torres, and Baltodano explain, "…embraces a dialectical view of knowledge that functions to unmask the connections between objective knowledge and the cultural norms, values and standards of the society at large."[30] Our class eschews the skills-based approaches popular in some information and media literacy schools of thought and complicates notions of power, authority, and knowledge. Our goal is to facilitate higher order critical thinking by encouraging students to go beyond just applying evaluation checklists to consider the ways in which the authority of those sources can be challenged. The critical pedagogy component became increasingly important and occupied a more central place each time the class was taught. For example, on the first day of class in fall 2017, we began with a discussion on what college is for, dissected what it means to be a critical thinker, and introduced banking versus problem-posing methods of education.

The three practical examples from our media and information literacy course detailed below reflect our CMIL perspective, foreground its critical pedagogical focus, and further illustrate the connections between media and information literacy. The first example is a unit on advertising and propaganda. Using resources and adapting lesson plans created (and made freely available) by media literacy researcher Renee Hobbs,[31] students ex-

amine definitions and functions of propaganda, what media/information "genres" could be thought of as propaganda, and identify various techniques used to attract audiences. Students then watch the provocative "A Television Commercial for Communism" (also available on Hobbs' website) and answer five key media literacy questions:[32]

1. Who created the message and what is the purpose?
2. What techniques are used to attract viewer attention?
3. What lifestyles, values, and points of view are represented?
4. How might different people interpret the message differently?
5. What is omitted?

Prior to this unit, students learned about ideology and various basic "how communications works" theories, including Stuart Hall's encoding/decoding model.

A second unit in our course that illustrates the central tenets of critical information and media literacy is remix culture.[33] We challenge students to think about how information and media have been reused over time for creative, entertainment, financial, and scholarly purposes, and the ways in which remix, fair use, and open access are important to advancing new knowledge. Students watch and read a variety of materials before in-class discussions on the topic. By emphasizing that all forms of media and information are inspired by previous works and that nothing is purely original, the exploration of remix culture cements this idea, a radical one for some students.

Students typically offer divergent opinions regarding copyright and the impact economics and ownership has on various media/information texts. Some take the position of the typical neoliberal creator, arguing knowledge is a commodity and entitled to be inaccessible to many behind paywalls. Other students see copyright as restrictive to both creation and participation, especially in the context of online environments. This perspective understands that creators should be referenced and acknowledged for their work, but that information should be shared freely and not stuck behind inaccessible paywalls.

In addition, we challenge students to think about remix culture in relation to academic writing. As a class, we read "Remix Everything: BuzzFeed and the Plagiarism Problem" (Gawker);[34] and "Remix: The Art and Craft of Endless Hybridization" by Michele Knobel and Colin Lankshear,[35] and watch "RiP!: A Remix Manifesto."[36] Students are often told to write "orig-

inal" research papers in college, but struggle with the question, what is original? This raises important issues regarding the differences between building on someone else's ideas and plagiarism. They struggle with this idea because in writing research papers they see themselves reading and building off of information and ideas that have already been produced and *remixing* that information into their own thoughts and ideas. It is the disconnect between the realities of remix and some educators' insistence on originality that causes many students to question once taken for granted ideas about the latter.

It is equally important that students consider the emancipatory potential of information and media beyond traditional capitalist narratives and paradigms (i.e., Should information even be sold? What does it mean for a privileged few to have access to paywalled knowledge?, etc.). One way we get students to think about this issue is to have them read the "Guerilla Open Access Manifesto" by Aaron Swartz[37] and watch the documentary about Swartz, *The Internet's Own Boy*.[38] Learning about Swartz's life, work, and activism makes a powerful impression. For example, students have typically been taught that databases contain the highest quality research and make our lives easier when conducting research. Through Swartz's work, they see a different side of the issue where a company is making money off of research that is not freely available; they are introduced to the idea that corporations working with institutions of higher education may not always have the best interests in mind for the institution or their students. By examining remix culture and its associative concepts, we want our students to understand how media and information are created and then sold to different audiences.

The final unit that helps illustrate our CMIL approach focuses on Wikipedia. We modify an assignment originally developed by media literacy researcher and educator Henry Jenkins and problematize common understandings (and misunderstandings) on the value of Wikipedia.[39] By working in pairs, students analyze the different policies that shape the work of the popular internet site. This exercise challenges students' long-held notions that the site is "bad," a belief drilled into them by a majority of teachers and professors (we can't be sure that educators truly understand why they promote this approach either). Students are repeatedly told not to use Wikipedia for their research, although most in our classes admit that they do. Inspired by Jenkins, the guiding principle of the assignment is that

we need to teach students how to critically engage with Wikipedia, as they are utilizing the site irrespective of educators' preferences.

Students are often surprised to learn about the lengthy, detailed policies and procedures in place, the majority of which they had no idea about. And although Wikipedia is obviously not without its problems, given the frequency with which students use it, "tinkering 'under the hood'" as Jenkins called it,[40] is an essential critical media and information literacy practice. Another example of useful "tinkering" occurred during our first semester teaching this course when a student attempted to make their own fake Wikipedia page about an invented anime character for a final project (which they assumed would be fairly easy given the common stereotypes about the site.) The student ended up with an unpublished entry (it was quickly flagged as "abuse") as they were unable to adhere to Wikipedia's minimum requirements regarding support for their entry.

Class discussions on Wikipedia also help illustrate concepts such as participatory culture, collective intelligence, and the power of networks (including smart mobs[41] and notions of the commons)—concepts students learn about by reading work by media scholars Howard Rheingold and Henry Jenkins. Ultimately, we attempt to empower the class to think of themselves as creators of information through this Wikipedia assignment and illustrate that students can contribute to the commons in productive ways through collaborative, open platforms.

CMIL Challenges

In this section, we outline four main challenges encountered over the three times we have now taught this still-evolving media and information literacy course.

1. Student Reactions

Teaching from a critical media and information literacy perspective is inevitably challenging, given that we are attempting to decenter the role of the teacher and invite students to challenge not just the material but the power dynamics and hierarchies inherent in the classroom space. Students sometimes struggle with this critical pedagogical approach for a number of reasons. For some, it simply disrupts familiar ideas of how a teacher "should" act and what a classroom "should" be like. Throughout our own

education, from kindergarten to graduate school, we were predominantly taught in very traditional ways, with authoritative teachers using banking methods of education. As our teaching developed and became informed by critical theory, we've moved further away from these traditional classroom practices, not only because we believe in a critical pedagogy that challenges these methods and ideologies, but also because we don't believe the older methods actually work.

Relatedly, the idea that knowledge is not neutral is a radical concept for the majority of our students, who typically accept teachers' and professors' definitions of "authority." Many of our students commonly see learning as a linear process. They are used to a system where information passed from teacher to student is the most credible and authoritative. When posed with ideas and questions about the peer review process, for example, that push back on these traditionally held notions, they sometimes struggle to understand that bias and power occur at even the upper echelons of the academy. Our students are typically and understandably indoctrinated by neoliberal traditions of education that dictate "correct" ways of being a student, such as deference to authority, as well as equally hegemonic notions of how professors "should" teach (i.e., depositors of knowledge).

We continually grapple with the most effective and constructive ways to teach from a critical perspective to our students, a significant number of whom are conservative, working class, white and were raised in rural environments. We've had to develop ways to introduce material without necessarily signaling it as explicitly politically progressive. To do so would only silence, marginalize, and alienate many students in our class, obviously something we do not wish to do. As a result, it is also important to realize that the ability to not have to think critically about situating critical pedagogy for students (by the educator) is itself an indicator of privilege. Not all educators, especially in cases where they lack autonomy (i.e., some adjunct instructors and librarians), have the privilege to practice critical pedagogy in their classrooms. Fear of backlash from fellow faculty members as well as students, many of whom expect "traditional" banking methods of instruction and balk at "alternative" methods, is a lived reality on many campuses.

2. Institutional Reactions: Too critical?

Even as liberal arts-focused institutions insist they want students to "think

critically," critical media and information literacy is ironically perceived by some as a dangerous concept that "goes too far." Regrettably, there are many educators who define authority in simplistic ways by upholding the authority of "x" journal or "x" database, as well as their own traditional, perceived position of infallibility in the classroom. Journal articles from a database are frequently considered the most authoritative sources and students are required to use them. Of course, the construction of credibility and authority is not so simple. There is very little or no consideration of open educational resources or discussion regarding what research gets left out of some mainstream journals or the financial and ideological power publishers have on the academic publishing industry by those many educators who define authority in simplistic ways.

Some administrators, educators, and institutions are slow to realize that academic publishing is evolving, along with alternative means of discussing research in non-traditional arenas, including blogs and on social media.

3. Institutional Reactions: Assessment
Another element being driven by dominant educational ideology is the desire to assess everything—to "prove," often with data, that the work you are doing matters and that students are succeeding. This dominant ideological paradigm would have us believe that success is corroborated by grades, retention rates, and other quantitative measures. In developing and implementing our critical media and information literacy course, the inevitable question emerged: How do we know that what we are doing in the classroom works? In an effort to answer this question, we attempted to assess and quantify competency levels in regard to student learning in this course through the use of a survey. Admittedly, this was driven in part by the desire to "prove" the worth of information and media literacy, as well as our own value, in an assessment-obsessed educational culture. Moreover, the significance attributed to quantitative "evidence," both at our home institution as well as the academy in general, further prompted this approach, despite our own frustrations with the inadequacies of survey instruments and quantitative approaches in general. Nevertheless, our survey asked students to define information literacy and media literacy as separate concepts. One dilemma with this, at least in the first iteration of this course, was that media literacy was a more dominant idea for students and we

realized that this was our fault. Our class was called "Media Literacy" the first time we taught it and Casey was the lead teacher (she had taught a media literacy course for the previous four years). Throughout the course, we failed to explicitly discuss the crossover between information and media literacy enough with the students, which resulted in poor understandings of information literacy in the survey. When the course was offered the second time, the name was officially changed to "Media and Information Literacy" and we had worked out a much more equitable teaching partnership. In addition, it took us until the second time the class was offered to regularly use the phrase "Media and Information Literacy." These factors impacted student perceptions of the media and information literacy concepts and the class overall. Since then, media and information literacy are routinely explained in depth and are more explicitly and regularly stated as a unified concept to the class.

We plan to continue the survey but realize its inherent problems, including modifying questions to get the kinds of answers that reflect favorably on the course and addressing accusations of "navel gazing" by using our own students to "prove" the worth of our efforts. However, we are also moving toward a "student-centered, co-operative" assessment model[42] by incorporating student-authored reflection papers, final projects, weekly Twitter takeaways, and various other assignments to examine and improve student learning as well as our own teaching. A survey is unlikely to elicit qualitative, reflective, student-authored perspectives on the class. For example, in the reflection paper, it became clear that students started to see themselves as creators and participators in media and information environments, a realization that would not be immediately obvious through the survey:

> Another idea that I had never thought about until I took this class was that we are creators of media as well as companies and so forth. When we tweet, share something on Facebook, create a video or write about a story we are creators of media. Gillmor (2009) in his article "Media Users, Media Creators: Principles of Active Engagement" argues that "tools of creation are increasingly in everyone's hands." In the past I have worked a lot with Photoshop creating different pieces for coursework. I never thought

> about it as being a creation of media. Therefore, this was something interesting that I learned and that I hope to possibly look into more in the future.

Assessment is clearly a contentious idea in the context of critical pedagogy. Herbert Marcuse's critique of education[43] comes to mind when in the midst of the implementation of the most conventional and often quantitative assessment strategies. And although there are some benefits to assessment—such as motivating educators to think through why they are teaching what they are—there are obvious downsides. Rubrics and learning outcomes focus too narrowly on "measurable" skills. This is a problem in the US higher education system and restricts critical reflection about the instructor's position in the classroom when discussing critical content and its relationship to students. Davidson (2013) wrote, "More and more assessment is detached from the standard of excellence it is supposed to measure in some productive way," ultimately concluding, "the tragedy is that, in many cases, we have reached a binary: assessment *versus* innovation."[44]

4. Co-teaching

As Baldwin and Chang note, "One of the principal benefits of collaborating with others is to achieve goals that cannot be achieved alone…."[45] And although co-teaching isn't essential to the CMIL approach outlined here, we found it facilitated experimentation, creativity, and caused us to routinely reflect on classroom practices. Given the unusual nature of our media and information literacy experiment, especially during the first couple of semesters we co-taught it, we needed to explain our approach to students. In our specific college culture, students needed this context as not only is co-teaching uncommon, co-teaching between librarians, who are classified as staff, with professors is even more so. In our case, co-teaching developed organically and slowly became more formal as both became instructors of record after the first iteration of the course. The partnership meant relinquishing power in the classroom in addition to giving up some allegiances to our own disciplines. Whitworth asks, "*Can* libraries/LIS give up information literacy, or at least recognise that it is a notion that spreads well beyond their own landscape—even if this would *strengthen*, not weaken their position?"[46] This willingness to "give up" "our" areas in the classroom has only served to strengthen the critical information and media literacy

partnership. Given a recent job change by one of the authors, we no longer teach the course together, but both are still involved in its continued evolution. We realize that co-teaching is not a realistic option at many institutions; however, a CMIL course like the one outlined here could still be developed through intentional faculty/librarian partnerships.

Conclusion

Critical information literacy and critical media literacy are natural allies due to the increased convergence of media and information, especially during the last twenty years. Despite this, media literacy educators and information literacy educators, including those in the critical wings of both, remain resolutely siloed. By offering CMIL, it is not our intent to construct yet another silo. CMIL is not an umbrella term for various literacies but rather aims to make connections among them. And just as we have built off other approaches, we hope the same can be done with ours and that those working in CIL and CML can envision collaborative possibilities.

A CMIL approach that combines CIL and CML would no longer represent a blip on the radar of each area (information literacy and media literacy), and a concerted effort across disciplines and professional associations could bring these ideas to wider audiences. One way this could be done is through professional associations from both fields including the UNESCO based Global Alliance for Partnerships on Media and Information Literacy, the National Association for Media Literacy Education, the Canadian Association of Professional Academic Librarians, and the American Library Association.

Giroux and McLaren (1992) write:

> If critical pedagogy is to be taken seriously as a form of cultural struggle, it must seek to create new forms of knowledge not only by breaking down disciplinary boundaries but also by creating new spaces where knowledge can be produced. This means that pedagogy as a form of cultural production must not be limited to canonical texts and social relations that mediate and produce forms of dominant culture. Knowledge must be reinvented and reconstructed by inviting students to be border crossers, by encouraging

them to collapse disciplines that separate high from popular culture, theory from practice, art from life, politics from the everyday, and pedagogy from education.[47]

There is a surprising lack of understanding of overlapping traditions from the perspective of both disciplines. It is our hope that critical media and information literacy represents one approach with which to transgress disciplinary boundaries, create new knowledge, and encourage many more "border crossers."

Acknowledgments

The authors thank their students for inspiring this work, as well as the many researchers working in both information literacy and media literacy, many of whom generously shared time, ideas, and research with us.

Endnotes

1. De Abreu et al identified five global approaches to media literacy education: inoculation, critical analytical, media arts, social participatory, and the reflective media production approach. Belinha S. De Abreu, Paul Mihailidis, Alice Y. L. Lee, Jad Melki, and Julian McDougall, eds., *International Handbook of Media Literacy Education* (New York: Routledge, 2017).
2. This simple dichotomy doesn't reflect all the various factions or schools, but this isn't the appropriate place for a comprehensive survey (see Hobbs, "Digital and Media Literacy").
3. Renee Hobbs, "Digital and Media Literacy: A Plan of Action," a white paper on the Digital and Media Literacy Recommendations of the Knight Commission on the Information Needs of Communities in a Democracy, The Aspen Institute (2010), 51, https://assets.aspeninstitute.org/content/uploads/2010/11/Digital_and_Media_Literacy.pdf.
4. Doug Kellner and Jeff Share, "Toward Critical Media Literacy: Core Concepts, Debates, Organizations, and Policy," *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 26.3 (2005): 372.
5. Kellner and Share, "Toward Critical Media Literacy," 373.
6. Jeanne Prinsloo, "Critical Media Literacy: A Design for the Future," *OPENSPACE,* 1(5) (2007): 20.
7. Manuel Alvarado and Oliver Boyd-Barrett, eds., *Media Education: An Introduction* (London: BFI, 1992); Len Masterman, *Teaching the Media* (London: Comedia, 1985).

8.   Jeff Share, e-mail message to authors, January 20, 2018.

9.   Kellner and Share, "Toward Critical Media Literacy," 373.

10. Eamon Tewell, "The Practice and Promise of Critical Information Literacy: Academic Librarians' Involvement in Critical Library Instruction [preprint]," *College & Research Libraries,* 78, Number 6 (2017), retrieved June 14, 2017 from http://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/article/view/16616.

11. Tewell, "The Practice and Promise of Critical Information Literacy."

12. Eamon Tewell, "A Decade of Critical Information Literacy," *Communications in Information Literacy,* 9, Number 1 (2015).

13. Cushla Kapitzke, "Information literacy: The changing library," *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 44 (5) (2001).

14. Troy A. Swanson, "A Radical Step: Implementing A Critical Information Literacy Model," *portal: Libraries and the Academy,* 4 (2) (2004).

15. Michelle Holschuh Simmons, "Librarians as Disciplinary Discourse Mediators: Using Genre Theory to Move toward Critical Information Literacy," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 5 (3) (2005).

16. Eamon Tewell, e-mail message to author, January 23, 2018.

17. Marcus Leaning, "Towards the Integration of Media and Information Literacy: A Rationale for a 21st Century Approach," in *Media Literacy Education in Action: Theoretical and Pedagogical Perspectives*, ed. Belinha S. DeAbreu and Paul Mihailidis (New York: Routledge, 2014).

18. Sonia Livingstone, E. Van Couvering, and Nancy Thumin, "Converging Traditions of Research on Media and Information Literacies," in *Handbook of Research on New Literacies*, eds. Julie Coiro, Michele Knobel, Colin Lankshear, and Donald J. Leu (New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, 2008).

19. Thomas P. Mackey and Trudi E. Jacobson, "Reframing Information Literacy as a Metaliteracy," *College & Research Libraries*, 72, Number 1 (2011): 62–78.

20. Thomas Mackey and Trudi Jacobson, Zoom call with authors, September 8, 2017.

21. In our conversation with Mackey and Jacobson, they note that the critical dimension wasn't something they thought much about in the earliest incarnations of metaliteracy. They also acknowledged that recently some researchers have discussed and applied their concept from a critical perspective.

22. Livingstone, Couvering, and Thumin, "Converging Traditions of Research.

23. Marcus Leaning, "Towards the Integration of Media."

24. C. Wilson, A. Grizzle, R. Tuazon, K. Akyempong, and C. Cheung, *Media and Information Literacy Curriculum for Teachers*, Paris: UNESCO, 2011.

25. Marcus Leaning, "Towards the Integration of Media," 100.

26. We found just two other media and information literacy course examples. The first, offered at Southern Illinois University Carbondale, is collaborative and utilized critical theory and pedagogy, although it remains quite different from ours as it is taught online by three educators—a librarian, one faculty member in

film and one in journalism. Each week, they take turns to teach media literacy and information literacy concepts from the perspective of their own disciplines. Thanks to Christina Heady for sharing her syllabus with us. The second example is the open access UNESCO curriculum promoting a global alliance between media and information literacy, although it lacked the overtly critical perspective discussed in this chapter (Wilson et al).

27. Leaning, "Towards the Integration of Media," 100.

28. Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL), *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* (2016), accessed November 4, 2017, http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework.

29. "What is Media Literacy? NAMLE's Short Answer and a Longer Thought," 2001, http://www.medialit.org/reading-room/what-media-literacy-namles-short-answer-and-longer-thought.

30. Antonia Darder, Rodolfo D. Torres, and Marta P. Baltodano, "Critical Pedagogy: An Introduction," in *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*, eds. Antonia Darder, Rodolfo D. Torres, and Marta P. Baltodano (New York: Routledge, 2017), 11.

31. Renee Hobbs, "Mind Over Media: Analyzing Contemporary Propaganda," *Media Education Lab* (2015), accessed January 5, 2018, http://www.mindovermedia.tv.

32. There is considerable debate over both the origins and usefulness of key questions. There are also many different versions (NAMLE, CML, etc.). The ones used here are gleaned from Renee Hobbs' Media Education Lab.

33. Catherine Burwell, "The Pedagogical Potential of Video Remix: Critical Conversations About Culture, Creativity, and Copyright," *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 57.3 (2013): 205–13, doi:10.1002/JAAL.205.

34. Adrian Chen, "Remix Everything: BuzzFeed and the Plagiarism Problem," *Gawker*. http://gawker.com/5922038/remix-everything-buzzfeed-and-the-plagiarism-problem.

35. Michele Knobel and Colin Lankshear, "Remix: The Art and Craft of Endless Hybridization," *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 52(1) (2008): 22–33.

36. *RiP!: A Remix Manifesto,* film, directed by Brett Gaylor, 2008 (New York: The Disinformation Company, 2009), DVD.

37. Aaron Swartz, "Guerilla Open Access Manifesto," 2008, accessed January 7, 2018, https://archive.org/details/GuerillaOpenAccessManifesto.

38. *The Internet's Own Boy,* film, United States, Brian Knappenberger, 2014.

39. Henry Jenkins, "What Wikipedia Can Teach Us About the New Media Literacies (part one)" (June 2007), http://henryjenkins.org/blog/2007/06/what_wikipedia_can_teach_us_ab.html.

40. Jenkins, "What Wikipedia Can Teach Us."

41. "Smart mobs consist of people who are able to act in concert even if they don't know each other. The people who make up smart mobs cooperate in ways never before possible because they carry devices that possess both communication and

computing capabilities" (see http://sociology.morrisville.edu/readings/STS316/
Rheingold_Smart-Mobs.pdf).

42. Linda Keesing-Styles, "The Relationship between Critical Pedagogy and Assessment in Teacher Education," *Radical Pedagogy* 5.1 (2003), retrieved from http://www.radicalpedagogy.org/radicalpedagogy/The_Relationship_between_Critical_Pedagogy_and_Assessment_in_Teacher_Education.html.

43. Doug Kellner, Tyson E. Lewis, and Clayton Pierce, "On Marcuse" (Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2008).

44. Cathy Davidson, "Assessment versus Innovation," in *Hacking the Academy*, eds. Daniel J. Cohen and Tom Scheinfeldt (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013), 98–99.

45. Roger G. Baldwin and Deborah A. Chang, "Collaborating to Learn, Learning to Collaborate," *Peer Review* 9.4 (2007): 27.

46. Andrew Whitworth, *Radical Information Literacy: Reclaiming the Political Heart of IL Movement* (Oxford: Chandos Publishing, 2014), 71.

47. Henry A. Giroux and Peter L. McLaren, "Introduction: Media Hegemony: Towards a Critical Pedagogy of Representation," in *Media Knowledge: Readings in Popular Culture, Pedagogy, and Critical Citizenship*, by James Schwoch, Mimi White and Susan Reilly (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1992), xv-xxxiv.

Bibliography

Alvarado, Manuel, and Oliver Boyd-Barrett, eds. *Media Education: An Introduction*. London: BFI, 1992.

Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL). (2000). *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency.

———. 2016. *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*. Accessed November 4, 2017. http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework.

Baldwin, Roger G., and Deborah A. Chang. "Collaborating to Learn, Learning to Collaborate." *Peer Review* 9.4 (2007): 26–30.

Burwell, Catherine. "The Pedagogical Potential of Video Remix: Critical Conversations About Culture, Creativity, and Copyright." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 57.3 (2013): 205–13. doi:10.1002/JAAL.205.

Chen, Adrian. "Remix Everything: BuzzFeed and the Plagiarism Problem." *Gawker*. http://gawker.com/5922038/remix-everything-buzzfeed-and-the-plagiarism-problem.

Darder, Antonia, Rodolfo D. Torres, and Marta P. Baltodano. "Critical Pedagogy: An Introduction." In *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*, edited by Antonia Darder, Rodolfo D. Torres, and Marta P. Baltodano, 1–23. New York: Routledge, 2017.

Davidson, Cathy. "Assessment versus Innovation." In *Hacking the Academy*, edited by Daniel J. Cohen and Tom Scheinfeldt, 98–99. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013.

De Abreu, Belinha S., Paul Mihailidis, Alice Y. L. Lee, Jad Melki, and Julian McDougall, eds. *International Handbook of Media Literacy Education*. New York: Routledge, 2017.

Drabinski, E., M. Accardi, and A. Kumbier. *Critical Library Instruction: Theories and Methods*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2010.

Elmborg, James. "Critical Information Literacy: Implications for Instructional Practice." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32.2 (2006): 192–99.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 1986.

Gillmor, Dan. *Mediactive*. Dan Gillmor, 2010.

Giroux, Henry A. *Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning*. Massachusetts: Bergen and Garvey, 1988.

Giroux, Henry A., and Peter L. McLaren. "Introduction: Media Hegemony: Towards a Critical Pedagogy of Representation." In *Media Knowledge: Readings in Popular Culture, Pedagogy, and Critical Citizenship*, by James Schwoch, Mimi White and Susan Reilly, xv-xxxiv. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1992.

Hobbs, Renee. "Digital and Media Literacy: A Plan of Action." A White Paper on the Digital and Media Literacy Recommendations of the Knight Commission on the Information Needs of Communities in a Democracy, The Aspen Institute (2010). https://assets.aspeninstitute.org/content/uploads/2010/11/Digital_and_Media_Literacy.pdf.

———. "Mind Over Media: Analyzing Contemporary Propaganda." *Media Education Lab* (2015). Accessed January 5, 2018. http://www.mindovermedia.tv.

hooks, bell. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

The Internet's Own Boy. Film. United States, Brian Knappenberger, 2014.

Jenkins, Henry. "What Wikipedia can Teach Us About the New Media Literacies (part one)" (June, 2007). http://henryjenkins.org/blog/2007/06/what_wikipedia_can_teach_us_ab.html

———. *Spreadable Media: Creating Value and Meaning in a Networked Culture*. New York: New York Press, 2013.

Kapitzke, Cushla. "Information literacy: The changing library." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 44 (5) (2001): 450–56.

Keesing-Styles, Linda. "The Relationship between Critical Pedagogy and Assessment in Teacher Education." *Radical Pedagogy* 5.1 (2003). Retrieved from http://www.radicalpedagogy.org/radicalpedagogy/The_Relationship_between_Critical_Pedagogy_and_Assessment_in_Teacher_Education.html.

Kellner, Doug, and Jeff Share. "Critical Media Literacy is Not an Option." *Learning Inquiry,* 1.1 (2007) 1–12.

———. "Toward Critical Media Literacy: Core Concepts, Debates, Organizations, and Policy." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 26.3 (2005): 369–86.

Kellner, Doug, Tyson E. Lewis, and Clayton Pierce. "On Marcuse." Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2008.

Knobel, Michele, and Colin Lankshear. "Remix: The Art and Craft of Endless Hybridization." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 52(1) (2008): 22–33.

Leaning, Marcus. "Towards the Integration of Media and Information Literacy: A Rationale for a 21st Century Approach." In *Media Literacy Education in Action: Theoretical and Pedagogical Perspectives*, edited by Belinha S. DeAbreu and Paul Mihailidis, 97–102. New York: Routledge, 2014.

Livingstone, S., E. Van Couvering, and Nancy Thumin. "Converging Traditions of Research on Media and Information Literacies." In *Handbook of Research on New Literacies*, edited by Julie Coiro, Michele Knobel, Colin Lankshear, and Donald J. Leu, 103–32. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, 2008.

Mackey, Thomas P., and Trudi E. Jacobson. "Reframing Information Literacy as a Metaliteracy." *College & Research Libraries*, 72, Number 1 (2011): 62–78.

Masterman, Len. *Teaching the Media.* London: Comedia, 1985.

Prinsloo, Jeanne, "Critical Media Literacy: A Design for the Future." *OPENSPACE,* 1(5) (2007): 16–20.

Rheingold, Howard. *NetSmart: How to Thrive Online.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2012.

RiP!: A Remix Manifesto. Film. Directed by Brett Gaylor. 2008. New York: The Disinformation Company, 2009. DVD.

Simmons, Michelle Holschuh. "Librarians as Disciplinary Discourse Mediators: Using Genre Theory to Move toward Critical Information Literacy." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 5 (3) (2005): 297–311.

Swanson, Troy A. "A Radical Step: Implementing A Critical Information Literacy Model." *portal: Libraries and the Academy,* 4 (2) (2004): 259–73.

Swartz, Aaron. "Guerilla Open Access Manifesto," 2008. Accessed January 7, 2018. https://archive.org/details/GuerillaOpenAccessManifesto.

Tewell, Eamon. "A Decade of Critical Information Literacy." *Communications in Information Literacy,* 9, Number 1 (2015): 24–42.

———. "The Practice and Promise of Critical Information Literacy: Academic Librarians' Involvement in Critical Library Instruction [preprint]." *College & Research Libraries,* 78, Number 6 (2017). Retrieved June 14, 2017 from http://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/article/view/16616.

"What is Media Literacy? NAMLE's Short Answer and a Longer Thought," 2001. http://www.medialit.org/reading-room/what-media-literacy-namles-short-answer-and-longer-thought.

Wilson, C., A. Grizzle, R. Tuazon, K. Akyempong, and C. Cheung. *Media and Information Literacy Curriculum for Teachers*. Paris: UNESCO, 2011.

Whitworth, Andrew. *Radical Information Literacy: Reclaiming the Political Heart of IL Movement.* Oxford: Chandos Publishing, 2014.