

Information Literacy, Diversity, and One-Shot “Pedagogies of the Practical”

Karen P. Nicholson and Maura Seale

This essay examines the information literacy one-shot in conjunction with similar one-off training approaches often found in diversity education. Through this lens, we interrogate the ways that superficial approaches to complex issues such as mis- or disinformation and racism inhibit the kinds of engagement and (un)learning that transformative pedagogy requires as well as the structural conditions that give rise to such approaches. We find that information literacy and diversity one-shots emerged within the neoliberal turn in higher education and share a common philosophical foundation in liberalism and a belief that educated publics will come to consensus in the interest of the social good; they are based in narratives of individual deficiency, empowerment, and self-work. They are “pedagogies of the practical,” practices that ultimately fail to challenge white supremacist structures in higher education. Because education is about affect, emotion, and beliefs as well as knowledge, transactional one-shots can never truly be transformational or liberatory. We conclude by considering the role of affect in teaching and learning, and how “pedagogies of emotion” might help us to better address power and race in the information literacy classroom.

Introduction

In the context of the call for proposals for this special issue of *College & Research Libraries*, which asked us to consider information literacy one-shots in relation to “effective teaching practices; assessment; and power structures related to care-work and Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI),”¹ we were reminded of the recent claim by Sofia Leung and Jorge López-McKnight that information literacy remains centered in “the racist, misogynistic, capitalist, colonialist history and legacy of libraries,” impacting our work and relationships.² We pondered whether the information literacy one-shot could ever truly be an effective antiracist or antioppressive practice, one that seeks to challenge or transform librarianship’s racialized power relations.³ This led us to think about other kinds of one-off “trainings” in higher education that also engage with positionality, power, and race, such as implicit bias and microaggression trainings, and to ask ourselves, beyond their common abbreviated format, beyond their effectiveness (or lack thereof), what *else* do they share with information literacy? The insights that emerged from this “contradictory coupling”⁴ are the subject of this article. In establishing parallels between information literacy one-shots and similar

*Karen P. Nicholson is Associate Librarian in the McLaughlin Library, University of Guelph, email: kanichol@uoguelph.ca. Maura Seale is History Librarian at Hatcher Graduate Library at the University of Michigan, email: mseale@umich.edu. © 2022 Karen P. Nicholson and Maura Seale, Attribution-NonCommercial (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) CC BY-NC.

approaches to diversity education, we seek to interrogate the ways that superficial approaches to complex issues inhibit the kinds of engagement and (un)learning that transformative pedagogy requires and the structural conditions that give rise to such approaches.

While Library and Information Studies (LIS) scholars have explored information literacy through the lens of social justice for nearly a decade,⁵ it is only recently that attention has been paid to information literacy in relation to issues of race as well as ethnicity.⁶ This is somewhat surprising, given that critical approaches to literacy seek to address “meaning making, identity, power, and authority, and foreground the institutional nature of what counts as knowledge in any particular academic context.”⁷ Pedagogy is more than choices made by teachers about instructional strategies and classroom management techniques; it is also the sociopolitical contexts and values connected to teaching.⁸ It is with these ideas in mind that we undertook this exploration. We learned that the discourses and practices of information literacy and diversity share a common philosophical foundation in liberalism (liberal pluralism and liberal multiculturalism) and a belief that educated publics will come to consensus in the interest of the social good. They both emerge in the context of the neoliberal turn in higher education, marked by a focus on managerialism, metrics, outcomes, student satisfaction, and “consumerist attitudes towards learning,”⁹ including instrumental approaches to the development of students’ marketable skills. Moreover, as information literacy and diversity have become institutionalized—produced, reproduced, and managed by the institution¹⁰—they have been stripped of any radical critique. Finally, while information literacy and diversity practitioners may be invested in their work, myriad structural factors stand in their way. They occupy a marginal status on campus, and the success of their efforts is hampered by uneven institutional commitment, of which the decontextualized, abbreviated, and episodic format of the one-shot, which cannot foster the trust necessary to engage participants in the critical conversations necessary for transformative learning, is but one manifestation. In summary, we contend that information literacy and diversity one-shots are what David James Hudson describes as “pedagogies of the practical,” practices that ultimately “entrench structures of white supremacy” in higher education.¹¹ In our opinion, because education is about affect, emotion, and beliefs as well as knowledge, transactional one-shots can never truly be transformational or liberatory. In the final section of this essay, then, we consider the role of affect in teaching and learning, and how “pedagogies of emotion”¹² might help us to better address power and race in the information literacy classroom.

A few caveats are in order. First, the bulk of the literature we are drawing from considers information literacy and diversity in the context of American higher education. The work of Sara Ahmed, which considers diversity in the UK context, and that of Lisa Hussey and David James Hudson, both of which focus on diversity in LIS, nonetheless suggest broad commonalities across the Anglo-American higher education sector.¹³ Second, we are not saying information literacy and diversity one-shots have no value—only that their value is limited. Finally, while one-off interventions are common in information literacy and diversity paradigms, they are not the only approaches that exist.¹⁴ Our aim instead is to interrogate the discourses and practices of information literacy and diversity as exemplars of higher education’s persistent recourse to instrumental, market-based solutions to address complex social issues. To paraphrase Ahmed, whose book *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life* laid the groundwork for critical diversity studies, we seek to question what we are doing when we are doing this work¹⁵ and to consider how we might do things differently.

Liberalism

Both information literacy and diversity discourses are rooted in liberalism, the hegemonic ideology within modernity. In *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*, David Theo Goldberg delineates liberalism’s core concerns, demonstrating that, through a commitment to individualism, universal principles applicable to human beings as rational agents, and careful institutional planning, “liberalism seeks to transcend particular historical, social, and cultural differences” and engender social progress.¹⁶

Information literacy’s fundamental premise, namely that providing people with information skills will necessarily lead to better social outcomes,¹⁷ is founded in liberal ideals. In their analysis of early information literacy texts, Lisa G. O’Connor claims that “the idea that simply providing people with more or better information (and even the skills to use the information)” will redress social inequities fails to acknowledge “the resilience of systemic cultural repression,”¹⁸ including the role that libraries have played in such repression. In a related vein, Marcia Rapchak argues that the absence of race in the ACRL’s *Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education* masks the “structural [intersectional] oppression of people of color”¹⁹ within information environments. Using the “Authority Is Constructed and Contextual” frame as an example, Rapchak highlights the liberal multicultural paradigm within which the *Framework* apprehends diversity as a celebration of differences in “worldviews, gender, sexual orientation, and cultural orientations.”²⁰ Maura Seale further argues that the *Framework* might best be understood as a liberal approach to the problem of information literacy.²¹ The *Framework* is inconsistent in its analysis of power; promotes a universalizing approach to learning; reproduces narratives of progress; focuses on individual rationality, agency, and learning; downplays history and context; and embraces institutionalism as the means of achieving information literacy. As Seale contends, the *Framework*’s assumption that information literacy can ultimately be achieved through the actions of rational individuals functions well within neoliberalism, which similarly emphasizes the primacy of individual action.

Other analyses of the discourses around information literacy also reveal this tendency to reinscribe liberalism. Alison Hicks and Annemaree Lloyd’s recent discourse analyses of the professional literature on information literacy reveal multiple narratives around information literacy and library educators, both outward-facing—intended for higher education colleagues outside the library—and inward-facing—directed at librarians.²² In outward-facing narratives, information literacy itself is primarily seen to be a project of personal empowerment, providing “learners with the skills, attitudes, behaviors and understandings” necessary for making “appropriate and informed choices” now and in the future.²³ The treatment of those involved with the project of information literacy is quite different, however. Hicks and Lloyd suggest that outward narratives marginalize and erase library instructors and their work, while inward-facing narratives portray librarians as unfit for their role: incompetent, underprepared, unassertive, and disempowered. They also portray learners as fundamentally deficient: “overwhelmed, passive, uncritical and plagiarizers.”²⁴ As is the case with the *Framework*, Hicks and Lloyd’s analyses demonstrate that broader information literacy discourses are rooted in liberal understandings of individualism, consistently turning to individual agency and action to argue for the necessity of information literacy. The diffusion of information literacy is seen as a form of progress; to move from information illiterate to information literate is to become a better individual learner. Information literacy discourses prioritize influencing the reasoning of individuals rather than effecting structural or political change. Moreover, as Hicks and Lloyd

suggest, the focus on the learner's deficiency locates information literacy within individual behavior, rather than the social contexts within which people use information, limiting the scope of any sort of empowerment.²⁵ Although the *Framework* does gesture toward emotion and affect, information literacy discourses largely favor individual reason and rationality, where information literacy itself is understood to be about developing competence through cognitive change. Indeed, it is this framing that lends urgency to the information literacy project. Conceived at a time when librarians found themselves sidelined by educational reforms and confronted by public fiscal crisis and perceived technological threats, information literacy reaffirmed the importance of librarians as educators.²⁶ Recent controversies around mis- and disinformation, propaganda, and the popularization of the term "fake news" continue to legitimize the enduring value of the information literacy project.²⁷ As O'Connor underscores, "the liberal pluralist function of information literacy.... assumes that truth is historical and apolitical; an objective, demonstrable reality that everyone can ascertain if they simply draw on their ability to evaluate information around them critically."²⁸

But what if our beliefs are not solely based on reason, rationality, and learning? Gabriel N. Rosenberg has recently argued that understanding Trumpism as "Trump's supporters are misinformed and need better information" is fundamentally wrong; Trumpism is instead "a structure of feeling."²⁹ Neither Trumpism nor other populist movements are the concern of this essay, but Rosenberg's analysis does point to the ways in which the information literacy project prioritizes reason, rationality, learning, and the cognitive to the exclusion of the emotional and affective, and to the way in which feelings might also play into how we learn and process information. Similarly, in *Strangers in Their Own Land: Anger and Mourning on the American Right*, Arlie Russell Hochschild describes the "deep story," her conceptual framework for understanding how her white interviewees negotiate their political subjectivities: "A deep story is a *feels-as-if* story — it's the story feelings tell, in the language of symbols. It removes judgment. It removes fact. It tells us how things feel."³⁰ The deep story of Hochschild's interview subjects entails waiting in line to access American prosperity and progress while marginalized groups constantly cut in front of them. Hochschild takes great pains to explore the social terrains of her interviewees — church, schools, media, local and state government — and the ways in which they both challenge and reinforce this deep story. Hochschild also challenges the interviewees, revealing the extent to which what one believes to be true is as much, or even more, a matter of feelings as of facts, logic, reason, or rationality. Racism, misogyny, and homophobia are key elements of this deep story, but emerge primarily out of feelings rather than reason. How, then, can information literacy (and diversity) instruction that functions only at the level of learning and cognition actually address the deep story? Hochschild carefully attends to the large and complex systems that structure the material realities of her interviewees' lives and create the conditions that make the deep story feel so strongly true, but these systems are not legible within individualist information literacy work.³¹

Discourses of diversity are similarly rooted in liberal values of individualism and self-work. In the context of the postwar racial project in Western nations, diversity "reorganizes and redistributes the meaning and continued significance of race around abstract ideals of equality, fairness, and market opportunities."³² The fundamental paradox of the Anglo-American diversity paradigm, that which makes it historically distinct, culturally powerful, and ultimately ineffective as a form of social redress, lies in its separation of "discussions about diversity, difference, and multiculturalism from more uncomfortable conversations

about inequality, power, and privilege.”³³ Diversity discourse simultaneously portrays race as “everywhere and nowhere,” just another identity.³⁴ It also portrays racism as “accidental (as if every now and then, it just happens)” and anachronistic, belonging to the past.³⁵ Diversity “happy talk,” a widespread celebration of racial, sexual, class, religious, cultural, and ethnic differences as equal and beneficial to everyone, has become a mainstay of Anglo-American culture, formalized in legal decisions, curricula, and training programs.³⁶ Decoupled from social justice and racial equality, diversity discourse works to shore up whiteness as normative and neutral, while ascribing racial innocence to white institutions.³⁷ While this discourse putatively acknowledges difference, it fails to address systemic inequality, thereby working against progressive racial politics.³⁸ The cultural identities, practices, and artifacts of Black, Indigenous, and people of color are instead primarily apprehended as enrichments to the white cultural experience.³⁹

Drawing on the work of Goldberg, Hudson analyzes the LIS diversity paradigm as liberal anti-racism, demonstrating how it locates race “within the realm of the (ir)rational individual.”⁴⁰ Race figures “as a fixed, apolitical human attribute” and racism is perceived as “individual error, bias, or incompetence,” inhibiting growth and creativity within the profession and causing exclusion.⁴¹ Addressing racism is a matter of education, of self-work, achieved through cultural competence, implicit bias, and microaggression training; the diversification of collections and programming; and recruitment, retention, and advancement initiatives. As Lisa Hussey points out, the act of reducing race to diversity, and group problems to individual problems, relieves white guilt, obfuscates power relations and systemic inequalities, and sustains white supremacy.⁴² Through their analyses of diversity in Anglo-American institutions of higher education, Ahmed and James M. Thomas further demonstrate that institutions, not just people, can admit to racism and accept “treatment” as a sign of reconciliation, healing, and progress.⁴³ Admitting to institutional racism thereby becomes a performative speech act, a way of “getting over it.”⁴⁴

Information Literacy, Diversity, and the Neoliberal Turn in Higher Education

The discourses and practices of information literacy and diversity emerged in higher education in the 1980s in the context of neoliberal reforms that brought an increased market orientation to the sector to drive innovation and economic growth on the one hand, and institutional efficiency and accountability on the other. In the global knowledge economy, human capital—“the knowledge, skills, competencies, and other attributes embodied in individuals that are relevant to economic activity”⁴⁵—drives economic growth, purportedly attracting new capital investment and creating high value-added, well-paying jobs.⁴⁶ Producing job-ready graduates enables higher education administrators to demonstrate institutional alignment with economic policy objectives and assures taxpayers and policy makers of the strong return on investment of a university education. Because skills such as leadership, communication, teamwork, and cultural competence are perceived to hold the capacity to bring about desired outcomes and financial rewards, they become conceptualized as “things” to be acquired and measured.⁴⁷ Students are therefore encouraged to see and describe themselves in terms of their marketable or transferable skills. Central to this “reincarnated concept of skill” is that idea that skills can be “inculcated” into learners through training.⁴⁸

The emergence of information literacy in the context of this neoliberal skills agenda for higher education has been well documented.⁴⁹ The concurrent emergence of discourses of

diversity, “the rationalization of racial inclusion” in higher education,⁵⁰ is perhaps less well known in the LIS context, however.⁵¹ Derived from “the imbrication of neoliberal doctrine with contemporary racial ideology,”⁵² contemporary diversity discourse represents a shift in higher education away from the affirmative action and equal employment opportunity movements of the 1970s and 1980s toward diversity as a celebration of difference and a global skill.

Within the context of this neoliberal turn, diversity is recast as a form of human capital, a way to foster understanding of and respect for cultural differences within the workplace, thereby providing employers and laborers with an edge in the global economy.⁵³ Moreover, reframing diversity as cultural competency means that *all* employees need to become cross-culturally competent, not just members of majority groups.⁵⁴ Ultimately, diversity improves the experience of white students by preparing them as workers for a globalized world.⁵⁵

In the context of academic libraries, Hudson contends that the motivation to address racism stems from a desire to achieve full productivity and advance the institutional mission.⁵⁶ Diversity matters not because it reduces racial inequality, but rather because it is seen to promote “personal portfolio growth” and corporate or institutional success.⁵⁷ In the words of Ahmed, diversity represents “good practice,” “a set of practices that enable an organization ‘to look good.’”⁵⁸ Discourses of diversity and other skills are performative: by their existence alone, they enact “an active identification with futurity and the market,”⁵⁹ holding open the possibility of increasing returns. A commitment to diversity (along with excellence, leadership, communication, and teamwork) enhances reputation; it therefore becomes central to the academic mission and to recruiting and marketing efforts by universities, colleges, and academic libraries.⁶⁰

Thomas describes three processes through which diversity in higher education is “economized” —that is, that it is managed, produced, and justified through economic values and practices: diversity as investment, diversity as metrics, and diversity as affective labor.⁶¹ First, diversity as investment requires reimagining diversity as a tool for enhancing institutional and personal portfolios.⁶² Through this process, diversity work is converted into a series of market-oriented tasks.⁶³ Next, diversity metrics define, measure, and report progress, the “extent to which diversity as investment is made ubiquitous” through efficient processes.⁶⁴

As a matter of workplace equity, diversity’s progress is measured not by whether historically marginalized groups have greater access to power, resources, opportunities, or decision making but by the number of employees who demonstrate self-investment and self-improvement [by completing diversity training or participating in diversity events].⁶⁵

Assessing the effectiveness of diversity initiatives is not important; what matters is the *performance* of meeting objectives—checking the boxes. Finally, diversity as affective labor describes the process through which “a set of affects associated with diversity” such as satisfaction and excitement are mobilized, fueling investment and demonstrating progress while obscuring power and inequality.⁶⁶ Through this labor, which falls disproportionately to minoritized and marginalized faculty, students, and staff, creating “new forms of exploitation by way of expropriation of their racial differences,”⁶⁷ diversity becomes an intangible institutional asset, the main beneficiaries of which are white students.⁶⁸ Moreover, the creation of this “inclusion bureaucracy” allows the institution itself to control the outcomes of dissent, protest, and activism.⁶⁹

LIS scholars Jennifer Brown, Nicholae Cline, and Marisa Méndez-Brady make similar claims, underscoring the inequitable burden of responsibility that Black, Indigenous, and people of color bear for advancing libraries’ diversity agendas, including leading diversity committees and teaching cultural competencies to white colleagues. Diversity becomes a way for institutions to “perform wokeness” rather than to acknowledge and demonstrate accountability for dismantling interconnected inequalities.⁷⁰ Moreover, in many American libraries, a key strategy for advancing diversity objectives is to create the role of diversity resident, a position designated for early career, contractually employed librarians of color, thereby enabling institutions “to offset and offload a complicated array of responsibilities and expectations onto racially marginalized librarians”⁷¹ while simultaneously freeing up nonmarginalized librarians from engaging in this work, even though they also stand to benefit from it.

Similar processes exist in the context of information literacy discourses and practices. Information literacy teaching, a form of gendered, affective labor that facilitates the development of students’ academic skills and subjectivities, serves to reproduce the academy itself.⁷² Librarians are nonetheless challenged in their efforts to embed information literacy into the curriculum because it is commonly seen as remedial or transactional, a service carried out for the benefit of both the teaching faculty and students.⁷³ Supporting the institution’s educational mission is demonstrated through processes of counting and accounting that focus on information literacy events as statistics (classes, consultations, reference transactions) rather than student learning or engagement.

Ahmed’s concept of organizational modes of attention, the ways that institutional discourses and practices “come into view”⁷⁴ or are obscured according to their perceived value, is instructive here. According to this concept, work that is of less value, that is difficult to accomplish, or creates friction, disappears from institutional priorities, advancing only by means of personal commitment and effort. Ahmed observes “if diversity is not someone’s agenda, then it tends to fall off the agenda.”⁷⁵ This observation is easily extended to information literacy work, often described as invisible, neglected, or liminal.⁷⁶ Moreover, when certain kinds of work, such as the work of information literacy and diversity practitioners, are less valued, those organizational units responsible for performing this work also end up less valued.⁷⁷ In a related vein, Barbara Fister argues that, if librarians have failed in their efforts “to make information literacy a universal educational outcome,” it is because information literacy “has no specific place in the curriculum. It’s everywhere, and nowhere. It’s everyone’s job, but nobody’s responsibility. In many cases, the people who care about it the most have had their jobs felled by the austerity ax.”⁷⁸ Such forms of less valued work therefore require a champion, someone with the institutional social capital necessary to turn personal commitment into institutional commitment.⁷⁹ Diversity practitioners work to routinize or embed diversity within the institution, both persisting against institutional resistance and mobilizing techniques to accomplish this work.⁸⁰ Information literacy librarians likewise find themselves jostling for “a seat at the curricular table”⁸¹ and seeking out faculty champions to advance their agendas.

Practical Pedagogies

Having outlined the ways that information literacy and diversity discourses and practices are positioned within the academy, we now return to the issue of the one-shot as a pedagogy of the practical. To some extent, LIS and diversity studies scholars have explored the ways that the one-shot model aligns with and advances the aims of the neoliberal university. Using time

as a heuristic, Nicholson argues that the information literacy one-shot, with its “superficial, skills-oriented approach,” is in sync with the “corporate time” of the neoliberal university.⁸² Nicole Pagowsky notes that the requirement to use metrics to demonstrate support for the institutional mission, even when such metrics do not “adequately demonstrate student learning, good teaching, [or] collaborative relationships with faculty,” may compel librarians to adopt skill-based pedagogies.⁸³

The pedagogy of the practical takes a slightly different form in diversity one-shots. Applebaum argues that implicit bias one-shot trainings are limited by the concept of bias as “hardwired” in individuals, and therefore inevitable and normal; a focus on individual belief rather than the institutional or systemic conditions that enable bias; and the assumption that unknowing can be corrected by awareness.⁸⁴ Jessi Lee Jackson further contends that, while implicit bias training is commonly presented as an effective, evidence-based strategy, these claims have been questioned by anti-racist scholars and activists.⁸⁵ Thomas draws attention to the gap between a shared belief in the value of diversity practitioners’ work and the institutional diversity regime that “enables and supports the very conditions of racial inequality that diversity initiatives mean to address.”⁸⁶ In the words of Jackson, one-off diversity trainings are examples of what Ahmed refers to as “the non-performativity of anti-racism,” namely “ostensibly anti-racist (non)practices that maintain contemporary racist realities.”⁸⁷ The diversity one-shot’s practicality emerges in its assumption that racism is not structural or systemic, but resides within individuals, and that one-shot trainings will cure those individuals. One-shot trainings do not require much institutional investment but do allow for the collection of metrics and the development of diversity “skills” and do not challenge the structural inequities that pervade higher educations.

Teaching is care work that can negatively impact those who perform it.⁸⁸ Because it is feminized and racialized, care work is especially open to exploitation.⁸⁹ One-shots can therefore exacerbate burnout, particularly for women, people with disabilities, and Black, Indigenous, and people of color. Despite being aware of this, librarians often justify doing them in the name of service. Making a connection between librarians’ professional service ethic and the persistence of the one-shot, Christine M. Moeller argues that understanding information literacy as a service rather than as collaborative work perpetuates gendered stereotypes; invites inauthentic, ineffective pedagogical practices; and contributes to the reproductive and emotional labor of librarians.⁹⁰ In related work, Mirza, Nicholson, and Seale contend that “accepting last-minute requests for classes, teaching more classes than [one] can handle, or spending countless hours tweaking content” reinscribes vocational and institutional awe, subjecting librarians to “relentless care without replenishment.” Such practices further uphold white savior narratives and the archetype of the benevolent white woman in the library.⁹¹

Instilling Small Cracks

Both critical LIS and diversity scholars have recently suggested that an engagement with theories of affect might afford the possibility of a critical engagement with race in the classroom.⁹² Informed by feminist and queer theories, the affective turn in the humanities and social sciences marks a conceptual “shift in thinking about the intersections and interrelations of discourses and social and cultural forces on the one hand, and the human body and individually-experienced but historically situated emotions and affects, on the other.”⁹³ Affect understands emotions not just as individual psychological and physiological phenomena but

as integral to the practices, activities, and forces that shape our interactions with each other and the world around us.⁹⁴ Affect is an *in-between-ness* that emerges “in the capacities to act and be acted upon.”⁹⁵

In a foundational article that explores the role of emotions and bodies in mobilizing racism and hatred, Ahmed proposes an economic model of emotions, an *affective economy*, in which emotions create connections between people.⁹⁶ They are not simply feelings, but also create and sustain relationships between individuals and groups. Affective economies are made up of situated, shared, and embodied practices; in this framework, whiteness, racism, and (information) literacy are understood to be things that we *do* with others in particular sociocultural, political, and historical contexts. This understanding allows us to move beyond binary logics of fixed identities, in the case of race, and individual, bounded cognitive skills, in the case of literacy. Thomas suggests that affective approaches to racial politics are founded on notions of “shared spaces and practices,” not “racial identity (sameness and difference).”⁹⁷ Literacy practices also involve values, attitudes, feelings, and social relationships; they exist *in-between*, in the relations between people and within groups and communities and in shared understandings represented in ideologies, institutions, and social identities.⁹⁸ Moreover, because power overdetermines how people interact,⁹⁹ affective economies can create, perpetuate, strengthen or subvert power disparities, determining “what bodies can and cannot do (or should and should not do)” in particular spaces.¹⁰⁰ Michele R. Santamaria’s autoethnographic exploration of academic libraries as purportedly neutral, democratic white “fantasy spaces” and the ways that students of color uphold and subvert them as they assert their right “to take up space in libraries and fashion their own, sometimes fantastic narratives,”¹⁰¹ provides a powerful example of affective economies and racialized power in LIS.

Drawing on Foucault’s notion of technologies of power, critical education scholars have theorized whiteness as an affective technology, “through which affects and emotions come to be instrumentalized, containing certain social norms and dynamics of inclusion/exclusion with respect to one’s self and an Other.”¹⁰² Neoliberal practices also leverage affect to produce and reinforce desired behaviors and subjectivities; in the neoliberal university workplace, these include flexibility, lifelong learning, entrepreneurialism, and a willingness to accept work intensification.¹⁰³ Similarly, diversity as liberal multiculturalism draws on an affective technology of happiness to assuage white guilt and obscure the persistent whiteness of institutions such as universities, while diversity as self-work echoes neoliberal technologies of affect.¹⁰⁴

Affect has recently been invoked to theorize issues central to information literacy and diversity work, including affective labor, resistance, and antiracist pedagogy. Lisa Sloniowski offers a feminist reading of librarians’ often invisible, pink-collar public service work as a form of affective labor.¹⁰⁵ Making a connection between affect, emotional labor, burnout, solidarity, and critical self-reflection, Kate Adler and Lisa Sloniowski contend that an affective lens that attends to both patriarchy and white supremacy enables us to “see clearly how unevenly emotional labor is distributed” in the neoliberal university, and how it impacts some workers more than others.¹⁰⁶ In their view, incorporating affect offers potential for doing intersectional, social-justice work.¹⁰⁷ Julia Ismael, Althea Lazzaro, and Brianna Ishihara similarly explore the affective, gendered, and racialized care work of teaching in higher education, highlighting the ways that it is at odds with the intensification and acceleration of work in the neoliberal university.¹⁰⁸ In the context of advancing DEI efforts in libraries more broadly, Jennifer Brown, Jennifer Ferretti, Sofia Leung, and Marisa Méndez-Brady highlight the value of peer mentorship

and communities of practice, particularly for early-career librarians of color, albeit not without underscoring the additional labor that such practices demand.¹⁰⁹ From these examples, we can see that resistance can also be understood as “a flux of affects” producing (un)anticipated (micro)political effects that confront power.¹¹⁰ While not always progressive or emancipatory, acts of resistance can nonetheless produce “alternative affective spaces” that allow for new ways of being in community.¹¹¹

In contrast to pedagogies of the practical, antioppressive pedagogies can therefore be understood as “pedagogies of emotion,”¹¹² founded in shared practices of caring, solidarity, and resistance. In the words of Mita Banerjee and Olga Zlatkin-Troitschanskaia, affect reveals “the gap between knowledge and belief” required for the deep learning of higher education.¹¹³ Affective pedagogies enable us to see educational encounters as emerging and unfolding in the moment rather than as expected and foreseeable.¹¹⁴ Similarly, Ahmed describes feminist pedagogy as “the affective opening up of the world through the act of wonder, not as a private act, but as an opening up of what is possible through working together.”¹¹⁵ How might the one-shot accommodate a pedagogy of emotion without further exacerbating exploitation and burnout, particularly for library workers of color? We acknowledge that, as care workers under neoliberalism, we work within a space of contradiction that relies on care work and care workers but does not value either. We turn to Leung and López-McKnight’s suggestions for “more authentic, liberatory, and imaginative” approaches to library teaching, particularly their emphasis on small interactions as transformative.¹¹⁶ Barbara Fister echoes this emphasis, noting that, because small changes occur on a human-scale, they can make a big difference in peoples’ lives.¹¹⁷ Small changes to library teaching practices offer an opportunity to resist the pedagogies of the practical that dominate library instruction but do not require substantially more labor from library workers. Greater attention to affect can therefore “instill small cracks” in pedagogical spaces and practices, liberating students and teachers from existing affective investments in racial oppression.¹¹⁸

Conclusion

Leung and López-McKnight call on library educators to “explore our teaching and learning experiences against, and through, white supremacy – while interrogating, and responding to critical library instruction.”¹¹⁹ In this essay, we have attempted to take up this call by considering the discourses of information literacy and diversity one-shots. Because education is about affect, emotion, and beliefs as well as knowledge, because it is about sociocultural practices and not just cognitive skills, transactional one-shots can never truly be transformational or liberatory. As Fister reminds us, our information literacy efforts must address the fact that our information environment is, and will continue to, reflect the assumptions of the social world.¹²⁰ This includes race and racism, and addressing them requires trust, care, and persistence; understanding antiracism is a process, not an outcome. What’s missing from these well-intentioned interventions is a recognition that “canned classroom situations don’t necessarily transfer to more complex realities.”¹²¹ Information literacy and diversity are not “skills” to be obtained through training; they are situated, affective practices embedded within particular sociopolitical contexts. An affect-informed praxis would work to destabilize the pedagogies of the practical that otherwise structure our information literacy and diversity work.

Notes

1. Nicole Pagowsky, “The Contested One-Shot: Deconstructing Power Structures to Imagine New Futures,” *College & Research Libraries* 82, no. 3 (2021): 300, <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.82.3.300>.
2. Sofia Y. Leung and Jorge R. López-McKnight, “Dreaming Revolutionary Futures: Critical Race’s Centrality to Ending White Supremacy,” *Communications in Information Literacy* 14, no. 1 (2020): 22, <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2020.14.1.2>.
3. David James Hudson, “On the (Anti-Racist) Politics of Anti-Racism Research,” 2nd Annual Lecture on Research & Scholarship, Canadian Association of Professional Academic Librarians, May 11, 2021, <https://youtu.be/3lkqk7B9Y0Q>. In this article, we use “information literacy” in the broad sense of the term to include both mainstream and critical approaches.
4. This expression was used by Christine Pawley in her examination of the concepts of information and literacy that are joined in information literacy. Christine Pawley, “Information Literacy: A Contradictory Coupling,” *Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 73, no. 4 (June 27, 2003): 422–52, <https://doi.org/10.1086/603440>.
5. See, for example, *Information Literacy and Social Justice*, eds. Shana Higgins and Lua Gregory (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2013); Andrew Battista et al., “Seeking Social Justice in the ACRL Framework,” *Communications in Information Literacy* 9, no. 2 (2015), www.comminfolit.org/index.php?journal=cil&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=v9i2p111&path%5B%5D=214; Laura Saunders, “Connecting Information Literacy and Social Justice: Why and How,” *Communications in Information Literacy* 11, no. 1 (2017): 55–75, <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2017.11.1.47>.
6. See, for example, Jessie Loyer, “Indigenous Information Literacy: nêhiyaw Kinship Enabling Self-Care in Research,” in *The Politics of Theory and the Practice of Critical Librarianship*, eds. Karen P. Nicholson and Maura Seale (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2018), 145–56; Marcia Rapchak, “That Which Cannot Be Named: The Absence of Race in the Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education,” *Journal of Radical Librarianship* 5 (2019): 173–96; Leung and López-McKnight, “Dreaming Revolutionary Futures”; Veronica Arellano Douglas, “WILU Closing Plenary Session,” *Libraries + Inquiry*, 2021, <https://veronicaarellanodouglas.com/information-literacy-2/wilu-closing-plenary-session/>; Rafia Mirza, Karen P. Nicholson, and Maura Seale, “Acting ‘As If’: Critical Pedagogy, Empowerment, and Labor,” in *The Critical Librarianship and Pedagogy Symposium: An Anthology of Works*, eds. Anthony R. Sanchez and Yvonne Mery (Chicago, IL: ACRL, in press).
7. Mary R. Lea and Brian V. Street, “The ‘Academic Literacies’ Model: Theory and Applications,” *Theory into Practice* 45, no. 4 (2006): 369, https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4504_11.
8. David James Hudson, “On Critical Librarianship & Pedagogies of the Practical,” Keynote Address, *Critical Librarianship and Pedagogy Symposium*, Tucson, AZ, February 25, 2016.
9. Cathy Eisenhower and Dolsy Smith, “The Library as ‘Stuck Place’: Critical Pedagogy in the Corporate University,” in *Critical Library Instruction: Theories and Methods*, eds. Maria T. Accardi, Emily Drabinski, and Alana Kumbier (Duluth, MN: Library Juice Press, 2010), 314.
10. Ferguson outlines the concept of institutionalization in the context of the rise of the minority interdisciplines (departments of race, gender, and ethnicity, and fields such as queer studies) into the academy in the 1960s and 1970s. Ferguson asserts that this emergence “was not simply a challenge to contemporary power as manifest in academia, the state, and global capitalism but was, rather, constitutive of it.” Rod Ferguson, *The Reorder of Things: The University and Its Pedagogies of Minority Difference* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2012). Matthew Johnson argues that universities co-opt dissent selectively, thereby rendering racial inclusion and racial inequality compatible. Matthew Johnson, *Undermining Racial Justice: How One University Embraced Inclusion and Inequality* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2020).
11. David James Hudson, “The Whiteness of Practicality,” in *Topographies of Whiteness: Mapping Whiteness in Library and Information Science*, ed. Gina Schlesselman-Tarango (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2017), 206.
12. Michalinos Zembylas, “Pedagogies of Strategic Empathy: Navigating through the Emotional Complexities of Anti-Racism in Higher Education,” *Teaching in Higher Education* 17, no. 2 (2012): 118, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2011.611869>.
13. Sara Ahmed, *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012); Lisa Hussey, “The Diversity Discussion: What Are We Saying?” *Progressive Librarian*, no. 34/35 (2010): 3–10, www.progressivelibrariansguild.org/PL/PL34_35/003.pdf; David James Hudson, “On ‘Diversity’ as Anti-Racism in Library and Information Studies: A Critique,” *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 1 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.24242/jclis.v1i1.6>.
14. Information literacy can be integrated into the curriculum and addressed by instructors as well as librarians. It can also be addressed at the reference desk, in consultations, and broader library programming. Likewise, diversity and inclusion programs in academic libraries include diversity plans, recruitment and retention

initiatives, programs to promote an inclusive workplace, and various staff development strategies, including “training on conflict management, implicit bias, microaggressions, cultural and gender identity, and safe zones.” Toni Anaya and Charlene Maxey-Harris, *Diversity and Inclusion*, SPEC Kit 356 (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2017), 4, <https://doi.org/10.29242/spec.356>.

15. Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 16.

16. David Theo Goldberg, *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning* (Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1993), 5.

17. Lisa O’Connor, “Information Literacy as Professional Legitimation: A Critical Analysis,” *Journal of Education for Library & Information Science* 50, no. 2 (2009): 81, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40732566>; Kimmo Tuominen, Reijo Savolainen, and Sanna Talja, “Information Literacy as a Sociotechnical Practice,” *Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 75, no. 3 (2005): 329–45, <https://doi.org/10.1086/497311>.

18. O’Connor, “Information Literacy as Professional Legitimation,” 81.

19. Rapchak, “That Which Cannot be Named,” 173.

20. Rapchak, “That Which Cannot be Named,” 180, emphasis in the original.

21. Maura Seale, “Enlightenment, Neoliberalism, and Information Literacy,” *Canadian Journal of Academic Librarianship* 1 (January 2016): 80–91, <https://doi.org/10.33137/cjal-rcbu.v1.24308>.

22. Alison Hicks and Annemaree Lloyd, “Relegating Expertise: The Outward and Inward Positioning of Librarians in Information Literacy Education,” *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science* (June 6, 2021): 1–12, <https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006211020104>; Alison Hicks and Annemaree Lloyd, “Deconstructing Information Literacy Discourse: Peeling Back the Layers in Higher Education,” *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science* 53, no. 4 (December 2021): 1–12, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000620966027>.

23. Hicks and Lloyd, “Deconstructing Information Literacy Discourse,” 6.

24. Hicks and Lloyd, “Deconstructing Information Literacy Discourse,” 6.

25. Hicks and Lloyd, “Deconstructing Information Literacy Discourse,” 8.

26. O’Connor, “Information Literacy as Professional Legitimation,” 79–80; Emily Drabinski, “Toward a Kairos of Library Instruction,” *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 40, no. 5 (September 1, 2014): 480–85, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2014.06.002>.

27. See, for example, Barbara Fister, “Lizard People in the Library,” *Project Information Literacy* (February 3, 2021), <https://projectinfolit.org/pubs/provocation-series/essays/lizard-people-in-the-library.html>; Nicole A. Cooke, “Tell Me Sweet Little Lies: Racism as a Form of Persistent Malinformation,” *Project Information Literacy* (August 11, 2021), <https://projectinfolit.org/pubs/provocation-series/essays/tell-me-sweet-little-lies.html>.

28. O’Connor, “Information Literacy as Professional Legitimation,” 82.

29. Gabriel N. Rosenberg, “The Apophenic Thrall: Trumpism in the Shimmering Empire,” *Substack Newsletter*, <https://bearistotle.substack.com/p/the-apophenic-thrall>.

30. Arlie Russell Hochschild, *Strangers in Their Own Land: Anger and Mourning on the American Right* (New York, NY: New Press, 2016), 102.

31. There has been some work on information literacy and affect. Laura Saunders and Melissa A. Wong provide an overview, as does Alison Hicks. The ACRL Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education, too, as Saunders and Wong point out, touches on affect through its inclusion of dispositions. Laura Saunders and Melissa A. Wong, *Instruction in Libraries and Information Centers* (Urbana, IL: Windsor and Downs Press, 2020); Alison Hicks, “Moving Beyond the Descriptive,” *Journal of Documentation* 76, no. 1 (2020): 126–44.

32. James M. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity,” *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 5, no. 4 (2019): 471, <https://doi.org/10.1177/233264218793981>; Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*, 3rd ed. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2014).

33. Joyce M. Bell and Douglas Hartmann, “Diversity in Everyday Discourse: The Cultural Ambiguities and Consequences of ‘Happy Talk,’” *American Sociological Review* 72, no. 6 (2007): 905, 906.

34. Ellen C. Berrey, “Why Diversity Became Orthodox in Higher Education, and How It Changed the Meaning of Race on Campus,” *Critical Sociology* 37 (2011): 587, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920510380069>.

35. Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 48.

36. Bell and Hartmann, “Diversity in Everyday Discourse,” 910.

37. Johnson, *Undermining Racial Justice*, 2.

38. Bell and Hartmann, “Diversity in Everyday Discourse,” 896.

39. Bell and Hartmann, “Diversity in Everyday Discourse,” 910.

40. Hudson, “On ‘Diversity’ as Anti-Racism in Library and Information Studies,” 12.

41. Hudson, “On the (Anti-Racist) Politics of Anti-Racism Research.”

42. Hussey, “The Diversity Discussion,” 3–10.

43. Ahmed, *On Being Included*; James M. Thomas, *Diversity Regimes: Why Talk Is Not Enough to Fix Racial In-*

equality at Universities (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2020).

44. Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 47.
45. Center for Educational Research and Innovation (1998), *Human Capital Investment: An International Comparison* (Paris, France: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1998), 9.
46. Marnie Holborow, “Neoliberalism, Human Capital and the Skills Agenda in Higher Education: The Irish Case,” *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies (JCEPS)* 10, no. 1 (2012): 97, www.jceps.com/archives/693.
47. Bonnie Urciuoli, “Skills and Selves in the New Workplace,” *American Ethnologist* 35, no. 2 (2008): 212, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1425.2008.00031.x>.
48. Urciuoli, “Skills and Selves in the New Workplace,” 218.
49. See, for example, Shirley J. Behrens, “A Conceptual Analysis and Historical Overview of Information Literacy,” *College & Research Libraries* 55, no. 4 (1994): 309–22, https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_55_04_309; O’Connor, “Information Literacy as Professional Legitimation”; Nathaniel F. Enright, “The Violence of Information Literacy: Neoliberalism and the Human as Capital,” in *Information Literacy and Social Justice*, eds. Lua Gregory and Shana Higgins (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2013): 15–38; Maura Seale, “The Neoliberal Library,” in *Information Literacy and Social Justice: Radical Professional Praxis*, eds. Lua Gregory and Shana Higgins (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2013): 39–61; Emily Drabinski, “Toward a Kairos of Library Instruction,” *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 40, no. 5 (September 1, 2014): 480–85, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2014.06.002>; Karen Nicholson, “Information Literacy as a Situated Practice in the Neoliberal University,” in *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for Information Science*, eds. M. Griffis, H. Julien, and L. Given (St. Catharines, ON: Canadian Association for Information Science, 2014), 1–7, <https://doi.org/10.29173/cais864>; Karen P. Nicholson, “‘Taking Back’ Information Literacy: Time and the One-Shot in the Neoliberal University,” in *Critical Library Pedagogy Handbook. Volume 1, Essays and Workbook Activities*, eds. Kelly McElroy and Nicole Pagowsky (Chicago, IL: Association of College & Research Libraries, 2016), 25–39; Karen P. Nicholson, “On the Space/Time of Information Literacy, Higher Education, and the Global Knowledge Economy,” *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 2, no. 2 (2019): 1–31, <https://doi.org/10.24242/jclis.v2i1.86>; Nicole Pagowsky, “A Pedagogy of Inquiry,” *Communications in Information Literacy* 9, no. 2 (2015): 136–44, <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2015.9.2.190>.
50. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity.”
51. For further analyses of diversity discourse in the LIS context, see Hussey, “The Diversity Discussion”; David James Hudson, “The Whiteness of Practicality”; Hudson, “On Diversity as Anti-racist Critique”; Hudson, “On the (Anti-racist Politics) of Anti-racist Research.”
52. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity.”
53. Berrey, “Why Diversity Became Orthodox in Higher Education,” 587.
54. Rohini Anand and Mary-Frances Winters, “A Retrospective View of Corporate Diversity Training from 1964 to the Present,” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 7, no. 3 (November 16, 2008): 362, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40214554>.
55. Johnson, *Undermining Racial Justice*.
56. Hudson, “On the (Anti-racist) Politics of Anti-racist Research.”
57. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity,” 477; Johnson, *Undermining Racial Justice*.
58. Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 106.
59. Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 110.
60. Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 27; Berrey, “Why Diversity Became Orthodox in Higher Education,” 586; Johnson, *Undermining Racial Justice*; Laurie Kutner and Alison Armstrong, “Rethinking Information Literacy in a Globalized World,” *Communications in Information Literacy* 6, no. 1 (2012): 24–33, <https://doi.org/10.1002/fut>; Nicholson, “On the Space/Time of Information Literacy, Higher Education, and the Global Knowledge Economy.”
61. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity,” 474. Similar processes are described in Berrey, “Why Diversity Became Orthodox in Higher Education,” Ahmed, *On Being Included*, and Johnson, *Undermining Racial Justice*.
62. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity,” 476.
63. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity,” 476.
64. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity,” 477.
65. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity,” 476.
66. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity,” 476.
67. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity,” 476.
68. Thomas, “The Economization of Diversity,” 476.
69. Johnson, *Undermining Racial Justice*, 2.
70. Jennifer Brown, Nicholae Cline, and Marisa Méndez-Brady, “Leaning on Our Labor: Whiteness and Hierarchies of Power in LIS Work,” *Knowledge Justice: Disrupting Library and Information Studies through Critical Race Theory*, eds. Sofia Y. Leung and Jorge R. López-McKnight (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2021), 95–110,

<https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11969.003.0007>.

71. Brown, Cline, Méndez-Brady, "Leaning on Our Labor," 104.
72. Lisa Sloniowski, "Affective Labor, Resistance, and the Academic Librarian," *Library Trends* 64, no. 4 (2016): 651, <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2016.0013>.
73. Christine Moeller, "'Insert Instruction Here': The Impact of the Service Model on Authentic Teaching," in *Deconstructing Service in Libraries: Intersections of Identities and Expectations*, eds. Veronica Arellano Douglas and Joanna Gadsby (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2018), 240–41.
74. Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 30.
75. Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 138.
76. William B. Badke, "Why Information Literacy Is Invisible," *Communications in Information Literacy* 4, no. 2 (2010): 130, <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1141&context=comminfolit>; Sharon A. Weiner, "Information Literacy: A Neglected Core Competency," *EDUCAUSE Review* (2010), <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2010/3/information-literacy-a-neglected-core-competency>; Nora Almeida, "Librarian as Outsider," *Hybrid Pedagogy* (July 7, 2015), <https://hybridpedagogy.org/librarian-as-outsider/>;
- Sloniowski, "Affective Labor, Resistance, and the Academic Librarian"; Rafia Mirza and Maura Seale, "Who Killed the World? White Masculinity and the Technocratic Library of the Future," in *Topographies of Whiteness: Mapping Whiteness in Library and Information Science*, ed. Gina Schlesselman-Tarango (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, 2017), 171–97;
- Fister, "Lizard People in the Library."
77. Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 4.
78. Fister, "Lizard People in the Library."
79. Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 134.
80. Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 30.
81. Drabinski, "The Kairos of Information Literacy," 483.
82. Nicholson, "'Taking Back' Information Literacy," 27.
83. Pagowsky, "The Contested One-Shot," 302.
84. Barbara Applebaum, "Remediating Campus Climate: Implicit Bias Training Is Not Enough," *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 38, no. 2 (2019): 132, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-018-9644-1>.
85. Applebaum, "Remediating Campus Climate," 130.
86. Thomas, *Diversity Regimes*, 144.
87. Jessi Lee Jackson, "The Non-Performativity of Implicit Bias Training," *Radical Teacher* 112 (2018): 46.
88. Julia Ismael, Althea Eannace Lazzaro, and Brianna Ishihara, "It Takes Heart: The Experiences and Working Conditions of Caring Educators," *Radical Teacher* 119 (April 17, 2021): 30–40, <https://doi.org/10.5195/rt.2021.707>.
89. Sloniowski, "Affective Labor, Resistance, and the Academic Librarian"; Ismael, Lazzaro, and Ishihara, "It Takes Heart."
90. Moeller, "Insert Instruction Here."
91. Mirza, Nicholson, and Seale, "Acting 'As If,'" n.p.
92. An extended discussion of affect is beyond the scope of this article; our intention here is to highlight existing scholarship related to affect that suggests avenues for further exploration.
93. Michalinos Zembylas, "Making Sense of the Complex Entanglement between Emotion and Pedagogy: Contributions of the Affective Turn," *Cultural Studies of Science Education* 11, no. 3 (2014): 541, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-014-9623-y>.
94. Zembylas, "Making Sense of the Complex Entanglement between Emotion and Pedagogy," 541.
95. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, "An Inventory of Shimmers," in *The Affect Theory Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke), 1.
96. Sara Ahmed, "Affective Economies," *Social Text* 22, no. 2 (2004): 119, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/55780>. Ahmed notes that Hochschild's concept of emotional labor was instrumental to the development of their own theorization of affect.
97. James M. Thomas, "Affect and the Sociology of Race: A Program for Critical Inquiry," *Ethnicities* 14, no. 1 (August 2, 2013): 72, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796813497003>.
98. *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context*, eds. David Barton, Mary Hamilton, and Roz Ivanič (New York, NY: Routledge, 2000).
99. Zembylas, "Pedagogies of Strategic Empathy," 116.
100. Thomas, "Affect and the Sociology of Race," 84.
101. Michele R. Santamaria, "Concealing White Supremacy through Fantasies of the Library: Economies of Affect at Work," *Library Trends* 68, no. 3 (2020): 431–49, <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2020.0000>.
102. Zeus Leonardo and Michalinos Zembylas, "Whiteness as Technology of Affect: Implications for Edu-

cational Praxis,” *Equity & Excellence in Education* 46, no. 1: 151, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2013.750539>.

103. Catherine Rottenberg, “The Rise of Neoliberal Feminism,” *Cultural Studies* 28, no. 3 (2013): 418–37, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2013.857361>; Melissa Gregg, “On Friday Night Drinks: Workplace Affects in the Age of the Cubicle,” in Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, *The Affect Theory Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007): 252.

104. Leonardo and Zembylas, “Whiteness as Technology of Affect,” 162.

105. Sloniowski, “Affective Labor, Resistance, and the Academic Librarian,” 647.

106. Kate Adler and Lisa Sloniowski, “Introduction: Strange Circulations: Affect and the Library,” *Library Trends* 68, no. 3 (2020): 369–378, <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2020.0006>.

107. Adler and Sloniowski, “Introduction,” 377.

108. Ismael, Lazzaro, and Ishihara, “It Takes Heart,” 30.

109. Jennifer Brown et al., “We Here: Speaking Our Truth,” *Library Trends* 67, no. 1 (2018): 163–81, <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2018.0031>.

110. Michalinos Zembylas, “The Affective Dimension of Everyday Resistance: Implications for Critical Pedagogy in Engaging with Neoliberalism’s Educational Impact,” *Critical Studies in Education* 62, no. 2 (March 15, 2021): n.p., <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2019.1617180>.

111. Zembylas, “The Affective Dimension of Everyday Resistance,” n.p.

112. Zembylas, “Pedagogies of Strategic Empathy,” 118; Thomas, “Affect and the Sociology of Race.”

113. Mita Banerjee and Olga Zlatkin-Troitschanskaia, “The Gap between Knowledge and Belief: Narrative, Affect and Students’ Deeper Learning in Higher Education,” *Studies in Higher Education* 46, no. 10 (2021): 2087–98, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1953330>.

114. Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2014), 181.

115. Cathy Burnett and Guy Merchant, “Returning to Text: Affect, Meaning Making, and Literacies,” *Reading Research Quarterly* 56, no. 2: 4 (2020), <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/25653/>.

116. Leung and López-McKnight, “Dreaming Revolutionary Futures,” 18. Brown, Cline, and Méndez-Brady also offer suggestions for addressing inequitable labor practices in the context of broader library diversity efforts in “Leaning on Our Labor.”

117. Barbara Fister, “Disruption and the Value of Small Things,” *Library Babel Fish* (November 28, 2014), <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/library-babel-fish/disruption-and-value-small-things>.

118. Leonardo and Zembylas, “Whiteness as Technology of Affect,” 158.

119. Leonardo and Zembylas, “Whiteness as Technology of Affect,” 158.

120. Fister, “Lizard People in the Library.”

121. Fister, “Lizard People in the Library.”