

Information, communication and COVID-19: a literature review of seeking models from academic libraries

*Información, comunicación y COVID-19:
una exploración de la literatura desde los modelos
de búsqueda de las bibliotecas académicas*

Alfredo Cruz-Vázquez

Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores
de Occidente ITESO, México
alfredocruz@iteso.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3058-8936>

Diego Noel Ramos-Rojas

Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores
de Occidente ITESO, México
diegoramos@iteso.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3541-7151>

Received on: 04/06/2022 **Revised on:** 15/08/2022 **Approved on:** 25/10/2022 **Published on:** 01/03/2023

Abstract

This paper offers an approach from various theoretical and empirical references close to academic libraries; around the challenges they face from their object of research: the users of information. A relationship is proposed that can be aimed at a dialogue with digital culture, seeking to establish a framework of encounter based on the adaptation that academic libraries have had to incrementally complex information environments. The circulation of information from various sources and approaches in everyday life represents a multiple challenge to produce knowledge. The pandemic by COVID-19 puts the subjectivity of the information process back at the center of the discussion, which increases in contexts where uncertainty and the multiplicity of meanings prevail to interpret it. From a literature review and the selection of informational behavior models and user studies, clues were detected to study digital culture from a research perspective of academic libraries. The argumentation allowed to detect clues to find an entry framework for the study of users from an interdisciplinary construction between communication, health and information sciences.

Keywords

Information, libraries, users, subjectivity, searches.

Suggested citation: Cruz-Vázquez, A. and Ramos-Rojas, D. N. (2023). Information, communication and COVID-19: a literature review of seeking models from academic libraries. *Universitas-XXI*, 38, pp. 161-181. <https://doi.org/10.17163/uni.n38.2023.07>

Resumen

Este texto ofrece una aproximación desde diversos referentes teóricos y empíricos cercanos a las bibliotecas académicas, en torno de los retos que enfrentan a partir de su objeto de investigación: los usuarios de la información. A partir de la revisión de la literatura se plantea una relación que puede ser encaminada a un diálogo dentro de la cultura digital, buscando establecer un marco de encuentro fundamentado en la adaptación que han tenido las bibliotecas académicas a los entornos informativos incrementalmente complejos. La circulación de información desde diversas fuentes y aproximaciones en la vida cotidiana representa un reto múltiple para la producción de conocimiento de las bibliotecas académicas. La pandemia del COVID-19 pone nuevamente en el centro de la discusión la subjetividad del proceso informativo, que se acentúa en contextos en los que la incertidumbre y la multiplicidad de sentidos para interpretarla prevalecen de manera pronunciada. La selección de modelos del comportamiento informacional y los estudios de usuarios abordan rutas a las prácticas informativas en la cultura digital desde una mirada de investigación de las bibliotecas académicas. Se presenta un marco de entrada para el estudio de los usuarios desde una construcción interdisciplinaria entre la comunicación, la salud y las ciencias de la información.

Palabras clave

Información, bibliotecas, usuarios, subjetividad, búsquedas.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic produced global changes, forcing people to reformulate ways of working and living together in different areas of life caused by confinement, biosecurity methods and social distancing, creating complex scenarios regarding the search for information. These changes highlighted the effects of information overproduction and its possible effects in the health fields, characterized as “infodemic” (conjunction of the terms “epidemic” and “information”) by the World Health Organization (WHO), to refer to the spread of information - in some cases correct, in others not - on a particular subject (WHO, 2020). The excess and characteristics of the information made it difficult to find reliable sources in the pandemic scenario, where misinformation and rumors increased the use of mobile devices, and socio-digital networks and virtual communities gained popularity (PAHO, 2020).

Additionally, it worsened by the blackout in 2020 and the first half of 2021 of educational, heritage and cultural institutions, such as libraries, archives, museums (Quitral, 2020), which allow sharing information. Likewise, there

was an increase in health information searches on the Internet, starting from the various epidemic situations and the interest in these topics (Aquino Canchari *et al.*, 2020); however, these were mediated by information retrieval interfaces and sorting algorithms, which underwent difficulties to organize the information in terms of reliability and relevance for the public (Petrocchi and Viviani, 2022). The search for information during confinement was framed in a context of informational uncertainty, subtracting exclusivity from conventional media and giving more importance to sociodigital networks and instant messaging platforms (Rogers, 2020; Magallón Rosa, 2020). Finally, there was a phenomenon of information fatigue derived from its proliferation and reproduction at a global level, causing disconnection and saturation about the multiple consequences of the pandemic in everyday life (Kalogeopoulos *et al.*, 2020).

In this context, the infodemic implied a pressing change for academic libraries to focus on roles, organizational changes and services to support educational activities in diverse environments related to information uncertainty and confinement, as shown by a national study in the USA during the pandemic (Willenborg and Withorn, 2021). Based on this situation, several information centers adapted pre-pandemic frameworks to approach their users, organize information gathering, and modify library instruction in these contexts as, for example, in the case of adapting the Association of College and Research Libraries ACRL framework to promote infoliteracy (Gross *et al.*, 2022).

The aim of this paper is to explore the literature, both pre- and post-pandemic, on how to approach users in this context of informational uncertainty in a daily basis, seeking to expand the research value of academic libraries (Oakleaf, 2010). The increasingly complex environments in which users operate place the subjectivity of the information process at the center of the discussion, bringing together other approaches from, for example, communication and digital culture in contexts of uncertainty, subjectivity and construction of meaning.

Methodology for the literature review

We sought a literature review that disseminates the findings of previous research synthesized in a rigorous and systematic way (Cooper, 2017). Likewise, this work adopted a qualitative approach and a critical look, beyond a mere narrative review. A pointed search strategy was sought that looked for critical

thinking, heuristic explanations, and the integration of specific findings into broader theoretical contexts (Botella and Gambará, 2002). Although the narrative review offers clues for including different types and sources of information which helps to discuss and understand the main topic in a broad way, a method of its own was implemented, far from being a quantitative synthesis method or an arbitrary narrative review, focused on the theoretical and contextual foundation (Hart, 2018) to review previous studies considering their historical processes, advances in the area and new perspectives (Vestena and Díaz-Medina, 2018; Byrne, 2016; Ferrari, 2015).

There has been an increment of search models that has hindered the formulation of both theories that allow an orderly systematization of knowledge about information search (Savolainen and Thomson, 2022) and empirical research that addresses these aspects (Turcios *et al.*, 2014). Speaking of a qualitative literature review under a critical approach within librarianship and from the analysis of texts on information systems is to open the way out of the orthodox method of “narrative synthesis” or meta-analysis in which past studies are described in an “objective and quantitative” way but restricts the voice of the researcher or the narrative review, which is highly subjective (Tate *et al.*, 2015).

We did not opt for an intermediate point between the two, but a methodological approach based on the daily searches of the authors of this text, who implement logical operators and search commands to enhance the algorithmic ordering of information systems on the Internet. These methods were carried out in search engines, but also in different databases such as Ebsco, Google Scholar, SciELO, Scopus, Web of Science and Redalyc, including the academic social networks Academia.edu and ResearchGate. Some of the journals were Journal of the American Society for Information Science, Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries and *Revista Cubana de Información y Comunicación*.

Considering that literature review is defined as a selection of available documents containing information, ideas, data, and written evidence on a particular topic (Hart, 2018), the selection of information sources for the research used terms and keywords whose combinations were entered into the internal engines of the databases. Keywords such as “information”, “users”, “practices”, “searches”, “internet” and “health”, mainly, were used. Hence, two types of papers were identified: a) those essayistic with an argumentative deployment to defend an idea or present a model; b) empirical papers that

account for the informational processes of users on the Internet. The main questions that motivated their analysis were: What has been investigated or written on the subject in the last ten years? How has it been thought of? What have been the conceptual and/or methodological tools used?

This literature review focused on studies that have initiated or maintain the debate on the user's information processes in everyday life. This methodological decision implied considering some inclusion and exclusion criteria (thematic relevance, contribution and timeliness), giving more attention to information processes, digital culture and academic libraries, as suggested by Fink's (2014) systematic literature review method: literature search, selection by means of criteria, by extracting main contributions and establishing relationships between them. This entire process was guided by an inductive gaze that emphasizes the role of libraries (Cruz-Vázquez *et al.*, 2022).

The research was classified for its analysis and presentation along three axes: 1) user studies and information practices, 2) health information searches on the Internet, and 3) information, communication and digital culture. This literature review collects the academic postulates that build interdisciplinary dialogue to account for the discussion on informational behavior and user studies, and to identify possible contributions to approach informational processes in digital culture and infodemics from a research perspective of academic libraries.

Results: subjectivity, research, and libraries to study users

User studies and information practices

The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) has highlighted the dual role of academic libraries in research and advisory work, since they are entities that provide a scholarly service and can obtain the data they need to make decisions about what purposes they can serve and how they can do so; they also require rigorous research in the contexts in which they operate, documenting their experiences with their own methods, with a view to developing research that will deepen the value of academic libraries and their contributions to the value of academic libraries and their contributions to the research and advisory work of the academic community (Oakleaf, 2010).

Reliable methods that support decision making based on practices that start from the services, constitute a way of operating libraries and information centers that has been described in the Anglo-Saxon literature as Evidence Based Library Information Practice (EBLIP), and guidelines are established to gather evidence, constituting a tradition to approach the problems of library practice, both service and research, with mixed methods (Eldredge, 2012).

Beyond the introspective look, research elements are established on the informative and complex academic contexts because they allow generating models to know their value to the educational institutions. These aspects are based on the relationship between the service and the connection with the academic context, providing innovative approaches to the way in which the various activities of the educational communities are approached and questions about the value and impact of libraries in academic and university life (Connaway *et al.*, 2017).

The field of User Studies is within library research, which is composed of activities involving research on information users, understood as all those individuals who require information to carry out their daily activities, including potential users who need it but are not aware of it, and real users, who can express their needs in these aspects, and who actively use information to carry out their daily activities (Pagaza García, 1996). There is consensus on what motivates the knowledge of information users, inasmuch as these studies arise from the need libraries and information centers have for planning, which is a main aspect of their operation and which obliges them to know the needs of the communities they serve; however, there is discrepancy as to their first applications and the meaning of these investigations. Some authors place its origins during the 1920s, with the organized quantitative exploration that originated in libraries in the United States to model the use and exploitation of modern libraries; however, without considering the need to incorporate the user as part of the search process, hence modeling the latter as a mere receiver of a process that starts with the administration of information resources (Pagaza García, 1996).

It was not until the 1980s that a shift towards the user was proposed because of a cumulative change of focus and direction, in which the lesser centrality of information was proposed to favor the behavior of the subjects and their documentary choices. Hence, research concentrated first in libraries and later in other centers, promoting research that considers the user (his expectations, decisions and behaviors), encompassing a diverse amount of re-

search that gradually configured differentiated methods coming from other disciplines (Julien *et al.*, 2018).

From this point on, user studies can be understood, from its historical development, as an effort that starts from libraries to know the ways in which information users interact with resources, no matter their origin or administration:

(...) We can consider user studies as a multidisciplinary method of knowledge that allows to analyze different aspects and characteristics of the relationship established between the information and the user, using different research techniques. In practice, they can be a tool that allows access to a behavioral model of both actual and potential users of information centers by applying different data collection and processing methodologies. (Pagaza García, 1996, p. 133)

Consequently, studies have focused on two research traditions that involve different aspects of users, starting from pre-established theoretical models with two main branches: those based on needs (Kuhlthau, 1991) and those based on behaviors (Wilson, 2006). Studies on information needs emphasize the personal and affective dimensions that relate subjects to these products and their motivations for seeking them, which configure contexts in which users search, focus on the way they make decisions but without delving into the specificities of technological systems. In the case of informational behaviors, these explain the subjection of users to a procedural modeling through operation schemes within a delimited technological system, which arises between the subject and the information they seek.

From the researcher's point of view, these processes can be described as behaviors interacting with systems. These investigations delve deeper into information design; however, they do not emphasize the specificities of technological systems in relation to users. Although both lines have multiplied with models and theories on needs and behaviors due to the growing interest in information sciences and studies, the integration of multiple empirical research on both needs and behaviors has given rise to a sort of methodology with imprecise characteristics that encompass a large number of approaches, which have hindered scientific discussion and the construction of comparative knowledge (Savolainen, 2007). In addition, there are few works that address the behaviors and needs of users with particular interests (Hirsh *et al.*, 2012).

Since the 1990s, the emergence of new tools to retrieve information within the different daily scenarios led user studies to move beyond the spatial or digital delimitation of a library and attempted to address other aspects rela-

ted to the search for information, framed by social and technological structures. This alternative in user research was configured from the approach more attached to the study of practices mediated by technological systems, especially since the popularization of Information Retrieval Interfaces (IRI) on the Internet, delving into the senses with which information is searched and selected through these tools.

Technological changes forced libraries and information centers to model increasingly complex contexts to use these systems and gradually focused on the meaning processes in different search contexts (for example, in a library search engine or in a search engine such as Google), favoring the search for more inductive models on information behaviors. An important component of the informative search is modeled through the meaning subjects give to their informative practices, considering that there is a technological structure in which information searches are carried out, in connection with other different languages. On this point, methodologies have focused on the construction of meaning from an inductive point of view (Dervin, 1998). The modeling of information search is understood from the scenarios of information practices, as part of the daily life of users who do not limit their searches only to formal contexts, but group strategies that operate in different sources as a practice of information search within daily life (McKenzie, 2003; Savolainen, 2008b), recently expanded to a more robust model with theoretical potential (Savolainen and Thomson, 2021). Search has been an important component of information practices, understood as the totality of ways in which people search for, use, and share information in different contexts (Savolainen, 2010). One aspect of information seeking studied in the United States since the 1970s has been nonwork information seeking, formally known as everyday life information seeking (ELIS). It is expressed in a variety of domains, including leisure time activities, for example, such as those related to consumption, health care and hobbies (Savolainen, 2010).

There is a variety of topics in ELIS studies, mainly focused on diverse groups, such as urban young adults, adolescents making career decisions, elderly people, parents with children under five, battered women, overweight women, hospital patients, blind and visually impaired citizens, homeless parents, immigrants, people interested in paranormal topics, amateur cooks, environmental activists, among others (Savolainen, 2010). The main ELIS models include the Sense-making approach (Dervin, 1983), the small or impoverished world theory (Chatman, 1991), ELIS ecological model (William-

son, 1998), ELIS in the context of the way of living (Savolainen, 2008b), the information practices model (McKenzie, 2003), and the concept of information fields (Fisher and Naumer, 2006).

Studies on judgments to search, evaluate and retrieve information stand out in ELIS, highlighting that they are dynamic, complex (non-binary) and changing in users over time, among them there is the relevance and pertinence criteria (Borlund, 2013; Roitero *et al.*, 2020; Savolainen and Kari, 2006) and the preference criterion (Savolainen, 2008a); these criteria are popular in research focused on web search. Regarding the study of the preference criterion, there is no defined basis for its approach because its studies are still exploratory. As for the relevance criterion, there are two ways: testing with predefined judgments and relevance identification, in which the user defines criteria arising from self-assigned search tasks, depending on variables and subjectivities that affect their idea of relevance (Savolainen and Kari, 2006; Savolainen, 2015).

Health information searches on the Internet

Since the late 1990s, the internet burst in as an everyday source (Rieh, 2004), reconfiguring ELIS practices by providing easily accessible sources, complementing (without replacing) traditional or analog sources (Savolainen, 2008b, 2010). For giving an approximation of the volume of information produced decades later, 361 million videos were uploaded on YouTube in March 2020 in the categories of “COVID-19” and “COVID 19” and there were 550 million messages on Twitter with the terms: coronavirus, corona virus, covid19, covid-19, covid_19 or pandemic.

The antecedents to infodemics can be traced in the academic literature from the 1970s, related to the reception of too much information, characterized as a break from the amount of information elements that can be understood by a subject in a given context, a situation that led to various constructs related to overload and fatigue (i.e. information overload, information fatigue, communication overload), grouped along three axes of interest: retrieval, ordering and analysis, decision and communication (Eppler and Mengis, 2003).

In 1996, the neologism infoxication (conjunction of the terms information and intoxication) emerged, an adaptation of the English term information overload used by Alfons Cornella to encompass the growing production

of information at the end of the 20th century, mainly in companies (Cornella, 1998). Many studies have used this term since the early twentieth century to account for cognitive aspects and increasingly in the social effects but adding the health-information relationship along to the consumption habits of subjects and the quality of information (Dias, 2014). The term infoxication is also associated with aspects related to the quality of information rather than quantity, for example, in the work of verifying information from journalism (Franco and Gértrudix, 2015).

Infodemiology, on the other hand, is a term coined since 2002 by Eysenbach (2002) to propose an interdisciplinary research methodology that studies the determinants and distribution of health information and misinformation. The author defines it as the distribution and determination of information in an electronic medium, especially on the internet or in a population, with the objective of informing public health and public policy (Eysenbach, 2011). Similarly, infodemic has focused on the broader context of information production, insisting on thinking of health and information issues as a joint phenomenon that has also focused on the context of disinformation. A clear example of this phenomenon was Google searches using terms to account for the symptoms of a cold or flu in 2018, when the Google Flu Trend app was launched to use information about online searches (Eysenbach, 2011). The infodemiology proposal uses the concept of infovigilance, a type of online health information monitoring and cyberbehavior for public health. Likewise, Eysenbach (2011) has developed this emerging area of research using infometrics and web analytics tools to measure attitudes, behavior, knowledge and consumption of health-related information.

Given that the number of users resorting to the Internet for basic health-related information has been increasing, Mayo-Yáñez *et al.* (2021), influenced by infodemiology and using Google Trends data as a source of information, statistically analyzed the use of Internet-based information, focusing on the search for behaviors related to Covid-19 in the autonomous community of Galicia, Spain. For this purpose, the authors systematized, interpreted and compared the data downloaded from the search entry with the keywords (individually and in combination): Coronavirus, Covid-19, SARS-CoV-2. They conclude, among other things, that Big Data analysis of the internet in health research has potential, i.e., studying internet search patterns makes it possible to assess public interest regarding a number of health-related topics. One of their main findings was that the term coronavirus, being the most generically

used by users, has a linear correlation with the number of confirmed cases of Covid-19 in a statistically significant way.

The pandemic led to a novel production of health information in record time in a viral form, consistent with the metaphor of the virus and its possibilities to propagate and its social effects in sociodigital networks (Zarocostas, 2020). This virality was taken to a global scale by means of different technological devices, with a significant production coming from sources without medical, governmental or scientific authority (López Veneroni, 2021), placing the emphasis on the excessive abundance and not on the premeditation that allows separating misinformation -without intentionality- from disinformation -which disseminates information with the purpose of misleading (Floridi and Morán Reyes, 2012; Sequoiah-Grayson and Floridi, 2019; Simon Ríos, 2021).

The volume of information, along with its intentionality and veracity about COVID-19, caused risky social behaviors that are still under analysis, such as the rejection of vaccines, doubting the existence of the virus and not abiding by elementary protective measures such as healthy distance and the use of masks (López Veneroni, 2021, p. 299), creating confusion about the data coming from health sciences (Alfonso Sánchez and Fernández Valdés, 2020).

Pellegrini (2021) says that there are different ways of seeing the pandemic due to the excess of information (both truthful and erroneous), mediated from different interpretative frameworks, in which the absence of dialectical reasoning prevailed and in which it was possible to characterize, according to the meaning given by means of specific argumentative elements coming from different information, homogeneous or contrasting, full of contradictions, focused on the progression of events, either dynamic or static, when it was necessary to approach a particular aspect and informative relations that were established between different situational contexts.

From the framework of Evidence-Based Library and Information Practice (EBLIP), it is possible to imagine an approach to the informational practices of users in digital culture and infodemic, considering that libraries have a relevant role in digital transformations (Pérez Salmerón, 2018). An evidence-based study that points to the centrality of information in the health crisis by COVID-19 is that of Montesi (2021), who starts from the idea that informational practices allow people to adapt to the changes derived from crises.

Montesi (2021) asserts that the contribution of library and information science (LIS) and human information behavior (HIB) research provide evidence, to some extent, on the implications of information on people. The

author also insists that HIB and health information practices can be addressed more deeply in local or specific contexts and go beyond methodologies based solely on massive data, i.e., it is urgent to contemplate a framework to investigate, from library knowledge and communication research, users, their experiences and their contexts under situations of health crisis, disinformation and infodemic, since the research done has been on information practices in *normal* circumstances.

Discussion: digital culture, towards information and communication

Campillo Vélez (2021, p. 57) points out that the pandemic was “a good excuse to use the digital”. However, digital culture has been an everyday life dimension for several decades, and as a concept it has undergone a dizzying evolution since its first mention in the mid-1970s, generating its own sub-concepts since then, while it has been related to various topics, including information management, literacies, and information sciences (Hidalgo Toledo, 2021a). Hidalgo Toledo’s (2021a) argument is taken up again to specify digital culture as a conceptual category capable of conversing with information studies pointing out that although it has a direct relationship with information “the symbolic and material processes that arise from the interaction with digital transformation and the reality that it produces and sustains” (p. 317) should be central.

Searches for information on the web are an inherent part of the digital environment, hence of everyday life as a whole; what we search, consume and produce on the internet is digital culture, now accentuated by the pandemic (Trejo Delarbre, 2021), but always based on digital technologies and their mediations, therefore, it is a culture in constant transformation that challenges researchers to take advantage of consolidated instruments of the social sciences and at the same time employ methods to approach the digital (Flores-Márquez and González, 2021) and hypermediatized lives (Hidalgo Toledo, 2021b). Given the digitization and virtualization of everyday practices through devices and screens, life itself has become digital; it is a digital culture that is being redefined and transformed, at the same time that academic interest increases over the years (Hidalgo Toledo, Rodrigues da Cunha and Barredo Ibáñez, 2020).

From some positions in the health sciences, García-Saisó *et al.* (2021) consider “infodemics” as the scenario that opens the need to promote media and information literacy (skills that allow verifying digital content). This literacy, as has been widely discussed, speaks of the role of information professionals and of a critical competence in information, also called information literacy (Alfonso Sánchez and Fernández Valdés, 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic further accentuated this digital culture in an increasingly convulsive, complex and contradictory information society. In this sense, a connection between information studies and librarianship with communication sciences has been info-communication, conceived as a complex action that seeks to “articulate information with the communicative processes that mobilize it, mediated by educational processes” (Pirela Morillo, 2021, p. 82); info-communication urges to discuss theoretically and in an interdisciplinary way the articulation between information, communication and technological mediation, both in the production-circulation and in the consumption of content on digital platforms (Pasarelli *et al.*, 2014; Saladrigas and Linares, 2017).

There is research that focus on the use of the media by citizens to inform themselves about the COVID-19 pandemic. These studies, mostly quantitative, show interest in the equivalent competencies between media literacy and information literacy, having a bridge between the two the technologies that mediate the consumption and access to information sources (Muñiz, 2021). For their part, Grajales *et al.* (2014) qualitatively studied the health information that interacts with users from digital social networks and media applications, reviewed narratives in several cases to understand the different ways in which people use the internet for health care and the reasons for doing so, with the objective to show how informed decisions are made from the daily use of social networks and similar tools.

Info-communication explores universal literacy (information, cognitive and media literacy) to strategically address problems, including the overabundance of information (Pirela Morillo, 2021). However, it is necessary to point out that, beyond digital competencies and information consumption habits, people, in their daily lives, conduct their own information practices. Users develop criteria for selecting one source or another when searching for information on a given topic. It is essential to consider three aspects to address information practices on the Internet: 1) the user’s point of view in the context of everyday life; 2) the theoretical background and empirical contributions to discuss the

ways in which people access and use diverse (although sometimes limited) sources of information to satisfy information needs in areas such as health, consumption, education, transportation, and leisure (Savolainen, 2008b); and 3) that users create their own digital ecosystems, i.e., they reconfigure their environments, making them more complex (Figueroa Benítez, 2019).

Information and communication have a natural bond, information-seeking behavior and human informational practices in general are within a larger area, which is the very study of human communication practices in an everyday sense (Savolainen, 2007). However, in the absence of an interdisciplinary conceptual framework focused on the study of health information practices on the Internet in times of pandemics and infodemics, it is urgent to consider these practices as a changing phenomenon within digital culture, connecting the knowledge of libraries and information studies with the communicational perspective.

Given the abundant presence of global information flows and communications, it is necessary to consider the critical view of the global information order, which in turn alludes to the challenges of approaching a technological and digital culture, in which identities and practices are ordered, disordered and reordered by means of information (Lash, 2002). Studying the uses and social practices within the uninformed society of information, due to irrational information overload, misinformation, disinformation and uncontrolled information (Lash, 2002), represents opening the way to new objects from solid approaches to the study of communication and information.

Conclusions

From academic libraries, it has been essential to decode infodemic by incorporating elements from different fields of action, including the study of digital culture and communication. Addressing the phenomena related to the search for information in the context of the pandemic from research implies an open look at the world of the subjects, in which the search for meaning and the daily ways of approaching the multiplicity of sources, beyond their criteria of quality or extension, are emerging as constitutive elements to investigate the informative practices that face high uncertainty processes, from the possible constitution of identities and ways of thinking from aspects derived from the logics of the same information.

The main element emerges from this subjectivity to study these informative practices of the user in the digital culture, representing a challenge for future research since they have to focus on the motivations, interpretations and experiences of the subjects, but without losing sight of the environment that they configure from the overabundance of information sources and processes in which performance is the axis of the practice, where speed and compression are key to approach these issues, as Lash says:

The creation of meaning or knowledge is the gloss, the commentary of everyday activities, and is inseparable from them. In technological culture, reflexivity is not an independent reflection process. There is a lack of time and space for such reflection. There is a fusion of words and things, thought and practice. Thinking is not only doing; it is also communicating. In technological culture, reflexivity becomes practice: it becomes communication. (2002, p. 46)

In this aspect, we cannot ignore the scenario of uncertainty and the complex context through which information processes go through, as in the case of the pandemic, since the excess of information not only prevents finding reliable sources, but also invites to discuss with different disciplines to approach the search for meaning in everyday life and the digital transformations in times of crisis.

The role of academic libraries, given their nature of service to users and their legitimate interest in research on the phenomena surrounding infodemics and digital culture, is becoming increasingly relevant in the field, especially because they are open to interdisciplinary dialogue and have been able to generate their own models to understand the context in which they operate, still lacking a relation between communication and information sciences in a deep and reflective sense.

It is up to librarianship and information studies to develop a critical, less naive view, so that they can provide information in relation to subjectivities, behaviors and needs by analyzing the information practices of users in digital culture and infodemics. In this sense, the bridge between communication sciences and information is not only possible but urgent, based on the contributions and methodological hinges proposed by Fuentes-Navarro (2002), in his shift to everyday life, useful for research from academic libraries.

References

- Alfonso Sánchez, I. and Fernández Valdés, M. (2020). Comportamiento informacional, infodemia y desinformación durante la pandemia de COVID-19. *Anales de la Academia de Ciencias de Cuba*, 10(2), e882. <https://bit.ly/3dgAVQY>
- Aquino Canchari, C., Caira Chuquineyra, B. and Chávez Bustamante, S. (2020). Asociación entre la pandemia de COVID-19 y las tendencias de búsqueda en internet en Latinoamérica. *Revista Cubana de Información en Ciencias de la Salud*, 31(4). <https://bit.ly/3QTb5k4>
- Borlund, P. (2013). Interactive information retrieval: An introduction. *JISTap*, 54(10), 13-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1633/JISTaP.2013.1.3.2>
- Botella, J. and Gambará, H. (2013). *Qué es el meta-análisis*. Biblioteca nueva.
- Byrne, J. A. (2016). Improving the peer review of narrative literature reviews. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 1(12), 1-4. <https://bit.ly/3eV5BYJ>
- Campillo Vélez, B. E. (2021). Vigilancia y disciplina en tiempos de pandemia: ¿Se expande en Occidente el modelo chino? In E. Vieira Posada (ed.), *La pandemia de covid-19 y un nuevo orden mundial*, 3, 55-79. Ediciones Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia. <https://doi.org/10.16925/9789587603248>
- Chatman, E. A. (1991). Life in a small world: Applicability of gratification theory to information-seeking behavior. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci*, 42(6), 438-449. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4571\(199107\)42:6<438::AID-ASIS6>3.0.CO;2-B](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199107)42:6<438::AID-ASIS6>3.0.CO;2-B)
- Connaway, L., Harvey, W., Kitzie, V. and Mikitish, S. (2017). *Academic Library Impact: Improving Practice and Essential Areas to Research*. American Library Association, 1-124. Elibro. <https://bit.ly/3Bi3Gos>
- Cooper, H. (2017). *Research Synthesis and meta-analysis: A step-by-step approach* (5th ed.) Sage.
- Cornella, A. (1998). El uso de la información en las empresas. *El profesional de la información*, 7(7), 10.
- Dervin, B. (1983). An overview of sense-making research: concepts, methods and results [Conferencia]. International Communication Association, Dallas, TX, May. <https://bit.ly/3DoEn6V>
- Dervin, B. (1998). Sense-making theory and practice: an overview of user interests in knowledge seeking and use. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 2(2), 36-46. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673279810249369>
- Dias, P. (2014). From “infocination” to “infosaturation”: a theoretical overview of the cognitive and social effects of digital immersion. *Ámbitos*, 24. <https://bit.ly/3jZ93UN>

- Eldredge, J. D. (2012). The evolution of evidence based library and information practice, Part I: Defining EBLIP. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 7(4), 139-145. <https://doi.org/10.18438/B8GC99>
- Eppler, M. J. y Mengis, J. (2003). *A Framework for information overload research in organizations*. ICA. <https://bit.ly/3xrVi4I>
- Eysenbach, G. (2002). Infodemiology: the epidemiology of (mis)information. *The American Journal of Medicine*, 113(9), 763-765. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9343\(02\)01473-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9343(02)01473-0)
- Eysenbach, G. (2011). Infodemiology and infoveillance: framework for an emerging set of public health informatics methods to analyze search, communication and publication behavior on the internet. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 11(1), e1157. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.1157>
- Ferrari, R. (2015). Writing narrative style literature reviews, *Medical Writing*, 24(4), 230-235. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2047480615Z.000000000329>
- Figuerero Benítez, J. C. (2019). Nuevo ecosistema comunicativo digital: el consumidor. *Ámbitos: Revista Internacional de Comunicación*, 46, 261-263. <https://doi.org/10.12795/Ambitos.2019.i46.14>
- Fink, A. (2014). *Conducting research literature reviews: from the internet to paper*. SAGE.
- Fisher, K. E. y Naumer, C. M. (2006). Information grounds: Theoretical basis and empirical findings on information flow in social settings. In A. Spink, C. Cole (eds.), *New Directions in Human Information Behavior* (pp. 93-111). Springer: Dordrecht, <https://bit.ly/3I25AN4>
- Flores-Márquez, D. and González Reyes, R. (coords.) (2021). *La imaginación metodológica. Coordinadas, rutas y apuestas para el estudio de la cultura digital*. Tintable.
- Floridi, L. and Morán Reyes, A. A. (2012). Pasos a seguir para la filosofía de la información. *Revista Interamericana de Bibliotecología*, 35(2), 213-218. <https://bit.ly/3AkKis2>
- Franco Rodríguez, R. y Gértudix Barrio, M. (2015). Infocation: implications of the phenomenon in journalism. *Revista de Comunicación de la SEECI*, 19(38), 141-181. <https://bit.ly/3LwNftn>
- Fuentes-Navarro, R. (2002). Comunicación, cultura, sociedad: fundamentos conceptuales de la postdisciplinarietà. *Tram(p)as de la Comunicación y la Cultura*, (1), 12-29.
- García-Saisó, S., Martí, M., Brooks, I., Curioso, W., González, D., Malek, V., Medina, F. M., Radix, C., Otzoy, D., Zacarías, S., Dos Santos, E. P. and D'Agostino,

- M. (2021). Infodemia en tiempos de COVID-19. *Revista panamericana de salud pública*, 45, e89. <https://doi.org/10.26633/RPSP.2021.89>
- Grajales, F., Novak, H., Ho, K. and Eysenbach, G. (2014). Social Media: A review and tutorial of Applications in medicine and health care. *Journal of medical internet research*. 16(2). 10.2196/jmir.2912
- Gross, M., Julien, H. y Latham, D. (2022). Librarian views of the ACRL Framework and the impact of covid-19 on information literacy instruction in community colleges. *Library & Information Science Research*, 44(2), 101-151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2022.101151>
- Hart, C. (2018). *Doing a literature review*. SAGE.
- Hidalgo Toledo, J., Rodrigues da Cunha, M. and Barredo Ibáñez, D. (2020). Desafíos de la investigación sobre cultura digital en América Latina. Encuadres para un debate epistemológico. *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias de la Comunicación*, 19(34). <https://bit.ly/3nvIuEW>
- Hidalgo Toledo, J. (2021a). Los consumos culturales y la hipermediatización de la vida, la cultura y la existencia. In A. García Jiménez, D. Barredo Ibáñez y M. Rodrigues da Cunha (coords.), *Nuevas audiencias, consumidores y culturas digitales* (pp.11-27). Universidad de Alicante. <https://bit.ly/3yuGDXs>
- Hidalgo Toledo, J. (2021b). Bocetos bibliométricos para una arqueología y evolución conceptual de cultura digital. In J. Hidalgo Toledo *et al.*, *Transformaciones mediáticas y comunicacionales en la era posdigital*. RIA editorial y AMIC. <https://bit.ly/3OJP9ai>
- Hirsh, S., Anderson, C. and Caselli, M. (2012). The reality of fantasy: Uncovering information-seeking behaviors and needs in online fantasy sports. *CHI '12 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 849-864. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2212776.2212858>
- Julien, H., McKechnie, L., Polkinghorne, S. and Chabot, R. (2018). The “user turn” in practice: information behavior researchers’ constructions of information users, *Information Research*, 23(4). <https://bit.ly/3BIRLBr>
- Kalogeropoulos, A., Fletcher, R. and Nielsen, R. (2020). Initial surge in news use around coronavirus in the UK has been followed by significant increase in news avoidance. *Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism*. <https://bit.ly/3R0Bj5d>
- Kuhlthau, C. C. (1991). Inside the search process: Information seeking from the user’s perspective. *Journal of the American society for information science*, 42(5), 361-371. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4571\(199106\)42:5<361::AID-ASI6>3.0.CO;2-%23](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199106)42:5<361::AID-ASI6>3.0.CO;2-%23)

- Lash, S. (2002). *Crítica de la información*. Amorrortu Editores.
- López Veneroni, F. (2021). De la pandemia a la infodemia: el virus de la infoxicación. *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, 66(242), 293-312. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22201/fcpys.2448492xe.2021.242.79330>
- Magallón Rosa, R. (2020). *Desinformación y pandemia. La nueva realidad*. Pirámide.
- McKenzie, P. J. (2003) A model of information practices in accounts of everyday life information seeking. *Journal of Documentation*, 59(1), 19-40. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410310457993>
- Montesi, M. (2021). Human information behavior during the Covid-19 health crisis. A literature review. *Library & information science research*, 43(4), 101-122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2021.101122>
- Mayo-Yáñez, M., Calvo-Henríquez, C., Chiesa-Estomba, C. and González-Torres, L. (2021). Estudio de la búsqueda de información sobre la pandemia SARS-CoV-2 en Galicia. *Sociedade Galega de Medicina Interna*, 28(1), 13-16. <https://doi.org/10.22546/60/2305>
- Muñiz, C. (2021). *Medios de comunicación y pandemia de COVID-19 en México*. Tirant humanidades. UANL.
- Oakleaf, M. J. (2010). *The value of academic libraries: A comprehensive research review and report*. Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association. <https://bit.ly/3a8aMIZ>
- Organización Panamericana de la Salud. (2020). *Entender la infodemia y la desinformación en la lucha contra la Covid-19*. OPS. <https://t.ly/dmVx>
- Pagaza García, R. (1996). *Sanz Casado, Elias. Manual de estudios de usuarios*. Fundación Germán Sánchez Ruipérez.
- Pasarelli, B., Maljeiro, A. y Ramos, F. (2014). *E-infocomunicacao; estratégias y aplicacoes*. SENAC.
- Pellegrini, P. A. (2021). ¿Por qué resultó tan difícil creer en el coronavirus? Formas de pensar frente a la pandemia. In E. Vieira Posada (ed.), *La pandemia de covid-19 y un nuevo orden mundial* (pp. 55-79). Ediciones Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia. <https://doi.org/10.16925/9789587603248>
- Pérez Salmerón, G. (2018). Mapa de ideas para la transformación de la estrategia de la IFLA. *Anuario ThinkEPI*, 12, 48-55. <https://doi.org/10.3145/thinkepi.2018.04>
- Petrocchi, M. and Viviani, M. (2022). Overview of ROMCIR 2022: The 2nd Workshop on Reducing Online Misinformation through Credible Information Retrieval. Presentado en ECIR 2022: The 44th European Conference on Information Rretrieval, Stavanger, Noruega. <https://bit.ly/3xot22I>

- Pirela Morillo, J. (2021). Info-comunicación educativa para contrarrestar la desinformación. In Estela Morales Campos (coord.), *Información, desinformación, bibliotecas y usuarios en el siglo XXI*. UNAM.
- Quitral Q., Y. (2020). *Bibliotecas frente a la pandemia COVID-19: fundamentos y acciones en Latinoamérica*. Biblioteca Universitaria. <https://doi.org/10.22201/dgb.0187750xp.0.0.992>
- Rieh, S. Y. (2004). On the Web at home: Information seeking and Web searching in the home environment. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 55(8), 743-753. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20018>
- Rogers, K. (2020). How bad is the COVID-19 Misinformation Epidemic? *Five ThirtyEight*. <https://53eig.ht/3QEAJJ2>
- Roitero, K., Soprano, M., Fan, S., Spina, D., Mizzaro, S. and Demartini, G. (2020). Can the crowd identify misinformation objectively? The effects of judgment scale and assessor's background. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '20)*, July 25-30, 2020, Virtual Event, China. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401112>
- Sequoiah-Grayson, S. and Floridi, L. (2022). Semantic conceptions of information. In E. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Spring. <https://stanford.io/3OTcnLb>
- Saladrigas, H. and Linaes, R. (2017). La infocomunicación. *ALCANCE. Revista Cubana de Información y Comunicación*, 6(14). <https://bit.ly/3Qj1IeL>
- Savolainen, R. and Kari, J. (2006). User-defined relevance criteria in web searching, *Journal of Documentation*, 62(6), 685-707. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410610714921>
- Savolainen, R. (2007). Information behavior and information practice: Reviewing the “Umbrella concepts” of Information-Seeking Studies. *Library Quarterly*, 77(2), 109-132. <https://doi.org/10.1086/517840>
- Savolainen, R. (2008a). Source preferences in the context of seeking problem-specific information. *Information Processing and Management*, 44, 274-293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2007.02.008>
- Savolainen, R. (2008b). *Everyday information practices: a social phenomenological perspective*. Scarecrow Press.
- Savolainen, R. (2010). *Everyday life information seeking. Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences*. Taylor & Francis.
- Savolainen, R. (2015). Approaching the affective factors of information seeking: the viewpoint of the Information search process model. In *Proceedings of*

- ISIC, the Information Behaviour Conference*, Leeds, 2-5 September, 2014: Part 2, (paper isic28). <http://InformationR.net/ir/20-1/isic2/isic28.html>
- Savolainen, R. and Thomson, L. (2022). Assessing the theoretical potential of an expanded model for everyday information practices. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 73(4), 511-527. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24589>
- Simon Ríos, G. (2021). Misinformation y desinformación en la infodemia. En J. Oyarce Cruz (coord.), *Infodemia. La otra cara de la información*. RIA editorial.
- Tate, M., Furtmueller, E., Evermann, J. and Bandara, W. (2015). Introduction to the Special Issue: e Literature Review in Information Systems, *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 37(5). <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.03705>
- Trejo Delarbre, R. (2021). Para indagar y comprender la cultura digital. In Dorismilda Flores-Márquez y Rodrigo González Reyes, *La imaginación metodológica. Coordinadas, rutas y apuestas para el estudio de la cultura digital*. Tintable.
- Turcios, M. E., Agarwal, N. K. and Watkins, L. (2014). How much of library and information science literature qualifies as research? *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(5), 473-479.
- Vestena, J. G. and Díaz-Medina, B. (2018). Revisión narrativa: elementos que la constituyen y sus potencialidades. *Journal of Nursing and Health*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.15210/jonah.v8i1.13654>
- Willenborg, A. and Withorn, T. (2021). *Online learning librarianship in a fully online world: findings (and advice) from a national study during the COVID-19 pandemic*. Faculty Scholarship. <https://bit.ly/3qDnKwu>
- Williamson, K. (1998). The role of incidental information acquisition in an ecological model of information use. *Libr. Inf. Sci. Res.*, 20(1), 23-40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-8188\(98\)90004-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-8188(98)90004-4)
- Wilson, T. D. (2006). Beyond information seeking: A general model of information behaviour. *Information Research: An International Electronic Journal*, 11(4), 17. <https://bit.ly/3S28IBE>
- World Health Organization. (2020). *Infodemic management Infodemiology*. Geneva: WHO.
- Zarocostas J. (2020). How to fight an infodemic. *The Lancet*, 395(10225). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30461-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30461-X)