

PARECER 2

Artigo Avaliado HANDRIANTO, Ciptro; SETIAWATI, Setiawati; AZIZAH, Zahratul; ARINI, Fitri Dwi; BANSENG, Saripah. Information Literacy for Digital Citizens: Examining the Role of Community Libraries in Reducing Misinformation. **Encontros Bibli**: revista eletrônica de biblioteconomia e ciência da informação, Florianópolis/SC, Brasil, v. 31, 2025. DOI: 10.5007/1518-2924.2026.e110306. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/eb/article/view/110306>. Acesso em: 23 jun. 2026.

Rodada de Avaliação | 01

- ☐ Rejeitar
- ☒ Correções obrigatórias (requer grandes ajustes e nova rodada de análise pelo avaliador)
- ☐ Aceitar com pequenos ajustes (não necessita nova análise)
- ☐ Aceitar sem alterações

Originalidade e Plágio: espera-se que o trabalho seja original e não contenha plágio ou outras formas de fraude e má conduta, caso contrário se sugere justificar e rejeitar de imediato. Se o artigo provém de uma publicação em evento, esta versão deve conter melhorias significativas em relação ao original *

Bom

Contribuição/Relevância para a área *

Excelente

Título e Objetivo: o título deve representar adequadamente o artigo e o objetivo devem estar explicitado com clareza no texto *

Bom

Referencial teórico: deve ser suficientemente aprofundado e conter citações a outros estudos de prestígio relacionados e publicados em revistas nacionais (inclusive nesta) e/ou internacionais *

Bom

Metodologia: os métodos utilizados devem ser claros e adequados aos fins perseguidos *

Excelente

Resultados e Conclusões: devem estar em consonância com as evidências do estudo e os objetivos propostos, demonstrando o atingimento dos mesmos *

Bom

Redação e normas ABNT: o texto está escrito de forma clara, coerente, sem erros e cumpre com as normas ABNT *

Avaliação Geral: indique seu parecer e as recomendações exigidas em caso de aprovação, em caso de rejeição indique os motivos de forma clara (este parecer será visível para os autores)

*

The manuscript presents satisfactory scientific quality, with an original proposal, rigorous methodology, and an effective contribution to the information literacy literature in community contexts within the Global South. The tension identified between CIL praxis and cultural expectations of institutional neutrality constitutes a conceptually relevant finding with potential impact on the field. The "Community Anchor" framework, though still lacking empirical validation, represents a concrete product derived from participatory research.

This paper presents an original proposal by articulating, within a Global South context (West Sumatra, Indonesia), the relationships between community libraries, critical information literacy (CIL), and combating misinformation. No evidence of plagiarism or misconduct was identified upon reading. The mixed-methods approach and the co-created "Community Anchor" framework constitute a genuine contribution, not a direct transposition of prior studies. There is no indication that the work derives from a previously published conference paper.

The work fills a relevant empirical gap: literature on CIL in community libraries of the Global South is scarce, and research in the Indonesian context is virtually nonexistent. The identification of the tension between institutional neutrality and critical praxis as the structural axis of the problem is conceptually sophisticated and opens a productive research agenda. The "Community Anchor" framework proposal — though requiring longitudinal validation — offers tools applicable to similar contexts, which broadens the contribution's reach beyond the case studied.

The title is informative and adequately represents the article's content. The three research objectives/questions are clearly stated and maintain internal coherence. It is recommended, however, that the introduction define more precisely the concepts of "misinformation" and "disinformation," operationally distinguishing them, since this distinction is relevant to the field and appears in the data collection instrument without being previously established in the text. The reviewer on page 3 already flagged this need in a handwritten note — the revision must address this demand explicitly.

The theoretical framework draws on pertinent and updated international literature in the areas of CIL (Cuevas-Cerveró et al., 2023; Flynn et al., 2023), situated digital literacies (Mensonides et al., 2024), and the role of libraries in socially vulnerable contexts (Righetto et al., 2022). The inclusion of work published in Encontros Bibli itself (Handrianto et al., 2025; Sunarti et al., 2024) is appropriate. However, two weaknesses should be addressed: (a) the

concept of lateral reading (Werner Axelsson; Nygren, 2024) is cited but not sufficiently developed, despite being fundamental to understanding the performance assessment instrument used in Phase 2; (b) Critical Pedagogy, listed as a keyword, is not treated with the expected theoretical depth — Freire is an indispensable reference in this field, and his absence weakens the theoretical grounding of the discussion section.

The exploratory sequential mixed-methods design is well justified and appropriate to the study's objectives. The description of the three phases is clear: semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions (Phase 1), a survey with a performance-based task (Phase 2), and a participatory co-design workshop (Phase 3). The qualitative analysis procedures (reflexive thematic analysis, Braun & Clarke, 2021) and quantitative procedures (EFA/CFA, ANOVA, Pearson correlation) are appropriate and reported with satisfactory detail. The CFA model fit indices are acceptable, and the inter-rater reliability ICC (.92) is excellent. One methodological limitation not addressed by the authors is the absence of any discussion regarding potential social desirability effects in responses to the PIL Scale, given that data collection was conducted on-site and assisted by research staff.

The results address the three research questions in an articulated manner, and the integrative synthesis (section 3.4) is well constructed. The central finding — the miscalibration between perceived self-efficacy and actual performance ($r = .28$) — is relevant and well explored. The absence of correlation between library visit frequency and PIL scores is correctly interpreted as an indicator of the libraries' current "praxis gap." The conclusions are consistent with the evidence and do not overextend the data. The discussion of the neutrality/critical praxis tension (section 4.1) represents the most analytically dense section of the article. However, section 4.3 (critical appraisal of the framework) is relatively brief for a study whose primary output is the framework itself — a more detailed discussion of implementation conditions and success criteria for each pillar would be expected.

The writing in English is fluent and technically suited to the scientific article genre. However, there are instances of first-person plural constructions that, as flagged by the reviewer on the final page ("Se sugiere revisar la redacción y las palabras que se encuentran en primera persona"), must be revised to conform to the impersonal scientific register required by the journal. The references follow ABNT format, but there are occasional inconsistencies: (a) some journal titles alternate between italics and bold; (b) the Notley et al. (2023) reference presents formatting divergent from the others (missing standardized separation between elements). A full revision of the reference list is recommended prior to publication.

Required recommendations:

- Explicitly define and operationally distinguish the concepts of misinformation and disinformation, addressing the demand already flagged by the prior reviewer.
- Expand the discussion on lateral reading and include grounding in Critical Pedagogy, with reference to key authors in the field (e.g., Paulo Freire), given that the concept appears as a keyword and underpins central arguments in the discussion.

- Include a paragraph discussing potential limitations arising from social desirability effects in the on-site administration of the PIL Scale.
- Expand the critical appraisal of the framework, detailing success criteria, minimum implementation conditions, and measurable indicators for each pillar (Reframe, Connect, Facilitate).
- Revise and eliminate first-person constructions, adjusting the text to the impersonal scientific register.
- Standardize the entire reference list according to ABNT guidelines, correcting the formatting inconsistencies identified.

HISTÓRICO

Designado: 3/03/2026 - **Confirmado:** 24/03/2026 - **Concluído:** 24/03/2026