



Information Research – Vol. 31 No. 3 (2026)

Broadening the understanding of affect: a critical review of the embodied and social aspects of affect in information behaviour and practices

Aira Huttunen

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47989/ir31344569>

Abstract

Introduction. The concept of affect has been discussed in information behaviour and practice research as an ongoing research trend from 2000s. However, the definitions of affect remain vague. This critical review extends the current use of the concept for making sense of people's affective models in empirical research in library and information science.

Method and analysis. Nine studies focusing on affect in information practice or behaviour research are introduced and analysed with the aim of understanding how the concept has been defined, empirically studied, and its relation to embodiment and social aspects.

Results. In the selected studies, affect is understood either as a personal phenomenon or as a social phenomenon. The role of embodiment in these studies is discussed to understand the connections between affect and embodiment. This paper discusses selective strands of the concept of affect and the nuances of prior understandings, discussing them through a gender studies lens.

Conclusions. This conceptual paper suggests that affect theory, following the feminist strand that highlights the embodiment, social structures, and power imbalances, would benefit empirical research on information behaviour or practice research as it enables understanding the complexity of lived experiences in social reality.

Introduction

The concepts of affect and emotion have been used in information behaviour and practice research to highlight that humans do not only act based on cognitive reasoning, but emotions and feelings are also part of information-related processes (Hartel, 2019). The roots for studying affect in library and information science (LIS) has its basis in education and cognitive sciences and it emerged in the 1990s when information seekers' emotions became the object of interest for many LIS scholars (Hartel, 2019; Nahl, 2007a). Although studying affect has been seen as an ongoing research trend in information behaviour and practice literature since the turn of the millennium (Huvila and Gorichanaz, 2025; Julien, Pecoskie and Reed, 2011), it has been stated that affects have largely been missing in LIS research (Fourie and Julien, 2014a; Keilty and Leazer, 2018; Krakowska, 2020; Worrall et al., 2021).

In LIS, the affective turn has been discussed as being separate from the embodied turn, which highlights the role of the human body in information activities (Hartel, 2019; Krakowska, 2020). However, in the humanities and social sciences, the affective turn is commonly understood as a turn to *embodied*, located and relational subjectivity (Koivunen, 2010; Liljeström and Paasonen, 2010). In other words, the affective and embodied are interlinked and affects are understood as both embodied and social.

The terms affect and emotion are often used interchangeably and typically remain undefined in LIS research (Fourie and Julien 2014a). In this paper, I use affect as an umbrella term that includes emotions and feelings, and I follow the affective turn of humanities and social sciences which understands affect as a 'force that creates a relationship (conscious or otherwise) between a body (individual or collective) and the world' (Cifor, 2016). As such, the goal of this paper is not to try to separate affect and emotion, but instead to discuss how these concepts are understood and used on theoretical and empirical levels.

There have been previous literature reviews that aimed to understand affects in information behaviour and practice (see Fourie and Julien, 2014a; 2014b; Julien, McKehnie and Hart, 2005; Julien, Pecoskie and Reed, 2011 and Krakowska, 2020). Julien, McKehnie and Hart (2005) examined the article types, affiliations, indexing, and treatment of affect in articles in selected journals and found that affects have received minimal attention from authors in system-related research in LIS. In contrast, Krakowska (2020) examined how affect and emotions are defined, theorised and studied empirically in LIS. Based on her review Krakowska (2029) argues that LIS research too often follow the tradition of examining emotions through Kuhlthau's model (1991) instead of referring to the concepts, research, tools and methods of psychology.

This paper highlights the need for conceptual and theoretical clarity about the concept of affect (see Fourie and Julien, 2014a; Krakowska, 2020) and aims to make visible the theoretical roots of the concept. Moreover, how affect is connected to embodiment has been understudied. The purpose of the paper is twofold. First, it introduces how affect and embodiment have been defined and studied in the field of LIS and gives some examples of studies where these two concepts are combined. Second, this paper extends the notions and subsequent use of affect and embodiment in a broader sense to find nuances in how the concepts can be used to make sense of feelings and emotions in empirical research on information behaviour and practices. This paper contributes to the field of LIS by examining how affect and embodiment are connected theoretically and empirically, and it gives suggestions on how adapting affect theories (such as Ahmed 2004; 2010; Brennan 2015) could benefit empirical research by giving tools with which to understand how affect is tied to power structures. This paper offers a selective literature review of the concept of affect in the field of LIS.

The affective turn in LIS

Broadly speaking, the affective turn (Hartel, 2019) or paradigm (Albright, 2010; Nahl, 2007a) in LIS has been described as a turn towards research to information seekers' subjective emotional experiences (Hartel, 2019; Krakowska, 2020). However, the notion of there being an affective paradigm has been questioned by Fourie and Julien (2014b) who discussed if there is enough of a body of literature for an affective paradigm beside the systems paradigm in LIS, and see it very much as 'an emerging paradigm.'

There is no single definition of the term affect in LIS. Rather, the term has been defined in a myriad of ways, including motivation or interest (Nahl, 2007b), feelings and emotions (Dervin, 1998; Kuhlthau, 2004; Savolainen, 2014; 2015a; 2016; Wilson, 1981), emotion, mood, preference and evaluation (Julien, McKechnie and Hart, 2005), emotion, feeling and mood (Savolainen, 2015c), attitudinal and emotional responses and behavioural intention (Fourie and Julien, 2014), and emotion and mood (Hartel, 2019). Fourie and Julien (2015) have used affect as a synonymous term with emotion. However, there is no commonly agreed-upon definition of the terms of affect or emotion in the field (Dervin and Reinhard, 2007), and these terms are occasionally mixed up and described as being indistinct from feelings or moods (Krakowska, 2020).

As Fourie and Julien (2014) note, the terms affect and emotion are often used interchangeably and typically remain undefined. Whereas the prior examples describe affects mainly as emotions and feelings, Fourie and Julien (2014) distinguish between emotions and affects. Fourie and Julien (2014) argue that affects are attitudinal and emotional responses and behavioural intentions, whereas emotions are something that can be displayed, expressed or remain hidden and can be reflected in terms such as boredom, enjoyment, love and fear. Savolainen (2014, 2015b) refers to Davidson, Scherer and Goldsmith (2003, p. xiii) and defines emotion as 'a relatively brief episode of coordinated brain, autonomic and behavioural changes that facilitate a response to an external or internal event of significance for the organism'. Affect is not defined, though affective styles are described as 'relatively stable dispositions that bias an individual toward perceiving and responding to people and objects with a particular emotional quality, emotional dimension, or mood' (Davidson et al., 2003, p. xiii; Savolainen, 2014, p. 60; 2015b, p. 177). According to Dervin and Reinhard (2007, p. 53), within LIS, emotion is generally defined as 'a state of being that occurs inside individuals and is associated in some way with those host states of being that laypeople call feelings'. They point out that within LIS, emotions are understood to be 'caused by the individuals because of personality, demographic, genetic, physiological or experiential attributes, which are ascribed to them as traits being brought into situation, task, searching process etc.' (Dervin and Reinhard, 2007, p. 54). It is noteworthy that the authors state that emotions are 'caused by the individuals'. This approach has been criticised in empirical research in LIS by Olsson (2010) and Floegel (2021) as it does not consider that emotions can be born in social encounter and can also be seen as responses to something.

Affects are usually conceptually separated from cognitive and situational (Dervin, 1983), conative (Kuhlthau, 1991) or physiological (Wilson, 1981) realms. Even though cognitive and affective elements are separated in theories, researchers highlight that, in real-life information seeking, cognitive and affective elements are seen to be intertwined (Chen, 2021; Savolainen, 2015b; Wilson, 1981). Uncertainty has been understood both as a cognitive state and as a negative feeling influencing information seeking (Kuhlthau, 2004; Savolainen, 2015a). However, as Keilty and Leazer (2018) have pointed out, cognition and information are commonly seen as tightly connected to each other, as, according to the cognitive model, information is understood to be a thing that changes a cognitive state and the subjective knowledge we carry around in our heads. In this narrow understanding of cognition, affect and embodied aspects as part of information processing are largely missing (Keilty and Leazer, 2018).

The embodied turn in LIS

In this section, I briefly introduce the research concerning embodiment in the field of LIS. The emerging 'bodily turn' has highlighted the importance of the body, especially within research on information behaviour and practices and information literacy (Hartel, 2019). According to an annual literature review by Huvila and Gorichanaz (2025), during the past two decades there has been steadily growing interest in embodiment in the field of LIS. In his review on body and embodiment in LIS, Cox (2018) found that most of the studies focusing on the body in the field of LIS have been influenced by Merleau-Ponty (2012), whose phenomenological understanding of the body argues that human consciousness cannot be abstracted from the body. Other strands include practice theory, embodied cognition and sensory studies and, less often, feminism or critical theories (Cox, 2018). Cox (2018) mentioned that Merleau-Ponty influentially noticed that affect is connected to perception as our senses are not separated from our emotions. However, Cox (2018) did not examine the connections between affect and embodiment in LIS research.

One of the first empirical studies in which information emerging through embodied practices was acknowledged was Lloyd's (2007) study on firefighters, in which the experiences of the body during the execution of the work were legitimised as a source of valued information. For Lloyd (2007), the body is a source of sensory information and is inseparable from the social realm. Sensory activities, such as touching and smelling, represent embodied information practices (Bonner and Lloyd, 2011), and these practices are products of social construction (Olsson and Lloyd, 2017). Senses can be important for gaining information in different settings (Gorichanaz, 2015; Olsson and Hansson, 2019). Besides the senses, embodied information practices may include body listening, self-monitoring and measuring and observational learning (Godbold, 2013b; Lloyd, 2009; St. Jean et al., 2018).

While studying theatre professionals, Olsson (2010) found that the ability to embody their knowledge is vital to manifest their understanding of the physical world as physical actions in physical space. With our bodies, we create and produce embodied knowledge (Olsson and Lloyd, 2017; Prigoda and McKenzie, 2007) and share this embodied knowledge through our bodies with others (Guzik, 2018; Huttunen, 2022; Lloyd, 2014; Multas and Hirvonen, 2022). In complex work settings, information creation may include flexible transitions from words to gestures and then to using tools and back again (Suorsa et al., 2019).

Although interest towards embodiment has been rising in the field of LIS, its connection to affect has not been much discussed. It is interesting that studies focusing on embodiment rarely mention affect or emotions (see Guzik, 2018; Harviainen, 2015; Lloyd, 2007; Kitzie, et al. 2022). This is surprising, considering that our affects and emotions are highly embodied.

Approaches to affect and emotion in LIS

In this section, I will introduce a total of nine studies that have approached affect and emotion from different perspectives in LIS. The studies that consider affect as something personal are selected because several previous studies have noted those being important for understanding affect in LIS (Fisher & Landry, 2007; Hartel, 2019; Krakowska, 2020; Savolainen, 2014, 2015). In contrast, the studies that consider affect as something social were selected as those that are based on different theoretical frameworks for and discussions on embodiment.

Affect as something personal in LIS research

According to Hartel (2019), one of the first studies relating to affect in LIS is Mellon's (1986) conceptualisation of library anxiety. Mellon's study focused on the feelings that students have when using a library for research, and they found that students largely felt confusion, fear and shame about their skills when using the library (Mellon, 1986). Moreover, Wilson's (1981, 1997) models of information behaviour, Dervin's (1983) sense-making theory, Kuhlthau's (1991)

information seeking process model, and Nahl's (2004b, 2007) social-biological information technology model are often seen as important contributions to understanding affect in the field of LIS (Fisher & Landry, 2007; Hartel, 2019; Krakowska, 2020; Savolainen, 2014, 2015). Even though many of these models (see Dervin, 1983; Kuhlthau, 1991; Wilson 1981, 1997) have been largely cited and adapted in LIS research, the focus has not been on affect but on cognitive aspects (Fisher and Landry 2007).

Wilson (1981) mentioned affect when discussing information needs, noting that affective needs, such as the need to be recognised or accepted or the need for aesthetic experiences, can motivate information seeking. Wilson (1981) adopted user studies and psychology as his theoretical roots. He argued that holistically understanding the information user, requires addressing their affective needs and notes that physiological, affective and cognitive needs are interconnected. However, Wilson (1981; 2005) stated that needs are difficult to examine empirically, as they are 'internal states' that cannot be observed, unlike the information-seeking behaviour caused by these needs (Wilson, 1981; 2005). Wilson's (1997) revised general model of information behaviour is an example of a personal or psychological approach to understanding affect in information behaviour. In Wilson's (1997) model, affects and emotions are understood as psychological factors that can, like other barriers, including demographical, role-related or interpersonal, environmental and those related to source characteristics, intervene in or interfere with information seeking. Although Wilson (1999, p. 256) later modified the model and mentioned that 'the use of the term intervening variables serves to suggest that their impact may be supportive of information use as well as preventive', this approach can be criticised as in affects and emotions are separated from the person as well from the contextual factors, such as interpersonal factors, that can create affects and emotions.

Sense-making theory by Dervin (1983) pays attention to cognitive and situational factors in information seeking and named 'feelings, emotions and intuitions' as one of the elements for bridging sense-making. Dervin (1998) lies within a range of theoretical starting points, including philosophy, sociology, psychology, education, cultural studies, communication and feminism, and cultural and postmodern studies. According to Dervin (1998), sense-making theory pays attention to emotional or feeling framings of knowing. Emotions play an important role in sense-making, as they are a major measure of outcomes for humans because they play an important role when sharing and co-operating with other people and because they may block people's thinking or cause repetitive mistake making (Dervin, 1998). When describing sense-making theory as a method, Dervin and Reinhard (2007) did not define terms of affect, feelings, emotions and intuitions, but instead suggested that if the sense-making theory is used empirically, the subjects of the study can define and understand these terms in their own way.

Kuhlthau (1991, p. 366), in turn, incorporated 'the affective (feeling), the cognitive (thoughts) and the physical (actions)' in the information search process stages in her information search process model. Kuhlthau (1991) mentioned psychology and information studies as her theoretical starting points. In her model, the theoretical basis for affective aspects of the information search process follows the personal construction theory of American psychologist George Kelly (1963), which, according to Kuhlthau (1991), described the affective experience of individuals involved in the process of constructing meaning from the information they encounter.

Social-biological information technology model introduced by Nahl (2007b) is informed by studies on human-computer interaction, psychology and cognitive science. It includes affects, bodily functions and social aspects and aims to demonstrate how the cognitive and affective domains of humans are organically interdependent in processing and using information. Nahl (2007b) describes affective states as having biologically based characteristics, which are categorised as follows: Bipolarity (this is fun or boring; I feel engaged or disconnected), intensity (how relevant this is), steady state (being optimistic, having a need), ambivalence or uncertainty (it is good as in

some ways but not in others) and neutrality (I am neither accepting nor rejecting it). According to Nahl (2007b; 2007c), all information environments can be understood as an 'affective information environment because all information needs, seeking, reception, and use is processed through emotions'. According to Savolainen (2015b), Nahl's framework (2007b) does not primarily approach the affective and cognitive factors in terms of individual categories, such as feelings, mood and thoughts, but prefers the terms sensorimotor, cognitive and affective domains, and subsystems or procedures. However, the approach to affect is still the individual who, as Nahl (2007b, 2007c) describes, processes information.

All four models introduced above are examples of research on LIS that includes emotions or affects as part of human information seeking. What these four models have in common is a theoretical underpinning in psychology. In these models, the approach to affects is that an affect is personal and subjective. This approach is based on a psychological model of understanding affects and emotions, which, according to Ahmed (2004, p. 8), follows the logic of 'I have feelings and they are mine'. According to Ahmed (2004) several sociologists and anthropologists have criticised this model and have argued that emotions should be understood as social and cultural practices, as most of our tendencies are not developed by us but come to us from without.

All four models have been influential in LIS research and have helped us to understand affect. Kuhlthau's (1991) information seeking process model has been the most common source for understanding affect in the field of LIS (Krakowska, 2020). However, Wilson's (1981, 1997) models of information behaviour and Dervin's (1983) sense-making theory have also been popular when discussing affect (Krakowska, 2020). It is beyond the scope of this paper to go through empirical studies that have dwelt on these models, and previous literature reviews have done that already (see Fourie and Julien, 2014a, 2014b; Julien, McKehnie and Hart 2005; Julien, Pecoskie and Reed, 2011 and Krakowska, 2020).

Affect as something social in LIS research

Godbold (2013a) divided perspectives on affect or emotions in previous information behaviour research into research that focuses on an individual's emotions (see Kuhlthau, 2004; Nahl, 2004), the social aspects of emotions as part of information sharing (see Pettigrew, 1999) and emotions modifying what is seen as information (see Olsson, 2010). As described by Pettigrew (1999), in studies that approach affect as something social, the understanding of information tends to be different as well, citing Tuominen and Savolainen (1997, p. 89), who described information not as 'an entity with fixed boundaries or as a commodity that is transferred through communication channels' but instead as 'a communicative construct which is produced in a social context'. This notion is important because when the same concept is used and studied with different theoretical underpinnings, the meaning of the concept can also be different.

The importance of emotional connectedness and embodiment as part of information sharing has been noted by Pettigrew (1999), whose model of the information ground highlights the social context, interaction and discourse. Pettigrew's study lies in sociology (especially Granovetter), LIS, nursing, gerontology and social psychology. Pettigrew found that a social atmosphere that supported seamless information sharing, described as a caring atmosphere, included careful listening and responding in a caring manner. As part of the social atmosphere, touch was also an important part in the context in which nurses and seniors were sharing information. Touch as part of creating a caring social atmosphere brings affects and embodiment together, as affect, embodiment and social realm are not seen as separate from each other but as building the (social) atmosphere together (Pettigrew, 1999). Pettigrew's (1999) understanding of affect comes close to feminist philosopher Brennan's (2015) concept of affective atmosphere and understanding of affects as energies transmitted through bodily encounters. For Brennan (2015), the individual emotional experience cannot be separated from the social environment. The affective atmosphere

is the feeling that you get when you walk into a room and sense a particular mood in the air (Brennan, 2015).

Olsson (2010) understands emotions and affects as synonymous, understanding both as social constructs. His study followed sense-making (Dervin), sociology (especially Goffman) and critical discourse analysis (Foucault) as its theoretical stands. In his study on theatre professionals, sense-making of the work of William Shakespeare focuses attention on affect, not only as emotion of a subject, but also on emotion as a social construct. For actors, an emotional connection to characters was an important part of sense-making. According to Olsson (2010, p. 6), for theatre professionals, 'exploration and interpretation of their emotions was the product of established social practices within the theatrical community and the focus of much discussion'. Affective factors are understood as emotional truths that are part of a socially validated practice among theatre professionals. Olsson (2010) described embodiment as part of the sense-making process of theatre professionals. For them, the ability to embody their knowledge is important, as they must manifest their understanding in the physical world as embodied actions in a certain space. Actors need to physically become their characters by finding their voices and movements. The process of embodiment includes not only actors but also designers and directors. Although Olsson (2010) criticises the previous research for the division of the affective and rationalist components as well as Cartesian model separation of body and mind, in his analysis he separates affect and embodiment from each other. This separation is surprising, as Olsson (2010) stated that affects and emotions include bodily reactions stating that 'emotion, for participants, was clearly more than a matter of hormones and endorphins.'

Similarly to Olsson, Godbold divided affect and embodiment in her research. Her first article (2013a) focused on the affective dimensions of collaborative information behaviour in an online forum on kidney failure and in her second article (2013b) she focused on the embodiment in the same context. Of course, she may have done this for a myriad of reasons, but it is still interesting when taking into account that in the latter article, feelings are discussed in relation to the body, such as she states that a 'good feeling could not be trusted because other, unfelt changes were happening in the body' (Godbold, 2013b). However, in the paper focusing on affect (2013a), embodiment is not mentioned. The paper focusing on affect (Godbold, 2013b) is based on ethnomethodology (Garfinkel) and sense-making (Dervin) and it pays attention to emotions that change throughout interactions (Godbold, 2013a). These can be understood as collaborative emotions, which are in dialogue with individually owned feelings. Godbold's (2013a) study described how online interaction combines tones, feelings, ideas and meanings to form shared sense-making.

Gorichanaz's (2015) study examined ultrarunning as socially controlled in nature and looked at information experience and information sources that were taken for granted during the run. Gorichanaz applied interpretive phenomenological analysis, autoethnography and systematic self-observation to collect data during the run. According to Gorichanaz (2015), the body was a primary source of information during the run. However, social support was important part of ultrarunning forming affective bond between the runners: 'Even though we shared comparatively few words over the eight or more hours we ran together, the shared experience of our physical proximity formed an affective bond that helped both of us complete the event' (Gorichanaz, 2015). According to Gorichanaz (2015) information during the run was based on a series of interactions of corporeal information with mental state and knowledge base. During the run 'corporeal information affects the mental state and can lead to an interaction with the knowledge base. This interaction can lead to several outcomes, including positivity, self-confidence, worry and a sense of being overwhelmed' (Gorichanaz, 2015).

In their study on embodied engagements, Keilty and Leazer (2018) connected affects and embodiment so that affects are essentially seen to be embodied. They approached embodiment

from an existential phenomenological point of view, including affective responses, in the context of browsing pornography online. They highlighted the understanding of cognition as a broad concept including social, affective and embodied aspects. They described the process of sense-making as an 'undifferentiated experience that ground and conjoins body and language, feeling and knowledge' (Keilty and Leazer, 2018, p. 473). According to Keilty and Leazer (2018), while seeking documents, a person judges them not only to be relevant or irrelevant in the context of what they already know but the person also to emotionally respond to them. Affective experiences are both carnally and consciously meaningful when browsing pornography or watching a horror movie in movie theatre (Keilty and Leazer, 2018; Keilty, 2016).

Comparing the approaches to affect

Well-known models and theories by Wilson (1981), Dervin (1983), Kuhlthau (1991) and Nahl (2007b) approach affect from a psychological perspective (see Table 1). This perspective approaches affect as something that is born inside the individual. Nevertheless, there is a growing interest in the social aspects of affects and emotions, which can be seen in studies by Pettigrew (1999), Olsson (2010), Godbold (2013a), Gorichanaz (2015) and Keilty and Leazer (2018). These studies have a theoretical background in sociology, ethnomethodology and existential phenomenology (see Table 1). These approaches highlight affect as something born in social relations. However, it is important to note that among these studies, there are differences in what concepts are used and, in how they are defined, if they are defined. In Table 1, the theoretical roots and separation into the approaches to affect of these nine studies are listed.

Researcher	Theoretical framework	Concepts used	Embodiment (included/excluded)	Approach to affect
Wilson (1981)	User studies, psychology	Affective needs	Not included	Affect as something personal
Dervin (1983)	Philosophy, sociology, psychology, education, cultural studies, communication, feminist, cultural and postmodern studies	Emotions	Not included	Affect as something personal
Kuhlthau (1991)	Psychology, information studies	Affective aspects, attitudes or moods	Not included	Affect as something personal
Nahl (2007b)	Cognitive science, affective neuroscience, affective computing, affective human-computer interaction, information science	Affective states	Included	Affect as something personal
Pettigrew (1999)	Sociology (Granovetter), library and information science, nursing, gerontology, social psychology	Affective needs	Included	Affect as something social
Olsson (2010)	Sense-making (Dervin), sociology (Goffman), critical discourse analysis (Foucault)	Emotions, affects	Included	Affect as something social
Godbold (2013a)	Ethnomethodology (Garfinkel), sense-making (Dervin)	Emotions	Not included	Affect as something social
Gorichanaz (2015)	Interpretative phenomenology	Mental state	Included	Affect as something social
Keilty and Leazer (2018)	Existential phenomenology	Affect	Included	Affect as something social

Table 1. Selected studies on affect and emotion in LIS and their approach to affect.

In addition to analysing how affect is understood in these models, I examined whether embodiment was part of these models. From models that approach affect from a psychological perspective, Nahl's (2007b) model includes embodiment. Focusing on human-computer interaction, embodiment is seen through 'biological activity, such as the user's sensorimotor, cognitive and affective procedures'. In other words, affective procedures are seen as something biological that Nahl (2007b, p. 8) describes as 'an emotional reaction or value judgements that have intensity and bipolar directionality'. Sensorimotor procedures, on the other hand, are biological and socially constructed practices, such as noticing expected features or affordances.

Four studies representing the social approach to affect (Gorichanaz, 2015; Keilty and Leazer, 2018; Olsson, 2010; Pettigrew, 1999) take embodiment into account. However, the relationship between

affect and embodiment in these models differs and the connection of the concepts of embodiment and affect is not discussed. Pettigrew (1999) focused on touch as part of creating a certain kind of atmosphere that is important for information sharing. This is like the concept of affective atmosphere described by Brennan (2015). In her research, affect and embodiment create a certain social context. Likewise, Keilty and Leazer (2018, p. 477) approached embodiment through touch, saying, 'As touching in pornography becomes actualized as the touch of oneself, one becomes conscious of his or her desire. The actualization and the consciousness are both embodied'. Touch does not happen without affective experience, which is carnally and consciously meaningful.

In contrast, Olsson (2010) approached embodiment through understanding that theatre professionals must embody a certain knowledge of a character, even *become* a character, by learning to speak, move and act like the person they are playing. Creating a character involves not only physical movements but also finding the affective factors and what the character is feeling in a certain situation. However, in his analysis he keeps affect and embodiment separate from each other.

Gorichanaz (2015) analyses the connection between the body and affect during run stating that corporeal information affects to mental state, leading to different affective outcomes such as positivity or worry. In his model of the on-the-run information experience the body and affect are directly linked to each other. This model does not include the social aspect of the run, and Gorichanaz (2015) analyses that 'though ultrarunning can be seen as social, much of the information exchange during an ultrarunning event occurs inside the heads of individual athletes.' However, the social world of ultrarunning is analysed through Chatman's (1999) live in the round in which much of the information is taken for granted.

With some exceptions (see Gorichanaz, 2015; Keilty and Leazer 2018; Olsson, 2010) studies focusing on embodiment rarely mention affects or emotions. Considering that affects and our emotions are highly embodied, this seems surprising. However, the reason for this may lie in the theoretical background of the studies in LIS. While examining the theoretical frameworks (see Table 1) it is notably surprising that *affect theories* have not been widely presented in information behaviour and practice research although it is often seen as a multidisciplinary field (see Albright, 2010). A couple of exceptions to that are found in the work of Cifor (2016), who suggested that affect theories could be applied in the archival field and Gramini (2022), who applied affect theories in science communication. However, those contexts are beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, affect theories can be seen as prominent for research on information behaviour and practice as well.

Feminist affect theories

As an alternate approach, I next introduce the affective turn and affect theories in the social sciences and humanities. This turn has been highly influential in several fields, including political theory, cultural geography, environmental studies, literary studies, art history, architecture, media studies, and cultural studies (Salmela, 2017). For many of these fields the affective turn is a reaction towards the limitations of post-structuralist theorisations (Liljestöm & Paasonen, 2010). I will specifically focus on the feminist understanding of affect, as it is an important strand in theorising affect (Jokinen et al. 2015) and it has been extensively researched in gender studies and feminist research throughout the years. I will first introduce the roots of the affective turn to make the theoretical scope and diversity visible. After that, I will discuss more about the feminist strand and discuss how feminist affect theories in particular could be beneficial to LIS research.

The affective turn in the social sciences and humanities is based on two separate roots that introduce the concept of affect, including Sedgwick's and Frank's study relying on Tomkins's psychobiology and Massumi's ontological reading of Deleuze (Jokinen et al., 2015; Salmela, 2017; Seigworth and Gregg, 2010). For Sedgwick and Frank, affect is understood as a prime interest

motivator that helps us understand bodily drives, and for Massumi, affect is an entire, vital and modulating field of a myriad of becoming across human and nonhuman (Keilty and Leazer, 2018; Seigworth and Gregg, 2010). These two roots of the affective turn in the social sciences and humanities represent different ways to theorise the concept of affect (Koivunen, 2010). The strand following Tomkins's (1995) psychobiological aims to find the language of private emotions and broaden the epistemological and methodological focus (Koivunen, 2010). For Tomkins, affect is a psychobiological notion, and based on his empirical studies, his model (1995) includes nine discrete human affects, including fear, interest, joy and anger, that have distinct neurological profiles and measurable physiological responses (Adam and Wilson, 2020; Koivunen, 2010). Following this strand, the concepts of affect and emotion are sometimes understood as two aspects of the same phenomenon (Koivunen, 2010). In this strand, emotion is understood as social expression affect, while affect is the biological and psychological experience of it (Probyn, 2005; Koivunen, 2010).

Massumi's understanding of affect is based on new materialism and philosophers such as Spinoza and Deleuze (Koivunen, 2010; Massumi, 1995). The strand following Massumi views affects as pre-personal and non-intentional, having a logic different from that of emotion (Massumi, 1995). This strand views affects to transcend the individual and aims to theorise on the boundaries between reality, language, discourse and representation as well body and material, culture and nature, and psychic and social (Koivunen, 2010). Rather than focusing on single emotions, the aim is to explore the ability to affect and to be affected (Åhäll, 2018). The difference between affects and emotions is vital in this strand (Ahmed, 2004; Salmela, 2017), as Massumi understands affect as intensity and finds it central to the 'understanding of our information- and image-based late-capitalist culture, in which so-called master narratives are perceived to have founder' (Massumi, 1995, p. 88). However, the strand following Massumi has been criticised for excluding the social aspects of affect (Hemmings, 2005). Moreover, it has been stated that the separation between affects and emotions undermarks the work of emotions (Ahmed, 2010).

It is important to note that there is no straightforward separation between embodied and affective turns in the social sciences and humanities (see Ignatow, 2007; Koivunen, 2010). An important field for theorising affect is feminism, which Jokinen et al. (2015) view as the third main strand of theorising affect. Feminist theorisation breaks down the dualism between mind and body, cognition and emotion, and man and woman (Jokinen et al., 2015, 2021), pointing to how gender and other identity markers, such as race, class, age and (dis)ability, function as a politics of bodies is personal, meaning that the political logic of gender is personally felt (Åhäll, 2018). Overall, according to Pedwell and Whitehead (2012), feminist theorists have long been concerned with the relationships between affect, knowledge and power.

For the feminist strand, the concept of affect is tightly connected to the body. The bodily or embodied turn in social sciences as well as in other disciplines, such as geography, history and anthropology, emerged in the 1980s and 1990s (Cox, 2018; Ignatow, 2007; O'Connor, 2017) to challenge the longstanding Cartesian mind-body dualism in Western culture that privileges thought over the supposedly separate and lower functions of the body (Cox, 2018). The bodily turn in social sciences is based on several roots, including phenomenology of the body (Merleau-Ponty, 1964), working body (Marx, 1957), feminist theorisations on second sex (de Beauvoir, 1949) and postmodern theorisations such as body without organs (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972).

Feminist philosophers such as Brennan (2015) and Ahmed (2004, 2010) have been highly influential on the fusion of embodiment and affect. In this strand of thought what is placed at the centre is not what the affects are, but what the affects do (Åhäll, 2018; Ahmed, 2004; Jokinen et al., 2015). For example, racist hate is born and lives as an emotion; thus, it is the emotion that causes racism (Ahmed, 2004; Jokinen et al., 2015). Moreover, many feminist scholars connect embodiment and affects with knowledge, highlighting the idea that knowledge is not only cognitive and emotion-free but also thoroughly embodied (Parviainen and Aromaa, 2017). Several concepts, such as

embodied knowledge, bodily knowledge, body knowledge, corporeal knowledge and somatic knowledge, have been used by scholars with different research aims when approaching the embodied, and affective, aspects of knowledge (see Parviainen and Aromaa, 2017). The detailed examination of this area of research is beyond the scope of this paper, but interested readers may familiarise themselves with the work of Parviainen and Aromaa (2017), Evans et al. (2004), Ignatow (2007) or Samudra (2008).

What then could affect theories offer to information behaviour and practice research? The most important aspect is that the feminist approach to affect that enables us to understand how affective experiences are social and have bodily responses as affects are felt and shared through our bodies and can form bodily information. The theoretical emphasis on affective experience can serve to help us understand power relationships and social roles in social encounters that otherwise remain concealed or even invisible. Understanding affect as something both social and embodied makes such power relationships visible and can inform information behaviour and practice empirical research in three contexts. First, affect theories could enable a more nuanced understanding of information sharing taking into account that we are embodied beings in a socially constructed world. Understanding affect in information sharing for example, in situations with clear power-imbalances (see Huttunen 2023), as well as those in social media information sharing, should be considered. Second, affect theories are particularly suitable for understanding marginalised communities. Some empirical studies focusing on marginalised communities' information practices have highlighted the interconnectedness of affects and embodiment (see Floegel, 2021; Huttunen, 2022; Kitzie, 2017), but there is a need for theoretical development in this matter. Third, affect theories would be fruitful to apply when building a more nuanced understanding of affect in the context of health information behaviour and practices. Although there is a growing body of literature on embodiment and affect in this context as separate phenomena (see Gotbold 2013a, 2013b; St. Jean et al., 2018), I believe affect theories could offer a more nuanced understanding in this context.

Conclusion

This critical review has outlined previous accounts of affect in LIS and shown the white spots on the theoretical map that a feminist studies-based notion of the conglomeration of affect and embodiment offers to fill. It seems in LIS the concept of affect has been used as a label to name a particular area of interest (see the affective turn by Hartel, 2019 or affective paradigm from Albright, 2010 and Nahl, 2007a) or as an empirical concept, but there is a lack of theorising based on the concept (see Pilerot & Ekström, 2025). As Cooke and Kitzie (2021) noted, much powerful and significant work 'which features issues of race, class, gender, sexuality, and ability and does not centre white Western norms [...] has not been widely accepted or appreciated' in the field of LIS. I would argue that this has also been case while adapting theories from different fields, at least when considering affect theory.

As Cifor (2016) argued, 'affect is a crucial dimension of envisioning and enacting social justice across archival contexts, and affect theory is key to identifying and examining the conditions, personal and societal, which have created injustice and oppression in the past.' I claim that this also applies to information behaviour and practice research: We cannot keep our eyes closed to social structures and injustices but need to challenge normative structures. Understanding affect from a feminist perspective gives us tools with which to analyse and understand affect not just as something personal or social, but also as an inevitably embodied phenomenon tied to societal power relations.

The emerging affective turn in LIS is somewhat different compared with many other fields of the humanities and social sciences. When compared with other fields, the division of affect and embodiment is rather unique in LIS. This is probably because the major theories used in LIS come from psychology and its tradition for excluding embodiment. Moreover, while affect theories in

other fields are reactions towards post-structuralist theorisations this is not the case in LIS as there has not been a paradigm shift to post-structuralism. However, it is notably surprising that although interest towards embodiment in LIS has increased to the extent that it is seen as a *turn* (Hartel, 2019), the intersection of affect and embodiment has not been much discussed in research. Instead, affect and embodiment are commonly understood as separate concepts and handled separately in empirical research. However, this paper suggests that the affective turn and embodied turn within LIS (Hartel, 2019) do not have to be seen as separate from each other but can be seen as interconnected in the lived experiences of people. Although the concepts of affect and emotion are defined in several ways in LIS, most of the models selected for this research did not define these concepts. However, it is important to note how the concept of affect is understood in theory has implications for empirical research.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Professor Noora Hirvonen and Dr. Björn Ekström for valuable comments and discussions concerning the topic of the paper. Moreover, the author would like to acknowledge the anonymous reviewers of this paper.

About the author

Aira Huttunen is a post-doctoral researcher in Information studies, University of Oulu, Finland. They hold a PhD degree in information studies from the same university. Their research interests include information practices in everyday life and in life transitions, technologies, affects and embodiment. They can be contacted at aira.huttunen@oulu.fi

References

- Adam, F. J., & Wilson, E. A. (2020). The positive. In A. J. Frank, & E. A. Wilson (Eds.), *A Silvan Tomkins handbook: Foundations for affect theory* (pp. 51–60). University of Minnesota Press.
- Åhäll, L. (2018). Affect as methodology: Feminism and the politics of emotion. *International Political Sociology*, 12(1), 36–52. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/olx024>
- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2010). Creating disturbance. Feminism, happiness and affective differences. In S. Paasonen, & M. Liljeström (Eds.), *Working with affect in feminist readings: Disturbing differences* (pp. 31–44). Routledge.
- Albright, K. (2010). Multidisciplinarity in information behavior: Expanding boundaries or fragmentation of the field? *Libri*, 60(2), 98–106. <https://doi.org/10.1515/libr.2010.009>
- Bonner, A., & Lloyd, A. (2011). What information counts at the moment of practice? Information practices of renal nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 67(6), 1213–1221. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2011.05613.x>
- Brennan, T. (2015). *The transmission of affect*. Cornell University Press.
- Chatman, E. A. (1999). A theory of life in the round. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 50(3), 207–217. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4571\(1999\)50:3<207::AID-ASI3>3.0.CO;2-8](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(1999)50:3<207::AID-ASI3>3.0.CO;2-8)

- Cifor, M. (2016). Affecting relations: Introducing affect theory to archival discourse. *Archival Science*, 16(1), 7–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-015-9261-5>
- Cooke, N. A., & Kitzie, V. L. (2021). Outsiders-within-library and information science: Reprioritizing the marginalized in critical sociocultural work. *Journal of the Association for Information Science & Technology*, 72(10), 1285–1294. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24449>
- Cox, A. M. (2018). Embodied knowledge and sensory information: Theoretical roots and inspirations. *Library Trends*, 66(3), 223–238. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2018.0001>
- Davidson, R. J., Scherer, K. R., & Goldsmith, H. H. (2003). Introduction. In R. J. Davidson, K. R. Scherer & H. H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. xii–xvii). Oxford.
- Dervin, B. (1983). An overview of sense-making research: concepts, methods and results to date. [Paper presentation]. *Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association*, Dallas, TX.
- 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>
- Dervin, B., & Reinhard, C. D. (2007). How emotional dimensions of situated information seeking relate to user evaluations of help from sources: An exemplar study informed by sense-making methodology. In D. Nahl & D. Bilal (Eds.), *Information and emotion: The emergent affective paradigm in information behavior research and theory* (pp. 51–84). Information Today, Inc.
- Evans, J., Davies, B., & Wright, J. (Eds.). (2004). *Body knowledge and control: Studies in the sociology of physical education and health*. Routledge.
- Fisher, K. E., & Landre, C. F. (2007). Understanding the information behavior of stay-at-home mothers through affect. In D. Nahl & D. Bilal (Eds.), *Information and emotion: The emergent affective paradigm in information behavior research and theory* (pp. 211–233). Information Today, Inc.
- Floegel, D. (2021). *Investigating structural articulations of power in information creation: A constructivist grounded theory study of queer-created fanfiction* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Rutgers University. <https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/65777/PDF/1/play/> (Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20250109102101/https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/65777/PDF/1/play/>)
- Fourie, I., & Julien, H. (2014a). Ending the dance: A research agenda for affect and emotion in studies of information behaviour. *Information Research*, 19(4), paper isic09. <http://InformationR.net/ir/19-4/isic/isic09.html> (Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20251207150547/http://InformationR.net/ir/19-4/isic/isic09.html>)
- Fourie, I., & Julien, H. (2014b). IRS, information services and LIS research – A reminder about affect and the affective paradigm ... and a question. *Library Hi Tech*, 32(1), 190–201. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-10-2013-0144>
- Fourie, I., & Julien, H. (2015). Reflections on affect in studies of information behavior in HIV/AIDS contexts: An exploratory quantitative content analysis. *Library & Information Science Research*, 37(1), 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2014.09.001>

- Godbold, N. (2013a). An information need for emotional cues: Unpacking the role of emotions in sense making. *Information Research*, 18(1), paper 561. <http://InformationR.net/ir/18-1/paper561.html> (Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20260220175752/https://informationr.net/ir/18-1/paper561.html>)
- Godbold, N. (2013b). Listening bodies and watching machines: Developing health information skills, tools and services for people living with chronic kidney disease. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, 44(1), 14–28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2013.773859>
- Gorichanaz, T. (2015). Information on the run: Experiencing information during an ultramarathon. *Information Research*, 20(4), paper 697. <http://InformationR.net/ir/20-4/paper697.html> (Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20260205080531/https://informationr.net/ir/20-4/paper697.html>)
- Graminius, C. (2022). Research communication on climate change through open letters: Uniting cognition, affect and action by affective alignments. *Science as Culture*, 31(3), 334–356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09505431.2022.2049597>
- Guzik, E. (2018). Information sharing as embodied practice in a context of conversion to Islam. *Library Trends*, 66(3), 351–370. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2018.0007>
- Hartel, J. (2019). Turn, turn, turn. *Information Research*, 24(4), paper colis1901. <http://InformationR.net/ir/24-4/colis/colis1901.html> (Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20250428112226/https://informationr.net/ir/24-4/colis/colis1901.html>)
- Hemmings, C. (2005). Invoking affect: Cultural theory and the ontological turn. *Cultural Studies*, 19(5), 548–567. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380500365473>
- Huttunen, A. (2023). “I had to teach my own doctor what this was about”: Information sharing barriers and information evaluation of Finnish transgender people. *Library and Information Science Research*, 45(2), 101235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2023.101235>
- Huttunen, A. (2022). *Friction and bodily discomfort. Transgender experiences of embodied knowledge and information practices*. (Acta Universitatis Ouluensis, B Humaniora 201) [Dissertation, University of Oulu]. JULTIKA – University of Oulu repository. <https://oulurepo.oulu.fi/handle/10024/36957> Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20250909011007/https://oulurepo.oulu.fi/handle/10024/36957>
- Huvila, I., & Gorichanaz, T. (2025). Trends in information behavior research, 2016–2022: An Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST) paper. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 76(1), 216–237. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24943>
- Ignatow, G. (2007). Theories of embodied knowledge: New directions for cultural and cognitive sociology? *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 37(2), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.2007.00328.x>
- Jokinen, E., Venäläinen, J., & Vähämäki, J. (2015). Johdatus prekaarien affektien tutkimiseen. In E. Jokinen & J. Venäläinen (Eds.), *Prekarisaatio ja affekti* (pp. 7–30). Nykykulttuurin tutkimuksen julkaisuja 118, Jyväskylän yliopisto. https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/54537/Prekarisaatio_ja_affekti_kansil

[la.pdf](#) (Archived at https://web.archive.org/web/20250123075348/https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/54537/Prekarisaatio_ja_affekti_kansilla.pdf)

- Julien, H., McKechnie, L. E. F., & Hart, S. (2005). Affective issues in library and information science systems work: A content analysis. *Library & Information Science Research*, 27(1), 453–466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2005.08.004>
- Julien, H., Pecoskie, J. J., & Reed, K. (2011). Trends in information behavior research, 1999–2008: A content analysis. *Library & Information Science Research*, 33(1), 19–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2010.07.014>
- Keilty, P. (2016). Embodied engagements with online pornography. *The Information Society*, 32(1), 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2015.1107162>
- Keilty, P., & Leazer, G. (2018). Feeling documents: Toward a phenomenology of information seeking. *Journal of Documentation*, 74(3), 462–489. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-09-2016-0113>
- Kelly, G. A. (1963). *A theory of personality: The psychology of personal constructs*. Norton.
- Kitzie, V. (2017). *Beyond behaviors, needs and seeking: A qualitative investigation of information practices among individuals with LGBTQ+ identities* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Rutgers University. <https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/53647/PDF/1/> (Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20231030105429/https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/53647/PDF/1/>)
- Kitzie, V., Wagner, T., Lookingbill, V., & Vera, A. N. (2022). Advancing information practices theoretical discourses centered on marginality, community, and embodiment: Learning from the experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex and asexual (LGBTQIA+) communities. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 73(4), 494–510. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24594>
- Koivunen, A. (2010). An affective turn? Reimagining the subject of feminist theory. In S. Paasonen, & M. Liljeström (Eds.), *Working with affect in feminist readings: Disturbing differences* (pp. 8–28). Routledge.
- Krakowska, M. (2020). Affective factors in human information behavior: A conceptual analysis of interdisciplinary research on information behavior. *Zagadnienia Informacji Naukowej-Studia Informacyjne*, 58(1A (115A)), 75–95. <https://doi.org/10.36702/zin.725>
- 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)
- Kuhlthau, C. C. (2004). *Seeking meaning. A process approach to library and information services* (2nd ed.). Ablex.
- Liljeström, M., & Paasonen, S. (2010). Introduction. Feeling differences – Affects and feminist reading. In S. Paasonen, & M. Liljeström (Eds.), *Working with affect in feminist readings: Disturbing differences* (pp. 1–7). Routledge.
- Lloyd, A. (2007). Learning to put out the red stuff: Becoming information literate through discursive practice. *Library Quarterly*, 77(2), 181–198. <https://doi.org/10.1086/517844>

- Lloyd, A. (2009). Informing practice: Information experiences of ambulance officers in training and on-road practice. *Journal of Documentation*, 65(3), 396–419. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410910952401>
- Lloyd, A. (2014). Informed bodies: Does the corporeal experience matter to information literacy practice? In C. Bruce, K. Davis, H. Hughes, H. Partridge, & I. Stoodley (Eds.), *Information experience: Approaches to theory and practice* (pp. 85–99). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Massumi, B. (1995). The autonomy of affect. *Cultural Critique*, 31(2), 83–109. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1354446>
- Mellon, C. (1986). Library anxiety: A grounded theory and its development. *College & Research Libraries*, 47(2), 160–165. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_47_02_160
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2012). *Phenomenology of perception*. Routledge.
- Multas, A. -M., & Hirvonen, N. (2022). ‘Let’s keep this video as real as possible’: Young video bloggers constructing cognitive authority through health-related information creation process. *Journal of Documentation*, 78(7), 42–64. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-02-2021-0027>
- Nahl, D. (2004). Measuring the affective information environment of web searches. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 41(1), 191–197. <https://doi.org/10.1002/meet.1450410122>
- Nahl, D. (2007a). Introduction. In D. Nahl & D. Bilal (Eds.), *Information and emotion: The emergent affective paradigm in information behavior research and theory* (pp. xvii–xxix). Information Today, Inc.
- Nahl, D. (2007b). The centrality of the affective in information behavior. In D. Nahl & D. Bilal (Eds.), *Information and emotion: The emergent affective paradigm in information behavior research and theory* (pp. 3–37). Information Today, Inc.
- Nahl, D. (2007c). Social-biological information technology: An integrated conceptual framework. *Journal for the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 58(13), 2021–2046. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20690>
- O’Connor, C. (2017). Embodiment and the construction of social knowledge: towards an integration of embodiment and social representations theory. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 47(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsb.12110>
- Olsson, M. R. (2010). All the world’s a stage: Making sense of Shakespeare. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 47(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/meet.14504701115>
- Olsson, M. R., & Hansson, J. (2019). Embodiment, information practices and documentation: A study of mid-life martial artists. *Information Research*, 24(2), paper colis1928. <http://InformationR.net/ir/24-4/colis/colis1928.html> (Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20251129062102/https://informationr.net/ir/24-4/colis/colis1928.html>)
- Olsson, M. R., & Lloyd, A. (2017). Being in place: Embodied information practices. *Information Research*, 22(1), paper colis1601. <http://InformationR.net/ir/22-1/colis/colis1601.html> (Archived at

<https://web.archive.org/web/20251227075617/https://informationr.net/ir/22-1/colis/colis1601.html>)

- Parviainen, J., & Aromaa, J. (2017). Bodily knowledge beyond motor skills and physical fitness: A phenomenological description of knowledge formation in physical training. *Sport, Education and Society*, 22(4), 477–492. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2015.1054273>
- Pedwell, C., & Whitehead, A. (2012). Affecting feminism: Questions of feeling in feminist theory. *Feminist Theory*, 13(2): 115–129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700112442635>
- Pettigrew, K. E. (1999). Waiting for chiropody: Contextual results from an ethnographic study of the information behaviour among attendees at community clinics. *Information Processing & Management*, 35(6), 801–817. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4573\(99\)00027-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4573(99)00027-8)
- Pilerot, O., & Ekström, B. (2025). Information practice and information behaviour: On the need for conceptual and theoretical clarity. *Information Research*, 30(CoLIS), 461–473. <https://doi.org/10.47989/ir30CoLIS52270>
- Prigoda, E., & McKenzie, P. (2007). Purls of wisdom: A collectivist study of human information behaviour in a public library knitting group. *Journal of Documentation*, 63(1), 90–114. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410710723902>
- Probyn, E. (2005). *Blush: Faces of shame*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Salmela, M. (2017). Affektiivinen käänne: yksi vai monia? Käsitteellisiä ja metodologisia pohdintoja. *Tieteessä tapahtuu*, 2(2017), 32–35. <https://journal.fi/tt/article/view/61405> (Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20231228052228/https://journal.fi/tt/article/view/61405>)
- Samudra, J. K. (2008). Memory in our body: Thick participation and the translation of kinesthetic experience. *American Ethnologist*, 35(4), 665–681. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1425.2008.00104.x>
- Savolainen, R. (2014). Emotions as motivators for information seeking: A conceptual analysis. *Library & Information Science Research*, 36(1), 59–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2013.10.004>
- Savolainen, R. (2015a). Cognitive barriers to information seeking: A conceptual analysis. *Journal of Information Science*, 41(5), 613–623. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551515587850>
- Savolainen, R. (2015b). The interplay of affective and cognitive factors in information seeking and use: Comparing Kuhlthau's and Nahl's models. *Journal of Documentation*, 71(1), 175–197. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-10-2013-0134>
- Savolainen, R. (2015c). Expressing emotions in information sharing: A study of online discussion about immigration. *Information Research*, 20(1), paper 662. <http://InformationR.net/ir/20-1/paper662.html> (Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20251207154701/https://www.informationr.net/ir/20-1/paper662.html>)
- Savolainen, R. (2016). Approaching the affective barriers to information seeking: The viewpoint of appraisal theory. *Information Research*, 21(4), paper isic1603. <http://InformationR.net/ir/21-4/isic/isic1603.html> (Archived at

<https://web.archive.org/web/20250619041114/https://informationr.net/ir/21-4/isic/isic1603.html>)

- Seigforth, G. J., & Gregg, M. (2010). An inventory of shimmers. In G. J. Seigforth & M. Gregg (Eds.), *The affect theory reader* (pp. 1–25). Duke University Press.
- St. Jean, B., Jindal, G., & Chan, K. (2018). “You have to know your body!”: The role of the body in influencing the information behaviors of people with type 2 diabetes. *Library Trends*, 66(3), 289–314. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2018.0004>
- Suorsa, A., Suorsa, T., & Svento, R. (2019). Materiality and embodiment in collaborative knowledge processes: Knowledge creation for a virtual power plant. *Information Research*, 24(4), paper colis1930. <http://InformationR.net/ir/24-4/colis/colis1930.html> (Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20251129062102/https://informationr.net/ir/24-4/colis/colis1930.html>)
- Tomkins, S. (1995) What are affects? In E. Sedgwick & A. Frank (Eds.), *Shame and its sisters: A Silvan Tomkins reader* (pp.33–75). Duke University Press.
- Tuominen, K., & Savolainen, R. (1997). A social constructionist approach to the study of information use as discursive action. In P. Vakkari, R. Savolainen, B. Dervin (Eds.), *Information seeking in context: Proceedings of an international conference on research in information needs, seeking and use in different contexts*, 14–16 August 1996, Tampere, Finland, Graham Taylor. pp. 81–96.
- Willson, R., & Given, L. M. (2020). “I’m in sheer survival mode”: Information behaviour and affective experiences of early career academics. *Library & Information Science Research*. 42(2), 101014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2020.101014>
- Wilson, T. D. (1981). On user studies and information needs. *Journal of Documentation*, 37(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb026702>
- Wilson, T. D. (1997). Information behaviour: An interdisciplinary perspective. *Information Processing and Management*, 33(4), 551–572. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4573\(97\)00028-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4573(97)00028-9)
- Wilson, T. D. (1999) Models in information behaviour research. *Journal of Documentation*, 55(3), 249–270. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000007145>
- Wilson, T. D. (2005). Evolution in information behavior modeling Wilson’s model. In K. E. Fisher, S. Erdelez & McKechnie, L. (Eds.), *Theories of information behavior* (pp. 31–38). Information Today.
- Worrall, A., Cappello, A., & Osolen, R. (2021). The importance of socio-emotional considerations in online communities, social informatics, and information science. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 72(10), 1247–1260. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24489>

Copyright

Authors contributing to *Information Research* agree to publish their articles under a [Creative Commons CC BY-NC 4.0 license](#), which gives third parties the right to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format. It also gives third parties the right to remix, transform and build upon the material for any purpose, except commercial, on the condition that clear acknowledgment is given to the author(s) of the work, that a link to the license is provided and that

it is made clear if changes have been made to the work. This must be done in a reasonable manner, and must not imply that the licensor endorses the use of the work by third parties. The author(s) retain copyright to the work. You can also read more at: <https://publicera.kb.se/ir/openaccess>