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Abstract

Web 2.0, social media, and hand-held mobile devices have had a significant impact on libraries in the last 10 years. The utilisation of such emerging technologies in the design and delivery of library programs and services has become popular, and this practice is often known as “Library 2.0”. Since Library 2.0 is a derivative of Web 2.0 technology, discourses on Library 2.0 have tended to excessively focus on technological aspects and neglect the participatory nature of the contemporary library.

This research was designed to respond to the above context. It does not focus on the technology itself, but on what the technology allows university libraries to do, and how the technology fosters participation. Using Straussian grounded theory, through semi-structured interviews with academic librarians and library users throughout university libraries in Vietnam, this qualitative research explored the radical change in the nature of libraries and in the way users experience libraries.

The research proposed a participatory library model that consists of three core categories or phenomena – community, empowerment, and experience – and associated building blocks. The research views the participatory library as a community within which all members are connected through either physical or virtual library spaces. The connection helps them to easily share interests and concerns, and it enables them to learn from one another. The participatory library also empowers users and provides them with innumerable opportunities and enjoyable experiences, as they are actively involved in library activities. Noticeably, the participatory library is fluid rather than rigid. The fluidity is represented in the variations, particularly at the centre of the participatory library, in which core categories and associated properties are fleshed out. The variations provide insights into the categories as well as the model. In addition, the participatory library model also includes the causal conditions, the contextual conditions, the intervening conditions, and the consequences that together make up the complete participatory library model.
This research provides a fresh perspective on the contemporary library. It advances an understanding of the relationship between libraries and users, and it demonstrates the evolution of this relationship over time. The research reflects the nature of the contemporary library and paints a vivid picture of what it can be. The research findings can be used as a guideline or a benchmark that helps libraries and librarians to develop their participatory libraries.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This thesis documents a grounded theory investigation into the participatory library in university libraries in Vietnam. This chapter sets the scene of the research. It begins by describing the context in which the research problem arises. Next, it presents the aims of the research and the research question. This is followed by a statement of the research’s significance, scope, and limitations. The chapter then explains key terms that relate to the title of the research. Finally, it provides an outline of chapters in the thesis.

1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

New and emerging technologies such as Twitter, YouTube, Facebook, and hand-held mobile devices have had profound impacts on the library in the last decade. While libraries and librarians have always had a relationship with users, this relationship has been changing under the influence of emerging technologies (Hall, 2011). Traditionally libraries were a temple of literature in which librarians were book keepers or temple guardians. Their typical roles and tasks included acquisition (review, selection, and purchase of resources for the collection), cataloguing and organising (description of resources and making them ready for use), and serving users (recommendation of books and materials to readers, checking materials in and out, and answering users’ questions). All of these tasks were often carried out by librarians without the involvement of users. In such libraries, the relationship between libraries and users was seen as a relationship between book providers and receivers, or libraries and readers. This meant libraries provided what they had or what they owned (mostly books and other paper-based formats) while users passively received what libraries offered. The library was a closed system and users usually could not directly access books or items on the shelves. Librarians were the only people who could access closed stacks. Users obtained items by giving librarians a request slip with some brief bibliographic information about the item. This one-directional service limited both users’ interaction with the library system and their contribution of ideas to the development of the library.
As new and emerging technologies came into existence and were adopted, this relationship has changed and evolved. The introduction of network technologies, e-books, e-journals, and various electronic information resources has enriched library collections and services, and upgraded the roles of both libraries (librarians) and users. From book keepers, librarians have now become information editors, information organisers, and information advisors. Similarly, from readers or viewers, library users have also become watchers, listeners and browsers. The relationship between libraries and users has changed to a relationship between information services providers and clients, in which the library users have become more independent in choosing and using library services. For instance, they can access library online databases at anytime and anywhere, register to receive notifications on a topic of interest via email, or comment and give feedback on the usability of the library website. These mean that they can flexibly use library services as well as partially contribute to the service improvement.

The degree of user involvement has become clearer, especially with the recent emergence of Web 2.0, which has brought in new opportunities for library users to be more involved in the library activities. Web 2.0 was a term coined by DiNucci (1999) and popularised by O’Reilly (2005). Web 2.0 refers to the second generation of the World Wide Web, which allows a greater degree of participation, individualisation, collaboration and co-creation. It includes platforms such as wikis, social networking spaces and micro-blogging. More and more of the world’s libraries are starting to integrate the use of Web 2.0 within the design and delivery of their programs and services. Known as Library 2.0, a spin-off of Web 2.0, this new approach to library services is giving more power to users and providing them opportunities to be a real part of libraries (Casey & Savastinuk, 2007; Lankes, Silverstein, Nicholson, & Marshall, 2007b; Maness, 2006a).

While scholars have examined various aspects of Library 2.0, their investigations have tended to focus mainly on the practical use and application of technology (Lankes et al., 2007b). For example, some scholars introduce potential applications of Web 2.0 tools for building a Library 2.0 service model (Bradley, 2007; Courtney, 2007; Miller, 2005), focus on technical aspects of Library 2.0 (Yang, Wei, & Peng, 2009), or concentrate on a Library 2.0 model or the use of Web 2.0 technologies in specific libraries (Cohen, 2007; Gross & Leslie, 2010; Pienaar & Smith, 2008).
Similarly, Stephens and Collins (2007) have noted that the majority of discussions in conference presentations and journal articles have a strong focus on technologies. These discussions sometimes neglect to address the application of open and participatory thinking to library services.

Although participation is considered an important factor in the contemporary library, it has not been widely discussed or given much attention (Casey & Savastinuk, 2007; Fichter, 2006). This is understandable because Library 2.0 is a spin-off of Web 2.0 and as it is obviously based on the principles of Web 2.0 (Crawford, 2006; Lankes, Silverstein, & Nicholson, 2007a; Widén-Wulff, Huvila, & Holmberg, 2009) it is characterised by Web 2.0. As the discourse pays more attention to technology and less attention to other aspects, the non-technical (and a combination of technical and non-technical) ideas need to be discussed and explored (Lankes et al., 2007b).

Lankes and Silverstein (2006) proposed the “participatory library” idea, referring to it as a truly integrated library system that must allow users to take part in core functions of the library, like the catalogue system, rather than the more peripheral functions. Whilst there has been some discussion of the term (Casey & Savastinuk, 2007; Lankes, et al., 2007b), it has not yet been fully adopted into mainstream library discourse and practice, nor has it been discussed in empirical studies. The library community is witnessing the birth of a new library model that is more firmly grounded in user engagement and participation than ever before. Emerging technologies are challenging libraries and librarians to re-conceptualise and re-position the role of users within the context of the contemporary library. This context highlights the need to understand what is happening to the library’s evolution and what is the true nature of the contemporary library.

This research problem is significant to various types of libraries worldwide. However, because functions, missions, and targeted clients of each library system (i.e., academic, public, and school libraries) are different, a study focusing on a specific type of library, such as university libraries, will allow the investigator to immerse in the research environment and interact with key stakeholders in that library system. The research phenomenon is therefore more thoroughly investigated and the research results would be drawn from the best practice of that specific library system.
1.3 RESEARCH AIMS

Therefore, the aims of this research are to:

- Explore the nature of users’ participation in the contemporary university library;
- Investigate the relationship between libraries/librarians and users; and
- Propose a model that reflects the practice of participation and the library-user relationship.

In short, the research addresses the following research question:

*What is the (a) participatory university library?*

Both “a” and “the” are used in the question because each implies a particular meaning. This research seeks to develop “a” participatory library model that represents the concept of participation in university libraries. However, the model being developed might also be “the” participatory library model, as it would be the first empirically devised model that might represent the concept of participation in not only university libraries but also all library types.

1.4 RESEARCH CONTEXT

Libraries in Vietnam are mainly administered and funded by the government. (Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, 2002) and are operated under the Library Ordinance issued by the Standing Committee of National Assembly (2000). University libraries are also operated under the regulations on organisation and operation of university libraries (Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism, 2008), which guide on issues related to functions, mission, organisation and operation, library users and staff, infrastructure, and budget. The Library Ordinance and the regulations serve as the legal base for library development in the country.

The last two decades have witnessed significant changes in libraries, particularly university libraries in Vietnam. Tran (1999) observes that Vietnamese libraries experienced difficulties for many years, with outdated information resources, needy services, and undeveloped infrastructure. However, the pace of library development has speeded up. From the early stage of automation, standardisation of information organisation in 1990s (Nguyen, 1998; Lam, 1999), the pace of change in university
libraries have been dramatic due to the improvement of national policy agendas, the development of the internet, and the improved ICT infrastructure (Welch & Murray, 2010). Apart from connecting with other libraries throughout Vietnam, university libraries have embarked on emerging technologies such as social media and mobile technologies to enhance communication in the library community and to provide users with new ways to get involved in library activities.

Due to the emergence of new technologies such as social media, user engagement in library programs and services has become more popular. Vietnamese library professionals and scholars have also reflected on this emerging phenomenon through online forums and professional discourses. However, their discussions centre around several topics such as Web 2.0, Library 2.0 and their possible applications in Vietnamese libraries (Nguyen, 2010; Truong & Nguyen, 2009); mobile technologies and promising mobile applications in university libraries in Vietnam (Nguyen & Hoang, 2013); and the influence of Web 2.0 and its use in university libraries (Hoang, 2010). Though significant changes have occurred in university libraries, user participation and user empowerment have not been widely acknowledged in the literature. Welch and Murray (2010) recommend, “community development, access to electronic resources, and education of information professionals are identified as areas for development” (p. 521). The improvement of these areas along with the development of social media would provide library users with more chance to get deeper involvement in the library operation.

1.5 RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE

The methodology and outcomes of the research will be of interest not only to the research community, but also to library managers and library and information professionals. The contribution of this research is in the following areas:

Theoretical significance

This empirical study provides fresh perspectives on contemporary libraries. Whilst there has been abundant literature on the modern library, much tends to have a strong emphasis on technology, especially the use of emerging technologies such as smartphones and social media in the library. This research does not focus on the technology itself, but on what the technology allows university libraries to do, and
how it fosters participation. This study focuses on a radical change in the nature of libraries, librarians, and the ways in which users experience libraries. In addition, it contributes to the current knowledge by providing an understanding of the relationship between libraries and users, and demonstrating how this relationship evolves over time. In doing so, this research reflects the nature of the contemporary library. Furthermore, the research will contribute to general knowledge of librarianship, for which the issues of library innovation and the improvement of users’ services are always a preoccupation.

**Methodological significance**

Since the existing discourse is primarily based on existing literature and personal and practical experience of the librarians when researching Library 2.0 (Chowdhury, Poulter, & McMenemy, 2006; Habib, 2006; Holmberg, Huvila, Kronqvist-Berg, & Widen-Wulff, 2009; Xu, Ouyang, & Chu, 2009), this study empirically investigates the influence of emerging technologies on academic libraries. This research may be employed as the basis for future research into other similar library contexts, e.g., school libraries. Furthermore, while social scientists have been using grounded theory for half a century, the information systems discipline and library and information science have been later adopters of the method (Hart & Gregor, 2007; Tan, 2010). This research contributes to the body of grounded theory studies completed in these fields. It also affirms and reinforces the position of the grounded theory method in these disciplines.

**Professional significance**

While the academic library is seen as “the heart of the university” (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010, p.11), this research provides empirical guidelines for libraries of 163 universities in Vietnam that serve over 1.5 million students and staff members each year (Ministry of Education and Training, 2011). Specifically, this research provides libraries and librarians with a benchmark that enables them to compare their current library model with the participatory library model to identify the areas that require change. This research is especially suitable for university or academic libraries. However, its applicability is not limited to academic library settings or to a specific country. Any library may find the research
results, the participatory library model, or parts of the model useful if they have a similar purpose, function, and clientele.

1.6 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Scope

As this exploratory research uses a grounded theory approach, it focuses on building theory rather than testing or validating an existing theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998). The rationale behind this is that grounded theory involves a long and complex process, because it is necessary to conduct data collection and data analysis simultaneously. Hence, testing or applying the model in a practical situation is outside the scope of this research project. However, adhering to the principle of grounded theory, concepts and categories (building blocks of the theory) in this study are validated against the actual data throughout the data collection and analysis process; and the validation stops once the model and its building blocks are fully developed (saturated). The interwoven process of data collection and data analysis (one informs another) helps the model to evolve over the course of study.

While the research problem is broad and applicable to all library contexts such as academic, public, special, and school libraries, this research focuses only on university libraries. This is because representativeness is not an important feature of qualitative research. Furthermore, as a small-scale study, it does not allow the involvement of a large number of participants in various library settings. Importantly, a few participants from each library context will not provide insights into the participatory library of all library systems because the purpose, function, and clientele of each library system are different. Focusing on university libraries allows the researcher to interact in-depth with various crucial stakeholders within the academic context such as library directors, library managers, technicians (librarians), students, and academic and professional staff (library users). This interaction brings about solid and focused results.

Limitations

Some possible limitations of this research may include subjectivity, generalisation, and underdevelopment of some provisional concepts.
Subjectivity of the researcher may have an influence on the research results to a certain extent. Subjectivity may be in the form of personal opinion, or previous knowledge and experience that prevent the theory from emerging from the data. This may happen during the time of data collection (i.e. the researcher leads the interview), or during data analysis (i.e. the researcher imposes previous knowledge on the data). Being aware of this possibility, this research adheres to the principles and guidelines pertaining to the research method (details are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.5.5 – Theoretical sensitivity).

In addition, the generalisability of this research may be limited. Due to the nature of qualitative research, the number of research participants is modest. The research also focuses on a specific library system, i.e., university libraries in Vietnam. This may limit the generalisation of the research results to other library systems (i.e., public, special, and school libraries) and those libraries in other countries.

Underdevelopment of some provisional concepts is a self-imposed limitation of this study. As Strauss and Corbin (1990) explain:

Your final theory is limited to those categories, their properties and dimensions, and statements of relationships that exist in the actual data collected – not what you think might be out there but haven’t come across…What you can’t find in your data becomes one of the limitations in your study. (p. 112)

During the data collection and analysis stage, this research finds some interesting concepts and ideas, but they are not supported by data in the subsequent interviews. Therefore, they are left out of the theory and remain as potential topics for future research.

1.7 EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Though the terms below are explained and discussed to some extent throughout the thesis, they are briefly explained in this section in order to provide the reader with further clarification before moving deeply into other sections of the thesis.
“Theory” versus “Model”

The terms “theory” and “model” sometimes confuse readers. According to Bates (2005), a professor in Library and Information Studies, “a theory is a system of assumptions, principles, and relationships posited to explain a specified set of phenomena … The core meaning of theory centres on the idea of a developed understanding, an explanation, for some phenomenon” (p. 2). Meanwhile, “models are a kind of proto-theory, a tentative proposed set of relationship, which can then be tested for validity” (p. 3). Bates also explains that in science, a typical sequence of development has been characterised as “description, prediction, [and] explanation” (p. 3). In the light of this explanation, Bates distinguishes a theory from a model. A model tends to focus on a description and prediction of a phenomenon, whereas a theory provides an explanation for a phenomenon. However, Bates (2005) also states, “there is not always a sharp dividing line between a model and a theory about the same phenomenon” (p. 3).

In terms of methodology, Strauss and Corbin (1998) describe theory as “a set of well-developed concepts related through statements of relationships, which together constitute an integrated framework that can be used to explain or predict phenomena” (p. 15). These grounded theorists use the term “theory” to emphasise the results of a grounded theory study, which is the integration of a series of concepts, categories, and the relationships and interrelationships among them. They are systematically developed and together provide an understanding of the phenomenon.

This research adopts grounded theory to investigate the phenomenon of the participatory library. The research results provide empirical delineation and explanation of the participatory library, and are represented in a graphical format called the “participatory library model”. In accordance with the explanations above, this research can be either a theory or a model. Therefore, both terms are used interchangeably throughout this document.

“Participatory library” versus “Library 2.0”

The concept of the “participatory library” was introduced by Lankes and Silverstein (2006). It refers to a truly fully integrated library system in which users are crucial
and have the power to take part in core functions of the library (e.g., cataloguing) rather than engaging on the periphery (e.g., writing a blog entry or adding a photo to the library’s photo sharing site). This term implies a newer version of Library 2.0. The underpinning belief for this implication is that Library 2.0 appears as a marketing term that does not reflect the nature of the contemporary library. Though technology is not acknowledged as the only important part of Library 2.0 (Casey & Savastinuk, 2007), existing discourse on Library 2.0 demonstrates an excessive attention to technological aspects, while neglecting the participatory nature of the contemporary library. Instead of paying attention to the actual technology, the participatory library has a focus on what technology allows libraries and users to do, that is, their participation. Therefore, the participatory library concept represents the true nature and current state of the contemporary library.

As mentioned, Library 2.0 is a spin-off of Web 2.0 and there is a prevailing use of the “Library 2.0” term in library discourse. For this reason, though this research focuses on the participatory library, it still provides details about Library 2.0, especially in the literature review. This will enable a fuller picture of the evolution of the library over time.

“Web 2.0” versus “Social media”

The term “Web 2.0” and “social media” are sometimes used interchangeably in the literature. However, one may be slightly different from another. The term Web 2.0 was coined by DiNucci (1999) and made popular by Tim O’Reilly and Dale Dougherty in 2004 (O’Reilly, 2005). Web 2.0 includes earlier tools such as weblogs and tagging (Collins & Quan-Haase, 2012) and is considered a platform for the evolution of social media. Recently, the term “social media” has become more popular and is defined as a group of Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, and allow the creation and exchange of user-generated content (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). Social media include a wide range of social networks such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and wikis. This research refers Web 2.0 and social media (and associated mobile and handheld devices such as smart phones, tablets, and laptops) as “emerging technologies”.
1.8 BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE CHAPTERS

Apart from appendices, references and other components, this thesis includes seven chapters. An overview of each chapter is presented below.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter provides a background to the research topic. It includes the research problem, research aims, and a research question. The chapter also presents the significance, scope and possible limitations of the research. It clarifies some terms that are used in or are related to the title of the research and provides an overview of the chapters.

Chapter 2: Literature review

This chapter provides a brief definition and discussion of Web 2.0 and social media, which are often referred to as emerging technologies. The chapter discusses the emergence of Library 2.0, opinions about Library 2.0, and Library 2.0 in research and practice. The chapter also synthesises, compares, and contrasts various Library 2.0 models that have been developed to date. It presents some of the changes that have occurred in the relationship between libraries and users. It also discusses the idea of participation and the participatory library, and finally demonstrates the gap in the existing discourse.

Chapter 3: Research methodology

This chapter concerns the research approach adopted by this study. It describes grounded theory and provides a rationale for the use of Straussian grounded theory in this research. It also details the steps involved in data collection such as identifying participants, developing data collection instruments for semi-structured interviews, and transcription and translation. The chapter describes the process of data analysis, and related issues including memoing, theoretical sensitivity, theoretical sampling, and saturation as well as the trustworthiness of the study.
Chapter 4: Research participants

This chapter is dedicated to introducing the research participants. It acknowledges the fact that participants are a crucial part of this research project. They are excellent informants. The research would not be successful without their great contribution. The chapter introduces all 16 participants who took part in individual interviews.

Chapter 5: Deconstruction of research participants’ narratives

The results of this research are reported in chapters 5 and 6. Chapter 5 deconstructs the narratives of research participants via three core categories called “community”, “empowerment”, and “experience”. The chapter thoroughly delineates each category by identifying and explaining their sub-categories, properties, and dimensions. It also analyses the categories and their related concepts, and illustrates the narratives by providing excerpts taken from interviews. These elements together illuminate the three categories, which constitute the centre of the participatory library.

Chapter 6: Establishing a participatory library model

This chapter presents the complete participatory library model. It demonstrates the process of identification of the relationships and interrelationships between and among the core categories (the foundation of the model) as well as the connections between the foundation and other building blocks of the model. The chapter also fully interprets, illustrates, and justifies all details in the model.

Chapter 7: Discussion and conclusion

This chapter positions the findings of this research in relation to the existing discourse. It presents an overview of the research and outlines its major research findings. It relates the research findings to the previous discourse through comparison and contrast, which clearly show the commonalities and variations between the new findings and the existing knowledge, and demonstrates how the gap in the knowledge has been filled. The chapter also discusses the contribution of this research to the existing Library 2.0 models. In addition, it demonstrates the significant contribution of this research to the library knowledge base as well as to library practice. It also discusses potential limitations of the research and suggests directions for future research.
1.9 CHAPTER CONCLUSION

This chapter has defined the context of the research. It has presented the background to the research, research aims, and the research question. The chapter has also stated the significance, scope, and limitations of the research. Explanations of key terms related to the research title and an overview of chapters have also been provided. The next chapter will review literature relevant to the research topic.
Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter explores the existing literature and thinking about participatory library, Library 2.0 and their associated concepts. The chapter covers literature published in various regions in the world, from Asia-Pacific and African regions to European and American countries. However, the majority of the literature is published by authors in the United States, where there are a significant number of studies in the library and information studies field. Excluding several articles and discussions that were written by key authors in the field, but published on “.com” domains and in non-scholarly journals, the majority of the literature consists of peer-reviewed articles from top-tier journals in the discipline, conference papers from prestigious professional organisations, and monographs and books relevant to the topic. They are all published from 2004 (when the term “Web 2.0” was born) to the present date.

The literature is organised in a broad-to-specific style. It consists of six main sections. The first section justifies the use of literature in grounded theory. Next, the chapter explores literature on emerging technologies that are concepts closely connected to contemporary libraries. This is followed by a discussion of the use of emerging technologies in libraries and their derivative term – Library 2.0. The chapter then examines theories and models of Library 2.0 that have been developed to date. The subsequent section synthesises the changes in the library-user relationship. Finally, the chapter discusses the idea of participation and the concept of participatory library before summarising significant findings of the review.

2.2 ROLE OF LITERATURE IN GROUNDED THEORY

The use of literature in grounded theory research is a topic of debate among grounded theory schools of thought. For this reason, a brief discussion of this is included here to describe the advantages of using literature in the Straussian grounded theory approach.

The debate primarily relates to the questions of when, where and how the literature should be used. Classic grounded theory has strict rules regarding the use of
literature. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967), the researcher should start with an open mind. The purpose of keeping an open mind is that the theory should be allowed to naturally emerge from data, rather than from the literature or existing knowledge. Glaser is faithful to the idea that covering all the literature before commencing research will increase the probability of brutally destroying one’s potentialities as a theorist (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 253). Glaser (1978) further stresses that the researcher should have as few preconceived ideas about the research phenomenon as possible. Otherwise, there is a risk that interpretation of the data may be biased if the researcher is too imbued with concepts from the literature. Therefore, it is necessary to suspend knowledge and experience in order to approach data without preconceptions (Glaser, 1978). The literature search should be undertaken and woven into the theory once the grounded theory is nearly complete, during the sorting and writing up of the theory (Glaser, 1998).

On the contrary, an early review of literature is recommended by contemporary grounded theorists. Suddaby (2006) asserts, “grounded theory is not an excuse to ignore the literature” (p. 634). Dey (1999) also clarifies, “there is a difference between an open mind and an empty head” (p. 251). The researcher needs to use prior knowledge wisely. The literature should be used to inform our analysis rather than to direct it. Reflexivity is crucial in order to prevent previous knowledge from distorting the researcher’s perceptions of the data (Dey, 1993; McGhee, Marland, & Atkinson, 2007). In addition, Charmaz (2006) asserts that it is impossible and often undesirable to suspend one’s knowledge and experience. Creswell (1998) upholds this view and contends that preparation for the research is crucial. She emphasises that some pre-research literature is still necessary in qualitative research to frame the problem and provide a rationale for the research. Street (2001) adds that qualitative researchers should conduct preliminary work to avoid re-inventing the wheel. This is necessary to identify gaps in the literature and to justify why a grounded theory approach is needed. Similarly, Walls, Parahoo, and Fleming (2010) note that in contemporary research, the researchers must normally present research proposals demonstrating that they know what they are doing, and how and why they are going to do it.

The central point of grounded theory (which will be discussed in Chapter 3) is to ensure that the theory must emerge from fieldwork and analysis rather than from
previous research. For this reason, an exhaustive review of literature was not conducted at the beginning of this research because reviewing all of the literature in the field beforehand is not necessary (Dunne, 2011; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The review of literature in this research was therefore undertaken in two phases. In the first phase (in 2010-2011), a preliminary review was conducted so that the researcher was familiar with relevant literature, which can enhance sensitivity to subtle nuances in data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The early literature review also helped the researcher better understand the research problem and helped shape the research question. In the second phase (2013), the preliminary literature review was revisited and updated when data collection and analysis had been completed. This extensive review helped the researcher to confirm findings – to position findings in the existing literature and illustrate how the gap is filled (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This pragmatic approach enhanced theoretical sensitivity and allowed the researcher to take full advantage of the existing knowledge (see details in Chapter 3, Section 3.5.5 – Theoretical sensitivity). Sections below will explore and discuss the existing literature and thinking about participatory library, Library 2.0 and associated concepts.

2.3 EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES: AN OVERVIEW

The term “emerging technologies” refers to Web 2.0, social media, and associated mobile and hand-held devices that have had a significant influence on libraries in the last ten years. While the terms “emerging technologies”, “Web 2.0”, and “social media” are sometimes used interchangeably in the literature, one might be slightly different from another. This section briefly discusses the terms that help to contextualise the library transformation and sets a background for discussion of concepts such as Library 2.0 and participatory library in the next sections.

2.3.1 Web 2.0

Web 2.0 and Library 2.0 has a close relationship. Courtney (2007) suggests that in order to understand the concept of Library 2.0, it is necessary to understand what Web 2.0 is and is not. The term Web 2.0 was coined by DiNucci (1999) and it was made popular by Tim O’Reilly and Dale Dougherty in 2004 when the first Web 2.0 conference was organised by O’Reilly Media and MediaLive (O’Reilly, 2005). Web 2.0 refers to the second generation of the World Wide Web that allows a greater
degree of participation, individualisation, collaboration and co-creation. It includes things such as wikis, social networking spaces and micro-blogging.

Most of the early Web 2.0 discussions argued about the meaning of Web 2.0 and its applications. Web 2.0 could be viewed as a tool, specific technologies, or a social impact. For example, O’Reilly (2005), the founder and chief executive officer of O’Reilly Media Incorporated, generalises that “Web 2.0 is the Web as platform” (para. 7) and applications are based on that platform. In other words, Web 2.0 applications are built upon the Web (the previous generation of the Web or Web 1.0) rather than on the desktop. In addition, in an attempt to explain the meaning of Web 2.0, two senior professionals of the National Library of New Zealand considered Web 2.0 to be a second wave that covers web tools and services such as weblogs, wikis, Ajax, RSS, and tagging. These tools and services allow web users to generate, describe, post, harvest, search, annotate and exchange online content in various forms ranging from music and bookmarks to photographs and documents (Macaskill & Owen, 2006).

In terms of social impact, Miller (2005) describes Web 2.0 as “an attitude not a technology” (para. 5) while Birdsall (2007), a library consultant, asserts that Web 2.0 is “a social movement” (para. 1). Similarly, Abram (2005) confirms that Web 2.0 is about a social phenomenon. He says it is not just about social networked experiences, but also about the distribution and creation of Web content itself. It is characterised by open communication, decentralisation of authority, and freedom to share and reuse content. He further emphasises that “Web 2.0 is about the more human aspects of interactivity. It is about conversations, interpersonal networking, personalisation, and individualism” (p. 44). Hence, there is a shared view among these three authors as they all assert that Web 2.0 is not purely a technology.

Some authors express opposing viewpoints on the concept of Web 2.0. In an article in Library Technology Reports, Stephens (2006b) indicates that Web 2.0 is the next embodiment of the World Wide Web, where digital tools allow users to create, change and publish dynamic content of all kinds. On the contrary, Notess (2006), while noting that Web 2.0 uses new technologies, doubts that Web 2.0 might be nothing new as he says that people are “using older technologies in a new way” (p. 40). Miller (2005) also believes that people are exaggerating the bubble of Web 2.0.
Notably, the majority of the early literature endeavours to define and discuss Web 2.0, its features and implications. There is no commonly accepted definition of the term, as some look at its technical aspects while others focus on social and human aspects. However, most share the view that Web 2.0 is a new generation of the Web that enables users to participate in processes of creating, exchanging and sharing information (Aharony, 2012; Birdsell, 2007; O’Reilly, 2005); and Web 2.0 consists of a wide range of technologies and services such as wikis, weblogs, RSS and instant messaging. Libraries are encouraged to engage with Web 2.0 as it “will have substantial implications for libraries” (Maness, 2006a, para. 1).

2.3.2 Social media

In recent years, the term “social media” has prevailed in the library and information studies discourse, while the term “Web 2.0” has been less common. Well-known social media such as Facebook and Twitter have connected billions of people and enabled them to communicate with one another easily (Canty, 2012). According to Kaplan and Haenlein (2010), social media had its inception in the late 1990s when weblogs first appeared. As high-speed internet connections were increasingly available and social networking sites such as MySpace and Facebook were created in 2003-2004, the term “social media” become prominent. While the term “social media” is often used interchangeably with “Web 2.0”, the terms refer to slightly different things. Web 2.0 includes earlier tools such as weblogs and tagging (Collins & Quan-Haase, 2012) and it is considered a platform for the evolution of social media. Social media is defined as a group of Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, and that allow the creation and exchange of user-generated content (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). Social media include a vast array of social networks such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and wikis, and they are usually associated with mobile and handheld devices like smart phones, tablets, and laptops.

2.4 EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES IN LIBRARIES

2.4.1 Emergence of Library 2.0

The term “Library 2.0”, a derivative or a spin-off of Web 2.0, was coined by a public librarian, Michael Casey, and first appeared in October 2005 on his personal blog
entitled Library Crunch (Arif & Mahmood, 2012; Courtney, 2007; Crawford, 2006; Murley, 2008). Library 2.0 is a topic that has since been debated in professional journals, at conferences and workshops, and in social media spaces. The Library 2.0 entry in Wikipedia was even nominated for deletion due to contradictory viewpoints between the participants (Holmberg, et al., 2009). There are various opinions on Library 2.0. Some people opt for a broad definition of Library 2.0, while others try to narrow it to make the implications for libraries more explicit. It is suggested that understanding the range of definitions and theories behind Library 2.0 is the key to understanding where and how Library 2.0 differs from the traditional library (Eilers, 2012).

Though Michael Casey is credited as the person who coined the term Library 2.0, his blog entry “Working towards a Definition of Library 2.0” (Casey, 2005b) does not provide a concise definition of the term. Instead, Casey triggers the Library 2.0 discussion by asking colleagues to look at Web 2.0 and see how it fits into the library. Casey (2005b) concludes that the concept of Library 2.0 embraces something new and Library 2.0 is a disruptive idea. Since 2005, there have been many discussions around the concept, both in scholarly publications and in informal conversations such as blogs and online forums. In a form of an explanation, Casey and Savastinuk (2006) make the term clearer when they state that:

The heart of Library 2.0 is user-centred change. It is a model for library service that encourages constant and purposeful change, inviting user participation in the creation of both the physical and the virtual services they want, supported by consistently evaluating services. It also attempts to reach new users and better serve current ones through improved customer-driven offerings. (p. 40)

The heated discussion surrounding Library 2.0 continued.

**2.4.2 Library 2.0: revolution or evolution?**

The controversial concept of Library 2.0 has led to debates among the library community. Some believe that Library 2.0 is a real revolution. For example, Chad and Miller (2005) suggest that Library 2.0 accurately depicts the new opportunities and challenges facing the library and information studies sector. The library domain
has repeatedly evolved to embrace new technologies and to adapt in line with changing expectations, and it will doubtless continue to do so. However, the current challenges are more subtle, more significant, and thus more disruptive than in the past. Miller (2006) further comments that the evolutionary change named Library 2.0 happens across a wide range of systems, processes and attitudes. Sharing the same opinion, Courtney (2007) explains that the use of Web 2.0 tools in libraries presents a significant difference from the past application of information technologies in the library. In spite of the fact that libraries and librarians have evolved over the years to meet changing community needs, the current context requires newer strategies, tools and models of services (Courtney, 2007).

On the contrary, other scholars and practitioners hold the view that Library 2.0 is an evolution instead of a revolution. Brevik (2006) affirms that “Library 2.0 is the natural evolution of library services to a level where the library user is in control of how and when she gets access to the services she needs and wants” (para. 6). He also adds that “Library 2.0 is a reaction from librarians to the increasingly library relevant developments in information communication and technologies (Web 2.0 and social software) and an environment that is saturated with information available through new and more easily accessible channels” (para. 2). Furthermore, Fichter (2006) argues that books, other information resources, librarians and users have existed throughout library history, and a Library 2.0 environment will be created by the participation of participants (not users, customers or patrons) and a radical trust. The difference of Library 2.0 from its previous version is the involvement of participants who actively participate in the creation and development of Library 2.0 services. Thus, the core of Library 2.0 is the participation of the community, who are co-creators or co-authors. The line between librarians and library users is blurred.

Holding a different view from others, Farkas (2006) states that the so-called Library 2.0 is just a bunch of very good ideas that have been squashed into a box with a trendy label slapped on it. Library 2.0 does not exist, even though people are endeavouring to promote it. Similarly, Crawford (2006) states that Library 2.0 might not even be something new; he argues that although the environment changes, the core functions of libraries still remain much the same. Therefore, Library 2.0 is neither an evolution nor a revolution. Holding a neutral view, Kwanya, Stilwell and Underwood (2009) do not debate the evolution or evolution of Library 2.0. Instead,
they consider Library 2.0 to be the latest instance in the development of the library, and a combination of Web 2.0 and librarianship.

2.4.3 Library 2.0: only about technology?

While a number of scholars and practitioners hold the view that Library 2.0 is about technology (or depends on technology), others posit that technology is not a necessary part of Library 2.0. Various reasons are given to support such assertions. For instance, in early articles, Maness (2006a) states that Library 2.0 is “the application of interactive, collaborative, and multi-media web-based technologies to web-based library services and collections” (para. 8). In this line of thought, Library 2.0 is purported to be primarily web-based and hence involves the implementation of web tools, particularly Web 2.0 tools. This perspective is one that gives the impression that Library 2.0 is primarily technology driven (Shoniwa & Hall, 2007).

Those who see Library 2.0 as a technology-based library also reason that the increase in virtual services within the library environment is primarily the implementation and experiment of Web 2.0 technologies (Bradley, 2007). The use of Web 2.0 technologies enables libraries to easily collaborate and create online communities, to explore new ways to communicate with, educate, and attract new users. In a study by Shoniwa and Hall (2007), a survey and interviews with chief librarians was carried out to test the assertions of those who believe that Library 2.0 is intimately related to technology. They found that Library 2.0 is predominantly considered to be the application of Web 2.0 tools and techniques in which users were the centre of services.

Contrary to the viewpoints above, some authors posit that Library 2.0 is not about technology. One of them is Casey (2005a), who coined the term Library 2.0. He states, “Library 2.0 is not about technology” (para. 2). Instead, Library 2.0 seeks to gather good ideas from outside and use them to deliver improved and new services, and it attempts to reach new target population. His perspective focuses on the role of users in Library 2.0, as they can take part in the creation and development of library services. Library 2.0 also focuses on attracting not only current but also potential users. Likewise, some commentators believe that “technology is not a necessary part of Library 2.0 ... Participatory service and change are the heart of Library 2.0, and
In their book, Casey & Savastinuk add that Library 2.0 is both a physical and a virtual library, and suggest that Library 2.0 is a model of constant change and user driven services).

In addition to the viewpoints above, the review of literature also reveals that Library 2.0 is not purely technology. Instead, it is the combination of technology (Web 2.0) and a new culture of participation of users. In an attempt to find the meaning of Library 2.0, Crawford (2006) gathered statements on Library 2.0 from blogs, professional journals, and forums and synthesised a list of 62 views and 7 definitions for the Library 2.0 term. He concluded that there are two terms representing the library practice, which are Library 2.0 and “Library 2.0”. The former term represents the set of tools while the later one shows the movement or a bandwagon in libraries. Put another way, Library 2.0, in general, is the combination of tools and attitudes. He further asserts that Library 2.0 is an ambiguous and a confused term (Crawford, 2006). After five years, Crawford carried out an analysis of discourses on Library 2.0 and determined that there should, in fact, be three parts. Besides the movement and the toolkit, there should also be philosophies which include the idea of direct multidirectional contact with the user community (Crawford, 2011).

The combination of various elements in Library 2.0 is further supported by other studies. For instance Holmberg, et al. (2009), who gathered ideas from practitioners and researchers via a survey, sees “Library 2.0 as a change in interaction between users and libraries in a new culture of participation catalysed by social web technologies” (p. 667). Technology is an important part of Library 2.0, but it is not the only part. Interaction and a culture of participation are also essential elements of Library 2.0. Similarly, Wallis (2007) simply considers Library 2.0 to be a conjunction between libraries and Web 2.0 in order to better serve their users.

2.4.4 Library 2.0: current discourse

From the discussions above, it is notable that different scholars and practitioners look at various angles of Library 2.0 or focus on different aspects of it. Whatever Library 2.0 is considered to be, there is a common sense that Library 2.0 is different from its previous version (traditional library), as it offers users innovative services as well as
new ways to access information. It is also worthwhile to review why and how the library community is interested in Library 2.0.

In terms of statistics, Brantley (2010) found that the number of articles about Web 2.0 and Library 2.0 published in the library and information science journals increased dramatically in the period between 2005 and 2009, in which 2008 was recorded as the peak of Library 2.0 publication. For example, in the database Library Literature and Information Science Full Text, the number of articles went from 89 in 2005 to 459 in 2008 and dropped to 340 in 2009 (Brantley, 2010, p. 351). Similarly, Crawford (2011) found that the discussion on Library 2.0 peaked in 2007 and 2008 and then declined. His statistics revealed that in WorldCat.org, the phrase “Library 2.0” yielded one item in 2005, 39 in 2006, 149 in 2007, 131 in 2008, 90 in 2009, and 42 in 2010. Similarly, on LISTA (Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts), he found 4 items in 2005, 28 in 2006, 130 in 2007, 169 in 2008, 138 in 2009, and 56 in 2010 (Crawford, 2011). The figures show that the interest of scholars and practitioners has decreased over time and Library 2.0 discussions have become saturated.

The interest in Library 2.0 has been diverse since its inception in 2005. This review of literature suggests that before 2010 the Library 2.0 discussions tended to use the term “Web 2.0”, while from 2010 onward the term “social media” has been used more frequently. The discussions are diverse in terms of topics. However, they might be categorised into a few broad areas as follows:

*Potentials, benefits, implications, and solutions of Web 2.0 and social media in libraries.* This theme accounts for a significant portion of the publications. Authors contributing to this theme include Arya and Mishra (2011); Carlson (2007); Charnigo and Barnett-Ellis (2007); Curran, Murray, Stephen Norrby, and Christian (2006); Ganster and Schumacher (2009); Hagman (2012); Jennings (2012); Joint (2009, 2010); Kajewski (2007); Lilburn (2012); McManus (2009); Phillips (2011); Rutherford (2008); Stephens (2007a, 2007b); Sump-Crethar (2012); Wallis (2007).

*Adoption of Web 2.0 or social media tools in libraries.* This theme includes discussions and studies of the use of emerging technologies in various types of libraries. This theme also makes up a large part of the publications. Typical authors
of this topic are Ayu and Abrizah (2011); Bosque, Leif, and Skarl (2012); Cao (2009); Charnigo and Barnett-Ellis (2007); Chew (2009); Chua and Goh (2010); Gosling, Harper, and McLean (2009); Han and Liu (2010); Harinarayana and Raju (2009); Kai-Wah Chu (2009); Kelly, Bevan, Akerman, Alcock, and Fraser (2009); Kim and Abbas (2010); Nguyen (2008); Thornton (2012); Torres-Salinas, Cabezas-Clavijo, Ruiz-Pérez, and López-Cózar (2011); Wan (2011).

**Librarian 2.0, which refers to the changing and challenging role of librarians.** This theme covers aspects such as the challenges that librarians encounter, new skills, knowledge, and characteristics required by library and information professionals. Typical authors of this theme include Abram (2005, 2008); Arif and Mahmood (2012); Cullen (2008); Hao-Chang, Chen, Tseng, and Wen-Hui (2011); Huvila, Holmberg, Kronqvist-Berg, Nivakoski, and Widén (2013); Kealy (2009); Kirkland (2007); Knight (2009); Partridge (2011); Partridge, Lee, and Munro (2010); Partridge, Menzies, Lee, and Munro (2010); Peltier-Davis (2009); Syn (2010).

**Perceptions, perspectives, and opinions of users and librarians on emerging technologies and their usage in libraries.** Authors interested in this theme are Burhanna, Seeholzer, and Salem Jr (2009); Chu and Du (2013); Connell (2009); Grosch (2012).

In addition to the above themes, some publications cover part of a theme or combine several themes. Other publications discuss topics that are less popular, such as privacy and security challenges, contributed by, for example, Griffey (2010); Neiburger, 2010). Though Library 2.0 attracts the attention of the library community and the attention is represented by the diverse topics and significant number of publications, its heyday has passed. Its obsolescence relates to that of Web 2.0 because Library 2.0 originates from and is influenced by Web 2.0. According to Evans (2009), Web 2.0 is already a dated term. In fact, several months after the term Web 2.0 first appeared, there was already a prediction about the future of Web 2.0 and what Web 3.0 may look like. Abram (2005) predicted that Web 3.0 will probably be even more distributed in form than Web 2.0 and maybe some of the Web 2.0 applications will disappear or merge with a new integrated whole. Web services or the emerging semantic web may replace such things as social networking sites and repositories. Some scholars suggested replacing the term “Library 2.0” with others
such as “hyperlinked library” (Stephens & Collins, 2007), “Library 3.0” (Belling, Rhodes, Smith, Thomson, & Thorn, 2011; Evans, 2009; Kenefick & Werner, 2008; Tom Kwanya, Stilwell, & Underwood, 2012; Saw & Todd, 2007), “Library 4.0” (Saw & Todd, 2007), or “Library II” and “Library III” (Nesta & Mi, 2011). The term Library 2.0, according to Lankes et al. (2007a), is criticised for its ambiguity and limitations in the discussion of user-inclusive Web services. A study by Nesta and Mi (2011) found that the adoption by the public of “Library 2.0” has been low and they suggest that librarians should look towards a new version of the library.

2.5 LIBRARY 2.0 “THEORIES” AND “MODELS”

Though use of the term “Library 2.0” is declining, it is necessary to be aware of Library 2.0 models and theories that have been developed to date. These help to see the overall evolution of the library over time.

2.5.1 Introduction to theory and model

As explained in the first chapter, the concepts of “theory” and “model” are usually used interchangeably and they confuse readers. It is therefore important to understand the distinction between them before discussing what theories and models have been available in the library discourse. According to Bates (2005), “a theory is a system of assumptions, principles, and relationships posited to explain a specified set of phenomena ... The core meaning of theory centres on the idea of a developed understanding, an explanation, for some phenomenon” (p. 2). Meanwhile, “models are a kind of proto-theory, a tentative proposed set of relationship, which can then be tested for validity” (p. 3).

Bates (2005) further explains that, in science, a typical sequence of development has been characterised as “description, prediction, explanation” (p. 3). That is, a description of a new phenomenon is the necessary first task when studying it. The reason is that it is difficult to think about something or understand it without description. Once we know something about a phenomenon, it should be possible to predict relationships, processes, or sequences associated with the phenomenon. Then, based on the testing of predictions, we should be able to develop an explanation of the phenomenon, that is, a theory. Hence, models are useful at the description and prediction stages of understanding a phenomenon. We can properly say that we have
a theory only when we develop an explanation for a phenomenon (Bates, 2005, p.3). Though there is not always a clear dividing line between a model and a theory about the same phenomenon, Bates’s explanation is very helpful when discussing the “models” of and “theories” about Library 2.0.

In practice, literature on Library 2.0 is diverse and there have been a number of “models” and “theories” that have been developed in recent years, mostly between 2006 and 2009. It is noteworthy that although the degree of development of these models and theories may or may not be exactly the same as what Bates describes, the words “model” and “theory” are still used in this thesis in order to exactly reflect the term used by authors. Their names are also kept the same as they appear in the original work. The purpose of this is to reflect the authors’ assertion and opinion. A discussion of the use of terms (i.e., model, theory) will then be provided, which relates to Bates’s (2005) definition of theory and model.

While the word “conceptual” is taken from the original work, which indicates the type of model, the words “general” and “practical” are made up by the reviewer. For example, a conceptual model is composed of concepts that represent the subject of the model. A general model means that the model is proposed at a broad level. It presents an overview of the model and its features rather than focuses on specific details. A practical model is a description or a report on a model that has been used in a specific library. It should be noted that there is not a clear distinction between the two models because they may share some features. The type of model does not imply one is more developed or better than another. Below is an overview of the “models” and “theories” of Library 2.0.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model/theory name</th>
<th>Authors and Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Publication format</th>
<th>Methodology/Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library 2.0 theory</td>
<td>(Maness, 2006a)</td>
<td>General theory</td>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory library service model</td>
<td>(Casey &amp; Savastinuk, 2007)</td>
<td>General model</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building blocks of Library 2.0</td>
<td>(Holmberg, et al., 2009)</td>
<td>General model</td>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library 2.0 model</td>
<td>(Chowdhury, Poulter, &amp; McMenemy, 2006)</td>
<td>General model</td>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>Personal experience and Ranganathan law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Library 2.0 model</td>
<td>(Xu, et al., 2009)</td>
<td>Conceptual model</td>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>Inspecting websites for Web 2.0 features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Library 2.0 model</td>
<td>(Habib, 2006)</td>
<td>Conceptual model</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Brainstorming chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library 2.0 service model</td>
<td>(Pienaar &amp; Smith, 2008)</td>
<td>Practical model</td>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>Adapted from O’Reilly (2005) model of Web 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System architecture of Library 2.0</td>
<td>(Yang, et al., 2009)</td>
<td>Practical model</td>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.1 - Overview of existing Library 2.0 “models” and “theories”*

### 2.5.2 General theories and models

One of the early theories of Library 2.0 was proposed by Maness (2006a), a university librarian, in an article titled “Library 2.0 theory: Web 2.0 and its implications for libraries” that was published in *Webology* journal. It enlightened the library community on the changes in libraries. Maness details the changes that Web 2.0 technologies will bring to Library 2.0. He defines Library 2.0 as “the application of interactive, collaborative, and multi-media web-based technologies to web-based library services and collections” (para. 8). He confirms that Library 2.0 is primarily technology-driven, as most of the applications in Library 2.0 involve Web 2.0 tools. He suggests “this definition be adopted by the library science community” and further explains that “limiting the definition to web-based services, and not library services more generally, avoids potential confusion and sufficiently allows the term to be researched, further theorized, and renders it more useful in professional discourse” (para. 8).
In compliance with Maness’s theory, a Library 2.0 must have the following essential elements:

- **It is user-centred:** Users have the power to participate in the creation and development of the content and library services. They are both users and consumers. The roles of librarians and users are blurred.

- **It provides a multimedia experience:** Library collection and services contain video and audio components.

- **It is socially rich:** Users are involved in creation of content and services in library websites. The communication among librarians and users is multidimensional and may happen in both synchronous and asynchronous ways.

- **It is communally innovative:** This is a significant aspect that rests on the foundation of libraries as a community service, but understands that as communities change, libraries must not only change with them, they must allow users to change the library. The library seeks to continually change its services and find new ways to allow library communities to find and utilise information (Maness, 2006a).

Maness also provides a series of Web 2.0 technologies and explains how they can be used in libraries. This is an influential article and has been widely cited in the Library 2.0 literature. However, it is technology centric. Casey (2006) comments:

> A philosophy of change in library services is far more than a technology-driven concept. The heart of such change rests on a system of evaluating services and incorporating what our users want, including but not limited to certain new technologies… Pushing such new technologies to users, either through in-house creation or from vendors, does little to create purposeful change in the library itself. Indeed, without continuous and purposeful change, how is the library to keep up with what its users want with regard to new technology? Technology is very important, but it is only a tool that will help us build Library 2.0. (para. 8-9)

This comment somewhat explains why a majority of the Library 2.0 discourses have a focus on technology rather than other aspects, such as participation.
Another theory on Library 2.0 was presented by two public librarians Michael Casey, who is credited with coining the term “Library 2.0”, and Laura Savastinuk. Their theory is informed by a survey about libraries and the change, as well as being based on the personal experiences of the authors. They define Library 2.0 as a model for constant and purposeful change, which empowers library users through participatory and user-driven services. It seeks to improve services to current library users while also reaching out to potential library users (Casey & Savastinuk, 2007). The authors point out that Library 2.0 is about more than just new technologies. It is about “constant change, which includes re-evaluating library services and what our users need. Library 2.0 is less about what we can provide to our users and more about what we can allow our users to provide themselves” (p. xxii). Participatory service and change are the heart of Library 2.0, and technology is a tool that can help library to get there (Casey & Savastinuk, 2007).

The authors address a broad range of levels of integrating Web 2.0 technologies into the libraries. They presented two important criteria. Firstly, the service needs to be fluid enough to change according to the user needs and expectations; and secondly, it must provide a way for the user to participate in the library service, usually in the form of obtaining feedback. In addition, Casey and Savastinuk (2007) state that Library 2.0 is not only about virtual services, but also about a physical place. They question, “What makes a service Library 2.0?”, and then explain that any service, physical or virtual, that successfully reaches users, is evaluated frequently, and makes use of customer input is a Library 2.0 service. Even “older, traditional services can be Library 2.0 if criteria are met” (p. 66). They also add, “being new is not enough to make a service Library 2.0” (Casey and Savastinuk, 2006, p. 44). It is noteworthy that while Casey and Savastinuk mention Library 2.0 as both physical and virtual space, literature has rarely mentioned what area should be focused on or how to improve Library 2.0 as a physical place.

It is notable that while Maness’s (2006a) Library 2.0 theory focuses on Web 2.0, Casey and Savastinuk’s viewpoint and definition focus on various angles of Library 2.0. These two researchers balance the components of Library 2.0, such as Web 2.0 technologies, library services, user participation, and other characteristics of Library 2.0. Both regard library users as the centre of libraries. Users must be allowed to change the library to suit their needs and desires.
Casey and Savastinuk’s model, in the form of a book, is intended to serve as a guide for librarians, library administrators, support staff, and students. However, it is widely used by practitioners and researchers because the book provides definitions, essential ingredients, and practical guidelines and examples of Library 2.0, and, importantly, it is written by the Library 2.0 originator.

In a study by Holmberg et al. (2009), a Library 2.0 model was proposed in the form of building blocks. The model was developed based on a quick survey with an open-ended question: What is Library 2.0? The respondents were library and information professionals who participated in a Library 2.0 workshop. The researchers used a co-word technique to analyse the responses. They analysed the occurrence and co-occurrence of keywords in the responses and visualised them in the form of a network map and clustering terms (Figure 2.1), which then resulted in a Library 2.0 model (Figure 2.2).

![Figure 2.1 - Library 2.0 network map and clusters of related terms (Holmberg et al., 2009, p. 675)](image)

According to Holmberg et al. (2009), Library 2.0 must consist of seven core components including interactivity, users, participation, libraries and library services, Web and Web 2.0, social aspects, and technology and tools. Among those components, interactivity is the most important part of Library 2.0 as it is used the most frequently in the responses.
This model mentions not only the interaction between stakeholders in libraries but also social and technical aspects of Library 2.0. However, it does not provide much detail about the relationships between and among the Library 2.0 building blocks. Furthermore, though the model is empirically devised, the method adopted (a five-minute written survey) did not allow the researchers to interact with the participants. Such interaction would have helped to yield rich information from lived experiences. In addition, participants in the research were library and information professionals only. The model might be more complete if it were also based on the responses of library users, who are one of the main stakeholders in libraries.

In another study by Chowdhury, Poulter, and McMenemy (2006), a Library 2.0 model for public libraries was also proposed (Figure 2.3). Similar to the model of Holmberg, et al. (2009), the model by Chowdhury, et al. (2006) also lacks description and explanation. The development of this model is primarily based on personal understanding and experience, and underpinned by five library principles (devised in 1963 by Ranganathan, a well-known librarian). The principles are:

- Community knowledge is for use
- Every user should have access to his or her community knowledge
- All community knowledge should be made available to its users

*Figure 2.2 - The building-blocks of Library 2.0 (Holmberg, et al., 2009, p. 676)*
- Save the time of the user in creating and finding community knowledge
- Community knowledge grows continually.

According to Chowdhury, et al. (2006), the five principles are still applicable to the public Library 2.0 model. They stress that the public Library 2.0 model would be both a physical place and a virtual space that enables local people to access local knowledge (Chowdhury, et al., 2006). However, they discuss “why” very little and do not provide any explanation of “how” such principles can be applied in a Library 2.0 model. The proposed Library 2.0 model is not very systematic and precise. The researchers also suggest and encourage testing of the model for its practical applicability.

2.5.3 Conceptual models

There are a variety of approaches to creating a Library 2.0 model. Xu, Ouyang and Chu (2009) carried out a survey of 81 academic library websites for the adoption of Web 2.0 tools. Drawing on the survey results and a review of the literature on

---

Figure 2.3 - Design overview of Public Library 2.0 model (Chowdhury, et al., 2006, p. 459)
Library 2.0, the researchers propose a conceptual model of Academic Library 2.0. The researchers suggest four features of Academic Library 2.0, as follows (Figure 2.4).

- **User originated**: library services should be originated from users
- **Multimedia enabled**: video, image, text and other formats should be integrated, transferred, exchanged or displayed at library websites with Web 2.0 applications
- **Communally innovative**: users should also be contributors; users together with librarians should bring about innovative outcomes in the library environment
- **Socially rich**: users, librarians and the wider community should be able to easily communicate with each other via Web 2.0 tools and social networks.

The researchers also posited that the application of Web 2.0 in the library creates Library 2.0, which consists of five essentials (Figure 2.5).
Figure 2.5 - Web 2.0 and libraries: five essentials (Xu et al., 2009, p. 328)

- Open: allow and enable users to further develop libraries’ operations and services
- Interactive: enable users to contribute and react in a library based on the Web 2.0 applications
- Convergent: various Web 2.0 tools can be utilised to accomplish libraries’ missions
- Collaborative: librarians and users should be collaborators rather than disseminators and receivers
- Participatory: participation is the centre of Library 2.0; the creation and development of library services result from various stakeholders.

The researchers affirmed that the four features and five essentials of Library 2.0 above are depicted from the viewpoints of all types of libraries. They further outlined three components of Academic Library 2.0 as shown in (Figure 2.6).

Figure 2.6 - Academic Library 2.0: three components (Xu et al., 2009, p. 328)
Librarian 2.0: plays various roles, such as creator, contributor, organiser, facilitator and coordinator

User 2.0: quick adoption of Web 2.0 tools in teaching/learning and doing research, active participation in Academic Library 2.0 and extension of Academic Library 2.0 to other dimensions of campus life

Information 2.0: organised and contributed by librarians and users (rather than only librarians); multiple-way information flow among librarians and users (rather than one-way from librarians to users).

From the essentials and components above, the researchers proposed a conceptual model of Academic Library 2.0 as shown in Figure 2.7.

**Figure 2.7 - The Academic Library 2.0 model (Xu et al., 2009, p. 330)**

The model was visualised in a three-dimensional space, which presents three crucial components of Library 2.0 and their attributes: Librarian 2.0, User 2.0, and Information 2.0. However, it did not demonstrate the actual inter-relationships among components of the model. A more detailed explanation and interpretation would make it accessible for the reader. For this reason, Xu, et al. (2009) suggested that further studies are needed to revise and expand the model, because it is only an initial step to explore the applications and implications of Web 2.0 in academic libraries.

Approaching by a different method, the conceptual Academic Library 2.0 model of Habib (2006) demonstrates another perspective on Library 2.0. The development of the model is based on O’Reilly’s (2005) seven principles of Web 2.0 including:
- **The Web as platform**: the web is the only true link that unites whoever we are and wherever we are in the world. We need to include as many people as we can.

- **Harnessing collective intelligence**: Web 2.0 as “intelligent web” that enables information to flow freely. Therefore, a wider community can access, process, and contribute to the knowledge.

- **Data is the next Intel Inside**: to harness collective intelligence, people must have the capacity to process massive amounts of data. Therefore, data is the “Intelligence” (Intel).

- **End of the software release cycle**: software should be considered as a service and a product that can never keep up to date with all the changing information. So the service concept keeps the data relevant (and the harnessed decision accurate) by accessing as many sources as possible.

- **Software above the level of a single device**: more devices to capture information and a better flow of information between these devices leads to a higher degree of collective intelligence.

- **Rich user experiences**: a rich user experience is necessary to enable better web applications, leading to more web usage and better information flow on the web. This leads to a more “Intelligent” web (O’Reilly, 2005).

Habib (2006) developed a Library 2.0 brainstorming chart (Figure 2.8) to gather ideas on the effects of Web 2.0 on the library. The left-hand column is a list of Web 2.0 concepts, which are based on the seven Web 2.0 principles of O’Reilly (2005). The right-hand column lists the general categories of library services, and the middle column lists possible questions or effects of Web 2.0 concepts on library services. One can pick a general concept of Web 2.0 from the left and a general library service on the right, and then ask each of the questions posed in the centre. The same exercises might be conducted to create a list of possible effects of Web 2.0 on the library (Habib, 2006).
By carrying out the method mentioned above, Habib (2006) developed a model of Academic Library 2.0 as shown in Figure 2.9.
Habib’s model includes interaction types and places. All of the interactions occur in both physical and virtual places. The scale at the bottom of the model highlights some of the key spectra that lie between a student’s social and academic lives. The library inhabits a space somewhere in the middle ground between these extremes (Habib, 2006). It is interesting that while the academic environment is formal, the social one is informal. This Library 2.0 model covers not only the academic but also social aspect of student (user) lives, which occur in both physical and virtual spaces.

However, Habib’s model has its own shortcomings. While it presents the outline of Library 2.0 together with some explanations, it does not show the interactions between patrons and other stakeholders (i.e., librarians). In addition, the researcher did not provide the complete list of the questions that were included in the Library 2.0 brainstorming chart, therefore the method of model development is not so clear. Furthermore, once the questions were developed, the researcher did not explain how to gain the answers (or the effects of Web 2.0 on the library), or provide a list of answers. Hence, this model needs to be further developed and expanded to provide a fuller understanding and to cover other aspects of Academic Library 2.0.

### 2.5.4 Practical models

Some Library 2.0 models have been applied in practice. For example, Yang, Wei and Peng (2009) analysed and described a subsection circulatory management (SCM) model of Library 2.0 that is already applied in a university library. The researchers clarified differences between the traditional library management model and the SCM model of Library 2.0. They suggested that a Library 2.0 system should be constructed in the form of modules or layers instead of linear management, as tended to happen in library models of the past. The ideas for designing Library 2.0 system architecture include:

- **Close combination with digital library**: the digital libraries should be embedded closely in the Library 2.0 system

- **Personalised services and management for patrons and librarians**: library users should be able to customise and personalise their services
- **Comprehensive integration of knowledge services**: knowledge services are the core of the library's construction. The Library 2.0 system should integrate all services.

- **Uniform authentication system**: an important component of the Library 2.0 system.

Based on the ideas above, Yang, et al. (2009) visualised the system architecture of Library 2.0 with five layers as shown in Figure 2.10.

![Figure 2.10 - System architecture of Library 2.0 (Yang, et al., 2009, p. 289)](image)

- **Hardware foundation layer**: the hardware infrastructure of the system
- **System layer**: network operating systems, database management system and other platforms
- **Resource and data layer**: information resources of all types in the library
- **Service management layer**: business flows of library management
- **Knowledge service layer**: the user-oriented or service display layer.
According to Yang, et al. (2009), the two lower layers – the hardware foundation layer and the system layer – can be adopted directly by libraries because of the maturity of the technology solution. However, the other three layers need to be designed and developed in a specific manner to best suit specific libraries. The authors also state that the SCM Library 2.0 model is not formally accepted by the library circle; however, it is a practical example for the library community to refer to when create their own Library 2.0 models (Yang, et al., 2009).

Another practical example of the Library 2.0 model was proposed by Pienaar and Smith (2008). The researchers described and discussed how a university library develops their Library 2.0 model. Practically, the model was adapted from the Web 2.0 meme map of O’Reilly (2005). Based on the original Web 2.0 meme map, the authors modified and added several components to form a Library 2.0 service model as presented in Figure 2.11.

![Figure 2.11 - Library 2.0 service model (Pienaar & Smith, 2008, p. 8)](image)

The model by Pienaar and Smith (2008) appears in a form very similar to the Web 2.0 meme map of O’Reilly (2005) with some slight modifications for suitability with their own libraries. The researchers present the model without adequate information on the procedure or how they modified the Web 2.0 model to suit their needs. Furthermore, there is no discussion of the different components, or of the interactions.
among the components of the model. Therefore, it is not easy for other libraries to further develop, expand, or adopt this model.

Similar to Yang, et al.’s (2009) SCM Library 2.0 model, the Library 2.0 model by Pienaar and Smith (2008) is a description of the practice. The difference is that Yang, et al.’s (2009) model focuses on architectural aspects of Library 2.0 while Pienaar and Smith’s (2008) model illustrates the current situation of their library. Both models are abstract, as they do not provide detailed explanation and interpretation. In addition, they just report on what has been adopted in a specific library; therefore, it is unlikely that other libraries can adopt these models.

As an attempt to see the degree of development of the available Library 2.0 theories and models, they are set against Bates’s (2005) opinion about model and theory. It is recognised that the existing Library 2.0 theories and models are still in the early stage of development. None of them (including the work that is labelled as Library 2.0 theory) are genuine theories. Rather, they are preliminary models, or models that require further studies to develop. Notably, most of them are not empirically devised; therefore, they appear to be a list of principles, essentials, or themes related to Library 2.0. They do not demonstrate relations and interrelations between and among parts or dimensions of the models. The loosely woven nature of the proposed models means that discussions of the models are mainly in the form of a description of the phenomenon. Hence, the understanding that they provide is not profound.

It is notable that though Library 2.0 models might or might not be empirically based, the literature has demonstrated differences or changes in comparison to the previous generation of library (i.e., the traditional library). Whatever labels the library is assigned, it is important to acknowledge the changes that have been made in the last 10 years when Web 2.0 and Library 2.0 were born. Section 2.6 below will portray such changes in the Library 2.0 era.

2.6 CHANGES IN RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIBRARIES AND USERS

Librarians and users are two main stakeholders in libraries. There has been always a relationship between them, but this relationship has changed in the period of Library 2.0, when Web 2.0, social media, and associated technologies began to be used in libraries (Nguyen et al., 2012). It is important to be aware of the change, how it has
occurred, and whether or not these technologies make libraries better. The primary changes in libraries will be discussed below.

2.6.1 Enhanced interaction and communication

Improving the rapport between libraries and users is one of the significant changes in the Library 2.0 era. Libraries have made use of Web 2.0, social media, and associated technologies and tools to enhance interaction and communication with library users. Based on a study of drivers and impacts of emerging technologies on academic libraries, Shoniwa and Hall (2007) suggested that it is important to be aware of the relationship between libraries and users. Holmberg et al. (2009) found that interactivity is the most important building block of the library and this is catalysed by social web technologies. In addition, other scholars also point out different ways libraries adopt to enhance connection and communication with users. For example, using social networks to develop crucial community relationships with users (Connell, 2009; Ganster & Schumacher, 2009; Phillips, 2011; Sump-Crethar, 2012); reaching out to users to get them involved in library services (Sodt & Summey, 2009; Wan, 2011); encouraging communication and the sharing of information (Bosque, et al., 2012; Chen, Chu, & Xu, 2012). It is stressed that this two-way and social interaction is dynamic and it helps libraries better establish and strengthen the relationship with users (Stephens, 2007b). Importantly, this cohort includes not only the current but also potential library users (Casey & Savastinuk, 2007).

2.6.2 User's role has been transformed

Another important change is the role of library users. Under the influence of emerging technologies, users can to take part in a wide range of activities in the library. Stephens (2006b) believed that “libraries have historically been places to receive information but with some rare exceptions, less places to contribute information” (p. 12). Now, users are no longer conventional consumers of information and services but contributors, co-creators and disseminators. The consumption and creation of content is dynamic, and therefore the roles of librarians and users are not always clear (Maness, 2006a). Users can now take part in (co)creation of content and the development of library services. For example, a study by Xu et al. (2009) indicated that information in web-based service spaces is generated and contributed by both users and librarians. Users play an active role in
content creation. They are also active information disseminators through social media environments such as Facebook, Twitter, and blogs. Their engagement, activeness, and enthusiasm create multiple-way information flow in the library community, and this kind of information is referred to as Information 2.0 (Xu, et al., 2009). In addition, users are able to be involved in the job of cataloguers by reviewing, tagging, and bookmarking (Gordon-Murnane, 2006; Steele, 2009), collection development (Reynolds, Pickett, Vanduinkerken, Smith, Harrell, & Tucker, 2010), and improvement of services by contributing constructive feedback and suggestions (Curran, et al., 2006; Mahmood & Richardson, 2011). Indeed, they are no longer passive users but active participants. They are collaborating clients rather than consuming customers (Hall, 2011).

2.6.3 Improvement of users’ rights and power

Since the centrality of the user is intensified, users’ rights and power are also increased. According to Maness (2006a, 2006b), user-centredness is one of the essentials of Library 2.0. In collaboration with others and with librarians, users can create information content, services, and virtual communities for libraries. Such communities encourage users to be more dynamic in the consumption and creation of content and services. As a result, the users become more important stakeholders in the library. Similarly, Casey and Savatinuk (2006) emphasised that libraries have changed and users have become the heart of the library. Users are encouraged to participate in the creation and development of both physical and virtual services. Such services are usually called user-driven (Reynolds, et al., 2010) or user-centred services (Connaway, Hood, Lanclos, White, & Le Cornu, 2013; Harbo & Hansen, 2012).

There is no doubt that library users are being offered more power. According to Maness (2006a), “as communities change, libraries must not only change with them, they must allow users to change the library” (para. 12). In practice, users are taking more control over the library services and library operations. They now have more power and influence on libraries. Libraries become more open and users are more involved. The control of data and library services has been handed over to users to a certain extent. For instance, users can join in the process of acquisition by reviewing, commenting, and suggesting resources for purchase (Hodges, Preston, & Hamilton,
2010; Levine-clark, 2010; Nixon, Freeman, & Ward, 2010; Reynolds, et al., 2010). Also, they can customise and personalise their library pages and OPAC interface to suit their own needs, and contribute to the development of library policies and services via a wide range of tools like blogs, wikis, and social networking sites (Breeding & Kroski, 2010; Chua & Goh, 2010; Harinarayana & Raju, 2009; Wilson, 2007). Stephens and Collins (2007) stressed that “we are no longer in a time when librarians can decide what is best for the users” (p. 255). The users should tell us what they need, what they want, and what they can do for the libraries. In an open conversation mode, the opinions of users are welcomed and embraced. The users are engaged in planning library services, evaluating services, and suggesting improvements. Undoubtedly, users have been allowed to change the library (Maness, 2006a, 2006b).

2.7 PARTICIPATION IN LIBRARIES

2.7.1 Participation

Prior to the emergence of Web 2.0 technologies, user participation in the operation of academic libraries has existed in certain forms. For example, academic staff provide reading list recommendations to subject librarians, library users suggest their desired books, or contribute their opinions on library services (Lankes et al., 2007a; Stephens, 2006b). Web 2.0 technologies have opened new opportunities for users to be more involved in the library operation and participation is acknowledged as the key element in contemporary libraries. For example, at the 2006 Computers in Libraries conference, Fichter (2006) defined Library 2.0 by a formula: Library 2.0 = (Books ’n stuff + people + radical trust) x Participation

The formula can be understood as follows:

- “Books ’n stuff”: libraries have been providing access to materials for a long time
- “People”: libraries also have librarians and staff to serve users
- “Radical trust” and “Participation” are the concepts that are necessary to deal with in the Library 2.0 setting. Libraries need to demonstrate their trust in users and staff. The trust will make participation possible. The participation
should be at all levels: by library staff, by library users, and within library systems.

It is clear that Fichter emphasised the importance of participation in Library 2.0. Participation implies the involvement of library users in the process of creation and development of programs, services, and operation of the library. Participation is a must-have component of a Library 2.0. Without participation, and its enabler, trust, libraries will remain as they were in the past.

Participation in the library was also discussed by Casey and Savastinuk (2006, 2007). They define Library 2.0 as a model for constant and purposeful change that empowers library users through participatory and user-driven services, and seeks to improve services to current users and to reach potential users. In this definition, the authors affirmed that participatory and user-driven services are characteristics of Library 2.0. Users are able to take part in the design and development of services and shape them to best suit their demands. The participation here is described in terms of a service model rather than a library model. The authors also stressed the important role of users. In Library 2.0, user participation is one of the three essential ingredients (besides constant and purposeful change, and reaching current and future users).

The ideas of participation or involvement are further supported by other scholars. Participation means users are involved in planning library services, evaluating those services and suggesting improvements (Stephens & Collins, 2007). Likewise, a study by Holmberg, et al. (2009) upheld this idea by saying Library 2.0 enables “a new culture of participation catalysed by social web technologies” (p. 677). In addition, another study by Xu, et al. (2009) again highlighted the crucial role of user engagement in library operation. They posited that interaction, collaboration, and participation are essentials of the modern library. Users are able to contribute to the development of the library. They work in collaboration with librarians to create user-driven services and therefore they participate in the operation of the library (Xu, et al., 2009).
2.7.2 Participatory library

“Participatory library” is believed to be a more evolved version of Library 2.0. The term “participatory library” was first introduced by Lankes and Silverstein (2006) and widely presented by Lankes et al. (2007b) at the Sixth International Conference on Conceptions of Library and Information Science, “Featuring the Future”, in a paper titled “Participatory networks: the library as conversation”. Essentially, the authors underpinned their idea of participatory library with the “Conversation Theory”. The foundation of conversation theory is that knowledge is created through conversation. In other words, the core of conversation theory is very simple: people learn through conversation. In addition, libraries are in the knowledge business. Therefore, libraries are in the conversation business (Lankes et al., 2007b).

The idea of participatory networks is that the library is regarded as a facilitator of conversations in which current library systems, social networks, and Web 2.0 will enable stakeholders (librarians, library staff, library users, and community) to take part in conversations (Lankes et al., 2007b). The authors anticipated the development trend of library as follows (Figure 2.12).

![Figure 2.12 - Roadmap of how the library might make the transition from current systems to a truly participatory system Lankes et al. (2007b)](image_url)

Along the left side of the graph are systems that can be found on today’s library websites. The authors claimed that such systems are somewhat discrete. Therefore, it is not easy for users to navigate these systems for their information needs due to the
confusion. It is also a burden for library staff to operate and maintain the systems. The solution is to integrate systems, combining the best of each while discarding the complexity of the whole. The library is in the midst of the transition to the participatory library where there are only two large collections: the community repository and the enhanced catalogue. The community repository contains digital content, which is built by the library and its users collaboratively. The enhanced catalogue includes metadata, both formal and user-created (such as ratings, commentary, use data and the like). The use of social networking tools and Web 2.0 in current library systems sits at the periphery of the library. The true change must come from incorporating participatory concepts into the heart of the library (Lankes et al., 2007b).

Although the authors did not compare Library 2.0 to participatory library, they implied that participatory library is a more evolved version in comparison to Library 2.0. The use of social networking tools and Web 2.0 in current library systems sits at the periphery of the library. The true change must come from incorporating participatory concepts into the heart of the library (Lankes et al., 2007b). Such participatory concepts are further developed in “The atlas of new librarianship” (Lankes, 2011) that defines the future field of librarianship. He emphasises that there have to be significant changes in the worldview of libraries and librarians, especially in the way they conceive themselves, their mission, and their tasks. He challenges librarians (and libraries) to be facilitators of knowledge creation and states, “The mission of librarians is to improve society through facilitating knowledge creation in their communities” (p. 14). The idea is that facilitating knowledge creation must go beyond providing access to sources of knowledge. Libraries and librarians are under pressure to be active facilitators that create encouraging spaces and allow library clients to take part in the dynamic process of knowledge creation. Libraries and librarians should allow library clients to participate in the establishment, ongoing development, and operation of programs and services, as part of the client use of libraries to create knowledge. The new librarianship is therefore open to change, action oriented, and to be participatory.
2.8 CHAPTER CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed a review of literature that was conducted in two phases (at the beginning of the research, and after the data collection and analysis stages). The chapter has presented a range of topics closely relevant to this study. The review of literature has revealed that the publications on Library 2.0 are abundant. It has also found some significant issues, as follows.

Library 2.0 is an ambiguous term and now dated. There are a diverse range of views and even contradictions on the concept of Library 2.0. Library 2.0 used to be a hot topic that attracted a considerable number of scholars and practitioners. However, the heyday of Library 2.0 is past. This is evidenced by Brantley (2010) and Crawford’s (2011) data showing that publications on Library 2.0 reached a peak in 2007 and 2008 and then declined.

Another notable issue is that some Library 2.0 “models” have been devised or emerged among a large number of Library 2.0 publications. However, most of them are not based on empirical studies. The development of these models is primarily based on literature review, Web 2.0 principles, and the personal understanding and experiences of the researchers and practitioners. There is only one model that is empirically developed. However, it is not based on a key stakeholder in libraries (i.e., users). Rather, it is based on ideas provided by researchers and practitioners whose perspective may be different from that of users (the centre of the library).

The review of literature also reveals a change during the period of Library 2.0 in the relationship that users have with libraries and librarians. The most significant change occurred in the interaction and communication between libraries and users, which is enhanced thanks to the advantages of Web 2.0, social media, and associated tools and technologies. Other significant areas of change include the transformation of the user’s role. It means that users are no longer conventional consumers of information and library services. Instead, they are able and allowed to be involved in the job of librarians; therefore, the line between users and librarians become blurred. This practice, again, results from the adoption of Web 2.0, social media, and associated tools and technologies. This practice also helps to increase the rights and power of users.
The change in the relationship between libraries and users, the multiple roles users play, and the promotion of users’ rights, demonstrate the fact that users have had opportunities to participate in the business of libraries. Hence, the key issue here is the participation. Whilst technology has been the stimulus for a new type of library service, it is important that participation must sit at its core. The participation must be carried out at the core of the library rather than the periphery (Lankes & Silverstein, 2006). Nevertheless, though some literature emphasises the importance of participation in the library, the majority of the discourse has a strong focus on technological aspects (i.e., how to use tools and emerging technologies in libraries). The important issues, such as, for instance, how tools and technologies allow librarians and library users to do (i.e., participation), remain unexplored.

The “participatory library” (Lankes & Silverstein, 2006) brings to light a model of the library that reflects the nature of the contemporary library – the post-Library 2.0 generation. While the “participatory library” idea has been around for six or seven years, no empirical studies on this library model have been identified. In order to understand what the level of the library evolution is and how the library practice is changing, it is necessary to further investigate what the participatory library means in the context of contemporary libraries, how participatory library changes the library practice and the way libraries perform their role or librarians do their job. In brief, empirical studies are in need to answer the question of “what is the (a) participatory university library?” The next chapter will delineates the research methodology and the design of this study.
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3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes and justifies the qualitative research paradigm and the grounded theory methodology that were selected for this study. The chapter consists of five main sections. The first section describes the philosophical approach that directs the study. Next, the chapter describes grounded theory and justifies the Straussian grounded theory approach. It then delineates the data collection process, which includes identifying and accessing participants, the development of data collection instruments, interviews, transcription, and translation. This is followed by a depiction of data analysis that includes open coding, axial coding, selective coding, memoing, theoretical sensitivity, sampling, and saturation. Finally, the chapter demonstrates the trustworthiness of the study by setting this research against criteria for judgement of a grounded theory.

3.2 PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

Considering the philosophical orientation is a crucial step before choosing a specific research methodology. According to Corbin and Strauss (2008), philosophical orientation is “a worldview that underlies and informs methodology and methods” (p. 1). Meanwhile, the worldview or research paradigm (the terms are usually used interchangeably), as stated by Bryman (1988), is “a cluster of beliefs and dictates which for scientists in a particular discipline influence what should be studied, how research should be done, how results should be interpreted, and so on” (p. 4). Similarly, Guba (1990) concisely defines a paradigm as “a basic set of beliefs that guide action” (p. 17). Put another way, a research paradigm is the way in which the researcher sees or reflects the world. The worldview of the researcher will reflect the way the research is designed, how data is collected and analysed, and how the research results are presented.

Interpretivism is one of the major research paradigms. Interpretivist researchers believe that there is no single, tangible reality. Instead, there are only the complex, multiple realities of the individual (Flick, 2002). In addition, Lincoln and Guba (1985) highlight the important interaction that exists between the interpretivist
researchers and the object of study. They argue that the results of the investigation are a product of interaction between the object and the investigator. The construction of reality is investigated in its own right and is interpreted by the investigator.

This research adopted a qualitative research approach. According to Pickard (2007), the choice of a research paradigm implies a research methodology, meaning that the follower of interpretivism will have a qualitative approach. As stated by Creswell (1994), qualitative research is “an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting” (p. 2). Qualitative research attempts to understand and make sense of phenomena from the participant’s perspective. The researcher can approach the phenomenon from an interpretive and critical stance. The key feature of qualitative research is that it looks for meaning and understanding of the phenomenon. The researcher is perceived to be the primary instrument of data collection and analysis. The qualitative research has an inductive investigative strategy, and the product is a rich description of the phenomenon (Merriam, 1998).

The characteristics of qualitative research fit very well with the current research, which seeks an understanding of the participatory library from the stakeholder’s perspective (e.g., those who are the key people participating in the library such as librarians and library users). It allows the researcher to “enter into the world of participants, to see the world from their perspective and in doing so make discoveries that will contribute to the development of empirical knowledge” (Corbin and Strauss 2008, p. 16). It enables the researcher to deeply interact with and participate in data collection to exploit the intangible knowledge and lived experience that is not always documented and available in physical formats. Therefore, it helps to uncover the meaning or nature of experience of librarians and library users to generate a theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

3.3 GROUNDED THEORY

3.3.1 Grounded theory: introduction and rationale

Grounded theory is defined as “the discovery of theory from data systematically obtained from social research” (Glaser & Strauss 1967, p. 2). It allows the researcher to systematically develop a theory based on what is “grounded” in the empirical data
(Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Pickard, 2007). In other words, and as the Grounded Theory Online website (2009) explains, grounded theory enables the researcher to develop a theory that offers an explanation of the main concern of the population of a substantive area and how that concern is resolved or processed. Hence, the main aim of grounded theory is to generate or discover a theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This feature is particularly suitable for a research area where little knowledge or no research is available (the shortage of knowledge in this area is discussed in detail in Chapter 2 – Literature review).

Grounded theory, according to Strauss and Corbin (1990), means that the theory is inductively derived from data. The theory is discovered, developed and provisionally verified through a systematic process of data gathering and analysis, in which data collection and analysis inform one another. They also outline the process of advancing theory throughout the process by memo writing. Memo writing is a way to capture and explore the developing conceptual categories, properties and dimensions and to conceptualise the relationships among them. Strauss and Corbin also emphasise the theoretical sampling that is used to test the emerging categories. Theoretical sampling allows the researcher to seek data to further develop emerging theory (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998).

The discovery of a grounded theory is guided by several key principles. In practice, there are different versions or schools of grounded theory. However, all versions have some features in common. Overall, the major principles of grounded theory are:

- Conducting data collection and analysis simultaneously
- Constructing analytic codes and categories from data, not from reconceived logically deduced hypothesis
- Using the constant comparative technique
- Advancing theory development during each step of data collection and analysis
- Memo writing to elaborate upon categories, specify their properties, define relationships between categories, and identify gaps
After considering possible approaches (see Appendix A), it was found that grounded theory best suits the nature, focus, and purpose of this research project. This research set out to answer the question, what is the (a) participatory university library? The research aims was to explore the nature of user participation in the contemporary library and investigate the relationship between libraries and users. The purpose is to devise a mode reflecting the best practice of participation and the library-user relationship.

### 3.3.2 History of grounded theory and its development

Grounded theory was developed in the 1960s (Glaser & Strauss, 1965) and it was officially described by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss in *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* in 1967 (Mansourian, 2006; Selden, 2005; Tan, 2010). The goal of this original and seminal text was to help researchers to generate a theory that is derived from data. This approach was seen as a revolution at the time because it challenged the superiority of the quantitative research model in social science in terms of its artificial divisions between theory and research, and in the interior role assigned to qualitative research (Charmaz, 2000, p. 511).

It is noteworthy that the two originators of grounded theory have very different research backgrounds. Glaser grew up with positivist tradition at Columbia University where he trained in the use of quantitative survey methods. In contrast, Strauss was affected by the empirical tradition of University of Chicago where he completed his PhD (Cooney, 2010). Glaser’s positivist position acknowledges a single objective truth. Meanwhile, Strauss’s interpretivist position believes that the truth is subjective and is created within a particular moment. This difference is the reason for their bifurcation later years.

In the nearly 50 years since its inception, grounded theory has evolved into three major schools:

o Strauss and Corbin (or Straussian grounded theory) (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998)

o Charmaz (or constructivist grounded theory) (Charmaz, 2000, 2006)

The disagreement between Glaser and Strauss-Corbin centres on their different beliefs about and approaches to data analysis. Glaser is faithful to the original version of grounded theory, whereas Strauss and Corbin reformulate the original version (Cooney, 2010, p. 19). Glaser (1992, 1998) maintains that the researcher should play the role of the objective observer in order to generate theory directly from the data. The theory should naturally emerge, without force. In contrast, Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) hold the view that grounded theory should be verified and legitimately influenced by the researcher’s experience. Strauss and Corbin seek to make the data analysis process more structured and approachable for researchers. They assert that the original approach to grounded theory is too general and does not define the data analysis process in enough detail. Therefore, Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) propose a more pragmatic approach with structured guidelines for theory building.

Charmaz’s constructivist grounded theory emerges as the third major school. It is a contemporary revision of Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) and Glaser’s (1978) classic stances on grounded theory. Constructivist grounded theory assumes a relativist approach. It acknowledges multiple standpoints and realities of both the researcher and the participants. It also takes a reflexive stance toward the actions, situations, and participants in the field setting, and constructions of them in data analyses (Charmaz, 2000; Morse, Stern, Corbin, Bowers, Charmaz, & Clarke, 2009). Mills, Bonner, and Francis (2006) note that constructivist grounded theory considers the researcher as the participant’s partner in the research process rather than as an objective analyst of the subject’s experience. This mutual relationship is crucial in the construction process of grounded theory. Charmaz’s approach is criticised by Glaser (2002), who asserts that constructivist grounded theory is Charmaz’s misnomer. The close involvement of the researcher in the research process would prevent the theory naturally emerging from data.
Being aware of the differences among grounded theory versions provides a more complex picture of the methodology. Such an understanding can help to enrich the application of the methodology to the research problem.

3.3.3. Straussian grounded theory

This research adopted a Strauss and Corbin grounded theory approach, known as Straussian grounded theory. The following main texts were used as guidelines for the research:


While Straussian grounded theory is a systematic approach, it allows a flexible use of literature during the research process. This pragmatic approach is used widely. Dey (1999) states that the book of Strauss and Corbin (1998) has become the standard introduction to grounded theory in place of the original text of Glaser and Strauss in 1967.

It should be noted however that there is no right or wrong choice. Ultimately the choice of which grounded theory school to adopt should be based upon what is suitable given the nature of the research problem, the purpose, and context of the research. Once the choice of school has been made, the key to success, i.e., quality research outcomes, is strictly following the chosen approach’s principles and guidelines.

The establishment of the participatory library model went through the following five stages (see Figure 3.1).
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Figure 3.1 - Straussian grounded theory process of developing a participatory library model (adapted from Harwood (2001))

Generally, the process of the participatory library model development consisted of five stages. As illustrated in Figure 3.1, the research was started with an identification of an area of interest in Stage I. The area of interest was presented in terms of research aims and objectives. A review of the literature was conducted in Stage II. The purpose of stage II was to set up a background for the development of the research instrument as well as identifying gaps in existing knowledge including current models or methods used in previous studies. Stage III included four smaller steps named III.a, III.b, III.c, and III.d. The four steps occurred concurrently until a point of saturation was reached (e.g., no more gaps in the categories or no new information emerging from the data). The saturation point was reached after 16 interviews and then the participatory library model was developed through sorting memos, outlining the model structure, and writing the storyline in Stage IV. When the participatory library model was fully developed and explained, an extra task,
Stage V, was carried out. This involved relating the findings of the research to the existing literature in order to identify the commonalities and variations, which in turn revealed the new contribution of this research to the knowledge.

Specifically, in the stage of identification of the interest area, the researcher was interested in the broad area of Web 2.0 and its implications for academic libraries. The researcher was fascinated by the thought of exploring the potential that this new and emerging technology has to bring about changes in libraries. The research problem was presented in Chapter 1 of this document. In addition, the purpose of the research was also defined. They are the basis for the implementation of the next stages.

In the second stage of the research, a preliminary literature review was carried out. As this research adopted Straussian grounded theory, doing an early review of literature in the interest area is encouraged in the early stage of study (see details in Chapter 2, Section 2.2 – Role of literature in grounded theory). The early engagement with literature, according to Strauss and Corbin (1998, p. 49-52), is beneficial. It helps the researcher to enhance sensitivity, formulate and stimulate questions in data analysis, and suggest theoretical sampling. A preliminary review of literature was carried out that helped to:

- Shape the research problem and the research question
- Develop a research proposal and obtain ethics committee approval to undertake the study
- Identify gaps in knowledge that earlier research has not addressed
- Identify gaps in the research methodologies used in previous research
- Provide a background for the development of data collection instruments.

It should be noted that there is no right or wrong choice of a specific grounded theory version. The choice should be based upon what is suitable given the nature of the research problem, the context of the research, and the experience of the researcher. This pragmatic approach is widely adopted among researchers. Dey (1999) reveals that the book of Strauss and Corbin (1998) has become the standard introduction to grounded theory in place of the original text of Glaser and Strauss in 1967.
In addition to the early review of literature, data collection and data analysis were the key stages of this research. Sections 3.4 and 3.5 below will provide more details about these.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION

In qualitative research, “it is necessary to locate excellent participants to obtain excellent data” (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007, p. 231). Glaser (1978) states that in grounded theory, “all is data” (p. 8). Data may be drawn from a range of sources, such as interviews, observations, documents, and in any combination. Common methods for gathering data in grounded theory include interviews, focus groups, and observation, with interviews being the most widely adopted (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Creswell, 2007). This research chose to conduct in-depth individual interviews in order to gather empirical data for the development of a participatory library model.

3.4.1 Participants

Identifying participants

In order to determine suitable participants for data collection, a question was asked, “What sort of data is needed for the research?” The answer to this question would suggest the most suitable participants who could provide rich data for the research. The preliminary literature review revealed that whilst no participatory library model had been developed, the existing Library 2.0 models appeared to lack empirical evidence. As this study aimed to empirically establish a participatory library model for universities, it needed to gather data about the knowledge, understanding, and experience of the related stakeholders. Librarians and library users were identified as the key stakeholders in libraries who were the most appropriate for interviews.

As a step of identifying participants, the research used 163 public and non-public universities in Vietnam (Ministry of Education and Training, 2011) as the site for data collection. Each university may have more than one campus library. Basically, the library’s organisational structure includes three main levels. The top level is for the library management board including a library director and one or two deputy directors. The second level includes managers and deputy managers who are in charge of specific sections in the library (for instance, the ICT section, the...
information service section, and the cataloguing section). Under each section, there are staff members who usually do not hold a managerial position.

The rationale for the choice of this site was that the researcher used to be a library professional and a lecturer in Vietnam for about ten years. Therefore, it was more likely that he would be able to access rich-information cases (i.e., librarians and library users). In this research, “librarians” refers to the key personnel, such as directors, managers and technicians, who are involved in the design and delivery of library programs and services. “Library users” include undergraduate students, academic staff, and professional staff who are active in and experienced with the university libraries. Details of the participants are described in Chapter 4.

**Ethical clearance**

Ethical clearance was received from the Human Research Ethics Committee of Queensland University of Technology (Approval number: 100000984) in 2011. This research followed a QUT standard procedure in order to ensure the rights of all participants are protected during the research process. Participants were well informed of the research and signed the consent form before taking part in the interviews.

**Selecting and accessing participants**

This research used a theoretical sampling technique (see a detailed discussion in Section 3.5.6 – Theoretical sampling and saturation) to recruit participants. According to Corbin & Strauss (2008):

> Theoretical sampling is a method of data collection based on concepts/themes derived from data. The purpose of theoretical sampling is to collect data from places, people, and events that will maximise opportunities to develop concepts in terms of their properties and dimensions, uncover variations, and identify relationships between concepts. (p. 143)

Theoretical sampling was not a one-off task. Rather, it was part of the entire process of data collection. Because data collection and data analysis occurred concurrently, theoretical sampling was applied until categories reached a point of saturation, at which point the model was well developed (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).
Sampling in this research was purposeful and targeted. As mentioned above, participants involved in this research were librarians and users. With regard to the librarian participants, the first one was my colleague. After the first interview, this librarian was asked to recommend several potential participants. In parallel with this, the first interview was analysed and the results (i.e., emerged concepts) were used to inform the selection of the subsequent participant within the recommended pool of potential participants. After each interview, the participant was asked to recommend one or two potential participants. As the data collection progressed, the number of potential participants in the pool increased and this helped me to select the next suitable participant for interview.

In relation to library user participants, the researcher made use of a consultative team (including librarian participants and colleagues of mine) who were working in university libraries in Vietnam. Discussion with these consultants enabled me to locate information-rich informants who had positive attitudes, were active in library activities, and were able to contribute to the research. The consultants could identify such users through users’ seminars organised by libraries. The first user participant also suggested several potential user participants for subsequent interviews. The process was similar to that applied to librarian participants.

This strategy provided me with an abundant number of participants for interviews. At the end of the data collection stage, there were 35 participants in the pool. Of these, 16 participants were interviewed, and the rest either refused or were determined not to provide the best case for the research.

The process of recruitment of both librarian and user participants involved an invitation via email. The recruitment email (Appendix B) included an information sheet for participants (Appendix C), a participant’s profile (Appendix D), and a consent form (Appendix E). The participants were given an opportunity to have their questions answered before they decided whether to take part in the interview. Once they agreed to participate, they signed the consent form and returned it to me and then the interview was scheduled. As soon as each interview was completed, it was transcribed, translated, and analysed. The emerging concepts and categories were the basis for the selection of the next interview. The process was reiterated until all categories were well developed and fully explained.
3.4.2 Developing of data collection instruments

Interview is the most widely adopted technique by grounded theorists (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Creswell, 2007). In order to gather empirical data for the development of a participatory library model, an interview guideline (Appendix F) and interview questions were developed. The development of these data collection instruments was based on the preliminary literature review. Because the researcher was also a research instrument as he directly interacted with participants in the conversation, his interview skills and techniques were also honed via conducting the pre-test and pilot interviews (details are discussed in Appendix G – Pre-test and pilot study).

With regard to interview questions, there were two sets (one for librarians and another one for library users). The standard interview questions used for librarian interviews are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What can you tell me about your experience with using new and emerging technology such as blogs, Twitter, YouTube, and smart phones as a librarian?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What can you tell me about the way the library uses new and emerging technology such as blogs, Twitter, YouTube, and smart phones in designing and delivering library services and programs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. [We have been talking about the use of social media like Twitter, smart phones etc. to engage users in a more participatory way by both you as a librarian and the library more broadly]. Without such technologies, can library users and library staff become more active participants and how?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 - Interview questions for librarian participants

The main purpose of the first question was to learn about the experience of the participant in their role as a university librarian. It was assumed that many participants would find it easier to discuss their own individual experiences before moving into the experience of the library (broader) in the second question. The third question was often asked when the participant had already answered the first two questions and other probing questions. This question was designed to explore further information about non-technical aspects that were not discussed in the first two questions.

These interview questions served as a starting point for each interview. During the interview, a series of follow-up questions were asked in order to exploit further
information. The follow-up questions were based on the concepts and categories that emerged in the earlier interviews and on the interesting points that were mentioned by the participant during the interview. Importantly, the follow-up questions were usually not asked sequentially. This strategy allowed the participant to lead the conversation and talk comfortably without any concerns.

In order to ensure the interview questions functioned well, the questions were used in two pre-test interviews with two Australian university librarians and one pilot study with a Vietnamese librarian. The pre-tests and pilot helped the researcher to reflect on and adjust the questions that worked best in the main interviews. Details of the pre-test and pilot interviews and refinement of the interview questions are provided in Appendix G.

The interview questions for user participants were slightly different from those for librarians. Below are the three standard interview questions for library user participants.

1. What can you tell me about your experience with using new library services that are based upon emerging technologies such as blogs, Twitter, YouTube, and smartphones as a library user?

2. We have been talking about your experience in using and participating in Web 2.0 based library services such as blogs, Twitter, Facebook, and smartphones. Now, let’s temporarily forget technological issues. Have you ever played the role of an active participant (user) without using such technologies? If so, can you tell me about that experience?

3. If not, can you give me an example of a library service that allows users’ participation and contribution, but doesn’t involve technology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2 - Interview questions for user participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The aim of the first question was to learn about the experience of the participants in their roles as library users. The recruitment aimed to select participants who had used such types of services so that they would be able to share their opinions about these. The second question was often asked when the participant had already answered the first one and follow-up questions. It was designed to discover non-technical aspects that were not discussed earlier in the interview. The third question was intended to gather further information if the participants answered “no” to the second question.
In this case, they could still provide information based on their understanding, knowledge, or observation of the library practice.

In addition to the main questions, follow-up questions such as, “could you tell me more about this?” or “could you give me an example of that?” were also used to seek further explanation or to add details to an issue of interest. The interview questions and follow-up questions avoided use of terminology or jargon because “participatory library” and “Library 2.0” were not always terms with clear definitions. Lay language was also used in probing questions to orient participants to the phenomenon of study.

### 3.4.3 Gathering data: individual interviews

All interviews followed an interview protocol (see Appendix F). The interviews were conducted online via Skype. The voice recording tools MP3 Skype Recorder and Call Graph were utilised to record the interviews. These specialised software programs can catch streaming audio to ensure all interviews were recorded at the highest quality. After installation, these tools were configured in order to be able to automatically capture the Skype interview as soon as the conversation started. These tools were also set to operate in a silent mode so that both interviewer and participant was not distracted (the participants were informed about this before the interviews took place, and at the beginning of the interview session). The concurrent use of two recording tools decreased the risk of errors with the recording. When the Skype conversation stopped, each tool automatically saved the audio in an MP3 file format and in an indicated folder.

Each interview had an opening, middle, and end. Though participants completed and returned their participant’s profile to the researcher prior to the interview, each interview still began with the question, “could you please tell me about your role in the library?” or “could you tell me some information about yourself as a library user?” It was assumed that participants would find it comfortable to talk about these more general questions before moving to the main interview questions. The opening

---

1 Skype is a free, web-based communication tool that allows easy asynchronous exchange of voice, text and video ([http://www.skype.com](http://www.skype.com)).

2 Software applications designed to capture Skype conversations ([http://voipcallrecording.com](http://voipcallrecording.com)) and ([http://callgraph.biz/free-skype-recorder](http://callgraph.biz/free-skype-recorder))
stage of each interview focused on setting up a friendly atmosphere for the interview. The main stage of the interview included questions and answers occurring in a manner that was conversational but still enabled in-depth questioning. The interviewer was an active listener who noted down interesting points and then posed questions as the interview progressed for further information. Such a manner allowed the researcher to flexibly follow up with questions as the interview went on and helped participants to draw out and enrich their responses (Charmaz, 2006; Lloyd-Zantiotis, 2004). It also generated rich and detailed accounts of the individual’s experience. Furthermore, being flexible in the interview process allowed the discussion to lead to areas that may not have been considered prior to the interview, but which were relevant to the research (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Goulding, 2002).

The length of each interview was between 56 and 93 minutes, except for the pilot study interview. Ten librarians and six library users were interviewed. The sixteenth interview was the point at which no new information emerged. This was the point at which theoretical saturation occurred, all categories and related concepts were fully explained, and the participatory library model was established (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998). Details about saturation are provided in Section 3.5.6 – Theoretical sampling and saturation.

3.4.4 Transcription and translation

The researcher noted down immediate thoughts after each interview. These notes were a brief summary of and reflection on the interview (further details are discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.5.4 – Memoing. The notes captured the prominent ideas and concepts that stood out from the interview, which were usually demonstrated via the participant’s excitement, change of voice, and questions. The notes were made in the form of reflective rather than analytic thoughts, and were not used during the analysis of the interviews. Rather, the notes were referred to once the interviews were already analysed. This way helped to avoid the influence of the initial thoughts on the analysis, and sometimes it provided additional insights into analysis overall.

All audio-recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim by the researcher. The transcription activity made me familiar with the data and allowed a deeper interaction with the data. Then grammatical errors were fixed and interview noise or meaningless sounds (e.g., stutters, pauses, etc.) were removed. Apart from two
interviews with Australian librarians in the pre-test stage, all 16 interviews were carried out in Vietnamese. The transcripts of the interviews were then translated into English. Strauss and Corbin (1998) and Corbin and Strauss (2008) state that the translation of all transcripts is not necessary, as it is time consuming and the meanings might be lost in translation. They suggest to do “only minimal translating”, for instance, “key passages and their codes” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 285-286). The reason for minimal translation is that English-speaking readers can have some feeling about what the participant is saying and what the coding looks like (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). However, for this research a full translation of transcripts was decided upon because it served three main purposes. It provided the supervisory team with a better sense of what the interview was about, which enabled them to support me during the analysis process. Without the full translation and proper analysis, it would be hard to know which passage is important and which is not. The English versions of transcripts were also used for citation purposes in the stage of writing up the thesis. Importantly, the translation provided me with another opportunity to interact with the data and deeply think about it when looking for corresponding meanings. The translation was therefore very helpful for analysis.

### 3.5 DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis was firstly conducted in the original language. This helped to avoid the loss of meaningful data in translation (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The analysis was again conducted in the corresponding English transcript. This step was found very useful as it enabled the researcher to check over the earlier analysis. Adjustment was then made where there were variations between the two analyses. Each interview transcript was firstly done manually on paper. This allowed me to thoroughly read every piece of information, to critically analyse, and to assign appropriate concepts (codes). Once the analysis and cross-checking were completed, the English version of the transcript and its associated emerging concepts were entered into a software application named MAXQDA 10³ that helped to manage, extract, and visualise data.

Data collection and data analysis were carried out simultaneously. Though the presentation of the method appears to be linear, it was an ongoing and interwoven

---

³ MAXQDA is a professional software program for qualitative and mixed methods data analysis (http://www.maxqda.com/).
process, meaning that they informed one another. According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), this concurrence allows for “theoretical sampling on the basis of emerging concepts” and it “enables validation of concepts and hypotheses as these are being developed” (p. 46). The early analysis suggests future data collection and opens new avenues for further investigation (Grounded Theory Online, 2009). It is also emphasised that:

Analysis is the interplay between researchers and data. It is both science and art. It is science in the sense of maintaining a certain degree of rigor and by grounding analysis in data. Creativity manifests itself in the ability of researchers to aptly name categories, ask stimulating questions, make comparisons, and extract an innovative, integrated, realistic scheme from masses of unorganised raw data. (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 13)

Data analysis was started right after the first interview. A technique called “constant comparison” was applied throughout the analysis stage. The analysis procedure followed three steps including open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Below are details of each step.

3.5.1 Open coding

Open coding involves “breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualising, and categorising data” in terms of properties and dimensions (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 61). The purpose of this open coding step is to develop provisional concepts. Through the process of constant comparison, these concepts are integrated into categories. There are different ways of doing open coding such as word-by-word, line-by-line, and paragraph-by-paragraph. It is suggested that in the early stage of analysis, the analyst needs to examine data in a careful and detailed manner. This strategy, known as microanalysis, may be used in open coding and axial coding that helps to generate categories, their properties and dimensions, and to discover the relationships among them (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Because “doing microanalysis is an important step in theory development” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 71), a line-by-line and word-by-word approach was utilised in this early stage of analysis. Each word and line in the interview transcripts was read in search of the answer to the repeated questions such as “What is this about?”.
“What is this referring to?”, “What is the participant’s main concern?”, and “What category or property does this incident indicate?” The actual process involved picking up on a word or a line that appeared to be significant. Possible meanings were listed and validated against the text with the above questions in mind. A label, often referred to as concept, was then assigned to each piece of data. Figures 3.2 and 3.3 below show an example of open coding on paper and in the MAXQDA software.

Figure 3.2 - Example of open coding on paper

![Open coding on paper]

Figure 3.3 - Example of open coding in MAXQDA software

In addition to asking questions, the coding process was also involved in making comparison throughout the stages of analysis, which is known as constant comparison, in order to generate categories. Three main types of comparisons were made, including one piece of data to another (or incident to incident), concept to incident, and concept to concept. Such comparisons generated a list of concepts, which were repeatedly validated against the data and other concepts. The similar
concepts were then grouped to established tentative categories. Strauss and Corbin (1998) state that “grouping concepts into categories is important because it enables the analyst to reduce the number of units with which he or she is working” (p. 113). This makes it more manageable and possible for the analyst to make comparisons as the volume of concepts increases. Importantly, “the process of constant comparison stimulates thought that leads to both descriptive and explanatory categories” (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 334). Once some categories emerged from data, they were further validated and developed in subsequent interviews.

3.5.2 Axial coding

Axial coding is “a set of procedures whereby data are put back together in new ways after open coding, by making connections between categories” and by “relating categories to their sub-categories” (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 96). It is termed “axial” because coding occurs around the axis of a category, linking categories at the level of properties and dimensions (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 123). Procedurally, axial coding involves some basic tasks including:

- Laying out the properties of a category and their dimensions, a task that begins during open coding
- Relating a category to its subcategories through statements denoting how they are related to each other
- Looking for cues in the data that denote how major categories might relate to each other, and
- Identifying the variety of conditions, actions/interactions, and consequences associated with a phenomenon (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 126).

In axial coding the analyst must find the answers to the questions such as what, why, where, when, how, and with what results. Answering these questions helps to contextualise the phenomenon and adds depth and structure to it. In order to answer these questions, a matrix was developed to help organise data. Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) call this kind of matrix a paradigm, a conceptual analytic device that may be in the form of a mini framework, a matrix, or a graphical format. Table 3.3 below is an example of the paradigm used in the axial coding stage of this research. The development of these questions was based on the guidelines suggested by
Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) and the explanations made by Scott (2004) and Scott and Howell (2008). The matrix was constituted by questions as follows:

- What is (the name of category)? That is, what is “empowerment”?
- When does (the name of category) happen? That is, when does “empowerment” happen?
- Where does (the name of category) happen? That is, where does “empowerment” happen?
- Why does (the name of category) happen? That is, why does “empowerment” happen?
- How does (the name of category) happen? That is, how does “empowerment” happen?
- With what results/consequences does (the name of category) happen? Alternatively, with what results/consequences is (the name of category) understood? That is, with what results does “empowerment” happen?

Answers to the above questions were derived from the data. The matrix in Table 3.3 was under construction and it evolved throughout the analysis stages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>Why</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sharing, Connection, Peer support,</td>
<td>Collaboration, Looking for (peer) advice, Seeking partnership,</td>
<td>Community space, Users’ seminars and workshops,</td>
<td>Keeping informed, Seeking partnership, Enhancing service,</td>
<td>Being active, Empowering user, Playground establishment,</td>
<td>Library development, Getting involved, Reaching wider community,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Authority, Prosumption, Partnering,</td>
<td>Collaboration, Competition, Sharing job,</td>
<td>Virtual environment, Physical library space,</td>
<td>Enhancing service, New experience,</td>
<td>Listening to user’s opinions, Sharing job, Creating and developing content,</td>
<td>Better-tailored services, Equality, Favourable library environment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Playground, Comfort,</td>
<td>Using social networks, Perception, Facilitation,</td>
<td>Physical library environment, Virtual space, User services,</td>
<td>Enhancing service, Changing user view, Building community,</td>
<td>Listening to user’s opinions, Invitation, Creating a favourable environment,</td>
<td>Productiveness, Getting involved, Enhanced library experience,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Cat = Name of category; 1 = Community; 2 = Empowerment; 3 = Experience

*Table 3.3 - An example of emerging categories and conditional relationship matrix*

Based on the matrix above, relational statements were made to denote the ways in which a category was related to its sub-categories and associated concepts. Below is an example of a relational statement that demonstrates the internal relationships within a sub-category (i.e., connection).

*Connection* (what) occurs when librarians, users, and wider community members look for (peer) advice or seek for partnership (when). This practice happens in community space (where) and it happens because they want to be kept informed (why). Connection can take place thanks to the activeness of people (how), and this leads to the development of the library and involvement of people (consequences).

Each category might have many statements that demonstrate the relationships between the category and its associated concepts. This means that the number of statements depends upon the number of answers in each question. The more answers each question has, the more complex relationship it has. This matrix of conditional
relationship was developed until a saturation point was reached. It was the point at which no more answers were found in a new interview.

3.5.3 Selective coding

According to Corbin and Strauss (2008), as the aims of qualitative research are different, there are also different levels of analysis. The difference varies from description (depiction of data), to conceptual ordering (organising data in to discrete categories), to theorising (developing a model or a theory in which the categories and concepts are logically and closely related). Similarly, Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) state that the grounded theory procedure can stop after doing axial coding, if the researcher is only interested in theme or concept development. In order to devise a theory, it is necessary to carry out selective coding to gain a more complex and abstract level of analysis that helps to integrate the categories and concepts to generate a theory.

Selective coding is the process of selecting and identifying the core category and systematically relating it to other categories. It involves validating those relationships, filling in, refining, and developing categories that require further refinement and development. Ultimately, the theory or model is translated into the storyline that tells the complete story (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998). Three main themes – “community”, “empowerment” and “experience” – were selected and regarded as core categories of this study. The rationale behind this selection was that these themes appear frequently in the data. There were indicators pointing to them in all interviews. These categories selectively indicated the main concerns and preoccupations of the research participants, and other categories and concepts were related to them.

Selecting a core category was not easy. There were, however, a few ideas from experienced grounded theorists that informed my selection of the core categories. According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), while each category may tell part of the story, the core category must capture the whole story. “In an exaggerated sense, it consists of all the products of analysis condensed into a few words that seem to explain what ‘this research is about’ ” (p. 146). The statement assumes that only one category should be the core. However, Strauss and Corbin (1990) also offer some tips that help in making the decision in case there are two or more salient
phenomena. They comment that in order to fully develop two core categories the researcher has to integrate the two and write about them with clarity and precision. This approach is challenging. They suggest that an easier way is to choose one category as the core and to consider another as a subsidiary category. Then, in another paper, the research can take up the second idea and do the same (p. 122). A decision was made to integrate all the three categories, community, empowerment, and experience. The reasons were that a single category could not tell the whole story. The participatory library is not about a single category such as community, empowerment, or experience. It relates to all of these. The possibility of integration of these core categories is shown in Chapter 6, Section 6.2.2 – Relationships among categories of community, empowerment, and experience.

In the integration stage, the three core categories were linked to one another. Since a category is understood through its lower-level concepts such as sub-categories, properties, and dimensions, a table that roughly displays the shared characteristics among three core categories was developed (see Table 3.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Shared by Categories</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
<th>Indication of relationship between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Physical --- Virtual</td>
<td>Community, Empowerment.</td>
<td>Connection, Playground.</td>
<td>1 and 2, 2 and 3, 1 and 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership, Person.</td>
<td>Internal --- External</td>
<td>Community, Empowerment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>Informal --- Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer support, Comfort.</td>
<td>1 and 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Community =1, Empowerment =2, and Experience =3.*

**Table 3.4 - Shared properties and dimensions among core categories**

This table, together with the delineation of the three categories in chapter 5 helped to visualise the relationships among the three core categories (see details in Figure 6.1). These categories became the centre of the participatory library model. The model also had other parts that were developed based on the conditional relationships between categories (see details in Table 3.3 and Table 6.1). For instance, the answers to the questions of when, where, why, how, and with what results provided the conditions, inter/actions, and consequences that all linked to the centre to form the
complete participatory library model (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998) (see details in Figure 6.2). The model provided the flow to the storyline that was fully interpreted in Chapter 6, Section 6.3 – Participatory library model.

3.5.4 Memoing

Memos are a written record of analysis. They help the researcher to capture ideas or propositions related to concepts, categories, and their relationships, which emerge during the process of analysis (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998). They stimulate and document the analytic thoughts, provide direction for data collection and analysis, and help the researcher to sort out ideas to create the storyline. Because memos contain the products of analysis, they become a critical part of grounded theory. Without memos, the researcher has no accurate way to keep track of the cumulative and complex ideas that evolve throughout the course of research; categories and concepts therefore are under-developed, which leads to a thin theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998).

Memos were used throughout the entire process of this study. Some were written in the stages of literature review and data collection, while the majority was written in the data analysis stage. As memos are spontaneous and informal, they were varied in length, format, and content. Memos were very useful in the writing stage. Sorting of memos provided an outline for the story that helped write up the theory. An example of a memo is provided in Appendix H.

3.5.5 Theoretical sensitivity

Biases, assumptions, patterns of thinking, and knowledge gained from experience and reading may be unintentionally brought into analysis. These can block our ability to see what is significant in the data, or prevent us from moving from descriptive to theoretical levels of analysis. This situation is described as a lack of theoretical sensitivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). “Theoretical sensitivity is the ability to recognise what is important in data and to give it meaning. It helps to formulate theory that is faithful to the reality of the phenomena under study” (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 46). In order to generate a genuine grounded theory, it is important for the researcher to enhance his or her theoretical sensitivity.
Firstly, it is important to be aware of sources of theoretical sensitivity. Theoretical sensitivity mainly comes from literature and professional experience. If the researcher is aware of these sources and makes use of them, this can enhance theoretical sensitivity. With this in mind, a number of strategies were carried out during the data analysis. Regarding the literature, a comprehensive review was not done until data collection and data analysis were completed, and the participatory library model was established. The preliminary review of literature was carried out in the early stage of the research project, which helped me to be sensitive to what was going on with the phenomenon of study. The literature stimulated my thinking about data. As Strauss and Corbin (1998) state, concepts may be shaped by the analyst, may come from words or terms used by participants (in vivo concepts), or even come from the literature. Therefore, it is important that the researcher maintains a patient and neutral attitude, and periodically steps back to ask, for instance, what is going on here? Does what I think fit the reality of the data? (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 44). Such a strategy was applied and it helped the concepts to emerge from data.

Similarly, professional experience helps the researcher to understand the events, incidents, and actions in the data quickly. Strauss and Corbin (1990) emphasise, “the more professional experience, the richer the knowledge base and insight available to draw upon in the research” (p. 42). Since my professional experience may block me from seeing things that have become routine or obvious, an attitude of reflection and skepticism was maintained, in additional to being neutral and patient. A technique called “waving the red flag” (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 91) was adopted. This means that when words or phrases such as “never”, “always”, or “it couldn’t possibly be that way” were seen in the data, they were examined closely. This technique was sometimes used together with microanalysis technique, meaning that words, phrases, and sentences were thoroughly explored. This technique is usually used in the open coding and axial coding, but can be used anytime during the analysis stage when the researcher wants to have a closer look at an important point (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998).

3.5.6 Theoretical sampling and saturation

The theoretical sampling technique was used throughout the period of data collection and data analysis. Theoretical sampling is a typical characteristic of all three schools
of grounded theory. It is very similar to the process used in snowball sampling. The difference is in the purpose of sample selection in which the emerging theory will drive the selection of subsequent participants. This technique is particular to grounded theory (Pickard, 2007). Glaser and Strauss (1967) define:

theoretical sampling as the process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyses his data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges. (p. 45)

They assert that theoretical sampling is not a one-off task. Rather, it is part of the entire process of data collection. Because data collection and data analysis occur concurrently, then theoretical sampling is applied until categories reach a point of saturation, or until the theory is well developed (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Corbin and Strauss (2008) further explain:

Theoretical sampling is a method of data collection based on concepts/themes derived from data. The purpose of theoretical sampling is to collect data from places, people, and events that will maximise opportunities to develop concepts in terms of their properties and dimensions, uncover variations, and identify relationships between concepts. (p. 43)

It was assumed that accessing librarians is easier than accessing users; therefore, data collection and analysis in this research were started with 10 librarians. The emerging categories and the model were then validated through interviews with library users. The findings might or might not be different if data collection was started with library users. However, it is noteworthy that there were two sets of standard interview questions; one was used for librarians and another was used for users. The final research findings were collectively contributed by both groups. Data collection was ceased once no additional information could be found that added to the categories being developed, known as saturation. The ratio between librarians and library users was not pre-determined. Data collection was stopped after 16 interviews simply because it reached the point of saturation.
Strauss and Corbin (1998) provide a more precise definition: that a category is considered saturated when (a) no new or relevant data seem to emerge regarding a category, (b) the category is well developed in terms of its properties and dimensions demonstrating variation, and (c) the relationships among categories are well established (p. 212). Glaser and Strauss (1967) add that the depth of inquiry into different categories will vary because not all categories are equally relevant to the emerging theory. Core categories should be saturated as completely as possible. Efforts to saturate less relevant categories should not be made at the expense of the core categories (p. 70). Evidently, the core categories of this study were fully developed, and the relationships among core categories (the centre of the participatory library model) were logically linked to other parts of the model. Together, they create a flow of the storyline, meaning that the saturation point was reached. Thus, the theoretical sampling technique was applied throughout the data collection and data analysis stages, which helped to remain the trustworthiness of the research.

### 3.6 TRUSTWORTHINESS

Judging the quality of a study is not an easy task. The situation becomes more complex when judging the quality of a qualitative study (Creswell, 2007). Assessing the quality of a study involves the use of criteria which are the accepted standards against which a study is judged (Elliott & Lazenbatt, 2005). Research “must be evaluated in terms of the canons and procedures of the method used to generate the research findings” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 273). Strauss and Corbin suggest a series of eight criteria for evaluating a grounded theory, which can be used as a guideline to evaluate the empirical grounding of a study (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 270 – 272). This research is now set against these criteria.

**Criterion 1: Are concepts generated?**

Concepts are the building blocks of a theory. This criterion assesses whether the concepts are generated from and grounded in the data. It is evident that this study generates a series of concepts throughout three steps of coding. Concepts are presented in the form of categories, sub-categories, properties, and dimensions (further details are presented in Chapters 5 and 6).
Criterion 2: Are the concepts systematically related?

This criterion asks if the conceptual linkages have been made. This study demonstrates relationships and interrelationships between and among concepts that are systematically related and interwoven, which all together create the participatory library model (further details are presented in Chapter 6).

Criterion 3: Are there many conceptual linkages, and are the categories well developed? Do categories have conceptual density?

This criterion states that the number of linkages and the level of density of concepts are important. This research clearly demonstrates various linkages between concepts. For example, the relationships within each core category (internal linkages) and the relationships among categories (external linkages). It also shows the interdependence among core categories, meaning that a change of one category will have an influence on the others. The three core categories together create the centre of the participatory library. The centre is then connected to other building blocks of the model, which provide more insights into the model (further details are presented in Chapters 5 and 6).

Criterion 4: Is variation built into the theory?

This criterion emphasises that variation is important because it signifies that a concept has been examined under a series of different conditions and developed across its range of dimensions. Such variations are features of this research. Core category and their sub-categories are delineated and explained through a range of properties and dimensions, which demonstrates that the participatory library is fluid but not rigid because each property ranges in a form of a continuum (further details are presented in Chapters 5 and 6).

Criterion 5: Are the conditions under which variation can be found built into the study and explained?

This criterion suggests that the research needs to consider conditions. Certainly, this research presents the participatory library model that includes not only the phenomena, but also causal conditions (which lead to the phenomena), contextual conditions (within which the inter/actions responding to the phenomena occur), and
intervening conditions (which have an influence on interactional strategies that pertain to the phenomena. All conditions are integrated into the participatory library model and fully explained (further details are presented in Chapter 6).

**Criterion 6: Has the process been taken into account?**

This criterion stresses, “identifying process in research is important because it enables theory users to explain action under changing conditions” (Strauss & Corbin, p. 271). The findings of this research are clearly presented so that they fit this criterion (further details are presented in Chapter 6).

**Criterion 7: Do the theoretical findings seem significant, and to what extent?**

This criterion implies that a grounded theory study can fail to produce significant findings if the grounded theory canons and procedures are applied without creativity. It means, “the research fails to deliver new information or to provide guidelines for action” (Strauss & Corbin, p. 272). The findings of this research do seem to fit this criterion because they are openly presented (further details are presented in Chapter 6). The findings therefore should be able to “guide” action (further details are presented in Chapter 7, Section 7.7 – How does this research contribute to library practice?)

**Criterion 8: Does the theory stand the test of time and become part of the discussions and ideas exchanged among relevant social and professional groups?**

This criterion hints that the theory should be able to stand in the long term and be adopted by the profession. Perhaps this is the most important criterion that shows the quality of the theory. The theory should be able to have an influence on research and practice. It should be able “to direct research and to guide action programs” (Strauss & Corbin, p. 272). This research profoundly provides an understanding of the participatory library. Its results are interpreted and reported in a straightforward manner (further details are presented in Chapters 5 and 6). The research also presents the strategy that helps libraries and librarians to take advantage of the research results (further details are presented in Chapter 7, Section 7.7 – How does this research contribute to library practice?). The research therefore should receive active and positive reactions from the researchers and practitioners in the discipline. However,
this will only occur when the findings of this research are published in scholarly journals, and when the researcher continues to pursue and develop the concept and model of the participatory library.

In addition to the criteria suggested above, Corbin and Strauss (2008) further comment that the criteria should be used as a guideline for both the researcher and the reader. Once the researcher has thoroughly described the research process and clearly communicated the results, he or she can leave it up to the reader to judge the credibility of the findings.

3.7 CHAPTER CONCLUSION

This chapter has described the qualitative research paradigm and the grounded theory research methodology that were adopted for this study. Specifically, it has discussed the philosophical perspective that directs the study. It has described grounded theory and justified the adoption of a Straussian grounded theory approach. The chapter has also detailed the data collection and data analysis stages that were actually carried out in order to establish the participatory library model. It has also demonstrated the trustworthiness of this study. The next chapter will describe participants who dedicated their time and took part in the research through individual interviews.
Chapter 4: Research participants

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter described the preferred research approach. It discussed the data collection and analysis stages. Particularly, it detailed strategies used for the identification and selection of participants and the questions asked in the interviews. This chapter is dedicated to introducing the research participants who took part in the individual interviews during the data collection stage of this study. This chapter acknowledges the participants because they are essential contributors to the research. Bryant & Charmaz (2007) emphasise, “it is necessary to locate excellent participants to obtain excellent data” (p. 231). Their participation plays a crucial role in the success of this research. The research findings integrate their lived experiences; hence, the participants are co-creators of meaning.

There are two sources that provide necessary information on each participant. The first one is the Participant’s profile (Appendix D), which is completed by each participant and returned to the researcher before the interview. The second source of information is the interview. In addition to the main interview questions, there is a question serving as a warming up question. The question is “can you briefly tell me about your roles as a librarian” (when interviewing librarians) or “can you briefly tell me about your roles as a library user” (when interviewing users). These questions collect extra information that sometimes is not mentioned in the Participant’s profile.

Sixteen participants took part in the interviews. Ten of them are librarians and six are library users. When referring to the research participants, this research generally uses “librarians” or “users” instead of listing all their job titles. In doing so, it is important to note that “librarians” include various staff members working in the library such as library directors/deputy directors (the management board of the library); library managers/deputy managers (the second managerial level including those who are in charge of specific sections in the library such as the ICT section, reference services section, or cataloguing section); and librarians who are conventional staff members and do not hold a managerial position.
In order to preserve the participants’ anonymity, a random number was assigned to each participant. For example, “I. 4” stands for the Informant 4 (the participant who participated in the fourth interview). The terms “informant” and “participant” are used interchangeably in this thesis. Table 4.1 below shows an overview of all librarian and user participants.

### 4.2 RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Time in industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Deputy director</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>ICT manager</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>ICT manager</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Services manager</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Academic staff</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>4th year student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Academic staff</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>4th year student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>4th year student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Professional staff</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.1 – Research participant profiles*

**Participant 1** is a deputy director of the library. He holds a master’s degree in library and information studies and has worked the in library profession for eleven years. His duties are managing daily activities of the library, and ensuring the sections in the library work according to regulations. He is also in charge of
professional work such as library collection development, the library's web content management, and online services. Additionally, he also works as a reference librarian at the library help desk, and sometimes he is involved in the digitisation of library resources.

Participant 2 is a director of a library with three campuses. She holds a master’s degree in library and information studies. During her thirteen years in the library and information profession, she has held a number of positions such as library software consultant, library co-ordinator, electronic library consultant, librarian, and library director. Mostly based on the main campus, her current position involves managing the overall activities of the three campus libraries. Her main duties involve ensuring the regular operation of the branch libraries of the university, planning, and advising the university management board. She is also responsible for training staff members in the three campus libraries in areas such as the operation and maintenance of the library OPAC system, new and emerging technologies, and library services. She considers herself very active because she is “involved in almost everything”. In addition to the professional duties, she is an active researcher. Her research interest focuses on digital library, Web 2.0, and emerging technologies and their use in libraries.

Participant 3 is the manager of the information and communication technology section within a university library. He has been working in the library for nine years after gaining a bachelor’s degree in information and technology. Prior to his appointment as a manager of the ICT section, he experienced a number of positions, such as a library technician, and an electronic library officer. In the current position, he manages a team called “the electronic library” with six staff members. They are responsible for all ICT-related issues. Some typical tasks of the team are administering the computer network, setting up applications in the library, researching and deploying open-source software, maintaining digital storage, and communicating with library users through new media such as Web 2.0 applications and social networks. As a group leader, he is involved in all the work of the team, particularly the digital library and emerging technologies services.

Participant 4 is an ICT manager of a university library. He holds a bachelor’s degree in information technology and a master’s degree in electronics and
telecommunication. Prior to this current position, he was a library network administrator. He has a wealth of experience in library software development, hardware, server, and network. He is the developer of some software programs that are currently used in the library. His main duties in this current position include, but not limited to, network administration, library software maintenance, and integration of emerging technologies such as social media, mobile technologies, and associated tools into the library.

**Participant 5** is a librarian working in the information service section with three years’ experience. He gained a bachelor’s degree in library and information science and he is preparing to enrol in a master’s degree program. His daily professional duties include a range of tasks such as coordination of information literacy for library users, development of user-driven information resources, provision of reference services, and administration of the library website. In addition, he is a passionate blogger and social media enthusiast.

**Participant 6** is a library director who has been working in the librarianship field for twenty-one years. She holds a master’s degree in library and information science. Prior to the current position, she held a number of positions including librarian, head of the reference service section, deputy director, and director in another university library. During her time in the industry, she has worked in various areas such as library user management, reference services, professional development, public relations, project management, personnel management, and strategic planning. She finds that the job of a librarian is very demanding and it is becoming more and more challenging. This is because the users are becoming more tech-savvy and they have expertise in various fields. If librarians are not active, then they will be “laggards” according to clients. She admitted, “we are librarians, but sometimes we are slower than them (users). Therefore, librarianship is more challenging than ever before.”

**Participant 7** is a librarian working in the information services section. She holds a master’s degree in library and information science, and has been working in the library for eight years. She used to work as a library technician who was responsible for audio-visual collections. In the current role, she is involved in a range of tasks such as development of information services, marketing, and co-ordination of information literacy programs. She also works as a cataloguer and sometimes an
information advisor at the front desk. On occasion, she visits the university’s branch libraries and other universities to promote the library products and services. She finds Web 2.0 and social media tools are very useful for her work. She takes advantage of tools such as Facebook, Twitter, wikis, Delicious, and Bloglines in order to help her job run smoothly.

**Participant 8** is a librarian with eight years’ experience. She has a background in information technology and has a passion for librarianship; therefore, she pursued a course and currently holds a master’s degree in library and information studies. Her main duties in the library relate to database and network administration, website maintenance, and online and Web 2.0-based services. In addition to working as a professional, she also works as a part-time lecturer whose main teaching areas include management of digital resources, the internet and internet technologies, Web 2.0, and social media.

**Participant 9** is a library director who has been working for twelve years in librarianship. After graduating from university with a bachelor’s degree in library and information science, he started his career with a library technician position. After several promotions, he became a library director. In the current position, he is in charge of both managerial and professional work. However, he does not spend much time on personnel management as the library has a modest number of thirty staff members. He spends most of his time on professional jobs, which mainly centre on library automation. He considers himself as a library innovator and he believes that the library should be automatic as much as possible towards the direction of socialisation. He is also an active writer and often publishes on the area of library automation, Web 2.0, and emerging technologies.

**Participant 10** is a library services manager. She has been working in the library for six years. She holds a bachelor’s degree in library and information science and currently is pursuing a master’s degree program in the same area. Prior to the current position, her work involved library collection development, web content management, and management of periodical publications. In addition to managerial duties, her current professional work focuses on reference services, co-ordination of information literacy programs for users, and information on-demand services. She is an active manager who always finds various approaches to serve users and to get
them involved in the library services and activities. She is also an initiator who suggests many ideas to encourage users’ contribution.

**Participant 11** is a lecturer with ten years’ experience working in the library and information science area. He holds a master’s degree in library and information. His teaching area relates to user services, information literacy, and reference services. In addition to the academic work, he is also a co-ordinator of a library program that offers bachelors’ degrees and short courses. He is a regular user of different libraries. Moreover, he is very interested in the kind of library that is available everywhere and anytime, and that brings users together.

**Participant 12** is an undergraduate student who is pursuing a bachelor’s course in library and information science that is in the final stage (the fourth year). In addition to studying, he is involved in various community activities in the university. He is also a volunteer who manages several online forums and social networking sites. He is a regular library user. His main purpose for using the library is for his study and for his volunteering job. He is also a fan of “café book”, an open and social learning space that offers books and other kind of publications that users can check out for a period of time. He is very interested in the idea of making an academic library similar to café book.

**Participant 13** is a lecturer with six years’ experience in the field of library and information management. He holds a master’s degree in library and information. Prior to this position, he worked as a consultant in a library software company. In that role, his job was to provide libraries with support relating to library standards, library automation, and library software use. In his current position, his teaching area centres on the emerging technologies and their user in the library setting. As a regular library user, he admits that he used to find the academic library quite boring when he was studying his bachelor’s degree program. He did not pay much attention to his university library. He became aware of the benefits of an academic library when he worked in the industry. His passion for libraries really developed when he was studying for his master’s degree and when he was working as a lecturer. New and emerging technologies and their usage in libraries are his main interest.
Participant 14 is an undergraduate student who is pursuing two bachelor’s degree programs. One is in library and information studies and the other is in English. Both are in the final stage (year four). As a busy student, she often uses the university library services for both learning and entertainment. She comments that her use of the library was almost compulsory for assignment purposes. However, the university library is changing and becoming attractive thanks to social media and related technologies. She enjoys the library services associated with new technologies. She calls herself a Web 2.0-based library service user because she does not want to use traditional services due to their lack of interaction.

Participant 15 is a fourth-year undergraduate student majoring in library and information science. He considers his university library as his home because he is often on campus and lives more in the library than at home. He became a fan of the library because it offers great facilities to users. The emergence and adoption of social media in the library makes it more exciting. He uses most of the Web 2.0-based library services and also contributes many ideas to the library for improvement. In addition to the virtual or social media space that the library provides, he is interested in an “academic café” space that his library plans to deploy where users, librarians, and all staff members are connected.

Participant 16 is a professional staff member and has been working in his university for eleven years. He is an active library user who often uses various library services, both traditional (i.e., borrowing books) and modern services (i.e., online and social media-based services). As a busy professional, he appreciates the new services that his library offers, such as online chat with a librarian, or other services based on blogs, Facebook, and wikis.

4.3 CHAPTER CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented profiles of the sixteen librarians and library users who took part in the individual interviews of this study. They are key stakeholders who are directly involved in library activities. Their profiles show a diverse range of roles and experiences that would make them excellent informants of this study. The next chapter will report the first part of the research findings. It will deconstruct the narratives of the research participants via cornerstones of the participatory library.
Chapter 5: Deconstruction of research participants’ narratives

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The findings of this research are presented in two chapters (Chapters 5 and 6), which aim at answering the research question “what is the (a) participatory university library?” Findings presented in both chapters are based on the analysis of in-depth interviews with all research participants: the ten librarians and six library users who were introduced in Chapter 4. The findings are not presented in terms of a sequence of steps taken during the course of study, that is, open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. This is because data collection and analysis in grounded theory must be implemented concurrently, and therefore many steps were carried out in an interwoven manner (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Strauss and Corbin 1998). Rather, the findings are reported after finalisation of categories and establishment of the model. Results from analysis of librarian and user interviews are integrated to ensure the reported findings are in a complete form.

This chapter (Chapter 5) presents research findings in terms of three categories, which are the core of the participatory library model. Then, these three core categories are integrated into other parts in order establish a full participatory library model in Chapter 6. While each chapter might be read separately, reading them in sequence would make a better sense of the storyline.

Specifically, this chapter consists of two main sections. The first section briefly introduces the core categories and concepts that were emerged during the course of study. It also clarifies the difference in the abstract level of concepts, and provides examples of concepts and categories in each level. The second section then discusses details of the three categories – three cornerstones of the emerging participatory library model. Categories are delineated through a detailed discussion of their properties and dimensions. Interpretation and synthesis of ideas from research participants are also included to explain concepts. Categories are further interpreted
and brought to light thanks to inclusion of selected excerpts from interview transcripts.

5.2 THE EMERGENCE AND IDENTIFICATION OF CONCEPTS AND CATEGORIES

According to Corbin and Strauss (2008), the aim of qualitative research can vary from description (depiction of data), to conceptual ordering (organising data into discrete categories), to theorising (developing a model or a theory). This variation means that each piece of research may have a different purpose and not all researchers want to develop theory. However, genuine grounded theory research must result in a theory or a model that necessitates not only condensing raw data into concepts, but also arranging the concepts into a logical order with systematic explanation. For this reason, the purpose of grounded theory analysis is broader than pulling out a few themes of loosely interwoven concepts. The research findings must constitute a theoretical formulation of reality under investigation, rather than introduce a group of unconnected themes (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). In addition, it is also necessary to note that, “description is the basis for more abstract interpretations of data and theory development” (Corbin and Strauss 2008, p. 54). With these considerations in mind, as important steps in the construction of research participant narratives and the establishment of a participatory library model, this research comprises description, conceptual ordering, and theorising.

The concepts and categories in this research were identified in accordance with procedures and techniques of grounded theory analysis recommended by Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998). A number of tasks were carried out in order to build a model that includes conceptualising data (naming data in terms of concepts), defining categories (grouping similar concepts under a higher level concept), and developing categories in terms of properties and dimensions. Categories were then related through the identification of relationships, and this was a significant step to build up the model. Though grounded theory analysis involves much more than a consideration of sequential acts – meaning that steps overlap during the course of analysis – this chapter still presents the results of earlier steps, mostly in open and axial coding stages (identification and emergence of concepts and categories). The relationships between categories and the development of the theory are then presented in the next chapter (Chapter 6).
“Concepts” are words that stand for ideas contained in data. Concepts are interpretations; that is, they are the products of analysis. They are derived from data and are building blocks of the theory. Concepts vary in levels of abstraction and this means that there are lower-level concepts, such as properties, dimensions, and subcategories; and higher-level concepts, such as categories. The lower-level concepts provide detailed description and explanation for the higher-level concepts (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Corbin and Strauss, 2008).

A category stands for a phenomenon; that is, it is a problem, an issue, an event, or a happening that is defined as being significant to research participants. For example, in this research, the three main categories are identified as “community”, “empowerment”, and “experience”. These are also the main themes, or core categories, of the research. They are the central phenomena around which all other categories are integrated. Other categories are represented in terms of conditions and are discussed in the next chapter (Chapter 6). As a category labelled in a few words may not provide much detail, it is essential for a category, especially a core category, to have sub-categories. A “sub-category” is a concept that pertains to a category and gives it further clarification and specification (Strauss and Corbin 1998, p. 101). For instance, the category “community” has three sub-categories, namely “sharing”, “connection”, and “peer support”.

“Properties” are attributes or characteristics of a concept. They are the delineation, which defines and gives meaning to the concept (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Serving a different purpose, “dimensions” are variations within properties that give specificity and range to concepts. In other words, a dimension is a specific range along which a property of a category varies. It gives specifications to a category and variations to the theory (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Corbin and Strauss, 2008). The details of categories, sub-categories, properties, and dimensions are discussed below.

5.3 CORNERSTONES OF THE EMERGING PARTICIPATORY LIBRARY MODEL

In the early stage of data collection and data analysis (e.g., after six interviews with librarians), the research found five dimensions of the participatory library relating to technology, human aspects, education, socio-economic issues, and environment. These dimensions were then validated and refined through subsequent interviews.
with librarians and library users. Most of the dimensions were then developed and labelled as conditions that have an influence on the core categories.

According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), core categories represent the main themes in research. They must appear frequently in the data. In all or almost all cases, there are indicators pointing to the core categories. This research has three core categories that are cornerstones or building blocks of the emerging participatory library model. They are “community”, “empowerment”, and “experience”. These categories represent the preoccupations or the concerns shared by all research participants. Participants talk about these categories either in a direct or indirect way throughout all interviews. Each of these categories will now be thoroughly discussed via the deconstruction and analysis of the research participants’ narratives.

### 5.3.1 Category 1: “community”

“Community” implies a group of people who are connected through either a real-life or a virtual environment and they often have something in common. The nature of “community” in the library was acknowledged by all research participants. Each participant mentioned one or more aspects of community. For example, a librarian participant shared his opinion about new and emerging technologies, saying that:

> Web 2.0 has a great impact on library activities. It is a platform where the library community can share data and participate in developing and updating information in the form of collaboration and sharing through the internet environment. Wherever people are, they can still connect with one another and use library services. (I. 1, p. 2)

The activities of the library community were based on the foundation of Web 2.0 or emerging technologies. Such a foundation made it easier to share and maintain a connection between members in the library community, and enabled them to carry out their jobs in flexible modes. This librarian referred to such technologies as “participatory technologies”. He emphasised a new environment and a new type of “connection” that technology brings about and said “Participatory technologies are creating an environment of collaboration and sharing, therein multi-dimensional information channels are created: librarians with users, library staff with library staff, users with users” (I. 1, p. 7). The connection here was not only between the
librarians and users, but also among librarians, and all members of the library community. “Multi-dimensional information channels” implied a strong connection among members of the community. As a result, “the relationship between library and users becomes closer” (I. 1, p. 7). The table below presents details of the concept of “community”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensional range</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Physical --------- Virtual</td>
<td>Connection, Sharing, Peer support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Local ----------- Global</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Internal ------- External</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.1 - Category “community” and its associated concepts*

As presented in Table 5.1, the category “community” has three properties named, “location”, “scope”, and “membership”. Each of these properties is dimensionalised, or in other words, each property varies in terms of a continuum. For example, the “location” property, referring to the setting within which the “community” exists, can range from a “physical” library space to a “virtual” library space. The range also includes a compound environment that is the combination of the two spaces, such as a studio that is physically located within the library where users can implement social media activities such as chatting, blogging, and video making. Similarly, the property called “scope” can range from “local” (or within the library’s walls or library’s virtual space) to “global” (outside the library); this implies that the boundary of the community here is open. It is not limited within the library, but is boundless. Put another way, the category “community” could range from “inside” the library to “outside” the library along the property of “scope”.

Similarly, “community” could vary from “internal” to “external” along the property continuum of “membership”. That is, there are two main types of users. The first group includes persons who are officially affiliated with the university, such as students, faculty members, and administrative staff. In addition, there are also persons who are public users. This group comprises everyone with no affiliation with the university. It is not necessary for them to be registered members, but they are still viewed as part of the library user community. This does not mean that everyone is able to access all services. In practice, different user groups may have different rights
to access different services. In this library “community”, there are some services universally available, including to public users. Thus, the specificity of properties and their dimensions gives variation to the category of “community”, and this variation provides a deeper understanding of the “community” (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

“Community” has three sub-categories: “connection”, “sharing”, and “peer support”. They all pertain to “community”, provide it with greater explanatory power, and give it further clarification and specification (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Corbin and Strauss, 2008). Each sub-category also has its own properties and dimensions. The table below shows the details in terms of properties and dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-categories (of “community”)</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensional range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection</strong></td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Personal -------- Organisational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Physical -------- Virtual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Sometimes -------- All the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sharing</strong></td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Individual -------- Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Personal -------- Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer support</strong></td>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Passive -------- Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>Informal -------- Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Fixed---------- Flexible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.2 - Sub-categories of “community” and their associated concepts*

**Connection**

From Table 5.2 we can see that three properties delineating the sub-category of “connection” are “relationship”, “location”, and “availability”. Their dimensional continua provide explanation of the “connection”.

“Connection” was identified to vary from “personal” to “organisational” along the property of “relationship”. The relationship might occur at a personal level among users in the library community. It might also happen among librarians in terms of individuals, or between librarians who are representatives of the library and users. This is the relationship between the information services provider and users. At a
broader level, the organisational level, this is the relationship or connection between libraries. This means that there was co-operation between libraries or there was library partnership. In addition, the connection also varied from “physical” to “virtual” along the property of “location”. This property was shared with that of the category “community”. The connection could take place either in a physical or virtual library space or somewhere in between.

Furthermore, the “connection” varied from “sometimes” to “all the time” along the property of “availability”. The variation was dependent upon the nature of location (physical or virtual), and the type and feature of the emerging technologies adopted (in the case of connection within a virtual environment). For example, library community members could connect together via a physical “academic café” space or a common learning area of the library. This kind of connection happens when members want to connect and when they gather at such a space to chat about their shared interests. Such a connection can only be maintained dependent on aspects like the capacity of the space and its opening time. The connection could be maintained “all the time”, especially in the form of virtual connection through emerging technologies like instant messaging, Facebook, and Twitter. In this case, the connections among users, librarians, and libraries could be conducted in real-time. The participants’ questions, interests, or ideas could be communicated instantly.

The “connection” was well recognised by participants. According to the experience of a user participant, the library removed the limitation of geographic distance thanks to its use of emerging technologies:

*It is very difficult to keep in touch with friends and collaborate with colleagues. They are often too busy for a face-to-face meeting. For this reason, instant messaging is an ideal tool for working together without depending on geographical distance*. (I. 11, p. 3)

The librarian participant 10 also shared a similar view; she said:

*My library location is quite far from the city centre while the majority of users are around the city centre. This is a disadvantage. It is not very convenient for users to come to library for services. Users would not use the library or use it very little because of the geographical distance. The mobile
technology, Web 2.0 and social networks make libraries and users closer; they enable users to access services more easily. For example, a library notice previously was pinned on the library bulletin board or sent to the faculties and classrooms. This often took a few days. Now social media tools bring the information directly to users, on their mobile devices or smart phones in a few seconds”. (I. 10, p. 4)

Thus, the “connection” could be maintained at all times. The library’s adoption of emerging technologies made the relationship among library community members closer and the library services more convenient. Likewise, when talking about the experience of using emerging technologies in libraries, participant 13 described how an instant messaging tool plays an important role in keeping people connected. “This is really effective technology for libraries to connect with users even in real time. It is excellent for users who want to have their questions answered immediately. Instant messaging keeps users and the library connected all the time” (I. 13, p. 3).

It was noticeable that the connection was believed to go beyond the library wall. Participant 11 believed that:

**Users are not only students and staff within the university. They can include both internal and external users, from other universities, other communities, or sometimes in other countries. Thus, users here are diverse. Their contribution and participation make library services more profound, attractive, and useful”**. (I. 11, p. 8)

The connection here was mentioned on a broad level. The library can reach wider communities that are able to take advantage of their involvement. Sharing the same view, participant 5 expressed that:

**In a modern library, many things are infinite. For example, there are not only internal users but also external users; information resources are not limited to those found within the library’s walls or in the library’s servers. This means open information resources, open users, and open services”.** (I. 5, p. 5)
Hence, the connection creates opportunities for both internal and external users to access and get involved in library services and resources.

The connection opened up sharing and helped user access to external resources. Ultimately, “the library satisfies the information needs of many users, and helps them reach external information resources that are not owned by the library” (I. 8, p. 4). This idea mirrored that of participant 4. When observing a photo-sharing service that was based on emerging technologies like Flickr, he commented, “the library can quickly update and easily share information to millions of users. The amount of users of such services is often very large. It becomes much easier to connect users and libraries together” (I. 4, p. 2). The shared view of both participants 4 and 8 emphasised the role of sharing. In an open world, sharing is fundamental to a library. The library is about sharing rather than owning.

**Sharing**

“Sharing” was delineated through two properties and their dimensions. Sharing varied from “individual” to “collective” along the property of “ownership”. For instance, a staff member of the library drafts an interlibrary loan policy and posts it on the library’s blog. The draft is then commented on by other librarians and library users. Ideas are gradually gathered and developed until the policy is completed and, importantly, until it best suits the users. Originally, the policy is the idea of one member, but later on, it contains collective intelligence as members contribute to its development (I. 5). The ownership here was represented not only in ideas or information as detailed in the example above; it also embodied information, knowledge, experience, interests, and services. While information, knowledge, and experience might first be owned by an individual, they might become collective intelligence once they are shared, discussed, and developed by others.

For this reason, a library service originally might be internal but later might become a service for the wider community as many members take part. Similarly, individual interests or concerns might lead to co-operation or a library partnership. As a result, the property of “benefit” of sharing might range from “personal” to “social”. At a personal level, an individual member can profit from the contribution of others when sharing an idea. By sharing, he or she can have more friends, get answers to
questions or concerns, find advice easily, and have more access to resources. At a broader level, libraries in general could also take advantage of sharing. Sharing helps members to socialise and enables them to contribute to the library. The library can make use of their contributions to enhance services and operations. Sharing can open up opportunities for co-operation between libraries. Hence, sharing is an attribute of community building.

By connecting people and libraries, users can share various things such as interests, resources, and services. When talking about the use of social networking tools in the library, a user participant said, “such tools allow us to connect to others who have similar interests or concerns” (I. 16, p. 2). Participant 14 possessed the same opinion when he compared the library to the social network, stating, “the members of this society are connected by sharing similar values and similar interests” (I. 14, p. 6). They (users, libraries, and community members) are connected when they have something in common and when they want to share. Sharing help them to be connected and connection helps them easily to share. Furthermore, connection could be at the library level. When connection is established between libraries, users benefit, as participant 8 believed: “when the libraries are connected, and the resources and services are shared, users can access not only resources that their library offers, but they have more opportunities to reach resources and services outside their libraries” (I. 8, p. 5). The connection and sharing might take place at different levels, between individual library users, among library community members, and between libraries in the wider community.

Peer support

This learning community has a strong focus on “peer support”. This means people learn from their peers; their learning is based on the support and contribution from peers. Participant 5 provided a typical example of sharing and learning from peers’ practice:

A user reads a book and suggests it to others. Others also recommend books relevant to that topic. They share with one another and comment on those of one another. This is very useful as they can find comments, reviews, and advice from peer readers and colleagues. This is also good for the library.
Librarians can also find that it is necessary to purchase additional copies of relevant materials ... This makes a large community in which sharing and contribution aid the development of all members”. (I. 5, p. 9)

Such a practice is very simple and popular but also useful for users and libraries. Users can acquire information and knowledge from their peers. They are learning from peers, with the learning based upon collective intelligence. User contributions are also beneficial to libraries as libraries are informed of users’ needs, and therefore can direct the services and resources towards better meeting users’ needs. In return, both benefit. Having the same viewpoint as participant 5, participant 13 expressed:

The participation and sharing among users are very meaningful. In some cases, a user has specific needs on a topic, but does not find relevant materials or information sources. Through social networking sites and Web 2.0 tools in the library, he or she can find support from other users. In many cases the library cannot offer support, while some users are experts and very knowledgeable on the topic or field. I think this is a very interesting point that emerging technologies can bring to the library”. (I. 13, p. 11)

The sub-category “peer support” has three properties: “tone”, “mode”, and “timeliness”. “Peer support” could range from “informal” to “formal” along the property of “tone”. A support or contribution of a member might be provided in terms of personal preference or a favourite of sharing, that is, it might come from an informal suggestion, advice, or comment. It might also be more formal, in terms of a professional consultation or academic support program provided by user volunteers. The variation of “peer support” was also represented in the “mode” of the support ranging from “passive” to “active”. As the emerging technologies were adopted in the library and made available for members to use, there were peer members providing support in an unintentional manner. For example, they simply responded to questions or provided solutions for a problem that was posted on the library blog or Facebook. They do this because they want to present their expertise, because they are people who like to comment on and criticise others’ ideas, or simply because they know the answer (I. 8). On the other hand, some users might be active supporters of their peers. They might take part in a volunteering program, such as joining a “friend
of the library” club (I. 3) in which they might be able to play various roles including serving other users at front desks.

“Peer support” also varied from “fixed” to “flexible” along the property of “timeliness”. This property represented the timeliness of the support that a member may receive from their peers. Peers here might be any stakeholder, internal or external. They may be both internal and external library users, librarians, and staff within a university. The term “peers” implies the equality that members have when accessing the library. The peer support might be fixed. This means the support might be offered on a regular basis. For example, the library often cannot have librarians available to look after their Facebook or blog all the time, so librarians often respond to the questions on those sites after a period, perhaps every few hours or on a daily basis, and most occur in the daytime. However, once services are available on social media environments, any members, most are users, can be able to access and respond to the questions or concerns of their peers in a timelier manner (I. 1 and I. 13). This practice is effective because, as stated by participant 14, among several thousands of library users, at least some should be able to offer the answer. Thus, anyone might be able to get involved in the “peer support” practice, rather than only a few librarians.

In an open learning environment facilitated by the library, any member in this community can not only receive advice and assistance from peers, but also provide help or support to their peers. Participant 14 confirmed this point by giving an example when she stated:

“They (users) can also help other library users. For example, there is a question posted by a user, but the librarian has not answered yet. Meanwhile, as a user, I know the answer and respond to it. Thus, users can get the answer in just a few minutes or a few seconds or even in real time. In this era, a few minutes are very important”. (I. 14, p. 13)

Contribution and support can take place in various forms and in a timely manner, which is very important for people in need. Participant 14 made this point clearer when she gave another example:

“Details about an event at the library are not being known by every user for many reasons. In such a case, I will post a question on the library Facebook
and I believe I will get the answer in minutes because the library has several
thousand users and at least some should know the event very well. Early
information is very important. Sometimes, waiting for an answer from the
busy librarian will mean that I miss the event”. (I. 14, p. 14)

Beyond connection, sharing, and learning from peers is the learning community.
According to participant 16, libraries can make use of emerging technologies to
create a “learning community”. It is a “learning space” for all community members
and this is particularly significant in the university, he said:

I think this is a learning model of the future. It’s a learning community in
which one may teach others and one can also learn from others. This means
there is an active interaction among members. Each member is part of the
network and they are all connected to create a community”. (I. 16, p. 5)

He further explained that the learning community, in terms of a network society or a
virtual society, is formed based on ICT and emerging technologies. He said:

The library is similar. I think it is very important and necessary for future
libraries to build such a network society. Services and technologies that we
are talking about are all very good for community building, creating links
between the members of the library community. (I. 16, p. 6)

Such a network society or a learning community provided users with new
opportunities for learning. They can learn in a flexible mode, learn from anyone in
the community. In the role of a library user, the participant 12 believed that “many
users find answers for their questions through this playground [learning community,
learning space, or virtual space]. As such, they are connected together; they are
friends of each other and they can learn from one another”. He brought the idea to
light as he gave an example:

Sometimes I face a difficulty in the research that I am doing, I raise a
question on the library Facebook and then I receive quite a lot of
suggestions. Ultimately, I find the solution to the problem. It is interesting
that many suggestions come from users rather than the library. Thus, this
playground helps users obtain information from various sources. This is
especially so because it is based on the strengths of a community; it is based on collective intelligence”. (I. 12, p. 6)

Accordingly, more learning opportunities were created for any member of the library community. It is noticeable that users can learn from the wider community rather than that from those who are within their own library, and their learning is drawn from "collective intelligence”. Participant 10 repeatedly makes this point by saying:

I often look for lectures, presentations, or movies relating to my job. I find a lot of lectures and presentations from experts in the industry. I feel I have learned a lot from them even though they are not users within my university library. (I. 10, p. 3)

Learning opportunities were created for not only users. Libraries (and librarians) were also beneficiaries. When talking about social networks and their use in the university library setting, participant 5 acknowledged advantages of YouTube, stating:

Our sharing of this information with other communities is useful for them. In turn, users in other communities can also give us [libraries and librarians] feedback on what we are doing or they can comment about that shared information; then we can also learn from them. Therefore, not only one library and its users but many libraries and user communities can learn from each other, can share information with each other, can contribute to each other and together develop”. (I. 5, p. 8)

Hence, the user and the library each plays both roles as contributor and beneficiary. Users may learn from librarians, their peers, and wider communities. Similarly, libraries may learn from their users, their staff, and wider communities. This is a mutual relationship and a mutual benefit that together creates a complex or networked learning community featured by peer support.

This section has discussed the first category, “community”, of the three main categories representing the narratives of the research participants. The other two categories, “empowerment” and “experience”, will be discussed below.
5.3.2 Category 2: “empowerment”

“Empowerment” implies the process of giving library users power and status. The participants shared many ideas that pertained to the category “empowerment”. Some commonly shared comments by participants include, for example: “users are being able to…”, “users are allowed to…”, and “they [library users] take part in…”, “library users now have the rights to”. Table 5.3 shows details of the concept, “empowerment”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensional range</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Internal -------- External</td>
<td>Authority, Prosumption, Partnering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Physical -------- Virtual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.3 - Category “empowerment” and its associated concepts*

Two properties called “person” and “location”, together with their dimensions, provided a greater understanding of the concept of “empowerment”. Empowerment could change from “internal” to “external” along the property continuum of “person”. The person here refers to any individuals who are involved in library services. They might be internal users, public users, or librarians. They all are given more “power” in terms of what they are able to do and how they are allowed to take part in library services and operation, and this is especially true for library users. As for the aspect of setting or place, where empowerment might take place, empowerment could vary from “physical” to “virtual” along the property of “location”. Users are empowered in both spaces. As observed by participant 4, open library stacks and self-service functions are not new, but are good examples of being empowered in a real-life environment. Similarly, giving users the chance to express their opinions by using social media tools like library Twitter or Facebook is an example of empowerment in the virtual space (I. 6 and I. 14). The property “location” was shared by categories, “community” and “empowerment”. In whatever venue, if the “community” exists, then “empowerment” is also present.

Empowerment has three sub-categories: “authority”, “prosumption”, and “partnering”. Each has lower-level concepts that provide further explanation of the
main category of “empowerment”. The following table provides details of the three sub-categories in terms of their properties and dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-categories (of “empowerment”)</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensional range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Dependent------- Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Difficult-------- Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Unbalanced-------- Balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosumption</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Using--------- Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Partly participation---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering</td>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>Spontaneous-------- Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job type</td>
<td>Unskilled-------- Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>Few-------- All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 - Sub-categories of “empowerment” and their associated concepts

**Authority**

The sub-category “authority” possesses three characteristics or properties: “freedom”, “opportunity”, and “equality”. Authority might range from “dependent” to “independent” along the property of “freedom”. This embodies the level of autonomy that library users might have. For some services, users still need to see librarians; this represents the dependence to some extent. However, as the library becomes more and more accessible, users become more independent. Open shelves, open stacks, and self-checking out have become popular, and all are good examples of the independence that users have in the physical library (I. 4). In addition, customisation and personalisation of allocated virtual space and services were also indication of users’ independence. The self-reliance might also be seen in services such as RSS (users can decide to choose what information they want and when they need it), bookmarking and self-cataloguing (users can organise information resources according to their preferred way that works for them), and asking for peer advice (users can do this at anytime and from anywhere that suits them, and on whatever social media environment that the library provides, such as blogs, Facebook, wikis, etc.) (I. 12 and I. 13).

The variation of authority is also represented through the range from “difficult” to “easy” along the property of “opportunity”. The opportunity represents the level of
easiness and simplicity when library users claim their rights or raise their voices. It is not always easy for users to express their views or comment on what they are provided by the library. This is particularly the case when they want to do things in the traditional ways, such as meeting in person, or using a paper-based feedback box. However, it is easier when they take advantage of emerging technologies. Users can raise ideas; for example, they might poll Facebook users or other social media users, and call for support from other users in their community. Such an approach often works well, as the library will pay attention to and seriously consider the request. Users can do this with ease. In doing so, they prove that they are part of the library and that their voices should be heard. Librarians no longer solely do what they think necessary. Services are introduced based on consultation of user ideas (I. 2, I. 6, I. 14 and I. 16). This practice also shows another variation of authority, which is represented via the property of “equality”, ranging from “unbalanced” to “balanced”.

The positive change in a user’s rights was referred to as a good practice and many participants were fascinated by it. When talking about this change, participant 12 compared the difference between the traditional library and that of today and said, “Libraries today are a lot more open. Users today have the right to choose and use library services. They even have the ability to and are allowed to change the library in some way to suit their needs” (I. 12, p. 5). Users “have the right”, “have ability”, and “are allowed to change the library”. Such recognition represents the changes made in the library environment and shows the permission now given to users. These changes were also observed and supported by other participants. Many believed that library users now are more active, “they are able to not only read but also write comments or reviews for materials” (I. 7, p. 3). Libraries utilised emerging technologies to provide users with more power. “Like many other libraries, we are using very interesting tools such as Guru and Zotero to create, organise, and manage information resources. Users can retrieve, access, download, take notes, comment, or tag the items as they like” (I. 1, p. 2). Thus, the library users today are able to do a wide range of tasks. Their rights are recognised and supported thanks to new and emerging technologies.

Being a library user, participant 14 asserted, “Users now have more autonomy and they can request what they want” (I. 14, p. 12). This ability is maintained, again, because “libraries deploy emerging technologies”, and because “they [libraries] are
interested in user’s ideas” (I. 14, p. 13). “Users can raise their voice and they can do this a lot easier” (I. 16, p. 7). Participant 14 supported her idea by an example, noting that:

_Usually a user will not come to the library, meet a librarian and tell her ‘I want the library to open until 9 pm because I am a student and have to learn a lot in the library’. Sometimes he will meet a busy librarian with a frowning face, and it is difficult to propose the idea. However, with emerging technologies, it becomes simple. Users can definitely raise the question, express their views, or support and help other users. Such kind of things can be done easily with various emerging technologies”. (I. 14, p. 13)

This participant further explained:

“If several students require opening until 9 pm, then the library often does not meet their request. However, if several hundred students have the same requirements, and if one proposes the idea on the library Facebook and others click the "Like" button to support the idea, then I believe the library will seriously consider the request”. (I. 14, p. 14)

The rights of users or permission given to them were also observed from a slightly different angle. Raising users’ voices, making requests, or complaining, according to participant 16, “is not something too extraordinary. When the user is not satisfied with the service, they call the library to complain and this is a form of comment and this has occurred for a while”. He argues that library users have always had such rights. However:

_Technologies, as we are discussing, again, create better opportunities for users to express their rights. It is the user's rights that they should have. These are the rights that users deserve to have but before they did not claim or it was hard to claim. The situation now is a lot easier with the support of new technologies. It is extremely important that users are able to do this at anytime rather than on an irregular basis as previously”. (I. 16, p. 11)
Offering a similar view, participant 13 commented that:

*Previously, users could participate but in a passive mode; for example, libraries would ask them for assistance in some way, such as taking part in a survey or an interview. Now, Web 2.0 enables them to be directly involved. Users can take the initiative and let the library know what they need and want. They can even directly suggest services that the library should offer and how the library can do it*. (I. 13, p. 8)

Thus, the changes were clearly realised and pointed out by participants. Users may already have some rights but they hardly take advantage of these rights. The new and emerging technologies have made it more convenient for users to claim such rights; and as participants have observed, they “are allowed” to do something differently than in previous libraries, and in fact, they “raise their voice”, “take the initiative” and “let the library know what they need and want”. This practice was referred to as “a revolutionary change” (I. 13, p. 8).

**Prosumption**

The concept of “prosumption” pertains to the central category “empowerment”. Prosumption represents the reality described by both librarian and user participants. “Prosumption” is a portmanteau word that is formed by merging the sounds and meanings of the two concepts: “production” and “consumption”. It describes the practice in which library users perform two main roles, one as a producer (of information, services), and one as a consumer. In this situation, “user” is not really the “right” term to talk about those who “use” the library. This is because they not only can “use” the library, and “consume” information and services, but also can “produce” information, and “create”, “develop”, and “maintain” library services. For this reason, “prosumption” is a better term used to reflect the nature of a range of activities that library users are playing. Their title should also be changed to “prosumer”, rather than “user”. Two attributes adding variation to the sub-category prosumption are “extent” and “openness”.

In relation to “how much” or the degree of involvement, prosumption could vary from “using” to “contributing” along the property of “extent”. This means any library user can play the role of a beneficiary who uses library services and receives what
the library provides. In practice, there might be someone who only purely uses the services without any comment, feedback or response to the library, but this is very rare. Therefore, at some point, they might be contributing to the library in one or another way, even if it is in the form of making a complaint (I. 8 and I. 10). They can also play the role of a contributor who can comment on library procedures, respond to their peers’ question, categorise and bookmark information resources, develop and maintain services, or get involved in a library program as a volunteer to officially operate the library and change it. Their level of involvement is varied and it is dependent upon how open the library is. Thus, this also means the property of “openness” can range from “partly” to “fully”. Examples of levels of library openness include co-construction of subject guides, creation of content using social media, or establishment of a book club or a forum that is fully operated by library users (I. 4 and I. 15).

Participant 2, in the role of a librarian, shared her library’s success story about using social media tools to get users involved in library services. She talked about the library users’ participation in a virtual book club:

> They [users] themselves create a group called a book club, including those who love books. They recommend a lot of books; they share books and information resources with each other. Thus, the library is a successful initiator who makes the service available, and then users are responsible for its development. It would be challenging for a single library to collect and organise information resources. However, it will be easier if the whole community takes part. (I. 2, p. 4)

It must be acknowledged that the library has well fulfilled its job in facilitating and making things possible so that users can take part. Besides, it is noticeable that the users have also played their roles very well. They represent their passion and enthusiasm. They “create a book club” for their own use; they recommend and share information resources; and especially they are “responsible for its development”. Clearly, users have shown their important role in establishing and maintaining library services. Ultimately, the library and users both benefit.
Participant 13, as a user, shared a similar practice when talking about his enjoyable experience of playing with an open bibliographic database that the library offers. He said:

*We can interact with the database. We can search for materials, organise and sort them in our own ways. In addition, we can comment on existing records and add new records, as we want... An interesting feature that I would like to talk about is that it allows users to catalogue their favourite items in their own ways. For example, we may want the book cover to be like this or like that, we can replace it with another image of our preference. We can also write notes on the record or insert a translated title of the book next to the existing original title etc.* (I. 13, p. 7-8)

Thus, users are not only the persons who “use” the services. Traditionally, users purely used the services, undertaking actions such as searching, saving, or printing items in the database. Now they can do much more than that. They can customise and personalise the bibliographic database, to some extent, to suit their own needs. This is the result of utilising emerging technologies and facilitation of the library.

The dynamic role of users was also admitted by participant 4. He said:

*Apart from searching for and using information, users can take part in the process of creation of information. Such technologies create a two-way interaction between users and libraries. Users not only receive information that libraries provide, but also can participate in the process of building the information content. Since these information resources are built to serve users, it is ideal to have users involved in this process.* (I. 4, p. 6)

Through the viewpoints shared by participants, it is clear that users are now more active and have been involved in a wide range of services and activities of the library. “Clearly, users now can wear two hats. They are both beneficiaries and contributors” (I. 2, p. 14). Participant 12 repeatedly made this point as he talked about the online discussion forum offered by his library: “this is a playground for users and users are persons who operate and maintain the playground” (I. 12, p. 6).

This practice was again confirmed by participant 13 when he observed the type of roles that library users can play. He said, “They can participate in the process of
setting up services, and deploying and maintaining services and products. As I observe, there may be products and services that are mainly established and maintained by users” (I. 13, p. 11).

**Partnering**

“Partnering” is the third sub-category belonging to the category “empowerment”. This refers to the practice recognised by research participants in which library users were involved in the business of librarians. Together with librarians, users took part in the process of operating the library. They “share” the job with librarians and they are “responsible” for the job. The sub-category “partnering” is similar to the sub-category “prosumption” in some aspects; for example, both are about user involvement in the library. However, “partnering” has a stronger focus on a specific range of activities that users can be involved in, and the seriousness of the users when partaking in these activities.

The variation of the concept “partnering” is represented via three properties and their dimensions. Firstly, “partnering” ranges from “spontaneous” to “planned” along the property of “occurrence”. This represents the aspect of how often library users can (or are allowed to) act as a librarian or play the librarian role. Users can play this role whenever they like (spontaneous) once the library makes participatory technologies available (I. 1). For example, they can answer the question of their peers on the library blog, organise a collection of items in the library OPAC in their own ways and share with other users, or take part in the process of material acquisition via the library wiki. Such work can be done anytime at the convenience of users. In addition, they might also be able to share the job with librarians through planned voluntary programs in which they might work as library staff members on a regular basis. Both types of involvement make the user’s contribution diverse and imply the user’s role as a co-worker in the library.

As regards the level of difficulty of the job that users can undertake or share with librarians, the variation here ranges from “unskilled” to “professional” along the property of “job type”. This means users were allowed to take part in various types of jobs, some of which, such as watering and looking after the trees surrounding the library, do not require professional skills (I. 3). Other tasks might require some higher level of competency, for example shelving, scanning documents, and advising
peers on professional matters such as information consultation (I. 2, I. 3 and I. 10). Concerning the aspect of who is allowed to share work with librarians, the diversity ranges from “few” to “all” along the property of “involved”. “Few” denotes a limited number of persons who are allowed to do (and share) the job with librarians. The rights might be assigned to a specific group of users; for example, some active library users and academic staff who work in collaboration with librarians in information literacy or syllabus innovation programs. This often takes place in an internal rather than public mode, by using internal wikis or similar tools (I. 7, and I. 8). For other services, the library might enable everyone to take part; for example, everyone might take part in peer consultation and support services based on emerging technologies.

Participants observed that library users have been involved in various library operations, including the establishment and development of library services. Participants made many comments relating to this practice. For example, “users now can create content and share it with fellow users”; “they are people who propose ideas to improve services or to develop new ones”; “my library has just organised a strategic plan meeting... Many lecturers and students attended”. Similarly, throughout the interviews, participants talked about library users’ roles by using words such as commenting, cataloguing, information organisation, tagging, suggestion, content creation, reviewing, and information consultation.

It was acknowledged that the users’ rights have changed. “The rights of users have been promoted” (I. 7, p. 5). They have the skills and ability to do many more things than in the past. According to participant 2, “when Web 2.0 is used in the library, the development of library services not only belongs to the librarians, but also belongs to users” (I. 2, p. 3). It is not easy to always make a clear distinction between the role of the librarian and the role of library users. “The boundaries between library staff and users will fade away; users are also the information creators and information providers” (I. 1, p. 5). As mentioned above, the users can play various roles. They may be creators or producers, while still being users or consumers. By playing these roles at the same time, users are, to a certain extent, playing the role of librarian. They are sharing the job with librarians, and helping to ensure that the library runs more smoothly and effectively. As a librarian participant confessed, “librarians cannot always think of or devise services that meet user needs” (I. 2, p. 3). “The
library needs to listen to what users think and the kind of help that they desire” (I. 8, p. 7).

Regarding the type and form of users’ contributions, participant 3 made this more specific when stating that:

They can contribute to the library in various ways such as looking for sources of materials for the library, suggesting new items, or commenting about the library services. In addition, student participants can support the library by promoting library services, introducing library services to users. (I. 3, p. 9)

In order to make this point clearer, a librarian participant provided an example of what her library was doing:

My library is constructing a subject guide based on a blog platform that includes courses on offer in the university. The subject guide contains a wide range of information resources such as textbooks, reference materials, internet sources and others. Students and faculty members can leave comments on it, suggest useful materials, and provide links to sources on the Internet. (I. 2, p. 4)

Such assistance is vital and meaningful as it not only helps librarians and libraries to improve services, but also helps users to be more active and involved in their community. In return, they are offered improved services.

In practice, users can be involved in and do much more than many people think of. A librarian participant talked about the way his library get users involved, even without using emerging technologies or social media. He told his extended story:

My library established a club called Friends of the Library. This club gathers people who love the library. They are students, lecturers, and administrative staff. The purpose of this club is to support the library and to promote the library. Many elderly and retired lecturers and staff join the club. The library divides club members into groups. One group is responsible for supporting the library to organise book stacks, label, and insert magnetic strips into books etc. Another group assists material circulation by helping users to search, shelving, and supporting the front desk staff as necessary. Each
group has a team leader and members assign tasks to one another. In addition, we have one more group that supports the electronic library section. Their duties include material digitalisation, scanning, processing digital materials, and supporting users in searching and using electronic and digital resources. The last group includes people taking care the appearance of the library. Their tasks include looking after the trees, watering, and cleaning. The library has a large garden full of trees and flowers, so we need this group. (I. 3, p. 15)

Using the words of a participant, “the user’s ability to contribute is very large. It is unlimited” (I. 5, p. 6). Users will actively contribute to the development of the library once they are allowed to propose their ideas, when users feel themselves to be a part of the library, and when they feel that their voices are listened to and respected. Participant 5 provided an example of a possible way in which the library can share jobs with its users, stating that:

The library wants to introduce a new library service (i.e. the interlibrary loan service). The library can post a draft version of the policy onto the library blog and wiki. The draft includes some information, such as the number of items that can be borrowed, waiting time, procedures etc. Such rules and policies are firstly proposed by the library staff and manager, meaning that it is first the idea of the library rather than that of users. Once it is posted on the library blog, it will be commented on and improved. It will be revised to better meet users’ individual needs. Based on the users’ comments and feedback, the library can improve the interlibrary loan policy to make it best suited to the needs of users. This is desirable. (I. 5, p. 9)

So far, two of the three main categories have been presented. The previous section discussed the first category, “community”. This section has discussed the second category, “empowerment”. Each category conveys part of the story. The third category, “experience”, will be discussed below, and will help to fully deconstruct the narratives of the research participants.
5.3.3 Category 3: “experience”

The provision of facilities that offer a diverse range of innovative services to users was not sufficient for a good library experience. Experience is a holistic concept that refers to the way library users relate to the physical and virtual library. Experience is defined and understood by the individual library user; it relates to the process of doing, seeing, being, and feeling. Participants expressed their perspectives in either an implicit or an overt manner. They shared their views from various perspectives. Some were concerned about the physical and virtual appearance of the library. For instance, one said, “the library is not only a place to learn, but also a place for fun, entertainment and relaxation…” (I. 14, p. 14). Meanwhile, others were interested in the attitude or manner of the librarians who create a welcoming environment. For example, a user participant believed that, “when a user comes to the library, the first thing they look at is the appearance, the library environment, library space, and the attitude of the librarians ...” (I. 15, p. 6). Participants often referred to the library as a “one-stop place”, a “learning space” and a “playground”. Other common words used by participants when talking about libraries and librarians were “informal”, “friendly”, “exciting”, and “comfortable”. Table 5.5 provides further details for the concept of “experience”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensional range</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>Strong -------------- Stronger</td>
<td>Playground, Comfort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Served ---------------- Self-served</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>Human ------------------ Technological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 - Category “experience” and its associated concepts

The “experience” category has three properties: “appeal”, “service”, and “operation”. Each property and its dimensions further explain the concept of “experience”. As Table 5.5 shows, “experience” can range from “strong” to “stronger” along the property of “appeal”. This attribute of experience stands for the “look and feel” of the library. It is the overall design, the appearance of the library that users see and feel when being in the library. As both user and librarian participants acknowledged, the library should ensure that its appearance is good and convenient enough for users to perform their tasks. It is best if the library creates a favourable and attractive environment in which users enjoy their activities (I. 2 and I. 11). The “appeal” was
also recognised and expected in the library’s physical spaces (reading rooms, common area, and library café area, etc.) as well as its virtual spaces (personalised web space, library online forums, and social media service) (I. 3 and I. 15).

Regarding the way in which library services are provided, “experience” varied from “served” to “self-served” along the property of “service”. Both forms of service provided diversity in library experience, as users often have options to choose from to suit their preferences. The library still keeps services that are facilitated or “served” by librarians, such as reference services and information consultation, etc. Other services might be co-catered and co-facilitated by peer users, such as the library’s online forum, blogs, and Facebook. In addition to these, the diversification of the library experience is increased by services such as self-checkout, personalisable and customisable web spaces, and self-catalogues of information resources.

Experience also ranges from “human” to “technological” along the property of “operation”. All factors relating to the operations of the library – such as human, technology, and other factors such as procedures, standards, and rules – need to be friendly, accessible, and user-oriented. Staff members, especially those who work at the front desk, need to have a positive, enthusiastic, and dedicated manner. Similarly, any services, including those based on emerging technologies, also need to be user-friendly and approachable. Some endeavours to ensure better library operation and a greater library experience for users include predicting user needs based on user behaviour then offering suggestions (I. 9), utilising Web 2.0 to simplify the search process (I. 4), and ensuring the positive attitude of library staff in physical and virtual environments (I. 2).

Two sub-categories that give further clarification and specification to the concept of “experience” are “playground” and “comfort”. A discussion about each sub-category is as follows:
Table 5.6 - Sub-categories of “experience” and their associated concepts

**Playground**

“Playground” plays a significant role in the library experience of users. It implies the “place” (either real-life environment or virtual one) where people can “play” (performing their tasks such as learning, working, doing research etc.) with fun rather than stress. The playground can vary from “physical” to “virtual” along the property of “location”. In terms of physical spaces, the playground might be indoor (within the physical library) or outdoor (surrounding the library). The physical playground might also vary from “reading room” to “café” along the property of “character”. This means that the space might comprise both a formal, quiet environment and an exciting social area. The physical space might consist of any environment such as quiet study rooms, group study rooms, and customisable learning areas. In terms of virtual space, the playground might include web space and social media environments or platforms like wikis, Facebook, Twitter, and blogs, which together provide a “place” for users, and the library users’ community, to get involved.

In either location, the playground is always an important contributor to the success of the library. It must be flexible enough to meet the diverse and increasing demands of users. Recognising this, research participants, especially library user participants, appreciated the flexibility offered by the library. They described how the flexibility of the playground could be represented in terms of its variation from “personalised” to “shared” along the property of “possession”. A user might like to find an individual space in order to do personal work without interruption. He might also like to find a common area where he can work in a group or take part in social
activities. This again was organised in both virtual and physical library environments.

According to librarian and user participants, the library must firstly be a place where users can experience numerous activities relating to their working, learning, and personal lives. Participants often referred to the library as “a common space”, a “learning place”, and “a one-stop place”. For example, a user participant said:

*A library is a portal, a place that gathers information from various sources… It is a community space where all users can meet; it is a place for users of all ages and all skill levels to share, comment, and participate in discussions.* (I. 11, p. 5)

The library space was regarded as a crucial part in which the physical or real-life space is integral. As a librarian participant stated, “many users still need to come to the library to find books, to study, or to do research, rather than only use online resources and services” (I. 2, p. 7). Another user participant concurred, stating:

*In the coming 50 years, the physical environment in a library will be indispensable. It will still play an important role in terms of library services and resources. In the next few decades, the virtual environment and the physical environment will still support each other. The virtual environment will help to promote the prestige of the library and encourage users to use the physical environment more efficiently.* (I. 5, p. 8)

Users can experience the library as a virtual or physical environment, or as a combination of the two environments. Sharing a view about the advantages of emerging technologies when adopted into libraries, participant 11 emphasised:

*I find it necessary to take advantage of Web 2.0 tools to create new communication channels, to create a playground that attracts users to join in. This makes users change their minds. They won’t view libraries as a building with four walls and full of bookshelves. Instead, the library should be considered as a place that gathers all kinds of information sources that serve various kinds of users via diverse types of media.* (I. 11, p. 4)
Participants explained that the library was often expected to provide an interesting and attractive environment. This is different from what was expected in the previous generation of library. Such a contemporary library must go beyond the physical space of the library walls by reaching “various kind of users”, including internal and external users, as the participant 11 implied; and provide them with diverse information sources and communication channels. Participant 14 shared the same opinion and commented that the library is “something more than a place to borrow and return books” (I. 14, p. 9).

Besides being a “place” (both physical and virtual) for users to “play” in (doing their activities with convenience and fun), according to participant 12, the library “must be an open and friendly environment. My university library is planning to create a space called “academic cafe”, where students and lecturers can freely meet and exchange ideas” (I. 12, p. 5). Such an open and informal environment would “attract participants to join in. It is an ideal place for communication and exchange of ideas” (I. 12, p. 5). An open, friendly, and informal space in the library has many advantages. It attracts participants to join in library activities. It encourages participants to take part in the conversation, and it provides them with a good experience when exchanging ideas. Another user participant appreciated such a library space and described that:

The conversation here is not restrictive, rigid or too serious, as it can be in seminars or classes. This environment would create a good feeling for participants. In a seminar or class, it is not easy to have a lively discussion. However, in the space of “cafe books” or “academic cafe”, the conversation between a speaker (i.e., a lecturer) and students will be very open as they enjoy coffee while joining in the discussion. Participants become relaxed and more open. (I. 15, p. 8)

**Comfort**

The sub-category of “comfort” adds specification to the category of “experience”. It refers to the positive feeling when users experience the library. Comfort might range from “favourable” to “inspired” along the property continuum of “impression”. Impression reflects what users feel when they are in the library. This impression is
brought about by the general appearance of the library (as mentioned above in the section discussing “appeal”) and the attitude or service style of the librarians. Library users might experience the feelings of being encouraged and welcomed. They might feel at home in the library, since they enjoy doing things in the library without worry or stress. The manner in which library staff members conducted themselves was important, especially those who work at the front desk and in direct contact with the users. This created an atmosphere of being at home for many library users and they very much appreciated it (I. 2, I. 10, I. 11, and I. 14).

The concept of “comfort” also varied from “formal” to “informal” along the property continuum of “tone”. This stands for the level of formality of the library environment. Formality might vary depending on the specific user group and the environment in which the communication takes place. As the user community in university libraries is young, communication should be open and comfortable. In addition, the older or senior staff members of the library may prefer a less casual tone of conversation, so it should be reasonable, rather than too casual (I. 16). However, in spite of the fact that it is an academic library environment, informality and relaxation are still appreciated and preferred. This is because in an informal environment, people tend to be themselves and what they say is heartfelt (I. 8, I. 11, and I. 14). In relation to how relaxed and informal the library is, the concept of “comfort” was also represented through the variation from “relaxation” to “having fun” along the property of “magnitude”. In addition to being “academic”, “serious”, and “formal”, comfortableness was emphasised. Participants acknowledged this by using words such as “relaxation”, “entertainment”, “enjoyment”, “excitement”, and “fun”. All of these attributes provided the library community users with a better experience.

Other research participants discussed features beyond openness and informality, stating that besides providing services of an “academic” and “serious” nature, the university library should provide something more. A user participant who regarded her library as “multi-functional” shared her enjoyment of the library when she said:

_The library is not only a place to learn, but also a place to find fun, entertainment and relaxation. I myself sometimes need to attend classes all_
day. I always come to the library after lunch to read or to watch movies and then attend the afternoon classes. (I. 14, p. 14)

Experiencing the library in a physical mode and also taking part in the communication and exchange of ideas virtually, via emerging technologies, was important for this participant. She appreciated the advantages that such technologies offer and said, “The way of communication is also informal and more relaxed than the in-person way. It is not necessary to be always serious” (I. 14, p. 15). Hence, informality in an academic library should be taken into account in both physical and virtual environments. Attention to this feature can provide users with a better experience when using the library.

The comfortableness that the library provided was also highly valued by participant 15, who suggested that comfort plays an important role in the library operation and its effectiveness. He stated:

> When users come to the library, the first thing they look at is the appearance, the library environment, the library space, and the attitude of the librarians. These issues have a great effect on people’s habits of using the library and the effectiveness of library services. (I. 15, p. 6)

He also talked about his positive experience with using the library of a non-government organisation, stating that, “in addition to an abundant source of materials, the library is very beautiful, graceful, with tip-top services. I am sure users of the library are very comfortable and happy. University libraries need to do the same thing” (I. 15, p. 4). As library users, other research participants shared the same view regarding what the library space or environment should be. “Libraries need to create a comfortable environment for their users” (I. 12, p. 8). “They [users] should have a space to learn and have fun. The library is the environment that provides the most favourable conditions for learning and development” (I. 16, p. 8). As a result, “participation is voluntary and it will naturally come when users feel comfortable and encouraged. They will get involved in both virtual and physical ways” (I. 13, p. 8).
In recognition of the importance of a comfortable library environment, librarians also shared the ways that they facilitate this. Participant 2 disclosed the ways in which her library offers such features to users, saying:

_It is essential to create a healthy and comfortable library environment. Our university library is equipped with a perfume sprayer. Every 30 minutes the machine will spray once. The atmosphere in the library is always nice and comfortable, so it attracts users. All those things make a library attractive. In addition, the library also arranges many trees to create spaces of comfort and tranquillity. Beside bookcases are slogans such as "books are precious assets"; “the library is your home” etc. When users are in such spaces they feel very comfortable to work, study and participate in the library activities. The library is where they come to feel comfortable instead of stressed because of work and study._ (I. 2, p. 10)

The library here, according to participant 2, is really a place where users can experience their learning, research, or anything in between in the most comfortable way. The library is really a place where users can enjoy doing what they need to do rather than a place where they have to come to fulfil their tasks. A similar opinion about building a favourable library environment was expressed by a librarian participant who revealed one of the ways in which his library enhances the “look and feel” of the library:

_My library established a club called Friends of the Library. This club gathers people who love the library ... The purpose of this club is to support the library and to promote the library ... This club includes people who take care of the appearance of the library. Their tasks include looking after the trees, watering, and cleaning. The library has a large garden full of trees and flowers, so we need this group._ (I. 3, p. 15)

The attitude and manner of librarians are important aspects that attract and encourage users to come to the library and create an intimate atmosphere in the library. A librarian participant, who is in charge of the library services, shared her library’s success story about utilising emerging technologies to meet user needs. She was happy with the users’ positive comments on new services offered by the library, and
provided an example of what library users often tell the library staff: “we are experiencing the greatest services” or “the librarians are very nice, very friendly and jolly” (I. 10, p. 9). Participant 2 repeatedly made this point as she believed that her library users are happy with the services, saying that “the deployment of services based on Web 2.0 has satisfied their [users] expectations, and made their dreams come true” (I. 2, p. 6). Both librarians claimed that their success is the result of the service style that is provided by the young and dynamic librarians, who “are very courteous” (I. 2, p. 6), so the “user is pleased with the professional and dedicated manner of the consultation staff” (I. 10, p. 9). Participant 2 further shared the way that her library does this:

Although many library services are performed in the virtual environment, the library must have a real environment for effective communication. When users effectively communicate with the library in the physical environment, they see the librarians as gentle, cheerful, helpful and then when they move to the virtual environment, they will imagine they are communicating with the real library staff, who are friendly and easy going, so that it makes them more willing to participate. This creates the confidence in our users; it is very important. (I. 2, p. 9)

One user participant confirmed this as he expressed his appreciation for the librarians’ manner:

I think that the staff members in libraries need to have a passion ... Librarians need to be enthusiastic. They need to create a comfortable and welcoming environment for users. I'm fortunate to be practicing in the University of Technology Library where all staff members always treat students as friends. They are very friendly and enthusiastic, so students can discuss everything. (I. 15, p. 4)

This section has discussed the category of “experience”, which together with the other two categories, “community” and “empowerment”, fully presents the narratives of the research participants.
5.4 CHAPTER CONCLUSION

This chapter has described the structure of the core categories and explained the abstract levels of the categories and associated concepts. The chapter has deconstructed the narratives of the research participants via the three core categories of “community”, “empowerment”, and “experience”. They are cornerstones of the emerging participatory library model. Each core category was examined in depth through the identification and explanation of their sub-categories, properties, and dimensions. The variation within each category provided a fuller understanding of the category itself, and this is the basis for a deeper understanding of the model. The categories and their related concepts were also analysed and interpreted in conjunction with examples and excerpts taken from interviews, shedding further light on the categories.

The main themes of the research or cornerstones of the emerging model have been identified. Even though they have been thoroughly described and interpreted, and such description is important for the development of the theory (Corbin and Strauss, 2008), they still appear as a list of themes or a group of unrelated concepts on which the model cannot yet be formed. The next chapter will present the importance of these cornerstones in the emerging participatory library model and provide insights into other building blocks that together make up the participatory library model.
Chapter 6: Establishing a participatory library model

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 5 discussed three categories, their sub-categories and associated concepts that are the cornerstones of the participatory library model. This chapter presents a complete participatory library model, which demonstrates how the three core categories are interrelated and together form the foundation for the model. The chapter also presents and discusses other building blocks, which are related to the centre of the model in order to fully explain the participatory library.

Specifically, this chapter consists of two main sections. The “foundation of the participatory library model” section briefly demonstrates how the three core categories form the centre of the model. It defines the relationships between and among categories and then presents the initial model of the participatory library. The “participatory library model” section first presents the complete participatory library model. This is followed by a discussion of the causal conditions that lead to the phenomena of study. Next, it presents the interactions and actions that respond to the phenomena. It then discusses the contextual and intervening conditions that have an influence on the actions and interactions (inter/actions). Finally, it presents the consequences of these inter/actions.

6.2 CORE CATEGORIES: FOUNDATION OF THE PARTICIPATORY LIBRARY MODEL

The three categories discussed in Chapter 5 – community, empowerment, and experience – are core categories. They are the main phenomena, the cornerstones that together form the foundation for the participatory library. According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), ideas representing a core category must appear frequently in the data. In all or almost all cases, there are indicators pointing to that core category. In this study, ideas representing the three categories appear in all interviews with both library users and librarians, either directly or implicitly. They represent the main concerns of the research participants. Furthermore, Strauss and Corbin (1998) also state that a core category must have analytic power and must be able to explain
variations within categories. The three categories above have been thoroughly
delineated and explained. In addition to an introduction, the properties and
dimensions of each category have been defined. The analysis has clarified the
attributes of each category and explained the variations that together add density to
and richer understanding of the category. Each phenomenon conveys part of the story
and all three formulate the centre of the participatory library model.

This section demonstrates: (i) how the three core categories form part of and become
the centre of the participatory library model, and (ii) the relationships between these
three categories and the ways in which one is connected to another.

6.2.1 Relationships within each category of community, empowerment, and
experience

According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), if the researcher wants to build theory, then
it is important to understand as much as possible about the phenomenon under
investigation. In addition to the identification and interpretation of categories as
discussed in Chapter 5, this section demonstrates the internal relationships within
each core category (phenomenon). These relationships provide a deeper
understanding about the phenomenon and then help to establish the foundation of the
participatory library model.

The data that qualitative researchers work with are complex. They consist of multiple
concepts existing in interwoven relationships that are often difficult to tease out
(Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Therefore, it is necessary to have a way to think about
those relationships. In order to gain a depth of understanding of the phenomena, it is
crucial to understand the context in which the phenomena exist. Context is a set of
conditions that shapes the nature of situations, circumstances or problems to which
individuals respond through forms of action and interaction. In doing so, it brings
about consequences that in turn might go back to impact upon conditions. The matrix
below (Figure 6.1) helps to contextualise the phenomena. One of the purposes of the
matrix is to develop explanatory hypotheses about the relationships within and
among categories that can be verified or modified through further data collection and
analysis, and to provide direction for theoretical sampling (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).
As a significant step in developing this matrix, a series of investigative questions in
the form of “what, when, where, why, and how” were used. Answers to such
questions help to contextualise the phenomena. Below are forms and examples of questions being asked in order to build up the matrix (Figure 6.1). The development of these questions is based on the guidelines made by Strauss and Corbin (1998) and the explanations made by Scott (2004) and Scott and Howell (2008).

- What is (the name of category); What is “community”?
- When does (the name of category) happen; When does “community” happen?
- Where does (the name of category) happen; Where does “community” happen?
- Why does (the name of category) happen; Why does “community” happen?
- How does (the name of category) happen; How does “community” happen?
- With what results/consequences does (the name of category) happen? Alternatively, with what results/consequences is (the name of category) understood; That is, with what results does “community” happen?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>Why</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Consequences/Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Sharing, Connection, Peer support.</td>
<td>Collaboration, Seeking partnerships,</td>
<td>Social media space (blogs, Facebook,</td>
<td>Keeping informed, Seeking partnerships, Enhancing service,</td>
<td>Being active and enthusiastic, Empowering user, Library development, Getting involved, Reaching wider community, Learning from wide community, Learner centredness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empowerment</strong></td>
<td>Authority, Prosumption, Partnering.</td>
<td>Collaboration, Competition, Sharing job,</td>
<td>Virtual environment, Social media space (blogs, Facebook, YouTube, wikis), Physical library space, Library forum, Community space.</td>
<td>Enhancing service, Making use of collective intelligence, New experience, Building community, Competition.</td>
<td>Listening to user’s opinions, Sharing job, Creating and developing content, Using collaborative tools, Customisation and personalisation, Facilitation, Contribution.</td>
<td>Better-tailored services, Equality, Favourable library environment, Improved policy, Becoming dynamic learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption of emerging technologies,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raising voice, Policy, Facilitation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitation, Supportive policy,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education and training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6.1 - Core categories and conditional relationship matrix*
Though clues on how to respond to the above set of questions may be implicit or explicit in the data, the answers help to locate the context within a conditional structure and identify the “how”, or the means through which a category is manifested (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Below are explanations of each question.

The first question was “What is community?” The community was clarified with details in the earlier chapter. In short, community is about sharing (information, resources, interests), connection (among community members, i.e., librarians, library users, and broader community members), and peer support (assistance from peers in order to meet the needs of each member). The answer to this question captures the collective viewpoints of research participants.

The second question was, “When does community happen?” This question involves the time when an incident occurs or the rationale for the presence of community. According to the research participants, community exists when there is collaboration among members (or when members want to collaborate), when they look for support and partnership, when they have shared interests, and when there is facilitation (librarian, library user or community member facilitates the conversation).

The third question was, “Where does community happen?” Responses may use the word “in” or “at” that specify the place or space where the community and its activities take place. The answers may be general or specific; for instance, community might happen “in physical environment” (general) or “in library café” and “in library study room” (specific). As shared by participants, community exists in various environments including social media spaces such as blogs, Facebook, YouTube, and wikis. Similarly, community (sharing, connection, and peer support) also takes place in seminars and workshops, in the library café, in the library forum, at offline events, and anywhere.

The fourth question was “Why does community happen?” This question helps to investigate the reasons that make “community” happen. For example, as shared by the research participants, community happens (or exists) because people (library community members of all kinds) want to be kept informed, because they want to seek partnerships, and because they want to improve the library service. Participants also acknowledged that social media is convenient (so they adopted it for sharing,
making connections and supporting peers). Similarly, community exists because people have shared interests and because there is competition among university libraries (if libraries do not adopt social media and emerging technologies in their business, then they become less attractive and their counterparts become more competitive).

It is noteworthy that answers to the questions of “when” and “why” might sometimes be similar. For example, community exists during the time people seek partnerships (when) and it exists because people want to seek partnerships (why). This situation might not only occur in the same category, but also across categories. For instance, there might be an identical answer to the question “when” (i.e., both “community” and “empowerment” exist when people are working in collaboration).

While the previous questions (when, where, and why) help identify contextual conditions and boundaries, the fifth question asked “how”; i.e., “How does community happen?” This helps identify the actions and interactions among the categories. Hence, community exists, or in other words, sharing, connection, and peer support exist or can be made possible by being active and enthusiastic participants (in the case of librarians, users, and community members). Sharing, connection, and peer support are possible by empowering users, establishing playgrounds, adopting social media, encouraging users, and having an inviting attitude (in the case of librarians and libraries).

The actions and interactions (answers to the question “how”) lead to the consequences – the sixth question asked, “With what results does community happen? In other words, the actions and interactions in the question “how” result in library development and people getting involved. This also leads to the practice that people can learn from a wider community and the reality that learners (users) are the centre of the library.

The above discussion about the questions posed and their meanings explained the context in which the phenomenon of “community” exists. It also interpreted the actions and interactions within the category (phenomenon) and introduced the consequences of these actions and interactions. Similarly, the phenomena of
“empowerment” and “experience” can be better understood in the contexts set out in the above matrix (Figure 6.1)

As an important step to explicate the relationships within each category (phenomenon), hypotheses were then made in the form of relational statements that relate sub-categories and associated concepts to a category. The purpose of hypotheses is to denote the nature of relationships between concepts and the phenomenon (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). The hypotheses state the what, when, where, why, and how of the phenomenon, and what the consequences of the phenomenon are. Below are examples of relational statements that demonstrate the internal relationships within a (sub)category.

**Example 1 - Category: community (i.e., “sharing”)**

Sharing (what) occurs when librarians, users, and wider community members work in collaboration (when). This practice happens in social media space (where) and it happens because they want to be kept informed (why). Sharing can occur as people are active and enthusiastic (how), and this leads to the library development and involvement of people (consequences).

**Example 2 - Category: empowerment (i.e., “authority”)**

People have authority (what) during the time they voice their opinions (when) in either the physical or virtual library environment (where). The authority exists because the library and librarians want to enhance services (why) and library users want to make use of collective intelligence (why), so they (librarians and libraries) adopt emerging technologies and library users utilise them. The authority (of library users) can be made possible by listening to user’s opinions (how) and this leads to the fact that library services are better-tailored to users (consequence).

**Example 3 - Category: experience (i.e., “comfort”)**

There might be comfort (what) when the library and librarians perceive (when) that it is important for their users. The comfort might be set up in both physical and virtual library spaces (where). The library creates a comfortable environment for users because it wants to enhance services (why). It can be achieved by listening to the
user’s opinions (how) and as a result, the library can enhance the user’s library experience (consequence).

Each of the three phenomena above might have many relational statements. Such statements are formed based on connecting responses to the questions of what, when, where, why, how, and what the consequences of the phenomenon are. The examples above provide an idea of how a relationship or connection within each category is established.

### 6.2.2 Relationships among categories of community, empowerment, and experience

Each category is understood through its properties and dimensions. Therefore, to identify the connections between and among categories, it is necessary to relate categories at a dimensional level. This means that it is necessary to see if there are shared properties and dimensions among them. The table below helps identify if there are connections between and among categories. The identification of shared properties and dimensions is based upon tables in Chapter 5 that show categories, sub-categories and their associated concepts. Each of the three core categories is assigned with a number in order to make the table clearer; that is, Community=1, Empowerment=2, and Experience=3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Shared by Categories</th>
<th>Shared by Sub-categories</th>
<th>Indication of relationship between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Physical --- Virtual</td>
<td>Community, Empowerment.</td>
<td>Connection, Playground.</td>
<td>1 and 2, 2 and 3, 1 and 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership, Person.</td>
<td>Internal --- External</td>
<td>Community, Empowerment.</td>
<td>Peer support, Comfort.</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>Informal --- Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 and 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 - Shared properties and dimensions among core categories

As Table 6.2 shows, there are connections among the three categories. The connections are represented via properties and dimensions of either the main categories or their sub-categories. For example, the property “location” is shared by
the categories “community” and “empowerment”, and by the sub-categories “connection” and “playground”. This indicates that there are connections between and among the three core categories as they themselves or their sub-categories share the same property of “location”. This means that community, empowerment, and experience all happen or exist in both physical and virtual settings.

Similarly, the relationship between the categories “community” and “empowerment” is also represented via the properties “membership” and “person”, as both are about the people who are members of the community, and such people are empowered. These two properties share the dimension that ranges from internal to external. This means that not only people within, but also people outside the library (public users) could be members of the library community, and they are also empowered. In addition, there is a connection between “community” and “experience”, as their sub-categories “peer support” and “comfort” share the property of “tone”.

Based on the delineation of the three categories throughout Chapter 5 and the explanation of relationships within and among core categories in this chapter, Figure 6.1 below visualises the connections or relationships among the core categories.

---

**Figure 6.1 - Initial model of the participatory library**
As Figure 6.1 demonstrates, there are interactions among three phenomena. The interactions are represented in two directions. *Community* is the basis for (which leads to) the development of *empowerment*. This means that without connection, sharing, and peer support, there would not be the practice of authority, prosumption, and partnering. For example, without physical and social-media connections, it would be hard or infeasible for members to work in partnership with one another. Conversely (dashed arrow), by being empowered, members promote connection, enhance sharing, and strengthen peer support.

In addition, *empowerment* enhances *experience*. By being empowered, members have more opportunities to be actively and deeply involved in the business of the library. As they join in the playground, they diversify its activities (programs, services, etc.) and become an integral part of the playground. Since they are the people who directly shape and drive the development of programs and services, they actively create a comfortable environment for those activities. As a result, they enhance the library experience. Conversely (dashed arrow), a well-established and facilitated playground together with a favourable environment would contribute to the *empowerment* and encourage members to become more active in authority, prosumption, and partnering.

Furthermore, *experience* helps build up and develop *community*. Community members need a place to play. This means playground (part of the experience) provides a favourable environment for the community’s activities (connection, sharing, and peer support). Such activities would not happen without the availability of a playground and associated favourable conditions. Conversely (dashed arrow), typical features of community, sharing, connection, and peer support together enrich the *experience*. As mention above, they are not only the basis for empowerment, but also the aspects that make the playground exciting and attractive.

Three categories (phenomena) together formulate the initial participatory library model. None of the three can be left out; otherwise, there will be only separate parts of the model. There are strong connections among these phenomena and each one supports another. If one of the phenomena changes, then the others will also change. This is the reason why the participatory library is fluid rather than rigid.
So far, this section (Section 6.2) has discussed the participatory library’s foundation upon the three core categories of community, empowerment, and experience. The section has demonstrated how the three core categories together form the centre of the participatory library model. It has also illustrated the relationships between the three categories and the way in which one is connected to another to establish the initial participatory library model.

6.3 PARTICIPATORY LIBRARY MODEL

Chapter 5 and previous sections in this chapter have discussed the three core categories, which together form the initial participatory library model. Currently the model has only three phenomena (the foundation of the model). However, the data analysis reveals that the participatory library is more complex than what has been presented. This section will introduce the complete participatory library model (Figure 6.2). The section starts with the introduction of the participatory library model. Then it demonstrates how the model should be understood, and finally it delineates other details of the model.
Chapter 6: Establishing a participatory library model

Causal conditions
- Adoption of emerging technologies,
- Survival of the fittest.

Contextual conditions
- Shared interest,
- Facilitation,
- Physical and virtual environment,
- Enthusiasm and volunteering.

Inter/actions
- Establishing playground,
- Creating favourable environment,
- Getting involved,
- Contributing.

Consequences
- Learning community,
- Equality,
- Better-tailored services,
- Enhanced library experience.

Experience
- Playground, Comfort.

Empowerment
- Authority, Prosumption, Partnering.

Participatory Library

Community
- Connection, Sharing, Peer support.

Intervening conditions
- Perception,
- Policy,
- Education and training.

*Figure 6.2 - Participatory library model*
According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), if theory building is the goal of the research project, then findings should be presented as a set of interrelated concepts rather than just a listing of themes. In addition, Strauss and Corbin (1990) suggest that core categories may be related to other concepts (i.e., categories or sub-categories) by means of the paradigm that consists of conditions, context, inter/actions, and consequences. It is also noteworthy that the names given to categories may or may not include such paradigmatic terms. The issue is to identify which category denotes what part of the paradigm. This identification essentially orders them into subcategories in a paradigmatic relationship.

As the Figure 6.2 presents, the initial model showed in Figure 6.1 now becomes the central part of the model. Besides it, other parts connect with one another in order to create a complete and complex participatory library model.

The matrix (Table 6.1) provides a basis for the model. For example, answers to the questions “when, where, and why” provide contextual and intervening conditions within which the inter/actions respond to or handle the phenomena. In addition, answers to the question of “how” in the matrix suggest inter/actions in the model. Similarly, the answers to the question “with what results…” provide the basis for “consequences” in the model. It should be noted that while the answers to questions in the matrix were quite detailed, they are presented concisely in the model. Below is a brief explanation of the paradigmatic terms related to or used in the participatory library model (Figure 6.2).

*Phenomena:* are the central ideas in the data represented as concepts (Strauss and Corbin 1998, p. 101). Specifically, a phenomenon is the central idea, event, happening, or incident about which a set of actions or interactions are directed at managing, handling, or to which the set of actions is related Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 96).

*Conditions:* are a set of events or happenings that create the situations, issues, and problems pertaining to a phenomenon and, to a certain extent, explain why and how persons or groups respond in certain ways. Conditions might arise out of time, place culture, rules, regulations, beliefs, economics, power, or gender factors, as well as the
social worlds, organisations, and institutions in which we find ourselves, along with our personal motivations and biographies (Strauss and Corbin 1998, p. 130).

_Causal conditions:_ are events and happenings that lead to the occurrence or development of a phenomenon (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 96). In other words, causal conditions are sets of events or happenings that influence phenomena (Strauss and Corbin 98, p. 131).

_Contextual conditions:_ are the specific sets of conditions (patterns of conditions) that intersect dimensionally at this time and place to create the set of circumstances or problems to which persons respond through inter/actions (Strauss and Corbin 1998, p. 132).

_Intervening conditions:_ are those that mitigate or otherwise alter the impact of causal conditions on phenomena (Strauss and Corbin 98, p. 131). Put another way, intervening conditions are the structural conditions influencing action or interactional strategies that pertain to a phenomenon. They facilitate or constrain the strategies taken within a specific context (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 96). In short, intervening conditions shape, facilitate or constrain the strategies that take place within a specific context.

_Interaction and actions (inter/actions):_ are strategies devised to manage, handle, carry out, or respond to a phenomenon under a specific set of perceived conditions (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 97).

_Consequences:_ are outcomes or results of actions and/or interactions (Strauss and Corbin, 90, p. 97).

_How the participatory library model can be understood?_

As can be seen from Figure 6.2, the circles are the centre of the model. Contained within the circles are the three main categories, which are discussed in Chapter 5. The model can be read from the left to the right-hand side. The model starts with the _causal conditions_, which were the adoption of emerging technologies and the competition for survival among libraries. These lead to the _phenomena_ of community, empowerment, and experience. This means the causal conditions bring about community, give the community members opportunities to enhance their rights
and power, and provide them with a new library experience. The phenomena lead to inter/actions. In other words, the phenomena lead to the responses of libraries, librarians, and users. The inter/actions present how these stakeholders respond to or deal with the phenomena.

There were contexts within which the inter/actions were carried out. They were the shared interests, facilitation, etc. In addition, there were intervening conditions that are the background features of general perception, policy, etc. that pertain to the phenomena and influence on the inter/actions. Finally, there were the consequences, which resulted from inter/actions. Thus, this model of a participatory library is grounded in the experiences, opinions, and understanding of research participants. The model demonstrates not only the phenomena, but also the reasons leading to them, the inter/actions and contexts for this, and the results. Below is the discussion of details in the model.

6.3.1 Causal conditions

Two main causal conditions emerging from the data led to the phenomena of community, empowerment, and experience. The causal conditions were (i) adoption of emerging technologies and (ii) survival of the fittest.

Adoption of emerging technologies

Firstly, the availability of information and telecommunication technology infrastructure together with the emergence of social media tools, mobile and handheld devices has naturally influenced the operation of libraries. Tablets and smartphones are expensive, but as a participant predicted, they are becoming more affordable (I. 1 and I. 8). Besides this, “the wireless network is available everywhere on campus” (I. 2, p. 2), which makes things easier. Such features are a good basis for adoption of emerging technologies in university libraries. According to the ideas that were commonly shared by many participants, there were three levels of adoption as presented in Table 6.3.
Additionally, the two main stakeholders who adopted emerging technologies were libraries (librarians) and users. As for the librarians, they were interested in new and emerging technologies. When the technologies came into existence, they started to learn about them. Some librarians played with or used them mainly for personal purposes like entertainment and personal communication (I. 1, I. 3, and I. 5). They also attended workshops on topics such as social media and its potential for the library. Furthermore, in a more formal approach, they took part in short-term training courses on such topics. Consequently, they were aware of and gained knowledge of what emerging technologies are and how such things can change library activities (I. 3, I. 6, and I. 7).

Strategically, some librarians started with using several tools, such as Facebook, blogs, and instant messaging, for professional purposes. This usage was sometimes part of a pilot program that aimed to try out new tools in the library setting. In some cases, such experimentation was spontaneous and stemmed from librarians’ curiosity (I. 3 and I. 5). These experimental periods aimed to see the reaction from library users. Such pioneer librarians wanted to understand if the tools were suitable for their libraries and users. Once library users actively responded to the new tools, librarians officially deployed them and made them widely available. In this stage, librarians often set up emerging technologies-based library services for professional and institutional purposes rather than personal ones. They planned strategically for long-term development of such services in the library. The adoption pace was slow and limited (I. 4, I. 5 and I. 7). However, “the deployment of services based on Web 2.0
has satisfied their (students) expectations, made their dreams come true. They responded very actively and enthusiastically” (I. 2, p. 4).

In terms of the users’ adoption, while there were several librarians who acknowledged the students’ advantage of being young and technology-savvy (I. 6 and I. 8), it is noted that university libraries have not been active in making use of emerging technologies to better meet users’ demand (I. 4 and I. 7). In the meantime, library users appeared to be early adopters. When talking about the popularity of emerging technologies in university libraries, a participant believed that only a “few academic libraries are using Facebook, while every student now has a Facebook account. Facebook is the favourite of the younger generation of students” (I. 14, p. 7). User participants believed that social media is friendly, convenient, and handy; therefore, many library users utilise it in everyday life. They are familiar with it and ready for its adoption in the library setting (I. 10, I. 13 and I. 16).

**Survival of the fittest**

The second causal condition that emerged from the data was a competition for survival among university libraries. University libraries were under pressure to change or risk their existence. There were three main sources of challenges. The first challenge was quite apparent as the library has been widely acknowledged as a growing organism (Ranganathan, 1931). Naturally, the library needs to constantly change in order to adapt to new situations. For example, libraries used to adopt the personal computer so that they could keep up with changes and satisfy their users. Nowadays, social media and other emerging technologies have become popular in various sectors and the library is no exception. According to a participant, if university libraries function as they are required, they “must be active ...Libraries also need to find ways to help users become active. They need to support users, help them to form habits and demand rather than simply meeting their needs” (I. 11, p. 6). This participant added that libraries should predict users’ needs. For example, “our library often uses statistics on the needs of previous and existing users to suggest and provide services to subsequent users” (I. 11, p. 6).

There was also pressure from users regardless of what the library intended to do. Participant 11 stated:
Satisfying users’ needs is the reason for the library’s existence and development. For this reason, in order to survive and develop, the library needs to listen to the thoughts and aspirations of the people that they are serving – users. It is important for libraries to understand what their users need and want. If users raise their voice and contribute their ideas but the library ignores them, then it won’t be able to survive. (I. 11, p. 7)

With such a belief, the library users seemed to be more confident that they could contribute their voice and expertise to the development of libraries. In the position of a university library director, a participant recognised that the position of a librarian is becoming more challenging than ever before. This is because users are tech-savvy and they are more than competent in many other fields. She admitted, “we are librarians, but sometimes we are slower than them [users]. There is a lot of pressure placed on the library and library management” (I. 6, p. 1).

Apart from providing libraries with tools to enhance their programs and services, technological advances together with social media also enable users to raise their voices easily. This creates pressure on the library and requires the library to respond promptly. For example, “the user can give feedback whenever they want. This is the pressure forcing libraries to continuously improve the quality of their products and services. With these instant comments and feedback, the adjustment of the library's operation takes place faster” (I. 16, p. 9). Again, once the library opts to adopt technologies, then they must adapt with them. If the library can actively respond to what users raise, then it has more chance to operate in a user-driven manner. Concurring with this idea, another participant shared a story of her university library’s users proposing to have library Twitter. The library did not pay attention to the proposal at first. The idea was then posted on the library’s Facebook and a large number of users supported it. Ultimately, the library seriously considered the proposal and decided to set up a library Twitter channel (I. 6).

In addition to the pressure from users, a university library has to deal with pressure coming from its counterparts. This means there is competition among university libraries. A participant noticed:
Libraries are competing with one another. Although it is not as competitive as what we see in the market, if a library does not meet the needs of users, it is hard to survive. So libraries have to change themselves to keep users coming and participating. (I. 12, p. 9)

Clearly, libraries and their parent universities are providing educational services while users/students are customers. If they do not satisfy customers then they have to cope with elimination. It was believed that “if the library does not positively change, it will become outdated. Users will find the library tedious, and they will not engage with it” (I. 10, p. 6). In order to provide competitive services for users (or customers) the library needs to take full advantage of emerging technologies, diversify its services, and take into account what its users desire. An innovative library with an attractive environment will provide users with a greater experience. If a library cannot do that, then “there is no reason for its existence” (I. 11, p. 5).

6.3.2 Phenomena resulting from causal conditions

The two identified causal conditions labelled “adoption of emerging technologies” and “survival of the fittest” were the main drivers that led to the phenomena of community, empowerment, and experience. Details of the three phenomena have been discussed in Chapter 5 and earlier sections of this chapter. Figure 6.3 presents the relationship between the centre and other parts of the model.

![Figure 6.3 - Centre of the participatory library model](image-url)
It is noteworthy that a single causal condition did not lead to the phenomena. It was both causal conditions, which together caused the phenomena. Similarly, neither the causal conditions nor the data directly point to phenomena of community, empowerment, and experience. Rather, the data indicated or pointed to sub-categories (i.e., connection, sharing, and peer support) and their associated concepts (properties and dimensions) which all then formulated the category/phenomenon (i.e., community).

As discussed earlier, a phenomenon is the central idea, event, happening, or incident that a set of actions or interactions are directed at managing or handling, or to which the set of actions is related (Strauss and Corbin 1990, p. 96). The emergence of the phenomena results from the analysis stages, which include open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. Apart from the questions asked in each stage, the general question “what is this data referring to?” (Strauss and Corbin 1990, p. 96) was asked during each stage of analysis. The phenomena of community, empowerment, and experience appeared frequently in the data, which means the phenomena derived from ideas shared by all research participants.

The three phenomena formed the centre of the model. None of the three can be left out; otherwise, there will be only separate parts of the model. In other words, the phenomena do not stand alone. Apart from the relationships among the three phenomena as discussed earlier, these phenomena also have relationships with other parts of the model. Together, these relationships provide density and add fuller explanations to the model of the participatory library.

**6.3.3 Contexts in which inter/actions occurred**

There were contexts in which inter/actions took place in response to the phenomena of community, empowerment, and experience. These inter/actions were affected by a series of contextual circumstances, which included (i) shared interests, (ii) facilitation, (iii) physical and virtual environment, and (iv) enthusiasm and volunteering.

**Shared interests**

Similar interests and shared concerns and purposes are the basis for the creation of a community. Without such commonly shared features, it would be hard for members...
to be connected and to establish a community. Once there was a community, including members who shared interests and concerns, members had more opportunities to enhance their rights, get more power, and raise their voices. As a result, they would have a greater experience with the library.

**Facilitation in both virtual and physical environments**

The interactions might happen in either the physical or virtual environment of the library. Importantly, this environment must be facilitated by librarians and library users, which means there was a need to have a favourable environment for the community’s activities (i.e., it must be easy for members to get connected, as well as easy to share and support one another).

When talking about the importance of having such an environment facilitated, a participant disclosed:

> *My library has just had a strategic plan meeting. One of the key contents of the meeting is ‘how to bring readers to the library’. Many lecturers, staff, and students attended. They proposed to organise contests, such as ‘book contest’ (i.e. readers need to demonstrate their understanding of a book in their discipline and persuasively introduce it to an audience), ‘information retrieval’ (i.e. participants show ways to search for information effectively) etc. We decided to organise some events based on these suggestions in the coming year. (I. 3, p. 7)*

Thus, if the library did not organise such events, it would be hard to get useful advice from users. Under the observation of another participant, there was huge demand among library users for an ability to be engaged in what the library is doing. This is possible if the library can make use of social media tools. He emphasised that:

> *Libraries should facilitate users and enable them to participate. Users should be able to participate in building the information content, products and services. Libraries can take advantage of the collective intelligence by using collaborative tools like wikis, blogs, or an environment of the same kind. Sometimes, through the use of tools and services like these, the library can get valuable ideas, suggestions, and contributions from users. (I. 11, p. 5)*
**Enthusiasm and volunteering**

Apart from having shared interests among community members and a favourable environment that is well facilitated, the community would not exist, its members would not be empowered, and their library experience would not be good if there was no "enthusiasm and volunteering". Many participants believed that being active, enthusiastic, and having a culture of volunteering significantly changes the library. For example, enthusiasm was considered as a must-have attitude: “the librarian needs to be enthusiastic” (I. 6, p. 3). In earlier times, when emerging technologies were not popular in libraries, some librarians started to learn about them and play with them in both their personal lives and in their professional roles. For example, a participant librarian said that he was developing a library blog and a library Facebook site. He said, “They are my personal favourites. They originate from my passion and my interest in the application of emerging technologies into the library” (I. 5, p. 1). Without a willingness to try out new things and a positive attitude to adapt to changes, the library would not be innovative.

The enthusiasm might come from library users as well. The activeness and willingness of users made the library operate better in a user-driven manner. The contribution and input from users might be in various forms. For instance, commenting on library services, suggesting good information sources for acquisitions, answering peer users’ questions, and providing advice when a peer is looking for research ideas are a few examples of contribution. Specifically, users can take part in a wide range of activities in the library such as a volunteer program, or working as a part-time volunteer on a regular basis. For example, participant 3 stated that his library had a number of volunteers. Some of them are responsible for tasks inside the library, such as shelving and labelling, while others may look after the trees surrounding the library to improve its appearance. This participant called them “the library lovers” (I. 3, p. 14). Similarly, it was believed that in the library there are two types of users: beneficiaries, who just use the services, and contributors, who not only use but also are active in developing the library services (I. 2, p. 14). Contributors are a great source of enthusiasm that libraries can exploit. Participant 11 had a similar view as he asserted that the “user’s contribution ability is infinite” (I. 11, p. 8). The question is how to involve contributors. Again, the answer is that it depends on how the library facilitates.
6.3.4 Intervening conditions affecting the inter/actions

In addition to the contexts discussed above, there were also intervening conditions that influenced the inter/actions. Intervening conditions included (i) perception, (ii) policy, and (iii) education and training.

**Perception**

Librarians’ perceptions of emerging technologies, library services, and education had a significant influence on the way libraries offer services. According to participant 9, “university libraries have a similar goal, which is to develop toward a modern library. However, there is not a common viewpoint on what the modern library is. Different perspectives lead to different ways of doing things” (I. 9, p. 6). Talking about the perception of emerging technologies among university library professionals, participant 3 disclosed that according to his survey, some librarians and library managers thought, “emerging technologies like Web 2.0 or social media tools are not good for the library. They are something impractical” (I. 3, p. 5). These professionals may use the tools for personal purposes, but they do not support use for professional purposes. Some libraries deploy such tools, but for a limited extent. For instance, “they consider social media as a marketing channel or an additional channel for communication, while it should be viewed as a core library service” (I. 3, p. 6).

Sharing the same point of view, in the role of a library director, participant 2 said:

> Deploying Web 2.0-based services is not what many universities want to do. They do not want their librarians to stay online for chatting. However, in my library, they are encouraged to do so, as we think this is a customer service. (I. 2, p. 4)

This participant further extended that “education is a service. All activities need to aim at providing better services for customers [students]” (I. 2, p. 4). This point of view was reiterated by participant 10 when she talked about the positive attitude of her library toward this matter:

> My library always encourages users to contribute ideas, feedback and comments. This is different from other libraries, as they worry that in the
open social media environment, if users give negative comments, they will badly affect the credibility of the library. My library is different. We need to think of both sides of the issues. If users respond negatively to the services, that means we haven’t done well and we need to change. If the library keeps itself inside the shell then it will not be able to develop. We are very happy to receive feedback and suggestions from users. The library needs to offer what users need instead of what the library has. (I. 10, p. 12)

The library and librarians’ perceptions were also acknowledged by library user participants. Their way of thinking would affect their way of doing. As stated by a user participant, the key issue is “what people [librarians] consider a library to be. The traditional thoughts, which now are dated, viewed library as a place where materials are preserved and served … Libraries today are a lot more open (I. 12, p. 9). If the library and librarians are not interested in social media, do not think of an open library, and do not care about enhancing library services, then the library will have almost no choice (I. 10 and I. 12). “Things going well or not depends on librarians’ and their superiors’ awareness” (I. 11, p. 7).

Policy

Policy was another condition influencing the interactions. This concern was mostly shared by librarian participants. This might be the library policy, institutional policy, or national policy. Policy was represented in management mechanisms, administrative procedures, and a set of rules and regulations that either encourage (if they are reasonable) or discourage the development of library. The national policy is characterised by a top-down mechanism. A participant claimed, “policy makers often impose. Inferiors are allowed to propose constructive ideas but the ideas are usually being ignored. So once the superior issues the policy or regulation, we still have to follow it even if it is not reasonable” (I. 6, p. 8). Other participants also commented that the nation’s policy on social media is too strict. Libraries and users are not always able to take full advantage of social media. “The library often has to use a special software program to help users access Facebook. I mean the users cannot access Facebook by the usual way” (I. 7, p. 9). The rationale for this situation was that it is necessary to do so in order to protect the country from reactionaries’ misuse of social media (I. 4, I. 6, and I. 8).
The central government policy appeared to affect the institutional policy. National policy becomes the foundation for universities to make their own. As a university library director, a participant said:

*The university usually reminds us not to let the library website and services be abused. The university also wants to ask us to be responsible for all the information that external users upload or update on the library’s website or on social networking sites of the library. However, in fact the library cannot control every piece of information.* (I. 6, p. 5)

Another way of keeping control is to limit the availability of the services. For example, allowing only 5% of bandwidth for streaming media services and applications such as Yahoo messenger, YouTube, etc. (I. 5, p. 11) or blocking online social networks at a certain time (I. 4 and I. 7). Strict policies also led to complicated administrative procedures. For example, “*any tasks done in the library must be approved by the library management board. If the library management board does not plan for use of emerging technologies in the library then no one should deploy them*” (I. 4, p. 10). In order to illustrate how complicated the procedure is, a participant stated:

*I am the head of the ICT section in the library, but I am not allowed to make a decision on some issues, including the introduction of a new Web 2.0 service. To persuade the management board, it is necessary to have evidence or show potentials that would lead to success.* (I. 3, p. 7)

In spite of the rigidity of national policy, some libraries and librarians appeared to be flexible. They try to harmonise with the policy and take advantage of emerging technologies. They “*don’t fight for freedom of information*” or “*do things against the national policy*” (I. 6, p. 6). However, they persuade their superiors, enable users to raise their voices and use them as supporting evidence. A librarian participant said that she always asks her library directorate board for support, but before doing that, she must be well prepared (I. 7, p. 8). Another librarian revealed that her library’s success resulted from the flexibility of the directorate board, and the open thoughts and willingness of librarians (I. 2). Importantly, “*the library must dare to do*” (I. 6, p. 3).
Education and training

In addition to “perception” and “policy”, another condition affecting actions/interaction was “education and training”. A view shared by many participants was that education and training equipped librarians with the necessary skills, knowledge, and attitudes to help them carry out their jobs fulfil the job in a satisfactory manner. This involved formal education programs in universities and professional development programs in the libraries. Education was a common concern among the participants. A good education program can produce qualified librarians who are able to facilitate and provide better services to users. A participant expressed his regret that “at the time of my LIS course, Web 2.0 and emerging technologies were not integrated into the curriculum” (I. 5, p. 7). According to one participant, the lack of foundational knowledge among current librarians is because “LIS education programs did not update students with emerging technologies; so currently many librarians do not have much motivation or ability to learn about new technologies” (I. 1, p. 4). Education was also about professional development opportunities for librarians. After developing a Web 2.0-based system for the library, one participant found that “the challenge is to ensure librarians can understand, use, and take full advantage of the system. Perhaps helping librarians to adapt with the system is the most difficult task” (I. 4, p. 7). Many libraries have to face this problem, especially those that have aged staff members, and this becomes significant as the library moves into the digital age (I. 4 and I. 6).

Education and training are not only focused on technological issues, but also on customer service skills and attitudes. Without an approachable and positive manner in customer care, the library and librarians would not be successful, even if they have modern technologies. A participant stressed that:

The library and librarians need to create an encouraging environment for participation. For example, they need to create a favourable physical environment and have a friendly attitude. This will create a favourable reputation regarding participation when users move online. A welcoming environment is very important, but it is often overlooked and it hasn’t really been integrated into the LIS courses. (I. 2, p. 11)
This idea was further supported by other participants. For example, a participant stated that she and her colleagues always respect users; they appear to be dedicated and friendly. They bring a smiling, pleasant demeanour to library services, whether online or physical ones. This participant provided examples of what her library users often tell the library: “we are experiencing the greatest services” or “the librarians are very nice, very friendly and jolly” (I. 10, p. 9).

Education and training in relation to the library services also involved library users. Education helped familiarise users with emerging technologies and the services being offered and ways to make use of these services. A participant shared her library’s success story:

They [users] love the high-tech services. The deployment of services based on Web 2.0 has satisfied their expectations, and made their dreams come true. They responded very actively and enthusiastically. However, before doing these, we had to organise many offline activities. For example, organising courses, workshops, book and technology fairs etc. to train users, and to introduce and promote new services. (I. 2, p. 6)

The importance of providing education and training to users was further emphasised. In a changing digital and social media environment, it is crucial to become:

“smart users” or “intelligent library users”. This type of user has the ability to select sources appropriate for their needs, knows what they need and want, knows when they need information, where to find it, and when and how to get information, etc. ... Libraries must help them acquire and develop such abilities and skills. (I. 10, p. 7)

In the words of participant 2, “users must be very wise in evaluating and selecting information so that they can make use of it to improve their work” (I. 2, p. 3).

6.3.5 Inter/actions responding to the phenomena of community, empowerment, and experience

In the presence of the contextual conditions and intervening conditions already discussed, the three phenomena led to inter/actions, which included (i) establishing a playground, (ii) creating a favourable environment, (iii) getting involved, and (iv)
The first two inter/actions were mostly initiated and made by librarians and the other two were generally performed by the library users (including internal and external ones).

**Establishing playground**

Establishing a playground, according to the research participants, was the first thing libraries and librarians did in response to the existence of community, and the practice of empowerment and experience. The creation of a playground was one of the ways to facilitate and enable the library community to engage. The playground might be facilitated in a physical or virtual environment and might be in various forms. In terms of a virtual environment, there was a series of ways that libraries and librarians did this, for instance making use of social media tools and setting up online spaces that allowed the library community to participate. The most common way of doing this included establishing social media spaces like Facebook, wikis, blogs, Twitter, and online forums. Such spaces provided the library community, particularly the users, with multiple options to take part in library activities. Participant 14 expressed:

*It might not always be necessary to assign live librarians to take care of Facebook or social media-based services. But it is necessary to have ones to co-ordinate the conversation there...Many libraries create an account and leave it there without caring.* (p. 6)

Participants emphasised that the creation and facilitation of spaces like these are important services that libraries and librarians need to initiate, “*Then encourage and invite users to create and develop their content. I believe the users will enthusiastically participate*” (I. 5, p. 7). It would be difficult or not feasible for users to be involved in library activities without the availability of these environments.

In terms of physical and traditional environments, there were numerous ways that libraries and librarians attend to these in order to provide more options for the library community to engage in the library’s operation. Common ways of doing this included founding clubs such as the “*friends of the library club*” (I. 3, p. 15), the “*reader club*” (I. 6, p. 9), and the “*book club*” (I. 2, p. 4); promoting voluntary programs and encouraging users to take part (I. 2, I. 3, I. 7, I. 11, and I. 12);
organising events, such as users’ seminars, workshops, and conferences (I. 2, I. 3, and I. 11); and offering face-to-face feedback services, such as having a desk and staff member available to receive comments and feedback directly from users (I. 3, I. 6, and I. 11). In addition, libraries could provide other facilities, even in a traditional way, for their users to get involved at their convenience. For example:

*We place a notebook and a pen in an easily accessible position in the library for users’ comment and feedback. Users can write down their feelings, their suggestion, etc. ... We check the notebook weekly, and note the comments on a certain day of the week.* (I. 10, p. 13)

Furthermore, there were other ways to get users on board even without emerging technologies (I. 6 and I. 10).

*Traditional forms of facilitation that are still working well include the “feedback box” – a user picks up a note card, writes comment on it, and puts it into the box – and “suggestion books”, which are made available all over places such as the borrowing area, computer room, and reference services area. Our library collects the feedback every month and analyses data every 6 months.* (I. 10, p. 14)

**Creating a favourable environment**

In addition to establishing a playground, it is necessary to create a favourable environment for the library community to engage in. According to the research participants, the library needs to create an encouraging, inviting, and attractive environment for users to take part in its operation and activities. In doing this, the library might take advantage of the contribution of users. A participant stated, *“We always appreciate the user’s role because without users the library has no reason to exist. Therefore, it is necessary to have something interesting and attractive to invite users to engage in the library”* (I. 7, p. 11). Sharing experience of ways to do this, a participant said that her library uses a perfume sprayer to fascinate users. Such things *make a library attractive*” (I. 2, p. 10). Moreover, libraries could grow decorative plants and flowers to create spaces of comfort and tranquillity (I. 2 and I. 3). Furthermore, libraries could encourage the user’s participation by organising competitions and contests. For example, book discussion competitions in which the
user contestants talk about books they have read and inspire the audience. Another form of encouragement is organising a video contest in which users create YouTube videos to promote the library’s prestige or to demonstrate key resources that first-year students should know about (I. 3, I. 12, and I. 15). Such activities would attract users and encourage them to be active participants in the business of the library.

**Participation and contribution**

As for the users, under the contextual conditions and intervening conditions as discussed earlier, the three phenomena led to users’ participation and contribution. It was believed that “participation is voluntary and it will naturally come when users feel comfortable and encouraged” (I. 13, p. 8). This opinion was echoed by another participant, who said that the “user’s participation habit is naturally formed” (I. 2, p. 7) once libraries take advantage of emerging technologies, and once the library’s appearance, spaces, and other facilities are attractive and convenient (I. 15). This would make users become more active participants, especially when they are encouraged. In practice, “users now can comment from anywhere, at anytime, by typing on the keyboard or touching the screen. This creates a habit, a culture of participation” (I. 16, p. 7). Getting users involved seemed to be possible as they were provided with a supportive environment. If the library could get users involved, then they were likely to succeed (I. 2, I. 10, and I. 16). This is because “librarians cannot always think of or devise services that meet user needs” (I. 2, p. 3), but the library users do.

As the participants acknowledged, the user’s contribution was valuable. It provided the basis and the direction that helped libraries to diversify and improve services. The user’s contribution could be very flexible and in various forms. Common forms of user contribution included comments, suggestions, and providing feedback on any aspect of the library operation. Specifically, users can comment on services that need improvement, suggest information sources that would be useful for other users, or provide peer users with advice and answers for their questions or concerns. To a certain extent:

> The ideas of users may be more important than what the library is thinking or intending to offer them. For instance, the recent development of the library
website is suitable for users because its development was based on the users’ ideas and contributions. (I. 9, p. 9)

Another participant talked about the enthusiastic response from users when her “library posted a quick question "what do you need from the library?" on Facebook. The number of users getting involved and contributing went beyond expectations. In this environment, the library could get opinions from the heart of the user” (I. 14, p. 12). In addition, users could be involved in and contribute to the library in other ways, such as being a casual volunteer or a regular helper of the library (I. 2 and I. 3). Such contributions definitely foster the development of library and its users (I. 5).

6.3.6 Consequences resulting from the inter/actions

The inter/actions of both libraries (librarians) and users led to certain consequences. They were (i) learning community, (ii) equality, (iii) better-tailored services, and (iv) enhanced library experience.

Learning community

Once the library has established a playground and facilitated a favourable environment, users tended to be more active participants in the operation of the library, especially when they are encouraged to be involved. This practice led to a “learning community” (I. 5, I. 11, and I. 18). This learning community was established based on connection among members. The community connects people to people and people to ideas. As members in this community continue to be connected, they share, support, and learn from one another. This learning community was characterised by a peer support culture in which members can do whatever they like in order to enhance their learning experience. For instance, they can “create content for themselves, for their fellow students, and for their colleagues” (I. 5, p. 6). They can also comment on content made by others, review what others have done, or suggest their ideas on topics of interest. This collective learning environment enables learners to learn independently. They can learn (i.e., asking for peer advice, seeking ideas or support) whenever they want without constraint. In this self-paced learning environment, learners could also be inter/dependent on others, as their interaction, communication, and relationships are part of the learning process. As stated by a participant, learners become "smart users" or "intelligent library users". They know
what they need, when they need it, and where and how to get it (I. 10, p. 7). Therefore, this learning community provided members with unlimited opportunities to learn. Importantly, their learning is based on the strengths of collective intelligence. Participants believed that an individual might not be able to address a problem or answer a question, but the community should be able to do (I. 2, I. 10, and I. 13).

Equality

The inter/actions also led to a change in the relationship between libraries (librarians) and users. There was equality since “all community members can participate in almost all activities [of the library]” (I. 2, p. 4). With the support of emerging technologies and the facilitation of the library, “everyone can ask, everyone can answer, and everyone can participate” in the library’s business (I. 14, p. 5). Notably, users could take part in and contribute to the library development without any psychological barrier. For this reason, they could “contribute very candidly” (I. 11, p. 4) and “the library would get opinions from the heart of the user” (I. 14, p. 12). Users can have their voices and keep control over the establishment and development of library services. As acknowledged, “there may be products and services that are mainly established and maintained by users” (I. 13, p. 11). According to a librarian participant, users might also play a key role in the maintenance of the services: “the library is the successful initiator who makes the service available and then users are responsible for its development” (I. 2, p. 4). In addition, users and their ideas are respected. Sometimes users’ contributions “are more important than what the library is thinking or intending to offer them” (I. 9, p. 9). In many cases, they “have a decisive role in what service the library should offer and in which direction the service should be developed” (I. 11, p. 5). “Clearly, equality has been greatly enhanced” (I. 16, p. 6). Users are able to and are allowed to become involved in a wide range of tasks in the library. They can share in the control of the operation of the library. As they become active participants, an equal relationship between users and libraries (librarians) can be developed.
Better-tailored services

As a result of inter/actions, the library services were better-tailored and more suitable to users. The process of improving the library service took place more quickly thanks to the openness and encouragement that the library facilitated. The user’s voice played a crucial role in enhancing library services. A participant said that instant comments and feedback help “the adjustment of the library's operation take place faster” (I. 16, p. 9). The process of change and improvement sometimes even takes place instantly, due to the advantage of emerging technologies and social media used in the library. Participant 2 provided an example of how social media tools like Facebook and blogs have helped her library in developing library materials, saying:

Previously, the development of library collections faced a lot of difficulties in meeting the changing needs of users. Now, with the participation of users, including faculty members and students, the job becomes much easier. Users suggest what they need. Students themselves select and recommend materials they want. Then the library purchases materials based on users’ suggestions; therefore, the information resources are more relevant to users. (I. 2, p. 9)

In addition, the library might facilitate various channels, even traditional ones such as a suggestion notebook, feedback box, and gathering users’ ideas at offline events, to help improve the library. For instance, based on a user’s suggestion, “a ‘sh!t’ sign is stuck in necessary areas in the library and then there are no more complaints about the noise” (I. 10, p. 11). Thus, there are many ways in which the library can improve its services. User participation and contribution depend on how open the library staff are and whether the environment that they facilitate is favourable and encouraging.

Enhanced library experience

In addition to better tailoring library services to users, inter/actions also resulted in an enhanced library experience. This experience was represented through various aspects, from the library’s appearance and services to the librarian’s attitude. The library is “something more than a place to borrow and return books” (I. 14, p. 9). The library was able to provide users with interesting and attractive services and associated facilities rather than “a building with four walls and full of book shelves”
It was believed that the library is a place to be and “a place to relax and have fun”, even though it is an academic institution. It should not be too serious, but informal and comfortable (I. 14, p. 14). There were such facilities as a cafeteria and chatting areas where users could facilitate their study, their work and their lives. Furthermore, the library is also a place where users are welcomed and respected (I. 2, I. 9 and I. 12). As stated by a librarian participant, “the library is your home” (I. 2, p. 10), therefore, it is an essential part of users’ lives.

This section (Section 6.3) has presented the complete participatory library model that includes not only the centre of the model, but also the associated parts such as conditions, inter/actions, and consequences.

6.4 CHAPTER CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed the identification of the inter/relationships between and among the core categories (the foundation of the model) as well as the connections between the foundation and other building blocks of the model. The complete participatory library model has been fully interpreted, illustrated, and justified.

Chapters 5 and 6 together answered the research question, “What is the (a) participatory university library?” The participatory library was viewed as a community within which all members are connected through either physical or virtual library spaces. The connection helps them to easily share interests and concerns, and it enables them to learn from one another. The participatory library also empowers users and provides them with innumerable opportunities and enjoyable experiences, as they are actively involved in library activities. Noticeably, the participatory library is fluid instead of being rigidly defined. This is represented via the variations, particularly at its core, in which each category and associated properties are dimensionally represented in terms of continua. The variations provide insights into the categories as well as into the participatory library model. Furthermore, the phenomena do not exist separately. The causal conditions, context, intervening conditions, inter/actions and consequences denote the nature of the relationships between them and the phenomena, and show the systematic connections between them and the phenomena. All of these together make up the participatory library model. The next chapter will discuss the research findings and position them to the existing knowledge to demonstrate the research’s contribution. It will also
present some limitations of the research, suggest direction for future research, and then conclude the thesis.
Chapter 7: Discussion and conclusion

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapters 5 and 6 reported the findings of this research, addressing the question, “What is the (a) participatory university library?” The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the findings in relation to similarities, variations, and possible contradictions with the existing literature. The chapter also reflects on the approach adopted by this research and highlights unique outcomes of the study. Following a presentation of the reported findings and a comprehensive review of the literature, this chapter is able to position and relate the most relevant research findings to the existing discourses in the research domain.

This chapter consists of seven main sections. The first provides an overview of the research and discusses the research context by introducing the research problem, and revisiting the aim and the research question. The second section briefly presents the key research findings. It explains the findings, and reconfirms that the research question has been answered. Together with an overview of the research section, this section provides background for subsequent discussion. The third section compares and contrasts the findings of this study to previous work in order to explore the commonalities, variations, and contradictions between them. The fourth section demonstrates how the research findings contribute to the existing Library 2.0 models. The fifth section then presents how the research findings advance an understanding of the library-user relationship. The sixth section is a discussion of strategies that libraries and librarians can adopt in order to take advantage of the research results. Finally, section seven presents some possible limitations of the study and suggests directions for further research.

7.2 OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

Emerging technologies such as blogs, Twitter, Facebook, and hand-held mobile devices have had significant impact on libraries in the last 10 years. During this period, there have been numerous discourses and publications on the subject of Web 2.0 or social media and their use in libraries. The utilisation of such emerging technologies has brought about a wide range of benefits to libraries and their users,
and such a transformation is often referred to as “Library 2.0”. Although some researchers note that technology is not a necessary part of Library 2.0 (Casey & Savastinuk, 2007), existing discourse and scholarly enquiry have tended to focus mainly on the practical use and application of technologies such as blogs, social networking and tagging within libraries (Bradley, 2007; Casey & Savastinuk, 2006, 2007; Coombs, 2007; Miller, 2005). This is understandable because Library 2.0 is a spin-off of Web 2.0 and is obviously based on the principles of Web 2.0 (Crawford, 2006; Lankes, et al., 2007b; Widén-Wulff, Huvila, & Holmberg, 2009) and is therefore characterised by Web 2.0. This has led to the reality that existing research into this new library has tended to focus on technology over participation.

The “participatory library” idea is therefore proposed as an idea that implies a truly integrated library system, which must allow users to take part in core functions of the library such as the catalogue system rather than peripheral functions (Lankes & Silverstein, 2006). Whilst discussion of the term has arisen (Casey & Savastinuk, 2007; Lankes et al., 2007b), the term has not yet been fully adopted into mainstream library discourse and practice, nor has it been discussed in empirical studies. This context highlights the need to understand the evolution and true nature of the contemporary library.

This research was designed to respond to the above context. Using a grounded theory approach, through the lens of academic librarians and library users, this research aims to address the question: What is the (a) participatory university library?

7.3 MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS

This study has revealed that the/a participatory library is a complex, dynamic and many-layered phenomenon. Providing a precise and prescriptive definition is therefore neither possible nor appropriate at this early stage of the phenomenon’s evolution and development. Instead, this study provides a rich description of the phenomenon. A participatory library is one that fosters community among the users, librarians, and broader society. It encourages the empowerment of all library users and provides them with a holistic experience in both physical and virtual library spaces.
The key findings of the research are three core categories or cornerstones of the participatory library, labelled “community”, “empowerment”, and “experience”. The first cornerstone, “community”, represents the connection among users, librarians, and the community. This connection is established when such groups of people have something in common (i.e., interests or concerns). Community also represents the sharing of information resources, experience, and expertise. By sharing, community enables “peer support”, meaning that people learn from their peers; their learning is based on the support and contribution from peers. The second cornerstone of the participatory library, “empowerment”, implies the process of giving library users, mostly students, power, and status. This practice embodies the users’ authority, their ability, their right to work in collaboration with librarians, and their dual role of production and consumption of library services. The third cornerstone is “experience”. This highlights the “comfort” or favourable conditions of the library. It also emphasises the importance of virtual and physical library spaces. Both are integral for the library as they form the “playground” where users, librarians, and the community can play (e.g., performing tasks such as learning, working, doing research, etc.) in a fun rather than stressful way.

In addition to the three main categories, the research also established a participatory library model that consists of other building blocks. They include: (i) conditions that caused the phenomena of community, empowerment, and experience; (ii) actions and interactions that responded to the phenomena; (iii) contexts in which the actions and interactions occurred; (iv) intervening conditions that affected the actions and interactions; and (v) consequences of the actions and interactions. All of these add more insights into the participatory library model.

Remarkably, although the participatory library model is presented in a logical and systematic diagram that shows the strong connections between and among the building blocks, this study found that the participatory library is fluid rather than rigid. This is particularly evident in the structure of core categories and the interrelationships among them. In terms of structure, each core category (i.e., community, empowerment, and experience) was delineated by sub-categories and, in turn, both the core categories and sub-categories were delineated by sets of properties and dimensions, meaning that the categories are flexible and changeable. The fluidity depends upon the dimensions, which range in terms of a continuum. Furthermore, the
fluidity of the participatory library is also represented via the relationships and interrelationships within and among core categories. There are strong connections between them, as one has an impact on the other. If a category changes, then others will also change.

By revisiting the research aim and the research question, what is the (a) participatory library, it can be said that the research findings have already addressed what was originally proposed. In order to see the uniqueness and the newness of this research, the research findings will be related to the existing knowledge on the subject. This will be discussed in the section below.

7.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THIS RESEARCH AND PREVIOUS DISCOURSES

This section will position this research into the existing literature. Specifically, it will compare and contrast the core categories that are found in this study with the existing work. The description and explanation of the relationship between the two will demonstrate how the research results fit in with the knowledge in this research domain. The identified relationships are roughly illustrated in Venn diagrams.

Community

![Diagram](image.png)

*Figure 7.1 - Overview of similarities and differences between this research and existing work relating to “community”*

As can be seen from Figure 7.1, the circle on the left contains concepts (subcategories) that represent the “community” category. The circle on the right contains concepts that represent topics or themes being discussed in the literature. The overlapping area between two circles represents the similarity in concepts, sub-concepts and/or their meanings. Thus, there are both similarities and differences in relation to the concept of community in this research and in the literature.
Firstly, there is a commonality as both share some characteristics of “community”. This research uses the concepts (sub-categories) of connection, sharing, and peer support to explain a higher-level concept of community. Similarly, though the existing literature does not directly use the label “community” to describe the phenomenon of Library 2.0, it uses a range of concepts including (but not limited to) communication, connection, conversation, and interaction. For example, in an early article, Maness (2006a) highlighted that Library 2.0 is social as it allows users to communicate with one another and with librarians in both synchronous or asynchronous ways thanks to Web 2.0 tools such as instant messaging, social networks, blogs and wikis. There was also the comment that Library 2.0 “is mostly about new methods of communication and social networking” (Crawford, 2006, p. 26). Likewise, Stephens and Collins (2007) described Library 2.0 in terms of its relationship to conversations, community, participation, a sense of experience, and sharing (p. 253). In the same manner, many researchers discussed community in either direct or indirect ways. For instance, reaching out to users and keeping them informed of the library activities (Sodt & Summey, 2009; Wan, 2011); establishing rapport with users; enhancing interaction; and building community (Connell, 2009; Ganster & Schumacher, 2009; Phillips, 2011). The existing Library 2.0 discourse has discussed various aspects of community in many ways and the concepts and topics used in such discourses imply the “community” in the library setting.

In addition to the similarities, there are also variations between the concept of community in this research and that in the existing literature. The most notable difference is that there is a link between the concepts (i.e., connection, sharing, and peer support) that are used to delineate community. In this research, connection opens up possibilities for sharing (i.e., by being connected via Web 2.0 and social media tools, community members can easily communicate and share with one another); and connection and sharing strengthen the practice of peer support. In the existing literature, however, concepts (i.e., communication, connection, participation, and interaction) are usually introduced in an unconnected manner. This is because the interpretation of these concepts is primarily based on features of Web 2.0 and the personal experience of the librarians. Though there are some studies that have been carried out in a sophisticated manner, their purpose is different from that of this research. Therefore, their findings are in the form of an ordinary list of essentials of
Library 2.0: openness and interaction, etc. (Xu, et al., 2009), or a trend (changing relationship between libraries and users) recognised by librarians (Shoniwa & Hall, 2007).

The comparison also reveals another difference. “Peer support” is one of the key concepts that help to establish the category of “community” in this study. This concept represents a strong connection between members in the community who help one another to learn. The learning is based upon the support and advice contributed by peers in the community and therefore there is a close and (inter)dependent relationship among members in the community. In contrast, although ideas such as user feedback, user contribution, and collective intelligence are popular in the existing literature, they do not emphasise peer assistance or peer-learning. Rather, they focus on how to make use of feedback and suggestions from users to enhance library services; for instance, they might focus on improvements to the library OPAC and collection development that are based on ideas collectively contributed by users (Reynolds, et al., 2010; Wenzler, 2007; Wilson, 2007).

**Empowerment**

![Figure 7.2 - Overview of similarities and differences between this research and existing work relating to “empowerment”](image)

As Figure 7.2 shows, there is an intersection between this research and the existing literature in relation to the category of “empowerment”. This indicates that the research upholds the previous work to a certain extent. There are also variations between the two, which are embodied in the meaning of the concepts in the two circles.
With regard to similarity, this research defines empowerment as the process of giving library users power and status. This is represented via three sub-categories: authority (the power users might have), prosumption (users involved in both production and consumption), and partnering (users working in partnership with librarians). Likewise, the available literature uses a vast array of ideas and concepts to describe and discuss the phenomenon of empowerment. For instance, user participation in the creation of the content and services (Chu & Du, 2013; Maness, 2006a), users have the ability to change the library (Maness, 2006a), and new information is created via collaboration between users (Stephens & Collins, 2007). In practice, users are acknowledged as active participants since they are able to be involved in acquisition processes (Levine-clark, 2010; Nixon, et al., 2010; Reynolds, et al., 2010), and can contribute to the improvement of library services via comments, feedback, and suggestions (Breeding & Kroski, 2010; Harinarayana & Raju, 2009; Wilson, 2007). Hence, such involvement of library users indicates that the power and rights of the user have increased, and that the user is now empowered.

In addition to this similarity, there are a number of variations between the category of empowerment in this research and the idea of empowerment in the literature. The most noticeable difference is the use of concepts to describe the phenomenon of empowerment, for instance the concept of “prosumption” in this research. This portmanteau term reflects the practical reality in which library users can play various roles. In one role (i.e., users), they use the library and consume the information and services that the library provides. In another role, they take part in various activities such as creation of content, establishment, and maintenance of library services. Therefore, library patrons are not conventional users. They are versatile. Recognising the multiple roles of users is important as libraries can then establish strategic plans that take users into account more seriously. This means that the library needs to regard users as real partners rather than simply as people who use services. The strategic vision will also enable libraries to facilitate services that make the most of contributions from users (producers-consumers or prosumers). The existing work, however, does not really acknowledge this practice. Although an abundance of publications mention the dual role of users (Abram, 2005; Coombs, 2007; Crawford, 2006; Maness, 2006a), none of the work has empirically explored this role.
Experience

Figure 7.3 - Overview of differences between this research and existing work relating to “experience”

Figure 7.3 shows the differences between this research and existing Library 2.0 work in relation to the concept of experience. The circle on the left represents the category of experience and its sub-categories. The circle on the right displays broad thematic areas that appear widely throughout the Library 2.0 literature. It is significant that there is no overlap between the two circles and this indicates that there are only differences between the two.

The first difference is mainly represented in the topic area and the meaning of each work. The “experience” concept in this study is understood via two main concepts: playground (the place where people can play, by which the researcher means they can perform their tasks such as learn, work, and do research) and comfort (the positive emotions that users have when they engage in the library). In contrast, Library 2.0 literature mainly focuses on areas such as the potential and adoption of emerging technologies in libraries, librarian 2.0, and the perceptions and perspectives of users and librarians on the use of emerging technologies in libraries. Although there are publications that regard libraries as both virtual and physical spaces, they do not really view them as a playground (Casey & Savastinuk, 2006, 2007; Maness, 2006a). While some works mention user satisfaction and user experience, they do not discuss “comfort” as part of the library user experience. Rather, they emphasise aspects such as the design of the physical library space, designing social media based services in libraries, maintaining a system to manage the relationship with library customers and to increase customers’ satisfaction, construction of a new library building to reaffirm the centrality to research and learning, and design and
development of services based on emerging technologies (Brodie & Martinelli, 2007; Kajewski, 2007; Shahvar & Hariri, 2010).

### 7.5 HOW DOES THIS STUDY CONTRIBUTE TO EXISTING LIBRARY 2.0 MODELS?

Figure 7.4 below shows the similarities and differences between the participatory library model that is developed in this research and the existing major Library 2.0 models.

![Figure 7.4 - Overview of similarities and differences between the participatory library model and existing Library 2.0 models](image)

As Figure 7.4 shows, while there is a similarity in the subject, the participatory library model that has emerged from this research is different from the existing Library 2.0 models. The main differences are in the method of development, stakeholder involvement in the model development, structure of the model, and level of abstraction and interpretation.

First, there is a commonality between the current participatory library model and previous models. Though the commonality is neither exactly the same nor imitative,
the two types of models share some features in terms of subject or aboutness. For example, in the “Library 2.0 theory”, Maness (2006a) emphasises user-centredness. Users are active participants who are involved in both consumption and creation of content and services. Similarly, in the “participatory library service model”, Casey and Savastinuk (2007) stress the user-driven services in which users enrich the programs and services of libraries. These features are actually part of “empowerment”, which is located in the centre of the current model. Furthermore, the previous models have certain common ideas and concepts that refer to the “community” in the current model. For instance, Holmberg et al. (2009) suggest some of the building blocks of Library 2.0, such as participation, social aspects, and interactivity. Casey and Savastinuk’s (2007) service model also highlights the connection between the library and users, especially external users. All of these features stress the importance of connection, interaction, and community building in the library.

In relation to variation, the most noticeable difference between the current and the previous models is the method of development or research approach. While the current participatory library model is empirically devised, most of the earlier models are based on the literature and personal experience of the researchers. Among the Library 2.0 models developed to date, there is only one model, established by Holmberg et al. (2009), that appears to be empirical. The authors surveyed library and information practitioners and researchers by asking them to complete a 5-minute written survey. Though the building blocks of Library 2.0 were then beautifully presented, the research’s approach had an obvious limitation: it employed a quick, self-administered survey without interaction. By adopting a grounded theory approach, this research allows the participatory library model to be empirically derived from the lived experiences of participants. The in-depth and conversational manner of the interviews (data collection) yields rich data that provide a fuller understanding of the participatory library and help develop a more complete model.

For instance, as noted earlier in Chapter 3 (methodology), in addition to asking about the experiences of participants with emerging technologies in libraries, the interview question 3, shown in Table 3.1, and interview questions 2 and 3, shown in Table 3.2, worked well to elicit interesting information about aspects of the participatory library other than technology, which led to the emergence of the category “experience”.
Another difference relates to the participants who provided data for the research. This research recruited various types of participants, such as library directors, ICT managers, service managers, technicians, students, and academic and administrative staff, who are the key stakeholders in libraries. The diversification provided rich data for the research. In particular, the conversational and in-depth interviews helped to yield data in the form of the lived experience of the participants. Meanwhile, previous models were based on different sources of data. For example, short written surveys (Holmberg, et al., 2009), visiting academic library websites and recording features of their Web 2.0-based services (Xu, et al., 2009), or self-responding to questions via a brainstorming chart (Habib, 2006), and personal experience (Casey & Savastinuk, 2007; Maness, 2006a). While library staff members (directors, managers, technicians) and users are key stakeholders of libraries, none of the previous models have taken them both into account. Different sources of data led to differences in the way the findings were explained, the level of details, and the reliability of each model.

There is another difference when comparing two types of models, which is the structure of the model. Structure is demonstrated in various forms, such as features, components, dimensions, building blocks, and the relationships and interrelationships between them. This research fully develops the participatory library model, which not only consists of the centre (the phenomena), but also other associated parts. These associated parts include causal conditions that lead to the phenomena; actions and interactions that respond to the phenomena; contexts within which actions and interactions occur, intervention conditions that influence actions and interactions, and the consequences of the actions and interactions. All of these together create a complex participatory library model that thoroughly explains the phenomena. Although some of the earlier models are beautifully presented, they do not clearly show a systematic connection and interrelation between and among the parts of the models. As a model is usually presented in a graphic format, it is very dense and concise. For this reason, it is important to provide adequate description and explanation rather than only proposing the model with a few details. The reason for a shortage of essentials is that the previous Library 2.0 models are probably not based on empirical data. Hence, the explanations are mainly based on the existing literature and the personal experience of the researchers.
One more difference is represented in the focus of each model. As the literature review found, existing Library 2.0 models have a strong emphasis on technological aspects, such as tools and techniques relating to the use of emerging technologies in libraries. Participation, although acknowledged in the existing Library 2.0 models, sits in the peripheral functions of the library rather than at its core. In contrast, the participatory library model developed in this study moves beyond just technology. It centres on what emerging technologies enable libraries and their users to do and how technologies foster participation. This is evident in the participatory library model (Figure 6.2). The model demonstrates that technological aspects are only the causal conditions (sets of events or happenings). Emerging technologies actually support participation. They help libraries and their users to create a community, empower the community members, and provide them with holistic experience.

Yet another specific difference is found in the degree of abstraction and detail of the models. In the participatory library model, the level of abstraction and detail is clearly illustrated at its centre via the three core categories (e.g., community, empowerment, and experience – the cornerstones of the model). Each core category is a concise concept that is made of hundreds of lower-level concepts in terms of sub-categories, properties, and dimensions. Each sub-category also possesses properties and dimensions. All of these lower-level concepts together delineate, explain, and provide deeper understanding of the core categories and the model. In particular, the variation within each property is dimensionally represented in terms of continua that provide insights into the categories as well as into the participatory library model itself. Hence, the set of properties and dimensions add explanatory power to the categories through which the participatory library is understood as being fluid rather than rigid. This significant difference between the current model and the previous ones is that the grounded theory approach in this research allows the participatory library model to be validated and evolved over time during the course of data collection and analysis, as the researcher can return to the field to seek further data to explain the emerging concepts. In contrast, for the previous models, though a few claim to be empirical, their data collection is a one-off task. Therefore, they did not have the opportunity to return to the field to gather more data to gradually develop the model. Rather, the models were usually in the form of a list of loosely woven
concepts (topics) that were found in the collected data. Therefore, the associated explanations, if there were any, tended to lack real depth.

This section has compared and contrasted the participatory library model developed in this research with existing Library 2.0 models. The main differences that have been identified are in the method used to develop the model, the participants who are involved in the model’s development, the structure of the model, and the level of abstraction and interpretation. Although there are a number of variations between the two models, they supplement rather than counteract one another. While some earlier models were based on assumptions, beliefs, and personal opinions of the researchers, for example the models of Maness (2006a), and Casey and Savastinuk (2007), these earlier models have triggered subsequent discussion and investigation of the phenomenon. Similarly, whilst some models were not based on lived interaction and conversation with key stakeholders, they provided an interesting perspective about the phenomenon through the lens of researchers and practitioners (Holmberg, et al., 2009), and they portrayed an overall Library 2.0 picture based on an inspection of a considerable number of academic library websites for Web 2.0-based services (Xu, et al., 2009). However, the participatory library model in this research is not based on a large number of participants. It is empirically devised and grounded in the lived experience of diverse groups of participants who are key stakeholders in the university libraries.

When comparing these Library 2.0 models to the definition and explanation of the theory and model of Bates (2005), it is noteworthy that the existing Library 2.0 models are still in the early stages. None of the Library 2.0 models might yet be regarded as a theory, because they need more time and effort to mature. Even an interesting work that is claimed to be a theory might not yet be a theory. For instance, the work by Maness (2006a) appears to be a set of assumptions and explanations that still require further empirical investigation. Though the above-mentioned models are useful, they are still in the description and prediction stages. They are in the inception of “proto-theory” (Bates, 2005, p.3). A model usually stands as a theoretical beacon for years, and serves as a guide and a driver of research before the research finally matures to the point of producing something closer to a true theory (Bates, 2005). It is necessary to have empirical studies that reach a point
that is closer to “a true theory”. The participatory library in this research, as demonstrated, is an example of this kind of theory.

7.6 HOW DOES THIS STUDY CONTRIBUTE TO OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE LIBRARY-USER RELATIONSHIP?

The recent decade has witnessed a significant amount of discourse on evolution and revolution in libraries. This evolution and/or revolution are usually referred to as Library 2.0, which embodies crucial changes. One of the most significant changes that has occurred in the relationship between libraries (or librarians) and users is represented via the enhancement of interaction and communication between libraries and users, the transformation of the user’s role, and the increase of the user’s rights and power. This relationship can be seen in the Library 2.0 literature. However, most of the work in the age of Library 2.0 focuses on description and prediction of the changes, rather than studying them empirically. Few or no studies have actually explored the relationship between users and libraries. For this reason, an extensive search for literature outside the Library 2.0 age was conducted after the completion of the findings and literature review chapters. The purpose of this search was to find out if any research about such a relationship was carried out before the time of Library 2.0. Such research may help to provide a more complete picture of library evolution over time, from pre-Library 2.0 to Library 2.0, and from Library 2.0 to the participatory library. Interestingly, a few works were found. The most relevant seminal study will now be related to the findings of this research.

One of the seminal studies is the Theory of Library Anxiety that was developed by professor Constance Mellon in *Library anxiety: a grounded theory and its development* (Mellon, 1986). Adopting a grounded theory approach, personal writings in the form of search journals were collected from 6000 university students over the period of two years. The purpose of the study was to explore the feelings of students about using the library for research. Instead of talking about the difficulties they faced when searching for information, Mellon found that the students reported their feelings about the library itself. Students talked about their fear, and about feeling lost – which kept them from beginning to search – or about their loneliness and fear when staying for extended periods in the library to fulfil their tasks. Mellon identified collective feelings of phobia and discomfort and labelled them as library anxiety (Mellon, 1986).
Mellon (1986) revealed that 75 to 85 per cent of the students demonstrated symptoms of anxiety. “Terms like scary, overpowering, lost, helpless, confused, and fear of the unknown appeared over and over again” (p. 162). Students with library anxiety experienced a sense of powerlessness and loneliness. This originates from the feelings of inferiority when a student compares his or her library skills to those of other students, thinking that other students are competent while he or she is not. Students who experienced those feelings were unable to work out how to begin a reference search and were unable to find expected materials in the library. They were also afraid to ask librarians for help as they thought that their lack of competence was shameful and should be hidden, and that asking questions would reveal their weaknesses.

Though the theory of library anxiety focuses on users’ information searching and using the library (information behaviour), it is still closely related to the findings of this research. The theory of library anxiety is about the feelings and emotions of users when they engage with and experience university libraries. Mellon found that the library users (students) are overwhelmed, and they appeared to be passive since the negative feelings such as powerlessness and discomfort are prevailing. In the current research, however, it is clear that the participatory library is about community, empowerment, and experience. Community demonstrates a sense of belonging, which is gained via the connection between users and the library, and among peer members. The strong connection enables sharing and peer support (users can seek information, advice, and other types of assistance not only from library staff but also from other members in the community). Empowerment in the participatory library indicates the improvement of the rights and power of users. They are able, allowed, and encouraged to undertake a diverse range of tasks in the library. Their power and status are heightened. Experience manifests a favourable environment where users have positive feelings and emotions. The library is a place for users to come to perform their tasks (studying, working, and doing research) with fun rather than stress.

The relationship between the theory of library anxiety and the participatory library model demonstrates that the library is transforming over time. This transformation is especially clear in the relationship between users and libraries/librarians. In the time of traditional libraries (or pre-Library 2.0 time), there was a loose connection and
interaction between them. Users were inactive and libraries appeared to have shortcomings in support services (Mellon, 1986). The changes significantly occurred in the time of Library 2.0, when levels of interaction and communication between users and libraries were clearly improved, and the user’s role was significantly reinforced. However, such changes in the era of Library 2.0 were mostly described and discussed rather than methodologically researched. Now, with this study into the participatory library, these significant changes have become clearer. This research, by investigating the participatory library, has extensively and empirically explored what, why, and how the user-library relationship has changed. The change is thoroughly delineated and interpreted via the concepts of community, empowerment, and experience, and by associated concepts that together add insights into the participatory library.

According to Katopol (2005), library anxiety is a useful theory for explaining information behaviours. It provides other research with a good theoretical perspective. Meanwhile, other studies have also helped to improve the original theory of library anxiety by further extending it in other contexts. For example, while the original theory focused on undergraduate students, Jiao and Onwuegbuzie (1998) researched the library anxiety experienced by graduate students. Similarly, Liu (1995) studied the library anxiety in a public library environment, while Bostick (1992) developed the library anxiety scale to measure the degree of anxiety of library users.

The theory of library anxiety and the participatory library model can complement each other. Although the theory of library anxiety was drawn from the data provided by a significant number of participants (6000 students), there was no interaction between the researcher and the participants during the data collection process. While the current grounded theory of the participatory library involved a modest number of participants, it is empirically grounded in the rich data yielded from the lived experience of both main stakeholders (users and librarians) via interviews. This profound source of data allows the participatory library model to be developed and explained with greater details. They both contribute to the knowledge in terms of research approach and research results. The participatory library model is especially useful for demonstrating the development of the library over time.
7.7 HOW DOES THIS RESEARCH CONTRIBUTE TO LIBRARY PRACTICE?

Contributing to library practice is another important feature of this research. There might be some questions relating to the potential contributions of this research. For example, how can libraries take on the model and use it so that they can become participatory libraries? What do the research findings tell libraries and librarians, and how should they use this model? Answers to these questions can provide libraries and librarians with ideas of how to take advantage of the participatory library model.

Before considering this research’s possible contribution to library practice, it is necessary to understand the process of developing a theory, and also to understand the complexity of the participatory library model. According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), developing theory is a complex activity. They “use the term ‘theorising’ to denote this activity because developing a theory is a process and often is a long one” (p. 21). Strauss and Corbin contend that theorising involves not only conceiving or intuiting ideas and concepts, but also formulating them into a logical, systematic, and explanatory scheme. The centre of theorising involves the interplay of making inductions and deductions. On one hand, theorising needs to generate concepts (and their properties and dimensions) from data. On the other hand, it needs to present the relationships between the concepts in the form of statements or hypotheses, which are also derived from data, but data that have been abstracted by the analyst from the raw data (Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

As Strauss and Corbin (1998) emphasise, “theory denotes a set of well developed categories (e.g., themes, concepts) that are systematically interrelated through statements of relationship”, which “explain who, what, when, where, why, how, and with what consequences an event occurs. This complex process helps the research findings move beyond conceptual ordering to theory” (p. 22). They further explain, “a theory does more than provide understanding or paint a vivid picture. It enables users to explain and predict events, thereby providing guides to action” (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 25).

How can the model of the participatory library guide action? There are a number of ways to take advantage of the model. The participatory library model provides empirical guidelines for universities that seek to develop their own participatory
libraries. The model serves as a benchmark so that libraries and librarians can compare their current library model with the participatory library model. The comparison would help them identify the areas that need to be changed in order to make their libraries more participatory. In order to make the most of the participatory library model, it is necessary to understand its complexity. First, the complexity is in the centre of the model, which consists of three main phenomena named community, empowerment, and experience. None of the three can be left out, or there will be only separate parts of the model. The phenomena do not stand alone. Apart from the relationships among the three phenomena as discussed earlier, these phenomena also have relationships with other parts of the model. All together, these parts provide density and add fuller explanation to the model of the participatory library.

The best approach for taking advantage of the participatory library model is that librarians set their current library model against the participatory library model. This is an opportunity for them to entirely revise strategies, programs, and services relating to library renovation, emerging technologies, and user services. Together with this, they need to carry out an environmental scanning, which is an analysis of a global environment. This scan can provide them with an understanding of the economical, social, and technological issues, expectations, and trends that influence their libraries. This strategic approach can help them to create a roadmap of considerations for planning and implementation. The advantage of this approach is that it enables the library to change in a consistent and smooth manner. It also helps the library to respond to the change in a proper and timely manner. In doing so, the participatory library model will effectively “guide” their action (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 25).

Libraries can adopt the participatory library model in flexible ways that suit their level of expertise and specific circumstances. If the total approach is not feasible for some libraries, they can opt for a partial approach. Instead of revising the whole strategy, including programs and services, libraries can focus on one or several areas of interest. The benefit of this approach is that it can improve part of the library without having to invest considerable resources. This approach is suitable for short-term planning when the library’s resources are not very ready. It might also be used in an experimentation stage before deploying the main one. Overall, the choice is quite flexible. The procedure for one approach is different from the other. However,
an important step that both need to carry out is to set their current model against the participatory library model. Paragraphs below will provide details about this step.

The comparison can be easier when working on the model part by part (see Figure 6.2). The centre of the participatory library is important. However, the first part to consider should be the “causal conditions”, which represent sets of events or happenings that influence phenomena (Strauss and Corbin, p. 131). The causal conditions consist of “adoption of emerging technologies” and “survival of the fittest”. The former condition implies that the library uses emerging technologies without a strategic plan. In this situation, a library adopts the technologies because they are available. This library jumps on a bandwagon without a thorough consideration of advantages and disadvantages of the technology. A library may aims to use technologies as a means of marketing or decoration. The latter condition refers to a well-planned strategy in which a library demonstrates awareness, motivation, and a sense of purpose regarding innovation and the use of technologies. If the library is in the former case, it is necessary to move to the latter case in order to increase the level of readiness for a participatory library.

Now, the centre of the model needs to be compared. As the centre consists of three main phenomena, the comparison can be made one at a time. For example, the phenomenon of “community”, which is represented via connection, sharing, and peer support. The comparison needs to answer the question of whether or not the library has created a “community”. Has it established and maintained connections among librarians, library users, and broader community members? Has this connection been strong enough to enable sharing and peer support? Such questions should be answered in order to gain an understanding of the current status of the library, and to see if the library has a community of its own.

Similar exercises should be applied to the phenomena of “empowerment” and “experience”. With regard to empowerment, there are a series of questions to ask. For example, has the library really taken users into account when designing library services and programs, and to what degree? Has it considered users as partners who are not only consumers but also producers? Has it acknowledged the practice of consumption? In brief, has it empowered users? Questions relating to the phenomenon of experience may be, for example, has the library really facilitated a
playground for stakeholders to get involved in? Has the library created a comfortable and favourable environment for users to take part in? In doing these exercises, libraries or librarians should have a clearer idea of what area their libraries need to change, and the extent and direction of the change. Importantly, as the three phenomena have interrelationships, the change of one will have an influence on another. Hence, it will be best to consider them as a whole, or at least to consider the centre of the model.

In addition, those libraries and librarians who want to make their library more participatory need to consider other conditions. For example, the contextual conditions (i.e., shared interests, being facilitated, etc.) in which the phenomena occur; the intervening conditions (i.e., perception, policy, etc.), which have an influence on the actions and reactions pertaining to the phenomena. It is noteworthy that the participatory library is fluid but not rigid. This is represented in the properties and dimension of the phenomena (core categories), in their interrelationships, and in the conditions (details are provided in Chapters 5 and 6). Therefore, the results or consequences gained by one library may be different from those of another library.

As discussed earlier, the purpose of this research is to establish “a participatory library model for university libraries” rather than “the” participatory library model for all types of libraries. Therefore, the model better suits academic libraries than other library systems. The model emerged from data provided by Vietnamese librarians and library users; hence, it will be closer and more applicable to academic libraries in Vietnam. However, the model’s applicability is not limited to university libraries in Vietnam. Any library may find the model or parts of the model useful if their libraries have features in common.

7.8 LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research may have some possible limitations. This section will discuss potential limitations including subjectivity, generalisability, and underdevelopment of provisional concepts. It presents strategies to deal with these limitations, and also suggests directions for future studies where relevant.

Being subjective may be a potential limitation of this research. Subjectivity perhaps is a common limitation, an inherent feature of any qualitative research. Qualitative
researchers need to minimise introducing subjectivity into the research process. As discussed earlier, the grounded theorist needs to avoid the influence of previous knowledge and experience that may prevent the theory from naturally emerging from data. However, in human related research, the researcher needs to be deeply involved in the process of data collection and data analysis. The researcher is a special research instrument that is immersed into conversation in order to capture the experience of research participants. Therefore, subjectivity, to a certain degree is introduced into the research results. Maintaining objectivity is important; however, there must be a balance between objectivity and sensitivity. Strauss and Corbin (1998) state, “objectivity is necessary to arrive at an impartial and accurate interpretation of events. Sensitivity is required to perceive the subtle nuances and meanings in data and to recognise the connections between concepts. Both objectivity and sensitivity are necessary for making discoveries” (p. 42-43). In order to minimise subjectivity while take advantage of sensitivity, a strategy was adopted during the course of this research (details are presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.5.5 – Theoretical sensitivity).

Generalisability is another possible limitation of this research. This research has some particular features, such as being based on a specific library system (i.e., academic libraries) in a specific country (i.e., Vietnam), and drawing on a modest number of participants (10 librarians and 6 library users). The purpose of this research is to build a theory, so it uses the theory-building methodology (i.e., grounded theory). Naturally, this research provides an explanatory power rather than generalisation. In addition to the above features, the research results may be not very applicable to other library contexts such as public, special, and school libraries. Though academic libraries in other countries may find the research results useful, and they may utilise them to a certain extent, the results are still more applicable to academic library systems. For this reason, some possible directions for future research are included below.

- Building a practical framework. Since the participatory library model is complex and dense, as it is constituted by a series of categories and concepts that present various levels of abstraction, it is not a how-to manual for libraries and librarians. It should not be “applied” directly to a specific library. A practical framework that is based on the current findings would
provide libraries and librarians with step-by-step guidelines in order to make their libraries more participatory.

- Taking other stakeholders into account. The current study recruits only two main stakeholders, librarians and library users. Future research may include other participants, such as deputy vice chancellors, deans of faculties, and heads of schools. Such diversified participant groups may provide more insights into the participatory library.

- Research on the participatory library in other library contexts. The current research has developed “a” participatory library model for university libraries. Although it is the first participatory library model and it might be “the” model, which represents the concept of participation in all library types, it would be worthwhile to study the phenomenon of the participatory library in other library contexts such as public libraries, special libraries, and school libraries. The study of these areas may provide a more holistic picture of the participatory library.

- Research on the participatory library in other countries and under other cultural environments. Studying the participatory library in a multicultural country like Australia is a typical example. Such a study may discover the similarities and differences between the participatory library in a single cultural environment and that in a multicultural environment. Thus, it will provide more insight into the participatory library.

- Testing the participatory library model. The purpose of this research is building instead of testing the theory (model). Though it is validated throughout the process of data collection and analysis (i.e., the concepts emerged in the early interviews and were tested in the subsequent interviews), the model is based on a limited number of participants. Hence, it may be an opportunity for quantitative studies, which will work out the degree to which library users can participate in the library activities. For example, future studies may address a question such as “to what extent can library users take part in the operation of libraries?”

- Employ other research approaches. For example, combining grounded theory and case study. Such a study will allow the researcher to make use of other
sources of data, such as documents, archival records, and observation. This approach may bring about substantial outcomes that are highly relevant to specific libraries.

One more limitation relates to the provisional concepts that emerged in the data, and ideas hinted at in the findings. Some concepts were initially held as provisional, but the subsequent interviews did not find sufficient evidence to support them, and so they were discarded. In other cases, some ideas were hinted at in the findings, but have not yet been fully explored. These cases pertain to grounded theory and they are the self-imposed limitation of the study. Strauss and Corbin (1990) explain, “your final theory is limited to those categories, their properties and dimensions, and statements of relationships that exist in the actual data collected – not what you think might be out there but haven’t come across…What you can’t find in your data becomes one of the limitations in your study” (p. 112). These concepts and ideas are discussed below.

The first idea relates to psychology. To what extent do psychological aspects affect on users’ participation? Without the user’s participation, the participatory library would not exist. However, as emerged from the data, there is a concern about the degree of the user’s participation. This concern relates to users’ personality, attitude, and feelings. For example, a participant suggested that “perhaps it is incorrect if we say they (users) don’t have anything to share. There may be users who have lot of things to share” (I. 8, p. 4). In terms of contribution and participation, it is believed that there are two groups of users including “beneficiaries (who mainly consume the services) and contributors (who actively involved development of services)” (I. 2, p. 14). However, what are the reasons for a low level of participation? Possible reasons were given such as the users were busy, shy, or they gained no benefit from participation. Other reasons may be that the library finds no benefit from the user’s contribution, or because the library has not made it attractive and easy to participate (I. 8).

The psychological aspect was believed to have an effect on the degree of involvement among library users. Participant 11 believed a virtual playground could remove psychological barriers that usually make users hesitant when meeting face to face with librarians. Some sensitive matters are difficult to communicate in person.
Similarly, participant 12 thought that an open and a relaxed environment like “academic café” would encourage students (users) to join in the conversation. “Perhaps it's just a psychological matter but I find it so interesting” (I. 12, p. 7). Clearly, there is a concern about the psychological motivations that exist when users engage in libraries. Though these interesting ideas were emerged from data, they were mentioned by only several participants. Therefore, this is a potential area for further investigation.

Another stimulating concept that emerged from data is “trust”. In a participatory environment, the trust that exists in the library has an influence on users and their ability to participate. A librarian participant shared what her library did in order to show their trust in users. She said that her library always appreciates what users contribute. Her library facilitates various channels, even traditional ones such as a suggestions notebook, a feedback box, and gathering users’ ideas at offline events. “Based on these seemingly simple suggestions, we have improved our library in many ways” (I. 10, p. 10). Another user participant also acknowledges the importance of trust. If information resources, services, and products are built based on what users need rather than what the library has, then the library indicates its trust in users (I. 11).

The importance of trust was also mentioned in some Library 2.0 discourses. For example, Stephens (2006a) asks, what can you do to let your staff and your users know you trust them? He suggests that it is important to create a culture of trust. Similarly, Fichter (2006) stresses the crucial role of radical trust, which is about trusting the community. In doing so, the library may not have a million customers, users, or patrons, but it may have a million participants and co-creators (Fichter, 2006). Similarly, the idea of trust is supported by Harris (2006), but he suggests moderated trust rather than radical trust. Then, content and contributions from users need to be moderated. Hence, the idea of trust is mentioned mainly in the inception of Library 2.0. In this research, some participants also had a concern about trust. Therefore, this idea is necessary to further explore in future research.

Yet another idea relates to the concept of “peer support”. The concept of peer support (part of the “community” phenomenon) is evidenced in the data. The research participants acknowledged the fact that connection and sharing one another created a
“peer support” practice. This means that people learn from their peers. Their learning is based on the support and contribution of peers. This practice creates a learning community that provides people with new opportunities and infinite resources for learning, which is referred to as collective learning. This situation raises a question that is, why university libraries have not really made use of such collective intelligence. Lankes and Silverstein (2006) suggest that policy, technologies, and standards and so on are barriers for participation (for contribution of collective intelligence). However, little or no research has explored this area. Perhaps the reason for this is that libraries and education, while having a close relationship, are often researched separately. If university libraries are centres for learning, then they must take this idea into account. An interdisciplinary study that draws from the fields of library studies and education is an area for further study.

7.9 CHAPTER CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented an overview of this research and outlined its major research findings. It has related the research findings to the previous discourse through comparison and contrast, which clearly show the commonalities and variations between the new findings and the existing knowledge. It has also discussed the contribution of this research to the existing Library 2.0 models, in not only the methodological approach, but also in the level of detail and comprehension. In addition, the chapter has demonstrated the significant contribution of this research to the knowledge in terms of an understanding of the relationship between libraries and users. The chapter has also discussed the research’s contribution to library practice by demonstrating how the participatory library model can be used in libraries. The chapter has finally indicated possible limitations of the research and suggested directions for future studies.

7.10 THESIS CONCLUSION

This research set out to explore the changes in the relationship between libraries/librarians and users. It also aimed to discover the nature of the contemporary library by examining the participation of users in the library operation. The research questions were raised in a context in which Web 2.0 and associated tools (often referred to as emerging technologies) have had a powerful influence on the library, leading to the emergence of Library 2.0. However, existing inquiries into Library 2.0
have an emphasis on technology rather than what technology allows libraries and users to do, which is to participate. For this reason, the research needs to respond to the question, “what is the (a) participatory university library?”

Adopting a Straussian grounded theory approach, the research has found that the participatory library is a community within which members are connected through either physical or virtual library spaces. The connection helps them to easily share interests and concerns, and it enables them to learn from one another. Participatory library also empowers users and provides them with innumerable opportunities and enjoyable experiences, as they are actively involved in library activities. Participatory library is fluid but not rigid. This is represented via the variations in its core, in which each core category (or phenomenon) and associated properties are dimensionalised in ranges or continua. Such dimensions provide insights into the categories. Remarkably, the phenomena do not exist separately. Causal conditions, the contexts, intervening conditions, inter/actions, and consequences – all have relationships with the phenomena. They together constitute the participatory library model.

Though there are several possible limitations that pertain to the research methodology (and these have suggested potential areas for future research), this research significantly contributes to knowledge and practice in a number of areas. Firstly, it empirically fills the gap in the Library 2.0 models that are mainly based on the literature or experience of the researchers. Secondly, it provides evidence to assist in understandings of the relationships between libraries/librarians and users. The research demonstrates that the library-user relationship has changed positively over the years. Users previously experienced a sense of powerlessness and loneliness that was referred to as library anxiety. Nowadays they have a sense of belonging (community), are empowered, and are provided with holistic experience – all of these are elements of the participatory library. Thirdly, this research contributes to library practice, particularly the practice of university libraries. It provides them with a guideline or a benchmark that assists them to revise their current library model and enables them to connect members in their libraries, to empower users, and to provide users with a greater library experience. Therefore, the research helps them to become participatory libraries.
Appendices

The appendices are organised in the order in which they are referred to in the body of the thesis. Some appendices have two copies (one was sent to the librarian participants and the other was sent to the user participants). For example, the email to the potential participant, the information sheet for the participant, and the participant profile all have two copies.
## Appendix A – Contrasting characteristics of qualitative approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Narrative research</th>
<th>Phenomenology</th>
<th>Grounded theory</th>
<th>Ethnography</th>
<th>Case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Exploring the life of an individual</td>
<td>Understanding the essence of the experience</td>
<td>Developing a theory grounded in data from the field</td>
<td>Describing and interpreting a culture-sharing group</td>
<td>Developing an in-depth description and analysis of a case or multiple cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of program best suited for design</td>
<td>Needing to tell stories of individual experiences</td>
<td>Needing to describe the essence of a lived phenomenon</td>
<td>Grounding a theory in the views of participant</td>
<td>Describing and interpreting the shared patterns of culture of a group</td>
<td>Providing an in-depth understanding of a case or cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis strategies</td>
<td>Analysing data for stories, restorying stories, developing themes, often using a chronology</td>
<td>Analysing data for significant statements, meaning units, textual and structural description, description of the “essence”</td>
<td>Analysing data through open coding, axial coding, selective coding</td>
<td>Analysing data through description of culture-sharing group; themes about the group</td>
<td>Analysing data through description of the case and themes of the case as well as cross-case themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written report</td>
<td>Developing a narrative about the stories of an individual’s life</td>
<td>Describing the “essence” of the experience</td>
<td>Generating a theory illustrated in a figure</td>
<td>Describing how a culture-sharing group works</td>
<td>Developing a detailed analysis of one or more cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Creswell (2007, p. 78-79)
Appendix B – Email to potential participants

A PARTICIPATORY LIBRARY MODEL FOR UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Subject: Invitation to participate in a QUT PhD research project exploring participatory libraries

Dear [Librarian participant name],

My name is Linh Nguyen from the Faculty of Science and Engineering, Queensland University of Technology, Australia. I am doing PhD research in building a new library model for university libraries. I am looking for librarians who have knowledge and/or experience in the use of Web 2.0 (e.g., RSS, Blogs, Wikis, Twitter, Instant Messaging, etc.) and social networking tools in the library.

I would like to invite you, as a current librarian, to take part in my research project by sharing your experience and understanding in an individual interview. The interview is expected to take 45-60 minutes. Your participation is completely anonymous and confidential.

Please find details in the attached files. If you have any questions or comments about the research, please do not hesitate to contact me at linhc.nguyen@student.qut.edu.au or (+61) 422634028.

Your involvement in the project will be significant for the university libraries. I wish to thank you in advance for your time and participation.

Yours sincerely

Linh

--------------------------------------------
Linh Nguyen
PhD student
School of Information Systems
Queensland University of Technology
Email: linhc.nguyen@student.qut.edu.au
Mobile: (+61) 0422634028
A PARTICIPATORY LIBRARY MODEL FOR UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Subject: Invitation to participate in a QUT PhD research project exploring participatory libraries

Dear [User participant name],

My name is Linh Nguyen from the Faculty of Science and Engineering, Queensland University of Technology, Australia. I am doing PhD research in building a new library model for university libraries. I am looking for university library users who have been actively involved in using Web 2.0 (e.g., RSS, Blogs, Wikis, Twitter, Instant Messaging, etc.), and social networking tools in the library.

I request your assistance as a current library user in a university library to take part in my research project by sharing your experience and understanding in an individual interview. The interview is expected to take 45-60 minutes. Your participation is completely anonymous and confidential.

If you are interested in the research project, please find details in the attached file (Info Sheet). If you have any questions or comments about the research please don’t hesitate to contact me at linhc.nguyen@student.qut.edu.au or (+61) 422 634 028.

Your involvement in the project will be significant for the university libraries. We wish to thank you in advance for your time and participation.

Yours sincerely

Linh

--------------------------------------------
Linh Nguyen
PhD student
School of Information Systems
Queensland University of Technology
Email: linhc.nguyen@student.qut.edu.au
Mobile: (+61) 0422634028
Appendix C – Information sheet for participants

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FOR QUT RESEARCH PROJECT

# A participatory library model for university libraries

**RESEARCH TEAM CONTACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Linh Nguyen</th>
<th>Professor Helen Partridge</th>
<th>Professor Sylvia Edwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Research Student)</td>
<td>(Research Supervisor)</td>
<td>(Associate Supervisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems Discipline</td>
<td>Information Systems Discipline</td>
<td>Information Systems Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+61 422 634 023</td>
<td>+61 7 3138 9047</td>
<td>+61 7 3138 2759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:linh.nguyen@student.qut.edu.au">linh.nguyen@student.qut.edu.au</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:h.partridge@qut.edu.au">h.partridge@qut.edu.au</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.edwards@qut.edu.au">s.edwards@qut.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION**

This project is being undertaken as part of a PhD project for Linh Nguyen. The project is funded by Australian Government. The funding body will not have access to the data obtained during the project. The purpose of this project is to establish a new library model for university libraries. The research team requests your assistance because as a librarian involved in library practice you can provide valuable information on the use of Web 2.0, social networking tools and other services to support the establishment of a new library model that enhances library services.

**PARTICIPATION**

Your participation in this project is voluntary. If you do agree to participate, you can withdraw from participation at any time without comment or penalty until the end of the data collection period that is until the end of November, 2011. Your decision to participate will in no way impact upon your current or future relationship with QUT.

Your participation will involve completing a short demographic questionnaire (via email) and then taking part in a one on one semi-structured interview. The interview will be conducted via an online environment or at a physical location that is convenient for you. The interview will take approximately 45-60 minutes and questions will include (for example):

What can you tell me about your experience with using new and emerging technology such as blogs, twitter, youtube in designing and delivering library services and programs?

**EXPECTED BENEFITS**

It is expected that this project will benefit both yourself and university libraries. Your involvement in the project will help ensure that university libraries will enhance and create new services for their users.

**RISKS**

There are no risks beyond normal day-to-day living associated with your participation in this project.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

All comments and responses will be treated confidentially and will be made anonymous when transcribed and published. The interviews will be recorded. The audio recordings will not be verified by participants prior to final inclusion. All recordings will be destroyed on completion of the project. The recordings will not be used for any other purpose. It is not possible to participate in the project without being recorded. Only the researcher will have access to the recordings. The privacy of all comments made by you as an interview participant will be respected. The data collected during the Interviews will be treated confidentially and will remain completely anonymous, but it may be published in our research reports both internally within the university and more broadly in the LIS literature.

**CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE**

We would like to ask you to sign a written consent form (enclosed) to confirm your agreement to participate.

**QUESTIONS / FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROJECT**

Please contact the researcher team members named above to have any questions answered or if you require further information about the project.

**CONCERNS / COMPLAINTS REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF THE PROJECT**

QUT is committed to researcher integrity and the ethical conduct of research projects. However, if you do have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the project you may contact the QUT Research Ethics Unit on +61 7 3138 5123 or email ethics@qut.edu.au. The Research Ethics Unit is not connected with the research project and can facilitate a resolution to your concern in an impartial manner.

*Thank you for helping with this research project. Please keep this sheet for your information.*
A participatory library model for university libraries

QUT Ethics Approval Number: 100000084

RESEARCH TEAM CONTACTS

Mr. Lanh Nguyen  
(Research Student)  
Information Systems Discipline  
Faculty of Science and Engineering – Queensland University of Technology  
+61 422 634 028  
linhncnguyen@student.qut.edu.au

Professor Helen Partridge  
(Research Supervisor)  
Information Systems Discipline  
+61 7 3138 9047  
h.partridge@qut.edu.au

Professor Sylvia Edwards  
(Associate Supervisor)  
Information Systems Discipline  
+61 7 3138 2759  
s.edwards@qut.edu.au

DESCRIPTION
This project is being undertaken as part of a PhD project for Lanh Nguyen. The project is funded by Australian Government. The funding body will not have access to the data obtained during the project. The purpose of this project is to establish a new library model for university libraries. The research team requests your assistance because as a library user, actively involved in using web 2.0-based library services, you can provide valuable information on the use of Web 2.0, social networking tools and other services to support the establishment of a new library model that enhances library services.

PARTICIPATION
Your participation in this project is voluntary. If you do agree to participate, you can withdraw from participation at any time without comment or penalty until the end of the data collection period that is until the 15th of December, 2012. Your decision to participate will in no way impact upon your current or future relationship with QUT.

Your participation will involve completing a short demographic questionnaire (via email) and then taking part in a one-on-one semi-structured interview. The interview will be conducted via Skype. The interview will take approximately 45-60 minutes and questions will include (for example):

What can you tell me about your experience with using new library services that are based upon emerging technologies such as blogs, twitter, youtube, and smartphones as a library user?

EXPECTED BENEFITS
It is expected that this project will benefit both yourself and university libraries. Your involvement in the project will help ensure that university libraries will enhance and create new services for their users.

RISKS
There are no risks beyond normal day-to-day living associated with your participation in this project.

CONFIDENTIALITY
All comments and responses will be treated confidentially and will be made anonymous when transcribed and published. The interview will be recorded. The audio recordings will not be verified by participants prior to final inclusion. All recordings will be destroyed on completion of the project. The recordings will not be used for any other purpose. It is not possible to participate in the project without being recorded. Only the researcher will have access to the recordings. The privacy of all comments made by you as an interview participant will be respected. The data collected during the interviews will be treated confidentially and will remain completely anonymous, but it may be published in our research reports both internally within the university and more broadly in the LIS literature.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE
We would like to ask you to sign a written consent form (enclosed) to confirm your agreement to participate.

QUESTIONS / FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROJECT
Please contact the researcher team members named above to have any questions answered or if you require further information about the project.

CONCERNS / COMPLAINTS REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF THE PROJECT
QUT is committed to researcher integrity and the ethical conduct of research projects. However, if you do have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the project you may contact the QUT Research Ethics Unit on +61 7 3138 5123 or email ethicscontact@qut.edu.au. The Research Ethics Unit is not connected with the research project and can facilitate a resolution to your concern in an impartial manner.

Thank you for helping with this research project. Please keep this sheet for your information.
Appendix D – Participant profile

Librarian Participant Profile

As part of your participation on my research, I would like to gather some basic demographic information. Please answer the questionnaire below and return it to me via email (lihkc.nguyen@student.qut.edu.au)

Your full name: ........................................................................................................................................

Gender:  Male ☐   Female ☐

Name of your employer/organization: ........................................................................................................

Title of the position you hold: ......................................................................................................................

Please briefly describe your role in this position:
.................................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................................

How long have you worked in the library and information profession? ................................................

What is the highest level of education?
☐ Undergraduate university degree
☐ Postgraduate university degree
☐ Others (Please specify) ..........................................................................................................................

What is the major of your highest degree? ...............................................................................................
User Participant Profile

As part of your participation on my research, I would like to gather some basic demographic information. Please answer the questionnaire below and return it to me via email (linhnnguyen@student.qut.edu.au)

Which of the following best describes your situation?

☐ A staff member in the university  ☐ (Go to part I)
☐ A student in the university  ☐ (Go to Part II)

Part I. FOR LIBRARY USERS WHO ARE A STAFF MEMBER IN THE UNIVERSITY

Gender:  Male ☐  Female ☐

Name of your university/organization:

Title of the position you hold:

Please briefly describe your role in this position:

How long have you worked in this university?

What is your highest level of education?

☐ Undergraduate university degree
☐ Postgraduate university degree
☐ Others (Please specify):

What is the major of your highest degree?

Part II. FOR LIBRARY USERS WHO ARE A STUDENT IN THE UNIVERSITY

Gender:  Male ☐  Female ☐

Name of your course:

Major:

How long have you studied in this university?

Thank you!
Appendix E – Consent form

CONSENT FORM FOR QUT RESEARCH PROJECT

A participatory library model for university libraries

QUT Ethics Approval Number 1006/06/984

RESEARCH TEAM CONTACTS

Mr Linh Nguyen (Research Student)
Information Systems Discipline
Faculty of Science and Engineering
Queensland University of Technology
+61 422 634 028
linhc.nguyen@student.qut.edu.au

Professor Helen Partridge (Research Supervisor)
Information Systems Discipline
Queensland University of Technology
+61 7 3138 9047
h.partridge@qut.edu.au

Professor Sylvia Edwards (Associate Supervisor)
Assistant Dean
Queensland University of Technology
+61 7 3138 2759
s.edwards@qut.edu.au

STATEMENT OF CONSENT

By signing below, you are indicating that you:

• Have read and understood the information document regarding this project.
• Have had any questions answered to your satisfaction.
• Understand that if you have any additional questions you can contact the research team.
• Understand that you are free to withdraw at any time without comment or penalty until the end of the data collection period that is until the 15th of December 2012.
• Understand that the data may be published in the student’s thesis and other relevant professional journals or conference proceedings.
• Understand that you can contact the Research Ethics Unit on +61 7 3138 5123 or email ethicscontact@qut.edu.au if you have concerns about the ethical conduct of the project.
• Understand that the project will include audio recording.
• Agree to participate in the project.

Name: .................................................................

Signature: ................................................................

Date: ....................................................................
Appendix F – Interview guideline

A PARTICIPATORY LIBRARY MODEL FOR UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Interview Protocol

I. Check-list of resources for interviews
- Audio recorder, pens and notebooks
- Copies of Participant Information Sheet, Participant Profile and Consent Form

II. Procedure of interviews
1. Getting started (5 minutes)
   - Greeting
   - Introduce myself
   - Introduction to the project overall
   - Purpose of the interview
   - Explain why the participant has been invited and chose to participate in the study
   - Confidentiality
   - Consent process
   - Individual opinion and experience (no right or wrong answer)
   - Audio recorded

2. Interview questions (45-60 minutes)
The following interview questions are indicative of type of questions that will be used:

For librarians:
1. What can you tell me about your experience with using new and emerging technology such as blogs, twitter, Youtube, and smart phones as a librarian?
2. What can you tell me about your experience with using new and emerging technology such as blogs, twitter, Youtube, smart phones in designing and delivering library services and programs?
3. Can you give me an example of services that don’t involve technology?

For library users:
1. Can you tell me some information about yourself as a library user?
2. What can you tell me about your experience with using new library services that are based upon emerging technologies such as blogs, twitter, Youtube, and smart phones etc. as a library user?
3. (a) We have been talking about your experience in using and participating in web 2.0 based library services such as blogs, twitter, Facebook, and smart phones etc. Now, let’s temporarily forget technological issues. Have you ever taken part in any kind of contribution to library services that don’t involve technology? If so, can you tell me about that experience?
   (b) If Not, can you give me an example of library service that allows user’s participation and contribution but doesn’t involve in technology?

3. Summary (5 minutes)
   - State what will happen next in the research process and the availability of results
   - Ask the interviewee for a recommendation of other librarians/users for next interviews
   - Question & Answer
   - Thank participant
Appendix G – Pre-test and pilot study

Pre-test and pilot study

This section discusses the pre-test and pilot interviews. The main purpose of these interviews is to ensure that the interview questions are clear, meaningful and obtain the type of data needed to establish a model of the participatory library. A pre-test and pilot study also suggests refinement that may be made in order to elicit the richest information from the participants.

1. Participants

This research aims at two main groups of participants (librarians and library users). The first phase focuses on the librarian participants in a small-scale study to ensure that data collection instrument has been well designed. Interviews with library users in the next phase follow a similar procedure as applied to librarians.

Three interviews were conducted. The first two pre-test interviews were conducted in English in a face-to-face mode with two Australian university librarians. The third interview, a pilot interview, was conducted in Vietnamese with a university librarian in Vietnam via Skype software. Research participants in the main study were Vietnamese librarians and library users while the pre-test interviews involved two Australian librarians. The job of Australian librarians and their counterparts in Vietnam are similar in nature. The main difference is in the language used for the interviews. The content of interview questions was translated into Vietnamese therefore the content of questions remain the same. Another purpose of using Australian librarians for pre-test interviews is that the original transcripts are in English. Therefore, it is easily to work closely with the supervisory team, to reflect on them, to adjust interview questions and interview protocol. There is a limited pool of available participants in Vietnam, it is necessary to avoid ‘using up’ potential participants. This is the reason why the pre-test was first with Australian and then moved to the pilot test with Vietnamese. The pre-test interviews were not used in the main study to establish the participatory model. They were used as a convenient and practical first step in finalising the data collection instrument while the pilot test was a way to check the instrument in the context of Vietnam.
The procedure to approach librarians for interviews is as follows:

An invitation email was sent to each librarian (one at a time) to invite them to take part in the research. The email included an Information Sheet for Participants. Once they agreed to participate, the participant was sent a Participant Profile and a Consent Form for completion. Then the date and time of the interview were confirmed. For the face-to-face interviews, the Australian librarians were asked to prepare a quiet room in order to ensure the quality of the interview recording. The Vietnamese librarian was interviewed online via Skype and asked to prepare a computer with a broadband internet connection, a plug-in microphone and speakers.

2. Interview results and reflections

Interview number 1: pre-test with an Australian university librarian

The interview was conducted on November 1, 2010. It was 26 minutes in length. The female participant has a master’s degree and a graduate diploma in library and information system management. She has worked in libraries for 10 years and is currently working as a liaison librarian for a university based in Brisbane.

The interview included three primary questions. Corbin and Strauss (2008) suggested that unstructured interviews will provide the densest data. However, it is not easy to sit with an open mind and an open agenda to get the free flow of information (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). For this reason, this research actively sought to avoid leading the participants. Instead, the researcher kept the interview questions very open in nature so that the participant was encouraged to provide as much information as she can. The three interview questions provided a way of starting the interview. Then, it was up to the interviewer to be an active listener and pose more questions as the interviews progress to yield the richest information possible.

The interview questions used are presented in the table below:
1. What can you tell me about your experience with using new and emerging technology such as blogs, Twitter, YouTube, and smart phones as a librarian?

2. What can you tell me about your experience with using new and emerging technology such as blogs, Twitter, YouTube, smart phones in designing and delivering library services and programs?

3. Can you give me an example of services that don’t involve technology?

Question number 1 focused on the experience of the participant in their role as a university librarian. This question encouraged the participant to talk about a wide range of Web 2.0 technologies and tools used within her professional role. This question was used first as it was perceived that it would be an easy way to introduce the topic to the participant. It was assumed that the participant would find it easy to talk about her own individual experience before moving into the experience of the library services and programs more broadly. The participant talked about many different technologies, their features, advantages, and disadvantages. Based on the participant’s response, the interviewer posed follow-up questions sought additional explanation of interesting points such as low adoption of mentioned Web 2.0 technologies and tools, the differences between the library (that used Web 2.0) and the previous library version.

None of the questions asked during the interview included the phrases ‘Web 2.0’ or ‘social media’. Instead, examples of types of technologies and applications representing this new and emerging technology were used. The reason for this approach is that the term Web 2.0, as analysed in the literature review chapter, is loosely defined. People may understand it in different ways. The examples used did not lead the respondent. Rather, it provided her with context and allowed her to provide the appropriate information. Smart phones were also included in this question. It reminded the respondent of the device that is usually associated with Web2.0 applications and technologies. As a result, the respondent talked about her experience with not only smart phones but also computers, laptops, and other handheld devices.

Similarly, the terms ‘Library 2.0’ or ‘participatory library’ were not included in the interview questions. This helped to avoid the use of jargon that may cause difficulties or misunderstanding for the respondent. The language of interview question became meaningful and accessible to the respondent because interview questions used the
language of the respondent rather than language of the researcher or scientific language.

Question number 2 still focused on experience of the librarian, but more specifically, concentrated on the applications of these technologies in designing and delivering library services and programs. However, this question appeared not to work well. The participant appeared to get confused as she already mentioned or discussed such technologies in the previous question. It is possible that the way the question was asked had an impact on the way the participant responded. The interviewer modified the question by asking: Can you give me an example of how you use Web 2.0 technology to design a specific product, service or program in the library? The participant confirmed that Web 2.0 has just been used to promote what the library already had rather than to create new products or services. She also talked about other technologies and tools like the rating system in the library catalogue, RSS feeds, and de.li.cious bookmarks. Again, she asserted that there was a low usage of such technologies among users. At this point, the interviewer again wondered ‘why’ - the reasons for low adoption. The response was that because ‘the users are too busy’. They just come in for what they need and get it and run out. ‘They are not looking for things to add more to their workload’. Web 2.0 has just been used as a marketing tool.

After a discussion about Web 2.0 and their use in the library in the previous questions, question number 3 was asked that moved the discussion away from a focus on technology. This question was included because it has been acknowledged by some researchers that Web 2.0 is just one part of Library 2.0. Web 2.0 is the primary focus of the current discourse on Library 2.0. The participatory library, however, should embrace both virtual and physical channels that support and enable participation. Physical participation may not always involve the use of technology (Lankes, et al., 2007a; Maness, 2006a). The participant found responding to this question challenging, as it seemed to turn the participant to another topic and as such moved the discussion away from obtaining the data needed by the researcher. The response was that ‘we will probably survive without Web 2.0’ because libraries may have online collections, databases and other traditional information resources to meet users’ information needs.
In summary, the interview ran smoothly. After carefully reading the interview transcript, the researcher recognised that the interview focused too much on technological aspects such as Web 2.0 and its application in the library. The excessive attention to technologies was further commented and discussed when the researcher presented his research intention at the Information Systems Discipline 2010 consortium. The overall comment of the audience was that the interview questions ‘seem to be not capturing the essence of participation’. The researcher believes that there were two reasons for this. The first is that the interview questions themselves are technology oriented. The second reason is that the researcher did not capture all ‘interesting points’ and pose additional questions on time as the interview progressed. Becoming an ‘active listener’ is important and it requires using interview techniques appropriately. Therefore, the next interviews need to consider such techniques.

**Interview number 2: pre-test with an Australian university librarian**

The interview was carried out on December 11, 2010. It was 50 minutes in length. The participant is a female and her highest degree is master of library and information management. She has worked in libraries for 15 years and is currently working as a liaison librarian at a Brisbane university.

After the first interview, in consultation with supervisory team, the interview questions were modified. Interview questions used in the second interview are presented in the table below (the addition and modification are made bold):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Could you please tell me about your role in the library?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What can you tell me about your experience with using new and emerging technology such as blogs, Twitter, YouTube, and smart phones as a librarian?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What can you tell me about the way the library uses new and emerging technology such as blogs, Twitter, YouTube, smart phones in designing and delivering library services and programs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>[We have been talking the use of social media like Twitter, smart phones etc. to engage users in a more participatory way by both you as a librarian and the library more broadly]. Can you tell me about how you or your library might encourage and support users’ participation without using technology?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>How is the relationship between library and users changing?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This second interview included five main questions in comparison to three questions in the first interview. The first additional question is that: *Could you please tell me about your role in the library?* This question helped to warm up the interview. The question worked well as it gave the participant an opportunity to talk about her professional role, what she is involved in and responsible for. The warming up question is easy so that the participant feel comfortable and relaxed. As the interview progressed, more challenging questions were posed in order to exhaust other tough aspects of the research topic. The added question also offered the researcher a chance to understand more about the job, working experience, and interests of the participant. Therefore, he might adjust the interview strategy to fit with the situation, and allow richer information to be revealed.

Question 2 (this was question 1 in the first interview) remained unchanged. This was another opportunity for this question to be re-tested to see if it is suitable. The response to this question provided much more details about the experience and opinion of the participant on Web 2.0 technologies. The participant also talked about user interest and the current state of participation among users and library staff.

Question 3 moved to a broader level. In the first interview, the question was:

```
What can you tell me about your experience with using new and emerging technology such as blogs, Twitter, YouTube, smart phones in designing and delivering library services and programs?
```

In the second interview, this question was changed to:

```
What can you tell me about the way the library uses new and emerging technology such as blogs, Twitter, YouTube, smart phones in designing and delivering library services and programs?
```

The modified question did not limit the answer within the experience of the participant but allowed her to express opinion on the use of new and emerging technologies (in general, at a broader level) in library services and programs. This question distinguishes itself from the previous question. Therefore, it did not make the participant confused.

This modified question worked very well. The participant discussed an interesting point that is the physical space for users to participate in the library. The literature review showed that technology is just a part of library, very little or none of the
research discusses about physical space in Library 2.0 and participatory library. In this interview, the participant talked about her observation of a State library, which offers significant physical spaces for users. Then she related to the context of the university library. She expanded her response to the question by emphasising the importance of having a balance between virtual space and physical space in university libraries. She stated that it is difficult for users to participate in library if the library just pays attention to development of Web 2.0 based services without creating a physical environment for users to comfortably use such services.

Question 4 was also adjusted. The focus of question is broader than it was in the first interview. It was changed from:

Can you give me an example of services that don’t involve technology?

to:

Can you tell me about how you or your library might encourage and support users’ participation without using technology?

This question required the participant to think of a situation of a library that can offer participatory services without technology (including Web 2.0). The question was designed to exploit further information about non-technical aspects that have not been discussed earlier in the interview or explored in the literature relevant to the topic. By answering this question, the participant guessed that the library would return to what it was in the past. The library would offer purely physical services and she further emphasised the importance of physical side of library. She asserted that whatever the library is, it should be a friendly and relaxed environment for users to take part in.

Question 5 (additional question) asked about the role of library users or the changing relationship between the library and the users. This is a gap in the literature where some researchers affirm that users’ role remains poorly investigated (Lankes et al., 2007a). The participatory library is being about changing the way libraries and library staff connect to their users. It is changing the power dynamics that exist between library and users. The participatory library is creating the opportunity for the user to become more of an equal partner in the library processes. Library 2.0 was the trigger for this. Question 5 was introduced because it was noticed that the interview 1
had an over emphasis on technology. It is necessary to balance that emphasis with a focus on users. This is similar to the previous question that focused more on non-technology ways of fostering participation.

This question can be asked at any time once questions 1, 2 and 3 have been answered. It depends on the progression of the interview and the response of the participant. In this second interview, this question was posed after the participant discussed the relationship between two terms: ‘participatory library’ and ‘participatory culture’. During this discussion, she mentioned the library users have been offered more power to engage in development of library collection. Therefore, this is an interesting point and it was a suitable time to pose question 5.

Generally, the modified set of interview questions worked better than the old one. A length of 50 minutes is reasonable that allowed the participant to answer all five main interview questions and prompt questions. After the second interview, the researcher learned that listening, posing and explaining questions are important. A change of interview questions or interview strategy is not necessary for the next interview.

The interview techniques were adjusted in this interview. The researcher paid more attention to the interview while noted down important points. Therefore, questions were posed more timely and appropriately as the interview progressed. For example, the fifth question about the evolving relationship between library and users was posed opportunely.

**Interview number 3: pilot interview with a Vietnamese university librarian**

Two pre-test interviews were conducted with Australian university librarians as a way of (i) developing the appropriate interview questions and (ii) allowing the researcher to practise the interview technique. Having achieved both aims, the next step is to pilot test with a member of the population to be studied (a university librarian from Vietnam). The pilot study had two aims (i) test the interview questions within the Vietnamese context; and (ii) allow the researcher to test interview skills and strategy using online process.
A 35 minute interview took place on January 1, 2011. The participant is a male librarian who is a library manager in a Vietnamese university. He holds a master’s degree in library and information studies and has worked in libraries for 14 years.

Overall, the interview conducted in a smooth manner. This interview used the same set of interview questions that worked satisfactorily in the second interview. The interview procedure and strategy were also remained the same. There was a balance between the questions. Apart from the first warming up question, the next two questions focused on technology while the last two questions focused on non-technology and the role of users. In this interview, the participant shared his experience on the use of various participatory technologies. Many technologies mentioned in the interview were different from that of the previous two interviews. Some significant points were also emerged as he considered the relationship between the library and users as co-operation or partnership.

Apart from the content of interview questions above, there are still some things to consider for the next interviews:

- Use of webcam (or video call function) rather than audio call. A video call will enable both researcher and participant to use body language or at least facial communication. This may contribute to the quality of the interview.

- A broadband internet connection is a must-have requirement for both interviewer and participant. In this first Skype interview, occasionally the conversation experienced a delay due to the network bandwidth. Therefore, sometimes one site could not hear from the other on time. The researcher copied and pasted the questions in the chat box for the participant to refer to as necessary. Probably due to some network delay, it did not encourage the participant to expand his response.

- It is better to reduce the speed of the conversation. This will make it easily for both to hear each other more clearly. This may be minor but can help to improve the quality of interviews.
3. Preliminary analysis of the pilot interview

The pre-test interviews were not analysed because they were not used as part of the main study. This pilot interview was analysed in order to orient the next interview (in the main study).

This section describes the initial analysis of the pilot interview. It focuses on the open coding. This analysis aims to identify initial list of codes and discover tentative categories from data.

The procedure to analyse this interview included two main stages, as follows:

Paper-based stage:

- Formatted the interview transcript in 2 columns, the larger one on the left is for the original transcript and the smaller one on the right is for codes (concepts)
- Printed out the formatted transcript
- Decided the method of data analysis (open coding - line by line approach)
- Read thoroughly the transcript, lines were labelled with codes
- The analysis continued until reaching the end of document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT</th>
<th>CODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewee:</strong> As you might know Web 2.0 has a great impact to library activities.</td>
<td><strong>Web 2.0 impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a platform where the library community can share data, participate in developing</td>
<td><strong>Web 2.0 as a collaboration platform</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and updating information in the form of collaboration and sharing through internet</td>
<td><strong>Availability of library services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment. Wherever people are, they still can connect with each other and use</td>
<td><strong>Interactive opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library services. Thus, this creates more exposure opportunities for both librarians</td>
<td><strong>Ability to access to information resources and services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and library users. Library users can easily access to information resources of the</td>
<td><strong>Lack of communication opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library as well as services. For the traditional library which does not use Web 2.0,</td>
<td><strong>Information update difficulties</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the communication between librarians and library users is not as much as the library</td>
<td><strong>Significant impact of Web 2.0 on libraries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Web 2.0. Information update is sometimes the problem if the users are not on site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It can be say that when Web 2.0 was born and used in the library, it significantly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impacts on activities of the library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of open coding (paper-based)
Computer-based stage:

- Once the paper-based analysis task was completed, opened the interview transcript in Atlas.ti\(^1\) that software.
- Based on paper-based analysed transcript, selected each block of text (line) and assigned a corresponding code (this step simply repeats what has been done on the paper. This made it possible for computer-assisted tasks to be done in later steps).
- Cleaned up synonymous codes by merging them.
- A list of codes (provisional concepts) for the transcript was generated.

An example of open coding (in Atlas.ti)

Once a list of codes have been created, codes were grouped into categories and sub-categories. These tentative categories were the basis for the next interview in which the researcher looked for further information to identify properties and dimensions of initial categories.

---

\(^1\) Atlas.ti is a professional software program for qualitative analysis of large bodies of textual, graphical, audio and video data (http://www.atlasti.com/).
4. Lessons learned and conclusion

In summary, the pre-test and pilot interviews have closed with a satisfactory result. Based on the first interview, the questions were modified and the interview strategy was adjusted. As a result, the next two interviews took place more satisfactorily.

After these pre-test and pilot interviews, some lessons in terms of interview techniques have been drawn and/or confirmed:

- Keep the participant focused: clearly provide the participant with a contextual background and the purpose of the interview, and inform him or her of what will happen next.

- It is necessary for the researcher to be an active listener. “Listen more and talk less” is a good strategy for such in-depth semi-structured interviews.

- Follow-up the participant but do not interrupt: if there is an interesting point is mentioned, note down keywords and pose more questions at an appropriate time. This way encourages the respondent to expand the conversation by continuing with their flow of thoughts.

- It is important to ask real question: the participant does not anticipate the answer.

- Share opinion occasionally so that the participant has a feeling of ‘I am on the right track’. This method encourages the participant to expand the conversation. This is also an opportunity for the participant to stop talking to think and have more time to reflect and add to what he or she has said.

- “Why” and “how” are useful for additional questions, which should be posed as the interview progresses to clarify significant points.

Below is an example of interview technique that the researcher has reflected on after the pre-test interview number 2:
An example of a brief reflection on interview techniques (types of question posed and way to share opinion with the participant) - used in the Pre-test interview number 2

5. Strategies for the main study

The main study followed the research procedure as applied for the pre-test and pilot interviews. Basic interview techniques above were used and developed or adjusted to best suit the interview situations. The interviews with Vietnamese librarians used the same set of interview questions as in the interviews 2 and 3. Additionally, based on the analysis of the pilot interview, the next interview focused on the some initial emerging categories in order to identify their properties and dimensions.

As for the library user participants, interview procedure was similar to that applied to librarian participants. Interview questions were modified based on interview questions for librarians. Below is a possible set of interview questions for library user participants:

1. Could you please tell me about yourself as a library user?

2. What can you tell me about your experience with using new and emerging technology such as blogs, Twitter, YouTube, and smart phones etc. as a library user?

3. Can you tell me how the library can use emerging technology such as blogs, Twitter, YouTube, smart phones etc. to meet the expectation of yourself and library user community?

4. Can you tell me about how you might take part in library activities without using technology?
Appendix H – Example of a memo

MEMO: Thoughts after an interview

In the first half of the interview, the participant shared his view and experience in using emerging technologies as a library user. He repeated or emphasised on a range of ideas. Some of them are:

- Communication
- Connecting people (users, librarians, etc.)
- Sharing information
- Being updated
- Learning from wider community/Reaching community knowledge
- Library as a playground/place/one-stop place/community space/integrated system where users can find all they need
- Informal conversation/communication
- Collaborating virtually
- User training
- Equal relationship
- Smart/intelligent users

In the second half of the interview, the participant talked a lot about the advantages of emerging technologies and the disadvantages of non-tech. Overall, users can be active participant but there are many issues to consider. He mentioned:

- Psychological barrier
- Volunteering (interesting – often mentioned in non-technology discussion – need to explore further)
- Awareness/Perception
- Peer support
- Equal relationship (between libraries and users)

NOTE: The thoughts were captured right after an interview without hearing the recorded audio again. It reflects my thoughts and impression on the interview. It can be seen in the memo there are many concepts that were listed randomly. The concepts were easily recalled and noted down due to the participant changed his tone repeatedly to express the ideas throughout the interview. As noted previously, this memo was not referred to until the analysis of this interview was completed. This memo was read after this interview was already analysed and this reference provided an extra check on the analysis to see if an idea was omitted when analysing.
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