
Nordic Journal of Library and Information Studies

Vol. 3, No. 2, 2022
ISSN (ONLINE) 2597-0593

About the journal

Vol. 3, No. 2, 2022

ISSN (online) 2597-0593

Focus and Scope

Nordic Journal of Library and Information Studies, NJLIS, is a scholarly peer reviewed open access journal, covering scientific issues and current trends in Library and Information Studies. Nordic Journal of Library and Information Studies publishes Nordic and international peer reviewed LIS articles and reviews of significant LIS literature. The editorial committee consists of representatives from LIS departments in Sweden, Denmark, Finland and Norway. The role of editor rotates annually between the members of the editorial committee. The journal is published on University of Copenhagen's online platform tidsskrift.dk.

Peer Review Process

Submitted articles are subject to double-blind peer review to ensure a high level of quality. Two reviewers are assigned to each article. The editor decides on publishing after the review process and is in charge of communication with the contributor(s). Papers may be rejected directly by the editor if judged to be out of scope, deemed as sub-standard or not adhering to the author guidelines.

Open Access Policy

The journal provides immediate open access to its content on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge.

Publication Frequency

Nordic Journal of Library and Informations Studies publishes two issues per year.

Editor-in-chief

Lisa Andersson, Department of ALM, Uppsala University, Sweden, lisa.andersson@abm.uu.se

Editorial committee

Rickard Danell, Department of Sociology, Umeå University, Sweden

Kristina Eriksson-Backa, Information Studies, Åbo Akademi University, Finland

Ola Pilerot, Swedish School of Library and Information Science, University of Borås, Sweden

Fredrik Hanell, Department of Cultural Sciences, Linnæus University, Sweden (deputy editor)

Joacim Hansson, Department of Cultural Sciences, Linnæus University, Sweden

J. Tuomas Harviainen, Communication Sciences, Tampere University, Finland

Nanna Kann-Rasmussen, Department of Communication, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Arwid Lund, School of Historical and Contemporary Studies, Södertörn University, Sweden

Ágústa Pálsdóttir, Department of Information Science, University of Iceland, Iceland

Kerstin Rydbeck, Department of ALM, Uppsala University, Sweden

Roswitha Skare, Department of Languages and Culture, UiT The Arctic University of Tromsø, Norway

Kim Tallerås, Department of Archivistics, Library and Information Science, Oslo Metropolitan

University, Norway

Editorial

This issue of the Nordic Journal of Library and Information Studies (NJLIS) contains three research articles all reflecting on different aspects of library and librarian practices. In “Mind the gap!” Hilde Moore introduces an alternative approach to teaching source evaluation, connecting the search and source evaluation with the actual use of sources. Ulrika Centerwall and Lill Langelotz article also concerns pedagogics, but from a school library perspective in “Norm Critical Projects in Swedish School Librarian Practices”. The article illustrates how norm critical projects are shaped by librarians in negotiation with the principals and other education professionals at schools. The results give interesting insight into how librarians’ work with literature and pedagogics not are accepted at face value, but evaluated in their actual situation of use and usefulness in the school setting. Finally, in “Easier material management - at what cost?” Lovisa Liljegren analyses how the introduction of automated systems for material management affects librarians’ work, particularly with regards to knowledge about the collections and skills to evaluate sources.

From the very beginning, the editorial board of the NJLIS has emphasised the importance of using the journal to disseminate research by junior scholars in library and information studies. This issue is certainly very “young” in that one article is a re-worked master’s thesis (Liljegren p. 33-53), one is an article making up part of a PhD compilation thesis (Centerwall p. 16-32), and one is authored by a professional librarian (Moore p. 1-15).

In addition to the research articles this issue presents four book reviews, two of which reviews newly defended Nordic PhD thesis (Hanell p. 59-64, Rasmussen, p. 65-70). The other two presents recently published research literature with Alison Hicks reviewing Jutta Haider and Olof Sundin’s *Paradoxes of media and information literacy* (p. 54-56), and Toumas Harviainen reviewing Ian Ruthven’s *Dealing with Change Through Information Sculpting* (p. 57-58). I find this exchange of perspectives from the Nordic Library and Information Studies community and the wider community beyond fruitful, and hope that the journal in the forthcoming issues can continue to expand its pool of contributors and reviewers beyond the Nordic area.

The year has also held exciting development “behind the scenes” of the journal. With encouragement and support from the Department of Research Support at the Copenhagen University Library, NJLIS has now applied to be indexed in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). Particular gratitude goes to Rasmus Rindom Riise for the hands on support in figuring out all the details required to fill out the application.

Lastly, I would like to thank the Editorial Board for good collaboration, and especially the 2022 Deputy editor Fredrik Hanell, Linnæus University, Sweden for a thorough introduction to journal publishing and continued support during my year as Editor-in-Chief. As of tomorrow, I will hand over the editorship to Kim Tallerås and Sunniva Evjen, Department of Archivistcs, Library and Information Science, Oslo Metropolitan University.

In 2023 we can look forward to the first issue (Vol. 4, No. 1), a thematic issue on *Library and information studies in the climate crisis* edited by the guest editors Jutta Haider, Björn Ekström and Carin Graminius. The second issue (Vol. 4, No. 2) will be an open issue, for the first time trying out the Continuous Article Publication (CAP) model.

Wishing you a happy new year, and a good read!

Lisa Andersson
Editor-in-chief

Hilde Moore, Senior research librarian, Department of sociology and social work, University of Agder, Norway, hilde.moore@uia.no

Mind the gap!

From traditional and instrumental approaches of source evaluation towards source consciousness

Abstract

This article gives a critical review and investigation of traditional generic ways of teaching source evaluation and source criticism. Furthermore, it aims to investigate a new approach to address this area of information literacy instruction for teaching librarians. While traditional approaches focus on evaluating the source at hand, this study offers a perspective to supplement this with a more reflective perspective.

The emphasises in this article is the need to focus on source consciousness though the newly developed model MIND (motivation – intention – need – debate). The goal is to supplement the traditional approaches of source evaluation where only the source is being assessed and no self-assessment is addressed. MIND also binds the searching process and source evaluation closer together and attempts to address the complexity of working with different sources. This approach does not attempt to replace former source evaluation processes, but rather to supplement it.

Keywords: information literacy; source consciousness; source evaluation; source criticism; critical information literacy

Introduction

Ever since the age of Enlightenment we have been encouraged to be critical and question the so-called established truths. This has further developed into the field of source criticism, or source evaluation. As we are becoming increasingly more educated and faced with a vast number of sources, distinguishing trustworthy sources from the more unreliable ones is a highly sought-after skill. Andrew Whitworth (2009) has stated that there is so much information available to us, and much of it of so poor quality that we should be talking not only about information overload, but also about information obesity. Nonetheless, studies have shown that students often rank source evaluation as

the least useful part of library instruction, or that they do not fully incorporate what they were taught during library instruction in terms of evaluating sources (Angell & Tewell, 2017; Bird et al., 2011; Daland, 2015). They are also fairly confident in their own abilities, thinking that they are well apt to find reliable sources. Other studies have shown that there is a discrepancy between what students say is important vs. how they perform in source evaluation situations and that most students new to research have difficulty defining their information need and do not naturally evaluate texts (Silva et al., 2018, p. 26).

Being able to critically evaluate sources takes time and demands familiarity with the subject at hand, and the research in that area. As an unexperienced student evaluating established researchers work and deeming it adequate or not would most likely be seen as very challenging. Sinatra & Lombardi (2020) describe this as the challenges of source evaluation in the “post truth era”, and further emphasise that “explicitly reappraising plausibility judgments may be a crucial addition to evaluating the connections between sources of information and knowledge claims” (p. 128). This is part of becoming a researcher and developing a deepened understanding of the field at hand takes years. Studies like List & Alexander (2018) indicate that students may have the knowledge of source evaluation but may not apply it. Being familiar with the information, research, and literature available can be considered step one, while understanding it and being able to use it is step two. The ability to understand and further critique established knowledge in a field is a vastly more advanced step, which may take years of effort to be able to master.

Different subjects deal with source evaluation in different ways. History will deem sources which are of little interest to other subjects highly interesting. Often because of the age of the source, but also because historical sources are not necessarily academic texts. It may be time to start talking about source consciousness in addition to source evaluation and source criticism. Source consciousness means that you do not judge the quality alone of the source as a one size fits all approach, but whether it is fitting of your needs. The value of the source is not constant as it may be deemed trustworthy, but at the same time irrelevant in another given context (Russo et al., 2019, p.308).

Source evaluation is a highly complex field, and the focus is on evaluating authored texts. But what about the student, or researcher’s role in creating their text? Are they being critical of themselves? Are they taking responsibility for how they find, choose, and use information? The aforementioned study of List & Alexander (2018) indicates that they are not, and that the discrepancy in students’ reported and demonstrated skills regarding source evaluation seem to stay unchanged. Further they conclude that “As a whole, this study provides evidence for a multifaceted approach to developing and accessing source evaluation” (List & Alexander, 2018, p. 213), providing a solid argument for moving onwards from the traditional and instrumental approaches and towards *source consciousness*. The question asked in this study is: how can we as teaching librarians further develop and elaborate the view on sources from source criticism or source evaluation into a more reflective practice of source consciousness to help students develop a more independent relationship with their academic work? A new approach to evaluating sources called MIND (Motivation – Intention – Need – Discussion) will be presented in this article as an addition to the existing approaches of source evaluation to promote source *consciousness*.

Source consciousness

Encyclopædia Britannica defines the term consciousness as ‘Consciousness, a psychological condition defined by the English philosopher John Locke as “the perception of what passes in a man’s own mind’ (‘Consciousness’, 2020). Further the term has been defined as being awake or being able to understand. Cambridge dictionary’s definition describes consciousness as ‘The state of understanding and realizing something’ (‘Consciousness’, n.d.). Being aware of one’s own prejudices, information behaviour and strategies for locating and selecting information can be a conscious process where you

have a 'perception of what is happening in your own mind' as you are going through it. It also brings up the question of ethical use of sources. Not only by citing sources the correct way but being aware of *how* and in *which context* they are being cited, in order to not change the meaning behind them.

Source consciousness is not yet a commonly used term in library science and will be presented in this study as a new approach. Source consciousness in this setting means looking for a transparency of reasoning and arguing why choices were made rather than just focusing on evaluating the texts one is faced with. The end goal is to reflect upon choices and be mindful of why the selected sources ended up being cited in the finished product and why others were merely a part of the process. This article is intended for teaching librarians who wish to incorporate a more reflective way of teaching source evaluation. The MIND approach may be used as a means for discussion for the librarian or as an aid for students in their selection of sources.

Method

This study has critically reviewed and analysed traditional approaches to source evaluation. The three approaches that have been assessed are CRITIC, CRAP/CRAAP and the 5 Ws. The three approaches have been compared to each other and further been critically analysed to assess whether they offer a comprehensive understanding of the challenge of evaluating sources. A thorough literature search has been made to investigate what has been written about source criticism, source evaluation and source consciousness. The search has been carried out in EBSCOHOST Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts. This search shows that little research has been published about source consciousness, and more on source criticism and source evaluation. The approaches have further been discussed considering a sociocultural understanding of IL (Hicks & Lloyd, 2021, 2016; Lloyd, 2017).

Mapping of the field

In this section the mapping of the field of source evaluation in academic librarianship is described. Source evaluation is considered an important part of information literacy and the academic practice, and something that can be quite challenging for students (Bartz, 2002; Daland, 2017; Mason et al., 2018). A study in librarianship also show that source evaluation is considered an important skill for journalists. 'A journalist's credibility and livelihood depend on their ability to locate, evaluate, verify, and accurately report credible sources [...]' (Bobkowski & Younger, 2020, p.822). Locating good sources is often described as the most complex part of information literacy (Bårnes & Løkse, 2015). One is advised to reflect upon what kind of sources one wants to locate and where to look for them. This is an organised approach and may be helpful, but it may also take away from the creative process and being subjected to a range of different sources that may apply in the process of thinking and understanding, though these sources may not actually be cited in the finished product. This also argues for the processes of seeking information and source evaluation being more integrated with each other as a whole.

Traditional generic approaches to source evaluation have some limitations. Mostly that they aim to give an answer to something too complex to be answered. And while a generic approach like a checklist may feel good upon completion, it requires prior knowledge that the students simply may not have (Russo et al., 2019, p. 296). Neither does it engage the students in a way that makes them reflect upon their own information behaviour and information needs. Even though they are given training about distinguishing the difference of sources, they may not really grasp this when faced with a vast number of sources and must decide as to which they choose to use. "Finally, it is difficult to discern how the use of such checklists develops the skills and transferable knowledge necessary for more advanced evaluative tasks"(Russo et al., 2019, p. 296). Or, in other words, how sources and the evaluation of them is highly reliant on context and the information landscape at hand.

Traditional views of source criticism can be challenging in library instruction as well-developed skills in source criticism require experience and acquaintance with one's own subject and experience in selecting adequate sources. Often, librarians are left with the option of one-shot-instructions that may force the librarian to focus on generic skills without the option of linking them to the subject at hand (Daland, 2017, p.93).

Source criticism skills can be difficult to teach, as much of it is based on tacit knowledge connected to familiarity and knowledge about the field of research. A study from USA looks at the concept of authority in library instruction session and conclude that students do not feel like they have the authority they need to be able to properly assess sources, and that they put too much emphasis on indicators like databases or publishing channels, while others are confused with the difference between a scholarly journal and a newspaper (Angell & Tewell, 2017, p.109).

A Norwegian study from 2020 concludes that even though students have the know-how, they may not use these skills when faced with the challenge, but rather choose a more convenient solution. This study is conducted by teacher education researchers, offering another perspective into the information literacy field. 'Overall, our findings indicate the teachers had some insight into how to evaluate digital content but tended to prioritise convenience and to access the resources that were most readily available' (Gudmundsdottir & Hatlevik, 2020, p.51). The article further argues for greater awareness among teacher students and teachers for what they call digital responsibility.

Other studies have focused on the limitations of traditional library instruction source evaluation because users may have few clues as to the source or sponsor of the information and that instruction should emphasize understanding authorship cues, purpose of a site, and currency (Bird et al., 2011, p.185). Instruction often takes an instrumental approach to teaching these skills because of the limited time provided. One shot instruction does not provide librarians to fully delve into the complexity of the issues at hand. To provide the students with some tools for evaluating sources, they are often provided with checklists in a generic approach (Sundin & Carlsson, 2016, p. 992). . Although checklists have their limitations, there are also great advantages to them. They are easy to remember, and they help get students started with a complex process. The issue is not necessarily checklist or no checklist, but rather what we want students to get out of them.

Of the research on source evaluation, much of it focuses on LI or approaches to teach students and pupils skills for critically evaluating a source. Less focus has been given to how sources are selected and what their intention is for the use of this source in their text. There seems to be a distinct polarization between what is considered a good source and a bad source. In a caricatured approach, this can be described as the battle between the good, peer reviewed, academic texts that are considered the heroes trying to inform and educate, and, on the other side, the bad villain texts trying to deceive and mislead. While this can be the case, it is in most cases not. There is no short-cut to finding the right sources, and there is no guarantee of finding all the sources you need. The amount of information available is simply too overwhelming. An author needs to locate adequate sources and be aware of why he or she decided to include them in their finished product.

Source criticism and critical thinking

Source criticism or source evaluation has long been the ideal for academics. Critiquing is one of academia's most known traits. However, how does this affect us and the texts we write? Could it be more fruitful to focus on source consciousness? The main goal of critical thinking is to question and challenge with the intention of confirming or disputing established knowledge (Eriksson, 2020). In my own experience, source evaluation and information searching has been considered separate steps

of information literacy instruction. This can also be supported by Haider and Sundin (2019, p. 111) who describe how teachers do not identify their students' abilities of searching as a problem, but rather the critical evaluation of the results. The skills also seem separated in the The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) guidelines, where searching, evaluating and using information is described in separate bullet points (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2000).

However, the skills of searching and source evaluation are so closely linked together in source consciousness that it is difficult to talk about one and not the other. Source evaluation happens in the evaluation of the search results, yes, but also in the searching process itself, not to mention the preparation for the search. When applying the method of *success* (Zins, 2000) students are encouraged to think of What, Where, Words, Work and Wow. Starting with *what* (what is your research question) they are encouraged to limit their question to location, gender, age and so on to get a more manageable result list when they start searching for information. Further in *where* they must consider where they think useful information can be found. Sometimes they will need a scientific article, other times they need a newspaper article to cover their information need. In this question they need to get an overview of different databases and assess the pros and cons of these and their relevance. The next step, *words*, makes the students find the words they think are relevant for their query. They are also encouraged to assess whether the words they choose are neutral or biased. Choosing biased search words will affect their result list and further their selection of sources. Many students have never considered this to be a problem before and see this as an eyeopener. They are also somewhat surprised that the stage of the actual search, or *work* is fourth in this approach. After the preparations and reflection, they are free to start searching for information. The final stage, *wow*, encourages the students to evaluate their results and make changes to their choices before they repeat their search. The biggest advantage of *success* is the reflective practice and that it forces students to think about their search strategy and information needs more than a mechanical approach where they are simply introduced to several databases and how to use them. The success approach also highlights that source evaluation may be relevant before the final stage of *wow* as the students are encouraged to critically reflect upon their selection of search words and databases.

Different sources have their place in different settings. Evaluating or critiquing sources indicates that some sources have a greater value than others. But is a sources value unchangeable? We are taught to evaluate sources through a set list of criteria. And students mistakenly believe that search engines screen for quality and may give too much credence to the look of the page itself, thusly outsourcing the critical evaluation to the search engines (Lorenzen, 2001, p.162; Sundin & Carlsson, 2016, p. 999).

Traditional approaches of source evaluation

Three well-I approaches to teach source evaluation is CRITIC, CRAP/CRAAP and the 5 Ws. These approaches will be presented and discussed in the following.

CRITIC

“Developed by Dr. Wayne Bartz, the original CRITIC Acronym is a simple methodology designed to help students remember the scientific method. To reinforce student learning of this methodology, Bartz developed an assignment that requires his students to use CRITIC to evaluate paranormal claims in the media” (Matthies & Helmke, 2005, p.65).

Dr. Wayne Bartz states that this acronym “provides neophyte skeptical students with an easy-to-remember, step-by-step format for applied critical thinking” (Bartz, 2002, p.42). Further he claims that “Most college students slouch into the first day of class assuming they already know a great deal about the world around them. As a result, they may have to unlearn an accumulated wealth of misinformation in addition to absorbing the priceless new pearls of wisdom teachers toss their way. An improvement in critical thinking skills should facilitate that sometimes painful process” (2002,

p.42). This model is perhaps the most student-negative one. It assumes that students have no knowledge and that they are arrogant and miseducated and need to unlearn what they have learned in the past to give room for new and valid knowledge.

The acronym focuses on *C-Claim*, where the student must be able to measure the fallibility of the claim at hand. *R-Role of the claimant* assesses the author of the text and what their motif for writing it may be. *I-Information backing the claim* focuses on what evidence is provided and whether it can be verified. *T-Test* asks if there is some reason to doubt the claim and how it can be tested. *I-Independent learning* looks for confirmation of the claim through for example peer reviews. *C-Cause proposed* asks “what is held out as a causal explanation for the claim and is it consistent with the physical laws of the universe?” (Bartz, 2002, pp. 43–44).

The CRITIC approach positions itself in a distinctly critical convergence. The text at hand is put under a thorough critical analysis. The author’s authority is challenged and evaluated in connection to who they are and how they can prove credibility. The students being taught these skills seem to be considered by Bartz to be unaware and uninformed. The main idea of this approach is to teach students a critical approach and be sceptical towards text they encounter. CRITIC provides the students with a helpful acronym, but the approach may be more applicable in subjects like mathematics and science where there are more right and wrong answers. This approach has a lot in common with the 5Ws as it focuses on the credentials and intention of the author. It distinguishes itself from the other approaches by focusing greatly on testing. This makes this approach less applicable to subjects in humanities and social sciences as they are generally not focused on quantitative measures that can be tested in a traditional way. This approach does not offer a reflective practice where the author’s choices and motives are challenged. There is a sole focus on the text’s value based on the criteria in the checklist.

CRAP/CRAAP

CRAP (currency, reliability, authority, purpose/point of view) (CCC Online Library, 2019) or CRAAP (currency, reliability, authority, accuracy, purpose) (Meriam Library California State University, Chico, 2010) was developed by Molly Beestrum and focus on a checklist for assessing sources using the CRAP/CRAAP acronym. The difference between CRAP and CRAAP is that CRAAP also includes accuracy in the checklist.

Currency focuses on timeliness, publication date, revisions and functionality of links. *Relevance* where the focus is whether the text is relevant for your needs and if it, in fact, provides the answers you need. This step seems to put more responsibility on the authors and the choices they make in selecting sources. *Authority* focuses on the source of the information, meaning the author, publisher or other. Here the credential of the author is being viewed and assessed. In accuracy “The reliability, truthfulness, and correctness of the content” (Meriam Library California State University, Chico, 2010) is assessed and if the information has been reviewed or if there are mistakes made in spelling, grammar and so on. The last point is *purpose* where the purpose of the information is questioned. Is it to inform, teach, sell, entertain or persuade?

The CRAAP test is also a critical approach, evaluating the value and reliability of the source, but is also provides the student with encouragement to reflect upon their information needs and what they intend to use the source at hand for. It also has similarities to the 5Ws as it questions who, what, when and why. An interesting difference is the focus on ‘relevance’ and whether the source fits the needs. The acronym itself has a negative connotation to it in terms of judging sources as crap, or not valuable. This might be useful to students as there truly are bad sources of information available, but in their academic work most of the sources they are faced with will be academic sources from their curriculum or library databases. While many of these will not hold a full scientific value, few of them

would be considered as “crap”. However, this approach seems to encourage independent thinking and reflection more than the other two.

The 5 Ws

The five Ws does not provide an acronym like the other approaches, but encourages to ask critical questions to assess the source at hand. The origin of the 5 Ws is difficult to retrieve, but it has been described in several information literacy webpages and in studies (Daland, 2017, Radom & Gammons, 2014). “The five Ws may be a simplifying way of explaining source criticism, but it still provides the librarian with an outline to approach bibliographical data that is important when assessing sources” (Daland, 2017, p. 98). The 5 Ws are the questions of *Who* the author is and what are their merits and affiliation, *what* kind of text it is, i.e. a blog post, a web page or an academic article. *When* was the text published? *Where* has the text been published? Is the publisher reliable, and is there a peer review procedure? *Why* has this text been written and published? And finally, *how* is the text presented regarding language, accuracy and objectivity?

The 5 Ws encourages a critical approach to evaluate the text but does not encourage self-assessment. The critical approach is merely focused on the text at hand and not why the students themselves would consider this a suitable source or not. There is also no focus on relevance for the work at hand. Students may be led to believe that as long as a text has all the academic criteria, it may, and should be included in their text.

The 5 Ws and CRAP/CRAAP approaches are very similar, but the CRAP/CRAAP acronym may have an advantage as it is easier to remember. The CRITIC approach is also similar to the other two but differs in that it seems more complex and extensive. The main idea is still to assess the source as such, and not self-assessment for the author. The only approach that offers some encouragement for critically assessing one’s own motives and intentions is the CRAAP test. The checklists still offer a valuable approach to assessing and selecting sources, but a reflective supplement could be very fruitful in approaching this. A very valuable part of checklists is that they teach students to locate relevant factors of an academic text like publisher, publishing year and so on. Most students will not be familiar with bibliographical data and getting acquainted with this will be of great value to them.

Theoretical framework

This study employs IL theory of sociocultural perspectives on IL. Annemaree Lloyd and her view of IL as a sociocultural practice (Hicks & Lloyd, 2021, 2016; Lloyd, 2017; Lloyd, 2006) is applied. Information literacy is not a single transferrable skill, but a complex process that is constructed in social settings and in collaboration with others transferred to knowledge.

“This knowledge, in turn, provides a person with the capacity to think critically about information, which is inherent in the contexts of their IL practice. The practice has, therefore, relational, situational, recursive, material and embodied dimensions, which are drawn upon to make it meaningful” (Lloyd, 2017, p. 93).

A sociocultural approach to IL argues that IL skills are not generic and transferrable, but rather discipline specific and therefore made in the learning environment at hand. This is highly relevant for source evaluation as different disciplines view sources differently. It is also a holistic approach that encourages reflection and assessment rather than a more shallow and insubstantial focus.

Lloyd describes IL landscapes as a principal element of the theory of IL and these landscapes are constituted through social, epistemic/instrumental, and physical corporeal information modalities which reflect the stable and established knowledge domains of a social site (Lloyd, 2017, p. 94). To

navigate these landscapes takes time and familiarity, explain why a mere checklist would not give a full insight to how to navigate sources.

MIND: An approach to source consciousness.

While the traditional approaches have their strengths, there is still need for a look into a more reflective practice. Like the success method offers a more reflective practice of information seeking and information needs (Zins, 2000), this may also be needed in the process of evaluating sources. Further, believing that IL skills is one single way of knowing, not being context dependent, will limit our understanding (Hicks & Lloyd, 2016, p. 335). Information needs and behaviours will, in most cases, depend on the information landscape, situation and subject at hand.

The complexity of information seeking and evaluation can be challenging to get through to students, even when it is presented and encouraged in instruction. Angell & Tewell (2017, p.99) conclude that students need to strike a balance between their opinions and the texts of others before they can begin to establish themselves as authorities, and further (p. 107) that the participants in their study generally accepted the sources they located as being trustworthy, and that fewer students supplied their own personal interpretations of trustworthiness and credibility that went against the grain of dominant voices.

Establishing knowledge, and further authority in a field is a complex and time-consuming process, in which navigating the information landscape through affordances is a large part. Assistance will also be needed through the process of getting familiarised with the landscape (Lloyd, 2006, p. 572). Some of this learning will happen through mentoring from more experienced professionals or peers, and other through experience. There is a difference between using a source in the process of learning and reading up on a phenomenon and choosing to let that source be part of your theoretical framework. Familiarity with the information landscape at hand will make the distinction between the two more recognisable.

As an attempt to supplement the area of source evaluation and highlight the need for more reflectiveness and self-assessment in the process of selecting sources, the MIND (Motivation – Intention – Need – Debate) approach has been developed. The main idea is that source evaluation should also be source consciousness, where sources are approached with mindfulness. The student, or researcher should be mindful of one's own prejudices and limitations and aspire to academic honesty and integrity, where sources are selected based on their value for the text, not to support biases or simply because it possesses the right criteria to be deemed an academic source.

The MIND framework has been developed by the author, an academic librarian at the University of Agder, through years of teaching source criticism and through conversations with students and colleagues, trying to make a complex area comprehensive and tacit knowledge explicit. The existing checklists provide a helpful starting point, but it seems what is missing is encouragement for reflection and awareness of one's own choices. MIND also attempts to empower students in their writing process by making them take responsibility and make educated choices. They should be asking themselves "what do I want to contribute to the academic debate?" and "how am I driving in terms of academic professionalism?", not only "what sources are acceptable to use?". MIND is not intended for only one level, but a suggested approach to a more reflective practice in academic writing for all levels. However, it may be most applicable to students who are familiar with general source criticism. MIND's main goal is to encourage independence, reflectiveness and source consciousness for the authors and their own choices rather than just evaluating the sources found.

MIND: motivation – intention – need – debate

Motivation:

What is the motivation for using this source?

Is it suitable for your text? Or was it just easy to find? Are you proving familiarity with the subject by citing sources that hold authority in the field?

The motivation can also be that it supports the author's prejudices. Have you self-assessed your choice? Most people will opt to seek documentation to support their beliefs or hypothesis. This is an important part of supporting your claim, but you also need to take part in the academic debate. This means challenging yourself and your hypothesis. Citing classics that proves your familiarity with curriculum and the subject is also important. The choice of sources should prove that the author of a text is well-read and oriented, proving the author's familiarity with the information landscape at hand as they have moved from novice to expert, or, in other words, has become an information literate (Lloyd, 2006, p. 571). Some sources are simply expected to be referenced and leaving them out should be done intentionally.

Intention:

What is your intention for the use of this source in your text?

Is this source an example of a phenomenon or a part of your theoretical framework? Will it serve as an academic brick in your text's foundation? Or are you trying to highlight a current example?

If the intention is to bring a current example into your text, a newspaper article may serve as a good source, and it can be a subject of the discussion you are trying to illuminate. If the intention is to provide a sound theoretical framework, you need to assess the source in a traditional way and make sure it holds up to academic standards and provides you with information that holds up in an academic discussion.

Need:

Do you need to cite this source?

Are you just reading up and informing yourself or is this the best source available to you? Does this source support your process or your finished product?

While many unacademic sources hold interesting information, they are not suited for supporting an academic argument. Some sources serve their purpose as the foundation of knowledge before you get to the level you need for your text. This means that you can read and learn from several different sources, and they may provide you with a useful foundation to further investigate more complex academic sources. It is common to start your learning with textbooks and introductions to get an overview and understanding of the phenomenon you are studying. This provides the foundation of your knowledge that allows you to build onto it and better understand research that investigates a small section of a field in greater depth. To understand details, it is important to understand the bigger picture. From a socio-cultural perspective this means that one engages "information that facilitates working collectively to develop intersubjectively shared understandings" (Lloyd, 2006, p. 574). But while this is important, it does not necessarily mean that these sources should be the ones to be cited in your text. The most famous example of a clear reflection of whether to cite a source is perhaps Culumber et al. (2014) where their article was mistakenly published with the caption 'Should we cite the crappy Gabor paper here?' in the parenthesis (Ferguson, 2014). The authors saw the Gabor paper as relevant, but not really good enough to be cited in their work. The proper

citation has since then been added to the article and the humorous parenthesis has been removed.

When writing on a higher academic level, you may need to consult primary sources and not just the discussion of them from other authors. This is more time-consuming but will eliminate the possibilities of misciting a source due to misunderstandings through a second-hand source. Even trusted sources of information can be misleading, because they may have cited a source incorrectly, or you may be reading the citation out of context (Osborne, 2018, p. 105).

Debate:

Have you found contradicting sources? To make an interesting discussion it is vital that more than one side of an issue is highlighted.

Finding contradicting sources may be challenging, but it will strengthen your text and make it more interesting. It will also make it easier to write, as a debate of different opinions highlights different propositions to the subject at hand.

Applying MIND

One of the main points of this approach is to put some responsibility onto the author and why they choose to use the selected sources. While traditional approaches aim to evaluate the external written source, MIND has the intention of making the author reflect upon how the selected source fits into their text and how it brings value and relevance. The value of a source is not a constant, but rather relative to the context of which it is being selected and used. Transforming from a novice to an expert entails engaging with texts and further with the landscape that “[...] reflects the social, historical embodied and negotiated experiences of the community of practice and the sources of information valued by the community” (Lloyd, 2006, p. 575).

While traditional approaches have the advantage of offering a generic approach to judge whether a source is trustworthy, it does not necessarily make students reflect upon their choices and how they intend to use the sources available to them. Informed by a sociocultural understanding of IL as situated, MIND attempts to make the students reflect upon their choices, not only evaluate what the author of the text at hand intended when writing it. It also poses the question of whether one *needs* to include the source or not. Teaching librarians may wish to use MIND as a checklist for themselves to start a discussion with students, or they may want to use it explicitly to have students assess their consciousness in their selection of sources. MIND would be likely to fit teaching as a master’s level when students are familiar with the general concept of evaluating sources and are starting a more independent academic product like a masters’ thesis.

Discussion

Hicks & Lloyd state that “As a practice, information literacy (IL) is shaped, reproduced, and transformed by social and public discourses” (Hicks & Lloyd, 2021 p.1). This construes a challenge for generic checklists. Academic texts – can be valid or invalid due to the context in which they are used. For example, if one is studying a social phenomenon, how this is presented in written texts will be affected by changes in legislation, historical events and so on. This means that if a text is written before an important change of legislation, it may hold no validity to your text. Or, on the other hand, it may serve as an excellent example of what is debated in the text. Furthermore, if one is only looking for sources’ validating one’s prejudices, the discussion in the paper will be of poor quality. Getting familiar in the academic landscape is a time-consuming process, as Lloyd (2017) has demonstrated. This might also explain why experienced researchers handle source evaluation better than new students as described in a study by Brand-Gruwel et al. (2017). This can further construe how and

why skilled researchers develop a deeper sense of what can be described as source consciousness. They will have the advantage of a deeper prior knowledge to make it possible for them to reflect and question established knowledge differently. This is a skill students should also be encouraged to master through navigating the IL landscape they are venturing into.

There are many types of sources and not all are written. An interview can for example be an important source of information. In choosing interview subjects, a reflective process is as important as choosing written sources. One needs to argue for why these people have been selected for the interview. What information and perspective do they bring to the discussion and what is left out when choosing these informants? It can be easy to choose informants based on convenience and not necessarily advantageousness. Deadlines, practical issues of transport and lack of networks can make this challenging. Yet, in my own experience when selecting informants, there seems to be a lot more emphasis on justifying the selection and arguing why this perspective will provide us with a valid and valuable perspective than when selecting written, peer reviewed sources. Perhaps related to the *cognitive authority* (Wilson, 1982, p.14) we assign peer-reviewed texts whereas conversations or interviews are seen as opinions. The stamp of approval of being a true academic source with everything that entails can sometimes seem to outshine the importance of relevance and what the written source brings into the discussion.

The approaches covered in this study (CRAP/CRAAP, CRITIC and the 5 Ws) offer a good introduction of how to evaluate sources and how to distinguish an academic text from a non-academic one. For unexperienced students this is an important skill to master. It is also important for students to develop into independent participants in the academic debate. This means that they must make conscious choices of what sources they select and why they chose to do so. They must also use these sources in such a way that they do not change the intended meaning behind them and thusly practice poor ethical use of sources. This aspect is less frequently addressed in source criticism checklists, but a very important part of the general sense of decorum.

However, checklists can be useful tools if they are able to encourage reflection and independent thinking and assessment of both texts and one's own prejudices, like the MIND framework attempts to do. Teaching librarians must be conscious of how they teach students to handle information and the assessment of this. Rather than providing a checklist to give all the answers, they should inspire students to consider different approaches and execute self-assessment in addition to the evaluation of the sources at hand. They should be aware of why they are selecting the sources they have chosen and how they intend on using them or be *conscious of sources* in addition to being *critical of sources*. They should also be aware of *how* they use the selected sources and do so in an ethical way, making sure they do not change the meaning of the text they are citing.

MIND suggests a socio-cultural approach to evaluating sources, where not only source criticism, but *source consciousness* is applied though a reflective process applied in the present information landscape. Source consciousness is constructed in subject specific settings and in collaboration with others. The focus on *debate* encourages students to include sources that disagree with their starting point, and though this improves their own discussion and further, their contribution to the academic field. MIND could also function as a frame for a discussion regarding selection of sources where the motivation, intention, need and debate must be defended and reflected upon by the author of the text. Having consciousness and awareness of why sources have been selected will most likely also deepen the academic understanding. Becoming information literate means that we understand what information is important and valuable in our information landscape, and further develop a reflective consciousness that makes transformations possible, making us "better students or better workers, better knowers of our landscape and its situated practices" (Lloyd, 2006, p. 578)

The value of sources

Being source conscious means accepting that the value of a source is not absolute. In the process of reading up on a subject, the academic criteria may not have to be met as this serves to lead you to a fitting source. Authority is often mentioned as an important aspect in source evaluation. But who is an authority in the field? And how can one establish one's own academic authority? Patrick Wilson introduced the term *cognitive authority*, where a person has authority not because they were appointed or elected to a position of authority, but because they influence other's thoughts. This authority is highly linked to credibility and expertise, emphasizing that there is a difference between knowledge and opinion (Wilson, 1983, pp. 14-16). According to Angell and Tewell students can begin to establish their own academic authority when they "[...] learn to strike a balance between their own opinions and the texts of others, their writing and comprehension of a scholarly discourse improves [...]" (Angell & Tewell, 2017). This can also be described as making one's own voice heard and proving in the text that one has understood and is debating the issue at hand. In doing this academic confidence and consciousness is being built and assessing and selecting sources becomes easier.

Traditional source evaluation methods are making students take an authoritative stance to published and peer reviewed research and other sources. Sources are often understood as having a set value, where the highest ranked sources are peer-reviewed texts. However, a peer-reviewed article may not always be possible to obtain and furthermore, based on what the intention is for the given source, it may not even be the right choice. If one is studying current events, non-peer-reviewed newspaper articles may be more relevant.

A Norwegian study about Ph.D. candidates and their information behaviour (Gullbekk et al., 2013) state that the Ph.D. candidates seem to have a more mature understanding of sources in that they do not necessarily consider where the information is found, but rather if it adds to the discussion at hand. This is not surprising, as they have spent more time delving into their area and have had time to develop a deeper understanding. Gullbekk et al. (2013) further state that Ph.D. candidates view the peer reviewing process as a relevant measurement of quality. It is also seen as an insurance that the information has been assessed in terms of quality and relevance in current academic discussions. Lorenzen (2001, p. 159) points out that teachers often focus on the web as an untrustworthy source of information, while the library represents a location for good sources. Haider and Sundin (2019, p. 111) further emphasize that teachers do not see the students' abilities to search to be the main issue, but rather their lack of abilities when it comes to assessing the result list.

Conclusions and further research

This study highlights that there is room for improvement in the established approaches to teaching source criticism and source evaluation. The suggested supplement to the traditional teachings, the MIND model, offers a more reflective and self-assessing approach to a highly complex field. The traditional approaches are still needed, and they serve an important role as an introduction to critical thinking. The problem with these approaches seems to be that they focus more on only evaluating the sources at hand rather than engaging students in a reflective process of why they make the choices they do. Evaluating already peer reviewed articles can be challenging for unexperienced students, and perhaps a more self-assessing approach can help them develop their source evaluation into source consciousness. In encouraging a conscious and aware use of sources, it also brings the discussion of ethical use of sources up to date. Being aware of not only selection of sources, but how they are cited in order to not change the meaning of them is an important part of being source conscious.

Pinfield et al. (2020) describe the relationship between theory and practice as complex and even problematic as development of theory is highly valued in the research community, yet it can be off-putting to many practitioners. They further explain that "Practice is complex, not simply because

practitioners in professional contexts are busy and have responsibility for a wide range of activities, but also because those activities happen within complex social, cultural, and historical contexts” (Pinfield et al., 2020, p. 64), proving the importance of a socio-cultural approach to understand the complexity of navigating and truly understanding an information landscape, including both theory and practice. Pinfield et al. also point out that theory may be used implicitly by practitioners, without being aware of it (Pinfield, 2020, p. 68). This implies that theory can be an important vessel in making tacit knowledge from the field of practice explicit and transferrable to others, offering a possibility of a deeper understanding of the practice, and further development of theory based on experiences in the field of practice. This way of thinking about the interconnectedness of theory and practice has informed the development of the MIND model, and holds similarities to the spiral of development of organizational knowledge, as described by Dalkir where “The knowledge spiral is a continuous activity of knowledge flow, sharing, and conversion by individuals, communities, and the organization itself” (Dalkir, 2011, p. 70), if we replace the organization with academia.

Applying a sociocultural view on source evaluation cannot be taught through instruction alone. It needs to be experienced and developed through familiarity with the subject at hand in a relevant information landscape (Lloyd, 2006). It can be introduced and encouraged through instruction, but at the end of the day, the student or researcher must do the evaluation themselves and make a conscious choice of what sources to include in their work. Even though MIND is also a checklist, it differs in the way that it asks the author or student questions about themselves and their choices rather than reducing the field of source evaluation to a certain number of questions regarding the source and its value. Hopefully, MIND can help to facilitate a more holistic approach to source evaluation, although further research in applying MIND in library instruction is needed to get more data on how this will be perceived and applied by students.

References

- Association of College and Research Libraries (2000). ACRL STANDARDS: Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. *College & Research Libraries News*, 61(3), 207-215. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.61.3.207>
- Angell, K., & Tewell, E. (2017). Teaching and Un-Teaching Source Evaluation: Questioning Authority in Information Literacy Instruction. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2017.11.1.37>
- Bårnes, V. B., & Løkse, M. (2015). *Informasjonskompetanse: Håndbok i kildebruk og referanseteknikker* (2. utg., p. 128). Cappelen Damm akademisk.
- Bartz, W. R. (2002). Teaching skepticism via the CRITIC acronym and the skeptical inquirer. *The Skeptical Inquirer*, 26(5), 42-44.
- Bird, N., McLnerney, C., & Mohr, S. (2011). Source Evaluation and Information Literacy: Findings from a Study on Science Websites. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2011.4.2.95>
- Bobkowski, P. S., & Younger, K. (2020). *News Credibility: Adapting and Testing a Source Evaluation Assessment in Journalism | Bobkowski | College & Research Libraries*. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.81.5.822>

Brand-Gruwel, S., Kammerer, Y., Meeuwen, L. van, & Gog, T. van. (2017). Source evaluation of domain experts and novices during Web search. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 33(3), 234–251. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12162>

CCC Online Library. (2019, July 10). *Learn about Evaluating Sources: CRAP Test*. <https://ccconline.libguides.com/c.php?g=242130&p=2185475>

Consciousness. (n.d.). In *Cambridge Dictionary*. Consciousness. (2020). In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/consciousness>

Culumber, Z. W., Bautista-Hernández, C. E., Monks, S., Arias-Rodriguez, L., & Tobler, M. (2014). Variation in Melanism and Female Preference in Proximate but Ecologically Distinct Environments. *Ethology*, 120(11), 1090–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eth.12282>

Daland, H. T. D. (2015). Just in case, just in time, or just don't bother? Assessment of one-shot library instruction with follow-up workshops. *LIBER Quarterly*, 24(3). <https://doi.org/10.18352/lq.9714>

Daland, H. T. D. (2017). Teaching Source Criticism to Students in Higher Education: A Practical Approach. In D. Oberg & S. Ingvaldsen (Eds.), *Media and information literacy in higher education: Educating the educators* (pp. 89–105). Chandos Publishing.

Eriksson, L. T. (2020). *Kritisk tenkning* (1. utgave.). Gyldendal.

Ferguson, C. (2014, November 11). Overly honest references: “Should we cite the crappy Gabor paper here?” Retraction Watch. <https://retractionwatch.com/2014/11/11/overly-honest-references-should-we-cite-the-crappy-gabor-paper-here/>

Gudmundsdottir, D. G. B., & Hatlevik, O. E. (2020). “I just Google it”—Developing professional digital competence and preparing student teachers to exercise responsible ICT use. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education (NJCIE)*, 4(3), 39–55. <https://doi.org/10.7577/njie.3752>

Gullbekk, E., Calvo, M. C. T., & Rullestad, T. (2013). *PhD candidates and the research process: The library's contribution*. Universitetsbiblioteket. <https://www.ub.uio.no/om/forskning-publikasjoner/skrifter-ub/hefte08.pdf>

Haider, J., & Sundin, O. (2019). *Invisible search and online search engines: the ubiquity of search in everyday life*. New York: Routledge.

Hicks, A., & Lloyd, A. (2016). It takes a community to build a framework: Information literacy within intercultural settings. *Journal of Information Science*, 42(3), 334–343. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551516630219>

Hicks, A., & Lloyd, A. (2021). Relegating expertise: The outward and inward positioning of librarians in information literacy education. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 09610006211020104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006211020104>

List, A., & Alexander, P. A. (2018). Corroborating students' self-reports of source evaluation. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 37(3), 198–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2018.1430849>

- Lorenzen, M. (2001). The land of confusion?: High school students and their use of the World Wide Web for research. *Research Strategies*, 18(2), 151–163. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0734-3310\(02\)00074-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0734-3310(02)00074-5)
- Lloyd. (2006). Information literacy landscapes: an emerging picture. *Journal of Documentation*, 62(5), 570–583. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410610688723>
- Lloyd, A. (2017). Information literacy and literacies of information: A mid-range theory and model. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 11(1), 91–105. <https://doi.org/10.11645/11.1.2185>
- Mason, L., Scrimin, S., Tornatora, M. C., Suitner, C., & Moè, A. (2018). Internet source evaluation_ The role of implicit associations and psychophysiological self-regulation. *Computers & Education*, 119, 59–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.12.009>
- Matthies, B. S., & Helmke, J. (2005). Using the CRITIC acronym to teach information evaluation. *Librarian Scholarship*, 2.
- Meriam Library California State University, Chico. (2010, September 17). *Evaluating Information – Applying the CRAAP Test*. <https://library.csuchico.edu/sites/default/files/craap-test.pdf>
- Osborne, C. (2018). Programming to Promote Information Literacy in the Era of Fake News. *International Journal of Legal Information*, 46(2), 101-109. doi:10.1017/jli.2018.21
- Pinfield, S., Wakeling, S., Bawden, D., & Robinson, L. (2020). Open access in theory and practice: The theory-practice relationship and openness (p. 256). Taylor & Francis.
- Radom, R., & Gammons, R. W. (2014). Teaching Information Evaluation with the Five Ws. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 53(4), 334–347. <https://doi.org/10.5860/rusq.53n4.334>
- Russo, A., Jankowski, A., Beene, S., & Townsend, L. (2019). Strategic source evaluation: Addressing the container conundrum. *Reference Services Review*, 47(3), 294–313. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-04-2019-0024>
- Silva, E., Green, J., & Walker, C. (2018). Source evaluation behaviours of first-year university students. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 12(2), 24–43. <https://doi.org/10.11645/12.2.2512>
- Sinatra, G. M., & Lombardi, D. (2020). Evaluating sources of scientific evidence and claims in the post-truth era may require reappraising plausibility judgments. *Educational Psychologist*, 55(3), 120–131. Academic Search Complete.
- Sundin, O., & Carlsson, H. (2016). Outsourcing trust to the information infrastructure in schools: How search engines order knowledge in education practices. *Journal of Documentation*, 72(6), 990-1007. doi:10.1108/JD-12-2015-0148
- Wilson. P. (1983). *Second-hand knowledge : an inquiry into cognitive authority*. Greenwood Press.
- Whitworth, A. (2009). *Information obesity*. Chandos Publishing.
- Zins, C. (2000). Success, a structured search strategy: Rationale, principles, and implications. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51(13), 1232–1247. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4571\(2000\)9999:9999::AID-ASI1034>3.0.CO;2-2](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4571(2000)9999:9999::AID-ASI1034>3.0.CO;2-2)

Ulrika Centerwall, Lecturer, Faculty of Librarianship, Information, Education and IT, Swedish School of Library and Information Science, University of Borås, Sweden, ulrika.centerwall@hb.se

Lill Langelotz, Docent, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Education, Department of Education and Special Education, University of Gothenburg, lill.langelotz@ped.gu.se

Norm Critical Projects in Swedish School Librarian Practices

Abstract

In this article, we explore the practices of school librarians with a specific focus on norm critical pedagogy, a distinctively Scandinavian concept with a basis in critical pedagogies. In Sweden, norm critique is a practice, a pedagogy and a discourse. Our article offers examples of school librarian practices that deal with issues of sexuality and gender conceptualized in their work with LGBTQ+ literature from a norm critical perspective. We analysed semi-structured interviews with eight librarians in four secondary and upper secondary schools through the lens of the theory of practice architectures (Kemmis & Grootenboer, 2008). Our findings demonstrate how the norm critical practices of school librarians are enabled and constrained by arrangements within the school site, as well as by management, colleagues and professional learning practices. The projects carried out by school librarians that employ norm critical perspectives are both strengthened and challenged by collaboration with principals and other education professionals at the school site. When teachers challenge the views of librarians, the latter have to re-think and re-negotiate normative positions. Hence, norm critical thinking is not only taught but also practiced in the everyday work in school libraries. This article argues that these norm critical perspectives and the librarians' practices represent important contributions to the democratic assignment of Swedish schools.

Keywords: critical pedagogy; education; democracy; gender; LGBTQ+; Scandinavia; norm critique; sexuality; school librarian; Sweden; theory of practice architectures

1. Introduction

One of the core tasks carried out at schools in contemporary Western societies is fostering and educating students in critical thinking, democracy and citizenship. Previous research has explored the democratic mission in education, often focusing on the practices of teachers (e.g., Biesta, 2011; Grannäs, 2011; Hakvoort & Olsson, 2014; Mooney Simmie & Edling, 2019). However, in this article we highlight the activities of another profession that can play an important role for the democratic mission: the school librarian. We explore how school librarians talk about and describe their work to foster norm critical thinking with a specific focus on the LGBTQ+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer/questioning and others) experience, gender and sexuality. Teaching students to think critically and develop the ability to assume critical dispositions in education and society is recognized as a mandate for schools and school libraries (Mahon et al., 2018). Critical thinking or, as Dewey (1910) refers to it, *reflective thinking*, has been discussed for centuries. Dewey defines reflective thinking as:

- (a) a state of perplexity, hesitation, doubt; and (b) an act of search or investigation directed toward bringing to light further facts which serve to corroborate or to nullify the suggested belief (Dewey, 1910, p. 9).

Following Dewey, in this article we emphasize critical thinking as crucial for, and in, democratic education and society. We understand school librarians work with norm critical perspectives, gender, sexuality and LGBTQ+ issues as part of the democratic mission in the Swedish school.

Despite the specific national context of this article, it has a Scandinavian as well as an international resonance because democracy as an educational aim is increasingly challenged and/or under threat in several parts of the world today (Ricci, 2020). The UNESCO school library manifesto, which is an international qualitative standard for the universal provision of school libraries, underlines the importance of the role of school librarians for supporting and teaching democracy and critical perspectives within schools (IFLA/UNESCO, 1999).

As the norm critical scholar Jannick Friis Christensen describes, norm critique “is to be critical of social norms and the normative spaces they give shape to” (2020, p. 60). According to Christensen, this entails understanding what norms are and how they work. Christensen goes on to argue that “to do norm critique is to denaturalize norms by explicating them, by interrupting their repetitions, and by demonstrating their contingency” (2020, p. 60). The concept of norm critique entails methods and theories that are used when working against discriminations and exclusions. There is also a strong connection between norm critique and LGBTQ+ communities, a cornerstone of which is their questioning of heteronormativity. Norm critical pedagogy combines feminist, queer and intersectional theories as well as critical pedagogy (e.g., Freire, 1972).

Norm critique is an important aspect of critical thinking and is included in the critical pedagogic approach employed in Sweden. The concept of norm critique is distinctively Scandinavian (the word ‘normkritik’ being used in Sweden, Norway and Denmark synonymously). Norm critique is regarded as a practice, a pedagogy and/or a discourse (Bromseth & Darj, 2010). As such, Swedish educators are encouraged to engage in norm critique. Authorities like the Swedish National Agency for Education [*Skolverket* in Swedish] highlight the importance of, and provide schools with, literature on how to work with norm critique (e.g., Åkesson, 2016). In addition, norm critical teaching resources such as literature, films and other materials have also been created for educators to use in teaching (e.g., Brade, 2008; Svaleryd & Hjertson, 2012; Åkesson, 2016). These materials often focus on the intersections of gender, sexuality and the LGBTQ+ experience. Providing students with LGBTQ+ positive and inclusive literature, materials and information is a common way for schools to support LGBTQ+ students and to demystify this experience for their heteronormative peers. Although such a

broad range of materials about employing norm critique have been created, there is still a lack of research, especially in a Swedish context, that explores how norm critique is enacted and expressed within school libraries.

This article explores how school librarians talk about and describe their work to foster norm critical thinking with a specific focus on LGBTQ+, gender and sexuality. The aim is to contribute examples of how work with norm critique as a part of the schools' democratic assignment is enacted, enabled, and constrained in school libraries. We adopted the theory of practice architectures as a theoretical and analytical lens (Kemmis & Grootenboer, 2008; Mahon et al., 2017). This theory emphasizes that sayings, doings and 'relatings', 'hang together' in characteristic and distinctive 'projects' (Kemmis et al., 2014). Although the school library and its librarians can engage in various practices with different purposes (projects), here we specifically study the project of norm critique and how it is enacted in librarian practices. The following research questions guide the article:

- What enables and constrains school librarian practices aimed at developing norm critical thinking?
- How is the project of norm critique enacted in school librarian practices?

We also discuss the role of librarian practices as part of the democratic assignment in contemporary schools.

To build on this introduction, the article is presented in five parts, starting with a short literature review contextualizing school library and librarian practices. This is followed by theory, method, and results, which are presented as a 'fictional narrative' in one school. The article ends with a concluding discussion on the conditions for school librarians' work with norm critique in Swedish school libraries.

2. Contextualizing School Library and Librarian Practices

In Sweden, school libraries are guided by the Library Act (SFS, 2013:801), the Education Act (SFS, 2010:800) and curriculums as well as municipal and local policies and guiding documents. Optimally, school library activities should exist in all Swedish schools. In practice, the resources and management of Swedish secondary and upper secondary school libraries vary to a great extent between schools and municipalities (Gärdén, 2017). Previous international research illustrates the important role that the school library can play in students' development of a variety of critical literacies and independent learning skills (e.g., Bikos, Papadimitriou & Giannakopoulos, 2014; Kaplan, 2010; Lance & Kachel, 2018). School librarians generally describe their libraries as informal, safe spaces for students who may suffer from exclusion for a variety of reasons (e.g., Bannister, 2020). The conceptualization of the library as a safe space has previously been explored and problematized specifically in relation to LGBTQ+ user groups (Vaillancourt, 2013; Mehra & Gray, 2014; Oltmann 2016; Wexelbaum, 2016, 2018).

Previous studies have noted that school librarians play an important, yet often invisible or marginalized, social supportive role for students (Hartzell, 1997; Lawton, 2015; Sacco Ritchie, 2011). School librarians define their core contribution to students in terms of overall support for learning, one-to-one support, and the maintenance of a secure and safe environment (Shaper & Streatfield, 2012). This kind of support has been identified as a third strand of the school librarian profession (Shaper & Streatfield, 2012, p. 74). Further, school librarians emphasize service, integrity, equal access, trusteeship and intellectual freedom as the most important values and ethical principles for school librarianship (Foster & McMenemy, 2012). The integration of librarian practices in classroom teaching is negotiated in each school between librarians, teachers, management, and students. In Sweden, it is most common for school librarians to work mostly on their own which usually mean having autonomy and a great deal of independence in their practices.

2.1 *The democratic assignment and LGBTQ+ at the school library*

The UNESCO school library manifesto states that the major assignment of school libraries is to ensure intellectual freedom and providing access to information (UNESCO/IFLA, 1999). This is an essential prerequisite for enabling effective, responsible citizenship and participation in a democracy. Further, the manifesto emphasizes equal services to all members of the school community (UNESCO/IFLA, 1999). Traditionally, school libraries promote civic information literacy to inform and prepare young people to act as democratic citizens; in other words, they work with “the civic mission of school libraries” (Kranich, 2006, pp. 10-17). The literature explores and develops various critical perspectives on the educational practices of librarians, and on the intersections of critical pedagogy and library instruction (e.g., Accardi, Drabinski & Kumbier, 2010; Beilin, 2016; Farmer, 2009; Gibson, 2006; Subramaniam, Oxley & Kodama, 2013; Tewell, 2018).

Previous studies with a focus on LGBTQ+ collections and youth have largely been conducted in the United States (Hughes-Hassell, Overberg & Harris, 2013; Oltmann, 2015, 2016; Williams & Deyoe 2015). Some of these studies explore school library work in relation to the LGBTQ+ community. Oltmann (2016) examined the perspective of school librarians on creating LGBTQ+ media collections and found a generally strong support for this work. The librarians in Oltmann’s study discussed LGBTQ+ work as a service to society, emphasizing the importance of offering resources to all students and meeting the needs of diverse students (Oltmann, 2016). In addition, there are studies with a focus on how public and school libraries meet the needs of LGBTQ+ youth, and how to incorporate LGBTQ+ focused instruction into the academic preparation of school librarians (Clyde & Lobban, 2001; Knapp 2022; Sturge 2021). In a Swedish context however, there is a lack of research on LGBTQ+ and other marginalized user groups in school libraries.

3. A theory of practice architecture approach

Various practice approaches have been used in library and information science research (Pilerot et al., 2017), as well as in research studies within education (Mahon et al., 2017). We employ the theory of practice architectures in this article to understand how norm critique is enacted in school library practices, to trace enabling and constraining arrangements (Kemmis & Grootenboer, 2008) and to reveal how librarian practices with the specific aim of developing norm critical thinking relate to other practices (Kemmis et al., 2014). Practices such as teaching, professional development, leading, researching, and facilitating student learning within a school site are all connected: they can both constrain and enable each other (Kemmis et al., 2014; Mahon et al., 2017).

A practice is constituted by specific sayings, doings and relatings that hang together in a distinctive project - the aim/purpose of the practice - (Kemmis et al., 2014) in a certain time and place (Schatzki, 2002). Practices are preconditioned (or ‘prefigured’ as Schatzki [2002] puts it), by *cultural-discursive*, *material-economic*, and *social-political arrangements*; the practice architectures (Kemmis & Grootenboer, 2008). Arrangements and practices within schools are enmeshed with and can be traced to the society in which they are embedded, and are manifested, for instance, in policies and laws. Analytically, it is possible to separate arrangements to reveal how they might be changed or adapted (c.f. Mahon et al., 2017). As an example, one can analytically focus the cultural-discursive arrangements that enable and constrain what is currently possible to say about gender- and sexuality-focused projects in Swedish schools. Hence, the rhetoric around equality might be found both in policies as well as in the sayings in (or about) school practices. In Sweden today, homosexuality is no longer considered or talked about as a disease as it was 50 years ago. In the physical space, material-economic arrangements, such as staffing or media budget, enable and constrain what is possible to do in a library practice. The analytical focus is in other words on the ‘doings’ and what might enable (or constrain) peoples doings. Finally, the social-political arrangements enable and constrain relations amongst people in a practice like school staff and students. The analytical gaze is on how power and

solidarity is enacted. When teachers and librarians, for example, plan joint work, their practices are not only connected but might become a (new) collaborative teaching and learning practice enabled by the social-political arrangements of the site in which they are embedded. However, arrangements are entangled and only analytically separable. Both social-political and cultural-discursive arrangements are inbuilt traditions of the school, which enable or constrain all school practices.

Although we do not study the actual 'happeningness' (Mahon et al., 2017, p. 9) of librarian practices (that is, practices as they happen), the theory of practice architectures can be used as a methodological and analytical resource (Mahon et al., 2017), when analysing the librarians' talk about and reflections on their practices, as explicated in the upcoming section.

4. Data, selection, analyses, methodological and ethical considerations

This article reports parts of a PhD project wherein the empirical data was produced using ethnographic methods such as field notes from observations in schools and interviews with librarians. In the main project, 22 school librarians working in 14 Swedish school libraries were selected for semi-structured interviews, conducted in 2015. The librarians worked at schools that had been awarded prizes from the DIK, the Swedish librarian trade union for best-practices and well-functioning, successful libraries. The awards are primarily based on staffing, media budgets, the quality of collaboration with teachers and management support (DIK, 2022). Out of the 22 librarians interviewed in the PhD-project, eight librarians reported a particular interest and knowledge about issues concerning their democratic assignment and norms. Transcriptions from audio-recorded interviews with these eight librarians, working at four different secondary and upper-secondary schools in various parts of Sweden forms the empirical material for this article. The article was translated from Swedish to English by the authors. The semi-structured interviews lasted for 40 to 90 minutes and were guided by a pre-constructed, thematically designed manual. The character of co-construction in the interviews enabled the interviewing researcher to use personal professional experiences as a school-librarian. The study followed the research ethical principles developed by the Swedish Research Council (2017).

The library resources of the schools examined in this article are unusual in that they have at least one full time librarian each and well-equipped libraries. In addition, this selection represents circumstances where the school has tried to develop their school libraries and to employ professionally trained librarians, circumstances which are certainly not common in Sweden. The resources and support for the school libraries in this study were extraordinary compared to many other schools in Sweden (schools without libraries and/or librarians). This implies that the school library projects presented here cannot be assumed to take place at Swedish schools in general. Echoing conclusions in Kemmis & Grootenboer (2008), the material-economic arrangements in these school sites indeed enabled the librarian practices.

We adopted a case study approach to examine how work with norm critique in school librarian practices is enacted, enabled, and constrained. Yin (1981, p. 98) states that case studies can be used when "an empirical inquiry must examine a contemporary phenomenon in its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident". The analysis was conducted in several steps to categorize and link ideas. First, we read the transcripts separately. Guided by the theory of practice architectures, we underlined enabling and/or constraining arrangements in the librarians' descriptions prefiguring (Schatzki, 2002) the librarians' practices and the norm critical project. By using the theoretical concepts, we traced the practices and arrangements that either challenged librarian practices or held the practices in place (Mahon et al. 2017). Finally, we compared and discussed the findings in each transcript to get a deeper understanding of the empiric material.

Despite a few site-specific circumstances, we found so many similarities between the four schools and in the architectures of library practices that we decided to present the results as coming from one (fictional) school – *Magnolia School*. An important reason for this coalescence of the four schools in this article is the ethical responsibility to protect the anonymity of our study participants so that they cannot be identified in this presentation of the material. The Swedish school library community is small and participants in the community might recognize themselves or others. Hence, the eight interviewees are amalgamated into two fictional school librarians and are assigned the fictional names Max and Riley.

5. Results

The findings are partly presented in two ‘scenes’ in Magnolia School to highlight the results and frame the discussion. With inspiration from Langelotz & Mahon (2021), this “composite narrative” strategy (Willis, 2018), allowed us to dramatize how the conversations at the school may have played out without revealing the identity of our interviewees (Piper & Sikes, 2010). Although the scenes and Magnolia School are fictional, the narrative and the descriptions of the practices are based directly on field notes and the librarians’ reflections and descriptions of their practices in the interviews. The quotes presented as those given by Max and Riley are taken directly from the stories and descriptions in the interviews and are translated by the authors from Swedish to English. The translations are literal as far as possible. The quote given by the principal is based on the descriptions of how supportive school management acted as described by respondents in the interviews. The quoted blogpost is a translation from Swedish to English from a webpage hosted by one of the schools that participated in the study.

5.1 *Joint school themes and professional learning prefigure the norm critical project*

At Magnolia School, where Max and Riley work as librarians, a ‘joint school theme’ has been dedicated to specific curriculum goals over the past school year. Such themes can either be proposed by teachers, other staff members or by the management team and are negotiated in staff meetings. The common school theme over the last year focused on the LGBTQ+ experience and gender. In classrooms, the library, and in ‘school-happenings’ like exhibitions, LGBTQ+ and gender issues were focused on and problematized. Shared projects encouraged the staff to collaborate across subjects and professions. In this way, the school’s traditions enable democratic actions, such as negotiations and collaborations among the staff, to influence the content and agenda of the academic year. The collaborative practices (meetings and teaching) and the LGBTQ+ and gender theme deepened Riley’s interest in learning more about norm critique. In the following quote, Riley also highlights the lack of insights displayed by other adults regarding their own preconceived notions, which provoked Riley to continue the work.

Riley: I’ve talked to people my age and adults in the school who are unbelievably certain in their belief that they don’t have any prejudices. I feel I would like to highlight various norms since we had this theme last year, and we still do: a[n] LGBTQ+ and gender theme.

Given this interest, Riley found a course called “The norm-aware school library” offered by the municipality. Together with another teacher from Magnolia School, Riley attended the course. One of the other librarians, Max, participated in a one-day conference focusing on the LGBTQ+ experience, which gave rise to new ideas and ambitions to work with LGBTQ+ issues.

5.1.1 *Scene 1: Implementing a new project – changing practices*

The first scene takes place in the library after the librarians have taken part in the respective professional learning activities: the course and the conference. The library at Magnolia School is centrally located in the school building. Students and staff pass by daily and often stay for a chat with the librarians. There are spaces for reading and studying combined with bookshelves and an open

floor plan, making the library a bright and welcoming space. Today the library is closed for an hour as Max and Riley attend a meeting at the principal's office. The librarians and the principal discuss how to benefit from the librarians' ongoing professional learning on norm critical perspectives and the LGBTQ+ experience. The librarians have an agenda: to make the library more inclusive, and to further contribute to the implementation of LGBTQ+-focused norm critique project in the school.

Riley: We've talked a lot about norms and especially LGBTQ+ as it's been a huge interest in the library community. And after taking part in these two fantastic educational opportunities, we decided that we want the LGBTQ+ experience to be a prioritized goal for us next year.

The principal: And in what ways are you planning to implement this in the school library?

Riley: We're talking about adding the word 'inclusive' to the school library plan. So that that is a prioritized goal for us.

The principal: And how would you say that word reflects your work?

Riley: The library should be a place for everyone! And that might also include people who are not privileged. It is, after all, a democratic right to be here. Hence, [the library] must be a place that is inclusive. So, it would mean that we would have a new aim in the school library plan; to be an inclusive and cultural meeting place. Previously we just used the phrase 'cultural meeting place'. But now we would like to add 'inclusive' to that.

Max: After the conference, I am inspired to focus our norm critical projects on LGBTQ+-related issues. We're thinking of making the work focused on the LGBTQ+ community into a specific aim of our work next year. You know, these issues are widely discussed in the librarian community and have been for a few years now. It's common now to focus on LGBTQ+ people as a specific user group in libraries.

The principal: Okay, and do you have any suggestions on how to work with this in a practical way?

Max: I'm thinking of giving the Rainbow shelf some extra attention. I like this kind of arrangement where the LGBTQ+ shelf is a sort of floating exhibition. I'm creating a reading list to place on the shelf. Students can approach it and check it out, it's visible, it's attention-grabbing, although it's not only 'here are these books', one can also just read the list and get inspired and curious.

In this first scene, various practices – of professional learning, the meeting practice, and the management/leading practice – enable the development of the norm critique project. For example, the practice of attending professional learning conferences or courses gives the librarians (collectively and individually) new ideas on how to conduct library work with norm critical thinking and LGBTQ+ issues in focus. In addition, the scene demonstrates how the principal encourages the librarians to describe *how* the changes are to be realized. The librarians' participation in continuing professional learning (CPL), their own reflections, as well as the leadership practice of facilitating change by encouraging real actions (Principal: *Okey, and do you have any suggestions on how to work with this in a practical way?*), contributed to real changes in practice; new wording (sayings) in local policy documents and changes in the librarians' everyday activities and placement and displays of books (doings). In other words, practices such as leadership and professional learning nurture the librarians' practices aiming at facilitating critical thinking and learning about norm critique. Furthermore, cultural-discursive arrangements beyond the school site play a role here. Both Max and Riley refer to the community of public s and how the importance of paying attention to LGBTQ+ youth (as a specific library user group) had been emphasized there recently. The practices librarians engage in at the

Magnolia School can be seen as related to and preconditioned by librarian traditions beyond the school.

Before we present scene two and the next theme, we need to contextualize parts of the results from scene one in a librarian tradition. In the interviews conducted as part of this study, the terms ‘selecting’, ‘purchasing’, ‘promoting’, ‘placing’, ‘special/break out shelf’ and ‘fronting’ recur. These terms are well known in the librarian community and concern literature promotion in the library. For quite some years, the school library at Magnolia School had a shelf solely devoted to books with LGBTQ+-connotations; the ‘Rainbow shelf’. This type of object – a shelf especially devoted to a theme – is a common way of increasing the visibility of literature for children and young adults. The issue raised by the interviewees, whether to distinguish books within certain themes through so called ‘break out’ shelves or sections of a library, reveals a well-established dilemma in library work. For instance, in the case of youth literature, librarians tend to hesitate about pointing out specific groups rather than letting the literature find its readers (see Clyde & Lobban, 2001). A compromise might be to place books on multiple shelves – that is, on the regular shelf and on the breakout shelf – or to label books with stickers with comments on content (‘pinning’), or to provide lists of books within the theme adjacent to the shelf. The latter was the option Max chose and mentioned in the meeting presented in scene one above.

5.2 Challenging the norm critical project

The professional learning course encouraged the participants to critically examine their own library work. Together with the other librarians at Magnolia School, Riley started to critically scrutinize their work in selecting, purchasing, and promoting literature. The selection process is reflected upon in collaborative work on the book *Fifty Shades of Grey* by E.L. James (2012). Some have argued that the book, which was originally written by James as *Twilight* fanfiction, eroticizes violence against women (Dines, 2014). It was also one of the best-selling books of the decade. At the time of its release, the book was given substantial attention in Swedish media for the portrayal of the female protagonist, the male antagonist, and their heterosexual relationship.

At Magnolia School, the librarians were hesitant to acquire *Fifty Shades of Grey* given this debate. Nevertheless, they decided to read the book and discuss it together before making the decision. To encourage a discussion at the school, the librarians blogged about the book on the school library homepage.

After watching the writer E.L. James on TV, reading articles about the book, and reading *Fifty Shades of Grey*, we at the Magnolia School library are not eager to lend out this book. It is exceptionally misogynist. But, since the students are asking, asking, asking for it, and after many discussions, we librarians have decided that James’ book will have a place at the library. However, as we would like our students to note the downside of this popular book, we will place it together with an exhibition on gender roles and men’s violence against women. (Quote from blogpost from 2015. Translated from Swedish to English by the authors.)

The critical reflections of the librarians about their own practice resulted in a range of activities (doings). First, they purchased the book to meet the students’ requests. Initially this may seem inconsistent with the views expressed after their own reading of the text. However, since there is a strong discourse of non-censorship within the librarian community (Downey, 2013; Nye & Barco, 2012; Pierce, 2015) the librarians at Magnolia instead wanted to give the students the opportunity to read the book for themselves while framing it in a critical context. Here, the librarians emphasize their discussions with students as important. In addition, there exists a discourse regarding student participation in the development of school library holdings. In other words, two professional traditions – non-censorship and participation – have significant impact on decisions about acquiring books.

In the blog post, the librarians criticized the book for being “exceptionally misogynist”. To some extent, these opinions about the book reflect how it was received and reviewed in the Swedish media (cf. Brors, 2012). The librarians drew their students’ attention to the downside of the book and explained their plan for an exhibition on men’s violence against women. When critically examining their work, the librarians used the knowledge and concepts gained from their continuing professional education. By examining their practices of selecting library books, they discovered weaknesses, which prompted actions. Likewise, the students’ opportunities to influence the choice of media transforms democracy from a topic of discussion in school sites to a practice that can be enacted.

The blog post enhanced the librarians’ feeling of “being critical” as they put it, which is mentioned together with being a ‘good’ librarian in several of the interviews. The librarians’ actions could be interpreted as taking a critical stance towards literature that eroticized violent sexual behaviour and depicted sexual inequality. But the way the book was displayed and promoted in the blog post provoked reactions among staff and students at Magnolia. In the following scene, these tensions are explored.

5.2.1 Scene 2: *Tensions between professionals*

Max and Riley are early at work, standing next to the Rainbow shelf and engaged in a quiet conversation. Nearby, a teacher explores the literature placed next to the library’s copy of *Fifty Shades of Grey*, which, as describe in the blogpost above, was placed on a display together with books on sexual and reproductive health and rights issues (SRHR), sexual education, dysfunctional relationships, violence in love relationships, et cetera. A teacher interrupts the librarians, holding up a copy of *Fifty Shades of Grey*.

Teacher: Hi, just wondered... why have you placed this novel with the SRHR display?

Riley: Well, we discussed the book after reading it and we all think it’s problematic, and portrays very unhealthy values and norms. We don’t think this book portrays women and their romantic relationships in a very good way.

Teacher: But who are you to decide which sexual interests and activities our students have? I think you are being too moralizing...

Riley: You know that I don’t think it’s our place to act like a morality police or something. We used our new insights in norm critical perspectives to reflect upon... well, we think the book is problematic and, well, then we had to act.... We hope this exhibition encourages people to form their own opinions despite the book being so popular. We have that kind of mandate in the library, as you know.

Teacher: But when you place the book among books about men’s violence against women, you send the message that it’s somehow wrong to like this book. You rub it in our – or the students’ – faces that the book may not depict an equal sexual relationship! Just like your blog post.

Max: Yes, you are right, but still we felt that we needed to take a critical perspective.... And, well, as Riley just said, we have such a mandate to do that.

The discussion between Max and Riley and the teacher, wherein the teacher challenges and is challenged by the librarians’ actions concerning *Fifty Shades of Grey*, shows how they are all (more or less) okey with a non-consensus conversation. They all stay in the awkward zone, trying to read each other’s intentions. Riley has explicit views on the book: “very unhealthy values and norms”. The librarians seem to have enough trust in their relationship to share different opinions. Frictions and

tensions between practices and professions are always present at the school site and contribute to and affect practices (Langelotz, 2017; Sjølie, Francisco & Langelotz, 2019). However, when they tried to act critically, the librarians ran the risk of creating exclusion or alienation and reproducing stereotyped notions. The position of the librarians who criticized the book and decided to place it in the context of SRHR is rooted both in their belief that it is problematic and in the importance of providing different points of view through which students can form their own opinions. However, when the librarians attempt to foster norm critical thinking, they simultaneously adopt an exclusionary or discerning practice when directing students with experiences of or interest in norm-breaking sexual practices towards issues of SRHR. This discerning or distinguishing practice highlights how educators risk discriminating groups of students while trying to integrate norm critical pedagogies into their practices (cf. Reimers, 2008).

6. Concluding discussion

In times when democracy is under threat education and the democratic mission of schools are more crucial than ever. In this article, we argue that school librarian practices aimed at enhancing norm critical thinking might have a significant contribution to a school and society where critical thinking, democracy and citizenship is enacted. By examining school librarian practices such as the selecting, displaying, and promoting of literature we can gain a glimpse of how the practices can be deliberately designed and adopted to change the sayings, doings and relatings of students (and teachers and librarians) towards a more just and equal society. The critical reflexiveness of school librarians thus becomes a fundamental part of the democratic mandate in schools. Based on the empirical data discussed above, we argue that currently, school librarian practices (or lack thereof) have an impact on critical educational practices in Swedish schools. In the light of the theory of practice architectures we will here further discuss the results, with a specific focus on the conditions and enactment of the practices and make a few concluding remarks.

6.1 Conditions that enable and constrain school librarian practices aimed at developing norm critical thinking

When policy documents, regulations and recommendations change, they give rise to new purposes and tasks for education and schooling. When norm critical perspectives are proposed by the authorities, as they are in Sweden, they (may) have an impact on educational practices. Further, LGBTQ+ issues have been raised over time in the library, as well as in school communities (see Hughes-Hassell, Overberg & Harris, 2013; Oltmann, 2015, 2016; Williams & Deyoe, 2015). Kemmis et al. (2014) argue that if new forms in education are to survive over time, they need support (i.e., enabling arrangements). However, many schools in Sweden lack educated librarians and functional libraries.

The librarian practices, in the four upper secondary schools in this study, were developed in sites with nurturing material-economic, cultural-discursive, and social-political arrangements such as appropriate premises, staffing, curriculums, and policies as well as enabling leadership practices. The librarians' everyday practices combined with norm critical work became important for local policy, and the librarians could link the school's democratic mission with their own interest in, for example, LGBTQ+ issues and anti-discrimination. The implementation of norm critical perspectives in school librarian practices was enabled by the management and the librarians' positions close to management. Support is a major facet in the success of school librarian implementation in the other teaching practices of the school (c.f. Bikos, Papadimitriou & Giannakopoulos, 2014; Francis, Lance & Lietzau, 2010; Haycock, 2011; Centerwall, 2022). The norm critical projects that the schools in this study carried out took place in Sweden after the national, regional and local elections in 2014, when issues of gender equality, ethnicity and immigration were widely discussed (Berg & Oscarsson, 2015). Political and educational discourses in society enabled the local LGBTQ+ work. In the two scenes presented above, it is also apparent that the possibility to conduct norm critical work was enabled (and constrained) by the conditions within the school library settings, the practices at the specific site,

together with the librarians' agency and ability to reflect upon their work. When a school has facilities like a school library with professional librarians (which is not always the case in Swedish schools), librarian practices are indeed part of educational practices, enmeshed with other core practices (like teaching, learning, leading, professional development and researching (cf. Kemmis et al., 2014)). The practice architectures that promote and enable work with norm critical perspectives in these cases, were, so to speak, in place. Thus, the various arrangements supported norm critical projects in a synchronized way and therefore made them possible.

6.2 The projects of norm critique enacted in school librarian practices

The upper secondary schools reported on in this article had ongoing gender, LGBTQ+ or norm critical educational projects, which implies that the interest in these topics extended beyond the librarians to the wider school community. Considering concepts from the theory of practice architectures, this could be interpreted as both cultural-discursive and social-political arrangements that enabled and, indeed, challenged practices at the schools. The norm critical projects were negotiated in tensions between the conditions, the goals of education and the more personal goals and beliefs of librarians and teachers. The tensions between librarians and teachers prompted the initiative to use norm critical perspectives to challenge the perceptions of colleagues and students.

The tensions associated with promoting books and specific reading versus allowing students experience a high degree of integrity and freedom of choice are always a concern in librarianship. Reflecting on collections and promoting and arranging books are part of everyday school library work. Likewise, when school librarians employ norm critical perspectives, they can encourage students to question preconceived biases and develop more nuanced opinions based on exposure to a broad range of texts and ideas. However, our empirical data did not indicate any signs of criticism towards norm critique. Simply put, older and institutionalized materials were questioned and criticized while norm critical ideas and materials were brought forward as good, refreshing, or non-biased. The decisions made with the intention of being norm critical were for example perceived by teachers as being overly moralistic. The project on norm critique and the tensions it contributed to among the teaching staff were nevertheless acknowledged and reflected upon by the librarians in our empirical data. This example demonstrates the complexity of enacting critical education and how, according to Dewey (1910), critical thinking always requires "perplexity, hesitation, doubt" (p. 9).

Framing the librarian as an ally to LGBTQ+ students connect to the schools' work in countering discrimination and heteronormativity. The example with the Rainbow shelf could be interpreted in a similar way. The shelf, along with other LGBTQ+ symbols such as the rainbow flag, plays a role as a symbol or marker of the LGBTQ+ youth community, making it easier for users to find the collection. Creating LGBTQ+ symbols such as the Rainbow shelf and positioning themselves as allies through inclusive language and attitudes towards students are fundamental ways for the library to be seen as a safe space. Positioning LGBTQ+ as an umbrella concept enabled reflection on the reading habits and preferences of genders, gender identities and sexual identities. However, in making visible certain dimensions in the LGBTQ+ concepts, others became invisible.

6.3 Future research

The examples discussed in this article mainly revolve around gender and sexuality and their intersections. These aspects are common choices when engaging in norm critical perspectives, among teachers (c.f. Martinsson & Reimers, 2020) as well as among school librarians (Centerwall, 2022). Using the intersections of gender and sexuality as dimensions of power and as bases for discrimination enables work around issues of LGBTQ+ without having to clarify or truly understand the complexities in sexuality (LGB) and gender (TQ). In the examples provided above, queer and trans issues are absent, while the focus lies solely on sexuality. Consequently, there is progress to be made,

and further research is needed to explore how queer and trans issues play out in schools and in the everyday practices of school librarians.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Merisa Martinez for the English language review.

References

- Accardi, M.T., Drabinski, E. & Kumbier, A. (Eds.) (2010). *Critical library instruction: Theories and methods*. Library Juice Press, LLC.
- Bannister, M.E. (2020). School Library as a Safe Harbor for LGBTQ Students and Families. *Knowledge Quest*, 48(3), E1–E6. http://knowledgequest.aasl.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/KNOW_48_3_OE_SchoolLibrary.pdf
- Beilin, I. (2016). Student Success and the Neoliberal Academic Library. *Canadian Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 1, 17–23. <https://doi.org/10.33137/cjal-rcbu.v1.24303>
- Berg, L. & Oscarsson, H. (2015). *Supervalåret 2014: Demokratistatistik: Rapport, 20*. Statistiska centralbyrån. https://valforskning.pol.gu.se/digitalAssets/1654/1654214_berg-superval--r-me0106_2014a01s_br_me09br1503-1-.pdf
- Bibliotekslag (2013:801). https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/bibliotekslag-2013801_sfs-2013-801
- Biesta, G.J. (2011). *Learning Democracy in School and Society: Education, Lifelong Learning, and the Politics of Citizenship*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bikos, G., Papadimitriou, P. & Giannakopoulos, G.A. (2014). School libraries' impact on secondary education: a users' study. *Library Review*, 63(6/7), 519–530. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LR-11-2013-0139>
- Brade, L. (2008). *I normens öga: metoder för en normbrytande undervisning*. Stockholm: Friends.
- Bromseth, J. & Darj, F. (2010). *Normkritisk pedagogik: makt, lärande och strategier för förändring*. Centrum för genusvetenskaps skriftserie, Uppsala Universitet.
- Brors, H. (2012). Femtio nyanser av sadistvåld. *Feministiskt perspektiv*, November 24. <https://feministisktperspektiv.se/2012/11/24/femtio-nyanser-av-sadistvald/>
- Centerwall, U. (2022) *Att ta plats och göra skillnad. Skolbibliotekariepraktiker i framgångsrika verksamheter*. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Borås].
- Christensen, J.F. (2020). Weird ways of normalizing: Queering diversity research through norm critique. In S.N. Just, A. Risberg, and F. Villesèche (Eds.). *The Routledge Companion to Organizational Diversity Research Methods* (pp. 59–72).
- Clyde, L.A. & Lobban, M. (2001). A door half open: Young people's access to fiction related to homosexuality. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 7(2) 17–30.
- Dines, G. (2014). Rethinking Fifty Shades of Grey within a feminist media context. *Journal of Women's Health*, 23(9), i-ii. <http://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2014.1512>
- Denzin, N.K. (2001). The reflexive interview and a performative social science. *Qualitative Research*, 1(1), 23–46.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How We Think*. New York: D. C. Heath & Co.
- Downey, J. (2013). Self-censorship in selection of LGBT-themed materials. *Reference and User Services Quarterly*, 53(2), 104-107. <https://doi.org/10.5860/rusq.53n2.104>

Farmer, L.S.J. (2009). School library Media Specialist Collaboration with Special Education Personnel in Support of Student Learning. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 4(2), 37–55. <https://doi.org/10.18438/B8R02B>

Francis, B.H., Lance, K.C. & Lietzau, Z. (2010). *School librarians continue to help students achieve standards: The third Colorado study* (Closer Look Report), Colorado State Library, Library Research Service. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED514556.pdf>

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Foster, C. & McMenemy, D. (2012). Do librarians have a shared set of values? A comparative study of 36 codes of ethics based on Gorman's enduring values. *Journal of librarianship and information science*, 44(4), 249–262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000612448592>

Garry, C.P. (2015). Selection or Censorship? School Librarians and LGBTQ Resources. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.29173/slww6884>

Gibson, A. (2006). Disability Support Services, Victoria University of Wellington. In P. Hernon & P. Calvert (Eds.), *Improving the Quality of Library Services for Students with Disabilities* (pp. 57–66). Libraries Unlimited.

Grannäs, J. (2011). *Framtidens demokratiska medborgare: Om ungdomar, medborgarskap och demokratiföstran i svensk skola* [Doctoral Dissertation, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis].

Gärdén, C. (2017). *Skolbibliotekets roll för elevers lärande: en forsknings-och kunskapsöversikt år 2010-2015*. Kungliga Biblioteket, Nationell biblioteksstrategi.

Hakvoort, I. & Olsson, E. (2014). The school's democratic mission and conflict resolution: voices of Swedish educators. *Curriculum inquiry*, 44(4), 531–552. <https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12059>

Hartzell, G. (1997). The invisible school librarian: Why other educators are blind to your value. *School Library Journal*, 43(11), 24–29.

Haycock, K. (2011). Connecting British Columbia (Canada) school libraries and student achievement: A comparison of higher and lower performing schools with similar overall funding. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 17(1), 37–50. https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1025&context=slis_pub

Hughes-Hassell, S., Overberg, E. & Harris, S. (2013). Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning (LGBTQ)-Themed Literature for Teens: Are School Libraries Providing Adequate Collections? *School Library Research*, 16, 1–18. https://www.ala.org/aasl/sites/ala.org.aasl/files/content/aaslpubsandjournals/slr/vol16/SLR_LGBTQThemedLiteratureforTeens_V16.pdf

IFLA/UNESCO School library manifesto (1999/2020). <https://www.ifla.org/publications/ifla-unesco-school-library-manifesto-1999/>

Kaplan, A. (2007). School Library Impact Studies and School Library Media Programs in the United States. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 16(2), 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.29173/slww6807>

Kemmis, S. & Grootenboer, P. (2008). Situating praxis in practice: Practice architectures and the cultural, social, and material conditions for practice. In S. Kemmis (Ed.) *Enabling praxis: Challenges for Education* (Vol. 1, pp. 37–62.). Sense Publishers.

- Kemmis, S., Wilkinson, J., Edwards-Groves, C., Hardy, I., Grootenboer, P. & Bristol, L. (2014). *Changing practices, changing education*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Knapp, C. (2022). Creating safe and inclusive spacing for LGBT2Q+ youth in public and school libraries. *Journal of Library Administration*, 62(6), 847–855.
- Lance, K.C. & Kachel, D.E. (2018). Why school librarians matter: What years of research tell us. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 99(7), 15–20. <https://kappanonline.org/lance-kachel-school-librarians-matter-years-research/>
- Langelotz, L. (2017). *Kollegialt lärande i praktiken: Kompetensutveckling eller kollektiv korrigerings?* Natur och kultur.
- Langelotz, L. & Mahon, K. (2021). Risk for professional learning when the academic community is forced online. *Studies in Continuing Education* 44(2), 284-289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2021.1928054>
- Lawton, A. (2015). *The invisible librarian: a librarian's guide to increasing visibility and impact*. Chandos Publishing.
- Mahon, K., Francisco, S. & Lloyd, A. (2018). Practice architectures and being stirred into academic practices of a research group. In Groves, C.E., Grootenboer, P., & J. Wilkinson (Eds.) *Education in an Era of Schooling: Critical perspectives of educational practice and action research. A festschrift for Stephen Kemmis* (pp. 167–181). Springer.
- Mahon, K., Kemmis, S., Francisco, S. & Lloyd, A. (2017). Introduction: Practice theory and the theory of practice architectures. In Mahon, K., Francisco, S., & S. Kemmis (Eds.) *Exploring education and professional practice* (pp. 1–30). Springer.
- Martinsson, L. & Reimers, E. (Eds.) (2020). *Skola i normer*. (3rd ed.). Gleerups.
- Mehra, B. & Gray, L. (2014). “Don’t Say Gay” in the State of Tennessee: Libraries as Virtual Spaces of Resistance and Protectors of Human Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) People. Paper IFLA WLIC 2014 - Lyon - Libraries, Citizens, Societies: Confluence for Knowledge in Session 151 - Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer/Questioning Users Special Interest Group. In: IFLA WLIC 2014, 16-22 August 2014, Lyon, France. <https://library.ifla.org/id/eprint/1011/1/151-mehra-en.pdf>
- Mooney Simmie, G. & Edling, S. (2019). Teachers’ democratic assignment: a critical discourse analysis of teacher education policies in Ireland and Sweden. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 40(6), 832–846. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2018.1449733>
- Nye, V. & Barco, K. (Eds.) (2012). *True stories of censorship battles in America's libraries*. American Library Association.
- Oltmann, S.M. (2015). Variables related to school media center LGBT collections. *Libri*, 65(1), 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.1515/libri-2014-0069>
- Oltmann, S.M. (2016). “They kind of rely on the library”: School librarians serving LGBT students. *The Journal of Research on Libraries and Young Adults*, 7(1), 1–23. <https://www.yalsa.ala.org/irlya/2016/03/they-kind-of-rely-on-the-library-school-librarians-serving-lgbt-students/>

- Pilerot, O., Hammarfelt, B. & Moring, C. (2017). The many faces of practice theory in library and information studies. *Information Research*, 22(1). <https://informationr.net/ir/22-1/colis/colis1602.html>
- Reimers, E. (2008). Asexuell heteronormativitet? In L. Martinsson & E. Reimers (Eds.) *Skola i normer*. (3rd ed.). (pp. 97–130). Gleerups.
- Ricci C. (2020). Democracy Under Attack: Learning, Schooling, and the Media. In P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research in Cultural Studies and Education* (pp. 299–311). Springer International Handbooks of Education. Springer.
- Sacco Ritchie, C. (2011). The self-perceived status of school librarians. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 43(2), 88–105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000610390994>
- Samuelsson, S. (2016). *Normkritik, hbtq och folkbibliotek: Ett försök*. Regionbibliotek Stockholms skriftserie. 16.
- Schatzki, T.R. (2002). *The site of the social: A philosophical account of the constitution of social life and change*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Shaper, S. & Streatfield, D. (2012). Invisible care? The role of librarians in caring for the ‘whole pupil’ in secondary schools. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 30(1), 65–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2011.651225>
- SFS (2010). *Skollagen* [Swedish School Law] (2010:800). (9th ed.). Norstedts juridic.
- Sjølie, E., Francisco, S. & Langelotz, L. (2019). Communicative learning spaces and learning to become a teacher. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 27(3), 365–382. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2018.1500392>
- Sturge, J. J. (2021). *School Libraries and Diversity of LGBTQ+ Voice: A Study of Equity and Practice* [Doctoral dissertation, Point Park University].
- Subramaniam, M., Oxley, R. & Kodama, C. (2013). School Librarians as Ambassadors of Inclusive Information Access for Students with Disabilities. *School Library Research*, 16, 1–34. https://www.ala.org/aasl/sites/ala.org.aasl/files/content/aaslpubsandjournals/slr/vol16/SLR_SchoolLibrariansasAmbassadorsofInclusiveInformationAccess_V16.pdf
- Svaleryd, K. & Hjertson, M. (2012). *Likabehandling i förskola & skola*. Liber.
- Swedish Research Council (2017). *God forskningssed*. Revised 2017. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet. <https://www.vr.se/analys/rapporter/vara-rapporter/2017-08-29-god-forskningssed.html>
- Tewell, E.C. (2018). The practice and promise of critical information literacy: academic librarians’ involvement in critical library instruction. *College & Research Libraries*, 79(1), 10–34. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.79.1.10>
- Vaillancourt, T. (2013). *Libraries as Safe Spaces: It Behooves Librarians to Figure Out How to Serve LGBTQ Patrons*. <https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2012/12/11/libraries-as-safe-spaces/>
- Wexelbaum, R. (2016). The Library as Safe Space. In *The Future of Library Space (Advances in Library Administration and Organization, Vol. 36)* (pp. 37–78). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0732-06712016000036002>

Wexelbaum, R.S. (2018). Do libraries save LGBT students?. *Library Management*, 39(1/2), 31–58.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-02-2017-0014>

Williams, V.K. & Deyoe, N. (2015). Controversy and diversity: LGBTQ titles in academic library youth collections. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 59(2), 62–71.
<https://doi.org/10.5860/lrts.59n2.62>

Willis, R. (2019). The use of composite narratives to present interview findings. *Qualitative Research*, 19(4), 471–480. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794118787711>

Yin, R.K. (1981). The case study as a serious research strategy. *Knowledge*, 3(1), 97–114.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/107554708100300106>

Åkesson, E. (2016). *Normer, normmedvetenhet och normkritik*. Stockholm: Skolverket.

Lovisa Liljegren, Librarian, Karolinska Institutet University Library, Sweden, lovisa.liljegren@ki.se

Easier material management - at what cost?

Librarians meet IMMS

Abstract

Intelligent Material Management System, IMMS, was developed in a collaboration between Lyngsoe Systems, a commercial company, and public libraries in Aarhus and Copenhagen, Denmark, with the aim to reduce the time staff spend on managing library materials. The aim of this article is to shed light on what IMMS means for the library practices and hence for the librarian profession. Two research questions will guide the analysis: How do librarians and IMMS interplay at the public library in Copenhagen, Denmark? How does the implementation of IMMS impact the library practices at the branch libraries in Copenhagen, Denmark? With the theoretical lens of practice theory, the article shows how new norms and rules as well as new tools and objects are implemented with IMMS. Librarians need to be able to work with the new objects and tools, the new norms and to create an inspiring library room for library users. Their relation to collection management is changed, and their ability to evaluate materials is not needed in the same way when it comes to selection of titles for the collection. This sometimes creates a tension between the librarian and the system, especially when the librarians' role in the practice is to perform the decision-making by the algorithm, and not to use their skills to evaluate resources.

Keywords: IMMS, Collection management, library automation, Lyngsoe systems, floating collection, practice theory

Introduction

In recent years, a shift has been made in public libraries from *collections* to *connections* (Thorhaug, 2010, p. 7). The core task of public libraries is no longer solely to provide access to a collection, but equally if not more to create engagement and activities for the local population (Kann-Rasmussen & Balling, 2014; Wandi, 2019). One of the consequences of this shift is that shelves are being used to display books, rather than to store them. At the same time, public libraries are dealing with tighter budgets and higher demands on statistical results in line with new public management. New technology continues to grow and offers new ways for libraries to carry out their activities. It is within this context that the company Lyngsoe Systems, together with the public libraries in Aarhus and Copenhagen, Denmark, developed the system called IMMS (Intelligent Material Management System). The system has been implemented in different libraries around the world (see for example Lyngsoe Systems, 2019c; Lyngsoe Systems, 2019d). The system reduces the time staff spend on managing materials, i.e., books and other items available to patrons, by introducing floating collection and logistical principles, i.e., chaotic storage principle and batch management. The system also consists of an algorithm that manages data provided by the library system through machine learning.

Little is known of how IMMS and librarians cooperate. The aim of this article is to shed light on what IMMS means for the library practices and hence for librarians as a profession.¹ Two research questions guide the analysis: How do librarians and IMMS interplay at the public library in Copenhagen, Denmark? How does the implementation of IMMS impact the library practices at the branch libraries in Copenhagen, Denmark? The first research question enables a broader perspective on the public library organization in Copenhagen as a whole; considering IMMS in its context as a system containing different parts, i.e., new physical objects as well as new rules, and observing how the different parts interplay with the existing parts at the public library in Copenhagen. The second research question focuses on the library practices at the branch libraries in Copenhagen. The article connects several research areas within the field of library and information studies: collection management, floating collections, library automation, and the use of algorithms and machine learning in libraries as well as the professional knowledge of librarians. Previous research in these areas is presented in the following section.

Background and previous research

The aim of a library collection is to provide its users with a balanced selection (Saponaro & Evans, 2019, pp.3-4). To determine what resources should be available to library patrons and users therefore lies at the core of collection management. During the last decade, collection management has encountered different challenges and opportunities due to new technology, new expectations from library users as well as tighter budgets (Albitz et al., 2014). The American Library Association makes a distinction between collection-centred and user-centred methods for evaluation of the collection (Saponaro & Evans, 2019, p. 183), where the latter is becoming more common. Saponaro and Evans (2019, p. 72) define this approach as a focus on the wants and desires of the users with less emphasis on what users need, which is associated with a more professional selection made by librarians. Just-in-case titles should be reduced in favour of just-in-time titles (Allison, 2013, p. 91). That is, no resources should remain unused, and the libraries need to be one-step ahead of their users to be able to provide resources before patrons ask for it. A consequence of this user-oriented approach can be a management style that shares many similarities with commercial business (see for example Kann-Christensen & Andersen, 2009).

¹ This article is based on the author's master thesis SMARTA BIBLIOTEK[ARIER] : samspelet mellan IMMS och bibliotekarier på folkbiblioteken i Köpenhamn (Liljegren 2021).

Floating collections

One way for library organizations to provide a user-oriented collection is to adopt a floating collection i.e., a system where items do not belong to a specific branch, but stay where they are returned (Bartlett, 2014). The positive aspects of floating collections include cost-efficiency (Bartlett, 2014, p. 5) and quicker access to resources (Greever, 2014). It is a user-centred system since it is based on patron activity (Saponaro & Evans, 2019, p. 46) which makes it important to investigate whether there are library patrons who are not reserving items and thereby not partaking in building their branch's collection (Obydzińska, 2016). An important question is thus to ask how the library can stay relevant for those people who are yet to become library patrons or the ones who do not want to place reservations for items. Another risk of floating collections is that they might create unbalanced collections, for example, one library might have overfilled shelves while another library's shelves are empty (Bartlett, 2014, p. 7). There are systems aimed to counteract unbalanced collections, for example a module from Decision Center (Enis, 2013) and Collection HQ (Obydzińska, 2016, pp. 130-131). IMMS can be seen partially in relation to these systems. A centralization of selection and acquisition is viewed as necessary to benefit economically from floating collections (Bartlett, 2014, p. 25). Little research has been made on floating collections. However, an article by Obydzińska (2016) as well as a master's thesis (Weber, 2014) both note that librarians experience a reduction in their knowledge of the collection. This consequently affects the professional knowledge of librarians where their knowledge of individual titles in the collection is reduced.

Library automation

Libraries have a long history of trying to find better ways to manage information resources and provide faster and better service through automating library practices (for historical accounts of library automation, see Hayes, 2010; Jost, 2015, pp. 1-5). One example is the introduction of RFID chips (Ferguson et al., 2014), which, among other things, has enabled libraries to offer unstaffed opening hours (Engström, 2019). What future automation might bring us remains to be seen and depends on technological developments (for a discussion of this, see Weiss, 2018, pp. 186-187).

Bibliographic records are now inscribed in databases in tandem with circulation data, in so-called integrated library systems. However, integrated library systems cannot always manage circulation data in a satisfying way, which means that libraries often adopt different modules like Decision Center or Alma Analytics. The data need to be translated into activities to be fruitful and therefore requires interpretation by humans. In the definition of smart libraries by Cao et al. (2018, p. 816) this idea is integrated by giving the definition three different components: smart technology, smart service, and smart people. Different ideas on what constitutes a smart library are circulating (see for example Jadhav & Shenoy, 2020; Ozeer et al., 2019; Weiss, 2018, p. 182). Smart technology, e.g., machine learning as well as automation of time-consuming tasks are often included in the definition. With this definition, IMMS can be seen as helping to create a smart library. Weiss (2018, p. 116) argues that it is important to remain critical of what data are being used and made available and for what purpose those data are being used. For example, library systems cannot yet incorporate data on e.g., societal events outside the library.

Technologies like artificial intelligence and machine learning are tools to manage data more efficiently (Boman, 2019) and to provide more generalized decisions and answers (Coleman, 2020). For a long time, algorithms in different search engines have captured the interest of researchers within library and information studies (see for example Bucher, 2018; Haider & Sundin, 2019; Noble, 2018). Much of the research on the implementation of AI in libraries is forward thinking (see for example Anoop & Ubale, 2020; Fei et al., 2015; Griffey, 2019). When it comes to this kind of technology new competencies, like data literacy and critical algorithm literacy (Olsson Dahlquist & Sundin, 2020), are needed in our society. Cox et al. (2019) asked library managers about the challenges that AI

implementation in a library setting entails. They received a wide range of answers regarding both opportunities and challenges, and containing librarians' lack of knowledge on how to use the technology. To create smart libraries with the use of AI technology, library staff will need to know how the technology works and how to work with it.

Adapting to new technologies

Jost (2015, p. 87) describes how long periods of stability in the advancement of technology have been replaced today by fast-paced changes that put significant pressure on library staffs' ability to adapt and learn. As seen in the previous section, library technology continues to develop where new professional skills and competencies are needed. For example, studies shows that librarians have insufficient knowledge of how AI works, how it can be used and what it really is (Hervieux & Wheatley, 2021; Li & Fleischmann, 2020). This could potentially constitute a challenge for future libraries and librarians, especially when new technologies are implemented in libraries.

Ørom wrote as early as in 1993 about how technology challenged the librarian's identity as a promoter of culture and as an expert at information retrieval and would be replaced with a focus on service, instead of enlightenment (cited in Kann-Christensen & Balling, 2011). As the users' perspectives and their wants and desires are becoming more important for librarians, it is not surprising how the idea of librarians as experts and users as laypeople has become outdated (Huvila et al., 2013). The term librarian 2.0 has been used to describe the changed relationship between professional librarians and library users explained by how social media and the web have changed the expected role and competencies of librarians (Huvila et al., 2013).

Theoretical framework

To be able to make sense of the interplay between librarians and IMMS the analysis builds on practice theory as presented by Shove et al. (2012). There are different understandings of what practices really are (for some definitions, see Barnes, 2001, p. 20; Schatzki, 2001, p. 2). In this article practices will be understood as "a routinized type of behaviour" consisting of different elements (Shove et al., 2012, p. 6). These are not inherent to individuals but constitute elements of practices that the individual performs. Shove et al. (2012) divide the practices into three elements: material, competence, meaning, and these will guide the analysis. These elements can change, move, and transform separately and practices are enacted when the three elements are linked and integrated. This means that the practices change when elements transform and change, or when the links between the elements are broken (Shove et al., 2012, pp. 21-22). This version of practice theory is thereby particularly useful to study both change and stability (see for example Carlsson, 2013) and it is thus useful when studying the implementation of new technology. The concept of "library practices" is used here to refer to the daily activities performed by the branch librarians at the branch libraries in Copenhagen, Denmark. The focus is on the practices concerning the physical collection at the branch libraries. IMMS does not affect the e-resources as these are managed separately. Using the three elements of practice makes it possible to de-centre the human in the practices (Shove et al., 2012, p. 22) and to see the entanglement of different elements that constitute a practice. Hence, the use of "library practices" and not librarian practices.

The three elements of practice are used to understand how the interplay between librarians and IMMS takes shape. The material elements encompass objects, tools and bodies (Shove et al., 2012, p. 23). Meaning elements refer to the symbolic significance of a practice, i.e., the norms and value of the practice. The competence elements refer to the know-how of the practice, i.e., the practical knowledge of how to perform a practice (ibid). The three elements will be used to conceptualize the library practices and to see the transformation of the elements with the implementation of IMMS. The three elements affect each other, and together form the practices. Using these three elements

make it possible to see the sociomaterial aspect of the practices, i.e., to see how the social and material are integrated (Orlikowski, 2007). The sociomaterial lens thereby reconfigures agency (Gherardi, 2017, p. 50) in the same way as practices consist of both meaning, competence and material elements. Orlikowski (2007, p. 1438) calls this “the constitutive entanglement of the social and material of everyday organizational life” and this is useful to study the effects of introducing IMMS to the library practices, which consists of sociomaterial entanglements.

The theoretical lens is important to unpack the black box that constitutes IMMS, that is, to see the different parts that constitutes IMMS. These includes both new material elements in the shape of new objects and tools, but also meaning elements in the shape of new ways to manage the physical collection. Being able to see the different parts of the system and how they interplay with the public library is connected to the first research question. Thus, the second research question zooms in on the branch libraries and how the library practices play out.

Methodology

A qualitative approach has been used to understand the interplay between IMMS and librarians. The empirical data consist of interviews with six branch librarians, A-F, and one branch assistant, G, located at three different branch libraries as well as one special librarian, H, located at the main library. The special librarian was interviewed to gain a deeper understanding of the IT side of the system. The informants are working at different branch libraries of different sizes and in different areas of Copenhagen. However, to protect their identities, they are not described in more detail.

Interviews were held during the spring of 2021 and because of the covid-19 pandemic, they were conducted digitally. An interview guide was used with five different themes: background, the role of librarians, users, collection management, and IMMS. Text material (Appendix A) consists of documents from Lyngsoe Systems, the company behind IMMS. Policy documents for the public library in Copenhagen are also used. All quotes in this article will be in English while the spoken language of the informants was Danish. Some informants interviewed were responsible for the IMMS at their branch, while others were not responsible. Their understanding of the system hence differed. Videos (Appendix B) were used to gain a visual understanding of the system. Because of the pandemic, it was not possible to conduct observations. The understanding of the library practices is thus built upon the analysis of interviews, videos and text documents.

The pilot project to develop IMMS began in 2011 in Copenhagen and Aarhus, Denmark (Lyngsoe Systems, 2014). Since then, the system has been implemented in different parts of the world, mainly in public libraries. The choice of Copenhagen, Denmark as the field of study is based on its relatively long use of the system. The interplay between IMMS and librarians most likely differs between different organizations since the system contains different parts meaning that it is possible to implement it in different ways. Therefore, my choice to focus on only one library organization has an effect on the results of this study.

When it comes to floating collections, previous research indicates that the biggest differences can be discerned at smaller branch libraries (Bartlett, 2014, p. 21). The reason behind this is that librarians at smaller branch libraries often do know their collection title by title in a different way than librarians in bigger libraries do, but also that they are working closer with their local community. Floating collections are also often centralized. In Copenhagen, they have decided to not let the main library’s collection float, so the staff there do not see this aspect of the system. These are the reasons behind the focus on library practices in branch libraries.

The analysis was conducted with the help of NVivo. Different themes arose from the informants' statements, which created the categories used to analyse the material: standardization, centralization, the role of the librarian. The analysis was also conducted by unpacking the black box that constitutes IMMS to be able to see the different parts that constitute the whole. That is, to be able to see IMMS not as one thing, but instead as many different though interconnected parts. The unpacking of IMMS is accomplished through the use of the different elements as described by practice theory. This is connected to the first research question, which takes a broader stance and involves the library organization. The different elements are furthermore used to answer the following research questions on how the implementation of IMMS affects the library practices. The interviews as well as the text documents have been analysed in the same way to be able to see the relations between the different elements that constitutes the practices.

Results and analysis

Implementing IMMS means implementing a wide range of objects and new norms and rules as well as competencies, which are presented and analysed in this section. I will start by outlining the meaning of the library practices as established in policy documents, but also introducing the material elements and how the new materials interact with the already existing material elements, e.g., the library system. These elements are closely intertwined with the meaning elements, i.e., norms for daily activities that together form the library practices. This part is thus connected to the first research question. In the following, I will turn specifically to the third element, that of competence and how it relates to the meaning and material elements. The three elements together constitute the library practices (Shove et al., 2012), which is the focus of the second research question.

New material and meaning elements

Lyngsoe Systems is a company specialized in storage management for a variety of organizations including libraries and airports, among others (Lyngsoe Systems, 2021b). The company developed IMMS together with the public libraries in Copenhagen and Aarhus, and financially funded by the ABT Foundation, a foundation specialized in technology for the public sector (Lyngsoe Systems, 2019b). The aim of the project, which started in 2011, was to reduce the time staff spent managing material and consequently increase the time spent providing service to library patrons (Lyngsoe Systems, 2014, p. 3). The special librarian, informant H, confirms the reason behind the development of the system: "I think it was motivated by the staff complaining about all the time they spent on moving around books." This also confirms the explicit shift at the public library in Copenhagen to focus more on creating *connections* (Københavns Biblioteker, 2012) where activities and inspirational exhibitions of books are important. Lyngsoe Systems (2014) distinguishes between value-activities and non-value activities where material management is the latter whereas activities and service are the former. This shift of the meaning elements of the practices at public libraries; to decrease the non-value activities (e.g., managing materials) and increase the value activities (e.g., meeting the patrons), has been mentioned previously in numerous studies (see for example Huvila et al., 2013; Kann-Christensen & Balling, 2011; Thorhauge, 2010; Wandt, 2019).

Previous research on public libraries have noted the shift of the use of the library room where the number of items is reduced in favour of inspiring exhibitions, emphasizing the role of the library as a centre for experiences (see for example Audunson, 2018; Carlsson, 2013, pp. 56-57). At the public library in Copenhagen, there is an explicit shift from the library as a room storing information resources to the use of the library room as an *inspirational space* showing the physical information resources (Københavns Biblioteker, 2019, p. 25). The role of the public libraries in Copenhagen is to create engaged citizens, eager readers, and critical cultural consumers (Københavns Biblioteker, 2019, p. 6). The meaning of the library practices can thereby be discerned in the documents as having a democratic value as well as inspiring its users to read and to relate critically to ones' environment.

Lyngsoe Systems also writes that one reason for implementing IMMS is to make time for meetings with the library patrons (Lyngsoe Systems, 2021a). Thus, the role of librarians and library staff is to be an intermediary between the library and the patrons. Less emphasis is put on selecting titles for the collection, which of course changes the professional knowledge of librarians and the competencies needed. This is discussed in the following section.

IMMS introduced new material elements that impact library practices. These include mobile phones that each branch library has, the application IMMS (connected to a web-based program), and a scanner. These three material elements are necessary to provide communication between librarians and the application. The library system Cicero generates circulation data to be processed and it contains bibliographic posts. The main library in Copenhagen has a central sorter where items are sorted to be sent to either other branch libraries, the main library, or the media hotel. The media hotel is a storage room where books not currently needed in circulation are stored. The items are stored based on the chaotic storage principle also used by e.g., Amazon, meaning that the items are placed where there is space and thereby not logically organized (Lyngsoe Systems, 2019a, p. 4). Batch management makes it possible to know where each item is currently located without having them organized, thus “chaos means control” (Lyngsoe Systems, 2021a). Batch management needs different objects in order to work, including an RFID-chip in each item as well as a barcode or RFID-chip on each box that can be connected to the RFID-chips on the items that are placed in the box. This makes it possible for the application, together with the library system to know what is in each box, and where each item is placed. The same principle is used for reserved books at the main and branch libraries. IDA (Intelligent Distribution-Algorithm) renders it possible to process data in real time by using machine learning and making decisions based on where items should be displayed or stored (Lyngsoe Systems, 2019a, p. 3). The parameters for the algorithms are set by the special librarians, but the algorithm is owned and developed by Lyngsoe Systems. These are all new material elements being introduced with the implementation of IMMS.

The meaning of the library practices is here defined to be to create connections through an inspiring library room and activities for the library users. The role of the librarians is emphasized to meet and guide the library users. New material elements are hence introduced along with new norms and rules on how to carry out the daily activities. The new norms and rules contain, beyond creating an inspiring room and guiding the patrons, using the new material elements, e.g., the scanner when moving items at the branch libraries. These are linked to the last element, that of competence.

Branch librarians and their competencies

Competencies in the library practices include the ability to attract and inspire the local population to use the library’s collection through inspiring exhibitions, activities, and encounters. Meeting with library users was mentioned frequently when the branch librarians were asked to define the role of the librarian. This transforms the activities in the library not only in relation to the patrons, but also when it comes to working with the collection and when creating different exhibitions. Informant D explains: “but we always move items around, like ‘this should be here now, should this be here?’ but that is not IMMS.” The informant indicates that deciding the shape of the library room is not something that is related to IMMS; still, IMMS is an aspect of this process since the librarians communicate with the algorithm and application through scanning the books with a mobile phone. It is also possible to discern the same reason for implementing IMMS as the need to move things around in the library room. That is, to focus on creating an inspiring room where people can meet and get inspired. Several of the informants emphasize this. An important competence for librarians is to have an instinct for what attracts and inspires. The focus of the branch librarians is consequently not on the individual items in the library collection, but instead on providing an inspiring and welcoming

room for library patrons. Hence, the focus on the shape of the library room, and the need to move things around.

The daily activities at the branch libraries consist of managing items, mainly books, in the library room. This is the aspect mentioned in documents by Lyngsoe Systems to be the main reason for implementing IMMS. When the library staff are moving items in the library room, or between branches and the main library, they need to use the mobile phone as an extended body. It is not enough that they as individual librarians know where a book is; they need to communicate with the application by using the mobile phone to scan the items they are moving and thereby telling the application where the items are being moved. Thus, the information of where each item is should always be found in the application. This obviously makes it easier to find items, as explained by many of the informants. For instance, the informant A says: "In the old days we could look everywhere [to find a book] but now I know that it is [e.g.,] at exhibition 5 [...]". However, there are some problems, as explained by the informant B: "I have some colleagues who [when they take a book] completely refuse to scan [it] so that IMMS believes that it is still on the shelf. But the book is not there, so the book is gone." The same informant continues to explain how overfilled shelves, as has been mentioned as a problem with floating collections (Bartlett, 2014, p. 7) can still arise. This happens when the library staff still use the previous rules and norms and not the new ones connected to the implementation of IMMS and its material elements. Therefore, they do not use the new material elements and the linkage between the elements is disrupted. This creates a tension and discrepancy between the new material elements and how they are supposed to be used (their norms and rules) and the actual norms of the branch librarians. The informant clarifies that the colleagues refusing to use the scanner and application do not lack the skill, but the motivation. There is a tension between the new norms and rules being implemented through IMMS and the motivations for some of the library staff. One informant says that some of their colleagues do not see IMMS as something they need to care about, hence they do not see, or refuses to take part in creating a library practice in collaboration with IMMS. Since IMMS is intertwined with the whole library organization, this refusal affects the interplay and how well IMMS, and specifically IDA, can perform.

Centralization of collection management is a natural part of the implementation of IMMS, as the special librarian, informant H, explains when asked if the system is possible to use without a centralization: "you can, but it doesn't give much." The acquisition is one aspect that has been centralized at the public library in Copenhagen, meaning that only some of the librarians in the organization are working with acquisitions. Selection of individual items at the branch libraries is done through different actors: IDA (and the special librarian and Lyngsoe systems who have decided how the algorithm works), acquisition librarians, the library user (giving data to Cicero and to the branch staff), the library room and the branch librarians (selecting the sections of the library room). There is thus an interplay between material elements (e.g., IDA) and meaning elements (the requested books of the library patrons are prioritized, the library should be able to give the patrons what they want when they want it) and the competency elements (the librarians involved know how to acquire the requested books and how to interpret statistics from the library system). The selection of individual items on the shelves can thus be seen as a sociomaterial practice (Orlikowski, 2007). I.e., it is a constitutive entanglement of the social and material doing the selection of where each individual title should be placed.

An overall view of the collection

The role of the branch librarians is to manage different sections in the library room, that is, deciding what and how many shelves each genre should be given. Thus, the branch librarians (if they are not part of the acquisition group) are not working with acquisition but shelving. Still, with IMMS, shelving is a part of collection management since the branch librarians can decide how large and what sections

there should be at their branch. Hence, the branch librarians will need to know how to arrange a section at their branches and how to work with both the technology (telling the systems what sections), patrons (knowing what sections the patrons want and need) and other branches (sharing the collection).

The sections, in turn, are affected by how the items are catalogued in Cicero. The branch librarians can affect their specific branch collection but only when it comes to deciding the different sections in the library room, not individual titles. If they want a specific title, they need to reserve in Cicero. The branch librarians hence decide the shape of the library room and the sections, i.e., what genres and how much of that genre their branches should contain. One informant, for instance, described how a fantasy section was established and how IMMS automatically filled up the new section with the same principle of selection as described above. They may also reserve individual titles in the same way as their patrons, meaning that they can affect the individual titles on the shelves in the same manner as the patrons.

The work that the branch librarians are doing with the collection is therefore on an overall level, i.e., deciding the shape of the physical library room (the sections), rather than building a collection by acquiring individual items. Some of the informants mention that one of the consequences is that their knowledge about what is on the shelves has been reduced. The informant F says: "You can no longer have a personal connection to the collection, one could say. I'm not sure if that really matters, I'm not sure. But perhaps you did feel a responsibility for your own [branch] collection. We no longer have that responsibility over selection." The informant E says almost identically: "So what I mean, what I 100 % mean, is that we do not have the same knowledge of what there is in our collection as we used to. But that does not mean... What I mean is that IMMS is not bad in that way." They thereby do not see their decreased knowledge of the collection as something negative. This can be seen in light of the changing role of public libraries in a digitized society, as will be discussed further down.

Though knowledge about the items standing on the shelves has been reduced, different knowledge has been gained. Many of the branch librarians say that it is easier to get an overview of the collection and what parts are being used. That is, they do not have the same knowledge of the titles in the collection, but they have knowledge on what parts of the collections that are being used and how. These two changes in knowledge and how a collection is built and managed have consequences for what competencies are needed and are established. Many of the branch librarians answer technical, statistical, and mathematical knowledge to the question of what competencies are needed from them in relation to IMMS. It is logical that more statistical and mathematical knowledge is needed since the collection is being translated to numbers and data through e.g., circulation data. Many of the informants also say that they do not have these competencies and contrast it by saying that they are humanities-oriented people, interested in literature and movies as opposed to numbers and computers.

Cheating the system?

Weeding is a core task of librarians working with a collection, that is, deciding when an item is no longer needed in the collection to create a balanced collection for the library users (Johnson, 2018, p. 197). When asked of the challenges with IMMS almost all the informants answer uniformly: weeding. Weeding is one aspect that has been outsourced to the algorithm whose parameters are set at the main library. Weeding is performed through the IDA (and the special librarian and Lyngsoe systems who have decided how the algorithm works) and the library user (giving circulation data to Cicero). Similar to the practice of selecting individual items for the collection, the practice of weeding is sociomaterial in the sense that the algorithm has been set up by the special librarians and Lyngsoe Systems, and its decision is based on data provided by the library users. Unlike the selection practice,

the branch librarians are not part of the decision-making process when it comes to weeding. New norms and rules are hence set up, meaning that the branch librarians' need to weed what the algorithm decides. Their competence to evaluate the library's resources is thus not needed in relation to building the physical collection. Weeding has, in other words, been centralized, meaning that the branch librarians do not have a lot to say when it comes to what items should be in the collections and what items should get weeded. This is though met with resistance.

For instance, informant B says: "...the problem with IMMS is that it doesn't consider if the book is worn out or not," so books or other items that have not been used or have been standing at the media hotel can be weeded. Informant C clarifies: "it could be a new shiny book. That's uninteresting. It should be weeded. There is no professionalism in it whatsoever." They explain that they usually place interns to do the weeding since "we get a stomach ache from it." The librarians can weed more books than the algorithm decides, but never less. The special librarian explains that the consequences need to be taken into consideration: if a book has not been circulated, it should not be included in the collection.

Many of the branch librarians talk about cheating the system in relation to weeding. A explains: "We sometimes hide a book and then put it back into the system later again. You shouldn't do it. But when you think, this book... in three months the same author will release a new novel and this novel will get reservations again." They explain later: "I miss a button that says valuation." The branch librarians consequently find it difficult to work with the new meaning elements, i.e., the new norms and rules set up with the implementation of IMMS, when it comes to weeding, and they thereby pose resistance through working outside the new material elements. This means that other norms are set up, where the librarians have found a creative way of, as they themselves explained it, cheating the system. The competence to evaluate individual items in the collection is delegated to the algorithm and is thus not needed by the librarians. This causes a tension where the librarians sometimes do not think that the algorithm makes the right decision. The librarians have the practical skills to perform the practice, but since they do not agree with the decision-making of the algorithm, they sometimes find new ways to perform the practice in which their competence to evaluate items is still needed, e.g., when they hide books to be able to put it back in the collection.

Discussion

IMMS was developed with the aim to reduce the time library staff spend at managing materials. It was implemented in the context of the shift from collections to connection in public libraries (Thorhauge, 2010). User-oriented methods for collection development are becoming more common and one way is through the use circulation data. New technology, like machine learning and algorithms, offers new ways to manage data more efficiently and is used as tools to predict what the users will need and want in the future. In the case of IMMS, the selection of items to the different branch libraries are centralized to the main library and decided by an algorithm. Using circulation data to manage a collection is not new in itself (Weiss, 2018, p. 117), but the outsourcing of decisions to an algorithm is. The role of the branch librarian in relation to the collection thus changes, and more emphasis is put on meeting the users, while the building of the collection is centralized and accomplished by the work of the acquisition librarian, special librarian, and library users (from circulation data). Two research questions guides this article: How do librarians and IMMS interplay at the public library in Copenhagen, Denmark? How does the implementation of IMMS impact the library practices at the branch libraries in Copenhagen, Denmark? The following section discusses the findings of the study in relation to two topics: the professional role of librarians, as well as new tools for a data-driven collection management.

The library practices

Liljegren: *Easier material management - at what cost?*

Using practice theory as a theoretical lens makes it possible to see how new material elements are introduced with IMMS, and consequently, new meaning and competency elements. For example, the norms of always scanning material when moving them around and weeding the items that the algorithm decides. This in turn means that new competencies are needed from branch librarians, like how to use the technology, but also how to work with the library room and the collection in collaboration with IMMS. These are more quantitative competencies like statistical and math skills. An eye for the inspirational is also important to be able to inspire the patrons to become critical cultural consumers. Some competencies are not developed as much after the implementation of IMMS, such as knowledge about individual items in the collection, meaning that the branch librarians do not have the same knowledge as previously of what items are standing on the shelves. The branch librarians work on an overall level with the collection (e.g., with sections in the library room and not individual titles) which requires an ability to interpret and work with data. Many of the informants talked about their own lack of this competency.

Less knowledge of individual items

Two studies on floating collections point to the effect the system has on the librarians' knowledge of the collection (Obydzińska, 2016; Weber, 2014). This lack of knowledge of individual titles in the collection can also be discerned after the implementation of IMMS. Interestingly, the informants in this study do not see this lack of knowledge of the collection as a problem. This can be seen in the context of the new information landscape where the physical collection does not have the same position as it once had (Audunson, 2018). Audunson (2018, p. 360) explains this decreased focus on the physical collection with the rise of digitization and "the world as a library." He argues that the traditional value of librarians as both experts at information and literature promotion remain, though how the tasks are performed has changed. This is something that can be seen in the branch libraries in Copenhagen, where the tasks of literature promotion and information retrieval are still important daily activities for the librarians. However, these tasks are related to their relation to library users and not to the building of a collection. The public library as a centre for experiences (Audunson, 2018) where the physical collection does not have the same role as it once had, means that librarians are working more public-facing, creating inspiring activities for their users (Kann-Rasmussen & Balling, 2014). At the same time, the librarian maintains the role of guiding users to find relevant sources as well as books to read. With the rise of digitization this is not only in relation to the library collection, but also to the digital environment (cf. Olsson Dahlquist, 2019). Olsson Dahlquist (2019, p. 217) writes how the role of librarian as a guide will probably become more important in the future. The shifting focus where branch librarians do not have the same responsibility for the individual titles in the collection can thus be seen in this light.

When the branch librarians are working with the collection, they are doing so in a different way than with individual titles. Instead, they select the shape of the library room and what sections there should be. In other words, they are working with the collection on an overall level. When working with the application IMMS the librarians are working with data, thereby other competencies are needed from them that are not related to books or culture, but technology and statistics. To be able to work with the new technology, librarians need to know the basics of it. As previously mentioned, studies show that librarians do not possess sufficient knowledge of how AI works and what it is (Hervieux & Wheatley, 2021; Li & Fleischmann, 2020). If the librarians' role is to be a guide in a society characterized by information overload with selection made by algorithms, these competencies are necessary to have. For example, the algorithm can only gain data connected to the collection and how it is used, and not from a societal context. It is thus important to remain critical of how the collection can stay relevant for those patrons who have not yet found their way to the library. The system is primarily based on quantitative parameters, hence not seeing other parameters that could benefit the collection development. Perhaps this could be a moment for librarians to start talking with

patrons about algorithms and how they decide much of what information we obtain, even at their public library. However, the informants said themselves that their own knowledge is limited.

The informants emphasized their increased knowledge of what parts of the collections are being used, which goes hand in hand with the user-oriented collection management (Saponaro & Evans, 2019, p. 183). This shows how it is important for the librarians to provide resources that the users ask for (Kann-Christensen & Balling, 2011). With the use of smart technology, it is possible to manage data efficiently to be able to provide so-called smart service. That is, data is used to predict the future and to provide titles just in time (Allison, 2013, p. 91). Smart technology and smart service are two parts of the definitions of a smart library mentioned by Cao et al. (2018, p. 816). However, these two need to collaborate with smart people, i.e., librarians, to promote the library's resources and activities, hence highlighting the librarians' role as an intermediary between information, culture, and library users.

The limits of circulation data

There are aspects that need to be addressed when circulation data is becoming the main tool for collection management. Transparency and integrity of the individual are two common concerns in the research on e.g., commercial search engines and social media platforms (see for example Bucher, 2018; Haider & Sundin, 2019; Noble, 2018). Even though IMMS does not collect any data, it manages data from the library system in a new way through machine learning. The use of machine learning provides a more generalized decision-making (Coleman, 2020). There is a tendency to view this as less biased (Coleman, 2020, p. 11) although it is important to note that the parameters are human made meaning bias will always be present (Haider & Sundin, 2020; Noble, 2018). When it comes to collection management, the shortcomings of data generated by the library system is not something new (Breeding, 2013). The shortcomings of data are important aspects when it comes to outsourcing decision-making to an algorithm that only has access to circulation data and bibliographic posts. Questions must be asked: Is there enough metadata in the bibliographic posts to create well-balanced collections at the different branch libraries? Are there, for example, some parameters that ensure perspectives from LBGTQ+ and other minorities at each branch? How can branch librarians and the algorithm, in practice, work with diversity in their collections when circulation data is the main source?

There are many aspects of IMMS that remain to be explored. Most importantly, the interplay between IMMS and librarians is context-based and further research needs to be done to examine how different library organizations shape the interplay. Though the system contributes to easier material management, questions remain as to how librarians can work together with the IMMS to create a library for not only the patrons already using the library, but also for potential users. It would also be interesting to investigate why some of librarians lack the motivation to collaborate with the system. Other questions arise as to how the branch librarians are working with reading promotion when their knowledge of individual titles in the collection is decreased. In the long run, these are questions connected to the meaning of the public library and more overarching questions like: what role should the public libraries have in our society and what competencies are thus needed from future librarians?

Conclusion

This article has shed light on what IMMS means for librarians at the public library in Copenhagen. Two research questions have been answered: How do librarians and IMMS interplay at the public library in Copenhagen, Denmark? How does the implementation of IMMS impact the library practices at the branch libraries in Copenhagen, Denmark? The theoretical lens of Practice theory made it possible to see how new meaning and material elements are implemented in the library practices, but also some

unexpected new meaning elements, like hiding books from the system. New materials, e.g., mobile phone and scanner, application, and an algorithm (IDA), are introduced to the practices and are used in tandem with new norms and rules for the daily activities. For instance, the use of the mobile phone as an extended body when items in the library room are being moved. This changes the last element, that of competence, where the competence to evaluate individual items in the collection is not needed by the branch librarians in service of building and maintaining the collection. This causes tension between librarian and system since the librarians' sometimes think that the algorithm does not always make the right decisions. This tension is most visible when it comes to the practice of weeding, where the branch librarians' role is to perform the decision taken by the algorithm. This problem can be seen in the light of the limited data that the algorithm has access to. The librarians' professional knowledge as information experts is challenged in relation to the building of a physical collection. This can be seen in a context where digitization has changed the role of the physical collection in public libraries. Information can be found online, and users do not need to visit their public library in order to receive information. Though the branch librarians do not have the same role in relation to collection management, they still work as intermediators between information, culture, and library users. Thus, information retrieval and literature promotion are still important tasks for the branch librarians to perform but not in relation to the building of a collection. How this changes the librarian's ability to give their patrons (and non-patrons) good service merits further research, as does further investigations of these issues from a user perspective.

References

- Albitz, B., Avery, C., & Zabel, D. (2014). Introduction. In B. Albitz, C. Avery, & D. Zabel (Eds.), *Rethinking collection development and management* (pp. xi-xiv). Libraries Unlimited.
- Allison, D. A. K. (2013). *The patron-driven library: a practical guide for managing collections and services in the digital age*. Chandos Pub.
- Anoop, A., & Ubale, N. A. (2020). Cloud Based Collaborative Filtering Algorithm for Library Book Recommendation System. *2020 Third International Conference on Smart Systems and Inventive Technology (ICSSIT), Smart Systems and Inventive Technology (ICSSIT)*, , 695-703. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSSIT48917.2020.9214243>
- Audunson, R. A. (2018). Do We Need a New Approach to Library and Information Science? *Bibliothek Forschung und Praxis*, *42*(2), 357-362. <https://doi.org/10.1515/bfp-2018-0040>
- Barnes, B. (2001). Practice as collective action. In T. R. Schatzki, K. Knorr-Cetina, & E. v. Savigny (Eds.), *The practice turn in contemporary theory*. p. 17-28. Routledge.
- Bartlett, W. (2014). Floating Collections: Perspectives from a Public Librarian. In B. Albitz, C. Avery, & D. Zabel (Eds.), *Rethinking collection development and management*. p. 289-296. Libraries Unlimited.
- Bartlett, W. (2014). *Floating Collections: A Collection Development Model for Long-Term Success: A Collection Development Model for Long-Term Success*. ABC-CLIO.
- Boman, C. (2019). An Exploration of Machine Learning in Libraries. In J. Griffey, A. Yelton, B. Kim, & C. Boman (Eds.), *Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Libraries*. p.21-25. ALA TechSource.
- Breeding, M. (2013). Mining Data for Library Decision Support. *Computers in Libraries*, *33*(5), 23-25.
- Bucher, T. (2018). *If...then: algorithmic power and politics*. Oxford University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190493028.001.0001>
- Cao, G., Liang, M., & Li, X. (2018). How to make the library smart? The conceptualization of the smart library. *The Electronic Library*, *36*(5), 811-825. <https://doi.org/10.1108/el-11-2017-0248>
- Carlsson, H. (2013). *Den nya stadens bibliotek: om teknik, förnuft och känsla i gestaltningen av kunskaps-och upplevelsestadens folkbibliotek* Lund : Faculty of Humanities and Theology, Department of Arts and Cultural Sciences, Lund University.
- Coleman, C. N. (2020). Managing Bias When Library Collections Become Data. *International Journal of Librarianship*, *5*, 8-19. <https://doi.org/10.23974/ijol.2020.vol5.1.162>
- Cox, A. M., Pinfield, S., & Rutter, S. (2019). The intelligent library. *Library Hi Tech*, *37*, 418-435. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lht-08-2018-0105>

Engström, L. (2019). *Att skapa självstyrande individer; effektivitet och motrörelser: Styrningsrationalitet och icke-rationalitet i bibliotek med obemannade öppettider*. Det Humanistiske Fakultet, Københavns Universitet. [https://portal.research.lu.se/portal/sv/publications/att-skapa-sjalvstyrande-individer-effektivitet-och-motroerelser\(aee5141a-c774-4376-8876-7f5ae1fb50f0\).html](https://portal.research.lu.se/portal/sv/publications/att-skapa-sjalvstyrande-individer-effektivitet-och-motroerelser(aee5141a-c774-4376-8876-7f5ae1fb50f0).html)

Enis, M. (2013). Industry: Decision Center Releases Floating Collection Module. *Library Journal*, 138(18), 21-21.

Fei, Y., Chengyu, Z., & Wu, C. (2015). Smart talking robot Xiaotu: participatory library service based on artificial intelligence. *Library Hi Tech*, 33, 245-260. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-02-2015-0010>

Ferguson, S., Thornley, C., & Gibb, F. (2014). How do libraries manage the ethical and privacy issues of RFID implementation? A qualitative investigation into the decision-making processes of ten libraries. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 47, 117-130. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000613518572>

Gherardi, S. (2017). Sociomateriality in posthuman practice theory. In A. Hui, T. R. Schatzki, & E. Shove (Eds.), *The nexus of practices. connections, constellations, practitioners*. p. 38-51. (1 Edition. ed.). Taylor & Francis eBooks.

Greever, K. E. (2014). Floating Collections: Perspective From an Academic Library. In B. Albitz, C. Avery, & D. Zabel (Eds.), *Rethinking collection development and management*. p.p 281-288. Libraries Unlimited.

Griffey, J. (2019). Conclusion [Article]. *Library Technology Reports: Artificial Intelligence And Machine Learning In Libraries*, 55, 1-29.

Haider, J., & Sundin, O. (2019). *Invisible search and online search engines: the ubiquity of search in everyday life*. Routledge.

Haider, J., & Sundin, O. (2020). *Algoritmer : så påverkar de din vardag*. Kungliga biblioteket. <https://internetstiftelsen.se/app/uploads/2021/01/algoritmer-internetguide.pdf>

Hayes, R. M. (2010). Library Automation: History. In M. J. Bates & M. N. Maack (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of library and information sciences*. 3326-3337. CRC Press.

Hervieux, S., & Wheatley, A. (2021). Perceptions of artificial intelligence: A survey of academic librarians in Canada and the United States. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102270>

Hui, A., Schatzki, T., & Shove, E. (2017). Introduction. In A. Hui, T. Schatzki, & E. Shove (Eds.), *The nexus of practices : connections, constellations, practitioners*. 1-7. Routledge.

Huvila, I., Holmberg, K., Kronqvist-Berg, M., Nivakoski, O., & Widén, G. (2013). What is Librarian 2.0 – New competencies or interactive relations? A library professional viewpoint. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 45(3), 198-205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000613477122>

Jadhav, D., & Shenoy, D. (2020). Measuring the smartness of a library. *Library & Information Science Research*, 42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2020.101036>

Liljegren: *Easier material management - at what cost?*

- Jost, R. (2015). *Selecting and implementing an integrated library system : the most important decision you will ever make*. Chandos Publishing.
- Kann-Rasmussen, N., & Balling, G. (2014). Every reader his book – every book its reader? Notions on readers' advisory and audience development in Danish public libraries. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 47, 242-253. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000614532486>
- Kann-Christensen, N., & Balling, G. (2011). Literature Promotion in Public Libraries—Between Policy, Profession and Public Management. *Nordisk kulturpolitisk tidsskrift*, 14(01-02), 102-119.
- Kann-Christensen, N., & Andersen, J. (2009). Developing the library. *Journal of Documentation*, 65. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410910937589>
- Københavns Biblioteker. (2012). *Fra læsestue til innovativ kulturdynamo*. <https://bibliotek.kk.dk/nyheder/aktiviteter/fra-laesestue-til-innovativ-kulturdynamo>
- Københavns Biblioteker. (2019). *Biblioteksplanen 2019-2023*. Kultur- og Fritidsforvaltningen. Københavns Kommune. https://bibliotek.kk.dk/sites/koebenhavn.ddbcs.dk/files/315976_biblioteksplan_2019-2023_final-a.pdf
- Li, L., & Fleischmann, K. R. (2020). Libraries and archives of tomorrow: How future information professionals perceive AI. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 57. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.343>
- Liljegren, L. (2021). *SMARTA BIBLIOTEK[ARIER] : samspelet mellan IMMS och bibliotekarier på folkbiblioteken i Köpenhamn*. Master's thesis, Lunds Universitet. <http://lup.lub.lu.se/student-papers/record/9050027>.
- Lund, A. B., Nissen, C. S., Torhauge, J., Andersen, T. S., & Kristensen, T. M. (2018). *Københavns Biblioteker: Scenarier for den fremtidige kerneopgave*. Kultur- og Fritidsforvaltningen. Københavns Kommune. <https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/edoc/63beda61-710f-44af-a561-83e6e8d59bf9/9fb1f727-99a0-489a-8135-4a1f69c31f25/Attachments/20554216-27816726-1.PDF>
- Lund, B. D., Omame, I., Tijani, S., & Agbaji, D. (2020). Perceptions toward Artificial Intelligence among Academic Library Employees and Alignment with the Diffusion of Innovations' Adopter Categories. *College & Research Libraries*, 81(5), 865.
- Lyngsoe Systems. (2014). *IMMS final report to the Fund for Welfare Technology*. Lyngsoe Systems. <https://lyngsoesystems.com/download/imms-final-report-to-the-fund-for-welfare-technology/?wpdmdl=6194&refresh=5ff41e5c9dea51609834076>
- Lyngsoe Systems. (2019a). *IMMS: Floating Collections By Intelligent Material Management System*. Lyngsoe Systems.
- Lyngsoe Systems. (2019b). *Intelligent Material Management System*. Lyngsoe Systems.
- Lyngsoe Systems. (2019c). *Helsinki City Library Introduces The Lyngsoe Systems Imms – The Machine Learning-Based Intelligent Material*
- Liljegren:** *Easier material management - at what cost?*

- Management System™*. Lyngsoe Systems,. Retrieved 2021-04-20 from <https://lyngsoesystems.com/news/helsinki-city-library-introduces-the-lyngsoe-systems-imms-the-machine-learning-based-intelligent-material-management-system/>
- Lyngsoe Systems. (2019d). *Liverpool University Library Has Become The First Uk Institution To Opt For Lyngsoe Systems' Intelligent Material Management System™*. Lyngsoe Systems,. Retrieved 2021-04-20 from <https://lyngsoesystems.com/news/liverpool-university-library-has-become-the-first-uk-institution-to-opt-for-lyngsoe-systems-intelligent-material-management-system/>
- Lyngsoe Systems. (2021a). *IMMS™ - The Lyngsoe Intelligent Material Management System*. Lyngsoe Systems,. Retrieved 2021-03-26 from <https://lyngsoesystems.com/intelligent-material-management-system/>
- Lyngsoe Systems. (2021b). *Lyngsoe Systems company profile and history*. Lyngsoe Systems,. Retrieved 2021-03-09 from <https://lyngsoesystems.com/company/>
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: how search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press.
- Obydzińska, B. A. (2016). Floating Collections—an Alternative Concept in Library Collection Management. *Folia Bibliologica*, 58.
- Olsson Dahlquist, L. (2019). *Folkbildning för delaktighet: en studie om bibliotekets demokratiska uppdrag i en digital samtid*. Lunds universitet, Institutionen för kulturvetenskaper.
- Olsson Dahlquist, L., & Sundin, O. (2020). *Algoritmedvetenhet i mötet mellan generationer: En forskningsrapport inom ramen för Digitalt först med användaren i fokus*. <https://lup.lub.lu.se/search/publication/9467d778-3efd-4e35-9745-0c219d33deb0>
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2007). Sociomaterial practices: Exploring technology at work. *Organization studies*, 28(9), 1435-1448.
- Ozeer, A., Sungkur, Y., & Nagowah, S. D. (2019). Turning a Traditional Library into a Smart Library. *2019 International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Knowledge Economy (ICCIKE)*, , 352–358.
- Saponaro, M. Z., & Evans, G. E. (2019). *Collection management basics*. ABC-CLIO.
- Schatzki, T. R. (2001). Introduction: Practice theory. In T. R. Schatzki, K. Knorr-Cetina, & E. v. Savigny (Eds.), *The practice turn in contemporary theory*. 10-23. Routledge.
- Shove, E., Pantzar, M., & Watson, M. (2012). *The dynamics of social practice : everyday life and how it changes*. SAGE.
- Thorhaug, J. (2010). The public libraries in the knowledge society. *Scandinavian Public Library Quarterly*, 43, 4-7. <http://doi.org/10.1515/libri-2013-0024>
- Wandi, C. (2019). Change Management in Public Libraries: Seven Recommendations from Copenhagen Libraries. *Journal of Library Administration*, 59(8), 915-926. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2019.1661746>
- Liljgren:** *Easier material management - at what cost?*

Weber, K. (2014). *The Benefits and Drawbacks of Working with Floating Collections: The Perceptions of Public Librarians University of North Carolina*. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. <https://doi.org/10.17615/yjdh-8626>

Weiss, A. (2018). *Big data shocks: an introduction to big data for librarians and information professionals*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Appendix A: Text materials

Forbundet kultur og information. (2014). Intelligent materialestyrning deler vandene. *Perspektiv*, nr 6.

<https://kulturoginformation.dk/perspektiv/fagmagasinet/2014/perspektiv6/intelligentmaterialestyrningdelervandene>

Kultur- og fritidsforvaltningen. (2018a). *Københavns Biblioteker: Scenarier for den Fremtidige kerneopgave BILAG*. <https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/d68a31f6-df69-4ddf-ae31-d4a2740b142c/e88820a4-2182-4728-afdf-6cd94ecae2ee-bilag-5.pdf>

Kultur- og fritidsforvaltningen. (2018b). *Københavns Biblioteker: Scenarier for den Fremtidige kerneopgave : Resume*.

<https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/8f983b1b-7977-448f-ad82-8b8a98018d7a/ead30e68-10f3-4de2-9a50-295621797faa-bilag-4.pdf>

Københavns Biblioteker. (2012a). *Et bibliotek for alle Københavnerne*.

<https://bibliotek.kk.dk/nyheder/aktiviteter/et-bibliotek-alle-koebenhavnerne>

Københavns Biblioteker. (2012b). *Fra læsestue til innovativ kulturdynamo*.

<https://bibliotek.kk.dk/nyheder/aktiviteter/fra-laesestue-til-innovativ-kulturdynamo>

Københavns Biblioteker. (2019). *Biblioteksplanen 2019-2023*.

https://bibliotek.kk.dk/sites/koebenhavn.ddbcs.dk/files/315976_biblioteksplan_2019-2023_final-a.pdf

Københavns Biblioteker. (2021a). *Lovgrundlag for folkebibliotekerne*.

<https://bibliotek.kk.dk/bibliotekerne/lovgrundlag-folkebibliotekerne>

Københavns Biblioteker. (2021b). *Om bibliotekerne: Organisation*. Københavns biblioteker.

<https://bibliotek.kk.dk/Organisation>

LBK nr 100 af 30/01/2013. (2013). *Biblioteksloven*.

<https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2013/100>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2014a). *IMMS final report to the Fund for Welfare Technology*. Lyngsoe Systems. <https://lyngsoesystems.com/download/imms-final-report-to-the-fund-for-welfare-technology/?wpdmdl=6194&refresh=5ff41e5c9dea51609834076>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2014b). *Intelligent Material Management Impact Measurement 11. April 2014*. <https://lyngsoesystems.com/download/intelligent-material-management-impact-measurement/?wpdmdl=7347&refresh=63920c33db8a61670515763>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2018). *Case: Aalborg Libraries – Intelligent System Transformed Patron Service at Aalborg Libraries*. <https://lyngsoesystems.com/case-stories/aalborg-libraries-imms/>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2019a). *Helsinki City Library Introduces The Lyngsoe Systems Imms – The Machine Learning-Based Intelligent Material Management System™*

Liljegren: *Easier material management - at what cost?*

<https://lyngsoesystems.com/news/helsinki-city-library-introduces-the-lyngsoe-systems-imms-the-machine-learning-based-intelligent-material-management-system/>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2019b). *IMMS: Floating Collections By Intelligent Material Management System*. <https://lyngsoesystems.com/download/floating-collections-by-imms/?wpdmdl=15709&refresh=63920d25477c51670516005>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2019c). *IMMS: Library Storage Management by Intelligent Material Management System*. <https://lyngsoesystems.com/download/library-storage-management-by-imms/?wpdmdl=15719&refresh=63920d3dcb6161670516029>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2019d). *Intelligent Material Management System*. <https://lyngsoesystems.com/download/imms-one-pager/?wpdmdl=8345&refresh=63920d4defa901670516045>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2019e). *Liverpool University Library Has Become The First Uk Institution To Opt For Lyngsoe Systems' Intelligent Material Management System™* <https://lyngsoesystems.com/news/liverpool-university-library-has-become-the-first-uk-institution-to-opt-for-lyngsoe-systems-intelligent-material-management-system/>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2020a). *Case: Naestved Library - IIMS – From Resource-Intensive Processes to a Modern Library that is Better for both Librarians and Users*. <https://lyngsoesystems.com/download/naestved-library-imms/?wpdmdl=13628&refresh=63920d80e95631670516096>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2021a). *Ballerup Libraries get IMMS*. Lyngsoe Systems. https://lyngsoesystems.com/news/ballerup-bibliotekerne-gets-imms/?fbclid=IwAR1vEfUpXgF9ofchqalbnFtRjgdadHJKEulawEet033Up0NIX9vzg_Z6EMg

Lyngsoe Systems. (2021b). *Floating Collections - is it worth it?* [Video] <https://register.gotowebinar.com/recording/6403899181784314635?cldee=bG92aXNhQGUcHJvLnNI&recipientid=contact-e3f1b2dd1336eb11a813000d3a25ccfa cd6c2a00d899423389454678b7f611fa&esid=c3781c76-3499-eb11-b1ac-000d3a4793c8>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2021c). *IMMS™ - The Lyngsoe Intelligent Material Management System*. Lyngsoe Systems. <https://lyngsoesystems.com/intelligent-material-management-system/>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2021d). *Lyngsoe Systems company profile and history*. Lyngsoe Systems. <https://lyngsoesystems.com/company/>

Appendix B: Video materials

Lyngsoe Systems. (2019). *Lyngsoe Systems' Intelligent Material Management System™ (IMMS)* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hBWKCF1A8b0>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2021a). *IMMS™ floating collection an introduction* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J1abPfm4mmM>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2021b). *IMMS™ Paperless holds – efficient holds management* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RGDZYDe627A>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2021c). *IMMS™ Making attractive shelf space and displays* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4u4mPgZ96N8>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2018). *Lyngsoe Intelligent Material Management System™* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7G8HSXuS1bk>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2021d). *IMMS™ Storage control – quick shelving and easy picking* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jgTUUwW_IfY

Lyngsoe Systems. (2016). *Aalborg Libraries IMMS System* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TxaK7ftjkD8>

Lyngsoe Systems. (2021e) *IMMS™ Sorting at branch using mobile phone* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4b2YpbgPAqA>

Alison Hicks, Lecturer in Library and Information Science, University College London, UK,
a.hicks@ucl.ac.uk

Book review:

Paradoxes of Media and Information Literacy: A Crisis of Information

Jutta Haider & Olof Sundin (2022) Paradoxes of media and information literacy: The crisis of information (1st ed.). Taylor & Francis.

The aim of Jutta Haider and Olof Sundin's recently published *Paradoxes of Media and Information Literacy: A Crisis of Information* is to interrogate the challenges that current technological and social upheaval is perceived to engender within understandings of media and information literacy. Examined through five paradoxes- responsibility, normativity, temporality, trust, and neutrality- the book also aims to bridge divisions between media and information literacy research, as well as, perhaps, discordant narratives within the field of information literacy itself. This is a tall order for a 174-page text, but it is one that is welcomed, especially by those of us who value information literacy as an umbrella term or field of study, rather than as a side-lined after thought.

The initial premise for the book lies in the perception that information literacy is becoming increasingly tested in an age of "ubiquitous information systems based on invisible algorithms, and premised on data extraction and market logic." (p.16). Within this framing, information literacy is simultaneously positioned as both ideally suited to and irrevocably changed by what the authors refer to as a "crisis of information" (p.1). Creating a meta-paradox of its own, these ideas are unpacked through an interrogation of five specific contradictions or self-contradictions (p.14) within the information literacy narrative, with the goal of extending research and practice in the area. Thus, the paradox of responsibility explores how individual obligations for dealing with "false or ambiguous claims" (p.30) conflicts with conceptions of individual choice, while the paradox of normativity deals with the contradiction between prescriptive and situated information literacy goals. Within the temporal paradox, ideas of progress are challenged by the need for information literacy to be both "future-oriented and historically aware" (p.88), a dichotomy that is mirrored within the trust paradox,

which positions information as equally reliant on and challenging of an “unconditional trust in information” (p.116). The final paradox refers to neutrality, or the idea that information literacy concepts can be “weaponised” to serve very different political aims and goals (p.138). Running throughout these inter-related sections are broader concepts of evidence, authority, expertise, and bias- all of which become unsettled within this “volatile” information environment.

There is much to admire about this book, not least because the need to examine the less palatable aspects of information literacy is long overdue. It has not been until recently that research has started to prod at information literacy’s hidden corners, including how knowing is developed in relation to dark knowledge (Burnett & Lloyd, 2020) and how COVID scepticism (Lee et al., 2021) and vaccine hesitancy (Hicks & Lloyd, 2022) is predicated upon the enactment of proficient information literacy practices. Haider and Sundin provide the space to interrogate these ideas further, including in relation to the impact on liberal democracy and civil society. Providing a refreshing contrast to the usual affirmative (Hicks & Lloyd, 2022) or fairy-tale (Olsson, 2010) narratives of progress, this approach also brings home the inherent (and potentially dangerous) issues that virtuous, ‘nice white lady’ narratives of information literacy harbour. It is additionally energising to see work that starts from an assertion of information literacy’s sociomaterial shape rather than its defence. Adding to our growing understanding of how material infrastructure constrains and enables the enactment of information literacy practice, this approach also provides a glimpse of how information literacy research could develop in future.

The authors’ decision to focus on paradoxes, which cuts across the media and information literacy field, provides one such case in point. Eschewing the more traditional territorial approach to research, the foregrounding of socially impactful questions provides a valuable example of how scholarship in our field can move beyond a rehashing of entrenched disciplinary quarrels and disagreements. While it is not fully clear how Haider and Sundin arrived at these paradoxes, it is obvious that collective organisation provides a way in which media literacy and the many splintered strands of information literacy might be able to address the scale of these challenges. At the same time, paradoxes are painted broadly enough to ensure that the “rich and important tradition of information literacy research” (p.10) does not get lost within the proposed merger, something that is important given the relative size of each field. Other interesting new approaches for information literacy research that are presented in this book include the integration of snippets of empirical material alongside more informal anecdotes and the noticeable integration of critical information studies work from the United States into existing scholarship. The emphasis on research from technology-driven fields rather than the information behaviour literature with which information literacy research is (rightly or wrongly) typically associated provides an interesting potential foretaste of changing influences and allegiances within this field of study.

The book is ambitious, though, and the broad sweep of the narrative means that some key ideas are glossed over. It would have been interesting, for example, to have reflected further on the link between information literacy and social responsabilisation (p.26) or the idea that certain (marginalised) groups need to be altered (p.83) to fulfil information literacy’s future promise. The breadth of the topic also means that the paradox thread occasionally gets lost within the text (for example in Chapter 6), a charge that could also, perhaps, be levelled at the treatment of information literacy itself. The original premise of the book was to “challenge taken-for-granted assumptions” (p.4) about information literacy or to explore how information literacy is shaped or made possible within the current socio-political environment (p.74). Yet the picture of information literacy that the authors paint is somewhat static: something that should be taught better or differently rather than a concept that might be fundamentally altered or modified by emerging infrastructures. The book might also have benefitted from more of a problematisation of the “information crisis” subtitle; while the authors provide useful caveats about the limits of the metaphor, situating information literacy in

terms of an exceptional or abnormal state could be seen as distancing it from broader contextual framings, including an interrogation of power and inequality. The frequent use of crisis to launch problematic policy on distracted citizens (Klein, 2007) provides a further illustration of the need to consider this positioning carefully.

References

Burnett, S., & Lloyd, A. (2020). Hidden and forbidden: conceptualising dark knowledge. *Journal of Documentation* 76(6), 1341-1358.

Hicks, A., & Lloyd, A. (2022). Agency and liminality during the COVID-19 pandemic: Why information literacy cannot fix vaccine hesitancy. *Journal of Information Science*, 01655515221124003.

Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*. Macmillan.

Lee, C., Yang, T., Inchoco, G. D., Jones, G. M., & Satyanarayan, A. (2021). Viral visualizations: How coronavirus skeptics use orthodox data practices to promote unorthodox science online. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1-18).

Olsson, M. R. (2010). All the world's a stage: Making sense of Shakespeare. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 47(1), 1-10.

Tuomas Harviainen, Professor of Information Studies, Tampere University, Finland, tuomas.harviainen@tuni.fi

Book review:

Dealing with Change Through Information Sculpting

Ian Ruthven (2022) Dealing with Change Through Information Sculpting. Emerald

Ian Ruthven's new book deals with the topic of Information Sculpting, which the author defines as "a process of creating information solutions" (p. 49). Very much keeping up with the times that emphasize individual and societal transitions and transformations, Ruthven too takes events and transitions as his focal point. Firmly nevertheless grounding his work on information studies, he uses the approach to discuss information phenomena and the importance of information to handling life changes, both positive and negative, as well as both momentary and prolonged. Using the metaphor of sculpting, Ruthven addresses information's role in how people adjust.

After a brief introduction, the second chapter of the book is devoted to theories of transitions. The most central of them to the topic at hand is the concept of coping. The challenge here is that information may either ease adjustment to a changed life situation - or complicate it further. Ruthven differentiates between meaning-making and sense-making, which allows him to distinguish between problem-solving and information that may lead to living one's life differently. A key result of this is nevertheless that the book seems to implicitly discuss problem-solving information a lot more often than it does orienting information, the role of which is present in many transitions.

The concept of sculpting is, surprisingly enough, presented in chapter three without references to the plethora of design theory that discusses the concept and many of its close relatives. This leads to some overt generalizations later, and one could argue that for example a reflection on Donald Schön's work would have strengthened the case. This noted, the book's description of the stages of

information sculpting processes comes very close to certain theories of iterative, developing design, particularly in the *Information Behaviour Theory of Transitions* (Fig. 9., p. 73).

From his rather eclectic set of sources, Ruthven nevertheless succeeds in creating a cohesive argument, which both the information scholar and the design researcher in me are able to appreciate. The work gains full speed when it moves to its example contexts, as the author uses issues such as relationship forming, health crises, downsizing and many sexuality-related themes to demonstrate how information phenomena function in action, and how varied people's strategies in similar situations may be. At this point, the diversity of references from the first third of the book becomes an advantage, helping guide readers who are not information professionals to understand the role of information in the discussed contexts.

This is an interesting, well-written and valuable book, and a solid contribution to the lines of thought that see information research as a broad discipline with much interactive potential in synergy with connected and sibling fields. I was, however, left to wonder what its actual target audience is. The pick-and-mix nature of the references does not lend itself to the volume becoming a course book on information studies, not even on an advanced level, and researchers in turn will be familiar with many of the cases and paradigms being discussed. The contrast to several highly streamlined recent contributions to information studies, such as Haider and Sundin's (2022) excellent *Paradoxes of Information and Media Literacy*, is stark. Yet it leaves this volume no less valuable.

The general feel is that more than anything else, Ruthven is here laying the basis of a research area, rather than summarizing work that has been done. If that is the goal, the book functions admirably as the first step to which other authors can then contribute, with both their fieldwork and their lists of further references. I, for instance, immediately wanted to start expanding on what was proposed in the short section on imagination as a response to uncertainty. *Information sculpting* is, first and foremost, a broad opening statement from which other scholars can find trajectories for numerous lines of further research.

References

Haider, J., & Sundin, O. (2022). *Paradoxes of Media and Information Literacy: The Crisis of Information*. Routledge.

Ruthven, I. (2022). *Dealing With Change Through Information Sculpting*. Emerald.

Fredrik Hanell, Department of Cultural Sciences, Linnæus University, Sweden, fredrik.hanell.@lnu.se

Bokrecension:

Att ta plats och göra skillnad: skolbibliotekariepraktiker i framgångsrika verksamheter

Ulrika Centerwall (2022) Att ta plats och göra skillnad: skolbibliotekariepraktiker i framgångsrika verksamheter. (Doktorsavhandling, Högskolan i Borås)

I avhandlingen *Att ta plats och göra skillnad: Skolbibliotekariepraktiker i framgångsrika verksamheter* konstaterar Ulrika Centerwall (2022) att skolbiblioteken kan sägas vara de mest reglerade biblioteken i det svenska biblioteksväsendet, men i flera fall kan också skolbiblioteken räknas till de mest försummade av våra bibliotek. Påståendet finner stöd i en rapport som fastslår att det inte finns en grundläggande likvärdighet som brister när det gäller skolbibliotek; likvärdigheten existerar inte alls (Schultz Nybacka, 2019). Bemanningläget vid skolbiblioteken har inte förändrats nämnvärt över tid, och skolbibliotekarier anses överlag åtnjuta en relativt låg status och låga löner. Samtidigt innebär läroplanerna och den pågående digitala utvecklingen att skolbibliotekens uppdrag får en delvis ny inramning. Skolbibliotekariens pedagogiska roll diskuteras alltmer, liksom betydelsen av arbete för digital kompetens, MIK (medie- och informationskompetens) och demokrati. Mot denna bakgrund framstår Centerwalls doktorsavhandling i biblioteks- och informationsvetenskap som ett värdefullt bidrag både teoretiskt och empiriskt. Avhandlingen knyter an till tidigare biblioteks- och informationsvetenskapliga studier av yrkespraktiker bland bibliotekarier och skolbibliotekarier.

Centerwalls forskning kan också sägas utgöra ett exempel på emancipatorisk biblioteksforskning där de politiska utgångspunkterna formuleras tydligt, något jag återkommer till nedan.

Till formen är avhandlingen en sammanläggningsavhandling som består av fyra engelskspråkiga vetenskapliga artiklar och en svenskspråkig kapp. Två av artiklarna är ensamförfattade, och två är samförfattade. Två av artiklarna är publicerade, en är accepterad för publicering och den fjärde artikeln publiceras i detta nummer av *Nordic Journal of Library and Information Studies*. Den svenskspråkiga kappan innehåller 8 kapitel där det samlade bidraget från avhandlingsarbetet introduceras, presenteras och fördjupas. Varje kapitel inleds med en föredömligt pedagogiskt utformad sammanfattning som hjälper läsaren. En av avhandlingens många styrkor är hur avhandlingens studier och resultat tydligt placeras i relation till tidigare forskning, och det vi vet om skolbibliotekens historiska, politiska och organisatoriska sammanhang. På så vis tecknas en fullödig bild av skolbiblioteket både ifråga om aktuellt forskningsläge och när det gäller aktuella diskussioner om, och inom, skolbibliotekssektorn. I litteraturoversikten presenteras tidigare forskning tematiserad utifrån avhandlingsstudiens empiriska aspekter: skolbibliotekariers identiteter, synlighet, skolbibliotekarien som pedagogisk resurs och arbetet med normkritiska perspektiv. Detta sätt att tematisera skolbiblioteksforskning fungerar överlag väl, samtidigt som det i flera fall blir problematiskt att tydligt avgränsa exempelvis *synlighet* och *skolbibliotekarien som pedagogisk resurs*, vilket Centerwall också diskuterar när resultaten presenteras. Samtidigt finns det goda skäl att just frågan om synlighet tar en betydande plats i avhandlingens olika avsnitt.

I forskningsläget som beskrivs i avhandlingen visas på flera kunskapsområden som avhandlingen knyter an och bidrar till. Överlag finns i den internationella forskningen en stor andel studier kring skolbibliotekens mätbara effekter när det gäller elevers studieresultat. Kvalitativa studier av skolbiblioteks effekter, relaterat till skolans olika aktörer, är behövt – och något som avhandlingen bidrar till. Vidare lyfter Centerwall fram hur tidigare forskning visat på svårigheter att tydliggöra skolbibliotekariers roller. Tidigare studier visar hur skolbibliotekarieyrket framträder som en feminiserad profession, kvinnodominerad och karaktäriserad av service, stöd och affektivt arbete, med tendenser till underordnad position och lägre status och lön. Denna stödjande och servicebetonade roll samspelar med ett osynliggörande, vilket är en vanligt förekommande upplevelse bland skolbibliotekarier samtidigt som stort fokus i skolbibliotekariens arbete därmed placeras på synliggörande och förespråkande.

Tidigare forskning är tydlig när det gäller att skolbibliotek har och ska ha en pedagogisk funktion. Det är väl belagt att undervisning i informationssökning kräver att både lärares och bibliotekariers specifika kompetenser används i undervisningen. Då forskning saknas när det gäller skolbibliotekariers undervisningspraktiker, vilket Centerwall menar kan ses som en brist på erkännande av skolbibliotekets betydelse inom pedagogisk forskning, tillför avhandlingen ett viktigt empiriskt bidrag på detta område. Trots tydliga kopplingar till skolbibliotekens demokratiska uppdrag i både policy- och akademiska texter finns det få empiriska studier som undersöker hur skolbibliotek arbetar med detta uppdrag, till exempel genom normkritiskt arbete, vilket är den aspekt av skolbibliotekets demokratiska uppdrag som Centerwall fokuserar på i avhandlingen. I detta val, liksom när det gäller att fokusera på skolbibliotekarien som en feminiserad och understundom osynliggjord profession, framträder det feministiska perspektiv som tydligt genomsyrar avhandlingen. Avhandlingens uttalade politiska inriktning präglar både avhandlingens utgångspunkter liksom teoretiskt och empiriskt fokus för avhandlingens studier. Detta kan förmodligen uppfattas som problematiskt av vissa. Jag menar att denna transparens snarare kan betraktas som en styrka hos avhandlingen. Till de som kritiserar en tydligt definierad ideologisk utgångspunkt kan frågan ställas: när bedrivs egentligen forskning från en neutral position? Samtidigt kan naturligtvis alltid resultatet

av vissa ställningstaganden diskuteras, exempelvis vilka aspekter av det demokratiska uppdraget som inte belyses tydligt när just normkritiskt arbete fokuseras.

Avhandlingens syfte är att bidra till fördjupade kunskaper om skolbibliotekariers arbete för att skapa framgångsrika skolbiblioteksverksamheter och hur det kan förstås med hjälp av det teoretiska begreppet skolbibliotekariepraktiker. I fyra olika delstudier undersöks fyra forskningsfrågor:

- 1: Hur skapar skolbibliotekarier professionell identitet?
- 2: Hur skapar skolbibliotekarier synlighet för biblioteket och bibliotekarien i skolan?
- 3: Hur utgör skolbibliotekarier resurser i skolans pedagogiska arbete?
- 4: Vad karaktäriserar arbetet med normkritiska perspektiv som en del av skolbibliotekariepraktikerna?

Därutöver formuleras den övergripande frågeställningen:

- På vilka sätt bidrar skolbibliotekariepraktiker till skapandet av framgångsrika skolbibliotek?

Utifrån avhandlingens syfte och frågeställningar valdes framgångsrika skolbibliotek ut, baserat på bibliotek som fått utmärkelserna *Årets skolbibliotek* respektive *Skolbibliotek i världsklass*. Utmärkelserna fungerar i avhandlingen som indikatorer på vad som kan sägas utgöra framgångsrika skolbibliotek, och är därmed en del av urvalsprocessen. Samtidigt nyanserar Centerwall kopplingen mellan framgång och utmärkelser genom att lyfta fram hur det framgångsrika också kan ligga i att lyckas driva en meningsfull skolbiblioteksverksamhet av betydelse för elevernas lärande trots brist på resurser eller utmärkelser.

Som tidigare nämnts ligger ett feministiskt perspektiv till grund för avhandlingsprojektet, något som syns tydligt i teorival (t.ex. performativitet) samt när det gäller avhandlingens fokus (t.ex. på normer). Genom avhandlingens delstudier undersöks fyra empiriska aspekter, med hjälp av fyra teoretiska ansatser. I Figur 1 (se s. 13) visas en modell över de olika teoretiska ansatsernas förhållande till de fyra empiriska aspekterna. Modellen åskådliggör hur varje delstudie presenteras i en artikel och besvarar en forskningsfråga, med hjälp av en teoretisk ansats. Sammantaget framträder genom artiklarna olika empiriska, och teoretiska, aspekter av skolbibliotekariepraktiker.

En uttalad ambition i avhandlingen är att bidra till skolbiblioteksforskningen genom att pröva och utveckla olika teoretiska ansatser. Denna ambition är hedervärd, inte minst då skolbiblioteksforskningen är i behov av teoretisk utveckling, vilket Centerwall helt riktigt påpekar. Den andra sidan av myntet är att teorianvändningen stöter på vissa utmaningar då närliggande begrepp i olika teoritraditioner används med särskilda konnotationer. Ibland framstår också vissa centrala begrepp som svåra att separera från varandra analytiskt. Till exempel kan behovet av både begreppen praktik och infrastruktur i avhandlingens analys diskuteras. Skillnaden mellan att tala om klassrumsundervisning som en praktik jämfört med att framställa klassrumsundervisning som en infrastruktur blir bitvis svårgripbar.

Vilka är då de teoretiska ansatser som prövas och utvecklas i avhandlingen? På ett övergripande plan har avhandlingen en praktikteoretisk ansats där fyra olika teoretiska ingångar används i de olika delstudierna. Centerwall presenterar praktikteorier som en bred familj av teorier. Rutinmässigheten betonas, liksom det sociala, och hur praktiker är bundna av tid och rum. Materialitet beskrivs vidare som en viktig aspekt av hur praktiker kan förstås (även om just materialitet är en dimension som kunde givits mer utrymme i avhandlingen), liksom den föränderlighet som praktiker präglas av. Sammantaget innebär detta ett fokus på handlingar, snarare än individer, och på det förkroppsligade, det sociala och det rutinmässiga. Ett teoretiskt begrepp som används och utvecklas i avhandlingen är *skolbibliotekariepraktiker*, det vill säga aktiviteter som skolbibliotekarier ägnar sig åt när de bedriver skolbiblioteksverksamhet.

I den första delstudien används Judith Butlers teori om performativitet (se t.ex. Butler, 2006). När identitet förstås som performativ förstås den som möjlig att förändra genom upprepade säganden, göranden och relateranden. Identitet är således något som görs, och människor strävar efter att skapa en identitet som är både igenkännbar och begriplig.

Infrastrukturer, som är teoretiskt fokus för den andra delstudien, kan vara elnät, transporter, men också klassrumsundervisning eller skolbibliotek. Star och Ruhleder (1996) pekar på hur välfungerande infrastrukturer tenderar att tas för givna, och hur infrastrukturer är beroende av varandra. Vårt perspektiv avgör vad som hamnar i förgrunden eller i bakgrunden och skolans infrastrukturer förstås därför i avhandlingen som relationella.

I den tredje delstudien används den teoretiska ansatsen infrastrukturer för lärande som fokuserar på infrastrukturer som är skapade för att stödja lärandepraktiker. För att undersöka skolbiblioteket som en av skolans infrastrukturer för lärande, och skolbibliotekarien som en pedagogisk resurs, utvecklas i avhandlingen en modell (se s. 72). I modellen görs en analytisk åtskillnad mellan strukturer och arrangemang, och resurser. De förra undersöks i artikel 2, medan skolbibliotekarien som en av skolans pedagogiska resurser är fokus för artikel 3.

Teorin om praktikarkitekturer, eller TPA, har använts för att studera utbildningssammanhang tidigare men inte för att studera just skolbiblioteksverksamhet, vilket görs i avhandlingens fjärde delstudie. Med inspiration från praktikteoretikern Theodore Schatzki (se t.ex. Schatzki, 2002) förstås en praktik i termer av säganden, göranden och relateranden. Relaterandet beskriver hur människor relaterar sig till varandra och till omgivningen. Inom TPA beskrivs de strukturer som håller samman, möjliggör och begränsar praktiken som arrangemang. Dessa arrangemang begreppsliggörs av Kemmis med flera (2014) som praktikens arkitektur.

Intervjuer är den huvudsakliga metoden som används i avhandlingens studier, och metodvalet motiveras nyanserat utifrån avhandlingens konstruktivistiska utgångspunkter och utifrån praktikteoretisk horisont. Totalt utgörs det empiriska materialet i avhandlingen av intervjuer med 22 bibliotekarier, genomförda under 2014 - 2015. Därutöver genomfördes guidade observationer, liksom insamling av skolbiblioteksplaner, material från skolornas hemsidor och skolbibliotekens sociala medier. Fältanteckningar från samtliga besökta skolor ingår också, liksom anteckningar från gruppintervjuer och samtal med kollegor till bibliotekarierna. Detta material har inte använts direkt i analyserna i artiklarna, utan har bidragit med en fördjupad förståelse för praktikerna (tillsammans med författarens egna erfarenheter som skolbibliotekarie).

För att översiktligt beskriva centrala resultat från avhandlingen, låt oss återvända till avhandlingens kategorisering i fyra empiriska aspekter och de korresponderande teoretiska ansatserna.

När det gäller identitet kopplar Centerwall sex aktiviteter till identitetsskapande: att uttrycka (t.ex. genom performativa uttryck som "jag som skolbibliotekarie"), att positionera (för att finna en meningsfull position), att synliggöra (för att bli erkänd och ihågkommen som professionell aktör), att påminna (genom rutinmässiga och performativa uttryck), samt att förklara och att informera (för att skapa begriplighet för bibliotekariers professionella identiteter och kompetenser). Dessa aktiviteter, som förändras i och genom praktiker, beskriver tillsammans hur skolbibliotekariernas identitet skapas, genom etablerandet av en tydlig position och genom rutinmässigt påminnande, förklarande och informerande, och hur synlighet kan förstås i relation till elever, lärare och skolläring.

När det gäller hur synlighet skapas, används i den andra delstudien en symmetrisk ansats där alla infrastrukturer i skolan ses som lika viktiga. Här blir alltså likställandet av skolbibliotek och klassrum,

som platser för praktiker eller som infrastrukturer, en metodologisk strategi för att synliggöra infrastrukturer som tenderar att tas för givna, och de "osynliga arbetare" som skapar och underhåller dessa infrastrukturer. Det ligger här nära tillhands att peka på kopplingen till den metodologiska ansats för att studera osynligt informationsarbete som bland annat McKenzie och Dalmer (2020) utvecklat. Intresset för att studera det osynliggjorda förefaller vara växande inom samtida biblioteks- och informationsvetenskaplig forskning vilket är välkommet inte minst när det gäller biblioteksforskning. Med hjälp av infrastrukturteori undersöks i avhandlingen skolbibliotekets strukturer och arrangemang, och teoretiska begrepp utvecklas som används i analysen – även om den teoretiska skärpan stundtals blir lidande av den teoretiska och begreppsliga mångfalden, vilket berörts ovan.

Infrastrukturminimering är ett begrepp som i avhandlingen fångar hur brist på tydliga direktiv innebär att "tillgång" till skolbibliotek kan tolkas och efterlevas av skolläringarna genom att göra minsta möjliga. Minimering kan innebära bristande bemanning, synlighet, integrering och tillgänglighet. Klassrumsundervisningens dominans kan sägas innebära en underordnad position för skolbibliotekarierna. Men samtidigt som beskrivningen av skolbiblioteket som en stödfunktion är vanlig från skollärdarhåll upplever flera bibliotekarier en relativ autonomi. Denna roll, där biblioteket drivs autonomt, existerar vid sidan av en sårbar men betydelsefull roll: att stödja klassrumspraktikerna och skolan överlag, vilket avhandlingen förtjänstfullt belyser.

När det gäller hur skolbibliotekarier utgör pedagogiska resurser används i den tredje delstudien analytiska begrepp från den teoretiska ansatsen infrastruktur för lärande. Skolbibliotekarier förstås härigenom som professionella och institutionella resurser som använder materiella resurser för att bedriva undervisning, och för att stödja andra pedagogers undervisning och elevers lärande. Skolbibliotekariepraktiker, avhandlingens teoretiska och empiriska fokus, utgör institutionella resurser i huvudsak i form av samarbeten och projektledning. Samarbete är en nyckelfråga och en röd tråd genom det empiriska materialet och avser oftast samarbete med ämneslärare. Skolbibliotekariepraktiker förstås som professionella resurser inom skolans infrastruktur för lärande i termer av undervisning och stöd, samt genom förespråkande och synliggörande arbete vilket tar en ansevärd mängd av skolbibliotekariernas arbetstid. Skolbiblioteksrummet och dess medier och teknik förstås som en materiell resurs. Skolbibliotekarien framträder i delstudien som en särskild typ av osynlig profession: "hidden in plain sight", vilket parafrazeras i titeln på den tredje artikeln i avhandlingen.

I den fjärde delstudien undersöks arbetet med normkritiska perspektiv som en del av skolbibliotekariepraktikerna, med hjälp av teorin om praktikarkitekturer. Praktikarkitekturerna är arrangemang som både möjliggör och begränsar aktiviteter i praktiker, samtidigt som dessa arrangemang håller samman praktiker. Resultaten skrivs fram genom en dramatisering av hur samtal på skolorna kan ha gått till, det vill säga baserade på intervjupersonernas redogörelser men utan att avslöja deras identitet. På den fiktiva *Magnoliaskolan* beskrivs hur praktiker såsom ledarskap och fortbildning möjliggör projektet om normkritik. Som ett kulturellt-diskursivt arrangemang nämns bibliotekssektorns fokus och intresse för hbtq+-frågor. I en första scen beskrivs hur normkritik kan realiseras genom arbete med en Regnbågshylla. En andra scen beskriver intressanta spänningar mellan medarbetare på Magnoliaskolan då bibliotekarierna problematiserar värderingar och normer som boken "Femtio nyanser av honom" kan sägas ge uttryck för genom att placera boken tillsammans med böcker om mäns våld mot kvinnor.

Sammanfattningsvis besvaras den övergripande frågeställningen (*På vilka sätt bidrar skolbibliotekariepraktiker till skapandet av framgångsrika skolbibliotek?*) genom utforskandet av de specifika empiriska aspekterna med hjälp av de korresponderande teoretiska ansatserna, vilket Figur

1 (se s. 13) pedagogiskt illustrerar. Vi ges kunskap om hur bibliotekarier och deras identiteter skapas och förändras i och genom praktiker, om skolbibliotekets synlighet som en av skolans infrastrukturer och om bibliotekarien som en pedagogisk resurs, och slutligen hur normkritiskt arbete kan förstås som säganden, göranden och relateranden som begränsas och möjliggörs av olika arrangemang. Klassiska utmaningar för skolbibliotekarier blir belysta, exempelvis *förespråkardilemmat* som beskriver hur förespråkandet av skolbiblioteket ses som nödvändigt men att detta samtidigt tar värdefull tid i anspråk på bekostnad av andra arbetsuppgifter. I avhandlingen argumenterar Centerwall övertygande för att skolbibliotekarien bör innefattas i en bredare förståelse av begreppet pedagog. Därmed kan en mer stabil och central position för skolbibliotekarien uppnås, något som visat sig avgörande när det gäller att skapa framgångsrik skolbiblioteksverksamhet. Avhandlingens titel, *Att ta plats och göra skillnad*, knyter på så vis an till avhandlingsstudiens resultat och kunskapsbidrag. Det är en uppslagsrik avhandling som förenar väl genomförda empiriska studier med kreativitet och mångfacetterad teorianvändning och analys. Avhandlingen tar nu plats bland 70-talet svenska avhandlingar i biblioteks- och informationsvetenskap där Centerwall gör skillnad för skolbiblioteksforskningen genom vad som kan sägas vara disciplinens första svenska avhandling med ett uttalat och genomgående fokus på skolbibliotekarier och skolbiblioteksverksamhet.

Referenser

Butler, J. (2006). *Genus ogjort: kropp, begär och möjlig existens*. Stockholm: Norstedts akademiska förlag.

Centerwall, U. (2022). *Att ta plats och göra skillnad: skolbibliotekariepraktiker i framgångsrika verksamheter*. (Doktorsavhandling, Högskolan i Borås).

Kemmis, S., Wilkinson, J., Edwards-Groves, C., Hardy, I., Grootenboer, P. & Bristol, L. (2014). *Changing practices, changing education*. Dordrecht: Springer.

McKenzie, P. J. & Dalmer, N. K. (2020). "This is really interesting. I never even thought about this." Methodological strategies for studying invisible information work. *Nordic Journal of Library and Information Studies*, 1(2), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.7146/njlis.v1i2.120437>

Schatzki, T. R. (2002). *The site of the social: A philosophical account of the constitution of social life and change*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Schultz Nybacka, P. (2019). *Värdet av skolbiblioteket: en verksamhet för hållbar utbildning och bildning*. Stockholm: Kungliga biblioteket, Nationell biblioteksstrategi.

Star, S. L. & Ruhleder, K. (1996). Steps toward an ecology of infrastructure: Design and access for large information spaces. *Information Systems Research*, 7(1), 111-134. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.7.1.111>

Nanna Kann-Rasmussen, Associate Professor, Department of Communication, University of Copenhagen, Denmark, nkr@hum.ku.dk

Anmeldelse:

Barnbiblioteket tar form: En idéanalytisk studie av perioden 1945–2018

Catarina Eriksson (2022): Barnbiblioteket tar form: En idéanalytisk studie av perioden 1945–2018. Bibliotekshögskolan. Högskolan i Borås

Catarina Erikssons ph.d.-afhandling har til formål at skabe viden om hvilke idéer som har formet børnebiblioteket i Sverige under efterkrigstiden, samt hvordan disse ideer har varieret i spændingsfeltet mellem politik og profession. Spændingsfeltet mellem politik og profession operationaliserer afhandlingen ved at behandle to typer empiri, nemlig love og udrædninger fra kulturpolitisk side og artikler fra to fagprofessionelle tidsskrifter, nemlig Biblioteksbladet (Den svenske biblioteksforenings tidsskrift) og bis (tidsskriftet for interesseorganisationen Bibliotek i Samhälle), fra professionens side.

Afhandlingens første kapitel angiver, at der mangler viden om hvilke forskellige idéer på børnebiblioteksområdet, der i perioden 1945-2018 konkurrerede om pladsen inden for rammerne af den etablering, der fandt sted, og hvilke idéer, der kom til at dominere (og hvilke ideer, som på den anden side ikke dominerede) under tilblivelsen af det svenske børnebibliotek. Eriksson vil vise hvordan disse ideer har fået betydning for børnebibliotekernes indhold og form. Ultimativt er formålet således at forstå, hvordan børnebiblioteket kom til at se ud som det gør.

Inden for dette formål beskriver første kapitel (p. 16) således de tre forskningsspørgsmål, som har været styrende for afhandlingsarbejdet:

1. Vilka idéer om barnbiblioteket kommer till uttryck i riksdagstryck, utredningsbetänkanden publicerade som SOU samt bibliotekspress, och hur förhåller sig idéerna till varandra?
2. Hur har idéerna som tagit sig uttryck i nämnda empiriska material varierat över tid?
3. Hur ska idéerna, relationerna dem emellan samt deras variation över tid förstås?

I afhandlingens andet kapitel beskrives den forskning som ligger som "resonansbund" og inspiration for afhandlingen. Det gælder forskning om folkebibliotekernes historie, folkebiblioteker som en del af det moderne samfund, folkebibliotekets legitimitet, forskning om børnebiblioteker, om børn i en kulturpolitisk optik, om læsefremmende aktiviteter og om børnebibliotekarer. Det er tydeligt, at litteraturen der beskrives, er valgt ud fra afhandlingens hovedbegreber om ideer. Dog er der ikke en tydelig angivelse af hvad dette kapitel bidrager med til afhandlingen, eller hvordan tydeliggørelsen af denne resonansbund bidrager til Erikssons analyser. Men selvom kapitlet primært er en opremsning af den skandinaviske og internationale forsknings om biblioteker og børn, kan man ane en gennemgående idé, nemlig at børnebiblioteket opererer i spændingsfeltet mellem forventninger til dets kulturelle potentiale og sociale potentiale.

Afhandlingens teoretiske tilgang beskrives i kapitel 3. Her kan man læse, at det overordnede perspektiv i afhandlingen er institutionelt. Afhandlingen definerer "institution" som en "överenskommelse om hur man ska göra, vara och tänka, och att dessa normer även kan ta sig materiella uttryck" (p. 45). Det er institutionsteoretikerne March & Olsen (1989), som er bærende i Erikssons institutionelle perspektiv. Institutioner og institutionalisering omtales i afhandlingen som fænomener der har en stivnende effekt (på svensk anvendes ordet "stelande"). På denne måde lover det teoretiske perspektiv et fokus på ideer som noget der kan blive formaliseret, institutionaliseret og fastfrosset.

De vigtige begreber i kapitel 3 er institutionelle logikker, ideer og idealtyper. I selve afhandlingen er der dog langt mest fokus på ideer og idealtyper, og mindre på institutionelle logikker. Ideer beskrives som en forklaringsmodel til institutionelle forandringer. Idéer defineres som tankekonstruktioner der har en vis varighed over tid, dvs. forestillinger om hvordan man bør handle. I afhandlingen påpeges det at tidånden/Zeitgeist er en bestemt type idé. Men det er udtrykte ideer som deles og som bliver fælles, Eriksson primært er interesseret i. Det er gennem sådanne kollektive ideer, børnebiblioteket tager form. Idealtyper er et andet hovedbegreb i afhandlingen. En del af afhandlingens bidrag er konstruktionen af 4 idealtyper af ideer, som konstrueres ud fra deres ideer om børnebibliotekets formål (som enten objekt- eller subjektorienteret) og middel (som ligeledes kan være objekt- eller subjektorienteret). Nedenfor ses afhandlingens mest centrale model (p. 54):

Figur 1. De fyra idealtyperna pekar ut kombinationerna ifråga om mål och medel inom barnbiblioteket.

		MÅL	
		<i>Objektfokuserat mål</i>	<i>Subjektfokuserat mål</i>
MEDEL	<i>Objekt-medel</i>	Rationella idealtypen	Civiliserande idealtypen
	<i>Subjekt-medel</i>	Egaliserande idealtypen	Musiska idealtypen

Målene er det, der forventes opnået ved børnebiblioteksvirksomheden. Når målet er objektorienteret, vil det sige, at adressaten er upersonlig. Målet kan i stedet dreje sig om samfundet, eller være et kollektivt målbillede. Et subjektorienteret mål er derimod et oplevende subjekt. Det vil sige et individuelt målbillede. Idealtypernes andet sigte drejer sig om gennem hvilke midler, børnebiblioteksvirksomheden bør føres. Også midlerne kan diskuteres gennem begreberne objekt og subjekt. Er midlet objektorienteret, er det fx bibliotekets rum eller bøger som man forestiller sig, er

midlet til at opnå målet. Er midlerne subjektorienterede, er det bibliotekets personale eller andre menneskers sociale funktion og kapacitet, der er i fokus (fx børnene selv). Her er ideerne sat ind i de fire idealtyper:

1. Den rationelle idealtipe: Mål = objekt. Middel = objekt: Biblioteket har ressourcer. Disse kan anvendes for samfundet
2. Den civiliserende idealtipe: Mål = subjekt. Middel = objekt: Litteraturen kultiverer individet. Primært fokus på skønlitteratur
3. Den egaliserende idealtipe: Mål = objekt. Middel = subjekt: Målet er et bedre og mere egalitært samfund. Dette kan opnås gennem fællesskaber på biblioteket.
4. Den musiske idealtipe: Mål = subjekt. Middel = subjekt. Bibliotekets personale og nogle gange børnene selv skal anvendes for at højne børns trivsel og oplevelser.

En idealtipe defineres som en abstrakt konstruktion, som forskeren skaber. Eriksson har således konstrueret de fire ovenstående idealtyper gennem eksisterende forskning, som på forskellig vis beskæftiger sig med idealtyper om biblioteker, kulturpolitik og børn. Det drejer sig om

- Douglas Rabers tre strategier for mulig folkebiblioteksudvikling: aktivisme, konservativisme og populisme (Raber 1996)
- Staffan Thorssons litteraturpædagogiske strategier: den emancipatoriske strategi, den traditionalistiske strategi og den pragmatiske strategi (Thorsson 1988)
- Åse Hedemarks diskurser om folkebiblioteker: allaktivitetsdiskursen, den boglige diskurs, og den informationsformidlende diskurs (Hedemark 2009)
- Dorte Skot Hansens kulturpolitiske rationaler: det humanistiske, det sociologiske og det instrumentelle rationale (Skot-Hansen 1999)

Disse er, som man kan se, alle tredelinger. Den fjerde idealtipe konstrueres ud fra Beth Junckers afhandling om det æstetiskes betydning for børns kultur (Juncker 2006) og Jon Roar Bjørkvolds bog, om det musiske menneske, der ligesom Juncker lægger vægt på børns egen kultur (Bjørkvold 2009). Således er idealtyperne konstrueret teoretisk, og angiver hver sin kombination af mål og midler. De anvendte teoretiske bidrag er alle mere end 13 år gamle. En ulempe ved dette kunne være at det kan være svært at få øje på nybrud i materialet når perspektivet i afhandlingen er formet af litteratur som er skrevet før fx emner som fake news, overvågningskapitalisme og New Public Governance slog rigtigt igennem.

Afhandlingen giver i første del af kapitel 4 en grundig forklaring på sammensætningen af det empiriske materiale, der består af 2 dele. Dels udsagn fra "politik/opdragsgivere" i form af SOU'er (statens offentlige udredninger) og rigsdagstryk, og dels fra "profession" dvs. artikler og notiser fra tidsskrifterne Biblioteksbladet og bis. Der redegøres på en god måde, for udvalgt og indsamlingsmetode. En figur på side 67 viser, at afhandlingen i alt behandler svimlende 849 stykker empirisk materiale!

Anden del af kapitel 4 er en noget kortfattet beskrivelse af analysestrategien, ideanalyse. Denne defineres som "ett systematiskt studium av meningsbärande budskap" (p. 73). Afhandlingen ønsker således at lave en kortlægning af de udtrykte ideer om børnebiblioteket. Denne kortlægning er kvalitativ og fortolkende. Analysen foretages med udgangspunkt i idealtyperne som udgør forforståelsen, således er der tale om en deduktiv analyse. Hovedparten af analysedelen i kapitel 4 er en beskrivelse af hvordan analysen struktureres tidsligt og tidsligt samt i tre temaer. Perioden 1945 til 1968 kaldes Forsøg og initiativ. Perioden 1969 til 1984, De forlængede halvfjerdser. Perioden 1984 til 2018 kaldes Andre tider og andre sæder. Inden for hver periode er materialet og ideerne ordnet

efter om de siger noget om kategorien "Bibliotek", fx bibliotekets rum, samling og rolle, "Personale" eller "Anvendere". Efter kapitel 4 er hele strukturen på plads. Afhandlingens næste tre kapitler udgør analysen af det empiriske materiale.

Materialet i kapitel 5 omhandler perioden 1945-1968. Det viser både noget om biblioteker og børnebiblioteker – men det viser også noget om Sverige og opbygningen af den svenske velfærdsstat. Det billede som træder frem, viser biblioteket som en del af opbygningen af det svenske samfund. Som dansk læser var det interessant at se, hvordan biblioteket havde en fin plads i den samfundsingeniørkunst som blev praktiseret i Sverige i 50erne og 60erne. Fra politiske side var der fokus på bibliotekerne som *rum* – og biblioteker som *bøger*. Dvs. fokus på biblioteket som et objekt. Fra de professionelle side var der fokus på indretningen af rummet og på bibliotekarens rolle. Afhandlingen konkluderer, at den idé der dominerede i perioden 1945 – 1968 var at biblioteket er en lokalemæssig ressource. Ideen om at biblioteket som en lokalemæssig ressource henføres til både den civiliserende, egaliserende og rationelle idealtype. En anden hovedstrømning handler om, at bibliotekaren som idé er under udformning. Det gælder både folkebibliotekaren i det hele taget, men også børnebibliotekaren. Ideen om bibliotekaren henføres i afhandlingen generelt til den rationelle idealtype (med en bibliotekar får man mere ud af biblioteket) og den civiliserende idealtype (det er bibliotekarer der kender til litteraturen). Når det specifikt gælder børnebibliotekaren, dominerer den egaliserende idealtype gennem betoningen af dialogen med anvenderen.

Kapitel 6 handler om det som Eriksson betegner de forlængede 70ere. Også dette kapitel viser hvordan biblioteket er en del af tidsånden. Dokumenterne befolkes i de forlængede halvfjerdser af idealister og progressive selvsikre fortalere for bibliotekets egaliserende virkninger. Kapitlet viser en forskel i, hvordan politikere og profession taler om biblioteket i perioden. Fra politisk side identificeres en forskydning fra, at biblioteket skal være et bogforsyningshus til, at det har mange opgaver, fx et engagement på det alment kulturelle område. Biblioteket skal nu være noget andet og mere end en samling. Eriksson understreger dog, at der (endnu) ikke kan spores en tydelig politisk vilje til at gennemføre disse ideer. Det er fortsat den rationelle idealtype der dominerer inden for politikken. Inden for det professionelle aspekt identificerer Eriksson forskellige spændinger mellem ideerne. Der er to fløje, fortalere for traditionel og fortalere for mere progressiv biblioteksvirksomhed. Den progressive fløj har mest taletid i tidsskrifterne. Og en idé som alle øjensynlig kan blive enige om i 1970erne er, at biblioteket skal modvirke kommercialismens negative virkninger. Dette har øjensynligt været et mantra i kulturpolitikken mange steder. Eriksson peger ligeledes på, at professionen kæmper for anerkendelse og derfor har ideer om biblioteket som et sted, hvor bibliotekarens rolle er væsentligt mere fremtrædende end den har været tidligere. En vigtig pointe er, at når biblioteket skal være andet og mere end en samling, så rykker det bibliotekarens rolle i front.

Kapitel 7 bærer titlen "Andra tider andre seder. Analogt og digitalt". Denne periode er præget af både en kulturpolitisk udredning fra 2009 og Sveriges første bibliotekslov. Det er også i denne periode at digitaliseringen og NPM (New Public Management) fylder meget. Den før så omtalte idé om at mindske kommercialismens negative virkninger stryges. Nu skal biblioteket digitaliseres. Der er en vigtig pointe i kapitlet at politikerne ønsker sig at biblioteket skal digitaliseres, simpelthen fordi man kan. Dette kapitel befolkes således af forandringsparate politikere og, om ikke af den gode bibliotekar, så af bibliotekets ildsjæle. Kapitlet viser konturerne af et skift, hvor man ser, at det er bibliotekarerne som i højere grad end bibliotekerne nu er midlet til at opnå bibliotekets mål, dvs. den egaliserende og musiske idealtype vinder frem. En anden vigtig pointe er kampen om, hvorvidt biblioteket skal være en udfordring, dvs. det moderne, overraskende nye bibliotek som til stadighed skal inspirere anvenderne eller om biblioteket skal være traditionelt, stabilt og pålideligt. En diskussion som også findes i resten af de nordiske landes biblioteksdebatter. Kapitlet er noget kortere end de to

foregående analysekapitler, hvilket muligvis skyldes, at det kan være svært at få øje på ideer jo tættere de kommer på.

Afhandlingens kapitel 8 er en opsummering af resultaterne og en diskussion af svarene på afhandlingens tre forskningsspørgsmål. Eriksson konkluderer, at mængden af ideer om biblioteker, personale og brugere både er øget og differentieret. Variationen er blevet større mht. hvad der forventes at være indeholdt i et bibliotek, hvad en bibliotekar skal kunne og gøre samt hvilke forskellige brugere og variationer af brugere, som børnebibliotekets aktiviteter skal tjene. I sidste del af kapitel 8 konkluderes, at den idemæssige forandring over tid på børnebiblioteket kan forstås som en institutionel transformation, hvor bibliotekets mål og midler er blevet nyfortolket. I begyndelsen af den undersøgte periode dominerede således den rationelle idealtipe, og i tiden efter var det den civiliserende idealtipe der tog over. Som det formuleres i afhandlingen, har den institutionelle transformation hovedsageligt fundet sted om en nyfortolkning af mål og midler for børns biblioteksaktiviteter i overensstemmelse med ideerne om den civiliserende idealtipe. Mod slutningen af den undersøgte periode begynder ideerne om hvad et børnebibliotek er at kunne beskrives mere som den egaliserende og musiske idealtipe. Sagt på en anden måde er fokus flyttet fra at have kredset om at forsyne selvstændige læsere med litteratur til individuel dannelse, til at dreje sig om hvordan bibliotekarer kan manifestere deres rolle i samfundet. Først med hele samfundet som adressat (den egaliserende idealtipe) og senere i forhold til enkeltpersoner (den musiske). Det er således ideerne om midler, der har ændret sig. Objektet har hele tiden både været samfund og individ. Det betyder, at børnebiblioteket er blevet formet i spændingen mellem fokus på "bibliotek" og "bibliotekar" som virksomhedens overordnede princip, og at bibliotekaren, det subjektorienterede middel, er blevet mere dominerende som tiden er gået. Til slut konkluderes det, at det er børnebibliotekarerne der har givet børnebiblioteket dets form. Både politikere og anvendere har en underordnet rolle i udviklingen af ideer. Børnebiblioteket har ikke haft politikernes store interesse, hvilket har givet professionen et rum til at forme børnebiblioteket.

Afhandlingen "Barnbiblioteket tar form" er resultatet af et særdeles stort empirisk arbejde, som Eriksson har arbejdet systematisk med. Måske endda for systematisk. Videnskab kræver både systematik og sensitivitet over for det materiale man arbejder med. Afhandlingen kunne måske have fortalt andre vigtige historier hvis man havde tilladt empirien at tale selv. Eriksson metode har været meget struktureret, hvilket styrker den vægt med hvilken hun kan udtale sig om idealtypernes dominans, men muligvis har det den konsekvens, at der er historier, logikker og mønstre som er blevet overset.

Declaration of interest

Kann-Rasmussen var opponert ved Erikssons ph.d-forsvar.

Litteratur

Bjørkvold, J-R. (2009) *Den musiska människan*. 2013. Stockholm: Liber.

Hedemark, Å. (2009) *Det Föreställda Folkbiblioteket : En Diskursanalytisk Studie Av Biblioteksdebatter i Svenska Medier 1970-2006*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.

Juncker, B. (2006) *Om processen: det æstetiskes betydning i børns kultur*. København: Tiderne Skifter.

March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1989) *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York etc.: The Free Press.

Raber, D. (1996) ALA Goal 2000 and Public Libraries: Ambiguities and Possibilities. *Public Libraries* 35 (4): 224–31.

Skot-Hansen, D. (1999) Kultur Til Tiden: Strategier i Den Lokale Kulturpolitik. *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift* 2 (1): 7–27.

Thorsson, S. (1988) Tendenser i Efterkrigstidens Läroböcker i Svenska. In *Skolböcker: rapport från Läromedelsöversynen*. 3 *Den (o)möjliga läroboken*, Rönström, T. (Ed.). Stockholm: Allmänna förlaget.