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1. Introduction

Why are there no blogs in the library catalogues? They are, as it seems, everywhere else.

One can answer from several perspectives, many of which will be processed in this study, a study that will, to some extent, travel into uncharted territory. Last couple of decades, not to say centuries, has seen movies, music, video games and electronic resources, even umbrellas and garden tools, enter the collections of public libraries (Michnik & Ericsson, 2014). Along with new technology, the possibilities for non-traditional publication, be it digital or in print, has given everybody a chance to make themselves heard (Bradley et al., 2012; O’Sullivan, 2005).

At the same time, it is widely recognised that present age is an age of information overload (Holden, 2010, p. 90; Propas & Reich, 1995, p. 44; Anderson, 2007, p. 190). In this steady stream, libraries, and even more, librarians, could, as José Ortega y Gasset (1961) called on the future information specialist, direct readers to sources of quality, acting as a “filter interposed between man [sic!] and the torrent of books” (p. 154). Books, here, are interpreted as any information resource.

So, where does blogs fit into this? An estimate from 2013 counts 152 million blogs on the Internet, with another 170,000 added each day (Gaille, 2013). This number differs somewhat depending on how you count, but it gives a rough description of the vast blogosphere. In comparison, the New York City Library held a collection of about 53 million items in June 2010 (NYC PL, 2011).

Some of those millions of blogs must have relevancy for libraries, may it be local interest, for future research, or as quality literature. An evidence for this, not relying on visitor counts or sales revenue is the number of blogs that were turned into books (McDonnell, 2007; Warner, 2007), if a book indeed is a mark of quality. Bowman et al. (2008), and Ehrlich (2009), give some examples. Among others, Minus Garfield (2008) by Dan Walsh can be found and checked out at the public libraries of Göteborg and Malmö (http://libris.kb.se/bib/11829137).

Apparently, what we see is a discrepancy between the media formats, the blog and the book in this case, rather than a critical review of the work or information they hold. With millions and millions of blogs and bloggers worldwide, the format may have a place in the library catalogues in its own merit. This is what this study will explore.

While casually, and highly unscientifically, surveying the subject among librarians, blogs in library catalogues was unheard of (several instances of personal communication). Despite that, most of those talked to were positive to the idea, some mentioning the possibility to reach patrons with quality resources otherwise overlooked as one important benefit. If this claim holds to scrutiny remains to be seen. One of the author’s motivations for why public libraries would want to add this kind of material to their catalogue regards the possibility to add sources with local relevance, such as blogs about community history, with the potential benefit that this information not will disappear if a blog is deleted, removed or unreachable.
1.1. Research problem

Hansson (2011) proposes:

Perhaps libraries should relax and let publishers muddle about with e-books until there is a large enough demand to justify libraries working seriously with them. Only when patrons start to ask for e-books can libraries then consider the best way to integrate them with daily library operations (p. 14).

This realist, traditionalist, or pragmatist stance, in this case towards the e-book, may, in fact, be sensible regarding any new media format. Why bother with any format other than the book before anyone asks for it? Of course, Hansson refers to not only what the patrons demand, but also to an industry that constantly hype its own products for its commercial interest (p. 14).

It is not obvious how librarians should react to new media formats, and Hansson’s prescription is as good as any. Each format brings new challenges and conditions to relate to, both for the professionals and for the organisations and systems they work in. Some look upon these changes with enthusiasm, others with fear, scepticism, or puzzlement, in regard to their own opinions, attitudes, or interests.

How, then, will new media formats be managed in a way that fulfils the mission of the librarian and without opposing quality works because of their physical or digital container? What challenges, possibilities, obstacles, and factors do the libraries and the librarians need to consider when adopting a new format?

Similar questions have been studied and discussed regarding a wide range of formats before: with video games (Tappeiner & Lyons, 2008; de Groat, 2015), with fanzines (Stoddart & Kiser, 2004; Gisonny & Freedman, 2006), with self-published books (Dilevko & Dali, 2006; LaRue, 2014), with grey literature (Tillett & Newbold, 2006), with tools and similar objects (Michnick & Eriksson, 2014), and, excessively, with e-books (Rao, 2005; Belanger, 2007; Martin, 2007; McKnight, et al., 2008; Bucknell, 2010; Beisler & Kurt, 2012; McClure & Hoseth, 2012; Crawley, 2013; Waugh et al., 2015; Ghaebi & Fahimifar, 2016; among others).

To add another dimension to this area, this study will examine the blog as a new media format, and which factors are affecting the inclusion of this format. For the author, the blog is a container of information as any other (with its own set of idiosyncrasies), but that may not be the general view. In fact, the attitudes of the librarians towards the blog as a format impact the possibility for an inclusion of blogs among the other formats. Furthermore, as experts and practitioners in the field, they have insight into how the library works and the systems within it, in a way that are essential for any new process of adoption.

The process of blog inclusion in library catalogues is only in its beginning. In its infancy, Entlich (2004) writes: “Most librarians and archivists have not yet identified blogs as online resources particularly meriting collection and preservation” (para. 20). By addressing the problems, the development progresses.

The adoption of blogs, as for any other non-traditional format, has the potential to be really cumbersome if not explored. The list of factors we need to bother with, derived from literature about blogs and other formats, and through interviews with professionals,
are almost limitless, including (but, of course not limited to): dynamic content; copyright; the ephemeral nature of Internet resources; responsibilities; standards and workflows; technology and integration, and; attitudes toward the blog (Anja Leiding, personal communication, February 23, 2016; Elisabeth Cserhalmi, personal communication, March 21, 2016).

The characteristics of physical objects are discussed in terms of materiality. Internet resources, entirely digital, are more unclear than their physical equivalents and the non-materiality$^1$ of them causes problems. How does one describe the dimensions of a blog? Or the date of origin? The questions sprung from a traditional view of the library catalogue may be irrelevant, but if the systems, as suggested by Holden (2010), are based on old paradigms (p. 114), the implications arrive as soon as the intangible objects is introduced into the system. For a library, cataloguing, metadata work, and bibliographical descriptions, are dependent on describing the materiality of the objects.

There is a lot to consider and evaluate, and this is as good a place to begin, as any.

1.2. Questions, goals and objectives

The intention of this study is not to be normative. Although the author’s interest in the matter is in favour of adding blogs to the library catalogues, the research is conducted in order to:

• Gain understanding of obstacles and possibilities surrounding the process of including blogs into the public libraries’ catalogues, and;
• Discuss how these factors affect an inclusion of blogs into the public libraries’ catalogues.

With these aims in mind, along with the above provided background, this study will try to answer the following questions:

1. What are the public librarians’ attitudes toward blogs as information sources?
2. What are the public librarians’ attitudes toward an inclusion of blogs into the public libraries’ catalogues?

The answer may be that this is not possible, or even relevant, in the near future. At least the subject has been put on the table and investigated. Then again, this study may contribute to the progress of the library catalogue in general.

1.3. Definitions and limitations

Here, the blog, media format, and the public library are described in order to define what is studied and what is left out of this thesis.

---

$^1$ Manhoff (2006) discusses digital collections in terms of materiality rather than non-materiality. This thesis is based on media formats being viewed equally, thus will the term materiality be used, even though, in a strict sense, non-materiality is more correct.
1.3.1. The blog

For the purpose of this study, the blog is the sole format of interest. One could include all websites into the research, but then the scope would be inexhaustible. Websites come in different forms: blogs; wikis; discussion boards, to name a few. As for different kind of print media, the forms are important, but, as we will see during the study, a whole different approach may be needed to welcome blogs into library catalogues, and if so, this may open doors for other kinds of websites, and other non-traditional medias in general.

In defining the blog, two main characteristics frequently occur: the technical and the content-based. Walker (2003) defines it as a “frequently updated website consisting of dated entries arranged in reverse chronological order so the most recent post appears first” (para. 1). Online dictionary Merriam-Webster defines it as “Web site on which someone writes about personal opinions, activities, and experiences” (n.d.). Boese (2004) divides the websites into weblogs and knowledge-logs, in line with Merriam-Webster, defining them from their content (p. 1). Blood (2000) describes the shift from news filters, to a plethora of different types:

- topic-oriented weblogs, alternative viewpoints, astute examinations of the human condition as reflected by mainstream media, short-form, journals, links to the weird, and free-form notebooks of ideas (para. 26).

For this study, the blog is defined as a content management system, much as Walker (2003) describes it. No weight, however, is placed on neither the author — may it be one or many — or the actual information within it. The website is the focus.

Furthermore, since the phenomenon of this study, to the author’s knowledge, never has been done, other comparable formats and processes are necessary as measuring sticks. The blog share features with e-books, online journals, self-published books, zines, and diaries. Had every thinkable form of website been the objects of my study, the comparisons would prove more forced.

1.3.2. Media format and genre

In this study, the blog will be discussed as a media format, as opposed to a genre. By that, the author focuses on the technology behind these web based self-publishing sites. In comparison, the printed book, the audio cd, and the e-book are all formats. The discrepancy in how blogs and, for instance, books, are managed is the point of interest. Would it have been the genre, as in the type of work held by the media, printing a book with the blog text material would have been including it in the catalogue, and thus already done.

From time to time, the blog will, mainly in the literature review, be discussed as bearer of genres, as this is the view some of other researchers (McNeill, 2003; O’Sullivan, 2005) in the field. The diary in particular is used in this context, as a counterpart to the blog as an online diary.

Unless otherwise mentioned, the blog refers to the media format.
1.3.3. The public library

On the other side, the focus has been limited to public libraries in Sweden. Each municipality is bound by Bibliotekslag 2013:801 (trans. Library Act 2013:801) to have a public library and it must be accessible for all and fit for the patrons’ needs (6 §). The catalogue of the library may be owned by the library organisation, or shared through collaborations or consortia. For the purpose of this thesis, the catalogue is understood as a manifestation of a library’s collection. An item in the catalogue is thus a part of the collection. Unless stated otherwise, the reader should assume that the terms ‘libraries’ and ‘librarians’ mean ‘public libraries’ and ‘public librarians’.

In Swedish Bibliotekslag 2013:801 one can see that a part of the public library mission is to “promote the democratic development of society” (2 §), that the libraries “range of media and services should be characterized by comprehensiveness and quality” (6 §), and that “the public, free of charge, get to borrow or otherwise obtain access to literature for some time regardless of publication form” (9 §; my emphasis). One should not interpret this as being an argument in favour of adding blogs to the library catalogues, just that there, in the ramifications of the law, might be possible and maybe even advisable. Thus are public libraries interesting in relation to the subject.

Public libraries, however, are not obliged, by law or governmental decree, to any archival function. Some might put upon themselves to archive local material, but in such cases, it is a decision for the administration of the library. The archival responsibilities are maintained by Kungliga Biblioteket along with six university libraries, and, in some cases not governed by law, regional archives (Lag om pliktexemplar av dokument 1993:1392).

1.3.4. Two general assumptions

Two general assumptions are made in order to conduct this study: 1. Among the millions of existing blogs, a number of them hold enough high quality to qualify to the library catalogue, and; 2. Resources are an obstacle in every kind of development or change, therefore are resources not considered a problem worth elaborating.

1.3.5. Pronouns

Lastly, when a gendered personal pronoun is needed, and not referring to any actual person, the author have used “her” instead of any variant of the ungainly “his/her”.

1.4. Literature review

This study’s perspective of the subject comes with challenges best overcome by combining knowledge gained in adjacent fields, with other non-traditional media formats. This literature review were conducted as a way of probing what the author might find and would want to investigate (Bryman, 2004, p. 94). A more complete picture of the obstacles and possibilities in including blogs in the library catalogue were gained and was invaluable in preparing both the actual survey and the analysis.

The main methods for finding literature include searching in the databases LISA and LISTA, following references, and browsing relevant journals and books about related
subjects. Keywords were both added and omitted during the process, but revolved around these: blogs; public library; the nature of the work; progress in collection management; archiving; cataloguing of electronic sources; participatory culture; acquisition of self-published books, and; fanzine collections.

The literature review will give a broad picture of the different aspects of this study, rather than immerse into one single theme. One thing is clear regarding the literature: many descriptions and divinations from shortly before the turn of the millennium has not aged well. For the purpose of this study, no shadows shall fall on the predictions or presumptions that turned out wrong. Instead, focus will lie on the arguments behind them, some of which holds true today.

1.4.1. The blog, the work, and self-published material

To understand a blog in a library context, the blog itself must be defined and seen as a work, like any other work.

Smiraglia (2003) discusses “The Work” as an intellectual or artistic creation in a historical context, from the 1840s to 2001. This entity is then put, by Smiraglia, into a library context: specifically, modern and postmodern catalogue (the latter being a part of the theoretical framework of this study). The main difference between the two consists of the view of the book. “The modern catalog saw books as its central entities, everything else as offspring” (p. 562) while empiricism and the view of bibliographic practice as language changes the catalogue (p. 563-564): “[F]or any given user, knowledge organization must be person- or context-dependent” (p. 564). In effect, this view opens up the catalogue for other material, i.e. works, without necessarily using the book as the measuring stick.

While the earlier researchers mainly have found their basis in literature, Paulus (2007) conducted “an informal survey to check his perception and assessment of blogs” (p. 34). His perspective was archival, and the survey focused on the nature and motives of blogs written by people with a relation to Princeton Theological Seminary. Among the answers from the 21 (out of 32 possible) respondents, the most notable findings was that a majority of those still blogging intended to save their blogs the day they stopped blogging, but only for personal reasons. This did not affect their position with the hypothetical question about if they would permit institutions to access the blog as historical record. All but one would allow it. This insight, however limited by both scale and sample, provides a picture of the reality of the blogger, and in line with this study one might ask: Would Princeton Theological Seminary Library be interested in collecting these blogs?

McNeill (2003) and O'Sullivan (2005) both refers to the blog as a genre as they investigate the phenomenon, this is in contrast to the view of the author where the blog is mainly seen as a content management system. However, the following studies provides a picture of the blog that enlightens merits of the information they — sometimes — possess.

Starting off somewhat prejudicial, McNeill (2003) examines the blogs as diaries, mainly with focus on the blogger. She states that the diarists presumes interest in their published life-stories and due to the massive attention some blogs receive, this is an adequate presumption. Furthermore, this new form of the old genre has blurred the lines between the private life and the public (p. 25-26). Suddenly, intimate and confessional texts are put in the open, and the reader might even participate in constructing the identities or narratives of the blogs (p. 27). This participation may prove difficult in relation to the
work of libraries: are the readers also authors of the blog? Are the comments parts of the work? Without bibliographic considerations in mind, McNeill would probably say yes (p. 29).

O’Sullivan (2005) makes an in-depth comparison between the blog and the diary from the perspective of research and preservation. “Historians have long recognized the diary’s merit as a window onto the past”, she writes, and continues, “Today’s on-line diaries hold potentially the same evidential value” if preserved (p. 54). O’Sullivan’s description of the blog in this context suggests both that blogging is for everyone (unlike diary writing some centuries ago), and that the blog is a genre (p. 65). Maxymuk (2005) agrees to the first statement: “If it is a subject of interest to a group of people of any size, someone is probably blogging about it” (p. 43).

O’Sullivan concludes that “archivists should act now to determine which ones will be relevant to future researchers and are, thus worthy of preservation, or loss to their collections will be inevitable” (p. 71). This claim is in contrast to preserve everything, and although the work of the librarian differs from the one of an archivist, one might ask how future need should be discerned? Then again, little of the information our knowledge of the past is built on is a product of conscious preservation.

1.4.2. Materiality of electronic material

Manhoff (2006) discusses the materiality of collections and how descriptions of objects seems limited to the physical. It is true that digital objects lack, for instance, physical dimensions, typefaces and textures in the traditional sense, but they are still possible to describe, and scholars “are developing new concepts and theories to explain how the properties of electronic objects alter our ways of creating and consuming information” (p. 311).

One of Manhoff’s key points is that the medium shapes the content and that the content thus can’t be transferred to another medium without becoming a new object. She exemplifies this with the acronym language of text messaging with phones, and since, the technology with smart phones has changed and strengthens the argument. One probably can, but in most cases would not, write longer texts on ones smartphone.

This view of materiality and the importance of medium answers one of the bases for conducting this study, namely that blog content bound in a book is more likely to end up in a library catalogue than the blog itself. Manhoff touches this briefly when describing the content-based approach. Her criticism of the concept, valid as such, does not change the fact that medium actually matters in the execution of the role as a librarian. In a postmodern perspective, her claim is an argument for including content regardless of media format, or, rather, for the sake of the media format. That is, the blog as a media format should in Manhoff’s view be included in the catalogue since the functionality of the blog shapes the content within it.

Nisonger (1997) states that in comparison with static traditional content, the Internet resources tend to undergo rapid change (p. 41). For blogs, the dynamic nature may even be a part of the definition, as exemplified by that of Walker (2003): “frequently updated website […]” (para. 1).

Manhoff (2006) points out that the ease digital objects can be changed and remixed is a difference between print and digital materials (p. 312-313). Plutchak (2007) addresses the
versioning trouble for academic journals, where “[n]umerous versions of an article may now be discoverable—the version on the author’s Web site, the version on a publisher’s Web site, the version(s) in institutional repositories” (p. 85). Not only are the boundaries of a blog not set, with new content constantly added, but the content already published is not constant. The author may change, add, subtract, or replace the content without any trace for the reader, if not voluntarily describing the changes herself.

And also, as Jul (1998) points out:

Many other resources, however, become unreachable when URLs change, and from a user’s point of view, unreachable resources share this in common with resources that do not exist: they are useless (p. 10).

He discusses common objections to cataloguing web resources, one of them being that “everything on the Internet is here-today-gone-tomorrow” (p. 9), and states that long-term access is a problem when resources become unreachable due to changed URLs, but also that there are resources that are temporary by nature (p. 9).

1.4.3. The catalogue

The catalogue as a record of the collection is discussed by several, and for the purpose of this study, the focus will remain on the relation to non-traditional objects.

Oddy (1996) declares the main purpose of the catalogue to be a list and description of the materials in the library’s collection (p. 28). “Of course, the catalogue is not, never has been and never will be, the sole means of access to the contents of a collection” (p. 99), she writes. Have the purpose of the catalogue changed in 20 years? It seems unlikely. Rather is it the nature of the collection it records that has changed.

Lee (2000) asks what a collection is, addressing the rise of information technology in the late 20th century. While describing this new paradigm, she rethinks the collection as a concept. Mainly, she reasons about how information overload affects the collections, as well as the act of collecting. New foci, such as access to and careful selection of Internet resources, will prove more important. For the future of collection management, she discusses whether computers can build collections and replace humans as intermediaries. She concludes:

Clearly, the computer will slowly take over some aspects of intermediation.
However, in collection development, subjective elements in the document, such as the quality of content and the author’s viewpoint, are unlikely candidates of automatic processing (p. 1110).

Advances in the technology may question this statement in the future. Banerjee (1998, p. 18), Johns (1997, p. 18) and Newton (2005, p. 45) all address the same question from different angles: Why should libraries process materials that are thoroughly indexed by search engines? This question is especially relevant with the discussions about materiality in mind.

However, the importance of the catalogue in finding material has been stated by, among others, Rossman et al. (2009), Rai (2016), and with Johns (1997), stating: “I believe that OPACs should be the gateway to information sources that can be made available to
library users [...]” (p. 20). Lee (2000) also states that: “By including all, not just some, documents, the IRS strengthens the integrity and accessibility of the collection, making the user aware of the full extent and depth of the collection” (p. 1112).

Lyons (2007) does contradict that answer somewhat, when he argues that putting local resources in the catalog can make them hard to find and many local information seekers may not think to look there” (para. 14). Research Information Network (2009) discusses the problem of including Internet resources from two perspectives: “immediate access to the full text may reduce the value of bibliographic records for end users […] Metadata for e-books are, however, of importance for libraries in acquiring and managing their collections” (p. 22).

1.4.4. Catalogue development in relation to Internet resources

Furthermore, the practice of the libraries, and the development of them, in relation to new media types — electronic, self-published, or both — and new technical conditions, plays a considerable role in the possibility to integrate the blog into the library catalogue.

In an early description of the Internet as an information source, Nisonger (1997) presents opportunities and challenges that the new technology brings for collection management. He focuses on academic libraries, but much of his review is relevant in a general context, and will be addressed later. “Collection management of Internet and traditional resources is fundamentally the same in many respects,” he states, and gives examples of areas in which the practice is alike, among them, knowledge of information needs (p. 40). The differences consist of: selecting rather than collecting; traditional space and cost restrictions do not apply; new resources traditionally not collected; macroevaluation rather than microevaluation; duplication is a less important issue; selection of unwanted or unneeded resources; dynamic resources rather than static; different kinds of collection maintenance; different evaluation criteria priority; more direct examination of Internet resources; libraries more likely to create Internet resources; less obvious bibliographic units; level of access critical, and; preservation issues (p. 40-43). Today, some of these differences may not apply, libraries buying stocks of e-books for example, while others may be discussed, and entirely new added. As a snapshot of what difficulties were identified in the beginning of the electronic resources process, Nisonger’s description serves a purpose.

An initiative for cataloguing selected parts of the Internet was initiated by Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) with a start during the fall 1994, OCLC describing it as an “OCLC Research investigation into the nature and extent of Internet resources and their potential impact on library operations” (n.d.). Jul (1996), Johns (1997) and Neuminster (1997) have reported on the progress. The project was voluntary and libraries could get involved to a degree corresponding their ambition and resources. During 18 months 231 libraries participated and made records of 5,000 online sources (Johns, 1997, p. 18). Since these reports, more libraries contributed and OCLC states that 1,000 were involved (OCLC, n.d.). The experience and knowledge gained from the project is communicating with the topic of this thesis, and gives insight into some of the obstacles found. Especially Jul (1998) is contributing when stating and answering the Three Stoppers:
(1) there is nothing on the Internet worth cataloguing, (2) everything on the Internet is here-today-gone-tomorrow, and (3) MARC and AACR2 […] would not work anyway (p. 9).

In the same line, Lee (2000) argues that tangibility and format no longer applies to collection development, but that this view has “deep roots in traditional thinking” (p. 1112).

Banerjee (1998) present a more critical view, and describes why the effort to include Internet resources in the library catalogue may be futile, indeed, underlining Jul’s Three Stoppers. He states that

1. Describing Interactive Documents is Inherently Difficult
2. Electronic Resources Are Unstable
3. The Relationship Between the Library Catalog and Electronic Resources Is Different than That Between the Catalog and Physical Materials (p. 6-7).

and concludes that “goals based on storing information about computer files in comprehensive integrated records are unrealistic” (p. 15). This statement is addressed to the materiality of the sources as discussed earlier.

Then again, there are already apparent differences between medias. Oddy (1996) writes:

Given the inclusion of materials other than books in a library, the primary division of the collection is now clearly by format or medium. Within the physical grouping of each form of knowledge record — video, audio tape, disc, book — secondary division is by the most sought characteristic of the intellectual content (p. 26).

This comes to no surprise to anyone who has visited a library², and may have an explanation. We live in a computer paradigm (Propas & Reich, 1995, p. 44). Still, the book is the benchmark within libraries, and all other formats are additions to this one traditional medium (Holden, 2010, p. 7). For physical collections, the division described by Oddy (1996) is hopefully a conscious choice derived from patrons’ needs, but the intangible resources are not that easy to divide or place, especially not in proximity to the traditional collection. At the present, blogs being perceived as every other medium just places them in a system of divisions according to format, and in this system, blogs are not catalogued or even collected. However, this may not be an eternal order.

1.4.5. The catalogue in relation to e-books

E-books are to some extent the preceding step for inclusion of blogs in the library catalogue. Much is written about the problems perceived with e-books as a media format, and the merits of succeeding in including them in the library catalogue, and some of it will be presented here.

---

² The author have observed a slight shift in this at the Public Library of Linköping, where some other media formats are alongside the books on the non-fiction shelves. No further digression into the matter will be conducted here.
Belanger (2007) investigates if, and how, e-books are catalogued in higher education libraries, a development that parallels the cataloguing of other new media in general. Lack of policies relevant to, or based on, e-books, results in ad hoc processes, and it seems unclear which e-books and which collections are actually catalogued. This adversely affects how easily these resources are discovered and accessed (p. 205). E-books poses many problems, many of them more or less unique for this format, but some bear relevance for the blog as well. The libraries, Belanger states, are reluctant to add free resources, due to “concerns about the quality, scholarly value, and long-term stability of the resource” (p. 207). The considerable labour of cataloguing for the libraries make them use collections of titles from other sources which, instead, provide records with less quality (p. 208). Belanger concludes that although there is a “general agreement that e-books should be catalogued, much work remains to be done […]” (p. 214). If look upon broader, this process could involve electronic resources of many kinds.

Hypén (2011) and Hansson (2011) describe the e-book revolution — if there is one — from one perspective each: the librarians’, and the readers’. Hypén asks in what ways the work will change, and what skills or help the librarian will need, in order to handle this new media format. She stresses that time and place are not as important as for physical books. Rather do the library need to consider an e-book collection shared with more libraries (p. 12). The way to present the material is equally important, and Hypén describes the ideal situation where e-books are just one format among others (p. 13). On the other hand, Hansson states that Swedish readers “aren’t entirely convinced of the benefits of e-books” and that the advantages mainly are a product of the electronic industry’s own hype (p. 14). He advises the libraries to be patient and “let the publishers muddle about with e-books until there is a large enough demand” (p. 14). These two perspectives contrast each other well, and in relation to the subject of this thesis, one must consider both views. Ultimately, there is a choice between being proactive or reactive, to the changes that may come.

Rai, Bakhshi & Singh (2016) describes the technical process of adding e-books into the library collection. As Belanger (2007) and Hypén (2011), they agree that e-books should be integrated in the regular systems, and they predict an increased use due to the inclusion (p. 8). Rai et al. describes the work with LIBSYS-7 in eight steps, found from experiments, in lack of literature, from the first excel file with bibliographic details, to the user search in the OPAC (p. 7-8). Their description is technical and too complex to include in this literature review, but their paper is an illustration of the work that needs to be done. Also, the process will probably differ between systems, and different system may vary in flexibility for adding different media types. This consideration is important in discerning whether adding blogs are doable. Practical examples, like this of Rai et al. will be crucial.

1.4.6. The catalogue in relation to other non-traditional media formats

Other non-traditional media formats include in this context grey literature, zines, online journals, and self-published books. In much the same manner as with e-books, the parallels with blogs help putting the latter into a library context.

Library presents how they have worked with grey literature in their collection. In trying to define this kind of content, they list some aspects:

Not primarily produced for commercial publication [...].
Difficult to acquire [...].
Few if any bibliographic controls [...].
Not peer reviewed.
Transient or ephemeral in nature.
Difficult to find [...] (p. 70).

Indeed, a lot of these aspects are shared with blogs, and their follow-up question is as relevant for them as it is for grey literature: “Why then [...] is it so important and why does the British Library collect it” (p. 70-71)? Tillett & Newbold states that the content often is not published in any other way, and that a problem is that “the producers do not consider their publications to be obscure or hard to find” (p. 71). The wider access provided by the Internet has induced a discussion among scholars: does this new development make the grey literature greyer, or will it erase the difference between the grey literature and the non-grey (p. 73)? If blogs are to be introduced into the library catalogue, this may spark a similar debate. Will the selection process make the sources not selected more obscure, or will it increase the status of blogs in general?

Self-published books and zines, these alternative publishing forms, show a wide range of both subjects and perspectives. Hayward (as cited by Dilevko & Dali, 2006) states that “[g]ood writers are writing and publishing good books on specialized subjects that trade publishers will no longer produce because of the limited financial returns possible on these books” (p. 212).

For a library, there is a complex hierarchical network underlying and making this important to consider: Firstly, Dilevko & Dali (2006) explains how publishers all progress towards expecting to show profits above all other goals, thus closing the door for books with less economical potential (p. 209). Then, the authors rejected of the conventional publishers turn to self-publishing, and the output of such books then increases to constitute two thirds of the total (Bradley et al., 2012, p. 108-109). If then, as Dilevko & Grewal (1997) and Deodato (2014) states, mainstream producers are favoured over alternative or small publishers, the libraries may be missing out on the self-perceived goal of diversity (p. 381; p. 748).

Bypassing the commercial, aesthetic, or political interests that dictate access to traditional print media, and that decide whose life stories deserve to be told, online diaries can be read as assertions of identity, and arguments for the importance of an individual’s life (McNeill, 2003, p. 26).

But finding those sources are not that easy. Traditional books are described and reviewed in order to help the librarian evaluate the object before acquiring it. Such systems are rare for other media formats. In regard to self-published books, Dilevko & Dali (2006) states:

In public and academic libraries, there has been, for the most part, an awkward silence about how to deal with books from self-publishers, mainly because of the lack of reviews of self-published books in mainstream reviewing outlets (p. 211).
Furthermore, Glantz (2013) describes how review journals actively dismiss self-published books (p. 20-21). Gisonny & Freedman (2006) states that fanzines, another equivalent to blogs, largely lack review sources as well (p. 27). It seems, based on the search for literature to this thesis, that it has never occurred that blogs can or should be reviewed in the same manner as other formats.

1.4.7. Other library systems

A library consists not only of the catalogue, and other systems and processor are a vital part of the operation. Such systems can be acquisitions and the policies surrounding it, or the bibliographic work that constitutes the information stored in the records.

Beisler & Kurt (2012) points out, in regard to e-books, that they did not fit within the existing workflows of the library (p. 96). They describe the process of building a new acquisition workflow from scratch, but that may not be necessary or feasible for every library. As a main problem for troubles with set procedures for managing e-books, they suggest the plethora of formats, platforms, and licenses (p. 96). This obviously holds true the more different formats one have to consider. However, by not regarding all formats as the same, the quality of the work with the less important formats is suffering. For the patron, however, this may not be important as long as they find what they want where they expect it.

One can solve the problem by creating new processes and policies, but Belanger (2007) writes,

[p]erhaps, as a result of the development of policies on an ad hoc basis, many of the libraries surveyed for this study catalogue some, but not all, of the e-books to which they subscribe; most importantly, however, it is often not clear which collections are catalogued (p. 205, original emphasis).

With bibliographic records in mind, cumbersome problems and ad hoc policies may cause the libraries to accept lower quality of records. Manhoff (2006) asks if this is due to the immateriality of the materials or if Google has switched sophisticated access to easy access, and urges librarians to be more careful when considering metadata standards (p. 317). And the differences between formats in this regard might not even be that big. In addressing that MARC or AACR2 standards would not work with Internet resources, Jul (1998) writes “It’s a point of view that could be applied equally to materials in other media, so the charge is not new” (p. 11). In addressing the difference causing the libraries to turn to special systems, lower qualities, or no actions at all, Plutchak (2007) writes, “there comes a point when the attempt to use outmoded categories actually holds us back from thinking creatively about the opportunities before us” (p. 82). Petersen (2014) even argues that the collection itself is outdated (p. 12).

1.4.8. Librarians and attitudes

This study will examine the attitudes and positions of librarians, and in order to put it into context, some insight into similar studies is needed.

Palmer, Dill & Christie (2009) researched the attitudes toward and activities related to
open access among academic librarians. In the three parts of the survey, the respondents first considered statements about open access, in the second they reported frequency of activities related to open access, and in the third they answered demographical questions (p. 318-319). Although positive attitude correlated with a higher frequency of open access-related activities, at the same time did the opinion that libraries should engage in such activities not necessarily spark activities (p. 320). Both the scope and the methodology are parallel with those of this thesis, and Palmer et al. serves as practical inspiration and a preview of what may be found within the limits of this study.

Partridge, Lee & Munro (2010) surveyed Australian librarians about the anticipated skills and qualities that are needed of a Librarian 2.0 (i.e. a librarian proficient in Library 2.0 and Web 2.0\(^3\) environments). By using focus groups, 81 librarians participated in the study (p. 320). The discussions revolved questions about the 2.0 aspect of librarianship, and desired skills for the professionals, but also touched whether it was a passing trend and if these skills were indeed unique for the new librarianship or qualities needed before as well (p. 322). The picture painted by the respondents is a librarian with a wide area of skills: technically versed, engaged in education of both others and herself, practitioner based on evidence, a good communicator, team-player, with user focus, master of project management, and also inspirational, enthusiastic, creative, flexible, resilient, open-minded, proactive and fearless doer, with only excellence in mind (p. 325-329). In relation to this thesis, the outlining of the ideal future librarian is, the author presumes, good news. Blogs fit well into the Library 2.0 and the skills desired would be a good basis for any inclusion of non-traditional media formats. For the public library as a larger entity, however, this brings questions: Is it even possible to fit all these traits into one person? And would a library with only Librarian 2.0s be functioning? Maybe the Librarian 2.0 would be too keen to “just do it” (although evidence based) and thus neglect other issues in other parts of the process.

Hammond (2010) investigated blogging as an activity that might be conducted by librarians. By surveying 498 public librarians in United Kingdom, she discerned the main obstacles for blogging in a library environment, and found these factors: technological barriers; organisational barriers; staff apathy; lack of relevance for the library; lack of time, and; other communication channels deemed more appropriate (p. 32). Interestingly enough, the problems presented were remarkably often induced by other people or departments in decisions or attitudes (p. 32). Respondents referred to the IT departments as “gatekeepers” hindering the engagement in Library 2.0 (p. 32). This angle on the blogging phenomenon provides insight into factors that may not be outspoken, but still could affect the perception of blogs as a resource as well.

In order to precede the, to that date, young e-book market of Iran, Ghaebi & Fahimifar (2011) surveyed which evaluation criteria was deemed important by academic information professionals. They studied those criteria both from the perspective of the academic, and from that of information professionals (p. 782). “[H]igh storage capacity and easy portability, multimedia capability, search ability, accessibility, hyperlink references” and “not occupying much space, ease of selection, and simultaneous circulation” were deemed most important (p. 790). The author was unable to verify whether this study’s results were

---

3 The term Web 2.0 is used by the authors of the literature and kept throughout the study, although the term has implications.
biased due to the political pressure on the Iranian researchers (Ackerfors, 2016, p. 52), but nonetheless does it serve as a template of how one could conduct a study about selection of other non-traditional media in a library environment.

Terrill (2014) studied the attitudes of librarians towards different channels for professional development, among those six sources selected were blogs one. They were evaluated in how they fulfilled professional needs, reliability, and usefulness for finding certain information (p. 181). Blogs were deemed useful in fulfilling information needs, and in reliability (although slightly), by a majority of the respondents, and ranked highest in information about trends (p. 196). Terrill’s perspective is of course different than that of a librarian working with selection and collection development, but in probing the attitudes toward blogs (and other channels) this view brings valuable insights. If the librarians use, or can consider using, blogs as a means for educating themselves, the media may also be worthy of incorporating in their library collections. Why else use them?

1.4.9. Missions

The pronounced missions of the library may be perceived as the ultimate attitude. If not a clear goal, then it may not be deemed important. Aabø (2005) states that the public libraries define their roles from the Library Act (p. 206), when discerning what role the library should take in this new information environment. As for this study, however, the goals here will be discussed in terms of relation to the patron and diversity.

Firstly, beginning with the user perspective, Lee (2000) recognises that ad hoc systems, discussed earlier, create a gap between different materials and this burdens the user and makes parts of the collection inaccessible (p. 1109). Furthermore, she writes that “when users are a central concern, their perspective can be directly incorporated” (p. 1111), and that a discrepancy between concepts of the collection may be unveiled; the collection developer sees the collection in terms of control, while the patron sees it in terms of access.

But if access were the sole mission of the library, a patron-driven acquisitions model would have made the selection of appropriate materials easy (Becker, 2011, p. 181). Everything the patron needed would be acquisitioned “just-in-time” (Burnette, 2008, p. 22). But, as Oddy (1996) points out, demand, in this context, is a consequence of market dominance and “may be undermining the long-term intellectual health of the community” (p. 22). Instead, the patrons might want something else, but what?

Oddy (1996) writes “[i]f people get what they want from the library, they come back for more and the collection is fully exploited” (p. 154). Nousiainen-Hiiri & Laine (2011) discusses this in regard to digital material and the patrons of Turku City Library. When asked,

the patrons appreciated the library’s active role in introducing new technology and perceived the library as a place where they can learn about new technology and new type of material easily and safely. […] In spite of the positive feedback, patrons were, however, disappointed with the type of digital material offered. Patrons would like the libraries to keep a diverse digital collection alongside the collection of printed material (p. 20).
Furthermore, the patrons responded that the e-materials explicitly offered by the library were something they wanted to use (p. 20). Not only do the patrons need the help from librarians, they actually and expressly want it.

But patrons may not always know what they want, or be able to use the material provided fully without help from a professional. One important difference to recognise is that information is not the same thing as knowledge, and information does not automatically lead to knowledge (Oddy, 1996, p. 21; Petersen, 2014, p. 13). The patrons need libraries and librarians to match them with information (Pritchard, 2008, p. 220); they want help in discerning good and valid sources (Cornish, 1997, p. 171), and; they need help contextualising the materials provided (Carlsson, 2011, p. 11). By that measure, libraries and their catalogues are intended for all those occasions where patrons not will be able to recognise if the found item is the right one (Oddy, 1996, p. 30). If blogs were to be included in the library catalogue, this would seemingly be of great benefit for the patrons. With Lee (2000): “Are users willing to sort through the information universe by themselves” (p. 111)?

Secondly, the alternative media of our technology intense world have a democratising effect on culture, or the public space (Deodato, 2014, p. 734). Sorapure (2003) call blogs from marginalised groups “evidence of this medium’s democratic potential” (p. 2). By addressing this one have progressed far in order to scrutinise the value of blogs in the library catalogue.

LaRue (2014) compare the public library with a family dinner, rather than a warehouse for books, but still many are left uninvited: “Yet they may be among the most vital new voices we have” (p 177). Deodato (2014) states that “[l]ibraries, therefore, have an ethical responsibility to make these biases transparent and create spaces for alternative perspectives” (p. 734). Dilevko & Dali (2006) concludes in regard of self-published books, and as much in favour of alternative publishing in general:

In blunter terms, collection development librarians in public and academic libraries should make a conscious effort not to exclude self-published titles from their field of vision because the stigma traditionally associated with self-publishing is quickly disappearing (p. 233).

These self-published titles must here be understood as including blogs as well.

1.4.10. The public library

Lastly, some description of the future of the public library will complete the picture of where this thesis positions itself in relation to the field of study.

Chowdhury, Poulter & McMenemy (2006) outlines the Public Library 2.0 and discusses how the public library can have a bigger impact on the creation, gathering and dissemination of local knowledge within its community. They start in the five statements of Ranaganathan (as cited by Chowdhury et al., 2006):
(1) Community knowledge is for use.
(2) Every user should have access to his or her community knowledge.
(3) All community knowledge should be made available for its users.
(4) Save the time of the user in creating and finding community knowledge.
(5) Community knowledge grows continually (p. 456).

From those, they apply the present situation and new technology onto the public library, and derive from it a model for the future. They recognise a shift in the view of the patron, from a recipient to a role as both consumer and producer (p. 457). In this, the public library should bridge the gap between people in the community caused (or at least not helped) by the Internet (p. 458). Their study parallels a part of this thesis, in how the library relates to its community. By following their model, libraries would be able, and even encouraged, to embrace the blog as a bearer of local knowledge.

This makes sense, as Pritchard (2008), with academic perspective, writes:

[The library] have great familiarity with our users, specifically, the advantage of being close to them physically and organizationally in academia, and we have institutional memory, and most important, credibility (p. 222).

Furthermore, UNESCO (2006) underlines the need for local content as opposed to imported content, and Uzuegbu & McAlbert (2012) writes:

A library with content of local relevance will encourage communities to make use of the library services, especially if they are empowered to participate in development of the content (para. 8).

This favours an inclusive stance to blogs, providing relevancy to the library in the community and society.

Norman (2012) tries to predict the future of the public library from the perspective of a library professional — a realist — rather than a futurist (p. 342). The realist view comes with a set of questions:

Why do we do this?
How many persons are we serving through this?
What do our users want us to do?
How much will it cost (staff, consumables, space, technology)?
And most importantly, what will we stop doing so we can pursue something new?
(p. 342)

From them, Norman presents some areas of attention, where access to digital content and bridging the digital divide are most relevant for this study. The mission may not be to provide e-books, especially not under the economic circumstances of today, but rather to provide skills and technology, and to making sure content is available (p. 345). Libraries need to discern how the combination of access to digital and physical resources will be (p. 346). But the future of the public library depends on something else. “If our community engagement indicates that this is what the community wants, then that is where we should be headed”, Norman concludes (p. 348).
In an article, Petersen (2014) discusses the public library’s collection in the digital environment. These new conditions match public libraries against commercial giants like Netflix and Spotify and there is a real risk that patrons, or citizens, bypass the library when there is no need to visit the library (p. 12). In this, the collection as we know it is outdated, and the modern collection is a collection of connections (p. 13; p. 12). Petersen further this discussion by relate it to enlightenment:

Is a historical growth in the volume and access to information accompanied by a corresponding development in the degree of enlightenment and education? Are all citizens as enlightened, well-educated and culturally active as one might wish (p. 13)?

It is tempting to interpret the questions as rhetoric, but Petersen moves the focus from the development of the collection, to the development of an educated community. How can the public library encourage enlightenment for all (p. 13)? This view of the modern public library provides two aspects to this study:

Firstly, the shift in focus would clarify the mission of the library, that is, to participate in general enlightenment of the citizens. “[A]n abundance of media does not in itself further enlightenment”, Petersen writes (p. 13). Instead, the education would come from the library taking bigger part in the citizens’ needs (p. 13).

Secondly, in Petersen’s view, the collection is in itself redundant. This would disqualify any attempt of including blogs into the public libraries’ catalogues, since the task rather would be to connect the citizen with the sources. On the contrary, the author of this study assumes that the collection would be the basis of how to meet the citizens’ needs.

Michnik (2014) asked Swedish library directors about the threats they see against the public libraries. Through a web questionnaire, she discovered seven kinds of threats:

1. the economy;
2. social change;
3. the external view of the public library;
4. a reduction in the use of the public library;
5. the (library) policy;
6. the public library; and
7. its activities [sic!] and the public library staff and its competence (p. 430, the 6th point should likely be “the public library and its activities”).

These threats are elaborated further by Michnik, but in all, they are a basis for understanding the situation in the public libraries. Resources such as economy and personnel (and its skills) have a huge impact on the public libraries, and although left out of this thesis, will be needed in order to commit to any change. The other threats affect this to different extent, as well.

The libraries reside in a globalised world. Modern communications have challenged them: “We quickly discover that libraries do things in other ways, and have different traditions and perspectives” (Oddy, 1997, para. 12). This may be perceived as a larger and more open world, but, as Giddens (1994) writes: “Globalization implies the idea of a world community, but does not produce it” (p. 81). In order to adapt to the changing
conditions are many libraries involved in a form of collaboration; be it large in a regional consortium, small within the municipality, or for in other ways sharing resources. Oddy (1997) writes:

The days are long past when each library created its own catalogue records for its own stock, following practices and traditions which were perceived as best meeting the requirements of its own users (para. 13).

Thus, the power and responsibility is “increasingly distanced” from the practitioners, in this case the libraries and librarians working with their collections (Oddy, 1997, para. 13). However, consortia with many disparate missions may have problems with particular tasks and even if it did not, the other benefits of collaborations, such as reduced costs, may, in which case, overweight any problems they causes for the inclusion of blogs in library catalogues (Burnette, 2008, p. 23).
2. Theoretical perspectives

This thesis will revolve around two theories, both elaborated further below. The first is a postmodern library where the systems within it are challenged in order to recreate them in a way that are not based on one singular media format. The second theory is a combination of different views of the library work and will help underlining how different missions in the library are perceived. Those views are corners of a triangle which the librarians may position themselves within.

2.1. A postmodern library

Postmodernism is mainly a “set of theories and constructs […] used to describe contemporary tendencies in visual art, architecture, and literature” (Propas & Reich, 1995, p. 44), and focuses on concepts such as difference and hyperreality in order to challenge, among other things, “epistemic certainty, and the univocity of meaning” (Aylesworth, 2015, para. 1). While focusing on language and the dissolution of set truths and structures, postmodernism have a relevancy outside art and literature, and both Propas & Reich (1995) and Holden (2010) connect this with library practice, as will the author of this thesis.

Postmodernist philosophy meets critique the author of this study largely agrees upon (Buschman & Brosio, 2006). One key argument is the economics of information. While the web undermines the economics for newspapers, Buschman & Brosio argues that

What librarianship does to try and diversify the viewpoints and voices on its shelves and on its screens (a worthy postmodern insight and goal) is critically affected by the global economics of the media and what gets produced to choose from among in the first place (2006, p. 413).

A possible answer to this lies within postmodern acquisition. Indeed, for the purpose of collection development and cataloguing in the Internet era, postmodernist merits serve the function of highlighting inclusion and pluralism.

Blogging, today, is an activity open for, more or less, everyone. The platforms are easy to use and accessible and the skills needed are relatively basic (O’Sullivan, 2005, p. 65). McNeill (2003) states that the form, the online diary, makes available publishing outside that of commercial, aesthetic, or political interests; aspects that weigh heavily on traditional print media. Otherwise untold life-stories can be told (p. 26). Lifting the perspective from diaries, this statement holds true regardless of topic of the blog. The inclusion of these alternative sources may be crucial to a diverse collection.

However important, this is just a part of the postmodern angle on libraries. The theories are, as Propas & Reich (1995) stated, mainly a tool to “describe contemporary tendencies in visual art, architecture, and literature” (p. 44). Why does contemporary art differ from that from twenty years ago? Obviously, art is not the only area affected by the winds of change (p. 44).

Smiraglia (2009) clarifies the difference between the modern and the postmodern catalogue:
[W]e can see the modern catalog as an inventory of documents, fit together into a unified, superimposed order. Now the modern catalog as we know it is a marvelous invention, governed by strictly adhered-to principles for the description of documents and the collocation and separation of headings (p. 556).

As for acquisitions, the identified period of change in society wrought on by the computer paradigm does influence libraries, even the very nature of libraries (p. 44). Suddenly, the standards, processes, workflows, and modes of the library are challenged and put to test. These traditions, with the words of Giddens (1994): “have to explain themselves, to become open to interrogation or discourse” (p. 5). Holden (2010) describes it further by pointing to the acquisition process in relation to the avalanche of Internet resources: “one should not anchor one’s conception of acquisitions work in a time before the Internet existed” (p. 7). From this, Holden argues in favour of basing the acquisitions on a postmodern foundation. The reinvented librarian must “actively incorporate new kinds of formats, unfamiliar objects, and challenging service models into their everyday work” (p. 110). Books must be treated as one media among many (p. 7), and new processes need to be invented to mirror this transition in focus (p. 108).

Although, more present in the second theoretical perspective, Benjamin (1998) writes “we must rethink the notions of literary forms or genres if we are to find forms appropriate to the literary energy of our time” (p. 89). That is, in a library context, to recognise what medias or forms are important or appropriate for our present time. Every inclusion or exclusion of formats should be a conscious choice (Manhoff, 2006, p. 322-323).

In relation to this, the author will test this format, the blog, against the suggestion put to words by Bodi & Maier-O’Shea (2005) in their paper about information literacy, that one should be “developing a collection, regardless of format, that meets curricular needs” (p. 145, author’s emphasis). Curricular needs, in the context of public libraries, are to be understood in a broader sense, as motivation behind the collection in the first place.

But the postmodern age is complex and potentially appalling. “Change on the scale that libraries face is threatening”, Propas & Reich (1995) concludes (p. 47). Are the librarians willing to proactively and radically change their practice while under the stress of their whole profession becoming a question of relevancy? An exclusively pragmatic approach would leave the librarians exposed to “severe criticism, even ridicule, and prone to acquiring and preserving for posterity a poorer and less reliable record” (p. 182), Cook & Schwartz (2002) writes of archivists, but the same thing could be applied to the librarian profession.

Racevskis (as cited by Propas & Reich, 1995) describes this psychological state:
While for some observers, the current juncture forebodes impending chaos and security is to be sought in a retreat to the psychic comforts offered by basic values and traditional disciplines, for others, the premise of chaos is itself a hopeful prospect and offers a welcome contrast to the bad faith and delusions fostered by traditional metaphysical thinking (p. 47).

The question of including blogs in the library catalogue, based on a postmodern view, are not just a matter of changing one kind of actions to another.

2.2. Quality filter, space maker, or trusting the patrons

[...] it is essential to define the mission of the library, [and] if we do it well, and I do not think we always do, then we gain significant shared understanding with our own stakeholders as to what we do and thus how we are prioritizing our resources (Pritchard, 2008, p. 223).

Along with the theories about postmodern acquisition, this study needs to relate to three different views on what the mission of libraries and librarians consists of (see Fig. 2.1. for an illustration of the relation between them). Are they information filters serving the patrons, are they creating spaces instead of maintaining a cultural hegemony with limited room for works outside the mainstream, or are they solely a means to fulfil the patrons’ needs? The truth may be part of either, or somewhere in between, but the view clearly affects how one may look upon blogs as a part of the library catalogue.

Ortega y Gasset (1961) describes the history of the librarian, from the clandestine keepers of books of the Middle ages (p. 140), through the cataloguers of plenty during the 1800’s before trying to answer what mission the librarian has (p. 142). The contemporary world of Ortega y Gasset — the end of the modernity, as one might have it — is one of information overload, and in such times, the librarian needs to act as “the doctor or the hygienist of reading” (p. 154). This statement ends up on the elitist part of the scale, but he points out that:

**Fig. 2.1. Triangle of mission perspectives.**
A librarian may position herself freely somewhere within the triangle, for example between two corners or in the middle, according to her view of the library’s mission.
Today people read too much. The condition of receiving without much effort, or even without any effort, the innumerable ideas contained in books and periodicals has accustomed the common man [sic!] to do no thinking on his own account; and he does not think over what he has read, the only method of making it truly his own (p. 154).

What he would say about the Internet and blogs, we will never know, but one can imagine from his description of publishing: “[Books] are being produced every day in torrential abundance. Many of them are useless and stupid” and continues to deem them nothing more than dead weight (p. 153). This does not stop him from suggesting a lack of books on certain topics and of satisfying quality. He envisions a future with librarians as regulators, and thereby held accountable, of what is worthy of publishing (p. 153). Most would probably be content with librarians discerning what fits in the collections. Simpson & Banach (1997), for example, states that “the library is, in effect, providing a quality filter for the Internet” (p. 246). Lee (2000) argues that such filters are appreciated for making “available high quality and useful items” (p. 1110). But Ortega y Gasset want harsher means to solve the information overload.

In the second corner of the triangle, Deodato (2014), with the help of Walter Benjamin, is found. His paper investigates the participatory culture of web 2.0 from a library perspective, and although interesting in its entirety, his description of the library is what will balance Ortega y Gasset and patron-driven acquisition for the purpose of this study. Deodato describes a cultural hegemony beyond the struggle between producers and consumers. The cultural hegemony in Benjamin’s terms is dependent on the technology that shapes social relations of cultural production. The new technologies — of 1934, mind you, the Internet was still way down the path — blur the lines between the roles in the production, readers become writers, and thus, the context of the production of a work deserves scrutiny (p. 736). Deodato states:

In highlighting the democratizing effect of new media technologies on cultural production, Benjamin anticipated the cultural transformation commonly associated with Web 2.0 (p. 737).

The libraries should be understood as institutions of cultural hegemonies, Deodato argues, and points to, among other things, the perception of librarians as neutral mediators, and to the tendency of libraries (and schools, museums, etc.) to reinforce a dominant worldview (p. 737). “Libraries, therefore, do not just organize knowledge, they construct it” (Deodato, 2010, p. 82). This may not be a problem, unless one wants to, and herein lies the relation to participatory culture for Deodato, and to blogs for the purpose of this study. Deodato states that libraries have an ethical responsibility to counteract the biases that favours the mainstream, and create spaces for alternative perspectives (p. 734). These other sources may be the patrons (p. 740). Furthermore, these may even be bloggers.

Indeed, this aligns well with the merits and shifts of the postmodern described earlier. Emerging with the rise of e-books, patron-driven acquisition (PDA), sometimes called demand-driven acquisition, forms the third corner in this comparison. PDA of e-books in its original form allows the library to load records of materials it does not own into its catalogue, but is bought or licensed when the patron needs it (Paulson, 2011, p. 66).
Anderson (2006) suggests a gradual shift from permanent (and wasteful) “just-in-case” collections to efficient “just-in-time” models were the users’ needs are the main force behind acquisition (p. 50, 52). Becker writes: “[Patron-driven acquisition] is helping bridge the gaps between e-book needs, usage, and availability from the library” (p. 182).

Although focused almost entirely on e-books and rich in technical solutions, the purpose of PDA for this study is mainly philosophical and in contrast with both Ortega y Gasset (1961) and Deodato (2010). With PDA, the librarian is neither a quality filter, nor an advocate for the marginalised. Instead, the librarian gives away or shares her power to the patrons:

Sharing selection duties with library patrons in a significant way requires at least some degree of acceptance that patrons can successfully judge what they need and that the subject expertise of librarians is not always required to make good selection decisions (Dahl, 2012, p. 123).

The more of this responsibility that is given to the patrons, the more time can be reallocated to other prioritised task (Dahl, 2012, p. 122). In the most radical form, all acquisition, regardless of content and media, can be solely based on demand, although a division between patron-driven acquisition and librarian selection is more realistic. But then again, as put by Norman (2012): “If our community engagement indicates that this is what the community wants, then that is where we should be headed” (p. 348). The question of blogs in the catalogue, may sum up to a question of user demand.

With Ortega y Gasset in one corner of the triangle, Deodato in the second, and patron-driven acquisition in the third, the attitudes of librarians toward not only the information and its carriers, but toward their own roles as mediators, will be studied. We will see that, regardless of stance, however, one can argue for the inclusion of blogs into the library catalogues.
3. Methodology

This chapter will describe the two interrelating methods of data collection used, as well as provide analytic basis and discuss the ethical considerations within the work with the study.

3.1. Mixed method

Although this study relies on quantitative data collected from a web survey, four additional qualitative interviews and dependence on literature makes it a mixed method study.

A survey was chosen in order to gain a broad insight into the public librarians perception of the blog as a media format, the mission of the library, and the future of blogs in the catalogue. However, to get a background of the subject and ensuring that the study in general and the survey particularly were relevant within the public libraries, two unstructured pilot interviews were conducted. The interviews furthermore contributed with another dimension in the discussion of the data. In much the same manner, literature about adjacent subjects was studied as a basis for problems that may relate to blogs as well.

Lastly, in two areas, lack of literature was overbridged by semi-structured interviews conducted with professionals in the respective area: the collaboration of LIBRIS and electronic legislation deposit.

3.2. Interviews

Two kinds of interviews were conducted. Early in the process, during February and March 2016, two pilot interviews were done to form a basis of the subject in relation to the public library. By the end of April 2016, two follow-up interviews gave specific answers to questions raised in relation to the survey.

The format of the interviews are presented in Table 3.1. below.

Consent to use the names of the respondent were provided, and are included here in order to establish them as experts in their fields.

Table 3.1. Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Communication method</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Cserhalmi</td>
<td>Head of media department, Public Library of Norrköping</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anja Leiding</td>
<td>Development manager for online services, Götabiblioteken</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-up interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Berggren</td>
<td>Coordinator, LIBRIS</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kungliga biblioteket</td>
<td>Electronic legal deposit department</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.1. Pilot interviews

To establish the subject within the actual milieu and explore the complexities (Oppenheim, 2005, p. 178), two pilot interviews were conducted in February and March, 2016. The interviews were unstructured and based on the author’s initial thoughts of the subject. The aim was to gain concrete knowledge about how the public libraries relate of different aspects of the subject. The insights gained through the pilot interviews were vital in problematising the research subject and constructing the survey in a thorough and, for the public libraries, relevant way.

The author met professionals working with different parts of the public library. The choice fell upon Anja Leiding (personal communication, February 23, 2016), Development manager for online services at Götabiblioteken, and Elisabeth Cserhalmi (personal communication, March 21, 2016), Head of media department at the Public Library of Norrköping. In deciding interviewees, the author relied heavily on contacts gained through the Public Library of Linköping to find professionals and experts in relevant areas. The public libraries of Linköping and Norrköping are both part of the shared catalogue in the Götabiblioteken collaboration (Regionbibliotek Östergötland, n.d.).

The interviewees were first approached via e-mail with a presentation of the author, the subject of the thesis, why they were contacted, and a question if they were able to participate in an interview and how the interview would be used in the study. After they agreed, they were sent a deeper presentation of the areas the interview would revolve around.

The meetings took place at the Public Library of Linköping, and lasted about one hour. They began with a presentation of the subject and the dialogues freely developed from the thoughts of the interviewee. To make the interviewees comfortable, written notes were the only recordings during the discussions (Bryman, 2008, p. 452). Lastly, the interviewees were asked if they wanted to see how the interviews were used, thus in the last stages of the study, the interviewees had the opportunity to read, expand, comment, and correct their statements. Correct descriptions to secure the relevancy were more important than an actual reconstruction of the interviews, thus will the respondents’ late additions not compromise the study.

3.2.2. Follow-up interviews

In April, 2016, shortly after the survey data collection, in direct response to questions posed by survey respondents, two additional interviews were conducted. The main purpose of them was to overbridge the gaps in literature and go directly to the source. They were approached in the same manner as the interviews described in 3.2.1..

As an answer to respondents referring to LIBRIS as a factor to consider in the inclusion, an interview with Anna Berggren (personal communication, April 26, 2016), coordinator at LIBRIS, was conducted through telephone. It lasted for about 30 minutes and recorded with the author taking notes. This interview provided insight into how LIBRIS can impact the inclusion of blogs in the library catalogue. LIBRIS is a search service, part of Kungliga Biblioteket, for titles held by Swedish libraries (LIBRIS, n.d.). It is also the collective of libraries, regardless of type, which are connected to the search service. By being connected, the libraries collaborate in providing metadata and updated holdings so
that the search service stays current (Berggren, personal communication, April 26, 2016). Anna Berggren contributed with the national perspective and her insights are answers to many of the questions and speculations raised in this study.

Furthermore, for insight into Sweden’s electronic legal deposit system, an interview with Kungliga biblioteket’s department for such operations was conducted by e-mail. Their answers were received together and when referred to, they will be described as personal communication with Kungliga biblioteket. This interview provided insight into the progression of including blogs within the electronic legal deposit system, as an answer to Berggren’s (personal communication, April 26, 2016) suggestion that such an inclusion would enhance the possibilities for including blogs in LIBRIS.

3.2.3. Informal discussions

Additionally, informal discussions with professionals at Public Library of Linköping and through e-mail contacts when the subject first was conceived, gave the problem more dimensions. Although no evidential significance can be drawn from these, being outside the formal methods of the study, they inevitable contributed with insights and leads to things for the author to investigate.

3.3. Survey

In order to gather data about the librarians’ attitudes, a web-based survey was conducted (Oppenheim, 2005, p. 174-178). The survey (see Appendix 1 and Appendix 2) was open for all librarians working at a public library in Sweden.

3.3.1. Dissemination and participation

Respondents were self-selected and could withdraw their participation at any time and without affecting the study. Survey invitations were disseminated through e-mail directly to all Swedish public libraries’ official, non-personal, e-mail addresses; 961 in total.

Regarding the public libraries, Kungliga biblioteket (2016) reported that there are 1,145 staffed public libraries (p. 16), with 2,881 annual work units for librarians (p. 21). The average number of persons per annual work unit is 0.86 due to part-time working (p. 21). Maximum number of respondents could thus be estimated to about 3,350.

The e-mail recipients were encouraged to share the URL to the survey with colleagues, directly or through their Intranets, in order to reach as many librarians as possible. The online survey form was open from April 11 to April 20, 2016, and received 239 responses.

The respondents remained anonymous throughout their participation, and by submitting their answers; respondents provided their consent and understanding of the usage and integrity of the data. In addition, it was not possible to participate without marking “I have read, understood, and accept how my answers will be treated” (see Appendix 2, section 9.2.1.).
3.3.2. Target group

As for the target group, public librarians, from the perspective of this study, are treated as a uniform group (although, the author is certain that there are significant individual differences). They are assumed to have knowledge about cataloguing and selection processes, they have adequate insight into information technology, and they possess, of own merit or through their institutions, the tools needed to receive, view, and respond to the survey. The only demographical differences monitored, as described below, are age, number of years in profession, and where their libraries are residing. This approach limits the possibility to discern if certain groups of the public librarians have different attitudes, but instead focus on the entire profession in order to provide a first insight into the subject.

3.3.3. Survey construction process

The author constructed survey drafts from the knowledge gained through the literature and the pilot interviews. In line with Oppenheim (2005, p. 47), some pilot work was conducted.

Before arriving at the final survey, the author sent drafts to librarians among the targeted group in order to discern whether the questions were comprehensible, relevant and valid in relation to the scope of the study from the perspective of Swedish public librarians, and whether some important aspect of the profession had been forgotten due to the author’s lack of insight (as suggested by Bryman, 2008, p. 218). With their additions and suggestions, improvements to the survey were made before dissemination. However, the comments on the first draft indicate that the author did not miss his target in the initial construction phase, much thanks to the pilot interviews.

Google form was chosen for collecting the data for two main reasons apart from fulfilling the needs of functionality. Firstly, in order to create a survey true to the study’s intention, the author chose a tool that he is familiar with. Secondly, due to economical limits, paid solutions were no option.

As discussed in ethical considerations (see 3.5.) free-text answers were initially a part of the survey, but later omitted due to requirements of the Swedish Personuppgiftslag 1998:204 (trans. Personal Data Act 1998:204).

3.3.4. Rating scale questions and internal reliability

For measuring attitudes, the main method chosen was Likert scale, in part due to its less laborious execution in comparison with other rating scale methods and its reliability (Oppenheim, 2005, p. 195; p. 200).

These scales were rated from 1-4 with the negative suggestion, mainly “Do not agree”, at 1, and the positive suggestion, mainly “Totally agree”, at 4. An even scale was chosen in order to motivate the respondent to form an opinion and not be neutral (Wildemuth, 2009, p. 280). The subject of the thesis might not be something the librarians have thought of earlier, and therefore being neutral by default. Wildemuth (2009) states that the most common approach in avoiding neutral answers is by using a 4-point scale (p. 279).

2 and 3 on the scale were not labelled, since the intention was to get the respondent to place their answers in an interval rather than an ordinal scale (Wildemuth, 2009, p.
The interval is based on the respondent’s own interpretation and is between her perceived maximum and minimum of agreeing (Bryman, 2008, p. 321-322). In this thesis, however, will they be translated to “somewhat” of the end labels in this thesis, for example: “Somewhat disagree” or “Somewhat agree”.

To calculate the internal reliability of the rating scale questions, Cronbach’s alpha was used. Bryman (2008) suggests that a figure of >0.80 is generally an acceptable level of internal reliability (p. 151). The reliability of the questions in this study reads 0.84.

### 3.3.5. Multiple choice and checkboxes questions

Questions about background mainly, but also those regarding, for example, the problems perceived in including blogs into the catalogue, were constructed as multiple choice questions and checkbox questions. A two-step combination (see Questions 32-33 and 34-35) was used in order to discern first all perceived instances and then to discern the gravest.

### 3.3.6. Survey structure

The survey was divided into three sections with a total of 49 questions (number of questions in each part in parenthesis) and in order to get consistent data, all questions were mandatory:

1. **You and your library** (13), consisting of background questions and questions about the library and the respondent’s perception of the library.

   Questions 1-3 and 5-6 are basic demographical questions. Although, the basis for this study is to investigate the librarians as a group, these questions were added in order to discern internal differences in areas deemed important for the subject.

   The answers to questions 4 and 7-10 will provide a picture of what the respondent’s library looks like, both its holdings and its organisation.

   Questions 11-13 will provide a picture of how changes are perceived and to what extent the respondent actually can influence the future. The postmodern perspective on acquisitions process and catalogue will need changes (Holden, 2010, p. 116).

2. **The blog and the library** (23), consisting of questions about how the respondent saw the library’s and the librarian’s mission, and about the respondent’s perception of the blog.

   Questions 14-21 asks the respondent to consider statements about the public library’s mission from their perspective. The statements all relate to the view of the library as exemplified within 2.2., and are derived from the literature about blogs and electronic medias in general.

   Questions 22 and 23 provide a picture of the respondent’s familiarity with the blog from the perspective of both reader and creator.

   Questions 24-30 moves the focus to the respondent’s view of the blog, its merits, and how it relates to the library. By comparing the answers to these questions, with the answers later questions, a view of how well the perceived mission of the public library and merits of the blog align with the inclusion of blogs.

   Question 31, together with question 10, provide a picture of how acute the inclusion of blogs into the catalogue might be.
### Table 3.2. Survey questions
M = Multiple choice question; C = Checkbox question; R = Rating scale question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>You and your library</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21-30 years old; 31-40; 41-50; 51-60; 61+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of years working in profession</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>&lt;5 years; 6-10; 11-20; 21-30; 31+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The library you work at resides in</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Blekinge län; Dalarnas län; Region Gotland; Region Gävleborg; Region Halland; Region Jämtland Härjedalen; Region Jönköpings län; Kalmar län; Region Kronoberg; Norrbottens län; Region Skåne; Stockholms län; Södermanlands län; Uppsala län; Värmlands län; Västerbottens län; Västernorrlands län; Västmanlands län; Västra Götalandsregionen; Region Örebro län; Region Östergötland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is your library organisation included in a consortium outside the borders of the municipality?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes; No; Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is your work mainly based at a main library or a branch library?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Main library; Branch library; Divided equally between main library and branch library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What is your main work task?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Acquisition; Cataloguing; Metadata; Programme and activities; Reference/Information/Support; Development work; Mixed; Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the library you mainly work at responsible for the library catalogue?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes; No; Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Which of these media formats are included in the library catalogue today?</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Blogs; E-books; E-journals; Fanzines, self-published ephemera; Audio books; Talking books; Online encyclopaedias; Self-published books; Video games; Tools, umbrellas or similar objects; Other websites; None of these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do your library have a pronounced policy for acquisitions?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes; No; Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do the library today collect blogs or websites in other ways than in the catalogue?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes; No; Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To which extent do you experience the library as open to changes?</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Not open to changes); 2; 3; 4 (Very open to changes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you feel that you can influence the goals to which your library is striving?</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2 (Not at all); 2; 3; 4 (Very much)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you feel that you can influence the methods and workflows your library uses?</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3 (Not at all); 2; 3; 4 (Very much)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The blog and the library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. The public library has the mission to collect a diversity of voices and perspectives.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The public library has the mission to collect material with local connection.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The public library has the mission to offer current and popular material for free.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The public library should strive towards including new, relevant media formats in the catalogue.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The public library has the task to distinguish quality material and to sift the information feed.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The public library has the task to show material that is otherwise hard to find.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Librarians should themselves take initiative to collect material that is relevant for the library’s patrons, regardless of medium.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The public library should strive towards being up-to-date.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perception of blogs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. I follow blogs, private or in my work.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I write, or have written, on a blog, private or in my work.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The blog as a medium/phenomenon is interesting.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The blog is a medium as every other.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. A blog can be of high quality.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Blogs show a diversity of perspectives.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I want to recommend blogs to the library’s patrons.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I search today actively for resources on the Internet that is</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant for the library’s patrons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Blogs can have a place in the library catalogue.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. If you today find a blog whose content would fit in the library</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Save it as a bookmark or equivalent;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catalogue, what do you do?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save it in a link list on the library’s website;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save it in another public system;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Share it within the organisation through intranet or e-mail;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Share it publicly through the library’s official social medias;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Share it publicly through your private social medias;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other; Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Which major obstacles do you see in including blogs in the library</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lack of coordination; Lack of bibliographic information;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catalogue today?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inconstant content; Lack of technical solutions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright; The library’s organisation or workflow;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of quality content; Lack of reviews; The catalogue’s present structure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internet resources disappear;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty finding relevant blogs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Which obstacle do you see as the biggest in including blogs in the</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lack of coordination; Lack of bibliographic information;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library catalogue today?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inconstant content; Lack of technical solutions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright; The library’s organisation or workflow;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of quality content; Lack of reviews; The catalogue’s present structure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internet resources disappear;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty finding relevant blogs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Which benefits do you see in including blogs in the library</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Show resources of high quality; Show resources with local connection;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catalogue?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Show a diversity of voices and perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Show that the library is up-to-date;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare the way for other new media formats in the future;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make available material that may otherwise be lost;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collect selected material in one place;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. What do you see as the biggest benefit in including blogs in the library catalogue?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Show resources of high quality; Show resources with local connection; Show a diversity of voices and perspectives; Show that the library is up-to-date; Prepare the way for other new media formats in the future; Make available material that may otherwise be lost; Collect selected material in one place; Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Which do you perceive as more likely? Whole blogs are all the posts written in a certain blog collected (as a book with chapters). Individual posts are each post on its own (as articles from a journal).</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>That whole blogs are included in the catalogue; That individual posts are included in the catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The future</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Blogs in the library catalogue would make my work harder.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Blogs in the library catalogue would deteriorate the quality of the catalogue as a whole.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Blogs in the library catalogue would help the patron to find relevant resources.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Blogs in the library catalogue would contribute to the library’s relevance in the community.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Blogs in the library catalogue would mean changes in the library’s workflow.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Blogs are a natural part of the future library catalogue.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. When do you think blogs will be found in Swedish public libraries’ catalogues?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Within 5 years; In 6-10 years; In 11 years or later; Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. My library organisation would want to include blogs in the catalogue.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. My library organisation would have problems including blogs in the catalogue.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I would recommend blogs to the library’s patrons.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1 (Do not agree); 2; 3; 4 (Totally agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions 32-35 are more concrete. They list a number of obstacles and benefits of blog inclusion in the library catalogue and ask the respondent to first choose any number of perceived obstacles/benefits and then choose one (1) that stands above the others in gravity. The lists are derived from the literature and the interviews and relate to the statements the respondent had considered earlier in the survey.

Question 36 relates directly to a frequently returning question about what the blog is, mentioned explicitly by Elisabeth Cserhalmi (personal communication, March 21, 2016) among others: Is the blog the whole website, or just a post?

3. The future (13), consisting firstly of questions regarding the consequences of including blogs into the library catalogue, and secondly, an imagined future where all the main obstacles were solved.

Questions 37-42 focus on how the respondent perceives the effect of blogs in the catalogue. The questions about the patrons are tied with the librarian’s mission, and the questions regarding workflow and quality relates to the postmodern view of the library.

Question 43 is above all a measurement of how far in the future the future might be.

For the questions 44-49, a possible future where all major obstacles identified through the literature and interviews, even resources, were solved:

There is an organisation that collects and ensures the quality of blogs. They provide the possibility to, for a reasonable sum, choose selected blogs that are interesting for your library, or all the blogs in their offer. Technical solutions are made and the blogs are described with a bibliographic standard that match the other resources in the library catalogue. The organisation overview so that the content in the blogs match the descriptions and contact the library with any changes within a selected blog, and ensures that the resource will be continuously available. The authors of the blogs have given their permission so that the libraries may include respective blog in the catalogue, and that the recourses will be continuously available even if they would chose to close their blogs.

With that in mind, the respondent were asked to consider similar statements as earlier in the survey, but without the weight of present day conditions.
3.3.7. Analysis method

The analysis of the survey data was performed using Google forms’ integrated visualisation of data, and Microsoft Excel.

Google forms present the data in diagrams according to the type of question (i.e. staple diagram for rating scale questions and checkboxes questions, and pie charts for multiple choice questions). These visualisations were deemed most accessible for the overview of the data.

However, for deeper analysing of the rating scale answers, Microsoft Excel was used. The software operations sufficed in calculating Cronbach’s alpha for internal reliability, and Mean (M) and Median (Med) for quantifying the answers and relating them to each other and the whole population. In order to discern differences between different groups of respondents, cross-tabulating was performed.

In visualising the results for the thesis, Adobe Illustrator and Adobe Indesign was used.

3.4. Research ethics

The main ethical consideration revolved around personal data and the Swedish Personuppgiftslag 1998:204 and that data collected through web surveys are considered structured. The survey in its initial form did not meet the requirements of the act in guaranteeing the integrity of the personal data potentially collected. This made it impossible to use free-text fields without compromising the respondents. Instead, alternative ways of providing deeper answers, mainly sending an e-mail to the author, were presented and encouraged in the survey. It is likely that this extra step in providing reflections adversely affected the study, due to the extra steps needed to participate more than in answering the direct questions in the survey.

Using Google forms, which is an open system, could potentially involve risks for the privacy and safety of participants, but since the possibilities to submit personal data in the survey was removed, no such concerns were needed. Nonetheless, the author described how the data would be used and collected consent from the survey respondents. In the survey, the terms about e-mailing responses directly to the author was described, and although explicitly stated that if e-mailing one might be quoted with name unless otherwise agreed, all names of respondents apart from those interviewed directly, was kept anonymous.

While disseminating the survey, the author made an effort to present both himself, with contact details to both him and the supervisor, and the study in a way that made clear the purpose of the contact made. The survey was sent one (1) time only, in order not to spam the recipients. Both the survey and the e-mail contacts were formulated in a polite way, properly thanking for their time and participation.
4. Empirical findings

This chapter is divided in the same way as the survey it describes. The first section present the data from the You and your library part, with background questions and questions about the librarians perceived influence over the libraries. The second section present The blog and the library part, with questions about the perceived mission of the library and the blog as a media format. The third section present The future and with questions focusing mainly on attitudes toward the inclusion of blogs in the library catalogue. Afterwards is a table showing Mean, Standard deviation, and Standard Error of the Mean for all the rating scale questions. Lastly, brief descriptions of the interview findings are found.

In cases where the background influences the answers, this will generally be presented in proximity with the question it affects.

4.1. You and your library

This section consists of data from the questions regarding the background of the respondent and the library she works at, for example: age, workplace, and which media formats can be found in the catalogue today.

4.1.1. Age and years in profession

Fig. 4.2. and 4.3. show the age and number of years working as a public librarian in order to provide a picture of the participants experience as librarians.

Firstly, with at least 3 years of education and the retirement around the age of 67 in mind, it is reasonable that the groups 21-30 and 61 and above are less represented than the others.

For the rating scales, high age and many years in profession have some correlation, but not as strong as one might anticipate. This makes the effect of years in profession less decisive than the effect of age, in comparison to the results of the whole population average.

When summarising the average value on each rating scale question for each age

![Fig. 4.2. Age](image)

![Fig. 4.3. Number of years in profession](image)
category, those 61 years or older stand out as generally higher, scoring almost 10 more than the average and just over 11 above the lowest scored category (41-50 years old). The difference in years in profession is, as elaborated earlier, lower, but the two longest timespans score just above 3 higher than the average, which is almost equal to the lowest scoring category (less than 5 years in profession). This is of course a blunt tool, not regarding the questions with reversed or ambivalent value, but it provides a general picture of the differences.

4.1.2. Main library or branch library

Fig. 4.4. shows whether the respondents work at a main library or branch library. Generally, if the librarian worked at a main library or a branch library had no significance over most of the result and where it had, this is presented.

4.1.3. Region of the library

Table 4.1. is a breakdown of number of respondents in different region. All regions, but one, provided at least two respondents. The four most represented regions, also the four most populated according to Statistiska centralbyråns (2016), were: Region Skåne: 41 (17.2 %); Västra Götalandsregionen: 40 (16.7 %); Stockholms län: 26 (10.9 %), and: Region Östergötland: 26 (10.9 %). Uppsala län provided none.

In order to discern whether the region itself had any affect on the results of the rating scale questions, the mean of the four largest regions were compared to the mean of the other regions together and with the population in whole. Generally, the difference were <0.3 in comparison with the population as a whole, and in comparison with the other regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blekinge län</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalarnas län</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Gotland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Gävleborg</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Halland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Jämtland Härjedalen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Jönköpings län</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalmar län</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Kronoberg</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrbottens län</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Skåne</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholms län</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Södermanlands län</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppsala län</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Värmlands län</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västerbottens län</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västernorrlands län</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västmanlands län</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Västra Götalandsregionen</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Örebro län</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Östergötland</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 4.4. Is your work mainly based at a main library or a branch library?](image-url)
4.1.4. Non-traditional medias in the catalogue

Fig. 4.5 shows which kind of non-traditional formats are present in the library catalogues today. The author anticipated a low rate of librarians reporting e-books in the catalogue, considering all the known and explored problems with such an inclusion (see 1.4.5.). Nonetheless, e-books are reported as present in the catalogue at 85.8 % of the respondents’ libraries.

In the case of the librarians working within Götabiblioteken, 19 out of 26 had e-books in their catalogue, despite all the libraries sharing catalogue (Regionbibliotek Östergötland, n.d.). Götabiblioteken, however, does not have one unified systems for e-books and other medias. Their main OPAC (https://www.gotabiblioteken.se/web/gotabiblioteken) displays their physical collection, and another system (http://ebok.gotabiblioteken.se/StartPage.aspx) displays the e-books.

10 respondents, in 8 different regions, reported that blogs could be found in their catalogues.

4.1.5. Summary

The first section provides a background of the respondents and their libraries. Main results are that the respondents are distributed over all age spans and years in profession, as well geographically over Sweden with the four largest regions presenting the most participants. 61.9 % are working at a main library.

The respondents reports a wide range of non-traditional medias in their catalogues, including blogs, although this is contested by observations.
4.2. The blog and the library

This section presents the data from the questions regarding the perceived missions of the library, the aspects of the blog, and the implications of including blogs in the library catalogue.

4.2.1. The missions of the library

Fig. 4.6.–4.9. display the perceived missions of the library.

A general trend in the answers to the statements about the library’s mission is that the average scores are high, most of them around 3.5 out of four. Collecting a diversity is ranked highest (M: 3.68), and collect local material and being up-to-date (see Appendix 3) tied second (M: 3.59). The below presented will be discussed further in this thesis.

---

**Fig. 4.6.** The public library has the mission to collect a diversity of voices and perspectives.
Mean: 3.68; Median: 4.

---

**Fig. 4.7.** The public library has the mission to collect material with local connection.
Mean: 3.59; Median: 4.

---

**Fig. 4.8.** The public library has the task to distinguish quality material and to sift the information feed.
Mean: 3.36; Median: 3.

---

**Fig. 4.9.** The public library has the task to show material that is otherwise hard to find.
Mean: 3.32; Median: 3.
As for age as a factor, those 61 years or older stand out somewhat in relation to the whole population on several results. Generally the respondents in the oldest category tend to answer with higher numbers on the questions about the library’s mission.

### 4.2.2. Perceptions of the blog

Fig. 4.10.-4.13. show the respondents perceptions of the blog as a format.

The respondents answered that a blog can be of high quality (M: 3.64) and that blogs show a diversity of perspectives (M: 3.18) to a high extent. Furthermore, they perceived the blog somewhat a medium as every other (M: 2.8), but were almost balanced between agreeing and not agreeing on wanting to recommend blogs to patrons (M: 2.49).

The librarians in Västra Götalandsregionen responded that they actively search for resources on the Internet to a greater extent (+0.4) than the average librarian.

The branch librarians answered higher on question 30, about blogs having a natural place in the library catalogue (+0.41) than the librarians working at a main library.

The respondents age 61 or older generally have a slightly more positive view of the blog.

---

**Fig. 4.10. A blog can be of high quality.**
Mean: 3.64; Median: 4.

**Fig. 4.11. The blog is a medium as every other.**
Mean: 2.8; Median: 3.

**Fig. 4.12. Blogs show a diversity of perspectives.**
Mean: 3.18; Median: 3.

**Fig. 4.13. I want to recommend blogs to the library’s patrons.**
Mean: 2.49; Median: 2.
Fig. 4.14. Which major obstacles do you see in including blogs in the library catalogue today?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination</td>
<td>91 (38.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bibliographic information</td>
<td>113 (47.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconstant content</td>
<td>160 (66.9 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of technical solutions</td>
<td>80 (33.5 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>103 (43.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library’s organisation or workflow</td>
<td>86 (36 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of quality content</td>
<td>75 (31.4 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The catalogue’s present structure</td>
<td>38 (15.9 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet resources disappear</td>
<td>93 (38.9 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty finding relevant blogs</td>
<td>64 (26.8 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>4 (1.7 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.15. Which obstacle do you see as the biggest in including blogs in the library catalogue today?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination</td>
<td>23 (9.6 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of bibliographic information</td>
<td>45 (18.8 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconstant content</td>
<td>17 (7.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of technical solutions</td>
<td>8 (3.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>17 (7.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library’s organisation or workflow</td>
<td>9 (3.8 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of quality content</td>
<td>19 (7.9 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The catalogue’s present structure</td>
<td>9 (3.8 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet resources disappear</td>
<td>35 (14.6 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty finding relevant blogs</td>
<td>15 (6.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9 (3.8 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3. Obstacles of the blog

Fig. 4.14 shows which obstacles of the blog the respondents deem important. Fig. 4.15 shows which obstacle the respondent deemed most important. The lists of obstacles are derived from observations and literature describing blogs and similar media formats. Inconstant content, Internet sources disappearing and lack of bibliographic information was frequently chosen as problems. Deemed most problematic were inconstant content, the library’s organisation or workflow, and Internet sources disappearing. The obstacles are a combination of problems inherent in the format, structural conditions of the library, and factors regarding the organisation of blogs. In average, 4.3 obstacles per participant were chosen.
4.2.4. Summary

The respondents rated all proposed missions high and showed a somewhat positive attitude towards the blog and its merits. Furthermore, they recognised that including blogs in the catalogue had implications were inconstant content and Internet sources disappearing were most frequent, the first being deemed the most important obstacle.

4.3. The future

This section presents the data from the questions about a possible inclusion of the blog in the library catalogue in the future.

4.3.1. Consequences of blogs in the catalogue

Fig. 4.16.-4.19. show how an inclusion of the blog into the catalogue would affect the present environment of the librarian.

**Fig. 4.16.** Blogs in the library catalogue would make my work harder.
Mean: 2.12; Median: 2.

**Fig. 4.17.** Blogs in the library catalogue would help the patron to find relevant resources.
Mean: 2.48; Median: 3.

**Fig. 4.18.** Blogs in the library catalogue would contribute to the library’s relevance in the community.
Mean: 2.41; Median: 2.

**Fig. 4.19.** Blogs in the library catalogue would mean changes in the library’s workflow.
Mean: 2.84; Median: 3.
The branch librarians perceived that blogs in the library catalogue would make their work harder to a lesser extent (-0.4), than those working in a main library.

The respondents age 61 or older generally have a slightly more positive view of blog inclusion in the library catalogue, and see the use for it to a somewhat greater extent than the librarians working at a main library.

4.3.2. The trouble-free future

Fig. 4.20.-4.23. relate to how the respondents perceive an inclusion of blogs in the library catalogue in a hypothetical future were most of the obstacles were solved. The respondents reported the libraries to be somewhat unwilling to include blogs into the library catalogue and change if needed.

Librarians in Stockholms län responded that blogs were a part of the future library catalogue to a lesser extent (-0.4) than the average librarian. Furthermore, they responded that the library would be willing to change its workflows in order to include blogs to a lesser extent than the average (-0.4).

**Fig. 4.20. I would recommend blogs to the library’s patrons.**
Mean: 2.69; Median: 3.

**Fig. 4.21. My library organisation would want to include blogs in the catalogue.**
Mean: 2.08; Median: 2.

**Fig. 4.22. My library organisation would have problems including blogs in the catalogue.**
Mean: 2.72; Median: 3.

**Fig. 4.23. The library would be willing to change workflows if it meant that blogs could be included in the library catalogue.**
Mean: 2.31; Median: 2.
4.3.3. Summary

The respondents reported that including blogs would mean changes to the library workflow and that the libraries would be unwilling to change. They perceived the patron benefit slightly more of finding blogs in the library catalogue in the future were most problems were solved.

4.4. Rating scale response comparison

The following Table 4.2. provide a broad picture of the rating scale answers, and to enable comparisons between different questions.

Table 4.2. Rating scale response comparison
M = Mean; Med = Median.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Med</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To which extent do you experience the library as open to changes?</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you feel that you can influence the goals to which your library is striving?</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you feel that you can influence the methods and workflows your library uses?</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The public library has the mission to collect a diversity of voices and perspectives</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The public library has the mission to collect material with local connection</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The public library has the mission to offer current and popular material for free</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The public library should strive towards including new, relevant media formats in the catalogue</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The public library has the task to distinguish quality material and to sift the information feed</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The public library has the task to show material that is otherwise hard to find</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Librarians should themselves take initiative to collect material that is relevant for the library’s patrons, regardless of medium</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The public library should strive towards being up-to-date.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relation to blogs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I follow blogs, private or in my work</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I write, or have written, on a blog, private or in my work.</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions of the blog</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The blog as a medium/phenomenon is interesting.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The blog is a medium as every other.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. A blog can be of high quality.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Blogs show a diversity of perspectives.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I want to recommend blogs to the library’s patrons.</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I search today actively for resources on the Internet that is relevant for the library’s patrons.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Blogs can have a place in the library catalogue.</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blogs in the catalogue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Blogs in the library catalogue would make my work harder.</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Blogs in the library catalogue would deteriorate the quality of the catalogue as a whole.</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Blogs in the library catalogue would help the patron to find relevant resources.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Blogs in the library catalogue would contribute to the library’s relevance in the community.</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Blogs in the library catalogue would mean changes in the library’s workflow.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Blogs are a natural part of the future library catalogue.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The future</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. My library organisation would want to include blogs in the catalogue.</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. My library organisation would have problems including blogs in the catalogue.</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I would recommend blogs to the library’s patrons.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. The library’s patrons would benefit from finding blogs in the library catalogue.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. The library would be willing to change workflows if it meant that blogs could be included in the library catalogue.</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I would be positive to blogs in the library catalogue.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5. Interviews

The presentation of the data from the interviews is brief since the relevancy of the pilot interviews rather is within the construction of the survey, and of the follow-up interviews within possibilities for further research.

#### 4.5.1. Pilot interviews

The pilot interviews outlined the complex reality of public libraries. The interview with Anja Leiding (personal communication, February 23, 2016) focused on Götabiblioteken and the work with the e-book collection and the relationship between the catalogue and the electronic resources. She underlined that public municipality libraries do not have the mission to preserve. From the library perspective, two major obstacles pointed out was resources and the will need for prioritisation. Furthermore, she briefly described Götabiblioteken’s media policy (found at http://regionbibliotekostergotland.se/tjanster/
kategori/goetabiblioteken/riktlinjer-foer-mediefoersoerjning), and gave an account of how technology is an obstacle for talking books.

The interview with Elisabeth Cserhalmi (personal communication, March 21, 2016) focused on the acquisition, metadata, and catalogue work of the public libraries, and the materiality of blogs in relation to the catalogue. She described Götabiblioteken’s relation to LIBRIS and the metadata records received from it. She accounted for examples of similar projects for collecting websites in link lists and portals. Mainly, focus was on blogs as a way of creating added value to the catalogue and how RDA can help patron’s find the right media format. She underlined a difference between the catalogue as a strict description of the collection, and the circulation system as a way to manage access.

4.5.2. Follow-up interviews

The follow-up interviews pinpointed certain aspects of the possible inclusion of blogs into the library catalogue directly addressed by respondents of the survey. The interview with Anna Berggren (personal communication, April 26, 2016) revolved around LIBRIS and the shared metadata used by about 100 public libraries today. She described the LIBRIS collaboration and agreement. LIBRIS tracks the national stock of books, provides records for described works, and thus enable libraries to benefit from one another’s cataloguing work. She said that blogs described in LIBRIS could be done today and thought electronic legal deposit to be a vital part of the process of including blogs in the catalogues on a larger scale.

The interview with Kungliga Biblioteket focused on electronic legal deposit in relation to blogs and Kungliga Bibliotekets progression in the matter of collecting professional blogs, a work they just have started and which consequences are to early to see. They did not work with private blogs and did not anticipate that those would be included in the electronic legal deposit.

The follow-up interviews are mainly present in the conclusion of this thesis.
5. Discussion and conclusion

The aim of this study was to:

- Gain understanding of obstacles and possibilities surrounding the process of including blogs into the public libraries’ catalogues, and;
- Discuss how these factors affect an inclusion of blogs into the public libraries’ catalogues.

And, in order to fulfil those aims, two research questions were posed:

1. What are the public librarians’ attitudes toward blogs as information sources?
2. What are the public librarians’ attitudes toward an inclusion of blogs into the public libraries’ catalogues?

This will be discussed from two angles, focusing on the key findings within the survey. Firstly, by discerning which issues the materiality of the blog imply for the library in order to include it into the catalogue. This will be based on the librarians’ perception of the blog and discussed in the light of the postmodern theoretical perspective. Secondly, by looking on how the perceived missions of the library align with the public librarians’ attitudes towards the blog.

5.1. The format: blog

A good rule of thumb might be this: If an Internet resource were published in any other media, say, paper, and it met your library’s selection and collection development criteria, would you catalog it? If the answer is Yes, then select the Internet resource and catalog it (Jul, 1998, p. 13).

Although it has the potential to be that simple, clearly it is, at the present, not. When considering “The blog is a medium as every other” (Fig. 4.10.), only 5% of the respondents totally disagreed to the statement. A resounding majority of 63.6% somewhat or totally agreed. But is it, though?

Blogs are turned into books as shown by McDonnell (2007) and Bowman et al. (2008) among others, and could then be catalogued by libraries. One example of this is earlier mentioned Minus Garfield (2008), which can be found at the public libraries of Göteborg and Malmö (http://libris.kb.se/bib/11829137). Blogs themselves do not, but have to transform into something else before earning the same treatment as traditional media.

5.1.1. What is to be catalogued?

Unfortunately, it is not even clear what it is the libraries may catalogue. What a book is and how to describe it is quite clear, but the blog, as both Elisabeth Cserhalmi (personal communication, March 21, 2016) and a respondent (personal communication, April 12, 2016) connecting through e-mail pointed this out, may be the entire website or individual posts.
The survey respondents were to answer if they considered that whole blogs or individual blog posts are more likely included in the catalogue (Appendix 3, Fig. 10.11.). 62.3% of the respondents found it more likely that whole blogs would be included, and thus; 37.7% found individual posts to be more likely. As the mailing respondent correctly mentioned, providing a link through the catalogue could have been an alternative as well. However, this ambiguity is a symptom of the problems imposed by the format itself, and neither practice nor theory seems to have reached any consensus about how to solve it. One possibility for making the confusion less decisive, described by Holden (2010), is “to have a flexible strategy that allows content to be acquired in any format” (p. 58).

The library is a set of interrelating systems where cataloguing is one, acquisitions is another, and so on. If those systems are based on old paradigms and traditional thinking (Holden, 2010, p. 114; Lee, 2000, p. 1112), objects not fit within these structures will provide trouble.

5.1.2. Obstacles within the format

In the survey, the respondents chose problems from a set, first discerning which were relevant (Fig. 4.13.), then which of them was the gravest (Fig. 4.14.). Only 1.7% perceived the presented obstacles was no problem at all. Three of the obstacles scoring high were derived from the format itself: inconstant content, that sources on the Internet disappear, and lack of bibliographic information.

The materiality of Internet resources proves hard to overcome within the existing limits of the public libraries. This is further supported by Manhoff (2006) and Nisonger (1997) in regard to inconsistent content, by comparing with self-published books in regard to lack of reviews (Dilevko & Dali, 2006), and by Manhoff (2006) and Tillett & Newbold (2006) in regard of bibliographic control, the latter in addressing grey literature.

5.1.3. Obstacles within the library

On the other hand, two frequently selected problems reside within the library organisation: the catalogue’s present structure and the library’s organisation and workflows. The materiality of Internet resources and the structures within the library are two sides of the same coin in regard of blog inclusion in the catalogue, and this is where the postmodern perspective comes in.

When asked if the inclusion of blogs in the library catalogue would mean changes in the library’s workflows, the librarians perceived that it would to some extent (Fig. 4.18.). Even in the presented scenario where the external obstacles for including blogs are solved, the librarians perceived their library organisations to be somewhat unable or negative towards this inclusion. The participants deemed the library unwilling to include blogs (Fig. 4.20.), somewhat unwillingly to change its workflows to enable inclusion (Fig. 4.22.), and that the library would have problems including blogs in the library anyway (Fig. 4.21.). This seems to contradict the positive view held by the librarians regarding the blog as a format, but it makes sense. Regardless of the opinions held by the librarians, they are still a part of the library and thus affected by the systems used.
5.1.4. The postmodern approach in Swedish libraries

The postmodern approach, briefly summarised as dissolving the traditional structures in order to construct flexible and inclusive ones, challenges the old definitions of collection, of access, of catalogue. Holden (2010) calls for a radicalisation of acquisitions (p. 108), but Pritchard’s (2008) perspective might be more realistic from the Swedish public libraries conditions:

Despite articles encouraging a total redesign of the entire library organisation, what might be called “blow it up and start over,” most of us find this impractical for reasons of time, money, and politics. You can, however, redefine and “explode” the way you use the resources that you have at hand (p. 222).

This holds especially true regarding the differences between librarians working in branch libraries and those working in main libraries. The latter perceived that their work would be harder if including blogs in the catalogue, than the branch librarians (see 4.3.1.). In general the catalogue work is a function of the main libraries, and the distance, contextualised by Oddy (1997, para. 13), between the different work places does affect the perception of how the work would change. The possibility for explosion of structures is limited by the realities of the librarian’s work.

The problems possessed by the blog should not be neglected, and the respondents are clearly aware that there are obstacles to consider, choosing in average 4.3 obstacles per participant. Nor should they be overrated or deemed impossible to overcome.

5.2. Blogs as a part of the library’s mission

The author will here discuss how the perceived missions of the library align with the perceived merits of the blog. Although more missions were considered in the survey, these, and their correlating blog merits, are the ones this discussion will revolve around:

- The public library has the mission to collect a diversity of voices and perspectives.
- The public library has the mission to collect material with local connection.
- The public library has the task to distinguish quality material and to sift the information feed.
- The public library has the task to show material that is otherwise hard to find.

As a foundation for this part of the discussion, the author formulated, with the help of Ortega y Gasset (1961), Deodato (2014), and patron-driven acquisition, three different perspectives from which one can relate to the library’s mission. The first being the quality filter, sifting through the information overload in order to help the patrons find only the best materials. The second being the space maker, collecting materials from marginalised voices in order to counteract the cultural hegemony. The third trusting in patrons, sharing the responsibility to form and develop with the ones using the library. Including blogs in the library catalogue could be motivated from each of these viewpoints, but the arguments and prioritised missions differ in between them.
In the following discussion, diversity, relevancy, and quality as missions will be contextualised by setting the librarians’ attitudes in relation to these three angles.

5.2.1. Diversity

73.2% of the respondents totally agreed and 22.2% somewhat agreed collecting a diversity of voices and perspectives was a mission of the library (Fig. 4.5.), and thus making it the strongest mission from the perspective of the librarians. It is no surprise and even stated in Sweden’s Bibliotekslag 2013:801, where the democratic society, free opinions, and diversity are represented as purposes for the libraries (2 §; 6 §). The mission of diversity is a conscious effort to admit that the library is a norming institution (in effect, reproducing a cultural hegemony) and to be inclusive of groups otherwise neglected. This is the key point of the view of Deodato (2014).

How does the blog fit within the question of diversity? The respondents recognises that blogs show a diversity of perspectives (Fig. 4.11.). And others agree: O’Sullivan (2005, p. 65; p. 69) and Maxymuk (2005, p. 43) both underline the blog as a format enabling diversity, and Deodato (2014, p. 734) and Sorapure (2003, p. 2) suggest a democratising effect of new technology in general and blogs in particular.

This is not to say that blogs automatically should be included in the library catalogue on that basis, but since the responding librarians both perceive the mission as important and the blogs as a bearer of a multitude of perspectives, there are grounds to consider it. It may be important.

If not blogs and other self-published sources become a part of the collections, or at least their sphere of access, the libraries, with Deodato (2014), “are deeply implicated in the maintenance and reproduction of existing power relations” (p. 737). Status quo, in this case, may passively oppose diversity (Dilevko & Dali, 2006, p. 209; Dilevko & Grewal, 1997, p. 381; Deodato, 2014, p. 748).

5.2.2. Relevancy

In this study, relevancy may be regarded in two ways: relevancy for the community within the library resides, and relevancy for individual patrons. Both perspectives will be discussed.

Firstly, considering collecting local material as a mission for the public library, rated second behind diversity. 64.4% of the participants totally agreed, and 30.1% somewhat agreed (Fig. 4.6.). As for showing objects otherwise hard to find, i.e. rare or special material, 48.5% totally agreed, and 39.7% somewhat agreed that this was a mission laid upon the library (Fig. 4.8.).

These missions for the library align with findings of Uzuegbu & McAlbert (2012), Chowdhury et al. (2006), and Lyons (2007) who all point out that focusing on local material may be the task for the library of the future, and Propas & Reich (1995) who underlines the weight of unique materials. Strengthening such collections is a possibility for the library to facilitate its relevancy in the society. Considering this could be motivated both with the view of Deodato (2014), creating space for local voices otherwise drowned in a globalised public consciousness, and Ortega y Gasset (1961), emphasising quality material with connection to the community.
The respondents, however, are more ambivalent toward the merits of blogs in this regard. 52.3% disagreed to blogs contributing to the library’s relevancy in the community, and 47.7% agreed (Fig. 4.17.). It should be noted that the relevancy for this result regarding blogs is dependent on the availability and knowledge of blogs with local perspectives and specialised subjects. While Deodato (2014) favour actions in order to support otherness (p. 740), Ortega y Gasset (1961) can be said to hold a more norming position in this regard (p. 154), even though he as well recognises a lack of material about certain topics.

Secondly, in relation to the patrons, the relevancy is a matter of the needs and whether the patrons themselves are trusted to discern those needs.

Considering whether the librarian would want to recommend blogs to the patrons, the answers were almost entirely balanced between agreeing and disagreeing, slightly favouring not agreeing with 51.4%. When the obstacles were removed, the respondents were more positive (+0.2) to recommending blogs (Fig. 4.19.). Instead focusing on the patrons and the perceived help they would gain from finding blogs in the library catalogue does not matter significantly. 51.1% agreed that the patrons would be helped, but those who strongly felt that patrons would not be helped where more than those who strongly felt that they would, 11.3% to 8.4% (Fig. 4.16.).

This positions the librarian between the patrons and the sources — the blogs in this case — and not beside them as a patron-driven model would have done. What answer would the patrons receive if they asked for this service? Cataloguing blogs as they are requested may be a way to slowly start to include these kinds of sources without investing much time in the matter. But the librarian as an intermediary in the sense formulated by Ortega y Gasset (1961) may not be entirely sure of the benefits the patron would gain, as suggested by the balancing answers from the survey.

5.2.3. Quality

The era of information overload is repeatedly established (Ortega y Gasset, 1961, p. 148; Propas & Reich, 1995, p. 44; Lee, 2000, p. 1110; Anderson, 2007, p. 190). The question is, what part can or will the librarians play when search engines and Internet giants transform the initiated search into mechanical full-text search and AV-media can be streamed right into the by the patron preferred space for experiencing it?

The respondents considered the statement: “The public library has the task to distinguish quality material and to sift the information feed” (Fig. 4.7.). 88.2% agreed to this being a mission of the library. This is a direct correlation to the addressed need of a quality filter formulated by Ortega y Gasset (1961). Lee (2000) suggests that such filter is appreciated (p. 1110), and Simpson & Banach (1997) states that this is what libraries in effect already are (p. 246), but normally with print media. Does this apply to the blog also?

The respondents seem to believe so. 67.8% totally agreed that blogs can be of high quality (Fig. 4.9.). And, of course, with the enormous amount of existing blogs, the odds are in their favour (Gaille, 2013), but had the perceived quality of the blogs been lower, it would be hard to argue for including blogs into the library catalogue with the help of Ortega y Gasset (1961).

But the problem may not be to motivate why libraries should be such a quality filter for Internet. No, the trouble is in practice. Librarians reside in the same information overload as everyone else, and Holden (2010) describes the information world as chaotic
and overwhelming even for professionals (p. 90). Where would one start this sifting and selecting? And where would the resources to do it come from?

5.3. Cornered librarians?

As earlier described, the theoretical basis consists of three corners and where the librarian positions herself may be a starting point in including blogs in the library catalogue.

With the view of Ortega y Gasset (1961), the quality is in focus, and an answer to that aspect, a system for reviewing blogs must be put into place. 15.9% perceive lack of reviews an obstacle for including blogs, and parallel to that, those 38.1% finding lack of coordination a problem may pinpoint the first step in creating a system for quality control.

With the view of Deodato (2014), the diversity is most important, and to address this, the librarians may need to actively search for relevant sources. A majority of the respondents, 69.2% answered that librarians themselves should take initiative to collect relevant materials (Appendix 3, Fig. 10.15). Without the proactive stance towards finding blogs, diversity may not be helped, regardless of including blogs in the library catalogue or not.

With the patron-driven approach, the immediate needs of the patrons are the important part, and the library and its librarians should only react to the expressed wishes of the patrons, be it set in system or spontaneous. If patrons do not ask for blogs, then libraries do not have to be concerned with them.

All missions, both included in this thesis and yet to be defined, relates to these viewpoints. The truth, however, may be that the librarians seldom adhere to extremes, and rather are somewhere in between in this triangle. To reconcile those perspectives is crucial.

5.4. The next step

“It is time for us to move from gatekeeper to gardener”, LaRue (2014) writes in favour of adopting self-published books and encouraging their authors (p. 185). Maybe this holds true for other non-traditional media formats as well. This study serves as a temperature check to see if the Swedish public librarians are positive and ready to embrace blogs as a media format.

Generally, the respondents’ answers, put into context, provide a favourable and inclusive picture. The attitude towards the blog is overall positive, and the missions perceived important may involve blogs if wished. Of course, there are problems that need to be solved regarding both the materiality of the blog and the structures of the library. The hypothetical future described as a part of the survey are yet a little way down the road.

Regardless of whether the mission of the librarian is to be a quality filter, a space maker, or to trust in the patrons, she needs to embrace change and take control. It is, indeed, possible to include blogs in the library catalogue. Shera (as reported by Smiraglia, 2003) means that each generation have to create its own order of bibliographic organisation (p. 555). And Oddy (1996) writes: “We must commit ourselves to the gradualist path, but we must be clear where the path is taking us and be prepared to ruthlessly clear the undergrowth” (p. 167). Still, the factors left out of this study — resources such as time,
personnel and money — does still have a crucial impact on the future.

The postmodern world of information in different formats is here and will be around for a while, and librarians better get used to it because this information will need organisation (Oddy, 1996, p. 81). “[W]hen looking at how information is being produced, distributed, and consumed, an approach to access should not impose distinctions from an old paradigm” (Holden, 2010, p. 114).

Given the general positive attitude presented, there is no sensible reason not to start the process towards inclusion in a small scale. It seems the answer to Jul’s (1998) question about cataloguing Internet resources could be yes: “If [it] were published in any other media, say, paper, and it met your library’s selection and collection development criteria, would you catalog it” (p. 13)? And since many others propose that catalogue presence correlates well with use, the call for some cataloguing instead of none is fair (Jul, 1998, p. 13).

5.4.1. A framework for the future library

A hope with this study was to gain insight enough to provide a framework for the inclusion of blogs specifically and non-traditional media in general. This is unfortunately not realistic. However, some points to continue the discussion about how these factors affect an inclusion of blogs into the public libraries’ catalogues will be provided.

*What is the mission of the library?* This is of course the first question any library should ask itself before entering a process of change. As shown in this study, there are many missions deemed relevant for the libraries. Is it possible to fulfil all of them at the same time, or should some be prioritised at the expense of others? The answer may be a positioning within the triangle between the quality filter imagined by Ortega y Gasset (1961), the space maker described by Deodato (2014), and the patron-trusting librarian, or formulated in another way, but without a mission, there is no library. The mission will form a basis for all the future questions and if a process, change or action does not support the mission, then probably it is something the library should consider doing.

*Quality content comes in many forms.* The respondents showed that blogs not necessarily have a lower quality than other medias. Editors and peer reviewing are quality signs, but apart from that, quality is a matter of the object, not the format. Today, as shown, Internet resources and self-published material prove difficult for the sake of quality, but new formats are constantly challenging the boundaries of the library. The task is to develop selection criteria and quality standards that include formats, but exclude poor content.

*There are many ways to organise materials.* This is made clear by Smiraglia (2003), adding that the order is context-bound (p. 555), but the respondents still thought the libraries unwilling to change in order to include blogs. The library needs to evaluate whether the used method of organisation is the most suitable for the library’s mission and the most flexible for the future, and as the respondents points out, the libraries’ structures may need some evaluation. Westrum (2014) deem MARC standards unsuitable for the future and describes how RDF will meet that need (p. 15-16). Similarly, Elisabeth Cserhalmi (personal communication, March 21, 2016) reports about a shift towards RDA at Swedish libraries and Kungliga Biblioteket (2016) accounts for the progress on a national level. “It is now that the shape of this future service has to be hammered out,” Lohne Mohn (2011) writes regarding e-book inclusion, but it holds true for every new service (p. 6).
How will the patrons find the collections? Roughly, patrons come in two forms (although one individual may be both): those visiting the library building and those browsing the website or OPAC. With both electronic and physical materials, the question needs to be answered from both perspectives, with all kinds of material in mind. Often enough, the digital collection is invisible to the visitors (McKnight & Dearnley, 2003, p. 237). Westrum (2014) suggest Active shelves and a book like Marketing Your Library’s Electronic Resources by Kennedy & LaGuardia (2013) provides explicit guidance in the area.

How can we retain access to the materials? The survey respondents address the problems of changing Internet resources, and how this is solved is a piece of the access puzzle. When the Internet resource is included in the collection and catalogued, the access to it needs to be guaranteed (Gust, 2012, p. 5). Is it a matter of, as worded by Johns (1997): “Who is going to maintain the URLs […]” (p. 20)? Or is it within the library’s limits to host a repository for Internet resources, as Deodato (2014) and LaRue (2014) suggest — the latter for self-published e-books (p. 750-751; p. 183)?

Who will do what? When resources are scarce and the staff overburdened with work, it is obviously necessary to discern where the responsibilities will fall. With a patron-driven model, users will do the selection. Deodato (2014) writes that patrons can be invited to participate in classification and cataloguing (p. 748). Johns (1997) reports that the InterCat project was voluntary, and Jul (1998) suggests the interest of the library should determine who will do what, and then shared cataloguing will make available a considerable collection (p. 18; p. 10). While Chowdhury et al. (2006) suggest that libraries should “facilitate the creation of [local] content”, Cornish (1997) suggests that anyone who can should be able to supply material (p. 164). And lastly, Jul (1998) writes that “Producers of significant resources want their users to find and access their resources with ease” (p. 11, original emphasis). The possibilities are almost endless.

Anna Berggren (personal communication, April 26, 2016) suggested that the Lag om pliktexemplar av elektroniskt material 2012:492 (trans. Act on electronic legal deposit 2012:492) could play an integral role in the inclusion of blogs in the public libraries’ catalogues. According to Kungliga biblioteket (personal communication, April 27-29, 2016) they have started to investigate in what manner the legal deposit can be extended to include professional blogs. If their work renders a set procedure for including these kinds of blogs, maybe it can be extended to other, non-professional, as well.1

Is it worth it and is this the right way to do it? Even though the attitude towards blog inclusion are somewhat positive, before any process of change is started, it needs a reality check. All changes come with costs, be it monetary or others, and those costs have to be compared with the gain. Maybe the costs are small and the improvement considerable, but often it will probably be hard to clearly discern what costs and gains are involved. Then it is good to have a mission to fall back on.

---

1 Noteworthy, however, is that blogs already can be found in LIBRIS. One example is The TSA Blog (http://libris.kb.se/bib/14661790).
5.5. Implications of the study

In retrospect, more formal unstructured, or even semi-structured, interviews at this stage would have been preferable. Although the interviews and the literature helped in putting both the subject in general and the survey data in particular into context, a clearly defined approach with qualitative data for balancing the survey may have filled the whole caused by the lack of free-text answers. By omitting the free-text answers within the survey, and referring to e-mail correspondence, composed too much a barrier for respondents since only a limited number of e-mails with such content were received. Of course, another likely explanation is a lack of further additions to contribute with in the first place. However, which is truer is impossible to discern.

The subject of this thesis may be unfamiliar ground for the respondents. Although the author tried to define the main aspects of the survey, the respondents may have misunderstood parts of it, mainly what a blog is and what the catalogue is. Obviously, this brings a questions left for future researchers to investigate.

Among the problems with this survey as the main sampling method, one was related to the use of Likert scales. By requiring the respondent to form an opinion, the survey might be harder to answer, especially since the subject in itself are, in many cases, unfamiliar ground for the librarians. This was of course the reason for choosing this kind of scale, but may nonetheless impact the number of participating respondents. There is no indication about how many terminated their participation before finishing, but one (1) librarian (personal communication, April 13, 2016) declared that suitable answers were missing. Unfortunately, the author’s follow-up questions got no response.

Furthermore, by choosing a 4-graded scale, the data became less nuanced and thus harder to interpret. A 6-graded scale, or even 10-graded, would in retrospect have been a better choice in order to gain a more natural spread of answers.

Two major kinds of slippages are identified (as defined by Gorard, 2004, p. 59):

Firstly, by prompting all librarians, or at least as many as possible, to answer questions about their libraries, the picture provided of the libraries may be skewed. Many librarians from the same library can have answered, and thus strengthening the picture of it in the results. For example, in question 11, about the library’s perceived willingness to change, if all the respondents come from the same progressive (or conservative) library, the result will be higher than the average may be if all libraries were represented. When analysing and reading, one must keep in mind that the main focus of this study is not on the libraries themselves, but on the librarians and their relations to their workplaces. No conclusions can or will be drawn about any library as a unit.

Secondly, the self-selection or proxy-selection (by e-mail recipients or other mediators) causes the sample to be somewhat problematic (Gorard, 2004, p. 71). Recipients with no interest at all in blogs (or answering surveys, for that matter) will be lacking among the respondents. This would of course be a factor to keep in mind regardless of how one defines and approaches the population. In one informed case, an entire library organisation declined to participate due to the librarians’ workload (anonymous, personal communication, April 12 and 13, 2016).

As described in 4.1.3., no respondent from Uppsala län participated in the survey. The most probable explanation is that the e-mail invitation were centrally marked as spam.
and thus never reached the intended recipients. A more reliable way of disseminating the survey may have been preferred.

Additionally, a foreseen problem regards the response rate. Gorard (2004) suggests ambitious goals (p. 62), and the author’s goal was to reach all librarians. As mentioned earlier, to whole population of public librarians in Sweden sums up to about 3,200. It would neither be realistic nor pragmatic to try to reach each of them in person (Gorard, 2004, p. 57). Instead, the chosen method was to e-mail each public main or branch library where possible, and each main library for the cases when branch libraries’ official e-mail addresses were not available and ask them to disseminate the survey within their organisations. 961 e-mails were sent, while about 250 branch libraries were omitted due to no public official e-mail or the official e-mail being personal. The number of respondents was 239; lower than anticipated. How should this be evaluated? When counted on, the response rate is very low: 7.5 % of all the librarians answered, and; 25 % of the e-mails sent generated an answer (not knowing whether the respondent got the invitation directly or by proxy). Although efforts have been done to define the sample in order to discern a width in respondents, it is safe to establish that it may be hard to extrapolate the results to the whole population, especially when taking volunteer bias into account (Oppenheim, 2005, p. 30). However, for the scope of this study as a first look into the relationship between the blog and the library catalogue, the sample is deemed sufficient. The author did not intend to provide an undisputable picture of this, but rather probe whether there were trends or patterns emerging from the respondents’ answers. As Gorard (2004) states: “after a certain number of cases/individuals have been involved each successive case is likely to add little to our understanding and do little to change any emerging patterns” (p. 57). Needless to say, this subject will need further research regardless of the quality of this study and the number of its respondents.

5.6. Further research

Obviously, the possibilities for adjacent studies of the relationship between library catalogues and non-traditional sources are next to endless. Due to limits in space and time — for this study, as well as in general — the author has selected a few of the topics of interest that has appeared during the work with this thesis.

Elisabeth Cserhalmi (personal communication, March 21, 2016) asked the author whether the blog was still relevant. This question is reasonable. The hype around the blog has somewhat faded, and the time when everyone should have a blog is long gone. In its wake, much of the content creation seems to have moved to social medias. Studies regarding these other platforms in relation to public library catalogues may be a task for the future, but even now the discussion about how to preserve social medias for the sake of research has accelerated and the Lag om pliktexemplar av dokument 1993:1392 and Lag om pliktexemplar av elektroniskt material 2012:492 may get a revamp to include social medias (Westin, 2016). A study with similar scope as this, but regarding social medias, may prove enlightening.

As described among the problems of this study in the implications section, the focus here lies on the librarians’ relations to their workplaces. This may produce skewed results about the libraries. A study with focus on the libraries as units, rather than the librarians may provide a complementary image of if and how an inclusion of blogs in the catalogue
is possible. This could be conducted in a number of ways, among those as a similar survey as this, but aimed at the library institutions, thus unveiling any organisational attitudes, or as a complete review of media plans or acquisition policies with non-traditional electronic media in mind. In a similar way, a focus on other library professionals (library assistants, for example) or patrons would provide insight to the wish for, need of, and possibility to include blogs or other non-traditional media into the library catalogue.

As Ghaebi & Fahimifar (2011) surveyed the evaluation criteria for e-books among academic information professionals, a similar study can be conducted with blogs or non-traditional medias in general. The scope might be public library catalogues, but since there are a lot of dimensions to investigate, the target could be something else or more general. The questions will probably be almost the same: What factors are important in selection of sources? Does the book as a traditional media govern these factors or is the evaluation dependent on something else?

The question of long-term preservation has been almost entirely neglected in this study, due to being outside the expressed mission of the public libraries in Sweden. It is nonetheless a problem in need of a solution. Jul (1998) writes that “[c]ataloguing is a long-term investment, and best applied to resources whose expected value exceeds the immediate and may extend to decades and centuries” (p. 13-14). From that perspective, the blogs that are still around need to be taken seriously. How this should be done, by whom, and to what extent are questions that would benefit from proper research. As the trend is, not least exemplified by Westin (2016), there is an on-going discussion about the preservation of electronic resources. One might as well make hay while the sun shines.
6. Summary

This is a summary of the thesis, outlining the main choices and results.

6.1. Introduction

Why are there no blogs in the public libraries’ catalogues? With 152 million blogs (2013) there must be some with high quality and relevancy for the libraries. That question is the basis of this study, and it could be approached in several ways.

Among them, the author chose to take the temperature of Swedish public librarians’ attitudes towards blogs and the possibility of including them in the library catalogue. Exploring the problems associated with this now may ease the process of including blogs and other non-traditional media formats in the future. Today, however, the book have precedence over other media formats in shaping the practice of the libraries and the appearance of their collections.

Two main research questions was investigated:

1. What are the public librarians’ attitudes toward blogs as information sources?
2. What are the public librarians’ attitudes toward an inclusion of blogs into the public libraries’ catalogues?

6.2. Theory and methodology

In order to conduct the study, two theoretical perspectives were applied. Firstly, the library was discussed from a postmodern perspective, where the systems within the library are challenged in order to recreate them in a way that are not based on one singular media format. Secondly, a combination of different views of the library work was formulated and underlined how different missions in the library are perceived. Those views were corners of a triangle which the librarians may position themselves within.

A mixed method approach was used in order to collect data. 4 interviews in total were conducted. Firstly, two pilot interviews provided insight from within the public library milieu and helped to outline and problematise the research subject in this context. Secondly, two follow-up interviews were conducted to pinpoint certain aspects that emerged during surveying.

The main data collection consisted of a web survey aimed to Swedish public librarians and sent to 961 public library e-mail addresses. It consisted of 49 questions about the background of the respondents and her workplace, her view of the blog as a media format, the library’s mission, and the inclusion of blogs into the library catalogue now and in the future. 239 responded to the survey.

6.3. Results

The respondents were generally positive towards the blog as a media format and acknowledged the merits of the blog in relation to the perceived missions of the library (i.e. collecting a diversity of voices and perspectives; collecting material with local connection;
distinguishing quality material and to sifting the information feed, and; showing material that is otherwise hard to find). However, including blogs in the library catalogue was associated with problems regarding both the materiality of the blog (mainly the changing nature of Internet resources) and the library organisations (the structure of the catalogue, for example). The positive attitude towards the blog and the missions perceived important may favour an inclusion of blogs in the library catalogue, even though the obstacles clearly needs to be solved.
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8. Appendix 1: Survey Invitation

8.1. Swedish version

Fig. 8.1. Print screen of e-mail invitation.

Enkätundersökning om folkbibliotekariers inställning till bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen

Hej!

Det här mailet är skickat till alla icke-personliga, officiella e-postadresser till folkbibliotek i Sverige.


Enkäten jag gör riktar sig till de som arbetar som folkbibliotekari i Sverige. Jag skulle vara väldigt tacksam om ni ville sprida den till bibliotekarierna i er organisation.

Enkäten består av 49 frågor och tar cirka 8 minuter att besvara. Enkäten i sig, samt mer information om den finns här: 

Slutligen, en fråga till huvudbibliotek, undrar jag om ni har någon inköpspolicy eller motsvarande som beskriver hur biblioteket arbetar med inköp och om ni i så fall kan skicka flen eller länken till mig.

Stort tack på förhand och allt gott,

Martin Ackerfors

Handler för uppsatsen är Osama Mansour.
8.2. Translated version

Hi!
This mail is sent to all non-personal, official e-mail addresses to public libraries in Sweden.

My name is Martin Ackerfors and I am studying the last semester of the master programme Library and Information Science: Digital Libraries and Information Services at Högskolan i Borås ([omitted url]). Presently, I work on a study about new media formats in public library catalogues, with focus on blogs as a media format.

The survey I am conducting is aimed at everyone working as a public librarian in Sweden. I would be very thankful if you wanted to share it with the librarians in your organisation.

The survey consists of 49 questions and takes about 8 minutes to answer. The survey itself, and more information about it, is here: [omitted url].

Lastly, a question for the main libraries, I wonder if you have any acquisitions policy or equivalent, that describes how the library works with purchases and if you, in that case, can send me the file or the link.

Many thanks in beforehand and all the best,

Martin Ackerfors
[omitted e-mail]

Supervisor for the thesis is Osama Mansour, [omitted e-mail].
9. Appendix 2: Survey

9.1. Swedish version: Bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen

9.1.1. Introduktion till enkäten

Fig. 9.1. Print screen of web survey 1/18.

Bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen

Den här studien riktar sig till dig som arbetar som bibliotekarie på ett folkbibliotek i Sverige.

Jag heter Martin Ackerfors och läser sista terminen på masterprogrammet Library and Information Science: Digital Libraries and Information Services vid Högskolan i Borås. Min uppsats handlar om nya medieformat i folkbibliotekens kataloger, med fokus på bloggar som ett medieformat.

Studien syftar till att undersöka inställningen till bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen hos folkbibliotekarier i Sverige. Genom att sammanfoga era svar med forskning på närliggande områden hoppas jag kunna besvara frågan om det i framtiden är möjligt att göra en sådan inkludering och vilka faktorer man i så fall behöver ta hänsyn till.


Några definitioner och avgränsningar:
* Blogg är i det här fallet ett webbinnehåll som presenteras i omvänd datordrift. Innahållet i sig spelar ingen roll (det kan vara såväl onlinedagböcker som populärvetenskap, skönlitteratur och läromedel), men utgångspunkten är att det är innehåll som i bokform hade haft en plats i bibliotekskatalogen.
* Då det näms "bibliotek" eller "bibliotekarier" är det folkbibliotek och folkbibliotekarier i Sverige som är täffats. Alla frågor rör ditt bibliotek. "Bibliotekorganisation" är din kommunens huvudbibliotek tillsammans med eventuella närbibliotek.
* I huvudsak handlar studien om katalogen, om bloggar kan katalogiseras precis som andra medieformat eller inte. I de fall katalogen inte är synonyms med cirkulationsystemet är det alltid katalogen som är fokuset.
* Ekonomi och resurser i form av tid och personal är medvetet uteslutet som en faktor då det är ett problem som många folkbibliotek brottas med, oavsett vad det gäller. Det är inte unikt för bloggar.


Stort tack för din medverkan och allt gott,

Martin Ackerfors

Handlerade för uppsatsen är Osama Mansour.

*Obligatorisk
Fig. 9.2. Print screen of web survey 2/18.
9.1.2. Du och ditt bibliotek

Fig. 9.3. Print screen of web survey 3/18.

Du och ditt bibliotek


1. Ålder *

- 21-30 år
- 31-40 år
- 41-50 år
- 51-60 år
- 61 år eller äldre

2. Antal år som verksam folkbibliotekarie *

- Mindre än 5 år
- 6-10 år
- 11-20 år
- 21-30 år
- 31 år eller mer

3. Biblioteket du arbetar på ligger i *

Välj

4. Ingår biblioteksorganisationen du arbetar för i ett samarbete som sträcker sig utanför kommungränsen? *

- Ja
- Nej
- Vet inte
Fig. 9.4. Print screen of web survey 4/18.

5. År ditt arbete i huvudsak förlagt till ett huvudbibliotek eller ett närbibliotek? *
   - Huvudbibliotek
   - Närbibliotek
   - Uppdelat lika mellan huvudbibliotek och närbibliotek

6. Vilken är din huvudsakliga arbetsuppgift? *
   Välj det område som du arbetar med mest tid. Om det är alltför blandat går det bra att svara "Blandat".
   - Inköp
   - Katalogisering
   - Metadata
   - Program och aktiviteter
   - Referens/Information/Kundtjänst
   - Utvecklingsarbete
   - Blandat
   - Annat

7. År biblioteket du huvudsakligen arbetar på ansvarig för biblioteckskatalogen? *
   Många bibliotek ingår i något samarbete och delar katalog, antingen inom den egna kommunen eller i en annan geografisk sammanslutning, med andra bibliotek. Är det något annat bibliotek eller sammanslutning som har huvudsansvar för katalogen är svaret "Nej".
   - Ja
   - Nej
   - Vet inte
8. Vilka av dessa medietyper finns idag i bibliotekskatalogen? *
Kryssa för alla alternativ som finns i bibliotekskatalogen. Egna system eller sidokataloger räknas inte.

☐ Bloggar
☐ E-böcker
☐ E-tidningar
☐ Fanzin, självpublicerade småtryck
☐ Ljudböcker
☐ Talböcker
☐ Nätbaserade uppslagsverk
☐ Självpublicerade böcker
☐ TV-spel
☐ Verktyg, paraplyer eller liknande föremål
☐ Andra webbsidor
☐ Inga av dessa

9. Har ditt bibliotek en uttalad policy för inköp eller förvärv? *

☐ Ja
☐ Nej
☐ Vet inte

10. Samlar biblioteket idag på bloggar eller webbsidor på annat sätt än i katalogen? *
Exempelvis i en länklista eller annat system.

☐ Ja
☐ Nej
☐ Vet inte
11. I vilken mån upplever du att biblioteket du arbetar på är förändringsbenäget? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mycket förändringsbenäget

Inte förändringsbenäget

12. Känner du att du kan påverka vilka mål ditt bibliotek ska sträva mot? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Väldigt mycket

Inte alls

13. Känner du att du kan påverka vilka metoder och arbetssätt ditt bibliotek använder? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Väldigt mycket

Inte alls

Fig. 9.6. Print screen of web survey 6/18.
9.1.3. Bloggen och biblioteket

Fig. 9.7. Print screen of web survey 7/18.

Bloggen och biblioteket

Frågorna i den andra delen handlar om dagsläget, om hur du ser på folkbibliotekets uppgift, om din inställning till bloggen som medium och vilka hinder och möjligheter du ser med att inkludera bloggen i bibliotekskatalogen.

Folkbibliotekets uppgift

Ta ställning till följande påståenden. 1 betyder instämmer inte, 4 betyder instämmer helt.

14. Folkbiblioteket har som uppgift att samla en mångfald av olika röster och perspektiv. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instämmer inte</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Folkbiblioteket har som uppgift att samla material med lokal anknytning. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instämmer inte</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Folkbiblioteket har som uppgift att gratis erbjuda aktuellt och populärt material. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instämmer inte</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Folkbiblioteket bör sträva efter att inkludera nya, relevanta medieformer i katalogen. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instämmer inte</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 9.8. Print screen of web survey 8/18.

18. Folkbiblioteket har som uppgift att urskilja kvalitetsmaterial och sovra i informationsflödet. *

Instämmer inte

1 2 3 4

Instämmer helt

19. Folkbiblioteket har som uppgift att visa upp material som annars är svårt att hitta. *

Instämmer inte

1 2 3 4

Instämmer helt

20. Bibliotekarier bör själva ta initiativ att samla material som är relevant för bibliotekets låntagare, oavsett medium. *

Instämmer inte

1 2 3 4

Instämmer helt

21. Folkbiblioteket bör sträva efter att hänga med i tiden. *

Instämmer inte

1 2 3 4

Instämmer helt
Fig. 9.9. Print screen of web survey 9/18.

Bloggen som medium

Ta ställning till följande påståenden. 1 betyder instämmer inte, 4 betyder instämmer helt.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer inte</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer inte</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Bloggen som medium/fenomen är intressant. ♦

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer inte</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer inte</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. En blogg kan hålla hög kvalitet. ♦

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer inte</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Bloggar visar upp en mångfald av perspektiv. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instämmer inte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Jag skulle vilja rekommendera bloggar till bibliotekets låntagare. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instämmer inte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Jag letar idag aktivt efter källor på internet som är relevanta för bibliotekets låntagare. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instämmer inte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Bloggar kan ha en plats i bibliotekskatalogen. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Instämmer helt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instämmer inte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Om du idag hittar en blogg vars innehåll skulle passa i bibliotekets katalog, vad gör du då? *</td>
<td>Sparar den som bokmärke eller motsvarande, Sparar den i länklista på bibliotekets webb, Sparar den i annat offentligt system, Delar den inom organisationen på intranät eller via mail, Delar den offentligt via bibliotekets officiella sociala medier, Delar den offentligt via dina personliga sociala medier, Annat, Inget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Vilka avgörande hinder ser du för att idag inkludera bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen? *</td>
<td>Brist på samordning, Brist på bibliografisk information, Föränderligt innehåll, Brist på tekniska lösningar, Upphovsrätt, Bibliotekets organisation eller arbetssätt, Brist på kvalitetsinnehåll, Brist på recensioner, Katalogens nuvarande struktur, Källor på nätet försvinner, Svårighet att hitta relevanta bloggar, Inget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. Vad ser du som det största hindret för att idag inkludera bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen? *
   Ekonomi, tid och personal är medvetet uteslutet som en faktor.
   - Brist på samordning
   - Brist på bibliografisk information
   - Föränderligt innehåll
   - Brist på tekniska lösningar
   - Upphovsrätt
   - Bibliotekets organisation eller arbetssätt
   - Brist på kvalitetsinnehåll
   - Brist på recensioner
   - Katalogens nuvarande struktur
   - Källor på nätet försvinner
   - Svårighet att hitta relevanta bloggar
   - Annat

34. Vilka fördelar ser du med att inkludera bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen? *
   - Visa källor som håller hög kvalitet
   - Visa källor med lokal anknytning
   - Visa en större mångfald av röster och perspektiv
   - Visa att biblioteket hänger med i tiden
   - Bereda väg för andra nya mediaformat i framtiden
   - Tillgängliggöra relevant material som annars riskerar att försvinna
   - Samla allt utvalt material på ett ställe
   - Inget
35. Vad ser du som den största fördelen med att inkludera bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen? *
- Visa källor som håller hög kvalitet
- Visa källor med lokal anknytning
- Visa nya och marginaliserade perspektiv
- Hänga med i tiden
- Bereda väg för andra nya mediaformat i framtiden
- Tillgängliggöra relevant material som annars riskerar att försvinna
- Samla allt utvalt material på ett ställe
- Annat

36. Vilket anser du vara troligast? *
Hela bloggar är alla de inlägg som skrivits på en viss blogg gemensamt (jämför med en bok med kapitel). Enskilda blogginlägg är varje inlägg för sig (jämför med artiklar ur en tidskrift).
- Att hela bloggar inkluderas i katalogen
- Att enskilda blogginlägg inkluderas i katalogen
9.1.4. Framtiden

Fig. 9.14. Print screen of web survey 14/18.

Tredje delen innehåller frågor som rör framtiden och hur bloggar och bibliotekens kataloger kan fungera framöver.

Framtiden för bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen

Ta ställning till följande påståenden. 1 betyder instämmer inte, 4 betyder instämmer helt.

37. Bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen skulle försvåra för mig i mitt yrkesutövande. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer inte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen skulle försämrå kvaliteten på katalogen som helhet. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer inte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen skulle hjälpa låntagaren att hitta relevanta källor. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer inte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen skulle bidra till bibliotekets relevans i samhället. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer inte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 9.15. Print screen of web survey 15/18.

41. Bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen skulle innebära förändringar i bibliotekets arbetssätt. *

Instämmer inte 1 2 3 4 Instämmer helt

42. Bloggar är en naturlig del av den framtida bibliotekskatalogen. *

Instämmer inte 1 2 3 4 Instämmer helt

43. När tror du att bloggar kommer gå att hitta i svenska folkbiblioteks kataloger? *

○ Inom 5 år
○ Om 6-10 år
○ Om 11 år eller senare
○ Aldrig
Fig. 9.16. Print screen of web survey 16/18.

Att inkludera bloggen i bibliotekskatalogen innebär i dagsläget en lång rad problem som måste lösas, inte minst resursfrågan. För de sista frågorna vill jag att du föreställer dig en framtid där problemen till stora delar är lösta:

Det finns en organisation som löser insamling och kvalitetsökning av bloggar. De erbjuder möjligheten att för en rimlig summa välja särskilda bloggar som är intressanta för ditt bibliotek, eller alla i deras utbud. Tekniska lösningar finns och bloggarna är beskrivna med

en bibliografisk standard som stämmer överens med de övriga resurserna i bibliotekskatalogen. Organisationen överblickar så att innehållet på bloggarna stämmer överens med beskrivningen och meddelar biblioteket om förändringar i en blogg man valt ut, samt ser till så att resursen kommer att vara fortsatt tillgänglig. Upphovspersonerna bakom bloggarna har givit sitt godkännande till att biblioteken får inkludera respektive blogg i katalogen och att resurserna kommer vara fortsatt tillgängliga även om de själva skulle välja att stänga ner sina bloggar.

Ta ställning till följande påståenden. 1 betyder Instämmer inte, 4 betyder Instämmer helt.

44. Min biblioteksorganisation skulle vilja inkludera bloggar i katalogen. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer inte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. Min biblioteksorganisation skulle ha problem att inkludera bloggar i katalogen. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer inte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instämmer helt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. Jag skulle rekommendera bloggar till bibliotekets låntagare.

*
47. Bibliotekets låntagare skulle ha nytta av att hitta bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen. *

Instämmer inte

Instämmer helt

48. Biblioteket skulle vara villigt att förändra arbetssätt om det innebar att bloggar kunde inkluderas i bibliotekskatalogen *

Instämmer inte

Instämmer helt

49. Jag skulle vara positivt inställd till bloggar i bibliotekskatalogen. *

Instämmer inte

Instämmer helt

BAKÅT  NÄSTA
9.1.5. Avslutning

Fig. 9.18. Print screen of web survey 18/18.

Avslutning

Vad händer nu?

När du trycker på "Skicka" nedan blir dina svar inskickade och en del av den statistik som kommer ligga till grund för min studie. Den 2016-04-20 stänger enkäten och därefter kommer svaren sammanställas och analyseras och om allt vill sig väl mynnar det ut i en uppsats till sommaren. Är du intresserad av att få den skickad till dig när den är färdig går det bra att skicka ett mail till [redigerad], så kommer det en PDF när allt är godkänt.

Jag vill också påminna om att jag skulle vara oerhört tacksam om du ville samla alla tankar, funderingar, idéer och tillägg som dykt upp under enkäten och maila dem till mig på [redigerad]. Allt relaterat är av intresse och kommer att fördjupa förståelsen för bloggar i biblioteksstudiet.

Har du andra frågor eller vill kontakta mig av någon anledning rörande studien nås jag i första hand via [redigerad], men även på 0709-2081-02. Handledare för uppsatsen är Osama Mansour, [redigerad].

Stort tack för din medverkan!

[Redigerad]

[Redigerad]
9.2. Translated version: Blogs in the library catalogue

During translation, the author has tried to correctly reproduce the Swedish version. Any bad formulations are a consequence of this straight translation.

9.2.1. Introduction to the survey

This study is addressed to you who work as a librarian in a public library in Sweden. My name is Martin Ackerfors and I am studying the last semester of the master programme Library and Information Science: Digital Libraries and Information Services at Högskolan i Borås ([omitted url]). My thesis is about new media formats in the public libraries’ catalogues, with focus on blogs as a media format.

The study is aimed at investigating the attitude of public librarians in Sweden, towards blogs in the library catalogue. By combining your answers with research in adjacent areas, I hope to be able to answer if it is possible, in the future, to do such inclusion and, if so, which factors one needs to take into account.

The survey consists of 49 questions divided into three sections: You and your library; The blog and the library, and; The future. It takes 8 minutes to answer. It closes 2016-04-20.

Some definitions and limitations:
* Blog, in this case, is a web content presented in reverse date order. The content in itself does not matter (it could be both online diaries, popular science, fiction, and teaching materials), but the assumption is that the content in a book would have had a place in the library catalogue.
* When “library” or “librarians” are mentioned, it is public libraries and public librarians in Sweden that is referred to. Every question regards your library. “Library organisation” is your municipality’s main library together with any branch libraries.
* The study is mainly about the catalogue, if blogs can be catalogued just as other media formats or not. In those cases the catalogue not is synonymous with the circulation system, it is always focus on the catalogue.
* Economy and resources in the form of time and personnel is consciously omitted as a factor, as it is a problem many public librarians struggle with, regardless of what is discussed. It is nothing unique for blogs.

Lastly, as this survey lacks free text answers, I would be tremendously thankful if you could collect all thoughts, reflections, ideas, and additions that pop up and e-mail them to me (after reading what it says under Personal data and integrity below). Everything related is of interest and will deepen the understanding of the possibilities and obstacles for inclusion of blogs in the library catalogue.

Many thanks for your participation and all the best,

Martin Ackerfors
[omitted e-mail]

Supervisor for the thesis is Osama Mansour, [omitted e-mail].
**Personal data and integrity**

Your answers will only be used and presented in the form of statistics together with the other respondents. No singular respondents will be displayed, and just me, Martin Ackerfors, will see the answers in their entirety. No personal data about you will be saved through this survey.

Your answers will not be send until you have pressed “Send” on the last page and you can terminate your participation at any time.

If you send e-mail to [omitted e-mail] regarding this study, you accept that your personal data will be handled and saved in accordance with Personuppgiftslagen [Personal data law] during the time it takes to complete this study. They can be included in the study (anonymously or with name according to your wishes). The intent with this is to give a deeper picture of the questions asked in this survey and discussed in the thesis. Only me, Martin Ackerfors, will take part in the e-mails you send to me. Högskolan i Borås ([omitted url]) is personal data controller.

Questions regarding the survey in itself, or personal data and integrity are exempt (it is naturally possible to ask about one’s participation before participating).

- I have read, understood and accept how my answers will be treated.

**9.2.2. You and your library**

The questions in the first part regard you, your work and the library you mainly work at. For you who work both at a main library and one or more branch libraries, assume that it is the library you work most hours at.

1. Age
   - 21-30 years old
   - 31-40 years old
   - 41-50 years old
   - 51-60 years old
   - 61 years old or older

2. Number of years working as a public librarian
   - Less than 5 years
   - 6-10 years
   - 11-20 years
   - 21-30 years
   - 31 years or more

3. The library you work at resides in
   [dropdown list of Swedish regions]
4. Is your library organisation included in a consortium outside the borders of the municipality?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Do not know

5. Is your work mainly based at a main library or a branch library?
   ○ Main library
   ○ Branch library
   ○ Divided equally between main library and branch library

6. What is your main work task?
   Choose the area in which you work the most hours. If it is all to mixed, it is welcomed to answer “Mixed”.
   ○ Acquisition
   ○ Cataloguing
   ○ Metadata
   ○ Programme and activities
   ○ Reference/Information/Support
   ○ Development work
   ○ Mixed
   ○ Other

7. Is the library you mainly work at responsible for the library catalogue?
   Many libraries are included in some consortium and shares catalogue, either within the municipality or in another geographical coalition, with other libraries. If it is another library or consortium that have main responsibility for the catalogue, the answer is “No”.
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Do not know

8. Which of these media formats are included in the library catalogue today?
   Mark all alternatives that exist in the library catalogue. Own systems or bi-catalogues do not count.
   □ Blogs
   □ E-books
   □ E-journals
   □ Fanzines, self-published ephemera
   □ Audio books
   □ Talking books
   □ Online encyclopaedias
   □ Self-published books
   □ Video games
   □ Tools, umbrellas or similar objects
   □ Other websites
   □ None of these
9. Do your library have a pronounced policy for acquisitions?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Do not know

10. Do the library today collect blogs or websites in other ways than in the catalogue? For example, in a link list or in another system.
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Do not know

11. To which extent do you experience the library as open to changes?

   1 2 3 4
   Not open to changes ○ ○ ○ ○ Very open to changes

12. Do you feel that you can influence the goals to which your library is striving?

   1 2 3 4
   Not at all ○ ○ ○ ○ Very much

13. Do you feel that you can influence the methods and workflows your library uses?

   1 2 3 4
   Not at all ○ ○ ○ ○ Very much

9.2.3. The blog and the library

The question in the second part regard the present, how you perceive the public library’s mission, your attitude towards the blog as a medium, and which obstacles and possibilities you see in including the blog in the library catalogue.

The public library’s mission
Consider the following statements. 1 means Do not agree, 4 means totally agree.

14. The public library has the mission to collect a diversity of voices and perspectives.

   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree ○ ○ ○ ○ Totally agree

15. The public library has the mission to collect material with local connection.

   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree ○ ○ ○ ○ Totally agree

16. The public library has the mission to offer current and popular material for free.

   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree ○ ○ ○ ○ Totally agree
17. The public library should strive towards including new, relevant media formats in the catalogue.

1 2 3 4
Do not agree 0 0 0 0 0

18. The public library has the task to distinguish quality material and to sift the information feed.

1 2 3 4
Do not agree 0 0 0 0 0

19. The public library has the task to show material that is otherwise hard to find.

1 2 3 4
Do not agree 0 0 0 0 0

20. Librarians should themselves take initiative to collect material that is relevant for the library’s patrons, regardless of medium.

1 2 3 4
Do not agree 0 0 0 0 0

21. The public library should strive towards being up-to-date.

1 2 3 4
Do not agree 0 0 0 0 0

The blog as medium
Consider the following statements. 1 means Do not agree, 4 means totally agree.

22. I follow blogs, private or in my work.

1 2 3 4
Do not agree 0 0 0 0 0

23. I write, or have written, on a blog, private or in my work.

1 2 3 4
Do not agree 0 0 0 0 0

24. The blog as a medium/phenomenon is interesting.

1 2 3 4
Do not agree 0 0 0 0 0

25. The blog is a medium as every other.

1 2 3 4
Do not agree 0 0 0 0 0

26. A blog can be of high quality.

1 2 3 4
Do not agree 0 0 0 0 0
27. Blogs show a diversity of perspectives.
   1  2  3  4
   Do not agree  O  O  O  O  Totally agree

28. I want to recommend blogs to the library’s patrons.
   1  2  3  4
   Do not agree  O  O  O  O  Totally agree

29. I search today actively for resources on the Internet that is relevant for the library’s patrons.
   1  2  3  4
   Do not agree  O  O  O  O  Totally agree

30. Blogs can have a place in the library catalogue.
   1  2  3  4
   Do not agree  O  O  O  O  Totally agree

31. If you today find a blog whose content would fit in the library catalogue, what do you do?
   - Save it as a bookmark or equivalent
   - Save it in a link list on the library’s website
   - Save it in another public system
   - Share it within the organisation through intranet or e-mail
   - Share it publicly through the library’s official social medias
   - Share it publicly through your private social medias
   - Other
   - Nothing

32. Which major obstacles do you see in including blogs in the library catalogue today? Mark all major obstacles. Economy, time and personnel is consciously omitted as a factor.
   - Lack of coordination
   - Lack of bibliographic information
   - Inconstant content
   - Lack of technical solutions
   - Copyright
   - The library’s organisation or workflow
   - Lack of quality content
   - Lack of reviews
   - The catalogue’s present structure
   - Internet resources disappear
   - Difficulty finding relevant blogs
   - Nothing
33. Which obstacle do you see as the biggest in including blogs in the library catalogue today?
   Economy, time and personnel is consciously omitted as a factor.
   - Lack of coordination
   - Lack of bibliographic information
   - Inconstant content
   - Lack of technical solutions
   - Copyright
   - The library’s organisation or workflow
   - Lack of quality content
   - Lack of reviews
   - The catalogue’s present structure
   - Internet resources disappear
   - Difficulty finding relevant blogs
   - Other

34. Which benefits do you see in including blogs in the library catalogue?
   - Show resources of high quality
   - Show resources with local connection
   - Show a diversity of voices and perspectives
   - Show that the library is up-to-date
   - Prepare the way for other new media formats in the future
   - Make available material that may otherwise be lost
   - Collect selected material in one place
   - Nothing

35. What do you see as the biggest benefit in including blogs in the library catalogue?
   - Show resources of high quality
   - Show resources with local connection
   - Show a diversity of voices and perspectives
   - Show that the library is up-to-date
   - Prepare the way for other new media formats in the future
   - Make available material that may otherwise be lost
   - Collect selected material in one place
   - Other

36. Which do you perceive as more likely?
   Whole blogs are all the posts written in a certain blog collected (as a book with chapters). Individual posts are each post on its own (as articles from a journal).
   - That whole blogs are included in the catalogue
   - That individual posts are included in the catalogue
9.2.4. The future

The third part contains questions about the future and how blogs and the libraries’ catalogues can work in the future.

The future for blogs in the library catalogue
Consider the following statements. 1 means Do not agree, 4 means totally agree.

37. Blogs in the library catalogue would make my work harder.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree  O  O  O  O  Totally agree

38. Blogs in the library catalogue would deteriorate the quality of the catalogue as a whole.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree  O  O  O  O  Totally agree

39. Blogs in the library catalogue would help the patron to find relevant resources.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree  O  O  O  O  Totally agree

40. Blogs in the library catalogue would contribute to the library’s relevance in the community.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree  O  O  O  O  Totally agree

41. Blogs in the library catalogue would mean changes in the library’s workflow.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree  O  O  O  O  Totally agree

42. Blogs are a natural part of the future library catalogue.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree  O  O  O  O  Totally agree

43. When do you think blogs will be found in Swedish public libraries’ catalogues?
   O Within 5 years
   O In 6-10 years
   O In 11 years or later
   O Never

The future
To include the blog in the library catalogue today brings a long list of problems that need to be solved, not the question of resources least. For the last questions, I want you to imagine a future where the problems in major parts are solved:

There is an organisation that collects and ensures the quality of blogs. They provide the possibility to, for a reasonable sum, choose selected blogs that are interesting for
your library, or all the blogs in their offer. Technical solutions are made and the blogs are described with a bibliographic standard that match the other resources in the library catalogue. The organisation overview so that the content in the blogs match the descriptions and contact the library with any changes within a selected blog, and ensures that the resource will be continuously available. The authors of the blogs have given their permission so that the libraries may include respective blog in the catalogue, and that the recourses will be continuously available even if they would chose to close their blogs.

Consider the following statements. 1 means Do not agree, 4 means totally agree.

44. My library organisation would want to include blogs in the catalogue.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Totally agree

45. My library organisation would have problems including blogs in the catalogue.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Totally agree

46. I would recommend blogs to the library’s patrons.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Totally agree

47. The library’s patrons would benefit from finding blogs in the library catalogue.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Totally agree

48. The library would be willing to change workflows if it meant that blogs could be included in the library catalogue.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Totally agree

49. I would be positive to blogs in the library catalogue.
   1 2 3 4
   Do not agree ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Totally agree

9.2.5. Finish

What happens now?
When you press “Send” below, your answers will be sent and a part of the statistics that will form the basis of my study. At 2016-04-20 the survey will close and thereafter will the answers be compiled and analysed, and if everything goes right will it culminate in a thesis by the summer. Are you interested in receiving it when it is finished, send an e-mail to [omitted e-mail] and the PDF will be sent as soon as everything is cleared.

I also want to remind you that I would be tremendously thankful if you wanted to collect all thoughts, reflections, ideas and additions that popped up during the survey and e-mail them to me at [omitted e-mail]. Everything related is of interest and will deepen
the understanding for blogs in the library catalogue.

If you have other questions or want to contact me for any reason regarding the study, I am mainly available through [omitted e-mail], but also on [omitted phone number]. Supervisor for the thesis is Osama Mansour, [omitted e-mail].

Many thanks for your participation!
10. Appendix 3: Survey statistics

This appendix contains the graphs from the survey data left out of the empirical findings due to not being discussed in the thesis. Some are commented, while others are left uncommented.

**Fig. 10.1. What is your main work task?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>8 (3.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloguing</td>
<td>4 (1.7 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metadata</td>
<td>1 (0.4 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and activities</td>
<td>12 (5 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Info./Support</td>
<td>19 (7.9 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development work</td>
<td>15 (6.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>166 (69.5 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14 (5.9 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 10.2. Do your library have a pronounced policy for acquisitions?**

- Yes: 145 (60.7 %)
- No: 65 (27.2 %)
- Do not know: 29 (12.1 %)

**Fig. 10.3. Do the library today collect blogs or websites in other ways than in the catalogue?**

- Yes: 52 (21.8 %)
- No: 150 (62.8 %)
- Do not know: 37 (15.5 %)

No examples of how the actual collection was done were provided.
10.2.1. Consortium and catalogue responsibility

Fig. 10.4. shows whether the library is involved in a consortium or collaboration. Fig. 10.5. shows whether the library the respondent work at is responsible for the catalogue. Table 10.1. is a cross-tabulation of how the respondents answered to those question in order to see how they are relating to each other.

A library may lack main responsibility if it is a branch library with a responsible main library, or a branch or main library within a consortium with responsibility. By cross-tabulating answers to questions 4 and 7 it will be clearer what the answers may mean.

The 33 (13.8 %) who responded No to both questions are likely to be branch libraries; they are not included in a consortium outside the municipality and they do not have main responsibility for their catalogue.

The 83 (34.7 %) who responded Yes to question 4 and No to question 7 are main libraries or branch libraries; they are included in a consortium, but have not retained the main responsibility for the catalogue.

The 49 (20.5 %) who answered No to question 4 and Yes to question 7 are main libraries with full responsibility of their catalogues, since they are not included in any consortium outside the municipality.

The 49 (20.5 %) who answered Yes to both question 4 and 7 are main libraries that are included in a consortium outside its municipality’s borders, but have retained the main catalogue responsibility. There is no way of knowing if this responsibility is shared with another main library in the consortium.

Fig. 10.4. Is your library organisation included in a consortium outside the borders of the municipality?

Fig. 10.5. Is the library you mainly work at responsible for the library catalogue?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Within collaboration</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.2.2. Influence of the librarian

Fig. 10.6., 10.7., and 10.8. show the perceived possibilities for change and influence over the library’s goals and workflows. The librarians working at a branch library felt less influence over goals (-0.5) and workflows (-0.4) than librarians working at a main library.

**Fig. 10.6. To which extent do you experience the library as open to changes?**
Mean: 2.99; Median: 3.

**Fig. 10.7. Do you feel that you can influence the methods and workflows your library uses?**
Mean: 2.90; Median: 3.

**Fig. 10.8. Do you feel that you can influence the goals to which your library is striving?**
Mean: 2.88; Median: 3.

**Fig. 10.9. When do you think blogs will be found in Swedish public libraries’ catalogues?**
10.2.3. Respondents' present relation to the blog

Fig. 10.10. and 10.11. show the respondents’ experience of following and writing blogs. Respondents age 61 or older responding that they follow (-0.3) and write (-0.6) blogs to a lesser extent than the average librarian.

As for regions, in just one case, the difference between both the average for the population and for the other regions differed with one of the largest with >0.5. The public librarians in Region Skåne responded that they write blogs (question 23) to a greater extent (+0.6) than the average librarian.

Fig. 10.10. I follow blogs, private or in my work.
Mean: 2.54; Median: 3.

Fig. 10.11. I write, or have written, on a blog, private or in my work.
Mean: 2.26; Median: 2.

Fig. 10.12. If you today find a blog whose content would fit in the library catalogue, what do you do?

- Save it as a bookmark or equivalent: 118 (49.4 %)
- Save it in a link list on the library's website: 30 (12.6 %)
- Save it in another public system: 11 (0.4 %)
- Share it within the organisation through intranet or e-mail: 87 (36.4 %)
- Share it publicly through the library's official social medias: 42 (17.6 %)
- Share it publicly through your private social medias: 41 (17.2 %)
- Other: 19 (7.9 %)
- Nothing: 64 (26.8 %)
Fig. 10.13. Which do you perceive as more likely?
Whole blogs are all the posts written in a certain blog collected (as a book with chapters). Individual posts are each post on its own (as articles from a journal).

Fig. 10.14. The public library has the mission to offer current and popular material for free.
Mean: 3.49; Median: 4.

Fig. 10.15. The public library should strive towards including new, relevant media formats in the catalogue.
Mean: 3.24; Median: 3.

Fig. 10.16. Librarians should themselves take initiative to collect material that is relevant for the library’s patrons, regardless of medium.
Mean: 2.96; Median: 3.

Fig. 10.17. The blog as a medium/phenomenon is interesting.
Mean: 2.77; Median: 3.

Fig. 10.18. The public library should strive towards being up-to-date.
Mean: 3.59; Median: 4.
Fig. 10.19. Which benefits do you see in including blogs in the library catalogue?

- Show resources of high quality: 87 (36.4%)
- Show resources with local connection: 117 (49%)
- Show a diversity of voices and perspectives: 148 (61.9%)
- Show that the library is up-to-date: 66 (27.6%)
- Prepare the way for other new media formats in the future: 66 (27.6%)
- Make available material that may otherwise be lost: 81 (33.9%)
- Collect selected material in one place: 45 (18.8%)
- Nothing: 26 (10.9%)

Fig. 10.20. What do you see as the biggest benefit in including blogs in the library catalogue?

- Show resources of high quality: 25 (10.5%)
- Show resources with local connection: 31 (13%)
- Show a diversity of voices and perspectives: 57 (23.8%)
- Show that the library is up-to-date: 21 (8.8%)
- Prepare the way for other new media formats in the future: 17 (7.1%)
- Make available material that may otherwise be lost: 40 (16.7%)
- Collect selected material in one place: 26 (10.9%)
- Other: 22 (9.2%)
Fig. 10.21. I search today actively for resources on the Internet that is relevant for the library’s patrons.
Mean: 2.69; Median: 3.

Fig. 10.22. Blogs can have a place in the library catalogue.
Mean: 2.22; Median: 2.

Fig. 10.23. Blogs in the library catalogue would deteriorate the quality of the catalogue as a whole.
Mean: 2.23; Median: 2.

Fig. 10.24. Blogs are a natural part of the future library catalogue.
Mean: 2.13; Median: 2.

Fig. 10.25. The library’s patrons would benefit from finding blogs in the library catalogue.
Mean: 2.55; Median: 3.

Fig. 10.26. I would be positive to blogs in the library catalogue.
Mean: 2.60; Median: 3.