Meghan A Gaherty. Romanian Libraries and Community Development: The case of the Community Participation Contest. A Master's Paper for the M.S. in L.S degree. April, 2011. 66 pages. Advisor: Sandra Hughes-Hassell

Biblionet is a five-year grant from the Gates Foundation for the development of the Romanian library system. The grant provides computers and training to public libraries, and has a subgrant competition called the Community Participation Contest (CPC) that allows librarians to apply for up to $2500 in funding to use technology in a new community program. A descriptive case study was conducted to study the ways that four iterations of the Community Participation Contest have operated in rural, suburban and urban environments.. The field of Community Informatics and Diffusion of Innovation theory informed the analysis of how librarians and library users think about the library and the CPC. The participatory design of the grant process allowed the programs to be tailored to the needs of the community, and it was perceived as a successful innovation in library services.

Headings:

Public libraries – Romania

Library – Community Relations

Libraries and socio-economic problems - Romania

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

ROMANIAN LIBRARIES & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE OF THE
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION CONTEST

by
Meghan A. Gaherty

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

April 2011

Approved by

_____

Sandra Hughes Hassell

Table of Contents

Introduction

Grants provided by not-for-profit organizations to introduce information and communication technology (ICT) into public libraries have been carried out in the United States and abroad. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has provided massive funding to bridge the digital divide and bring computers and training into libraries because they believe that access to information empowers individuals and communities and can improve lives (Gates, n.d.). Since 2001 Global Libraries, an international arm of the Gates Foundation has implemented programs in ten countries and expects to invest 328 million dollars in up to fifteen countries (Gates, 2006). Global Libraries aims to position public libraries as a major actor in a sector of international development work referred to as information and communication for technology for development efforts (ICT4D). ICT4D attempts to use information technology as a tool in socioeconomic development. Successful ICT4D efforts require a close examination of the cultural context and institutional capacity to sustain this effort.

Romania is one of the countries that has been selected for a Global Libraries grant, which includes a pilot year plus five years of implementation and approximately 25 million dollars in funding. In Romania, the Global Libraries program is called Biblionet, and it is administered by IREX, an international development organization that focuses on education, media and civil society strengthening (IREX, 2010). This grant is an example of an ICT4D project because the core goals include equipping libraries with

computers and increasing staff capacity to use technology to provide new services. Biblionet aims to put computers in about 2,000 public libraries in Romania and provide training to librarians in basic technology skills and modern library services. After an initial pilot year with 14 sites, the program has been expanded and regional training centers have been set up across the country (IREX, n.d.).

Romanian libraries have struggled with poor levels of funding since the fall of communism (Anghelescu, 2001). Despite accession into the European Union (EU) in January of 2008, the Romanian economy is in a severe recession that has led to further decreases in state salaries and positions. Libraries and librarians are struggling to survive; a problem that is compounded by the belief held by many Romanians that libraries are centers of culture and repositories for books rather than information and community activities (Anghelescu, 2001). Libraries also face competition in ICT from stand-alone telecenters and for-profit Internet cafes, and must address public opinion that reflects both satisfaction with and a failure to use the public library (IREX, 2009). A landscape study conducted by the University of Washington to investigate how public access computers are used and thought about in 25 developing countries indicates that public libraries rank poorly in user perceptions of where to find access and training in ICT (Gould & Gomez, 2010).

These are a few of the issues facing Romanian librarians and government actors as they attempt to broaden free public access to ICT and to modernize library services. The limited amount of research into the function of public libraries in Romanian society calls for further investigation into what challenges and opportunities exist when integrating ICT4D efforts with library development. How programs like Biblionet are

adopted and evaluated by local governments and librarians is significant to funding agencies, governments and researchers seeking to identify successful approaches to improving public information access in the developing world.

This study examines one aspect of the Biblionet program. The Community Participation Contest (CPC) is a small grants competition that allows individuals to apply for up to $2500 to implement innovative programming in Romanian libraries. Biblionet began the CPC during the pilot year of the program, 2007-2008. Its stated mission is, "to encourage innovation and community building among the Romanian Library Community" (Rapaneau, 2009, p. 1). In the pilot year, it was a monthly contest with 14 projects selected out of 114 applications (Rapaneau, 2009).

Research was done in the summer of 2010 to evaluate the impact of CPC grants on community engagement with the library. The study asked how participating librarians envision their role in the community and how they go about planning activities, as well as how the community perceives and uses the library. It is worthwhile to examine libraries that have implemented new technology and community programming to learn more about how these changes are thought about and adopted by the librarians and community members. The CPC efforts to promote and diffuse innovation through the library system have implications for the Biblionet program in Romania and future library development projects.

Literature Review

Library development projects bridge the worlds of international development and library and information science. The placement of information and communication for development (ICT4D) projects within an existing public institution highlights the role of these projects in strengthening civil society. Biblionet aims to strengthen communities through bringing ICT to public libraries in Romania, training librarians and building a professional network that will sustain development. As a small-grants competition embedded within Biblionet, how does the Community Participation Contest influence the engagement of the library with the community? What factors persuade the community to adopt this innovation, and what are the barriers to the success of the CPC in their communities?

There is little scholarship about the Biblionet program to date. This literature review will begin by examining the cultural context of Romania and Romanian libraries. Studies that have looked at the role of libraries in ICT4D and how ICT functions in developing countries will provide insight into the wider state of the field as well as a comparative analysis of barriers and opportunities in information access. Finally, Diffusion of Innovation will be assessed as a potential theoretical framework for a study of the Community Participation Contest and the experiences and perceptions of the program among librarians and community members.

Many of these studies are situated within the interdisciplinary field of Community Informatics. Community Informatics considers how ICT contributes to economic and social development and crosses a variety of academic disciplines, including library and information science and development studies. By focusing on how technology empowers communities, Community Informatics goes beyond looking at the digital divide as an issue of simple access to examine effective use and how ICT is harnessed for community activities in diverse contexts (Gurstein, 2003). This field provides a foundation for addressing the intersection of public libraries, ICT, and international development.

Cultural Context

The development of libraries in Romania and their current role in society is critical context to understanding how the CPC may function. Anghelescu has exhaustively studied the history of libraries in Romania (2000; 2001; 2005). Her dissertation traces the development of public libraries from the early 1800's. Libraries developed as cultural institutions, influenced by Western Europe and especially France, where many Romanian librarians were trained in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Throughout their history, these institutions served society in a role of cultural preservation, not as information centers. The onset of communism drastically changed the role of the library in Romanian life. Anghelescu (2000) explains that libraries were transformed into book repositories and tools in the dissemination of propaganda. Books were heavily censored and libraries were directed by political appointees rather than trained professionals. The Soviet influence damaged the reputation of the library in the community and filled collections with ideological tracts. The study concludes with the

observation that the development of user-oriented services in the American model will require a change in attitudes and mentalities in the library profession and in the broader society.

Further work evaluating the development of Romanian libraries highlights the damage done to the profession during the years of communism. The discontinuation of library science as a course of study in 1970 devalued professional training in librarianship (Anghelescu, 2001). After revolution in 1989, low prestige and pay have continued, and while degree programs have been reestablished there have been gaps in faculty expertise and a societal attitude that librarianship does not require advanced training. Anghelescu (2001) states that communism left libraries and librarians in a lingering state of neglect, and successive governments have not provided adequate funding to revive them.

ICT in Romanian libraries is a focus in studies that consider the library sector as a whole as well as case studies. Dragulanescu (2002) and Anghelescu (2005) have each considered the larger picture of ICT penetration relative to Western Europe. Dragulanescu (2002) reviewed ICT access in Romania as part of a survey of the state of the digital divide between Central and Eastern Europe and the West. This study presented statistics that showed the low level of ICT usage in Romanian society, even in comparison to other countries in the region.

When looking at the potential for EU succession, Anghelescu (2005) examines the state of ICT in libraries. Few libraries offered computer access to the public in 2005, and many did not have computers or Internet connections at all. EU accession reports at the time highlighted the need to increase funding and infrastructure to support research and education, and although they did not specifically mention libraries, a healthy library

system would contribute to these goals. Dragulanescu (2002) makes the point that computer hardware and Internet connections can be cost-prohibitive for individuals and believes that free access would be highly valued by the populace. Anghelescu (2005) summarizes a government report issued in response to the criticisms of the level of ICT penetration in Romania, which laid out a vision to improve conditions without substantive follow-up. Both Anghelescu (2005) and Dragulanescu (2002) point to the potential for philanthropy to address problems with information access in Romania.

Researchers have used case studies to explore the current role of libraries and information in specific Romanian communities. Nyce has conducted several studies as part of a qualitative methods course offered at Ball State University (Whipple & Nyce, 2007; Klimaszweski & Nyce, 2009, Closet-Crane, Dopp, Solis & Nyce, 2009). This research has focused on the information landscape in rural Romania. Using semi-structured interviews, observation and an ethnographic perspective, the teams of researchers have explored the role of the library in two small communities. In Lunca Ilvei, a community in northern Transylvania, Whipple & Nyce (2007) found that people did not go to the library for information, and it had little support from local officials. In this village, the mayor acted as a gatekeeper of information and librarianship was not perceived to be a professional activity. The study suggests that little value was placed on the library as a potential source of everyday information needs.

Later fieldwork in Viscri, a village of 450 people, looked at the community use of information in the context of the goal of universal access to ICT. Klimaszweski & Nyce (2009) write that in this community, access to ICT was extremely limited. Few residents had computers or mobile phones, and while adults believed children should be learning

about computers in school, they showed little interest in computers for themselves and cited the high cost of owning a personal computer as a barrier to increasing access to ICT. Klimaszweski & Nyce (2009) question the benefit of providing access to ICT through programs like Biblionet because of the lack of interest in technology that the villagers demonstrated. The need for economic development and attention to basic infrastructure is posited as a barrier to ICT4D efforts, stating, "for an ICT initiative to be successful, it must be carried out in conjunction with other community development projects" (p. 10). The study concludes that the most appropriate demographic targets for ICT implementation in Viscri are school-aged children (Klimaszweski & Nyce, 2009).

The most recent study done on the perceptions of Romanians regarding libraries and ICT is a qualitative analysis conducted by a sociological firm in Bucharest, Centrul de Sociologic Urbana si Regionala (CURS). A research team visited 12 localities of various sizes spread across the country, and used interviews, focus groups and observation. The study evaluated perceptions that users and non-users have about the library and the potential role of computers and the Internet within that space. CURS (2010) found that participants continue to think of the library as a cultural institution and repository of books, echoing the findings of Anghelescu (2000) and Whipple (2007).

Participants identified outdated collections and the draw of the media and Internet as sources of information as barriers to using the library. The study supported Klimaszweski & Nyce (2009) in their assertion that libraries are seen as a place for students. When asked about how having computers with Internet access would change the library, participants said that it would increase the use and value of the public library; providing more equitable access for those who cannot afford Internet connections at

home. There was controversy on what activities should be allowed, such as communication with relatives abroad, which would appeal to the elderly but may undermine the traditional purpose of the library as a cultural institution (CURS, 2010).

The Role of Libraries in ICT4D

The expansion of ICT has had a major impact on libraries around the world. Efforts to improve public access to information through technology have been situated within libraries, but have also occurred outside of them. Libraries must define and establish their role in the provision of ICT for their users, and can draw on interdisciplinary research that considers the wider scope of ICT4D. A literature review focused on community informatics initiatives and their role in addressing the digital divide reported findings from 49 critical, empirical studies completed in North America and Europe between 1994-2004. ICTs have the potential to be a cause or a cure for the decline of physical communities. Being able to connect to the wider world can isolate individuals within the community, or bring them together and deepen their connection to each other. In terms of access, "what people use the Internet for and its perceived relevance to their everyday life…influences not only levels of access but also different types of access according to socio-economic origins" (Loader & Keeble, 2004, p. 6).

Loader and Keeble (2004) found that access to and use of the Internet is associated with higher levels of educational attainment and achievement. The CPC seeks to expand library services through technology and often includes training and a focus on disadvantaged populations, therefore it is important to consider research into how different groups of people experience ICT4D. Socially excluded groups can find libraries

more threatening than familiar, multi-purpose venues. When targeting marginalized

users, informal training that relates to their lives is most effective. Building on existing

social networks is key to integrating ICT into communities (Loader & Keeble, 2004). A

nuanced understanding of the specific environment is required, because, "without

understanding the context in which individuals and communities would use ICTs, their

widespread adoption is constrained" (Loader & Keeble, 2004, p. 35). The evidence from

this literature view points to a participatory model where targeted communities are full

actors in the design and implementation of ICT4D efforts.

  The importance of the specific cultural context limits the utility of comparisons to

case studies of ICT4D in countries in different regions of the world, but a recent large

research project has looked at ICT in public access venues across 25 developing

countries. The Landscape Study is lead by the Technology and Social Change group at

the University of Washington, and involved in-depth individual country assessments

followed by a comparative analysis of trends and themes. The study looked at three

places where people can access information in their communities: public libraries,

telecenters and cybercafés. Accepting the conclusion that addressing the digital divide

goes beyond access and must consider effective use, the researchers sought to identify

how people use and think about these venues. Although Romania is not one of the

countries studied, the regional trends of the post-Soviet nations of Moldova, Georgia,

Kyrgyzstan and Kazakstan identified in the data supported what Anghelescu (2000)

found in Romania; that libraries were valued but suffered from outdated collections and

the legacy of trust after their time as propaganda centers (Gomez, Ambikar & Coward,

2009).

Across the 25 countries, access to ICT was concentrated in urban areas. There were issues with locally relevant content and the appropriateness of technology, including available content in local languages (Gomez, Ambikar & Coward, 2009). Human capacity, or a lack of individuals who can support training in ICT, was reported as an issue in over half of the countries. Researchers also observed that access was limited by socio-cultural inequalities, and that in many places, people did not believe that ICT access could add value to their lives (Gomez, Ambikar & Coward, 2009). Most users were high school educated, with use increasing relative to education. Low to medium income users did not cite fees for telecenters or cafes as influential in their choice of venue, indicating that low fees may not be a barrier to access. The poorest, most marginalized groups were not utilizing ICT venues (Gomez & Camacho, 2009). Increasing political support for improving information access in these countries has provided momentum that can be capitalized upon by building collaborations between types of venues. Early conclusions from the study suggest that defining what is legitimate use of public access ICT will be important, and that the assumption that people are motivated to use the venues as a source for information may be too narrow and should be adjusted to include motivations of communication and social interaction.

The information needs of the people surveyed in the Landscape Study indicate that the success of ICTs will hinge on the use of strategies like training that can demonstrate the relevance of technology to people's lives (Gould, Gomez and Camacho, 2010). The lack of locally relevant content and training opportunities as well as the human capacity problems experienced in many nations are barriers to users being able to build their own capacity to find and utilize resources that add value to their lives. In many

places, people continue to rely on informal, person-to-person channels of communication. "Infomediaries," a term used by the researchers to describe people able to act as intermediaries between community and digital information, are needed. However, librarians are not regarded as capable of serving in this role, in part because of technical knowledge. Youth are perceived as most likely to be interested in and capable of training, and can help training evolve from more formal professional models to training among peers (Gould, Gomez & Camacho, 2010).

The library as a place for students and young people is a sentiment repeated in multiple studies (Whipple & Nyce, 2007; CURS, 2010; Gould & Gomez, 2010). Youth and students aged 15-35 made up a large majority of the users of ICT, but preferred cybercafés to libraries (Gomez & Camacho, 2009). Although libraries in the landscape study enjoyed high political support and were seen as safer for children than cybercafés, they were not regarded as "cool" by youth. Young people preferred venues where they could, "meet and socialize with their friends, in person and online, and where they can use ICT for communication and social networking…" (Gould & Gomez, 2010, p. 261). This conflict between perceptions of what audience the library is for and what it offers is significant, especially in light of the goal of utilizing youth to improve the community capacity for ICT.

One of the factors highlighted in the initial analysis of the Landscape Study was the importance of trust. Gomez and Gould (2010) continued this discussion in a comparison of how trust functions in each of the three public access venues studied. Trust was considered in terms of safety, relevance, reputation and "coolness." Libraries were thought of as safe, but often did not have convenient locations or hours. They were

considered preferable for children over cybercafés because of perceived exposure to pornography and games. Public libraries ranked highly for credible information, but were not considered relevant because of outdated resources. Libraries ranked lowest in staff training and attitudes towards helping with ICT, and in the former Soviet countries the perception of libraries as book storage facilities recurred. An issue with these findings is that in many of the communities, libraries do not offer ICT to the public (Gomez & Gould, 2010). Only 31% of public libraries offered ICT, concentrated in urban areas. The majority of venues in the study were cybercafés, and one article suggests considering ways to make these locations more equitable and accessible rather than setting up new competition (Gomez & Camacho, 2009) The lack of currently available ICT services in public libraries makes it difficult to evaluate how the institution might be perceived if they had computers available.

Adoption of Innovation

Diffusion of Innovation (DoI) is a theoretical framework that traces the process through which a new idea is adopted within a social system (Rogers, 2003). The theory was developed by Rogers in the mid-20th century, and has been used by social scientists to describe innovations in a variety of contexts, beginning with rural sociology (Minishi-Majana & Kipling, 2005). It states that the diffusion of innovation is a social process with identifiable factors, including the innovation, channels of communication, time and the social system. Whether or not the innovation is adopted depends on its relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability and observability (Rogers, 2003). DoI has grown into a meta-theory (Minishi-Majana & Kipling, 2005). Individual

innovativeness, or the idea that there are individuals predisposed to adopting an innovation earlier than others, is one of the four most commonly used models and categorizes adopters as innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority or laggards (Rogers, 2003).

Minishi-Manjana and Kipling (2005) evaluated the use of DOI theory in library and information science. They analyzed two studies that used DoI theory to explore the diffusion of ICTs in Africa. DoI was a useful tool for description, but not explanation. Criticisms highlighted the shortcomings of the theory, including the pro-innovation bias that influences a great deal of the research and the lack of generalizability. DoI theory was developed in the specific cultural context of North America, and is not able to account for all of the complex factors affecting developing countries. Despite these limitations, Minishi-Manjana and Kipling (2005) found that DoI was a useful framework.

Chatman (1986) modified and tested diffusion theory in a study of information diffusion among a specific population. Framing job information as an innovation for a group of working poor women in a temporary employment program shifted the framework from considering innovations strictly as tangible items or practices. Chatman states that, "…it is conceivable that information which has not been part of one's awarenesss…can also be classified as new, and thus be considered an innovation" (1986, p. 379). Two aspects of DoI were considered in the research: the elements of diffusion, including time, social structure and communication channels, and the attributes of innovations, including relative advantage, complexity and trialability. Chatman found that the stages of adoption model had limited use when considering job information as the innovation, because once more people found out about a job, the information was less

valuable. The attributes of innovations model was more useful and allowed a careful description of how a specific population thought about and communicated job information (1986).

Tran (2005) applied DoI to a study of public libraries in New Zealand. Interviews with key staff members of one library involved in implementing a Community Information Network were conducted to assess if the model could be applied and what attributes had affected the adoption of the innovation. Community Information Networks are electronic resources that provide a variety of relevant content for a local community. DoI was chosen as a theoretical framework in part because of Chatman's (1986) work in expanding the definition of an innovation to include information. Tran evaluated how likely it was that the Community Information Network would be implemented successfully using DoI, and identified which factors had a positive influence on its development (2005). While DoI has limited use as an explanatory theory, it provided structure for investigating how library staff thought about the introduction of the Community Information Network as a library service.

Diffusion of Innovation was part of the research design for an empirical study of the willingness of Romanian librarians to accept social marketing techniques. Anghelescu (2009) surveyed a group of librarians attending a professional conference to assess if the group accepted the ideas of social marketing. She used DoI to inform her instrument design, with social marketing as the innovation. The survey looked at personal predictors that impact if individuals will accept an innovation, including, "age, educational attainment, professional cosmopolitanism (e.g. professional involvement, professional reading, attendance at conferences, travel abroad)…and levels of decision making

authority" (2009, 131). Anghelescu (2009) found that librarians rejected social marketing. The small sample size prevented comparison of personal predictors for adoption or non-adoption of this innovation. Anghelescu (2009) credits the negative reception to a lack of knowledge about social marketing, and a resistance to changing from the traditional role of libraries to a more service-oriented approach. Several factors contribute to limit the practicality of large-scale survey research with Romanian librarians, but further investigation into the adoption of innovation among Romanian librarians is warranted.

Conclusion

Gomez and Camocho state, "the sole provision of public access to ICT, without additional training and outreach to include people marginalized from social and economic goods and services, may not significantly transform inequitable relations and distribution of resources in the communities they serve" (2009, p. 26). The literature supports the complexities involved in strengthening information access in the developing world, and points to possible benefits and barriers for the implementation of ICT in Romanian public libraries. The impact of years of Communism, including the de-professionalization of the field and lack of funding, combined with the historical place of the institution as a repository and cultural center are hurdles that Romanian libraries must overcome (Anghelescu, 2005). The work of Gomez, Gould and Camacho (2009, 2010) suggests that the divide between urban and rural communities may limit access, and that users must feel that there is relevant information as well as opportunity for communication to adopt ICT. There is strong agreement in the literature that training and sensitivity to cultural

context is critical for all ICT4D programs, with Community Informatics providing a useful lens for focusing on how people use ICT for community development. Anghelescu (2009) raises concerns about the openness to change among Romanian librarians, and Klimaszweski and Nyce (2009) question if ICT is desired or relevant for the rural community they studied. Despite this, the recent CURS study (2010) indicates that people from diverse communities in Romania support the inclusion of ICT in public libraries and believe it will increase usage of libraries and equitable access to information.

Human capacity to provide training and support for ICT is central to success, and at this point, the Romanian people appear to doubt that librarians possess the skills or patience to fulfill this role (CURS, 2010). The near universal perception that libraries are for students is an opportunity to seize on the enthusiasm for technology that young people have demonstrated, but questions over what is appropriate or legitimate use of technology within libraries still exist at the macro-level of the Landscape Study and the micro-level of the CURS findings. Using Diffusion of Innovation as a theoretical framework provides support for describing how new ideas are considered, adopted and move through a social system, and previous studies in library and information science have provided background into how to use the models that are part of this theory to inform research on libraries and ICT. Identified factors that influence diffusion, including the characteristics of adopters, can structure an analysis of how Romanian librarians are participating in and thinking about the innovation of an influx of ICT and training into their library system.

Methodology

A descriptive case study was conducted to understand the impact of CPC grants in Romania on community engagement with the library. The study asked how participating librarians envision their role in the community and how they go about planning activities, as well as how the community perceives and uses the library. Fieldwork was completed during a two-week trip to Romania in July 2010. Semi-structured interviews and focus groups were conducted with the assistance of a translator. At each site, the librarian, CPC participants and community members met with the researcher and translator to discuss the library and CPC project. Arrangements for the visits were made with the librarians through the Community Participation Contest coordinator for IREX. The CPC coordinator was provided with a script to translate into a recruitment email. At each site, interviews were solicited through librarians using the snowballing technique.

Site Selection

Four sites were selected for the case study. The sample was determined from the 14 sites that participated in the CPC during the pilot year of the Biblionet program, 2007-2008. Out of these 14, the CPC coordinator for Biblionet selected six that had completed all stages of the project and were geographically feasible within the limited timeframe. Four of these were chosen, with one substitution from the larger group of 14 made after a scheduling conflict caused a site to withdraw from the study. Each site included elements

of the four major focus groups of the programming proposed under the CPC: education,

youth, minorities and employment

Ethical Considerations

Prior to beginning the research, approval from the university Institutional Review

Board was granted. A consent form that informed participants of the procedure, risks and

benefits of the study was reviewed with the participants prior to each interview and focus

group and signed by all the participants and the researcher. Consent forms were available

in English and Romanian, and are attached in English (Appendix A). Each participant

had the right to stop the interview at any time, chose to be recorded or not, and approve

any quotations attributed to them prior to publication. Respondents were informed that

the study had no bearing on their future relationships or funding with Biblionet and that

the researcher was not acting as an evaluator for the program.

Data Collection

Separate interview guides were created for librarians, participants in the CPC and

community members (Appendix B). Previous studies that had applied Diffusion of

Innovation theory in library and information science were consulted, including Chatman

(1986) and Tran (2005), in the construction of the instruments. The guide for the

participants was intended for only the focus groups, but the varied nature of the

interviews required flexibility and this guide was adapted for individual interviews. The

limited amount of time available for fieldwork prevented the completion of a full pilot

test. In lieu of a pilot test, Romanian field staff reviewed the interview guides and

proposal. The instruments and research question were also shared and discussed with translators prior to research.

Each site visit consisted of two to three days of observation in the library and community, interviews, and focus groups. All meetings were held in a private setting at the library or at the subject's place of business. Interviews and focus groups lasted from 20 minutes to 1.5 hours. One translator was used for the first two sites, a second for the third site and a fourth for the final site. Some respondents requested to conduct the interview in English, with the translator available to clarify questions and responses as needed. All interviews were recorded with consent and detailed notes were taken and reviewed throughout the research.

Data Analysis

While in the field, notes were reviewed daily to identify preliminary trends and adjust questions in an iterative process. Once complete, data was reviewed to identify concepts and themes relevant to the research question. The qualitative data analysis steps described in Rubin and Rubin (2005) were used to define categories, code data and draw conclusions. Parts of Rogers (2003) Diffusion of Innovation theory were applied to help describe the themes observed in the data. The CPC was the innovation, and its adoption was looked at through relative advantage and compatibility, which were the factors that influence adoption best suited to the research question. Observability, complexity and trialability were not discernible within the scope of the study.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. First, it is a descriptive case study of a particular program in a specific place. The short timeframe and small sample constrain comparisons and the depth of the findings. The timeframe also had an impact on the sample, as librarians were asked to recruit participants and often, though not always, pre-selected individuals for the interviews and focus groups. Conducting research through translation also creates increased opportunities for errors in meaning, and the different translators at each site may have impacted how questions were delivered and responses were explained.

The study was funded by IREX, the same organization that funded the CPCs. Although it was explained in the consent forms, recruitment information (Appendix C) and at the beginning of each meeting, some participants gave responses that conflicted with others or with project reports and indicated that they saw the research study as an evaluation. Anghelescu (2009) notes that Romanian librarians are not accustomed to research studies and can be hesitant to discuss sensitive employment issues despite assurances of confidentiality. Responses that could be substantiated as exaggerations of impact were excluded from analysis. Finally, the sites were selected in part because their programs were completed and perceived as successful by IREX. This selection bias was altered somewhat by the unexpected inclusion of the fourth site, but there is a clear impact that comes with studying CPCs judged as particularly effective rather than a larger sample.

Findings

A brief overview of the purpose, implementation and outcomes of the activities at each of the four CPC sites studied is provided, followed by an analysis of how the CPC has functioned as an innovation within the libraries studied.

Saschiz

Saschiz is a rural community with a population of approximately 2,000 people. The library in Saschiz is a room inside city hall in the center of town. It is cared for by one of the employees of the city hall in addition to her duties as a project manager on several initiatives. Prior to her tenure with the city hall, the library had been closed for many years and fallen into disrepair, but it is now open two hours a day, three days a week. In addition to the library, the city hall also hosts a telecenter offering Internet access via 6 computers for a nominal fee. The information point is staffed by the IT director for the town, and is one of the Public Access Points for Information (PAPI), part of a World Bank funded program called the Knowledge Economy Project. The goal of the PAPI centers is to bring information access to 255 disadvantaged communities in Romania (World Bank, 2007).

In 2007, Saschiz submitted an application for a two-pronged CPC that would allow the library to create a database on available EU structural funds and to hold information sessions on how to apply for those funds. The library would also host a

storytelling program called "Tales of Saschiz." Funds from Biblionet were used to purchase a LCD projector and a multifunctional printer and scanner (IREX, 2008).

After delays, a database of funding was created and six information sessions were held for citizens. The database, however, is rarely utilized by community members, who prefer person-to-person contact for information. There were also issues with low attendance at the sessions, and only a few applications were submitted for funding. One interviewee shared that while people attended the information sessions on EU funds, "perhaps it is true that EU funds are for people who already have money, and most people here do not." Interviews also indicated that residents of Saschiz see a clear division between the library as a cultural center and the information point as a place to access and share information.

Most interviewees focused on the Tales of Saschiz portion of the project, and believed this was more successful than the information sessions. The Tales of Saschiz sought to connect elementary-aged youth with the older members of the community through storytelling. The library worked with the school to have children gather stories and poems from parents, grandparents and neighbors, then write them up. These stories were posted on a website created for the CPC and featured in the local newspaper in a monthly column. Interviewees discussed the excitement and energy that surrounded the initial collection of the stories, and how valuable this experience was for the older people of Saschiz, who felt valued for their contributions and experience. Several people discussed the decline in population in Saschiz, initially through the flight of people of German ancestry after 1989 and now through youth, who attend high school in larger towns and rarely wish to stay in Saschiz as adults. People believed this project addresses

this issue, and the librarian pointed out that both the Tales of Saschiz website and the general town website have stories posted and receive high traffic, including a contribution of a story from a woman who moved abroad many years ago. The monthly column in the newspaper has become permanent, with a core of interested community members who continue to contribute stories.

The most frequently cited outcome of the CPC was increased visibility of the library in the community. Since it had been closed for years before the project was initiated, both the information sessions and the Tales of Saschiz served to raise the profile of the library in the community. There were donations of books by local residents and two computers by a local NGO. The budget for the town included money for purchasing books for the first time in fifteen years. Unfortunately, in practice, there is inadequate electricity in the library to set up the two computers, which are currently being stored on a table in the room, and the money for books has not been allocated because of larger town budget problems. Despite these setbacks, respondents stated that the increased profile of the library has allowed it to have more negotiating power when requesting funding and to play a role in community activities, including a summer festival where volunteers from a local NGO worked to put on a play based on one of the Tales of Saschiz and a Christmas Fair where children made crafts to sell at the library. The librarian has also applied for and received a grant to begin a youth volunteering initiative that aims to lengthen the number of hours that the library is open.

Focsani

The city of Focsani has approximately 100,000 residents, and the library system has completed two CPC projects at different branches. Efotografi@mea was administered by the Children and Youth Branch, which hosted a photography club for youth. Funds from Biblionet were used to purchase 7 digital cameras, which were loaned out to the children over the winter holidays. A local photographer volunteered to teach the children about photography in a series of sessions, and the photos taken by the children were exhibited in a superstore and on a website where visitors could vote for their favorite shots. Twelve children participated in the first iteration of the program, including 6 Roma children.

Children and parents who participated in the photography club spoke of the impact the club had on their families. The focus group discussed how a tour through Focsani with their cameras helped the children see the city in a new way and allowed them to explore different areas. Several of the children involved have maintained a connection to the city libraries, and are currently participating in one of the weekly summer activities at the children's branch or foreign language branch. One of the Roma participants said that her favorite part of the club was that her photos were displayed at the large supermarket, where everyone could see them.

Since completing the program, the library has continued the partnerships developed through the project with the superstoreand some volunteers, and made photography one of the activities in the summer vacation clubs in 2010. Although the librarian had considered using the photography club to focus on other marginalized groups, the current iteration of the program took children on a first-come, first-served

basis and as a result, there are no Roma participants. The librarian had forged a relationship with a local Roma organization to facilitate working with Roma families for the initial club, but a change in leadership within that organization has led to less active collaboration which may help explain why Roma children did not chose to participate.

The librarian who implemented Efotografi@mea sees libraries as a modern community space–about people, not books. While she decided to use photography as the focus for her CPC proposal because of her personal passion for it, prior to committing to a photography program, she had presented a list of options to her users that included several choices to ensure that there was interest in the topic. Since completing the CPC, she has gained confidence in her ability to do projects like this and has successfully applied for a grant to host 70 children from a rural village for a day in the city doing library-related activities. She believes that the CPC raised her profile and image in the community, and demonstrated to her colleagues that valuable resources like digital cameras could be lent to the children without loss. Interviewees consistently stated that the friendly and caring nature of the librarian, who goes by her first name with patrons, was a draw to being involved in the project and library, and that they saw the library as a community space. After completing a survey of children and both urban and rural librarians in the county, the librarian has applied for a training grant from Biblionet to use Efotografi@mea as a model for other libraries hoping to implement similar activities.

The other CPC completed in Focsani focused on bullying in schools. This project was developed by a librarian in a branch in a neighborhood that struggles with youth aggression, and sought to raise awareness by having children translate a series of children's books about bullying from English into Romanian. Biblionet provided two

computers and a printer for the project. Thirty children were recruited through their teachers at two neighborhood schools, and an older teen volunteered to assist with the project. Although many interviewees cited the Roma community in the neighborhood as a factor in this issue, the librarian did not attempt to recruit children from the community because she was warned by law enforcement that it was dangerous. The translated versions of the stories were posted on a blog, and the children who participated in the program were in a school parade to raise awareness about bullying.

After completing the project, the library continues to offer the computers for patron use, and the librarian stated that she has seen an increase in interest and traffic in the library because of the new technology. The librarian visits area schools annually and talks to classes about bullying in conjunction with police and social workers. She was approached by a social services organization to work on a project for battered women because of her work on the CPC, but this project was not completed because of political changes in the organization. She believes that her involvement with Biblionet has encouraged her to take risks, get out of the library and seek new ways to better serve her community.

Sacele

Sacele is a town of 30,000 adjacent to the city of Brasov. The Brasov county library solicited ideas for CPC projects from across the county, and offered support throughout the application and implementation process. Sacele was the first proposal that the county chose for a grant application. The county librarian stated that Sacele was chosen because of the unique focus on an adult education program for the Roma

community, the cooperation of the local government, and the experience of the branch librarian. Biblionet funds were used to purchase 4 computers, and 8 Roma volunteers were trained to provide workshops for the community on how to use the computers. The library also created an information kit to help users learn about finding a job, raise self-awareness, and understand their citizenship rights. Three information sessions were hosted at the library. The sessions on citizenship were not as well attended as anticipated, and the report on the project indicated that participants might have preferred to meet at the school in their neighborhood rather than the library. The third session on jobs had 200 attendees, though the librarian explained that there was a misunderstanding about if there would be direct hiring at the session.

Participants in the focus group discussed how they were able to come to the library and prepare for the driver's exam using the computers, and how they have helped friends and family to use the computers to search for jobs and recipes. One interviewee explained how she had used the computers to prepare for her job and write final reports. The Roma representatives from city hall and volunteers were critical to explaining the program and recruiting participants, and many believed this was the most important factor in the success of the CPC. While the workshops have not continued because of required time for an inventory of the library and the imminent retirement of the librarian, the information kit and blog about the project are available and the computers continue to be utilized by Roma and non-Roma members of the community.

Analysis

The data gathered during the interviews and focus groups was analyzed to identify themes and trends across the four sites. How study participants perceived the role of the library within their community and the role of the librarian were key concepts. Who the library serves and how the CPC may have influenced the way the library engages with the community were also considered. Finally, the CPC was evaluated using elements of Diffusion of Innovation theory.

The role of the library.

When asked what the role of the library was in the community, cultural preservation was a common response among community members. Another frequent theme was that the library is a place where young people develop values and further their knowledge. In Sacele, where there are several computers for patrons, the focus group believed that the library is a place for current information and a place to spend spare time. Librarians saw the potential for a broader role, with one stating that she sees the library as a "modern community space, about people, not books."

There was also evidence to support the differing viewpoints between rural and urban perceptions of the library that were observed in the CURS (2010) study. In the rural community, there was a strong division between the telecenter and library despite sharing a building and staff. The local authority who was interviewed spoke strongly that the library was a place for books, not computers, and explained his perspective that

technology did not mix with the role of the library in cultural preservation. The rural community's more traditional vision of the role of the library may have contributed to the perception that the Tales of Saschiz portion of the CPC was more effective than the database and EU funding sessions. In the urban and suburban locations, the library was in its own space and had computers and an Internet connection set up for public use.

While each librarian saw the CPC as an opportunity to improve library services, the variations in the manifestation of the proposals also reflect how each community's view of the library differs. In Saschiz, the CPC was seen as a chance to revive the library and to raise community awareness that it was open again. Efotografi@mea and the bullying in schools project were both born out of a personal interest in the topic on the part of the librarians, which motivated them to try to do something new at the library. In Sacele, the design of the CPC proceeded slightly differently, since the county library supported the application process. The county librarian presented the opportunity to branch libraries and asked them to submit proposals based on the needs of their community. Sacele designed their project to closely meet a specific community need, the integration of the Roma into the larger community.

Who the library serves

This study supported earlier findings that in Romania the library is thought of primarily as a place for students and youth. One of the libraries studied was a branch specifically targeted to children, but across all of the sites, students and young people were consistently cited as the main target of library services. Even at the site that hosted an adult education program, one interviewee mistakenly believed that schoolchildren had

been the target. Partnerships with schools were seen as critical, but in more than one location, librarians hoped for a stronger relationship with the schools than they had experienced thus far. Personal relationships were the most effective mechanism in securing support and recruiting community members to get involved in the project. Many of the CPC participants in the focus groups said that they were either already library users, or had a personal relationship with the librarian that influenced their decision to join the project.

Two groups that are non-traditional targets for library services in Romania are the elderly and the Roma. When asked whom the library could serve better, respondents frequently cited pensioners. One person said that pensioners do not use the library because they have so many financial concerns, and going to the library could help them escape from their problems, but they do not use it. The Tales of Saschiz project addressed this by asking schoolchildren to solicit stories from older people in the community, and this created a period of excitement among the older people, who felt important and valued for their contribution to the project.

Socially marginalized, the Roma experience a wide range of difficulties in accessing public services. EDUCERO and efotograpfia@mea both specifically included the Roma. Though the interviewees for the bullying in schools project alluded to Roma involvement in the problem the librarian chose not to recruit them because of safety concerns. Both EDUCERO and efotografi@mea relied on a partnership with representatives of the Roma community. EDUCERO had a representative who is employed by the local government as an aide. He stated that going to people in his community face to-face was the most successful method to convince them to come to the

library for training and information sessions, and noted that simple discussions about needing to be able to work on the computer were most effective. He stated that technology is interesting to the community and this enthusiasm is an opportunity to improve their education, but many do not know the library exists.

Efotografi@mea had an initial focus on bringing ethnically Roma and Romanian children together, but the later edition of the project does not include Roma children. A change in leadership at the partner organization and a limited number of Roma children interested in the course were cited as reasons, though Roma children continue to use the multimedia room and participated in a summer games club

The role of the librarian

A stated evaluation of the CPC grant competition is replicablity and scaleability (Rapaneau, 2009). The programs selected are intended to be something that another library in Romania could do. At each site visited, community members and partners indicated that the personality and personal relationships of the librarian were critical to the success of the project. The librarians chose the focus of their projects based on their own interests and professional experience as well as the needs of their community. This suggests that while the CPC projects may be replicable and scaleable, they will look very different in each community. One of the librarians has continued to develop her proposal for a photography course for children as a possible training course for rural and urban librarians in her county. At this site, the energy and enthusiasm of the librarian and her ability to motivate her patrons and partners were frequently discussed. People praised

librarians who were less formal with their patrons, using their first names and getting out of the library to visit schools and participate in activities.

Beyond the key role that the librarians played in adopting and implementing the CPC, three out of the four believed that the networking and exposure that they had received through their involvement in Biblionet had given them opportunities to get to know other librarians, learn new things and begin new projects. Attending conferences has allowed them to learn from and develop relationships with other librarians. The librarian in Saschiz met a librarian from another town with a PAPI center, and began a collaboration with them. Although the hardware and CPC programs are a clear benefit, the opportunity for the librarian to receive support and training is believed to be an important part of the sustainability of the changes experienced in the libraries.

The CPC and community engagement

At each site, there was ample anecdotal evidence of the impact of the CPC on the community. The limitations of the study prevent using these stories as scientific evidence, but the documented outcomes of the project and the perceptions of the librarians and community members are important to discuss. Each library was able to expand services because of the CPC. The hardware gained through the grant remains operational and in use by patrons and the librarian. In each location, the hardware has been re-purposed for new services, including showing films in Saschiz, implementing a new photography club in Focsani and providing general patron access in Sacele. A critical aspect of the CPC as an ICT4D project is that it requires that a community activity is designed and

implemented using ICT, but once that short-term project is over, it is up to library staff to choose how to use their new resources.

Community members across the board believed that the CPC offered a new, modern service that benefited the community. Adults said this type of activity was very different than their previous experiences with the library. One CPC partner said that the project changed her view of the library as an old-fashioned place. All of the librarians cited increased usage and awareness of the library as a benefit, but two believed that the experience of grant writing, project management and networking opportunities was the most valuable part of the experience. Two of the librarians have gone on to write and receive grants, one to train other librarians to deliver similar services, and one to develop a volunteer program to support the library.

Each library experienced challenges in engaging the community. The libraries that hosted information sessions for adults had trouble recruiting an audience. The programs that relied on schoolchildren as participants had to work with vacation schedules to find a time that the children could come. The CPC project was an additional duty on top of daily tasks, and several librarians cited mandatory inventories as a barrier to scheduling the initial CPC or sustaining further activities. The most frequently cited barrier, by both librarians and community members was attitudes. This was brought up concerning library staff, described by several respondents as having a reputation of being unsmiling or unwelcome to patrons, and the community, who were perceived as having a lack of interest in the library. One person in Saschiz said, "people interested in information leave this place." There was concern that computers and the Internet were

competition for the library, and that the people most likely to hear about library programs were those that had used the library before.

The CPC and DoI

The Community Participation Contest was assessed as an innovation in the Romanian library system through its relative advantage and compatibility, two components of DoI. The relative advantage, or idea that the innovation is better than what the community had before, seemed to have universal acceptance among the interviews and focus groups. The CPC was viewed as an opportunity for the library to receive additional funding and new technology and to connect to a wider network of training and development. Although a few participants in the study did not demonstrate a strong understanding of the CPC program, all believed that the changes and increased visibility of the library in the community were positive and wanted to see the library continue to grow.

Relative advantage, however, is more complex than simply saying that an innovation is good because it is more than what the library had before. Each CPC project required a large amount of work for the librarians, partners and participants. Several participants discussed difficulties with timelines, budget processes and recruitment, and with the grant requirement that written reports and documentation be submitted throughout the process. Despite these difficulties, participants overwhelmingly believed that the CPC was a good idea and a worthwhile venture. Several librarians regarded the CPC as a first step towards improving the status of the library within the community and

participants believed that it was a good way for the library to stay relevant to people's lives and modernize.

The CPC appears to have strong compatibility in the Romanian context-another component of DoI. The ability of each community to tailor the program to their own needs was crucial to the success of the CPC. Allowing the CPC to focus on addressing the needs of youth is compatible with Romanian perceptions of the place of the library in society. Three of the four CPCs developed programs centered on youth, thus suggesting that continued efforts to support programming involving youth may be more successful. Another surprising theme related to compatibility that emerged from the interviews was the role of competition. Contests are a part of efotografi@mea and are also included as a part of many community festivals and other activities for youth in Romania. Emphasizing the competitive aspect of the CPC grant, therefore, appears to fit well with how the Romanian people, at least in the communities studied, think about structuring activities for children and youth.

Discussion

The Community Participation Contest is designed to encourage innovation and community outreach (Rapaneau, 2009). The grant requires that all projects integrate ICT into a community outreach activity, with the goal, "to encourage librarians to reach out to their communities, to think and take action to better serve their patrons…" (Rapaneau, 2009). The purpose of this study is not to evaluate the success of the CPC sites visited, but to observe how the community thinks about the library and the project that was done there. Each site had a different population and was granted different hardware through the grant, limiting comparison but still allowing for common themes to emerge and provide insight on community engagement with the library.

The CPC can be considered an example of ICT4D because it requires that technology be a part of each program. The inclusion of technology varied from the purchase of cameras for a library already equipped with computers to the purchase of desktop computers. Although the opportunity to gain new technology for the library was cited as a benefit of the program, the librarians and community members emphasized the role of the program in terms of people, not computers or cameras. The ICT in the CPC is a tool, but the technology is deemphasized relative to the benefit that it brings to individuals in the community. This fits well with Gurstein's (2003) assertion that efforts to close the digital divide must look at how ICT is used by the community rather than only access. The relative advantage and compatibility requirements for an innovation to diffuse through a social system support this focus on relevance to the community ICT

projects are targeted at, as the tool itself will be rejected unless it is seen as valuable to the community.

The participants valued the CPC for varied reasons. Whether the program was praised for the technology hardware that was brought into the library or because of the opportunity for a new community activity, those involved saw the programs as a positive and worthwhile effort. Nevertheless, the narrow scope of participants in the CPC programs and struggles to recruit participants in some locations indicate that programs that require as much support and time as the CPC may struggle to be sustainable. It appears that while the CPC met the definition of relative advantage under DoI, issues like time-intensive inventories, infrastructure and staff turnover at libraries and partner institutions remain as potential barriers to the continuation or expansion of the original programs. Despite these barriers, the new hardware and the increased skill and abilities that have resulted from the librarians going through the grant process and entering the Biblionet training network has changed how the library serves the community in each location.

The findings of this study suggest that building human capacity has the potential to transform the role of libraries in communities. The process of the CPC required that librarians write proposals and reports, develop budgets, market and advocate for their programs and collaborate with local partners, other Romanian librarians and Biblionet staff. This was the first grant that all of the librarians had applied for, and they used existing personal relationships and library users to solicit ideas, help with the application and serve as participants. Several interviewees indicated that advertising was critical to their success and it was suggested that a portion of the budget developed in new

applications be set aside for marketing. Requiring a specific marketing budget may also address an observed reliance on local media and regular users to publicize programs by guiding librarians to create more varied advertising materials.

In each CPC studied, there were factors that created a climate conducive to innovation. In Focsani, a continued education in library science, a Peace Corps volunteer, trips to the U.S. and a volunteer from an American library school were cited as some of the influences in the changes in the library system. In Saschiz, a close relationship with a local NGO and the PAPI center inspired reinvention of the library, and in Sacele there was a great deal of support from the county library. Biblionet can develop climates such as this by continuing their existing strategy of hosting study tours to domestic and international libraries. Libraries that can serve as models, such as the Children and Youth Branch and Foreign Language branch in Focsani, could be identified in each region to organize smaller-scale trips where librarians can see an example in their local context. The Sacele model, where one person at the county library served as a support and intermediary in the CPC process, can also be applied in other counties.

It is clear that cultivating strong partnerships within the community is imperative to the success and sustainability of CPC projects. In the future, creating a mentorship system or requiring applicants to pair with another librarian or library may help to improve the support system available through implementation. All of the librarians had high praise for the support they received from Biblionet, especially in terms of reporting, but there was a sense of isolation that a closer mentor or shared responsibility for the CPC could address. Librarians may also benefit from formal advice, through a document or training, on how to obtain firm agreements from partners that can transcend changes in

leadership or individual projects and clarify the role that each actor will play in the implementation of the project.

Some libraries seemed satisfied with simply having the hardware gained available to the community rather than continuing or re-inventing the activities. Hardware that could be used by patrons, such as cameras, seems more likely to maintain regular use after the project is complete. Several interviewees indicated that they thought the people who benefited most from these activities were those already likely to use the library, indicating that outreach activities could be improved. In future iterations of the CPC, it may be useful for Biblionet to ask libraries to report on how many of the participants are new to the library and how the librarians envision using resources for activities after the project. Most of the towns where the projects were completed each have hosted festivals or exhibitions where the library was a partner and the participants in the program were honored, and in two cases the library has become a regular part of annual celebrations. Pairing library activities with holidays such as the International Day of the Roma or Christmas increases the possibilities for the library to reach new users and sustain an active role in the community.

Although the sample in this study is too small to generalize, many of the trends noted in earlier studies of Romanian libraries rang true. The rural community studied was more focused on the traditional role of the library in cultural preservation and providing access to books, as noted in the CURS (2010) study. Librarians cited old mentalities as a barrier to change, as Anghelescu noted in her Social Marketing study (2009). It was difficult to recruit socially marginalized groups to participate in library activities, though strong partnerships with community organizations helped. Finally, the library was seen as

a place for students and young people, as noted in the Landscape Study (Gomez & Gould, 2009).

The CPC has been modified since the pilot year of the program. It is now alternated with a small grant to conduct a training program. One of the librarians from this study has submitted an application to train librarians and volunteers together to implement the program she designed for the CPC. There are also specific themes, with November/December of 2010 asking for submissions to be organized by target age, including adults and the elderly (www.biblionet.ro/index/k/73). These adaptations encourage librarians to think creatively about how this opportunity can best fit with the needs of their community. The findings of this study indicate that offering a small grant focused on training opportunities is an appropriate step in promoting innovation in library services.

Implications

Initial analysis of the data from the study indicates that the CPC is well received as an innovation in Romanian libraries. The self-selection process, support and benefits that receiving an IREX grant provides are undoubtedly a large reason why the CPC received such high reviews from study participants, but barriers to growth and reaching non-library users remain. Strongly held perceptions that the library is a place for students and youth may hinder outreach to socially marginalized groups like the Roma, and senior citizens, Discussions with participants revealed a great deal of concern for pensioners, who are seen as being particularly vulnerable to economic unrest and potentially less likely to learn to use new technology or the library.

At this point, it is not possible to evaluate a CPC that has been repeated by another library system, but the data suggests that personal passion is a large part of the motivation that drove these librarians to apply for the CPC and complete the additional work that the program required. This indicates that if a CPC project is replicated, it will need to be adapted to the needs and interests of the librarian as well as the community. Each librarian, excluding one who was about to retire, has gone on from the CPC to apply for additional grants from other funding agencies. This suggests that while scaling and replicating the projects are valuable goals for IREX, the grant process, training, and networking opportunities that are open to the winners are perhaps the most significant outcome for the sustainability of innovation at these libraries.

Future research may look at the characteristics of librarians who enter the Biblionet program and how they perceive the benefits and drawbacks to pursuing NGO grants for their library. The differences in perceptions about libraries and telecenters as places to find information could also be examined, and the services available for and utilized by different age groups in libraries should be evaluated. Exploring the issue of attitudes towards libraries and ICT4D with a wider scope is an important next step in research into how Romanians think about and use their libraries.

References

Anghelescu, H. G. B. (2001). Romanian libraries recover after the Cold War: The Communist legacy and the road ahead. *Libraries & Culture*, *36*(1), 233-252.

Anghelescu, H. G. B. (2005). European integration: Are Romanian libraries ready? *Libraries & Culture*, *40*(3), 435-454.

Anghelescu, H. G., Lukenbill, J., Lukenbill, W. B., & Owens, I. (2009). Acceptance of social marketing concepts by selected Romanian librarians: Culture and context. In *Advances in Library Administration and Organization* (Vol. 27, pp. 123-150). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/10.1108/S0732-0671(2009)0000027012

Anghelescu, H. G. B. (2000). Public libraries in modern and contemporary Romania: Legacy of French patterns and Soviet influences, 1830--1990. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, United States -- Texas. Retrieved October 28, 2010, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 9992743).

Chatman, E. A. (1986). Diffusion theory: A review and test of a conceptual model in information diffusion. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, *37*(6), 377-386. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(198611)37:6<377::AID-ASI2>3.0.CO;2-C

Closet-Crane, C., Dopp, S., Solis, J. & Nyce, J.M. (2009). "Why Study Up? The Elite Appropriation of Science, Institution & Tourism as a Development Agenda in Maramures, Romania*." Advances in Library Administration and Organization*, 27, 221-238. DOI 10.1108/S0732-0671(2009)0000027016.

CURS . (2010). *Biblionet Community Analysis Study*. Centrul de Sociologie Urbana si Regionala. Bucharest.

Dragulanescu, N. (2002). Social impact of the "Digital Divide" in a Central–Eastern European country. *The International Information & Library Review*, *34*(2), 139-151. doi:10.1006/iilr.2002.0190

Gates Foundation. (2006). *Expanded Global Libraries initiative increases access to information by helping libraries provide free internet service and training.* Retrieved from: http://www.gatesfoundation.org/press-releases/Pages/GlobalLibrariesPR-061130.aspx

Gates Foundation (n.d.) Global Libraries. Retrieved from:
http://www.gatesfoundation.org/libraries/Pages/global-libraries.aspx

Gomez, R., Ambikar, R., & Coward, C. (2009). Libraries, telecentres and cybercafés: An international study of public access information venues. *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, *10*(1), 33-48. doi:10.1108/14678040910949675

Gomez, R., & Camacho, K. (2009). *Who uses ICT at Public Access Centers? Age, education, gender and income differences in users of public access to ICT in 25 developing countries*. Paper presented at International Conference on Information Systems ICIS, Phoenix, Arizona, Dec 2009.

Gould, E., Gomez, R., & Camacho, K. (2010). *Information Needs in Developing Countries: How Are They Being Served by Public Access Venues?* Paper presented at the 16th Americas Conference on Information Systems AMCIS, Lima Peru. Aug 2010.

Gomez, R. & Gould, E. (2010). The "Cool Factor" of public access to ICT: Users' perceptions of trust in libraries, telecentres and cybercafés in developing countries. *Information Technology & People*, 23(3), 247-264.

Gould, E., & Gomez, R. (2010). New challenges for libraries in the information age: a comparative study of ICT in public libraries in 25 countries. *Information Development*, *26*(2), 166-176. doi:10.1177/0266666910367739

Gurstein, M. *(*2003*)* 'Effective Use: A Community Informatics Strategy Beyond the Digital Divide'*, First Monday* 8*(*12*),* Retrieved from http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/1107/1027

International Research & Exchange Board. (2008). *Global Libraries Romania: Community Participation Contest Assessment*. Washington, DC.

International Research & Exchange Board. (2010). *Annual Report*. Retrieved from: http://www.irex.org/resource/irex-annual-reports

International Research & Exchange Board. (n.d.). *Biblionet: Global Libraries Romania.* Retrieved from: http://irex.org/project/biblionet-global-libraries-romania

Klimaszewski, C., & Nyce, J. M. (2009). Does universal access mean equitable access?: What an information infrastructure study of a rural Romanian community can tell us. *New Library World*, *110*(5/6), 219-236. doi:10.1108/03074800910954253

Loader, B., & Joseph Rowntree Foundation. (2004). *Challenging the digital divide? : a literature review of community informatics initiatives*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Minishi-Majanja, M., & Kiplang'at, J. (2005). The diffusion of innovations theory as a theoretical framework in Library and Information Science research. *South African Journal of Library & Information Science*, *71*(3), 211-224. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Rapeanu, A.C. (2009, August) "Library helps Russian minority preserve traditions online." Presented at World Library and Information Congress: 75th IFLA General Conference and Council. Milan, Italy.

Rapeanu, A.C, O'Connor, M. & Andersen, S. (2010, August) "Small Measures, Big Changes: The Case of the Community Participation Contest in Romania." Presented at World Library and Information Congress: 76th IFLA General Conference and Council, Gothenburg, Sweden.

Rogers, E. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Sheketoff, K. & O'Connor, M. (2009, June)"Innovation through Competition: The Global Libraries Romania Community Participation Contest." Presented at the American Library Association. Chicago, IL.

Tran, L. A. (2005). Diffusion of community information networks in New Zealand public libraries: A case study. *New Library World*, *106*(5/6), 269-283. doi:10.1108/03074800510595878

Whipple, M., & Nyce, J. M. (2007). Community analysis needs ethnography: an example from Romania. *Library Review*, *56*(8), 694-706. doi:10.1108/00242530710818027

World Bank. (2007). "*Romania: Knowledge Economy Project is supporting the county of Hunedora in nine localities.*" Retrieved from http://go.worldbank.org/ZOUFVKGXC0

Appendix A: Interview Schedules and Focus Group Guide

Interview Schedule – Librarians

1. Please tell me about yourself and your library.

2. Where did you hear about the CPC opportunity?   What was the process by which you developed your proposal?

3. How has your library changed since completing the CPC? How did those changes come about?

4. What did you learn through the CPC that has been most valuable in your current work?

5. What are some of the challenges you have faced when planning (name of CPC) and other programs? How did you deal with those challenges?

6. How do you receive and share news and information about libraries? Not including your family, who do you talk to most about your job? How do you talk with other librarians?

7. Are you interested in doing projects like this in the future? Can you give me some examples? Where do you look for ideas and resources? How would you design a new project, if you were to implement one?

8. How have you worked with local organizations, schools or individuals to accomplish things at your library? Have those partnerships been effective, or not?

Interview Schedule – Community Member

1. What is your role in this community? How do you see that role?

2. Do you think there are problems with how people find out about agriculture/jobs/their rights/local activities? What would be a way that could improve that?

3. What role does your public library play in helping people find information [on (see above)?]

4. What do you know about activities done at the library? If you have been involved, what did you do?

5. How do you think the CPC project has changed the ways the library serves the community?

6. How do you use the library? What do you do there? What would you like to be able to do?

Focus Group Guide – CPC Participants

1. When you think of your library, what comes to mind? What can you find there?

2. Think back to before your involvement with [name of CPC]. How often did you use the library, and how? What kinds of things do you do now that you did not do before? (library and community)

3. Tell me about your experiences with the CPC. How did you get involved? What was most surprising?

4. How did you personally benefit from your experience with the CPC? Do you think these experiences are true for the other CPC participants?

5. After participating in (name of CPC), are you interested in continuing to use the library? What would you like to be able to do there? How would you like to see it change?

Appendix B: Study Consent Forms

University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Adult Participants Social Behavioral Form

IRB Study #____10-1244_____ Consent Form Version Date: ____7/12_____

Title of Study: The Community Participation Contest in Romania

Principal Investigator: Meghan Gaherty
UNC-Chapel Hill Department: School of Library and Information Science
Faculty Advisor: Sandra Hughes Hassell
Faculty Advisor Contact email: smhughes@email.unc.edu
Funding Source and/or Sponsor: International Research and Exchanges Board
Study Contact telephone number: 011-703-789-5225
Study Contact email: mgaherty@email.unc.edu

What are some general things you should know about research studies?
You are being asked to take part in a research study. To join the study is voluntary.
You may refuse to join, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any
reason, without penalty.

Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge. This new information may help
people in the future.   You may not receive any direct benefit from being in the research
study. There also may be risks to being in research studies.

Details about this study are discussed below. It is important that you understand this
information so that you can make an informed choice about being in this research study.
You will be given a copy of this consent form. You should ask the researchers named
above, or staff members who may assist them, any questions you have about this study at
any time.

What is the purpose of this study?
The purpose of this research study is to learn about how the Community Participation
Contest (CPC) program at your local library has had an impact on your community.

How many people will take part in this study?
If you decide to be in this study, you will be one of approximately 60 people in this
research study.

How long will your part in this study last?
Participating in the study will take approximately 1-2 hours of your time.

What will happen if you take part in the study?
You will be asked questions in an interview. If your responses are going to be attributed to you in a publication, you will be contacted to review and approve the quotation.
What are the possible benefits from being in this study?
Research is designed to benefit society by gaining new knowledge. You may not benefit personally from being in this research study.

What are the possible risks or discomforts involved from being in this study?
Due to the limited number of people and locations participating in this study, there is the potential that people outside the study will know that you have participated. You should be aware of the possibility that your employer or neighbors may be able to deduce that published statements came from you. You will have the opportunity to review and approve any statements that are attributed to you before they are shared with anyone outside the research team.

How will your privacy be protected?

The researcher will be the only person with access to the research records. The translator will be held to the same expectations of confidentiality. If your name or other identifying information is recorded, it will not be associated with your responses. Each participant will be assigned a number that will be used for all notes, and the key will be kept separately in a password protected file. If the researcher or sponsor wishes to use a quote from you in a publication, you will have the opportunity to review and approve that use. You will be contacted through the phone or email address that you provide and have 15 days to respond. If you have not responded after 15 days your statements will be paraphrased without attribution.

Participants may be identified in any report or publication about this study. Although every effort will be made to keep research records private, there may be times when federal or state law requires the disclosure of such records, including personal information. This is very unlikely, but if disclosure is ever required, UNC-Chapel Hill will take steps allowable by law to protect the privacy of personal information. In some cases, your information in this research study could be reviewed by representatives of the University, research sponsors, or government agencies for purposes such as quality control or safety.

If you agree to be recorded, the audio tape will be kept secure by the researcher and used to make a transcript of your responses, then destroyed immediately after the transcript is complete.

Check the line that best matches your choice:
_____ OK to record me during the study
_____ Not OK to record me during the study

What if you want to stop before your part in the study is complete?

You can withdraw from this study at any time, without penalty. The investigators also have the right to stop your participation at any time.

Will you receive anything for being in this study?
You may receive small snacks for taking part in this study.

Will it cost you anything to be in this study?
There will be no costs for being in the study

What if you have questions about this study?
You have the right to ask, and have answered, any questions you may have about this research. If you have questions, complaints, concerns, or if a research-related injury occurs, you should contact the researchers listed on the first page of this form.

What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?
All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, or if you would like to obtain information or offer input, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 011-919-966-3113 or by email to IRB_subjects@unc.edu.

- -

Title of Study: The Community Participation Contest in Romania

Principal Investigator: Meghan Gaherty

Participant's Agreement:

I have read the information provided above. I have asked all the questions I have at this time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.

_____   _____
Signature of Research Participant   Date

_____
Printed Name of Research Participant

_____   _____
Signature of Research Team Member Obtaining Consent   Date

_____
Printed Name of Research Team Member Obtaining Consent

Contact Information: *Please circle your preferred method of contact.*

Phone: _____

Email: _____

University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Adult Participants Social Behavioral Form

_____

IRB Study #_____10-1244_____ Consent Form Version Date: _____7/12_____

Title of Study: The Community Participation Contest in Romania

Principal Investigator: Meghan Gaherty
UNC-Chapel Hill Department: School of Library and Information Science
Faculty Advisor: Sandra Hughes Hassell
Faculty Advisor Contact email: smhughes@email.unc.edu
Funding Source and/or Sponsor: International Research and Exchanges Board
Study Contact telephone number: 011-703-789-5225
Study Contact email: mgaherty@email.unc.edu

_____

What are some general things you should know about research studies?
You are being asked to take part in a research study. To join the study is voluntary.
You may refuse to join, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any
reason, without penalty.

Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge. This new information may help
people in the future.   You may not receive any direct benefit from being in the research
study. There also may be risks to being in research studies.

Details about this study are discussed below. It is important that you understand this
information so that you can make an informed choice about being in this research study.
You will be given a copy of this consent form. You should ask the researchers named
above, or staff members who may assist them, any questions you have about this study at
any time.

What is the purpose of this study?
The purpose of this research study is to learn about how the Community Participation
Contest (CPC) program at your local library has had an impact on your community.

How many people will take part in this study?
If you decide to be in this study, you will be one of approximately 60 people in this
research study.

How long will your part in this study last?
Participating in the study will take approximately 1-2 hours of your time.

What will happen if you take part in the study?

You will be asked questions in an interview. If your responses are going to be attributed to you in a publication, you will be contacted to review and approve the quotation.

What are the possible benefits from being in this study?
Research is designed to benefit society by gaining new knowledge. You may not benefit personally from being in this research study.

What are the possible risks or discomforts involved from being in this study?
Due to the limited number of people and locations participating in this study, there is the potential that people outside the study will know that you have participated. You should be aware of the possibility that your employer or neighbors may be able to deduce that published statements came from you. You will have the opportunity to review and approve any statements that are attributed to you before they are shared with anyone outside the research team.

How will your privacy be protected?

The researcher will be the only person with access to the research records. The translator will be held to the same expectations of confidentiality. If your name or other identifying information is recorded, it will not be associated with your responses. Each participant will be assigned a number that will be used for all notes, and the key will be kept separately in a password protected file. If the researcher or sponsor wishes to use a quote from you in a publication, you will have the opportunity to review and approve that use. You will be contacted through the phone or email address that you provide and have 15 days to respond. If you have not responded after 15 days your statements will be paraphrased without attribution.

Participants may be identified in any report or publication about this study. Although every effort will be made to keep research records private, there may be times when federal or state law requires the disclosure of such records, including personal information. This is very unlikely, but if disclosure is ever required, UNC-Chapel Hill will take steps allowable by law to protect the privacy of personal information. In some cases, your information in this research study could be reviewed by representatives of the University, research sponsors, or government agencies for purposes such as quality control or safety.

If you agree to be recorded, the audio tape will be kept secure by the researcher and used to make a transcript of your responses, then destroyed immediately after the transcript is complete.

> Check the line that best matches your choice:
> _____ OK to record me during the study
> _____ Not OK to record me during the study

What if you want to stop before your part in the study is complete?

You can withdraw from this study at any time, without penalty. The investigators also have the right to stop your participation at any time.

Will you receive anything for being in this study?
You may receive small snacks for taking part in this study.

Will it cost you anything to be in this study?
There will be no costs for being in the study

What if you have questions about this study?
You have the right to ask, and have answered, any questions you may have about this research. If you have questions, complaints, concerns, or if a research-related injury occurs, you should contact the researchers listed on the first page of this form.

What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?
All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, or if you would like to obtain information or offer input, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 011-919-966-3113 or by email to IRB_subjects@unc.edu.

- -

Title of Study: The Community Participation Contest in Romania

Principal Investigator: Meghan Gaherty

Participant's Agreement:

I have read the information provided above. I have asked all the questions I have at this time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.

_____   _____
Signature of Research Participant   Date

_____
Printed Name of Research Participant

_____   _____
Signature of Research Team Member Obtaining Consent   Date

_____
Printed Name of Research Team Member Obtaining Consent

<u>Contact Information:</u> *Please circle your preferred method of contact.*

<u>Phone:</u> _____

<u>Email:</u> _____

University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Adult Participants Social Behavioral Form

_____

IRB Study #_____10-1244_____ Consent Form Version Date: _____7/12_____

Title of Study: The Community Participation Contest in Romania

Principal Investigator: Meghan Gaherty
UNC-Chapel Hill Department: School of Library and Information Science
Faculty Advisor: Sandra Hughes Hassell
Faculty Advisor Contact email: smhughes@email.unc.edu
Funding Source and/or Sponsor: International Research and Exchanges Board
Study Contact telephone number: 011-703-789-5225
Study Contact email: mgaherty@email.unc.edu

_____

What are some general things you should know about research studies?
You are being asked to take part in a research study. To join the study is voluntary.
You may refuse to join, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any
reason, without penalty.

Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge. This new information may help
people in the future.   You may not receive any direct benefit from being in the research
study. There also may be risks to being in research studies.

Details about this study are discussed below. It is important that you understand this
information so that you can make an informed choice about being in this research study.
You will be given a copy of this consent form. You should ask the researchers named
above, or staff members who may assist them, any questions you have about this study at
any time.

What is the purpose of this study?
The purpose of this research study is to learn about how the Community Participation
Contest (CPC) program at your local library has had an impact on your community.

How many people will take part in this study?
If you decide to be in this study, you will be one of approximately 60 people in this
research study.

How long will your part in this study last?
Participating in the study will take approximately 2 hours of your time.

What will happen if you take part in the study?

You will be asked questions in a focus group. If your responses are going to be attributed to you in a publication, you will be contacted to review and approve the quotation.

What are the possible benefits from being in this study?
Research is designed to benefit society by gaining new knowledge. You may not benefit personally from being in this research study.

What are the possible risks or discomforts involved from being in this study?
Due to the limited number of people participating in this study and the focus group setting, there is the possibility that someone could identify statements that you make. Everyone who participates in the focus group will be asked to keep all discussion confidential, but you should be aware of the possibility that your employer or neighbors may hear what you have said. You will have the opportunity to review and approve any statements that are attributed to you before they are shared with anyone outside the research team.

How will your privacy be protected?

The researcher will be the only person with access to the research records. If your name or other identifying information is recorded, it will not be associated with your responses. Each participant will be assigned a number that will be used for all notes, and the key will be kept separately in a password protected file. If the researcher or sponsor wishes to use a quote from you in a publication, you will have the opportunity to review and approve that use. You will be contacted through the phone or email address that you provide and have 15 days to respond. If you have not responded after 15 days your statements will be paraphrased without attribution.

Participants may be identified in any report or publication about this study. Although every effort will be made to keep research records private, there may be times when federal or state law requires the disclosure of such records, including personal information. This is very unlikely, but if disclosure is ever required, UNC-Chapel Hill will take steps allowable by law to protect the privacy of personal information. In some cases, your information in this research study could be reviewed by representatives of the University, research sponsors, or government agencies for purposes such as quality control or safety.

If you agree to be recorded, the audio tape will be kept secure by the researcher and used to make a transcript of your responses, then destroyed immediately after the transcript is complete.

       Check the line that best matches your choice:
       _____ OK to record me during the study
       _____ Not OK to record me during the study

As a participant in a focus group, you do not need to use your name, or you may choose to use a fictitious name. You are expected to keep the discussion private and not share

what is discussed outside of the focus group. The translator will be held to the same confidentiality standards as the researcher and participants

What if you want to stop before your part in the study is complete?
You can withdraw from this study at any time, without penalty. The investigators also have the right to stop your participation at any time.

Will you receive anything for being in this study?
You will receive small snacks for taking part in this study.

Will it cost you anything to be in this study?
There will be no costs for being in the study

What if you have questions about this study?
You have the right to ask, and have answered, any questions you may have about this research. If you have questions, complaints, concerns, or if a research-related injury occurs, you should contact the researchers listed on the first page of this form.

What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?
All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, or if you would like to obtain information or offer input, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 011-919-966-3113 or by email to IRB_subjects@unc.edu.

- -

Title of Study: The Community Participation Contest in Romania

Principal Investigator: Meghan Gaherty

Participant's Agreement:

I have read the information provided above. I have asked all the questions I have at this time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.

_____   _____
Signature of Research Participant   Date

_____
Printed Name of Research Participant

_____   _____
Signature of Research Team Member Obtaining Consent   Date

_____
Printed Name of Research Team Member Obtaining Consent

University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Assent to Participate in a Research Study
Adolescent Participants age 15-17
Social Behavioral Form

IRB Study #_____10-1244_____
Assent Form Version Date: _____7/12_____

Title of Study: The Community Participation Contest in Romania

Principal Investigator: Meghan Gaherty
UNC-Chapel Hill Department: School of Information and Library Science
Faculty Advisor: Sandra Hughes Hassell
Faculty Advisor Contact email: smhughes@email.unc.edu
Funding Source and/or Sponsor: International Research and Exchanges Board
Study Contact telephone number: 011-703-789-5225
Study Contact email: mgaherty@email.unc.edu

What are some general things you should know about research studies?
You are being asked to take part in a research study. Your parent, or guardian, needs to give permission for you to be in this study. You do not have to be in this study if you don't want to, even if your parent has already given permission. To join the study is voluntary. You may refuse to join, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any reason, without penalty.

Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge. This new information may help people in the future. You may not receive any direct benefit from being in the research study. There also may be risks to being in research studies.

Details about this study are discussed below. It is important that you understand this information so that you can make an informed choice about being in this research study. You will be given a copy of this consent form. You should ask the researchers named above, or staff members who may assist them, any questions you have about this study at any time.

What is the purpose of this study?
The purpose of this research study is to learn about how the Community Participation Contest (CPC) program at your local library has had an impact on your community.

How many people will take part in this study?
If you decide to be in this study, you will be one of approximately 60 people in this research study.

How long will your part in this study last?

Participating in the study will take approximately 1-2 hours of your time.

What will happen if you take part in the study?
You will be asked questions in a group with a translator and the person doing the research.

What are the possible benefits from being in this study?
Research is designed to benefit society by gaining new knowledge. You may not benefit personally from being in this research study.

What are the possible risks or discomforts involved from being in this study?
Due to the limited number of people and locations participating in this study, there is the potential that people outside the study will know that you have participated. You should be aware of the possibility that your teachers, neighbors or classmates may be able to deduce that published statements came from you. All statements shared outside of the research team will be paraphrased without attribution.

How will your privacy be protected?
- The researcher will be the only person with access to the research records. Your name will not be recorded, and you may provide a fictitious name if you like. Each participant will be assigned a number that will be used for all notes, and the key will be kept separately in a password protected file. It is possible that other people in your community will know that you participated in the focus group.

- If you agree to be recorded, the audio tape will be kept secure by the researcher and used to make a transcript of your responses, then destroyed immediately after the transcript is complete.

Participants will not be identified in any report or publication about this study. Although every effort will be made to keep research records private, there may be times when federal or state law requires the disclosure of such records, including personal information. This is very unlikely, but if disclosure is ever required, UNC-Chapel Hill will take steps allowable by law to protect the privacy of personal information. In some cases, your information in this research study could be reviewed by representatives of the University, research sponsors, or government agencies (for example, the FDA) for purposes such as quality control or safety.

> Check the line that best matches your choice:
> _____ OK to record me during the study
> _____ Not OK to record me during the study

Will you receive anything for being in this study?
You may receive small snacks for taking part in this study.

What if you have questions about this study?

You have the right to ask, and have answered, any questions you may have about this research. If you have questions, complaints, or concerns, you should contact the researchers listed on the first page of this form.

What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?
All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, or if you would like to obtain information or offer input, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 011-919-966-3113 or by email to IRB_subjects@unc.edu.

- -

Title of Study: The Community Participation Contest in Romanian Libraries

Principal Investigator: Meghan Gaherty

Participant's Agreement:

I have read the information provided above. I have asked all the questions I have at this time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.

_____   _____
Your signature if you agree to be in the study   Date

_____
Printed name if you agree to be in the study

_____   _____
Signature of Research Team Member Obtaining Assent   Date

_____
Printed Name of Research Team Member Obtaining Assent

Appendix C: Participant Recruitment Script

Recruitment Script for The Community Participation Contest in Romania (to be delivered in Romanian by Anca Rapaneau).

I am contacting you to ask you to participate in a research study on the Community Participation Contest(CPC) that you completed at your library. Do you have time to hear a little bit about the proposal?
[If no]
Is there a better time to contact you?
[If yes]
This study will be done by Meghan Gaherty, a graduate student in library science at the University of North Carolina, between July 19 and July 30. The goal of the study is to examine any impact that the CPC may have had on your library and community. Your participation is completely voluntary and has no impact on your employment or any grants or funding through IREX or the Global Libraries program. If you choose to participate in this study, the researcher will visit your library for two days and interview you for approximately two hours. She will also solicit one- hour interviews from adults in your community and conduct a two hour focus group with participants from the program. If available, space in your library may be used for other interviews and the focus group. Everyone will have the opportunity to learn about the study and consent to being a part of it, and no one will be coerced into participation. Do you have any questions?
[Answer questions]
If you are interested in participating in the study or have further questions, you can contact me at xxx or by email at xxx. You may also contact Meghan Gaherty at xxx. Thank you for your time.