Minding User Desires:
Updating the “Universal” Library Catalogue and Library Space Using Google Statistics for Data Mining

Introduction, ideology, and justification for research proposal

This data mining research, if implemented, will help answer the questions: should (and can) Google search statistics be used to tailor the “universal” library catalogue to better meet public library users’ search needs and desires, and if so, how will this process work? Current universal cataloguing does not meet the diverse search desires and needs of library members. The universal catalogue assumes that people of diverse cultural and economic backgrounds classify, categorize, and experience the world similarly. The universal catalogue has also historically failed to consider the bias of the present. The present is always changing. We are always immersed in the bias and ideologies of the present—however, this is not considered in attempts at universal library cataloguing. These systems are not easily adaptable, even though our categories of classification are always changing and have never been universal. This proposal is for a data mining research project that examines trends in Google user searches and correlates these statistics with trends in library member searches, in order to examine and potentially critique the effectiveness of universal library cataloguing systems, such as DDC and LCC subject headings. This project does not aim to discredit the usefulness of an attempt at universal cataloguing, but instead aims to assist those interested in librarianship to think critically about whom these information organization systems are now designed for.

Categories of classification are often flawed but invisible, ideas that are so deeply ingrained in social behaviors and thinking that people forget that they are constructed. Cognitive theorist George Lakoff writes about the prototype theory of categories wherein categories are both human experience and imagination, with degrees of membership and no distinct boundaries (1987); these categories are then problematically naturalized through use and adoption and become invisible. The fictional novella Kitchen by Banana Yoshimoto could be entered into various main sections and subsections in a library catalogue as: post-colonial studies, feminist studies, food studies, literature, Japanese customs, Japanese culture, courtship, mourning, sexuality, and so on, exceeding the limit of standard contextual information allowed in an entry. Someone who is very specifically searching for one of those areas might miss out on the book, but currently there are not enough financial or human resources to catalogue in this detailed way to link ideas and concepts. The invisible and limiting categories exposed by prototype theory are problematic because, as Ian Hacking suggests, “social change creates new categories of people”—the more diverse the categories, the more diverse our ways of being” (1999, p. 223).

User-generated archives, such as social media websites and other collections of user data, can be used to take control over and reshape restrictive categories of classification, compensating for any supposedly universal system’s failure to capture more diverse categories; in this way users can address the subjectivity of classification, and researchers can use this data to uncover diverse trends.

In contemporary culture, where information is being produced much faster than it can be consumed, traditional categories of organization have been deconstructed. Not only are we more exposed to the past now more than ever—and all the aesthetics and romanticized rituals of the past—but we are also exposed to the immediate past, down to the minute. As such, with the present also constantly being updated, the way we define ourselves is complex. Counter cultures also become difficult to define in a global society with increased visibility of diverse ways of
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1 Music critic Simon Reynolds writes in depth about periodization and postmodern fragmentation of identity in Retromania: Pop Culture's Addiction to its Own Past (2011).
being, due to a rich exchange of information. MARC is shifting to linked data (RDA), a hybrid universal cataloguing system, in transition, that accounts for shifting postmodern attitudes towards classifying— making more detailed catalogue entries that account for diverse ways of classifying. However, in addition to the universal catalogue’s shift to the more accommodating RDA system of classifying, cataloguing systems must be able to easily adapt to accommodate shifting cultural ideologies attached to vocabularies of categorization and classifying; the universal catalogue must become more malleable and changeable than it has traditionally been— because categories of being have expanded and our information seeking behaviors have changed and continue to do so as technology changes along with cultural ideologies.

This data mining research project aims to examine if local and more broad Google search trends match with library cataloguing standards through user search queries; library circulation statistics will be compared to Google search statistics to make the library catalogue’s outdated searching terms visible. The elicited data from Google stats will also help tailor the public library catalogue to local communities, examining if universal cataloguing is consistent with the contemporary “zeitgeist” 2. Google stats and trends are public knowledge, yet public libraries have not yet made use of these search trends. The universal catalogue is tailored to specific North American hegemonic ideologies, and designed for trained librarians to navigate rather than library members. The librarian must often act as the intermediary between users and the library catalogue or other library resources, and though this is not a negative practice—since the librarian can hopefully enrich the user’s information-seeking process with their expertise—it still strips the library member of autonomy and forces them to participate within a specific ideology of classifying and organizing information and the world. Additionally, in most public libraries there is no “current awareness” or “trends” searching, only retrospective searching—which, while suitable for some members, does not satisfy all members’ search needs. This research project also aims to measure the potential success of incorporating a malleable “trending” section within universal cataloguing or the physical organization of information in the library by contrasting the statistics of how library members search with how other populations outside of the library search.

A data mining project like this would be important because of the inadequacy of the current universal catalogue, which still incorporates outdated language and limited and hierarchical categories of naming and classifying that reflect past cultural ideologies that have since shifted. For example, in DDC, there is one “God” for Christianity, while all other religions are categorized under one second “god”; in the LCC outdated categories such as “gypsy” and “oriental languages” still exist (at the time I am writing this), derived by what appears in the literature, with little regard for how these racist and stereotypical labels will affect users. Controlled vocabularies, such as name authority files, may not reflect current categories of naming; there are philosophical and subjective decisions involved with making “connections” within the universal catalogue. For example, the catalogue might use key words or catalogue to link the Jane Austen novel Emma to the teen film Clueless (1995), even though the film is only very loosely based on the novel. These links can mislead searchers and derail their research— although some users might find the connection useful. Alternatively, and as I will discuss in the final section of this paper, if users are bombarded with linked information they might be dissuaded from research, overwhelmed with the headlines; users might also begin to read the headlines instead of delving into the body of the information or artifact.

Along with the overabundance of user-generated information and exchanged ideas on the Internet, there is also a shift in what is considered “knowledge” or worthy of being catalogued. Many social networking websites cannot be catalogued because information on these websites changes so frequently with minute-to-minute updates, or sooner (like Twitter). Many websites
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function as self-maintained archives that do not necessarily need to be incorporated into the library collection. However, librarians must know how to access these archives, for example art resources or artworks that never come to life in print material form or physical artifact, but are instead archived on artist blogs or sites such as: Pinterest, Etsy, DeviantArt, Flickr, and Instagram. Users of these sites connect ideas and create “links” through shared information, including hyperlinks or hypertext, but the information quality of these links can be poor. For example, Facebook users can share links to articles simply because the topic headline interests them, or the article’s perceived subject coincides with their political beliefs, but they might not have actually read the body of the article until after they share the link—or perhaps they never do and they have shared the link to gain social and cultural capital.  

Although Libraries cannot realistically incorporate social media websites into the catalogue, Librarians should also have knowledge of social media trends, to connect library members who are perhaps not Internet savvy to the information that best meets their search desires and wellbeing needs; this information might not be located within the library’s physical collection. Librarians should also be versed in social media and Internet trends to connect with library members who are Internet savvy. If this data mining project determines that popular Google search trends can and should be incorporated into the public library collection, then librarians can consult these constantly shifting Google stats monthly, or perhaps weekly, to organize “current trends”, “current events”, and “local trends” sections incorporating various subjects within the library’s collection; I will discuss this further in the section “dimensions”. In this way, individual public library branches can pick up the slack of the universal catalogue. This data mining research can examine global—as well as unique communities’—search behaviors; good information organization in a library can better serve specific populations of people. This research will hopefully improve the way information is organized in the public library, so that the library can better contribute to community building, members’ improved wellbeing, and increased awareness of information pleasures, including learning through entertainment.

Key variables

Dependent variables will include: the terms that the users search, and “trending topics”, that will depend on users’ cultural backgrounds, hobbies, interests, experiences, location etc.; we will only be examining physical “location” in contrast with terms that users search. Independent variable will include: the user’s physical geospatial location as well as the online search engine Google specifically, although in the future other search engines might be considered; I will discuss problems with Google and other search engines in the “limitations” section. The data will not reveal any other independent variable such as the searcher’s: age, gender, race, class—although the category of class might be determined from the general economic status of the community where the user is located. For the purpose of this study, no other independent variable or information about Google or library searchers will be collected (such as age, sex, income).

Different dimensions (aspects) of each of variables with justifications

Specifically, for the purpose of this assignment, I am choosing to narrow my dimensions to examine how users search vocabulary related to gender identity, contrasting synonyms and vocabulary most popular for specific cities and provinces that use Google. For this proposal, the dimensions will also be limited to provinces and cities across Canada—although in the future the scope should be much larger, measuring effectiveness of the universal catalogue within other countries. Data related to the following search words will be examined both from Google stats

and library circulation statistics from participating libraries. To represent current search behaviors related to gender politics and queerness, the following search terms will be contrasted with each other, and then between the library catalogue and Google stats, and different populations of searchers:

Transgender issues; transgender politics; transgender news; transsexual issues; trans issues
Gay resources; queer resources; LGTBQ resources; LGTB resources; homosexual resources

Additionally, trends in areas of relevant terms will be mined both from Google stats and contrasted to participating libraries’ user keyword search data on the same phrase or word in order to understand how people in specific communities interact with information (for example in the library versus the home) or what information can be incorporated into a “current” or “trending” area related to news, arts, and entertainment—or whichever areas greatly interest particular communities; the librarian can consult the changing Google stats and update the section accordingly. Current events can be incorporated into the library through local “current event” sections as well, developed in part from popular library searches as well as mined Google statistics; librarians can contrast statistics from the broader country as compared to a specific province, and juxtapose this information to the public library user search data for the same topics (for example “trending” within the library community vs. trending globally or on Google locally). Library collections should be designed for library members to peruse and not just for skilled librarians. For the purpose of this proposal, areas mined for trends have been narrowed to the following dimensions related to gender identity (although in the future librarians can elicit Google stats data to help “update” cataloguing areas they feel are outdated or irrelevant):

Top local news stories related to transgender communities searched on Google
Top international news stories related to feminism and popular music searched on Google
Top LGTBQ author searched on Google
Top LGTBQ books searched on Google
Top LGTBQ film searched on Google for 2016

* Whether the catalogue or library space should be altered will be at the librarian’s discretion — and this data mining study might dispel the idea that the library universal catalogue should be modified using Google stats; perhaps Google stats will reveal biases and problematic popular search language; I will discuss this further in the section “limitations”.

Statements about how you tend to operationalize each dimension with justifications

This data mining research project will use anonymous aggregate Google search data, initially across North America (Canada for this proposal), but potentially from 20 countries, similar to the study developed by Seth Stephens-Davidowitz that looked at what pregnant women search from 20 countries (May, 2014). Stephens-Davidowitz writes, “Because we can examine the searches of foreign-language speakers in the United States and compare them with searches from their home countries, the Google window gives us a fascinating glimpse into cultural assimilation” (Stephens-Davidowitz). Google stats will show how more people search—outside of the library and from diverse communities; in turn this might draw people to the library instead of the Internet. Additionally, the librarian can then provide users with a critical perspective on trends or suggest alternative sources or related subject, making the library more relevant in a society where people need constant stimulation and to stay updated. Many people learn through entertainment and a “trend” searching section in a library can become a social space, where library members can converse about current events, even entertainment and celebrity trending subjects. A current events social club can also be introduced into library programming, including
local current events, which would foster community building. In a similarly designed study, Google took the “50 million most common keywords that Americans typed in search bars and tried to figure out, by comparing them with federal health statistics, where the H1N1 flu virus was to likely strike next” (Feuer, 2013). Although not everyone uses Google, the stats of what library users search and what Google users search in specific communities can be analyzed and then researchers can determine if Google stats should be used to update the universal catalogue.

Statements about how you tend to measure each of those dimensions or operationalizations with justification

User search data from the public library will be compared to Google user search stats, to measure the potential effectiveness of a current trends section or search category in the library catalogue, as well as the potential effectiveness of using popular search terms elicited from data mining Google to update the universal library catalogue. If there is a strong correlation between how library members search and how Google users search, then cataloguing practices within libraries should perhaps be updated. If trends in Google can be matched to trends or patterns in library searches—then perhaps a current trends category in the universal library catalogue should be introduced, or a physical section should be incorporated into the public library. Additionally, such statistical information would be useful to public librarians regardless, enabling them to be well versed in Internet trends, so that they can better connect to diverse populations, including younger generations who are perhaps more articulate in speaking the language of social media vocabulary. Other open data has been mined through research effectively from social media and the Internet, for example “Facebook data can reveal patterns that polls generally do not have large enough sample sizes to detect” (2014, Stephens-Davidowitz). In another study, researchers using data from Google web searches found that “the results, based on a decade of search data, offer a portrait of the very different subjects that occupy the thoughts of richer America and poorer America. They're a glimpse into the id of our national inequality” (Leonhardt, 2014). Google’s data is raw because users search with the façade of anonymity; their searches are unfiltered—they generally do not consider that they are being watched. Alternatively, perhaps this study will find that the library catalogue should not be altered to adhere to Google search trends, for example if these search trends are racist, sexist, homophobic, or otherwise harmful to individuals or larger communities.

Statements about how you intend to content-analyze your raw data by means of coding and categorization procedures (with justifications); an explanation of the procedures that you would need to undertake in order to amass and manipulate your trove of data

In interpreting the data, key words searched will be organized into the Google searcher’s geospatial location; we will study search trends within specific communities. We will also consider the location of participating libraries (for this proposal, across Canada) and contrast their user search data with elicited data from Google stats. Using this data, researchers will be able to examine how a specific community’s library members search, and then compare this to how members of the community outside of the library search; if there is a significant correlation for how local communities search within and outside of the library, that does not match how the universal catalogue organizes or describes corresponding information, then the library catalogue should perhaps be tailored to the more universal Google search stats. Google shows how more users search than in the limited space of the library—though Google stats can also help librarians determine how to organize a supplementary cataloguing or organization system. Librarians can use Google search stats from their specific city or the neighborhood in which the library is located in order to determine how local users search and interact with information outside of the space of the library, which might draw in more diverse library members.
This study will not reveal any identifying factors about Google search users or library users except for their generalized geospatial location; this will be used to determine whether local library branch members search the library catalogue similarly to how other people in their geospatial location search Google. The library catalogue can be better tailored to how contemporary library users search.

Limitations of proposal and concluding remarks; statements about possible methodological limitations of your project and possible solutions; retrospective overview with an eye to possible future work that is somehow related to your current work

One potential problem arising from the research might be that the Internet is not a controlled environment, and the trends of how people search on the Internet might not reflect how they would search in the more controlled environment of the library; for example, Google searchers might be more inclined to search “deviant” leisure pursuits, embarrassing medical questions, or more illegal-related searches—out of curiosity, or more sinister purposes. Internet users might be more daring with their searches at home because of the illusion of anonymity on the Internet, whereas the library tracks what books a user checks out, and often the library member will not feel comfortable consulting a librarian about private search requests that they perceive are embarrassing or immoral—even though all material in the library collection weighs the same on a moral level; all information should be treated equal in the library catalogue and members cannot be judged, because the library cannot know for certain why a member is researching particular information. Additionally, the library user might be more inclined to feel the pervasive panopticic eye in the space of the library and consequently self-regulate their behavior. As Michel Foucault argues, the panopticic feeling of being watched even if we are not, governed by social and institutional surveillance—still infiltrates “private” spaces, and “surveillance is permanent in effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action” (1995, p. 201).

Another critique of the outcome of this study might be that this research will potentially introduce more “junky” or “low value” information into a library environment, when a library should perpetuate cultivated learning. For example, a trending section might make more pop culture-related information visible, such as material about popular television, celebrities, movies, and authors, and critics might assume that this will take space away from (or discourage) more serious learning. However, through this study, researchers might discover that library members might already be using the Internet and the library largely for the purpose of entertainment, information pleasures which may also be educational along with improving a person’s quality of life. This critique exposes an elitist attitude that separates high art from low art and creates binaries based on cultural ideologies tied to economic class, for example discrediting different ways of learning and the value of entertainment, ignoring how different communities have historically related to popular culture or interacted with popular media. Many people learn through entertainment or already use the library as a social space, or as a safe space to pursue leisure activity. The library should be a community space, tailored to users needs and behaviors, and should meet the demands of the way local populations desire to interact with information and learn in unique ways.

Another potential problem involved in this study is that the Internet might not “tell the truth”, just as people in observational and ethnographical studies might not tell the truth or behave naturally if the researcher is present. Internet users lie and conceal constantly, immersed in the perceived safety mask and anonymity of numbers, acting out in ways that do not correlate with how they would act in their “real life”. Additionally, Google stats only reflect the searching and information seeking desires and needs of Internet users, and as such, large populations might be left out of the statistics. However, generally this information is a valuable untapped resource for public librarianship, although these factors do need to be considered before altering cataloguing standards and procedures or reorganizing the physical space of the library.
Another potential problem is that the library member might be less inclined to use the subject expertise of the librarian if a “current trend search” correlated with Google stats is introduced, or if the library catalogue is tailored to reflect Google search trends in specific communities. The librarian’s position might then become de-intellectualized and the quality of information sought out less valuable. Critics of this research might argue that the quality of information or “trends” on the Internet are already biased, elite, or exclusive, controlled by large corporations, influenced by celebrity culture, money, and complex power dynamics; for example, Google promotes their own products (such as Google maps) by placing them first in the search results over other similar and adequate services. Google also controls which search results appear before others— and even algorithms are biased. As such, if librarians were to blindly extend Internet search trends into the design of the library catalogue and collection, they might contribute to unfair subjective decision-making regarding which information should be most visible, privileging information on the Internet that is only superficially trending, popular, or otherwise reflective of cultural ideologies, beliefs, and information-seeking desires.

For future data mining experiments, the “dimensions” will depend on which outdated subject areas librarians within specific communities would like to update for the universal catalogue or as a complimentary cataloguing system to supplement the universal catalogue’s lack of consideration for diverse communities of users who will search for items differently and whose experience of categories in the world might not adhere to the way the universal catalogue organizes the world. This is especially pertinent for local library branches in a city like Toronto, where the neighborhoods are so culturally diverse. The 2011 Toronto census indicates that 36% of Torontonians have a first language other than English. The same census reveals that the top 15 languages, other than English, spoken by Toronto residents are Cantonese, other Chinese dialects, Mandarin Tamil, Spanish, Tagalog, Italian Portuguese, Persian (Farsi), Russian, Urdu, Korean, Gujarati, Bengali, and Vietnamese. According to the 2011 census, 34% of residents in Little Italy speak non-official home languages including Portuguese and Italian, and in China Town, 53% of residents speak non-official languages including Cantonese, Mandarin, and other Chinese dialects, and Thornecliffe Park has a significant Urdu speaking community. If librarians can know data mined statistics related to how users search in specific communities (both in the library and on the Internet), they could significantly improve both universal cataloguing and supplemental cataloguing systems for local branches and better satisfy users’ search desires.

Alternative information collecting method to data mining: member collaboration

An attempt at universal cataloguing is still important so that information can be shared broadly, and so that librarians and library members can access information more efficiently— however, universal cataloguing could coexist with user-centered and user-created systems of collecting and sharing information.

R. David Lankes suggests that future catalogues should be structured to include more contextual detailed information, so that the information seeker can more effectively get to the root of the information they need, or access related information that they might not have even realized would be useful. The design of a new information system could be a collaborative effort between library users and library staff who monitor the information and links that are entered. If the information linking system were created solely by users, this might also lead to information overload—an overwhelming map of connections that might discourage users from searching more narrowly because of having to sift through the chaotic abundance of “headlines” or links; this is the outcome of a system that embraces how users connect concepts and ideas and map out their own experiences and ideologies. Internet and social media users are bombarded with headlines, hypertext, and hyperlinks, that connect ideas and trends and link people and concepts
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together. This overwhelming abundance of information might provoke people to wade in a shallow level of information, barely skimming the surface of the headlines instead of investigating the depth of articles. Users might also share these headlines because they want to be included in a big conversation and receive feedback, or users might share headlines related to social issues they are politically engaged with; the reasons for sharing “headlines” and hyperlinks are vast. However, an article with an alluring headline might actually contain misleading or superficial information, such as inaccurate news reports or false information about scientific studies, or might not reflect the headline. Users might also share links that they intend to read eventually, but simply end up forgetting to read. Consequently, these shared links contribute to information overload and the spreading of inaccurate or misleading headlines and articles.

Linking or even tagging over the Internet is often immediate, with little contextual information available to the user about the destination of the link. Generally, before a user clicks on a link, they cannot see any user-generated information on the reliability and quality of the pathway. The Internet can be a vast dark forest of confusing information, with endless paths that mislead and derail users from their desired destinations or cater to their boredom. Library cataloguing, in contrast, can be made powerful through the improvement of contextual detail and accuracy describing the “links”, such as catalogue records as David Lankes suggests. Artifacts are made powerful through ideas people attach to them and through their relationship to other artifacts and the ideas people attach to those artifacts; the more users can know about the relationship between artifacts, the richer their learning experience and the more valuable the information-seeking process.

Lankes’ conceptual software model Scapes is an example of an alternative user-centered system of metadata information gathering and organization that could coexist with the library’s main cataloguing system. Scapes—unlike the Internet with its façade of anonymity—is utilized by contributors who can be held accountable for the information they share as library members, for example if they share abusive or misleading content under their library card number. If the user creates the Scapes anonymously, for example not providing their university ID, then they will have less access to information (Lankes, 361). Systems such as Scapes rely on contributors who care about connecting other users to concepts and ideas—ideally, users who would not “troll” or knowingly mislead other users. However, a system like Scapes, even just built of “headlines” or “links” is also in danger of building up to information overload. The abundance of user-generated “context” could overwhelm users, who might then be tempted to put all their effort into “reading the headlines”. Users might then make assumptions about articles and information based on how others link these articles and concepts and not meaningfully engage with the material and content of the subject. Users might also give up the search if confronted with too many options.

Librarians could “read the headlines” that users contribute in systems such as Scapes and use these headlines as a powerful tool to understand how local users connect concepts and search for information. A system like Scapes could assist librarians in connecting other local users to information and offer a dynamic array of alternative complimentary concepts and ideas based on other users’ contributions. Scapes is an interesting alternative method of mapping out users’ desires and interests, however it would need to be monitored and edited by librarians and library staff who could check for misleading or offensive information, and that would take time and money. Additionally, with this additional layer of monitoring, the user is denied the spontaneity and feeling of complete freedom of posting or sharing on the Internet, and other issues related to privacy rights and surveillance must also be considered. Or, perhaps these user-generated information organization systems do not have to be constantly monitored, because the space of the library might be enough to regulate user behavior—again that panoptic effect from the feeling of being watched.

In sociologist Kevin Haggerty’s essay “The Surveillant Assemblage” he writes about how online social surveillance systems reduce the human body into data; this data is separated
into “discrete flows” that are then reassembled into “data doubles” that reduce us to limited categories and therefore strip us of our imagined autonomous unique identities (2000). Systems such as Netflix or Amazon use algorithms to present users with “relevant” information suggestions, building “data doubles” composed of past information searching behaviors; this is a one-way inadequate reference interview, meant to capitalize off of the user’s perceived interests by guessing their desires. The library does not judge the user for accessing anything in the library collection; all information weighs the same, unlike the Internet. With user-generated data collection, users can control categories of classification, compensating for the “universal” system’s failure to capture more diverse categories; users can address the subjectivity of classification. However, categories are also necessary for users to participate in the social world and be “counted”; they make different ways of being visible and adoptable.

In contemporary society, there is an increase in visual information, blurred boundaries between high and low art, and academic fields are expanding to become more specialized—along with all this there is a shift in the way information is being sorted and absorbed. Frederic Jameson describes the postmodern psyche of “new depthlessness” where we obsessively create periodization of the past that become simulacrum, distorted fantasies of imagined past realities that manifest in entertainment and consumerist culture.\(^5\) Since information is produced so quickly it becomes more “gluttonous”, with different forms of information weighing more heavily than others. There are systems outside of libraries available for people to archive and catalogue their own information and work to increase the weight of their contribution, such as sponsored fashion blogs and online communities; this provokes a question of what should be included or omitted in the library catalogue: what information is “universal” enough? Contemporary cataloguing reveals the ways we are simultaneously nostalgic for and critical of the past. Jameson argues that a contemporary society over-saturated with information and stimulation leads to fragmentation of identity. However, this fragmentation of identity also reveals the breaking down of categories and acceptance of different ways of being and understanding—not yet reflected in universal cataloguing standards.

Cataloguers must be aware of cultural trends in information-seeking desires and not rely too heavily on copy cataloguing, but cataloguers are highly specialized and most cataloguing is copy cataloguing. Classification systems are a reflection of ideologies and power dynamics at work in the past and the present, and there will always be a “present bias” that overlooks ideologies we are currently immersed in. As I have argued, universal cataloguing systems should be malleable, easier to alter and adjust, in order to meet contemporary information-seeking needs, be it through data mining, member collaboration in linking library catalogue information—or many other possible methods. The design of the library catalogue should embrace the possibility of future shifts in how we categorize and understand the world, and reflect diverse ways of being.
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\(^5\) See Jameson’s “Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism” (p. 53-92).
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