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Why Convergence?

• Convergence of information and technology
• Demands and expectations for improved service
• Resource optimisation
• Reduction in service points
• Joint planning, delivery and evaluation of new technologies
Why convergence?

- Sharing and using marketing intelligence
- Growth in new IT products/services
- Changing demographics
- Changes in teaching and learning
- Changes in research, e.g. eScience
- Copyright and intellectual property
Types of convergence

• Administrative or organisational
  – Reporting lines

• Operational
  – Integrated planning, resource use and service provision
North America, the UK and Australia

- Bolin (2005) – 50 Land Grant universities
- Ferguson, Spencer and Metz (2004) – dimensions of convergence
- Akeroyd (2007) – taking stock of convergence
- Lewis & Sexton (2000) Sheffield experience
Organisation of Library and IT

• IT Departments
  – Engineers or system administrators
  – Applications developers
  – ICT support teams

• Libraries
  – Customer service teams
  – Information management and access teams
Organisational Culture

“A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.” (Schein, 1992, p.12)
"There is a huge cultural difference. I see librarians as working more with certainties, while IT involves unpredictability, uncertainty and to some extent trial and error. Most IT people will admit to an incomplete understanding of their craft, and there is maybe a greater need to rely on the expert knowledge of others" (Brady 1998)
Hofstede’s Cultural Framework

• Low vs. High Power Distance
• Individualism vs. Collectivism
• Masculinity vs. femininity
• Uncertainty avoidance
• Long vs. short term orientation

(http://stuwww.uvt.nl/~csmeets/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Power Distance</th>
<th>High Power Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates expect to be consulted</td>
<td>Subordinates expect to be told what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss should be resourceful democrat</td>
<td>Boss should be benevolent autocrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privileges and status symbols frowned upon</td>
<td>Privileges and status symbols expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy in organizations seen as exploitive</td>
<td>Hierarchy in organizations reflects natural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequalities between people should be minimized</td>
<td>Inequalities between people are expected and desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria, Israel, Ireland, Scandinavia</td>
<td>Malaysia, Panama, Mexico, Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA- 40; UK – 35; Australia 36</td>
<td>Turkey -66; India – 77; Malaysia - 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>High Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low time consciousness</td>
<td>High time consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few rules</td>
<td>Many rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High tolerance of deviant and innovative ideas</td>
<td>Low tolerance of deviant ideas; resistance to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low stress</td>
<td>High stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk taking</td>
<td>Risk adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People can appear quiet, easy-going, indolent, controlled and/or lazy</td>
<td>People can appear busy, emotional, aggressive and/or active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US- 46; UK – 35; Singapore -8; Denmark - 23</td>
<td>Japan -92; Chile – 86; Turkey - 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Collectivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity is based on the individual</td>
<td>Identity is based on one’s social network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task prevails over relationship</td>
<td>Relationships prevail over task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking one’s mind indicates honesty</td>
<td>Harmony should be maintained &amp; confrontation avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-context communication (direct)</td>
<td>High-context communication (indirect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management is management of individuals</td>
<td>Management is management of groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA – 91; Australia – 90; BUK – 89; Netherlands - 80</td>
<td>Turkey- 37; Brazil -38; Hong Kong -25; China -20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Change suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individualistic</th>
<th>Collectivistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Appeal to self-interest  
• Allow individuals to formulate and ask questions | • Appeal to “common” interest  
• Allow the group to formulate and ask questions |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Power Distance</th>
<th>Low power Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Use Senior staff to make announcements and to communicate change  
• Use legitimate/positional power to exercise authority  
• Tell subordinates what to do differently | • Use influencing skills  
• Include them in discussion and explain your/company’s position  
• Allow for challenges  
• Provide a forum where they can be involved in how things will be different after you provide the answer for “what” |
## Change suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Certainty Orientation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Risk Orientation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide specific rules/structures/steps/processes</td>
<td>Reward creative behavior that moves the org. toward the end goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the need for information, have available lots of supporting data and even theory if appropriate/</td>
<td>Focus on the process of learning as the employees move forward to the outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide them with examples of other that used these approaches successfully</td>
<td>Share information in open and many forms of communication forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide them with a cost analysis to help them see the cost-benefit comparison</td>
<td>There is less need to prove others have tried this approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share what they need to know Use channels Focus on compliance with procedures and policies</td>
<td>Start with the bottom line then build your case around their questions Challenge and question “the usual way the things are done”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Libraries and IT Departments
Turkey

• 132 universities
• 94 state and the rest – foundation universities
• Turkish Higher Education Council – YOK
• ULAKBİM ve ANKOS
• Convergence from Day One
• Shared office space
• Collaboration on projects
• Combined website
• Course Management System
• Student Information System
• ICT Governance Board
- Use of Help Desk application jointly
- ICT literacy training (incl. Information literacy)
- Policy and procedure development
- Marketing and communication
- Training, development, coaching and mentoring
Collaboration

- Libray Help Desk and equipment pool
- Faculty Librarian activities
- LMS project
- Information Services blog
- Joint presentations and seminars
- Use of project management (PMI) and ITIL principles
Conclusion

• New university, new organisation
• In a mature org harder to change things. Old dogs new tricks...
• Challenges and opportunities for a small and new library – IT converged organisation