

2012

# Open Source Software and Librarian Values

Jason Puckett

*Georgia State University*, [jpuckett@gsu.edu](mailto:jpuckett@gsu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/univ\\_lib\\_facpub](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/univ_lib_facpub)



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Puckett, J. (2012). Open Source Software and Librarian Values. *Georgia Library Quarterly* 49(3), Article 9. Available at: <http://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/glq/vol49/iss3/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Georgia State University Library at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Library Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gsu.edu).

# COMO WHITE PAPER

---

## Open source software and librarian values

By Jason Puckett

### Open source software

The term “open source software” (OSS) refers to computer programs released under terms allowing users to use, modify, or redistribute the software in any way they see fit, without requiring users to pay the creators a fee (Szczepanska, Bergquist, & Ljungberg, 2005, p. xvii). It is known as “open source” because the source code – the programming code that makes the software work – is made available along with the ready-to-use software itself. OSS is also known as “free software.” “Free” here is meant in the sense of liberty, not the sense of “without cost,” although both meanings are valid.

OSS may be developed by a single individual, a group (formally organized or ad hoc), or sponsored by a nonprofit or other corporate entity to fill a need. Because any interested party can view the source code and learn how the software works, OSS development naturally falls into a collaborative pattern. The OSS user community is made up of potential co-developers, since anyone can contribute improvements, new features,

and bug fixes. While many libraries and librarians have contributed to the development of OSS, these qualities have implications for libraries beyond the potential for direct participation in code development.

The decision to make a piece of software open source carries with it some implied stances on issues of freedom of information. Making the decision to share the source code to a software project implies that the creator believes that sharing information is a worthwhile good. In many cases, sharing access to a program’s code goes beyond simply making it publicly available to encouraging collaborative development from the software’s community of users. These values of free access and collaboration align with many of the tenets central to the profession of librarianship and with academic librarianship in particular.

In practical terms, both the OSS community and the profession of librarianship value open standards for its ability to promote accessible information. OSS tends to be

more compatible with open data standards, providing better long-term accessibility and preservation of data. And in fact, OSS itself is amenable to long-term preservation, since any interested party may save, examine, or archive the software’s code. OSS is more likely to be developed for multiple platforms, allowing longer-term compatibility with new and future technology. In many senses, OSS represents a manifestation of the same cultural and economic factors behind other movements toward free information in academic librarianship, like open access journal publishing (Morgan, 2004).

### Collaboration and community

The work of libraries, and particularly the academic library, as a facilitator and producer of scholarship both serves and relies on collaboration and the work of a community. So does open source development. The community may be that of readers, authors, and researchers, or of software users and developers, but both the OSS model and the scholarly community depend on collaborative contribution.

“People require unfettered access to information (read software) in order to build on the good work of others” (Morgan, 2004). This sentiment applies to scholarship as easily as it does to software development.

Open source developers often donate their time and energy to projects for no monetary gain, just as libraries provide information freely to their communities of users. Contributors see benefit in being part of a productive community, in learning from the work, and in appreciation for their valuable effort, demonstrating values that may even have diffused into internet collaborative models from academic research culture (Szczepanska, Berquist, & Ljungberg, 2005, p. 443). Many authors draw parallels between OSS and the anthropological concept of the “gift culture,” in which individuals give gifts in order to benefit the community and to gain status and recognition as well as the satisfaction of philanthropy (e.g., Raymond, 2000).

Librarians may see a clear parallel to their own work, which is that sharing information with the community provides a worthwhile public good that feeds back to benefit the community as a whole (Engard, 2010, pp. 31-32). Contributing work to an OSS project results in better software, benefits to the user community, and

possibly a learning experience as well as recognition for the contributor. Libraries’ contributions to the scholarly community (in the form of research assistance, information access, and other services) result in the production of more scholarship and recognition of the library’s value as an organ of the academic enterprise. In recognition of the “community gift” nature of open source, the Horowhenua Library Trust named their open source integrated library system Koha, the Maori word for “gift” (Eyler, 2003).

Like the scholarship valued by academic librarians, the OSS development process includes a form of collaborative peer review to ensure high quality results. Rather than a few expert reviewers, the “peer reviewers” of OSS are potentially the entire user community. The two processes share the same root idea, however; with sufficient examination by knowledgeable reviewers, problems can be identified and eliminated (Morgan, 2009). The OSS community summarizes this philosophy with the aphorism “given enough eyeballs, all bugs are shallow” (Raymond, 2001, p. 41).

#### **Privacy and security**

OSS supports libraries’ mission to provide information freely in an environment of privacy and freedom from judgment.

The American Library Association’s Code of Ethics states that “we protect each library user’s right to privacy and confidentiality with respect to information sought or received and resources consulted, borrowed, acquired or transmitted” (American Library Association, 2008). The *ALA Intellectual Freedom Manual* expands on this principle in the more specific forum of access to digital information, services and networks: “All library system and network policies, procedures, or regulations relating to digital information and services *should be scrutinized* for potential violation of user rights” (American Library Association., 2010, emphasis mine).

Commercial software, like many integrated library systems, is not nearly as subject to this scrutiny. Commercial software is generally a “black box” in that we can examine what goes in and what comes out, but not its internal operation, in our quest for improved privacy and security. Open source software may be more secure, since it allows libraries’ programmers and systems librarians to better identify security holes in the services we use; in short, the services become more accountable because we can see how they work (Asay, 2008; Paul, 2009). The community development model helps ensure that even libraries without programmers on staff can benefit. If one library can

identify a security hole, all libraries that use the software can address the problem in the next update.

### Information Neutrality

Librarians have historically opposed restrictions on information use, like censorship. Technological barriers are no less a significant challenge to libraries' provision of free information than social barriers. Issues like digital rights management and net neutrality have become libraries' fights as well (Bailey, 2006). The fight against information restrictions of all kinds – technological as well as societal – lies at the heart of librarians' professional values and could be framed as *information neutrality*.

Alfino and Pierce (1997) break down libraries' mission of neutrality into three components: neutrality of library materials (collections), neutrality of the information services provided, and professional and personal neutrality of the librarian. Their analysis of national library association codes from several countries concluded that "the stated ethical goal of the profession is the neutral, unbiased provision of library service to all patrons" (Alfino & Pierce, p. 119).

Technological tools for providing information, like software, logically fall into the services category and might perhaps even fit into

Ranganathan's law of library science "books are for use" (Ranganathan, 1931). When we choose technology for libraries, we should keep this mission of information neutrality in mind and make decisions on the basis of providing the most neutral and transparent service possible.

Open source tends to be antithetical to restrictive information barriers like digital rights management (DRM) – restrictions that librarians have begun to oppose more strongly on both ethical and economic grounds (e.g., Sellie & Goins, 2011). OSS runs on more devices (allowing users and librarians a voice in their choice of hardware), is more transparent in its function, is less susceptible to information restriction, and in general is ethically and philosophically compatible with libraries' mission of information neutrality:

It has been suggested that libraries are almost ethically required to use, develop and support open source software. The parallels between the rules of librarianship and open source are easy to spot just by comparing the open source definition (and/or the free software definition) to the rules set forth by nearly all library associations. Both organizations center their rules on freedom of use and free access to

information. (Engard, 2010, p. 29)

### Preservation and standards

Libraries value open information and open data standards for several reasons. Information in open formats can be preserved. Open information tends to be "portable" since it can be used more easily in ways unforeseen by the creator or by the library. Libraries are concerned about how they will preserve and make available information content not just today but also in a decade or a century.

Open source is typically designed with open standards in mind. Creators of commercial software have a vested interest in preventing their data from being easily used in other programs because the availability of other options represents a threat to their profit.

This limitation can apply even to non-profit library projects like homegrown integrated library systems, once common.

[Homegrown ILSes] did what the library needed, but staff changes in the library made it clear that homegrown systems were too much trouble. The problem was that libraries built systems that only they knew how to run and update; if libraries had thought to release their code on the internet and

work with other libraries, the open source integrated library system would probably be the standard today. (Engard, 2010, p. 23)

OSS tends to be more compatible with standard formats, and less so with proprietary and DRM-locked content. Like libraries, open source developers find it advantageous to be able to share data with other programs. A spokesperson for the open-source bibliographic software Zotero expressed their commitment to open data: "our commitment to open standards means that it is easy to move your information to whatever else comes along; you can import and export information in just about every bibliographic metadata format" (Morrison & Owens, 2008).

This attitude toward open data is typical in open-source projects. For one thing, it simply makes development easier if developers build on existing standards rather than creating a new proprietary data format. This tendency renders information from OSS programs more preservation-friendly

since data content can typically be migrated to other software. Even if no native converter is available, one could potentially be created since source code is available. In short, using OSS helps free libraries from becoming locked in to a particular program forever. Transparency and interoperability reduces risk (Engard, 2010).

Even abandoned OSS projects may be preserved and revitalized for the good of the library community. Because OSS is freely available, defunct programs can still be retrieved and revived, whether simply to access old data or to restart development. Emory University's open-source reserves system ReservesDirect ceased development in 2009, but the source code remains available (Emory University Libraries, 2009). Another library could download the code, contribute development resources, and release a new version.

## Conclusion

Open source developers and university libraries share the same fundamental goal, which is to share information freely and for the common good:

Librarians espouse many of the same ideals that drive the free software community. They collaborate and communicate; they work hard to share the results of their work with one another. They understand freedom and feel that it's an important value. That more librarians aren't actively using and evangelizing free software is an indictment against [developers] for not letting [librarians] in on our secret. (Eyler, 2003, para. 22)

Because we share so many of the values of the OSS community, we should feel an obligation to promote open source in the library community.

*Jason Puckett is Communication Librarian at Georgia State University*

References

- Alfino, M., & Pierce, L. (1997). *Information ethics for librarians*. Jefferson N.C.: McFarland & Co.
- American Library Association. (2008). Code of Ethics. *American Library Association*. Retrieved June 6, 2011, from <http://www.ala.org/ala/issuesadvocacy/proethics/codeofethics/codeethics.cfm>
- American Library Association. (2010). *Intellectual freedom manual* (8th ed.). Chicago: American Library Association.
- Asay, M. (2008, April 17). Open source “reduces risk,” federal agency’s CIO says. *CNET News*. Retrieved July 29, 2011, from [http://news.cnet.com/8301-13505\\_3-9921115-16.html](http://news.cnet.com/8301-13505_3-9921115-16.html)
- Bailey, C. W. (2006). Strong Copyright + DRM + Weak Net Neutrality = Digital Dystopia? *Information Technology & Libraries*, 25(3), 116-139.
- Emory University Libraries. (2009). ReservesDirect: Open Source EReserves System. *ReservesDirect*. Retrieved July 29, 2011, from [http://reservesdirect.org/wiki/index.php/Main\\_Page](http://reservesdirect.org/wiki/index.php/Main_Page)
- Engard, N. (2010). *Practical open source software for libraries*. Oxford [England]: Chandos Publishing.
- Eyler, P. (2003, February 1). Koha: a Gift to Libraries from New Zealand. *Linux Journal*. Retrieved June 28, 2011, from <http://www.linuxjournal.com/article/6350>
- Morgan, E. L. (2004). Open source software in libraries. Retrieved June 7, 2011, from <http://infomotions.com/musings/biblioacid/>
- Morgan, E. L. (2009, March 28). Open source software: Controlling your computing environment. Retrieved June 28, 2011, from <http://infomotions.com/musings/oss4cil/>
- Morrison, J. L., & Owens, T. (2008). Next-Generation Bibliographic Manager: An Interview with Trevor Owens. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education*, 4(2). Retrieved from <http://www.innovateonline.info/index.php?view=article&id=540>
- Paul, R. (2009, October). DoD: military needs to think harder about using open source. *Ars Technica*. Retrieved July 29, 2011, from <http://arstechnica.com/open-source/news/2009/10/dod-military-needs-to-think-harder-about-using-open-source.ars>
- Ranganathan, S. R. (1931). *The Five Laws of Library Science*. Book, . Retrieved August 11, 2009, from <http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/105454>
- Raymond, E. S. (2000). Homesteading the Noosphere. Retrieved July 8, 2011, from <http://www.catb.org/esr/writings/homesteading/homesteading/ar01s06.html>
- Raymond, E. S. (2001). *The Cathedral and the Bazaar: Musings on Linux and Open Source by an Accidental Revolutionary*. Beijing; Cambridge, Mass.: O’Reilly.
- Sellie, A., & Goins, M. (2011). About this Site. *ReadersBillofRights.info*, . Retrieved July 29, 2011, from <https://readersbillofrights.info/about>
- Szczepanska, A. M., Bergquist, M., & Ljungberg, J. (2005). High noon at OS Corral. In J. Feller, B. Fitzgerald, S. A. Hissam, & K. R. Lakhani (Eds.), *Perspectives on free and open source software*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.