APPENDIX E

Samples of Coded Guided Interview Data

This appendix contains samples of data from the guided interviews that the researcher coded. FolioViews allowed the researcher to code specific words and sentences with one or more codes (shown in examples as underlined text). Upon retrieval, FolioViews retrieves the “record” (i.e., paragraph) in which the coded instance occurs. This provided context to the actual coded instances. The samples provided represent selected data instances coded as Inputs and Constraining Factors.

Data Instances Coded “Inputs”

WED: So you had a situation there where there was not a cross section, not a representative sample of opinion in the development of what went out for ballot. I think JA and I had tried pretty much to do a survey and say, “these are the things that exist in contemporary information retrieval systems, and so we will put them in.”

CL: One of the roots of Z39.50 was in fact a set of political motivations that went back to Henriette Avram’s vision of a national bibliographic utility, and since we couldn't do it in one place, trying to build a distributed one. And if you read a lot of the stuff that happened in the late 70s and early 80s that fed Z39.50, that's really clear.

CL: Another piece of it was a thread where I and a number of other people felt that there was a technical problem we needed to solve so that we could share information over networks in a useful way.

SM: But it sometimes had different people from the institutions that had a few other people, extra people, and other people, that gave it a different perspective and made it change. So by the time it was standardized, it was I'm sure, improved and it was changed. But an awful lot of the really basic work went on in the LSP project, which was implemented as the pre-Z39.50 protocol in the project. A lot, a very -- examination of the search system and really parsing those searches down into the basic components -- that went on before it went on to the NISO committee. It went on in sort of a drawn out fashion.

FT: She was also concerned about the growing size of the ZIG membership and its ability to build consensus. FT suggested that there is a tendency in the ZIG for the “squeaky wheel to get the oil” and that those with the loudest voices to shape the consensus. This has led to including in the standard specific services that serve individual requirements rather than a broader set of requirements.

PR: Well, I think, like I was saying before about the extended services, I think you have to bring something in front of the group, especially an idea that is totally novel and different than any model that they had in their mind about Z39.50. And bring it in front of the group and really talk about what it’s going to accomplish and who it’s going to help, and what advantages this is going to give to the users of the standard. And really help them understand it. Sometimes it’s just a misunderstanding. They are not getting the concepts of what you are trying to accomplish. And so you have to present it a number of times before it really soaks in and people start taking it into their own realm. So I think it just takes time.

Data Instances Coded “Constraining Factors”

HDA: Giving away the records. We always talked, and in fact, I had several meetings with people from OCLC, the heads, the head of WLN, Rod Schwartz. I don’t remember which one was head of RLIN, it was probably Rowland. To look at the economics of the situation, how could they be paid for these records? You know the economics -- I never bypassed the importance of the economics. I just never wanted to mix up the two. I didn’t want them to give away their records, but I just didn’t want to mix up the two. I felt the technical part was one thing, and the economics of the whole thing is still the most difficult of all.
WED: So you had a situation there where there was not a cross section, not a representative sample of opinion in the development of what went out for ballot. I think JA and I had tried pretty much to do a survey and say, “these are the things that exist in contemporary information retrieval systems, and so we will put them in.”

WED: But some of the difficulties came, number one from the fact that we didn’t have a broadly representative group doing the text that went out for ballot. And as I say, a part of the reason for that had to do with the fact that it was hard for some folks to get funding, other folks didn’t....

WED: This, of course, wasn’t a situation where you had a lot of high level management involved with this. Henriette did to some extent but I don’t think the management at OCLC did and my management certainly didn’t.

RD: Here’s what was going on; I think one of the roadblocks to getting this thing off again and to a successful ballot was that we had not been able to bring some of the commercial services into the fold. And we specifically targeted DIALOG, BRS, and a third, perhaps Mead, I don’t remember. And so, what we did was we assigned an individual to each of those, because there somebody on the committee that was very close to, say, Mead, and another one, I don’t remember who, maybe RLG. What we were trying to do was to get those people to send somebody to the meetings so they could represent their organizations. Perhaps it was just ahead of its time.

CAL: Those standards are much harder in a way, because they now get into questions of organization, or process really. You do something, and now all of a sudden you are trying to open up this process to interchange with another organization that's got its own internal processes. And that's much tougher than saying you are going to do three millimeter screws. And I think that's one of the reasons why standards take so long.

SHM: Or identified? I don't really think they can be necessarily, partly because I've worked with Z39.50 from the LSP days and we thought we were ready and we weren't ready. We're just barely ready now. The systems were not ready to implement that kind of interconnectivity. There wasn't the demand. While people made a lot of noise, there really wasn't the demand for it above other kinds of capabilities they wanted systems to build in.

MD: There is a code phrase for this in the meetings: "I can't do that." This is different from saying that "I'm not sure I want to do it” or "I don't think we want to do that." Instead it reflects the capabilities of a particular system and what can or cannot be accommodated. So when that phrase is said, it's a no-go as far as incorporating it into the standard. This is different from RD saying that "you can't do that" which reflects his concern about how it fits into the model. An implementor who says he/she can't do that means a constraint of the technology.