Jack Tieszen
Department of Information Studies.
UCLA GSE&IS.
MLIS Portfolio Issue Paper.

(Dis)quiet in the Library: Anxiety as Created by Space in the Academic Library.

At its core, library anxiety is a broad feeling of fear associated with the library. It can stem from inadequacy, social interaction with librarians, or a variety of other sources. While the concept may seem simple, the discussions over what causes it and its varying solutions have been extensive, lasting over thirty years since the term was canonized by Constance A. Mellon in 1986. Within the academic library, the discourse has discovered a multitude of troubling features from the fact that over 70% of students feel some form of this anxiety during their tenure, to the problems of procrastination and student failure that are linked to this concept. While the previous discourse has focused on aspects of systems and communication, one barrier that is often overlooked is the space of the library and how often that can be overwhelming and anxious inducing to students. On many levels, the size, structure, and architectural aesthetics of the library can lead to effects like fear or confusion for those who aren't familiar with the building. How a library's space can hide workers, books, or information access has a significant consequence on how students relate to, and engage with it. Thus it should be critiqued in order to establish methods of reducing library anxiety. In addition to this, the theoretical aspects of library space and the ideological notions behind its functions within the framework of the academic institution also bring forth many different areas of criticism that tie space into anxiety. In essence: the physical and theoretical space of the academic library is a significant factor in the causes of library anxiety for students who use it.

Utilizing historical analysis and textual criticism, this essay will address the responsibility of spatial elements on anxiety in three parts. The first section will be a literature review of this topic in order to introduce the discourse as is and its limitations. The second section, split into two parts, will be on the physical and theoretical aspects of space and how they can fit into the library anxiety discourse. The last section is composed of the solutions that will be proposed in order to alleviate anxiety created by space.

Part I: Library Anxiety: The 30 Year Discussion.

In order to adequately understand library anxiety and how it has been standardized over the years, it is important to look at the previous literature and assess what has been discussed on the issue. In 1986 Constance A. Mellon wrote *Library Anxiety: A Grounded Theory and its Development* which introduced the concept into LIS scholarship. She finds that library anxiety in students stemmed from four specific causes: the size of the library; the lack of knowledge about where things were located; how to begin; and what to do (Mellon 1986, 162). She further discusses how these elements presented issues in personal feelings towards the library, stating that students felt a level of academic inadequacy through their lack of ability to utilize the systems that make up the library (1986, 160). This inadequacy was perceived as shameful to the students tested, therefore, if a student were to address this lack of knowledge through communicating with a library professional, it meant revealing this personal failure which could potentially cause more anxiety within the student. This inadequacy element is important as it displays not only this dissonance between what the student know versus what they don't know about the library within the context of preparedness to be in an academic environment, but more importantly it shows why library anxiety continues to persist despite the existence of librarians who would otherwise be able to answer the questions about use.

After Mellon's foundational text the trajectory of the discourse can be distilled into two major categories. The literature that focused on testing how library anxiety affects the academic population, and the literature that focused on the solutions to library anxiety. The former literature can be traced to Sharon Lee Bostick with her article *The Development and Validation of the Library Anxiety Scale* which studied five components: "barriers with staff, affective barriers, comfort with the library, knowledge of the library, and mechanical barriers" (Van Kampen 2004, 29). This was expanded upon Doris J. Van Kampen in her article *Development and Validation of the Multidimensional Library Anxiety Scale* to address elements like academic level achieved and gender with regards to anxiety. Quin Jiao and Anthony Onwuegbuzie are perhaps the most prolific authors who perform tests utilizing these scales with articles that study the effects of library anxiety on various populations as well as things like the effects of technological integration on the library, student perception, and librarians (Jiao and Onwuegbuzie 1997; 2017; Jiao, Onwuegbuzie, and Lichtenstein 1996; Onwuegbuzie 2000). These approaches to the discourse are more methodologically focused and therefore rely heavily

on statistical analysis to create conclusions, which is what brings forward articles proposing solutions.

Much like the trajectory of the discourse itself, solution-based articles can be split into two categories. In the first category includes articles like *Reducing Library Anxiety in First Year Students* by Anna M. Van Scoyoc and *Trending Now—Reference Librarians: How Reference Librarians Work to Prevent Library Anxiety* by Leslie J. Brown (Van Scoyoc 2003; Brown 2011). Both articles propose that libraries could utilize already existing methods to reduce library anxiety within the student population (2011, 316; 2003, 337).[1] The second category features authors such as Elizabeth DiPrince, Amber Wilson, Chrissy Karafit, Amanda Bryant, and Chris Springer whose article *Don't Panic! Managing Library Anxiety with a Library Survival Guide* suggests the creation of new modes to teach students how to use the library, such as an individual "survival guide" that is created by the library and given to newer students every year (DiPrince et al. 2016, 289). These solution articles take the theories presented in the previous discourse and attempt to put forward real-world solutions in comparison to the statistical analysis of the other literature mentioned. The discourse being fairly young present many exciting prospects for the future. However, despite the existing articles on the subject there is an issue at present with the discourse being far too limited in scope concerning to what it could address. This critique can be found in Appendix 1. Library systems have been discussed ad nauseam in this discourse while space has been either reduced significantly in importance or been removed entirely from the discussion, so to remedy that, this text will address the spatial elements of the academic library, how they are effectively creating barriers for all students, and what solutions can be determined that address spatial aspects.

Part II: Space: Practical and Theoretical Understandings of the Library as a Space.

Physical Space.

As it was discussed in the last section, spatial elements are referenced within the discourse of library anxiety, but only in briefly despite Mellon's paper indicating that students in her study routinely mentioned the "large size" of the library (Mellon 1986, 162). If you look at all of the causes behind library anxiety within her text, space contributes to most of them. The general barriers of use have multiple ways in which one can analyze them and space, for one

[1] Bibliographic instruction and reference desk workers to be precise about the existing methods.

reason or another, has been pushed to the side when compared to the likes of systems or population analysis. But before further connections between library anxiety and space are made it is important to define what space is and present the framework of how it will be utilized within this text.

Space within this issue paper will be defined in two manners. The first is practical/physical space or the finite area which is free, available, or unoccupied. This aspect includes elements like layout, architecture, design, geography, and material placements. The second way in which space will be defined is through a theoretical lens, the infinite/continuous expanse which is dynamically created and re-created on a daily basis. This aspect includes elements of social and knowledge construction, along with presentations of the library's internal ideology both by itself but also of how it fits into the larger institution. It is important to note that the separation is not due to any perceived distinction between the practical and theoretical elements. Henri Lefebvre himself wrote in his seminal text *The Production of Space* that "space considered in isolation is an abstraction" which refers to the idea of space being collectively physical, mental, and social. Each of these definitions leads into each other and should realistically be referred to through the unitary lens of "space" as a singular definition (Lefebvre 1974, 12). Physical existence is reproduced daily through use and the lens of what is being addressed looks at the practical as the tip of the theoretical iceberg, with both mutually reflecting upon each other and signifying a collective element of space as being determined by its physical presence, its social use, and its theoretical representation. Everything determines everything and the separation noted here is for textual analysis only. With this stated, let's lead into the physical library and its issues with regards to anxiety.

The academic library functions as a place of knowledge creation[2] and therefore as a space the building should be structured in order to easily facilitate the transaction between patron/student and library materials. Yet, despite this goal, navigation in the academic library remains difficult for students. George Freeman in his essay *The Library as Place: Changes in Learning Patterns, Collections, Technology, and Use* makes this clear by stating that "despite their handsome exteriors, the interior spaces (of libraries) were often dim and confining, the buildings were difficult to navigate, and specialized services and collections were inaccessible to

[2] Or knowledge production when looking at the ideology of an institution.

all but the serious scholar (Freeman 2005). Scholars Gale Eaton, Michael Vocino & Melanie Taylor have studied navigation in physical spaces and have found that many environmental factors relate what they refer to as "environmental legibility" (Eaton, Vocino, and Taylor 1993, 82). These included the simplicity of arrangement, visual access, and a lack of visual clutter. Despite the acknowledgment of these things as important, academic libraries find difficulty in resolving these problems within their buildings. An assessment by Doctor Angela Zoss at Duke University's libraries presents a real-world example to this analysis (Zoss 2019). Zoss writes that a majority of the issues concerning navigation within the three libraries on campus stem from building confusion and hidden rooms, both of which tie to the "where things are located" antecedent brought forth by Mellon. She further discusses the navigation of space in that depending on things like commonly used routes and where a student enters, it may make areas in the library more difficult to find. "There are still common destinations that are difficult to see from stairwells, elevators, and main hallways" she states (2019). This article is uniquely applicable to Duke university, but the same issues can be extended to other academic libraries. Powell at the University of California, Los Angeles, is a veritable maze of sorts in how difficult it is to navigate from high traffic areas if one isn't previously familiar with the space. Reference desks are slightly hidden from view, labels are often difficult to read from distances, and there are no visible maps within the main areas of the building such as the entrance lobby or the reading rooms.[3] But difficulties in navigation can refer to just more than how the hallways or elevators hide elements of the library. The places in which materials are located, and how the unique library reflects its "ideal use" have much to do with this as well.

The location of materials can be viewed as a form of library knowledge space as it references how libraries utilize the various catalogs/systems of organizational knowledge in how they represent their book stacks/other materials within the space. This organization of material follows these knowledge patterns in that things will likely be placed near each other within the library or in a (somewhat) intuitive shelving system, but where and how these stacks are placed become more individual to the library. Furthermore, the knowledge space can also reflect biases within structures such as subject classifications that misrepresent or unconsciously denigrate marginalized identities. This topic has been discussed extensively by authors such as Ellen

[3] There are maps within the space but they are in odd places or are out of date.

Greenblatt (Greenblatt, 1990). This can lead to newer, more pointed, and ideologically violent forms of anxieties that target underrepresented students. To read further critiques of physical space, see Appendix 2.

In conclusion of the physical elements of space, multiple issues have been raised that relate specifically to the concept of patron anxiety. First, through the lens of environmental legibility it has been determined that navigating academic libraries is an issue for students who aren't familiar with the space due to aspects like building confusion, hidden rooms/materials, and a lack of visually accessible wayfinders. Second, the manifestation and reflection of knowledge through organization both with regards to the textual materials associated with the library but also digital applications and non-library inclusions compound upon each other to further complicate the system. This inherently produces barriers of entry and accessibility into the library for many of the academic patrons that may utilize it thus presenting an environment conducive to the anxieties referenced in the previous section. If the space is difficult to navigate for students on the basic physical level, then the systems that would otherwise help these students to utilize the library become more difficult to engage with either because they can't find them or, more likely, because they force the confrontation between what the students know versus what they don't know about this space. This is the manifestation of the inadequacy antecedent which thus connects physical space to library anxiety. In essence, space determines how one engages with the systems within, so if the space causes anxiety, the students will likely not attempt to take part in the systems or will have difficulty if they do. However, "to reduce a library to simple architecture, bricks and mortar, is a mistake" (Radford, Radford, and Lingel 2015, 738). As hitherto expressed, the physical element is only a singular side to the discussion of space and its connection to anxiety. The theoretical portion is also a significant element that needs to be addressed with how the space of an academic library can create anxiety for students.

Theoretical Space.

The discussion of physical space presents a transition into the theoretical aspects as the social and ideological purposes of academic libraries are manifested within by seemingly physical elements including aesthetics, architecture, and geography. The purpose of a library and how it is utilized or seen by the student population is oftentimes reflected through these physical elements both as an individual library but also as a part of a larger academic institution. The

theoretical property, therefore, must be addressed as an extension of the physical as expressed earlier through the evocations of Lefebvre. However, not all academic libraries are the same in the manner of physical characteristics. There is a historical trajectory within the United States of how these particular libraries are built and their reflection of building aesthetics upon use. The trajectory, therefore, reflects ideological aspects and should thus be placed into a framework before the discourse is to continue. For this essay, academic libraries will be split into three major categories, determined by when they were built. Given the constraints of this paper I will be discussing only a single category. If you wish to read on the other two categories of libraries, see Appendix 3.

The first category of academic libraries will be referred to as Crypto-temples. These libraries are generally built before/around the 1930s with a particular church-like aesthetic. This includes UCLA's Powell library (1929), Cornell's Uris Library (1891), and the University of Washington's Suzzalo Library (1926).[4] The library as a "temple" isn't an uncommon association within the field. George Freeman in his *Library as Place* article referenced in the previous section writes that the library has assumed an "almost sanctified role reflected both in its architecture and its sitting" (Freeman 2005). Since the rise of Universities during the age of enlightenment, the academic library has presented itself as a central component[5] to knowledge creation for its population and the building itself aesthetically reflects this importance. But this importance isn't entirely virtuous as the library can function simultaneously as a symbol of scientific/academic progress and as a tool of dominant control enforcing the hegemony of the institution (Bales 2014a, 141). Perhaps the most prolific individual who has written on this connection between the library, its temple-like aesthetics, and the ideological issues present is author and academic librarian Stephen Bales. In his article *The Academic Library as Crypto-temple: A Marxian Analysis,* Bales provides a historical analysis of academic libraries both to explain why exactly these buildings were built in such a particularly religious way and how this style has been shifted over the years to reflect alternate dominant ideologies. Historically, academic libraries were built to be "explicitly politico-religious entities," serving similar purposes to that of churches (Bales 2014b, 7). These were communal places where people could

[4] Also includes Johns Hopkins University's George Peabody Library (1878), and the University of Michigan's Cook Legal Research Library (1931).

[5] Sometimes literally with the building being geographically located at the center of campus.

go to engage in knowledge creation for either God or the state/institution. However, the post-war secularization of American Universities led to the separation of the politico-religious aspects and transferred the purpose of the academic library to the engagement of scholarly research and education (2014b, 8). However, since these buildings were structured and built around/to elicit a dominant ideology[6], when the religion was "scrubbed" away it didn't remove this dominance, rather it shifted it and allowed for other secular ideologies to enter into the space as an addendum to the sacred elements. These religious characteristics that suffused through the space therefore never actually went away but were left primarily through the architectural design. They were thus made implicit rather than the previous explicit intentions. This unintentionally bolstered these newer ideologies which while different, functioned in the same manner of instituting status quo hegemony for the populations that used it. Whether that hegemony is through the lens of capitalism, colonialism, neoliberalism or other such critiques that have been placed upon the academic library as an ideological institution, the hegemony makes itself known and apparent through the building's aesthetics. The academic library also managed to distract from these newer ideologies, presenting the sacred aesthetics of the space as an important aspect while the function of the library downplayed the historical connection to religion, once again making it implicit. All of this offers a connection between the sacred aspects of the institution and how these buildings are utilized in the modern era. But how does this affect students who enter into the space both in general and concerning library anxiety?

Bales continues his discussion on the Crypto-Temple academic library to display the relationship that these structures, through the circular physical/ideological connection, present to those who enter into the space. He writes that patrons at Evan[7] position themselves in relation to a "hierarchal, crypto-religious ideological institution" that has separated itself from the framework of the library as a functionally religious building while still maintaining sacred characteristics (2014b, 11). He further writes that patrons implicitly assume the role of a supplicant in relationship to this institution and asks why this occurs. Bales answers this by detailing both topics of hegemony as well as analyzing the emotional reaction that one has when entering these specific styles of spaces. Both of these, much like physical and theoretical space, tie into each other significantly.

---

[6] Mainly that of Christianity.

[7] Texas A and M library.

Hegemony is defined by a concentrated dominance over a population. "According to Antonio Gramsci, a powerful group achieves hegemony when it gains control over a range of values and norms, to the extent that these are so embedded in society that they receive unquestioned acceptance" (Pawley 1998, 127).[8] Philosopher Louis Althusser expanded upon this concept to explain that a social class cannot hold power until it exercises this hegemony over and through what he referred to as an ideological state apparatus (ISA). The library as a crypto-temple can fit into this definition as it not only a formalized educational apparatus[9] but it also combines a variety of hegemonic cultural norms about both the church and academic libraries that present a "knowledge" of its functions to patrons such as the rules and the purpose of an institution. However, it does not present the lesson in how to actively use it outside of the dominant framework, thus masking the acting nature of universities as engines for reproducing hegemonic ideologies, or capitalist thought (2014b, 12).

When one enters into the space they are confronted with this hegemonic knowledge, i.e. the importance of an academic library, the rules for patrons, its function within the greater academic institution, etc. and have this knowledge ratified and represented through the crypto-temple aesthetics. High ceilings, ornate images, and century's old hallways are impressive to those who have never experienced such a place and therefore the heightened importance of the space can be assumed through entering into the building. Furthermore, those who are familiar with spaces similar, such as churches, unconsciously position themselves as supplicant in the hierarchy according to previous knowledge. By being awed by the academic library, a patron "has acted appropriately in relation to the ideology of the library and has entered into the library's hierarchical space" where they know nothing beyond surface-level values and production of knowledge aspect of the space (2014b, 16). This emotional reaction expresses a particularly important aspect of library anxiety that was mentioned earlier within this text. That is the dissonance between what the student knows about the library versus what they don't. What a student entering into an academic library knows about the library is produced, and re-produced through cultural hegemonic knowledge that provides the heightened importance of the space within the context of the academic institution as well as presenting a combination of dos and

[8] The church is perhaps the most often used example as religious control over societies is ever present and continuous, which presents another reason as to why the sacred elements of the libraries couldn't be fully removed from the library due to architectural design.
[9] A specifically mentioned institution within Althusser's writing.

don'ts with how to engage in the space. This knowledge is gained through life experience or other social osmosis means and likely introduces patrons to the idea of an academic library and its purpose before they even set foot on the property. So when they enter into the space and this knowledge ratified in importance by the aesthetics of the space it forces the confrontation between this knowledge and the lack of knowledge on use. This puts students into the supplicant role where they are forced to ask those with the "correct" knowledge[10] on how to engage with this intellectual church. Since this requires exposing inadequacy to professionals, students choose not to engage and either try to learn the library by themselves or avoid the library altogether. All of these responses have the potential to create anxiety, and all of which were caused by the crypto-temple aesthetics of the library and what that represents. More importantly, this anxiety is immediately introduced to the student upon entering the building or potentially by just seeing it from the outside. This is against the idea that anxiety is bred solely by students using the the library systems, and broadens the framework for when anxiety occurs within the academic community.

This entire section may seem hyper-critical of the academic library as an ideological space. However, it is important to understand that the three types of academic library spaces as represented through this framework present a positive truth about these institutions: academic libraries are constantly shifting. While the shift in the physical is easy to establish such as a shift in aesthetics and architecture, it can be applied to a shift in function. Author Karen Nicholson in her article *On the Space/Time of Information Literacy, Higher Education, and the Global Knowledge Economy* writes on theoretical, socially constructed space as something that produced and reproduced on a daily basis. Citing geographer Tim Cresswell she states that places like universities or libraries "are never established" and are created by "people conforming to expectations about what people do" at these given spaces (Nicholson 2018, 3). More succinctly to relate this back to Lefebvre: "(social) space is a (social) product" (Lefebvre 1974, 26). If this is true and space is reliant on human intentions and engagement, that means shifting the space to encourage non-hegemonic thinking and knowledge creation is a possibility (Molotch 1993, 887). If one shifts the space both physically and theoretically than the problems that link library anxiety to these spatial elements can be tackled.

---

[10] I.E. librarians.

Part III: Ways to Reduce Library Anxiety.

With all of the elements that create anxiety within the academic library space represented in the previous portions of this essay and further discussions that can be tied into this discourse such as the alienation of the student population and procrastination, the work that needs to be done to change the space is vast.[11] While it may seem as if the author of this piece wishes to destroy the space and start from scratch as the theoretical aspects are heavily ingrained into these buildings, understand that this isn't the intention of this essay. As expressed earlier things can be shifted and important elements both physically and theoretically can be changed. Keep in mind that in similarity to the "solution" articles mentioned within the literature review as well as the three pronged theory discussion, the library is not a monolith of spaces and ideas, therefore individual decisions must be made within these unique spaces. The solutions that will be proposed are broad enough to start discourses but should not be used as exact guidelines. Furthermore, as expressed in the literature review section many of the previous ideas and solutions have shown to be beneficial and just need to add space as an element so that will not be a part of this area of discussion. The first solution that is proposed is to create a function where the library acts as a third place.

Bernard Frischer in his article *The Ultimate Internet Café: Reflections of a Practicing Digital Humanist about Designing a Future for the Research Library in the Digital Age* writes that "users of physical libraries will want to experience something in a library that cannot be had in the office or home, and that something is the drama of community" (Frischer 2005, 17). This is almost the exact definition of a third place. This concept is defined entirely through distinction from other locations. It is the natural evolution from the first place (one's home) and the second place (one's work). Third places encapsulate zones and buildings and set social and communal tones that distinguish themselves from other locations and present opportunities for community inclusion. Marcela Cabello and Stuart M. Butler write on this community building in their article *How public libraries help build healthy communities.* They write that the important elements that make libraries into third spaces are location, accessibility, and trust (Cabello and Butler 2017). There are certainly other characteristics that can be discussed for instance all the ones in Ray Oldenburg's seminal text *The Great Good Place* (neutral ground, low profile, etc.) but for the

[11] See Loneliness in the Neoliberal Age: The Use of Libraries to Alleviate Alienation by Jack Tieszen as reference.

sake of academic libraries the three that Butler and Cabello bring up are important to dissect and implement into the space. The first element of location is easily achieved as academic libraries are generally geographically located at the center of campuses but accessibility and trust present some requirements for change. Accessibility is an issue of physical layout and can be dealt with through the inclusion of better signage and maps as discussed by Gale Eaton or through changes to benefit students with disabilities. Trust centers itself around the connection between students and those who work within the library, which as addressed previously doesn't always occur due to preconceived ideas of professional busy-ness or fear of showcasing inadequacy. To build trust between the librarian and students who use this space is imperative in reducing library anxiety as it bridges knowledge gaps and allows students to learn the systems and space with ease. The instruction classes mentioned in Anna M. Van Scoyoc for instance would be good programs to put into place to deal with this issue. This method of turning the library into a third space brings forth a few negative qualities as well, for it is not free of criticism.

Beyond the fact that many of these third space discussions are on public libraries which are different spaces than academic libraries with regards to multiple factors (communities, hierarchies, relationships to institutions, etc.) the idea of a third place puts a significant amount of value on the social aspects of a building rather than the communal. Author Jeffery Gayton discusses this distinction by stating that the social model envisions the library as a collaborative space which while good, can undermine the quiet, serious usage of the library as a location for knowledge creation (Gayton 2008, 60). A powerful attraction of the academic library "is the unique pleasure of being alone, in a quiet place, while simultaneously being in a public place associated with scholarship" (Demas 2005, 29). By making an academic library a place where social activity is privileged it presents issues of distraction referenced by both the crypto-temple and modern academic library.[12] This doesn't help with anxiety as it only gives students a place to be social rather than a place to create knowledge/engage with the space. Furthermore, there are plenty of other places on campus that can act as social spaces beyond the library so privileging this aspect can only lead to the library hegemonically fitting into the larger university on a social level. A way to distinguish the library from the rest of the university is through counter hegemonic programming. It is necessary to acknowledge the library as its own institution rather

[12] See Appendix 3.

than as one that is solely connected with the goals of the university. The connection doesn't need to be separated but a differentiating factor should be put into place if one is to view a library as a full third space. If that is addressed than the third place framework can be a good introduction into building trust between the students, librarians, and library systems. Once this trust is introduced then counter-hegemonic programming can truly begin.

The next solution will be referred to as "library as play" and unlike the third space discussions it is more ideologically focused in dealing with space and library anxiety rather than physically focused. The framework in which play will be discussed will be through a analysis of Foucault's Heterotopia as examined by Gary and Marie Radford, and Jessica Lingel in the article *The Library as Heterotopia: Michel Foucault and the Experience of Library Space.* Heterotopia conceptually as Foucault wrote on it, is something that can be directly tied into many of the theoretical elements of the library that have been previously discussed. By definition it is a cultural, institutional, or discursive space that is somehow other, being transforming, disturbing, intense, or contradictory. These are places that evoke "significant and memorable responses for those who enter and interact" with them (Radford, Radford, and Lingel 2015, 734). The space of the library through this lens lies in an odd theoretical place beyond the discussions of ideology presented earlier as through this framework the transformative aspect are in the notion that one enters the library to enter into endlessly expansive knowledge spaces as created by the materials housed within the walls. The library exists as a mirrored world where patrons get lost in a "mixed joint experience" being "neither in one place or another" but experiencing "multiple places at once within the same physical space (2015, 736). The physical space, the literary space, the patron mental space, the ideological space, and others amalgamate into singularity within this lens. This can, of course, be considered as a big cause of personal anxiety but why it was placed here instead of within the second section of this essay is with the introduction of play.

Radford states that when looking at David Macey's biography *The Lives of Michel Foucault* the dominant image from Foucault's activity in the library was him treating the research as play and "the library as a terrain in which play can take place, and which makes the play possible" (2015, 745). This is further extended by the statement that "having spaces become or contain "other spaces" is what children do in their games" (2015, 745). But what exactly constitutes play? Critic Roger Caillois discussed the characteristics in his book *Man, Play, and Games* by stating that play is: free, separate, uncertain, unproductive, governed by rules, make

believe, and a voluntary activity (Caillois 2001, 7–10). To present these ideas within the concept of counter-hegemonic programming at the library one needs to understand why people go to this place: for knowledge creation/production in efforts to succeed within the academic system which often times uses a neoliberal ideological framework. This presents the library as a space where people, through the classes they take, are encouraged/forced to enter into the library for the sake of successful productivity in a neoliberal context. To counter this, alternative ideas of the library's purpose that structure these ideas with library use need to be put into place. One needs to bring patrons into the library for a sake outside of production, something that encourages self determination and pushes against the alienation of the individual through fun methods that evoke Caillois theories. This can be through things like workshops that are voluntary for first year students or guidebooks as previously discussed. However, an underutilized concept within the academic library is the explorative aspect that libraries are fondly known for. As Sam Demas wrote "anecdotal evidence from students and faculty confirms that serendipitous discovery is a common and treasured experience in libraries" (Demas 2005, 32). This serendipitous discovery through exploration needs to be encouraged so that students can not only familiarize themselves with this expansive physical and mental space, but to present them alternative modes of success that exist outside of the production requirements of the university (Beilin 2016, 18). This can be achieved with multiple methods such as programming, improved communication, and better signs to make the navigation easier. Familiarization is perhaps the most key thing to work on as it allows students who experience anxiety through overwhelming space or confusing systems to engage with the library to the point of expertise, but familiarization can also be extended further into demystification which, while mainly appropriate for crypto-temples, needs to be addressed. To read additional solutions, see Appendix 4.

Conclusion:

When discussing the issue of library anxiety within an academic institution there are a variety of characteristics of the library that must be brought up. In the past, the various confusing systems and disconnect between librarians and patrons were viewed as important elements that led to this anxiety but unfortunately, they have been the sole focus of the discourse. Spatial elements have been left under-discussed within the discourse. The space of the academic library physically through characteristics like the layout, geography, signage, and location of materials

need to be addressed as the key elements of library anxiety deal with a feeling of inadequacy or a lack of ability to navigate the space. If the physical is simplified or made more intuitive than library anxiety could be reduced. Theoretical space is an extension of the physical as it deals with the reflection of hegemonic knowledge and dominant institutional thought, all of which help to bolster feelings of fear and inadequacy. It also condenses the potential use of the academic library to a specific framework, whether that be through neoliberal requirements of production or any other dominant exclusionary principal. Considering these elements brings forth either the ability to add space into the solutions that have been discovered previously or allows a framework few newer, more alternative solutions that can be proposed. The solutions offered within this text, following third-place discourse and making the library into a "play" space are just some of the possible options that an academic space can pursue depending on what they are allowed to change within the library spatially and through programming.

Bibliography:

Atlas, Michel. 2005. "Library Anxiety in the Electronic Era, or Why Won't Anybody Talk to Me Anymore? One Librarian's Rant." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 44 (4): 314–19.

Bales, Stephen. 2014a. "Every Thing Determines Everything Embracing the Flux of Academic Librarianship to Co-Author Meaningful Change." In , 16. Brock University, Saint Catharines, Ontario.

———. 2014b. "The Academic Library as a Crypto-Temple: A Marxian Analysis." In *Class and Librarianship: Essays at the Intersection of Information, Labor and Capital.* Duluth, MN: Library Juice Press.

———. 2015. "The Dialectic of Academic Librarianship A Critical Approach." *Litwin Books & Library Juice Press* (blog). 2015. https://litwinbooks.com/books/the-dialectic-of-academic-librarianship/.

Beilin, Ian. 2016. "Student Success and the Neoliberal Academic Library." *Canadian Journal of Academic Librarianship* 1 (January): 10–23. https://doi.org/10.33137/cjal-rcbu.v1.24303.

Brown, Lesley J. 2011. "Trending Now—Reference Librarians: How Reference Librarians Work to Prevent Library Anxiety." *Journal of Library Administration* 51 (3): 309–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.556950.

Cabello, Marcela, and Stuart M Butler. 2017. "How Public Libraries Help Build Healthy Communities." *Brookings*, March, 4.

Caillois, Roger. 2001. "The Definition of Play." In *Man, Play and Games*. University of Illinois Presss. https://www.press.uillinois.edu/books/catalog/64rcw3ts9780252070334.html.

Demas, Sam. 2005. "From the Ashes of Alexandria: What's Happening in the College Library?" Council on Library and Information Resources and Library of Congress.

DiPrince, Elizabeth, Amber Wilson, Chrissy Karafit, Amanda Bryant, and Chris Springer. 2016. "Don't Panic! Managing Library Anxiety with a Library Survival Guide." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 55 (4): 283. https://doi.org/10.5860/rusq.55n4.283.

Eaton, Gale, Michael Vocino, and Melanie Taylor. 1993. “Evaluating Signs in a University Library.” *Collection Management* 16 (3): 81–101. https://doi.org/10.1300/J105v16n03_06.

Freeman, Geoffrey T. 2005. “The Library as Place: Changes in Learning Patterns, Collections, Technology, and Use.” *Council on Library and Information Resources* (blog). 2005. https://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub129/freeman/.

Frischer, Bernard. 2005. “The Ultimate Internet Cafe. Reflections of a Practicing Digital Humanist about Designing a Future for the Research Library in the Digital Age.” *Council on Library and Information Sources*, 27.

Gayton, Jeffrey T. 2008. “Academic Libraries: ‘Social’ or ‘Communal?’ The Nature and Future of Academic Libraries.” *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 34 (1): 60–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2007.11.011.

Greenblatt, Ellen. 1990. “Homosexuality: The Evolution of a Concept in Library of Congress Subject Headings.” In Gay and Lesbian Library Service, edited by Cal Gough and Ellen Greenblatt. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1974. *The Production of Space*. Basil Blackwell, Inc.

Mellon, Constance. 1986. “Library Anxiety: A Grounded Theory and Its Development.” *College & Research Libraries*, no. 47: 160–65.

Molotch, Harvey. 1993. “The Space of Lefebvre.” *Theory and Society* 22 (6): 887–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00993685.

Nicholson, Karen. 2018. “On the Space/Time of Information Literacy, Higher Education, and the Global Knowledge Economy.” *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 2 (1). https://doi.org/10.24242/jclis.v2i1.86.

Novak, George, and Ernest Mandel. 1970. *The Marxist Theory of Alienation*. New York, NY: Pathfinder Press.

Pawley, Christine. 1998. “Hegemony’s Handmaid? The Library and Information Studies Curriculum from a Class Perspective.” *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 68 (2): 123–44.

Radford, Gary P., Marie L. Radford, and Jessica Lingel. 2015. “The Library as Heterotopia: Michel Foucault and the Experience of Library Space.” *Journal of Documentation* 71 (4): 733–51. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-01-2014-0006.

Sontag, Susan. 1964. “Notes On Camp.” *Partisan Review*.

Van Scoyoc, Anna. 2003. “Reducing Library Anxiety in First-Year Students: The Impact of Computer-Assisted Instruction and Bibliographic Instruction.” *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 42 (4): 329–41.

Zoss, Angela. 2019. “Where Do Patrons Get Lost? A Study of Library Navigation.” *Bitstreams: The Digital Collections Blog* (blog). December 6, 2019. https://blogs.library.duke.edu/bitstreams/2019/12/06/where-do-patrons-get-lost-a-study-of-library-navigation/.

Appendix for (Dis)quiet in the Library:

Appendix 1:

Michel C. Atlas critiques this discourse in his article *Library Anxiety in the Electronic Era, or Why Won't Anybody Talk to Me Anymore? One Librarian's Rant.* His criticisms focus heavily on the previous studies of library anxiety and especially on their findings. Atlas mentions Bostick's development of the library anxiety scale and its conclusion that there is a perception of library professionals being intimidating, aloof, and too busy to provide assistance in utilizing the library (Atlas 2005, 315). He takes this conclusion and applies it to the trajectory of library anxiety discourse, stating that many of the articles that followed the creation of this scale put the onus of reducing anxiety squarely on librarians when the reality involves issues of perception and student populations as well. There is an implication that he notes within this discourse that librarians, and only librarians, need to work harder to elicit a feeling of safety or warmth in the communication between themselves and patrons. He refers to as offensive and narrow-minded (2005, 317). The main point that he is inferring to within this text is this: the focus on systems and librarians within the discourse on library anxiety is myopic and can oftentimes lead to either restricted solutions that aren't viable for all who enter into the library at best or the re-mystification of the library at worst (2005, 316). By refusing to address alternative creators of library anxiety such as space, the discourse around and attempts to solve library anxiety are limited to a small field.

However, in a twist of irony, Atlas doesn't offer a solution beyond restating already existing librarian jobs in reference work and pedagogy as well as ending the paper by telling patrons to just "get over" library anxiety, which isn't the best manner of addressing the issue (2005, 318). With regards to space, Atlas does reflect slightly on how modern academic libraries have opted to include things like coffee bars, gift shops, and "finals resting places" amongst other spatial uses (2005, 317). He doesn't have a positive view on these inclusions, however, this inference is highly reductive in that it doesn't mention that all of those are "non-library uses" or non-traditional library inclusions, none of which help people learn how to use the space therefore not even addressing the main antecedents of anxiety within this institution but rather looking solely at the statistics of how many people enter (Demas 2005, 32). By stating that reducing library anxiety and getting people into the library through non-library inclusions like coffee bars

are part of the same field of study presents a false narrative that infers that library anxiety can be reduced by solely bringing people into the space. While the ability to come into and exist within the walls of the library is an important starting point and the inclusion on non-library uses has value, it is engaging with the space and its various library uses that can bring forth the reduction in the particular anxiety that is being discussed. When Mellon states that "the library can be an overwhelming place to someone who doesn't understand how to use it," she meant that if the space and systems are difficult to navigate, then it leads to anxiety (Mellon 1986, 163).

Appendix 2:

Continuing with the discussion on Powell library in the context of knowledge space the two major book stacks are located on differing floors according to the online floorplan. On the first floor holds the stacks with call numbers from A through G, using the Library of Congress Classification system. The ground floor holds the literature with the call numbers H through Z. The problem with this is that the locations are difficult enter, especially the first floor stacks which require that patrons enter through the computer lab or through two back entrances. The full map of the building (found online) doesn't include the special collections within the main reading room on the second floor beyond the reference collection. Entering into the space physically outside of the presented map is a slightly different experience. From this description, it seems as if the knowledge organization of Powell isn't exceptionally navigable for students regardless of if they have seen the digital maps or not. The layout of the materials is confusing and once again, reiterating upon the ideas within the literature on library anxiety if students don't understand how to utilize the space or even where to begin it causes confusion which leads to the feelings of inadequacy.

This confusion about where things are located can certainly be applied to the integration of other items into the space such as digital technologies, and the non-library inclusion within these spaces. With the former, a digital resource/catalog might give a student the information of the library material like its call number, but if it doesn't correspond to a location beyond the library with which it exists in it makes finding the material more difficult than it needs to be if things like maps and signs aren't included or are difficult to understand for students. Furthermore, if the material is located in multiple buildings that can present some confusion if the system doesn't make the specific buildings clear, even more so if the buildings are

functionally different, are differing sizes, or are located in different places on campus. This was referenced as a major issue within the Zoss article. When this finding aid technology is integrated into the space i.e. using computers or tablets with access to catalogs, the conflict of placement comes into view, especially if the number of computers is limited to a single floor. Of course, this aspect can be mitigated if students have access to smartphones or personal computers but that is an assumption that a library can't make of its patrons.

The latter confusion mentioned, the non-library inclusions such as coffee-shops, while not a major issue in comparison to other problems, could potentially hide the location of rooms or change the routes of students to focus on these elements in the library rather than learning how to actually use the space. While these particular inclusions may not be as influential in comparison to the organization of knowledge or even the structure of the building itself, they are additional compounding factors that make navigating the library a potentially difficult thing to accomplish. To reiterate Mellon's hypothesis, not knowing where things are located or what to do are major elements that lead to library anxiety.

Appendix 3:

The second category will be referred to as Warehouse Libraries which were built/renovated during the 1960s through the 1990s. These include UCLA's YRL (1964), New York University's Bobst Library (1973), and California Institute of Technology's Millikan Library (1967).[13] These libraries are oftentimes more aesthetically simple when compared to the crypto-temples but are more likely to contain a larger amount of materials within them. Lastly, the third category encompasses libraries built around the year 2000 and after, these will be referred to as Modern Libraries and include Southern Oregon University Hannon Library (2004), Loyola University of Chicago's Klarchek Information Commons (2005), and University of Chicago's Joe and Rike Mansueto Library (2001).[14] These particular libraries tend to reflect the growing digital landscape and focus on communal or social usages rather than the storage of materials. This isn't a comprehensive list of libraries and it would be remiss to express that all libraries fit into each timeline perfectly or into only three categories, but for the sake of brevity,

[13] Also includes Brown University's John D. Rockefeller Jr. Library (1964), University of Pittsburgh's Hillman Library (1968).
[14] Also includes North Carolina States James B. Hunt Jr. Library (2013), and California State University at Fresno's Henry Madden Library (2011).

this is what is being presented. Furthermore, all of these libraries function in the same hegemonic way as they are all classified as academic libraries, but these distinctions in architecture and aesthetics reflect different elements of this hegemony and should be discussed using differing angles.

The warehouse-style of academic libraries may not have the same crypto-temple aesthetics, so the inherent ornateness that places people into a bottom tier hierarchical position is removed. That being stated, these particular libraries still fit under the ideological state apparatus tent as libraries and are therefore beholden to the same issues as the crypto-temple such as hegemonic dominance. The distinctions in aesthetics and presentation of the warehouse-style library must be critiqued as they present alternative reflections of an institution's dominant ideology. In many ways, the warehouse-style is a polar opposite to the crypto-temple library. The spaces are closer together and closed off. There are often more book stacks than open areas. The outsides are generally grey and non-descript, nothing about the place exudes the sacredness of the crypto-temple beyond perhaps being surrounded by sculptures or gardens. The warehouse is benign. But it is this benign nature where the ISA is more apparent. Bales writes in his book *The Dialectic of Academic Librarianship: A Critical Approach* that the ISA's "manufacture acceptance – whether it be cheerful, grudging, or indifferent – towards the existing power relations through teaching the "rules of good behavior" and ultimately "the rules of the order established by class domination" (Bales 2015, 117). If the crypto-temple manufactures acceptance through an awed or fearful reaction to the space that muddles the modern hegemonic ideology through sacred architecture, then the warehouse manufactures acceptance through indifference by displaying the production aspects of the academic library front and center to its patrons. Whereas the reaction between the student and the crypto-temple is one of awe, the reaction to a warehouse is nothing of the sort. It is, as expressed, benign, stale, and cold. Free of any emotional connection and thus used solely as a warehouse for knowledge production. It is a simulacrum of the temple and in a way a crypto-prison, a place that seems less like it is for human use and more like a storage building for material knowledge. Yet, despite this difference, the warehouse produces the same hierarchical knowledge pressure on students as the crypto-temple due to its similar academic library function. Through this similarity, the small space thus becomes claustrophobic and suffocating and the increased number of seen materials present the same issue as the crypto-temple just in the opposite way. Whereas the crypto-temple forces

students to navigate large spaces that dwarf the books and other materials within, the warehouse-style forces students to navigate small spaces where the walls are covered with textual materials. If one doesn't know where to start or how to navigate this, anxiety is bred.

With the modern changes to the academic library due to the increase in the digital sphere, the space of the institution has seen a few changes as well. The modern library, or the examples designated earlier present an alternative to the crypto-temple and the warehouse model in the focus on this digital aspect as well as social space. Modern academic libraries through their design are attempting to create spaces that house access to knowledge creation but also allow alternative uses of the space such as computer labs built for the space rather than just integrated and non-library inclusions like coffee shops. These spaces become less about previous incarnations of the library and more about how to adequately reflect student needs through a series of relationships between these various library and non-library systems. When analyzed, this can almost be viewed as similar to what Bales stated in his article *Everything Determines Everything.* He states that when a dialectic approach is adopted to librarianship, the library "becomes a set of relationships of people, ideas, and places that are as materially real as Bales the person or as real as everything else in this room." (Bales 2015, 117). The relationships are no longer just between students and the library but between students and everything that has been included within, such as these computer labs. While this seems like a step forward for using space there are still concerns, both of which are addressed in author Jeffery Gayton's article *Academic Libraries: "Social" or "Communal?" The Nature and Future of Academic Libraries*. Gayton's concerns with the modern library are that non-library functions don't meaningfully increase the use of the libraries and that new services can potentially distract from the original functions of the library (Gayton 2008, 63). These concerns are directly tied in with the physical functions of space in that they deal with the inclusion of these alternative elements that are common within modern libraries and while this was referred to in the literature review through Atlas as a discussion of the distinction between bringing people into a place versus having them use it, these concerns present the theoretical issue of the modern library through a singular term: distraction.

The distraction can be read as a distraction from the library's main knowledge creation use but it can also be analyzed in a similar manner to the crypto-temples distraction method, where the digital focus and large communal spaces serve to muddle the hegemonic ideologies

that are propagated due to the institutional use of the space. The library in the modern age has thus unintentionally cycled back to the aestheticized form, but instead of an ancient church, it is now a digital temple. The space may be built differently, but the hierarchies and overwhelming spatial aspects that were so common within the crypto-temples have returned. And once again this brings forth issues of inadequacy and anxiety that are common across all forms of academic libraries, in addition to digital literacy anxiety given that these modern institutions are more focused on computer technologies and visual literacy. The distraction can also be broadened to the distraction of students from the awareness of their own condition within the context of existing in a capitalist academic institution which leads to anxiety and alienation in a similar manner to the crypto-temple (Novak and Mandel 1970, 49–50).

Appendix 4:

The last solution that will be offered is to demystify the space and it is the authors belief that with regards to the crypto-temple the sublime extravagance of these temples aesthetics falls under a certain level of Susan Sontag's definitive camp though it is not solely related to the crypto-temple style. The spirit of extravagance and too muchness of the century old academic library defined through its aesthetics and vastness of its space is ripe for critique (Sontag 1964, 7). As an extension of the previous solution, this solution, which will be referred to as the "camping of the library," should encourage students to question the severity of the spaces that they work within and therefore question the hegemony that is placed upon them. Not only would allowing students to criticize the status quo of the library and its control over the population demystify the aesthetics and physical aspects of the space, but if they can become "frivolous about the seriousness" than that would make working within the library's complex systems much less anxious inducing and possibly more fun, leading back into the aspect of play (1964, 10). Gale Eaton states more people tend to use the library when they become familiar with the space (Eaton, Vocino, and Taylor 1993, 85). Demystification is just familiarization with additional ideological barriers being broken and for the crypto-temple specifically that is extremely important to make note of.

Appendix Bibliography:

Atlas, Michel. 2005. "Library Anxiety in the Electronic Era, or Why Won't Anybody Talk to Me Anymore? One Librarian's Rant." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 44 (4): 314–19.

Bales, Stephen. 2014. “Every Thing Determines Everything Embracing the Flux of Academic Librarianship to Co-Author Meaningful Change.” In , 16. Brock University, Saint Catharines, Ontario.

———. 2015. “The Dialectic of Academic Librarianship A Critical Approach.” *Litwin Books & Library Juice Press* (blog). 2015. https://litwinbooks.com/books/the-dialectic-of-academic-librarianship/.

Demas, Sam. 2005. “From the Ashes of Alexandria: What’s Happening in the College Library?” Council on Library and Information Resources and Library of Congress.

Eaton, Gale, Michael Vocino, and Melanie Taylor. 1993. “Evaluating Signs in a University Library.” *Collection Management* 16 (3): 81–101. https://doi.org/10.1300/J105v16n03_06.

Gayton, Jeffrey T. 2008. “Academic Libraries: ‘Social’ or ‘Communal?’ The Nature and Future of Academic Libraries.” *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 34 (1): 60–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2007.11.011.

Mellon, Constance. 1986. “Library Anxiety: A Grounded Theory and Its Development.” *College & Research Libraries*, no. 47: 160–65.

Novak, George, and Ernest Mandel. 1970. *The Marxist Theory of Alienation*. New York, NY: Pathfinder Press.

Sontag, Susan. 1964. “Notes On Camp.” *Partisan Review*.