

POWER DIALECTICS IN MANAGING LIBRARIES

Nurdin Laugu

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta

nurdin@uin-suka.ac.id

Abstract

This paper was aimed at investigating the dialectics of power in library management in Islamic universities. The research used critical theory to understand power relations and ideology in the social dynamics of libraries. The research adopted a constructivist qualitative approach to examine the unique social phenomena of professional practices in which the power of ideology has taken place among library actors in a hidden way. The data collection technique employed interviews and observations validated through triangulation of sources, techniques, and time. The analysis technique used Miles and Huberman's three stages: display, reduction, and data conclusion/verification. The research results illustrate three main findings, namely the dialectic of ideology in the interaction of library actors that can be seen in the contestation between pluralist and non-pluralist groups, both among library actors and in its implications for library collections. The second issue is the struggle between internal and external actors in the library. This issue includes relations between the library and other units or with other library institutions. Lastly is the contestation between libraries and other institutions, especially international relations, such as corners managed in libraries.

Keywords: Power relation, ideology, library management, Islamic libraries

Abstrak

Tulisan ini membahas dialektika kuasa dalam pengelolaan perpustakaan di perguruan tinggi Islam. Kajian ini menggunakan teori sosial kritis untuk membaca relasi kuasa dan ideologi dalam dinamika sosial perpustakaan. Penelitian tersebut menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif konstruktivistik untuk melihat fenomena sosial yang unik dari praktik-praktik profesional yang di baliknya tersembunyi kekuatan ideologi dan kuasa di antara para aktor perpustakaan. Teknik pengumpulan data menggunakan wawancara dan observasi, yang validasinya melalui triangulasi sumber, teknik, dan waktu. Adapun teknik analisisnya menggunakan tiga tahap Miles & Huberman, yaitu display, reduksi, dan simpulan/verifikasi data. Hasil penelitian menggambarkan tiga temuan pokok, yaitu dialektika ideologi dalam interaksi aktor perpustakaan, yang dapat dilihat dalam kontestasi antara kelompok pluralis dan non-pluralis, baik di kalangan aktor perpustakaan maupun implikasinya pada koleksi perpustakaan. Isu kedua berupa pertarungan antara aktor internal dan eksternal dalam perpustakaan. Isu ini meliputi relasi kuasa antara pihak perpustakaan dan unit-unit lain dalam satu lembaga yang sama. Terakhir adalah kontestasi antara perpustakaan dan lembaga-lembaga lainnya, khususnya hubungan yang bersifat internasional, seperti korner-korner yang dikelola di perpustakaan.

Kata kunci: Relasi kuasa, ideologi, manajemen perpustakaan, perpustakaan Islam

INTRODUCTION

As power dialectics between actors in offering their ideas, libraries are ideological sites providing opportunities for everyone to play out their strategies to achieve domination (Althusser, 2014). This dialectic is part of a dynamic process in various institutions, including library development. As a dynamic process, the library becomes an arena for contestation of power ideologies among library actors, especially managers and librarians (Barker, 2004; Laugu, 2019). Library management practices can present two forms of power interactions: structural and cultural. These two forms are a natural process in every social relationship in society, which leads them into a dynamic circle and towards the progress of society. Differences in action and reaction among them will provide spaces to shape various events and social facts (Wijayanti, 2019).

In the structural world of institutions in society, no matter how professional they are in carrying out their functions, their organizational performance must be in the cultural atmosphere. This context means that the structural world, on the one hand, develops on the principle of professionalism, but aspects of culture overshadow it on the other hand. Therefore, social studies, including library sciences, cannot avoid such social facts. Awareness of these social relations brings researchers into a holistic space in reading social and cultural phenomena in library management practices (Jahmurataj, 2015). In cultural life, on the other hand, social interaction takes on a structural character that is no less influential. As a result, cultural conditions are often formed from cycles of structural currents, which often become the standard practice of social relations in society. At this point, it is shown how strong a person's position and functional institutions provide space for

societal expression (Alesina & Giuliano, 2015).

Power networks in social practices, institutional, and corporate hierarchies show interactions and connectivity at social nodes, holistically forming dynamic flows in society. In the library dialectical discourse, at least three main forms of phenomena interact dynamically. First, the ideological dialectics discourse has taken a contestation form in library management practices in almost every management line. The second phenomena manifest as a struggle between external and internal actors. Their collaboration and ideological rivalry become one in the form of institutional professionalism. A third possible phenomenon is institutional contestation. The presence of an institution is a key basis for interaction, how the position of one institution is relative to other institutions. Concerning these phenomena, this study will focus on three management practices of library institutions, namely the UIN Sunan Kalijaga, UII, and UMY libraries, to discover issues regarding ideological dialectics, actor contestation, and institutional rivalry of various professional practices.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Ideology as contestation apparatus

Ideology is a classic concept that is always active and dynamic in the development of society in various spaces and times. Many experts and theorists are involved in trying to interpret the concept. For example, Terry Eagleton (1991, p. 2) looked at that ideology has various meanings that cannot be unified. One of them is that not all ideological formulations are the same, so each definition is held by the group corresponding to it. In addition, some

ideological formulations are pejorative, and some are not, as on the one hand, the definition of ideology involves epistemological questions and not on the other.

Stuart Hall (Storey, 1993) proposed five definitions to understand this ideology. First, ideology refers to a collection of ideas articulated by a particular group, such as the ideology of a political party or professional group. Second, ideology is considered as a cover, distortion, and concealment. Ideology is used to show how cultural texts and practices present a distorted image of reality and what is called false consciousness. The third definition refers to a particular image of the world that depends on societal ideas that are more conflicted than consensual. Fourth, ideology is not a simple collection of ideas but rather a material practice of daily life that includes certain rituals and customs that have a binding influence on a social order. Finally, ideology operates at the level of connotation, which, according to Roland Barthes (1981), is called myth, which refers to the hegemonic struggle to limit connotations, determine certain connotations, and produce new connotations.

Concerning the first definition, ideology is related to legitimising the power of the dominant social group or class. John B. Thompson (1984) reinforced that ideology is an effort to examine how meaning functions to support dominant relations. This view is the most widely accepted definition. The legitimation process includes several different strategies related to the second and third definitions, namely a dominant power that can legitimise itself by promoting beliefs and values that are compatible with it, naturalise and universalise such beliefs to become

inescapably self-evident, demonise ideas that could challenge it; get rid of rival thought-forms; and obscure social reality in a way that pleases it. Such mystification sometimes takes the form of disguised and oppressive social conflict, where ideological conceptions emerge as an imaginary resolution of real contradictions (Eagleton, 1991, pp. 5-6).

In line with that, ideology is considered not a simple idea but a system of representation that includes images, myths, ideas, and concepts, as stated by Louis Althusser in the 1970s to 1980s (Storey, 1993, pp. 5, 111). Ideology, he argued, resides in apparatus and related practices. Therefore, he showed a series of institutions as ideological state apparatuses (ISAs), which include the family, the education system, the church, and the mass media. The church, according to him, was the dominant ideological apparatus in the pre-capitalist era but was replaced by the education system in the capitalist era. Schools and universities are involved in the ideological (and physical) reproduction of workers' power in so far as social reproduction relations pertain to capitalism. The education system, thus, becomes a site of opposing ideologies and an arena of ideological conflict rather than a site of problem-free and homogeneous reproduction (Barker, *The sage dictionary of cultural studies*, 2004, pp. 96-97).

Power representation

The concept of power is an interesting discourse among social scientists. Foucault, for example, said that power is everywhere and is not limited to dominant parties or the like (Eagleton, 1991; Sarup, 2008) so that the notion of power that is centred on coercion and orders or prohibitions begins to be questioned again. In interpreting power, Dhakidae

(Dhakidae, 2003) formulates two groups of meanings: first, power is seen as a finished product and as a substance that can materialise on two sides, namely the left with the term constitution and the right with the term state apparatus (Foucault, 2002); and second, power is seen as a relationship, a pattern of relationships with all its consequences. In this second sense, Hadiz & Dhakidae (2005) stated that such power can be seen with the help of concepts, one of which is Bourdieu's social capital, such as prestige, honour, and privileges, which can be attached and mobilised through social relations expressed in power networks, in addition to Michel Foucault's concept of power and representation.

Foucault (2002) said that power is not possession or ability. Power is not subordinate to or serves economic interests but rather is a pattern of power relations that does not originate from the ruler or state. Power cannot be conceptualised as belonging to individuals or classes. Power is not a commodity that can be obtained or achieved; it is a network in nature, spreading widely everywhere. Foucault wanted to say that the power analysis should focus on something other than the level of conscious goals but on the point of the exercise of power. He wants to change the focus of the question from "who has power or what are the goals/intentions of the power holder to the process that shapes subjects as a result of the influence of power" (Sarup, 2008, pp. 111-2).

According to Foucault, one of the important elements of power that must be understood is freedom. Power is exercised only on free subjects and lasts only as long as they are free. The subject in question is an individual or collective faced with an area of possibility to carry out several actions. There is no power relation if that

possibility does not exist, such as enslaved people or people in chains. Freedom and power are two facts that complement and negate each other. Freedom disappears when power is used, and freedom can appear when power is not used (Foucault, 2000, p. 342). According to him, power is nothing but a battle of meanings. This struggle for meaning denotes a core relation between power and knowledge. Foucault says that power and knowledge directly impact each other; there is no power relationship without the formation of a field of knowledge, and conversely, at the same time, there is no science that does not imply and constitute a power relationship (Ritzer, 2004, p. 94).

Alvin Gouldner in Dhakidae (2003, pp. 41-3) looked at that knowledge and knowledge systems determine the history and historical stages. Those who process knowledge and apply and organise it occupy a decisive position in society, so that a scholar, such as a doctor and a lawyer, fight each other in interpreting the same case differently. Foucault also provides a different understanding of the relationship between power and knowledge (Sarup, 2008, p. 102). He is in line with his predecessor, Nietzsche, who said that what is considered as knowledge of the truth is nothing but the will to power (Ritzer, 2004, p. 79). In this discourse of power, representation becomes an important process and stage in Foucault's discursive practice. Representation is a set of processes by which signifying practices appear to represent or describe objects or other practices from the real world.

Consequently, representation is considered an act of symbolism that reflects an independent world of objects. It is constitutive of the meaning it represents. Representation connects meaning with language in culture, which can be seen in three representational

approach theories: reflective, intentional, and constructionist. Reflective one asks to what extent the language reflects a meaning that is out there in the world of objects, people and events. At the same time, intentional approach discusses whether the language expresses only what the speaker, writer or painter will say, his personal, intentional meaning. The meaning constructed through language is then referred to as constructionist, which will become an important issue because it relates to cultural studies (Hall, 2003, p. 15).

Libraries in Political Economy

Libraries, as cultural products and ideological sites, experience dynamic processes in almost every activity they carry out. For example, in the collection development section, there is a process that can be political and economic, starting from selection to purchasing the collection. On this basis, political economy analysis/approach becomes important to read the possible involvement of market forces in determining the development of collections in libraries. This political economy approach, by Caporaso and Levine in Yustika (Yustika, 2009), is interpreted as the interrelation between political aspects, processes and institutions with economic activities, which, among other things, include production, investment, price creation, trade and consumption. As an approach, political economy is a domain of study that discusses the power and the distribution of economic resources, so this study seeks to explore who owns and supervises economic, societal and cultural institutions (Barker, 2004, p. 145; 2000, p. 278).

This issue shows that political economy is a study of social relations,

especially power relations, which together form the production, distribution, and consumption of resources, which are communication products, such as newspapers, books, videos, films, and audiences as the main source of scope and mechanisms, the sites by which corporate ownership and oversight of cultural industries shape cultural configurations. This formulation has heuristic value for communication learners because it can direct attention to market share's strengths and fundamental processes. It also emphasises the institutional circuit of communication products that connect, for example, a chain of primary producers to sellers, retailers, and consumers, whose buying, leasing, and concern create new production processes (Mosco, 1996, p. 25; Barker, 2004, p. 145).

Mosco (1996, p. 139) described three political economy foundations: commodification, spatialisation, and structuration. Commodification refers to the process of transforming use value into exchange value through various means, where this process develops into the much-neglected social fields of communication products, audiences, and labour. Everything that has use value, whether pure economic or cultural products, is a commodity that can be exchanged for economic and power purposes, giving rise to commodification. Meanwhile, Baudrillard states that the use value and exchange value of commodities have been replaced by sign value because the current value is determined by exchanging symbolic meanings rather than through use. Hence, commodities are not objects with use-value but a sign-commodity (Barker, 2004, p. 29).

The second foundation of political economy introduced by Henri Lefebvre (1979), namely spatialisation as a process to overcome the limitations of space and

time in social life. This spatialisation is important in political economy for basic reasons, namely technological advances and the communications industry. Distances in time and space will be cut as a further stage of the commodification process. The efficiency and effectiveness of using space and time are important in achieving the goals of actors and groups in relations between private and public life. Meanwhile, the third basis is structuration, which describes the process when an agent forms a structure; at the same time, this structure also acts as a medium that forms the agent. This concept aligns with Giddens (Giddens, 1990), who presents structuration as an effort to bridge the chasm between theoretical perspectives prioritising structure and perspectives emphasising action and agency (Mosco, 1996; Sudibyoy, 2004).

In political economy, there is a critical and practical approach, which, for example, is represented by the Frankfurt School in communication. This critical approach looks at the activities of people who are creative and free in order to change the situation, especially amid a major current of social change, capitalism. The praxis approach views knowledge as a product of continuous interaction and dialectics between theory and practice. Accordingly, the study of political economy is marked by an orientation towards a moral philosophy that looks at what is and what should be done. In addition, studies of this kind pay serious attention to the impact of capitalism on modern communication processes and institutions, which then influence the market economy in terms of the pattern of distribution of cultural products and the different forms and structures of social significance (Sudibyoy, 2004, pp. 4-9).

In this regard, it is important to track the market for books in libraries as an

effort to uncover ideological agendas, especially market ideologies, which are trendsetters in the development of library collections. In the world of libraries, the book market is an important and strategic part of building collections needed by the public. However, it is vulnerable to distortion and deviation from the goals to be achieved. The librarian, as the main actor, is formally responsible for the collection's ability to answer the community's needs. However, due to the involvement of various actors who often have greater power, librarians must act on the flow and only accept what those who are dominant want, whether from decision-makers or book market regulators. Consequently, book purchases sometimes fail to meet demand of library users.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research employed a qualitative method with a phenomenological-constructionist approach. Qualitative studies are often called multi-method research that is interpretive and based in natural settings. Natural here is intended as a study that seeks to examine something through its natural setting to interpret and interpret phenomena concerning meanings that can be understood (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 2). Meanwhile, studies based on a phenomenological-constructionist approach are intended to interpret and explain human actions and thoughts through a description of the basic structure of reality that appears to be self-evident in humans as individuals and groups in society. Therefore, this approach relies on social interaction, which gives rise to a construction and conveys the meaning of a reality that occurs in that society as social and cultural phenomena.

The research object is the entire problem discussed in the research, while the research subject is what discusses the object. Therefore, the object is everything that is researched, while the subject is the researcher who talks about and discusses the object. In a qualitative research, such data sources are referred to as objects because they are a component that must be examined in order to obtain accurate information about the object of research. Treating data sources as objects will give each researcher full authority to make interpretations in constructing an understanding (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Based on this view, objects are divided into primary/formal objects, namely the main issues being studied and secondary/material objects, namely data sources. Thus, the object of this study includes the primary object, namely the dialectics of power in library management practices and secondary objects, namely several informants and other data sources (Ratna, 2010).

The analytical method used in this study refers to the analytical process proposed by Miles and Huberman, which includes three stages: data reduction, data presentation, and conclusions or verification. Data reduction is the process of directing a collection of data obtained through pruning, which is considered irrelevant to the object of study, so that the analysis is carried out to achieve the point. Data is presented in brief descriptions, charts, and relationships between categories, often referred to as a structured and organized information collection that allows a conclusion. Verification and conclusion are carried out provisionally and will change if stronger information is found. The analyzed data was validated through three kinds of triangulation: technique, source, and time (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Sugiyono, 2006).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Discourses on ideological dialectics in interactions among library actors

Internally, the ideological configuration of librarians' pluralism and non-pluralism is a binary opposition. Although it is not transparently visible, their religious traditions and practices differ, both at the level of thought and daily practice. Their religious thoughts and practices in the library environment are similar to the pluralist moderate ideology. It is believed that a pluralistic librarianship competency binds their organizational vision, and their attitudes and behaviour must adhere to the paradigm of pluralism in carrying out their duties as library staffs (Raber, 1994).

The practice of religious pluralism and non-pluralism in the librarianship profession is rather difficult to read because every librarian is not open to their religious views. However, researchers found that the discourse of pluralistic practices can be seen in the institutional atmosphere where librarians carry out their profession. The discourse on ideological practice is carried out using expert statements and definitions of pluralist religious thoughts and practices, namely as a situation when a person has the freedom and openness to choose what he wants as long as it does not disturb his environment. Likewise, there is no pressure on other people to be followed or follow certain groups or opinions (Laugu, 2015).

Externally, the actors involved in library management are those who do not come from the librarian group but are policymakers on the structural top line in higher education. Among others, they are university leaders with hierarchical organizational power who appear to be driven by group ideology to change the

management configuration in libraries (Laugu, 2015). Organizational changes are normal, but their religious and social ideologies, which colour policy forms, are interesting to read further. For example, the UIN Sunan Kalijaga library is known to be led by people with rather liberal religious thoughts. As a result, liberality becomes a leading decision in every university policy, which has implications for library policy. This liberalist religious influence can be seen in collaborative discussions between UIN Sunan Kalijaga and representatives of Saudi Arabia regarding plans to establish a Saudi Arabia corner at the UIN Sunan Kalijaga library, which failed because UIN Sunan Kalijaga was considered too liberal (Laugu, 2019).

It is different from what happened at UII, which was not based on liberal religious thoughts but on "ideological" considerations that were temporary and usually occurred at the time of the succession of university leadership. Even though it is temporary, the trial also extends to library policies, for example, the appointment of the head of the librarian based on considerations of a kind of prerogative by the ruling leadership. This prerogative side provides a wide opportunity for every ruler to exercise his religious and ideological power. A different atmosphere, for example, can be seen in the library management practice at UMY, which is based on organizational goals (Laugu, 2015). Such conditions have shown several ideological constellations, as in the following explanation.

A library is an organization where people live to socialize and earn a living for themselves and their families. As a result, economic issues are often the main factor determining the behavior of each actor, from the bottom line to the top line,

in libraries in general and Islamic college libraries in particular. This issue is connected with Karl Marx's idea, which makes the economic base the determinant of cultural and social superstructure. According to him, when producing their material livelihood, people enter forms of social relations, forming the economic structure of society as a "base," where cultural and political superstructures are born (Barker, 2000). Therefore, such a mode of production of material life has determined the general character of society's social, political and cultural life processes that occur in the management of libraries. In line with that, religious, socio-cultural, and political superstructures have influenced the relationship between library actors and the people involved in managing the library. The economy becomes the main element, fundamental factor, and driving force in forming power relations among librarians in general and Islamic university librarians in particular, as well as other external actors (Laugu, 2019).

Generally, the structural relationship between people and leaders in a hierarchical organization is a line of command to ensure organizational orders run smoothly and effectively. With command channels, the relationship between librarians and library leaders becomes one of the domains of ideological power practices that utilize formal channels as a means of legitimation to achieve their ideological goals, such as the tradition of leadership orders that cannot be rejected even though they have nothing to do with the profession. This kind of power practice is the product of a relationship pattern labelled professional hierarchical but goes beyond managerial channels to regulate and normalize all organizational activities to achieve its vision and mission (Laugu, 2021). Therefore, the practice of power

gives rise to ideological power based on each organizational actor's various positions and backgrounds. The variety and diversity of these effects in the context of the Islamic university libraries studied, at least, shows four forms of relationship, namely reactive, silent, mediocre, and hidden rejection.

First, reactive power relations are usually seen from the emergence of a new policy that is not in accordance with the organization's professional path, such as overtime activities that do not pay attention to competency aspects, which raises various responses. When viewed from the culture of organizational actors, actions like this cannot be included in the resistance relations (opposition) pattern because the form of reactive behaviour is more caused by novelty and temporary shock that arises from the organization's new policies or rules. On the other hand, this kind of reactive action cannot be included in organizational cultural behaviour because its emergence may be driven more by an authority or personal ego who wants to display strength that must be followed. After all, according to him, the reactive response conveyed is a proposal that can solve the organizational problem. It is illustrated in the interview conducted with one of the informants from the three libraries studied as in the following.

"As librarians who are equipped with both formal and non-formal knowledge, we feel the need to provide input that is under our knowledge and experience as library managers who have been involved in libraries for a long time, so that if we find something that we consider is not following our knowledge and, in our experience, we usually directly confront our views so that policies or whatever form they take can be reconsidered

for the betterment of our library. "We feel that what we convey, whether in formal forums or not, has been considered based on insight into librarian education and long experience as a librarian, so these proposals should be heard and paid attention to if the leadership wants to see the library progress."

What was conveyed by the informants above has the same meaning as the expressions of some other informants of the three libraries, even though their verbatim is different. Therefore, these findings show the similarity of the reactive patterns of library management actors, especially librarians, in dealing with library leadership policies and programs in empowering libraries as an effect of the hierarchical path of the library organization of Islamic universities in Yogyakarta. The second form of power relations is that some librarians take self-silence to obscure their position on a problem and seek a safe position. Some librarians sometimes carry out this kind of attitude because it is considered a powerful strategy to maintain good relations with the leaders even though they do not agree with their policies. This silence is usually done when librarians have certain positions in the line of the organizational structure or they want to be considered professionally compliant so that they can later get promotions for certain positions in the line of the library organization (Maccoby, 2023).

The third form of relationship is taking the attitude of "appearing calm" (self-control) as an effort to avoid tension with leaders even though they disagree based on their knowledge and experience. The form of response from this relationship is usually no different from the second form of relationship, namely a strategy to

maintain their image as subordinates who obey the leadership so that the organizational position, they are holding remains safe, get promotions, and the like. Finally, approval before (formal forum) and rejection behind (informal), which is usually referred to as double-faced, is a form of power relations between librarians and their leaders. This form of response can occur to both parties as a strategy to broaden personal and group goals in building self-image in front of the library public so that they are appreciated as the right person in the organization – the right man in the right place. From the leadership side of the library, this strategy is used to show that they are good library leaders, do not discriminate, and can respect all their staff fairly so that they can master and control them well, effectively and efficiently. On the other hand, the staff uses this strategy to attract leaders' attention to continue gaining trust. Of course, the ultimate goal is better promotion.

The relationship between librarians and administrative employees shows a power effect in the library. Indeed, in the UMY library, which does not yet have library managers with librarian competency standards, who are then referred to as librarians, the power dialectics between librarians and library administration employees cannot automatically be seen because they all have the same competency standards and management duties, which are referred to as non-librarian library managers. Meanwhile, in the other two libraries, the UIN Sunan Kalijaga library and the UII library, as mentioned above, the power relations between the two parties, librarians and library administration employees, show several basic ideas about the power dialectics, as seen below.

Observations and interviews conducted show that the main factor that plays a role in the configuration of library actors is the issue of incentives, namely economic rewards, which differ from one person to another between librarians and library administration employees. As a result, tension and problem of relations arise between librarians and administrative employees because librarians' functional duties as professional library managers are also carried out outside formal working hours, which are referred to as overtime hours, thus generating additional economic incentives for librarians. In such a situation, overtime hours have implications for the relationship between both parties with the assumptions they each carry in the context of library management. According to the informant, the symptoms of tension resulting from this incentive drive could finally be overcome by involving all library managers in overtime activities, librarians and administrative staff, security guards, and parking attendants, which ultimately gave rise to synergism in managing the library. This point can be seen from the interview with the UII librarian below.

"We from the library management, both librarian friends and library administration staff, including security guards and parking attendants at the UII library and museum, have been working overtime together so that we can all get additional income, not just those who are librarians, because with this togetherness can overcome the problem of problem of relations which are very sensitive and can arise in every area of library activity, especially the issue of overtime... the involvement of administration and security and parking staff are still placed in positions that allow them to feel in

control while little by little being involved in something new for them, such as in the borrowing and returning process if there is a process that cannot be carried out independently, which is usually because the membership of the library concerned has been blocked for various reasons, such as having outstanding fines and losing library books."

This kind of overtime mechanism is also implemented in the library of UIN Sunan Kalijaga as a strategy to avoid the rise of tensions between librarians and administrative staff groups, even though the processes and involvement are different. This difference occurs because of differences in the working mechanism of security guards and parking in these two libraries. However, both have the same paradigm and thoughts about involving the main components of the library to reduce problem of relations, as discussed above. However, this strategy, on the other hand, gave rise to new tensions because the performance of some of the non-librarian groups was considered inappropriate to be involved in the overtime offered by the library. Ultimately, these tensions could be mitigated and resolved quickly (Laugu, 2015).

The presence of librarians in libraries as the main actors and one of the determinants in the configuration of library organizational mechanisms has given librarians high authority in library management. This authority is often a tool for librarians to show their strength, and sometimes they need to consider other main elements, such as users from student groups, so whatever they do seems necessary without the need for communication with users. This kind of behaviour manifests in an authoritarian

attitude because it forgets the role of library users, which is the main reason for the existence of a library. This excessive self-confidence can be a form of betrayal by some librarians towards the essence of their presence among users who have needs with different behaviours and habits (Leckie, Given, & Buschman, 2010).

This kind of behaviour of librarians symbolizes their self-recognition of librarian authority and library managers who have abilities that librarians cannot surpass. This point indicates a battle that could lead to every library element, especially its users. On the other hand, the users try to show that it is the users who must determine the direction of library development because the library's presence cannot be separated from the presence of the users. This kind of relationship again gives rise to a new contestation brought by the user. Both parties consider themselves one of the important elements that must be heard by the other (Laugu, 2015).

The relationship formed in the power constellation of both parties gives rise to behaviour that is difficult for each party to accept. On the part of librarians, a friendly professional culture is reduced to behaviour that could be more responsive to users. In contrast, users legitimize themselves as a group whose wishes must be heard and followed without much attention to polite behaviour and good communication arrangements because, according to him, the basic nature of libraries is to serve library users. This power struggle is resolved through several approaches. First, the three libraries studied held user education to introduce library users to how the library was designed to meet their needs and how to use it. Second, discussion space is provided by the library to users so that they can enjoy and feel like they own the

library property with all the services available, from information services to physical needs, such as the availability of a cafe. In the third approach, at the UIN Sunan Kalijaga library, students as users are allowed to work part-time in the library so that they have an attachment to the library as friends of the library whose function is to introduce the library to their friends.

These three forms of approach are, at the very least, a library strategy for overcoming the pattern of dominative-subordinative perspective relationships between librarians and users by directing them to a pattern of equal relations that is free from power machinations between them (Barker, 2000). Formally, this approach positively impacts library image efforts among users. However, on the other hand, the lack of improvisation and variations in the dynamics and mobilization of this implementation means that this approach, over time, shifted to a new pattern of relation between librarians and users in their frames between providers and recipients of information which developed into information workers as well as users. They need to realize their competitive attitude and mutual perception of themselves as the actors with the most rights and competence to carry out librarianship tasks, both by librarians and users (Agusta & Nurdin, 2021).

Contestation between internal and external actors

Higher education libraries as a part of higher education generally have various relationship mechanisms between parts of the library and other parts in higher education environment that supervise them. Of course, the relationship mechanism is open and different from one library to another. In addition to the

relations between these sections or units, there are also various relations between the library as an information institution and other institutions. In external relations, libraries have different strategies for establishing cooperative relationships with various institutions, both similar institutions and different institutions (Giddens, 1990). Although the two models of relations above are managerial and technical practices, they have produced and reproduced discursive practices that have given rise to ideological and political contestations among actors, as will be explored below.

In the world of education, higher education libraries are a fundamental component to support the achievement of the vision and mission of higher education institutions engaged in education in a broad sense, which is implemented through the establishment of various educational units, such as faculties with study programs, research centres, and language centres. In this context, the library can function as a major player in making a source of information and a collection of knowledge for the education carrier and developer unit to jointly and synergize to build education according to the vision and mission of its parent institution, namely higher education (Laugu, 2019).

In an organizational configuration like this, libraries organize themselves to have the ability to collaborate with other units, especially study programs developed by universities. In the research, it was found that although in formal forums, discussions always arise that show that libraries are important in the world of education, the policies made sometimes do not reflect the importance of libraries, so situations like this often become a big dilemma in library management, such as procurement of collections which are still

relatively far from fulfilment of user needs (Kumaran, 2012). Apart from such situations, the three library cases have built good collaboration with study programs in their respective higher education institutions and are trying to eliminate the nature of their subordination, which they have felt so far, to show and introduce the library's vision in supporting the university's vision which has service implications. Prima to the academic community. In this process, the UIN Sunan Kalijaga library, for example, formed a library development team involving lecturers from various faculties to provide input to the library in designing library services for the institution's progress as a whole. The UMY and UII libraries also actively communicate with lecturers, both those who come directly to the library and those who use virtual communication networks, such as social media and websites.

Libraries versus other institutions

In carrying out its duties progressively, the library seeks to collaborate with various parties that it considers capable of enriching library services to users. Therefore, through its universities, the library collaborates with several foreign cultural institutions through cultural and educational attachés from the embassies of several countries, such as the United States, Iran and Canada (US Embassy, 2023). In this context, the UIN Sunan Kalijaga library has agreed to collaborate with the Iranian Cultural and Educational Attaché to build a type of service in the library called Iranian Corner, which presents collections about culture and education in the country, seminar activities and training in Iran's national language, Persian, and the visit of the Corner staff to Iran (Laugu, 2015).

Meanwhile, the UMY library is collaborating with America to build an American Corner that presents various collections on culture, the world of science, and socio-politics of America. In addition to these collections, the library corner also presents regular monthly film screenings and discussions whose speakers are mostly from America with the theme of social issues and politics, which are the realm of American public diplomacy, in order to introduce the public to the library about the state system and social problems in America. The UIN Sunan Kalijaga library carried out collaboration with Canada through several Canadian alumni at UIN Sunan Kalijaga, so they took the initiative to hold discussions with the Canadian Cultural and Educational Attache, which eventually led to the collaboration in establishing a Canadian Corner at the UIN Sunan Kalijaga library (Laugu, 2015).

Although the collaboration with the five parties was found to be general, open, democratic and professional, political and ideological practices emerged in the process and implementation, making the library an arena of contestation, as can be seen in at least four forms. First, the juxtaposition of the corner in the library of UIN Sunan Kalijaga, for example, gave rise to a strong protest from one party who did not want to see another country's symbol close to his country's symbol (Laugu, 2015). As a result, the purpose of procuring a professional corner for the benefit of users turns out to be political and ideological. The second contestation was found related to efforts to disclose scientific background, which also cannot be avoided because the arguments underlying the procurement of certain corners are symbolic. For example, the Canadian corner procurement was based more on the efforts of certain groups to show that UIN Sunan Kalijaga had formed

a partnership that produced many alumni. It is difficult to avoid the presence of this kind of corner, which can be used to show the self-existence of certain groups to dominate the image amid inter-group struggles in an institution (Laugu, 2015).

Third, the Saudi Arabia corner procurement process, for example, is also coloured by issues that happen to be religious, namely pluralism versus non-pluralism. Initially, the supporters of this corner were motivated by an effort to balance the corner, which they called supporters of pluralism. Heated debates around religious considerations became the main characteristic of the presence of this collaboration at the UIN Sunan Kalijaga library. As a result, the library's main goal as a professional and managerial institution was dashed (Laugu, 2021). The fourth contest shows the library as a space full of negotiations. Libraries become a vehicle for certain groups to introduce themselves and attempt to dominate others. Indeed, the negotiations were not through a process of cooperation but rather through the distribution of certain books and intensive seminars that attempted to introduce themselves, which may have yet been understood by many others. In such a process, self-negotiation is carried out to invite the public's attention to understand themselves so that they can be accepted

and, over time, become dominant (Laugu, 2015).

CONCLUSION

Power dialectics in managing libraries is an important study to understand critical perspectives of social interaction in the context of the library phenomena. The results of the discussion have described three main findings, namely ideological dialectics in the interaction of library actors, which can be seen in the contestation between pluralist and non-pluralist groups, both among library actors and their implications for library collections. The second issue is the contestation between internal and external actors in the library. This issue covers relations between the library and other units within umbrella organisation or with other library institutions. The last one is the contestation between libraries and other institutions, especially international relations, such as corners managed in those libraries. Unfortunately, this study is more general in looking at various power phenomena and other ideological state apparatuses, both internal and external, so further study is needed to focus on certain object, such as the issue of particular corner being separated from other corners and issues.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Agusta, A. S., & Nurdin, L. (2021). Integrative leadership style of libraries at Islamic universities in Indonesia. *Library Philosophy and Practice, Fall*(May). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/5443/>
- Alesina, A., & Giuliano, P. (2015). Culture and institutions. *Journal of Economic Literature, 53*(4), 898-944. Retrieved Sept 02, 2023, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43927694>
- Althusser, L. (2014). *On the reproduction of capitalism: ideology and ideological state apparatuses.* (G. Goshgarian, Trans.) London: Verso.
- Barker, C. (2000). *Cultural studies: theory and practice.* London: Sage Publication.

- Barker, C. (2004). *The sage dictionary of cultural studies*. London: Sage Publication.
- Barthes, R. (1981). *Elements of semiology*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, .S. (1994) .*Handbook of qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Dhakidae, D. (2003). *Cendekiawan dan kekuasaan dalam negara orde baru*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: an introduction*. London: Verso.
- Foucault, M. (2000). *Essential works of foucault 1945-1984: power*. New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *Power/knowledge = Wacana kuasa/pengetahuan: wawancara pilihan dan tulisan-tulisan lain 1972-1977*. Yogyakarta: Bentang Budaya.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hadiz, V. R., & Dhakidae, .(2005) .*Social science and power in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Equinox Publishing.
- Hall, S. (2003). *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage Publications.
- Jahmurataj, V. (2015). Impact of culture on organizational development: case study Kosovo. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 4(2). doi:10.5901/ajis.2015.v4n2s1p206
- Kumaran, M. (2012). *Leadership in libraries: a focus on ethnic-minority librarians* . Oxford: Chandos Publishing.
- Laugu, N. (2015). *Representasi kuasa dalam pengelolaan perpustakaan: Studi kasus pada perpustakaan perguruan tinggi Islam di Yogyakarta*. Yogyakarta: Gapernus Press.
- Laugu, N. (2019). Ideology contestation in management of university library development. *JSW (Jurnal Sosiologi Walisongo)*, 3(2), 179-194. doi:10.21580/jsw.2019.3.2.4266
- Laugu, N. (2021). Power representation in the leadership of academic libraries in Indonesia. *Berkala Ilmu Perpustakaan dan Informasi*, 17(1), 85-97. doi:10.22146/bip.v17i1.1043
- Leckie, G. J., Given, L. M., & Buschman, J. E. (2010). *Critical theory for library and information science: exploring the social from across the disciplines*. Colorado: Libraries Unlimited.
- Levebvre, H. (1979). Space: social product and use value. In J. Freiberg (Ed.), *Critical Sociology: European Perspectives*. New York: Irvington.
- Maccoby, M. (2023). Why people follow the leader: the power of transference. Retrieved Sept 02, 2023, from <https://hbr.org/2004/09/why-people-follow-the-leader-the-power-of-transference>
- Mosco, V. (1996). *The political economy of communication: rethinking and renewal* . London: Sage Publications.
- Raber, D. (1994). Inquiry as ideology: the politics of the public library inquiry. *Libraries & Culture*, 29(1), 49-60. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25542620>

- Ratna, N. K. (2010). *Metodologi penelitian: kajian budaya dan ilmu sosial humaniora pada umumnya*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Ritzer, G. (2004). *Teori sosial postmodern*. Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana.
- Sarup, M. (2008). *Panduan pengantar untuk memahami poststrukturalisme & posmodernisme*. Yogyakarta: Jalasutra.
- Storey, J. (1993). *An introductory guide to cultural theory and popular culture*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Sudibyo, A. (2004). *Ekonomi politik media penyiaran*. Yogyakarta: LKis.
- Sudibyo, A. (2004). *Ekonomi politik media penyiaran*. Yogyakarta: LKis.
- Sugiyono. (2006). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Thompson, J. B. (1984). *Studies in the theory of ideology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- US Embassy. (2023). *American Corners Indonesia*. Retrieved from US Embassy & Consulates in Indonesia: <https://id.usembassy.gov/education-culture/american-corners-indonesia/>
- Wijayanti, L. (2019). Libraries as contestation arena of the stakeholders to achieve their goals. Retrieved Sept 02, 2023, from <https://scholar.ui.ac.id/en/publications/libraries-as-contestation-arena-of-the-stakeholders-to-achieve-th>
- Yustika, A. E. (2009). *Ekonomi politik: kajian teoretis dan analisis empiris*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.