



ARTICLE

Commons of knowledge in libraries of universities in Curitiba (PR), Brazil

Andressa Rando Favorito ¹  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7222-2751>

Ana Paula da Silva Rodrigues ²  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5345-9075>

Maria de Lourdes Alves Figueiredo ³  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5326-7874>

¹ City hall of Piraquara, Piraquara, Paraná, Brazil / e-mail: arfavorito@gmail.com

² Technological University of Paraná, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil. / e-mail: anageografia.smed@gmail.com

³ Technological University of Paraná, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil. / e-mail: mfigueiredo@utfpr.edu.br

ABSTRACT

In the context of the discussions on the hegemony of knowledge, a diverse view emerges aiming to show the plurality of knowledge and the necessity of sharing. In the scope of the development and dissemination of knowledge, prerogative of higher education institutions, libraries are characterized as a channel of access. Knowledge is considered in this research as a *Commons*, as proposed by Charlotte Hess and Elinor Ostrom. *Commons* of knowledge, from this perspective, is being considered a resource shared by a group of people and submitted to rules of self-governance. Thus, the present article aims to identify the university library as a *commons* of knowledge. Data was collected with the aid of semi-structured interviews conducted with librarians responsible for a public and a private library in the Brazilian capital of the state of Paraná – Curitiba, both of which run different management styles. The results indicate that the digital library of the public library conforms to the principles of *commons* of knowledge governance, regarding the rules of governance. On the other hand, the availability of the collection within the physical spaces at the libraries under evaluation, does not satisfy all the requirements, being, therefore, impossible to classify the university libraries analyzed in the present research as *commons* of knowledge.

KEYWORDS

Commons of knowledge. Library. University library. Curitiba (PR)..

Commons de conhecimento em bibliotecas de Instituições de Ensino Superior em Curitiba (PR)

RESUMO

No cenário das discussões sobre a hegemonia do conhecimento, surge um olhar diverso que busca mostrar a pluralidade dos saberes e a necessidade da partilha. No âmbito do desenvolvimento e disseminação deste conhecimento, prerrogativa de instituições de ensino superior (IES), as bibliotecas se caracterizam como um canal de acesso. Considera-se nesta pesquisa o conhecimento como um bem comum, conforme proposta de Charlotte Hess e Elinor Ostrom. *Commons* de conhecimento, sendo um recurso compartilhado por um grupo de pessoas e submetido a regras de auto governança. Assim, o presente estudo tem por objetivo identificar se a biblioteca universitária pode ser considerada um *commons* de conhecimento. Para a coleta de dados foram selecionadas duas bibliotecas de IES localizadas na cidade de Curitiba/PR, contando com organizações administrativas distintas, uma pública e outra privada. Em campo, realizou-se com os bibliotecários, entrevista focalizada na perspectiva de gestão desses profissionais. No que se refere às regras de governança, os resultados indicam que o acervo digital das bibliotecas pesquisadas se enquadra nos princípios de governança de *commons* de conhecimento. Por outro

lado, a disponibilização do acervo nos espaços físicos nas bibliotecas sob avaliação, não satisfaz todos os requisitos, não sendo, portanto, possível classificar as bibliotecas universitárias analisadas na presente pesquisa como *commons* de conhecimento.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Commons de conhecimento. Biblioteca. Bibliotecas universitárias. Curitiba/PR.



JITA: DD. Academic libraries

1 INTRODUCTION

Knowledge, in spite of the countless concepts, must be seen as a good that "does not go from the one who judges himself cognizant to the one who believes he does not know", but "constitutes in the man-world relations, relations of transformation, and is perfected in the critical problematization of these relations" (FREIRE, 1983, p. 22), therefore, the relationship, the exchange, is characteristic of knowledge. This is how it is constructed, becomes useful or valid, and is perfected. There is, therefore, no reason for the existence of knowledge except so that other people have access to it.

More specifically, scientific knowledge is defined as the result of the deepening of the sciences, based on reason, anchored in the rigor of methods that legitimize discoveries and that make use of analytical processes to make "precise what is in the mind (*res-cogitans*) and in matter (*res-extensive*)" (MOCROSKY; BICUDO, 2013, p. 409). It arises from the plot and intertwining of knowledge that occur in the collectivity (FLECK, 1986), having then as characteristic the "complex process of social interactions through time" (CONDÉ, 2005, p. 126).

This immeasurable value recognized in knowledge and its deep inter-relationship with society and everything that comes from it (education, culture, history, production, science), signals its potential for common good, thus potentializing the need for studies and debates about the forms of governance on access to developed knowledge. The discussions about this governance acquire differentiated relevance in teaching and research institutions, which exist under the pretext of the development and dissemination of knowledge, especially in Higher Education Institutions - (HEI), subject of this study. The question, when it comes to knowledge, is not its nature of access, but the institutional rules established for its conduction or use (DARDOT; LAVAL, 2014), which transform it into a closed access and use resource, giving it the status of a market product, or open categorizing it as knowledge *commons*.

"*Commons*" is an alternative to the exacerbated mercantilization of goods or resources and a divergent understanding of that which defends private property as the only means to ensure the durability or utility of a good. The idea of the *commons* as goods of production or of nature or as service is then eluded, defining it as constructions related to the good or resource, in which its value is not defined, but the way it is managed, in the context of sharing (DARDOT; LAVAL, 2014). There is not yet a term in Portuguese to represent *commons*, and the designation *commons* has been accepted, free translation, which fits the definition of *commons* as "resources shared by a group of people who are subject to social conflict" (HESS; OSTROM, 2007, p. 3).

The term *commons* of knowledge is a terminology used to define the sharing of intellectual and scientific assets (HESS; OSTROM, 2007), which gained breadth in the scientific world when discussions began about new forms of sharing natural assets (renewable or nonrenewable), material or scientific/intellectual (knowledge), (HESS; OSTROM, 2007). This debate arises, among other aspects, from the perception that knowledge was being locked up (enclosed), commoditized (commodity) and over-patented (over-patented) in an abusive way (HESS; OSTROM, 2007), preventing its main objective, to become knowledge from the access of the largest number of people, producing the common good.

On the other hand, the development of technologies has made the proliferation of information, exchange and sharing of themes, studies and knowledge in general almost spontaneous (HELLSTRÖM, 2003), thus generating an antagonism of situations - on one hand the defense that knowledge must be managed exclusively by its creators and peers and, on the other hand, technology disseminating knowledge in the network without control. This led to studies about the possible governance of knowledge, then treated as *commons*. Thus, the mode

of governance is one of the singularities of interest in the study of the knowledge *commons* (SCHIRRU, 2016) and has produced the most important debates.

Ostrom (1990) warns about the capacity of cooperation in the sustainable management and governance of common resources, going against the positions so far held that private property and external control would be the only means of managing assets, be they tangible or intangible, under penalty of being consumed to the limit.

The governance of knowledge *commons* needs to be analyzed in the context of the increase in communication and dissemination facilities fostered by technology. Thus, the institutions that traditionally govern scientific/intellectual productions are challenged to work on this new, emerging, global and unlimited scenario that technological networks have produced and that affect not only the dissemination and sharing of knowledge, but the very production, innovation and renewal of this knowledge (HELLSTRÖM, 2003).

The *commons* of knowledge are configured with very unique characteristics that differ from traditional *commons* in relation to the nature of goods, regime, ownership and mode of governance (SCHIRRU, 2016). In addition to instilling new insights into how this complex ecosystem of scientific and intellectual knowledge, didactic or otherwise, can be shared socially (HESS; OSTROM, 2007). A management of this process that allows access to the largest number of people, without disrespecting issues related to patents, authorship and other individual rights is a relevant issue in a globalized and technological society.

The focus is how to manage the knowledge *commons* in a way that is accessible, without eliminating the importance of authorial property, which is possible, in Ostrom's vision (1990). On the other hand, in the idea of Hardin (1968), it is understood that those who share and use resources do not cooperate to achieve common benefits, thus generating the theory of the tragedy of the *commons*. For Ostrom (1990), besides the market (privatization) or the state (public control), the only two alternatives theorized until then to avoid total consumption of resources (especially non-renewable naturals) concern the option of self-management and shared management or social management. This makes it possible to recognize the *commons* as an effective and possible model to be adopted, whether traditional or knowledge *commons*. This scenario prompted the present study, with the following question: how does the governance of the knowledge *commons* occur in the libraries of selected Higher Education Institutions - (HEIs) in the city of Curitiba/PR, taking into consideration one of the management being private and another public?

In general terms, some basic elements were elaborated by Ostrom (1990) from his studies and aggregating knowledge from the most diverse disciplines, indicating, therefore, the interdisciplinarity as a conductor of any study project or application of governance in *commons*, specifically, in this study, in the *commons* of knowledge.

The experiences have resulted in eight principles that synthesize the potential of governance of the *commons* (OSTROM, 1990), highlighting the necessary interdisciplinary collaboration in studies that contribute and continue to seek viable paths for their governance (OSTROM, 2009). In view of the above, the principles of the base in common goods management, according to Ostrom (1990, p. 90-102), are:

Framework 1. Principles for Common Goods Management

Principles	Definitions
1) Well defined borders	Definition of limits through clear rules that encourage cooperation between the users of the good (knowledge) and avoid externalities.
2) Consistency between the rules of appropriation and provision with local conditions	Be careful to maintain the equivalence between costs and benefits, that is, that the benefits associated with the resource of use of the common good are effected in accordance with the contributions made and appropriate to local conditions and needs.
3) Arrangements for collective decision	Decisions and definitions of rules must be operationalized and approved by the majority, and therefore the participation and co-production of users is recognized and practiced.
4) Monitoring	It is essential that there is an agreement for monitoring the actions of the <i>commons</i> , in order to create and maintain the trust of users, as well as the evaluation of rules, processes and behavior of users.
5) Gradual Sanctions	The rules should cover sanctions typified according to the seriousness of the violation, always seeking to encourage compliance with the rules, even by those who have broken them and suffered sanctions.
6) Conflict resolution mechanisms	Conflicts must be exposed in the community, debated, mediated and resolved, following low-cost mechanisms.
7) Minimum recognition of organizational rights (autonomy)	The creation or revision of the rules themselves by the <i>commons</i> users and their managers must be recognized by the State and other external authorities.
8) Alignment and intersectional articulation in management	Principle of alignment and intersectional articulation in management, recognizing that the common use goods of the <i>commons</i> is part of a larger system and, therefore, may suffer the interference of the State when necessary, in order to coordinate the interdependence between larger and smaller units. It is the so-called "sweetness", that is, governance in a structure of multiple layers of responsibility.

Source: Adapted from Ostrom (1990, p. 90 - 102).

Regarding university libraries, the focus of research, one of their main functions is the preservation of knowledge (CUNHA, 2000, p. 73), and it should be accessible to any individual and not to a privileged few in the context of the academy.

The concept applied to the word "library", from Antiquity, through the Middle Ages to the present day, refers to the registration and storage of human knowledge (SANTOS, 2014). This work uses the definition of the term 'library' by Martínez and Senseney (2013, p. 403, our translation) as "a repository of information that has been skillfully selected and organized in the interest of helping those seeking knowledge and that all libraries are characterized by the systematic collection and organization of information for access or preservation.

Regarding the public library, its definition is the IFLA/UNESCO Manifesto (INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS (IFLA), 1994), modulated from the Caracas Manifesto (SYSTEM OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES OF MEDELLÍN, 1985):

The public library is the local information center, making knowledge and information of all kinds readily accessible to its users. Public library services must be offered on the basis of equal access for all, without distinction of age, race, sex, religion, nationality, language or social status. Specific services and materials must be made available to users who, for any reason, are unable to use the current services and materials, such as linguistic minorities, disabled people, hospitalized or inmates. All age groups should find documents appropriate to their needs [...]. Collections and services must be free from any form of ideological, political or religious censorship and commercial pressure (INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS (IFLA), 1994).

Machado, et al (2014) present an aspect of the public library that associates the public space with the construction of a sociability along the lines of the "network society" of Castells (2005), in which people are, at the same time, users and co-authors of knowledge to the extent of their choices to search and share the elements. In this sense, Brazilian legislation brings an important contribution to individual and collective development, it is Law No. 12,244/10, which provides for the universalization of libraries in the country's educational institutions. It determines, in its first article, that all educational institutions in the country, whether public or private, have a library. This law seals the democratized right to information, promoting access to knowledge for all (BRAZIL, 2010).

According to Betancur (2002), the search for a social profile in public libraries, within a current context, presents many possibilities, including the vision of space as a proposal for development, inter-institutional and interdisciplinary scope, resizing the value of information in the most diverse reading media, having its positioning as a community interlocutor.

As an academic community, Alvarez (2017) indicates the emergence, in the United States, of Information *Commons* (IC), spaces without restrictions of access to products, information services and resources in the university library. These spaces, according to the author, evolved into Learnings Research Centers (LRC), or Learnings *Commons* (LC), designed to promote learning. The ICs and LCs meet the needs of accessibility to the services offered to users, promoting facilitation in the handling of information in the university environment (ALVAREZ, 2017).

Regarding the supply of public libraries in Brazil in 2015, according to the site of the National Public Library System, we have 503 in the North Region, 1,847 in the Northeast Region, 501 in the Midwest Region, 1958 in the Southeast Region and 1293 in the South Region. In the relation between libraries/population the South region has 442/10,000,000 inhabitants; the Northeast region 327/10,000,000 inhabitants; the Midwest region 10,000,000 inhabitants; the North region 288/10,000,000 inhabitants and the Southeast region 228/10,000,000 inhabitants (SPECIAL SECRETARY OF CULTURE, s/data). Considering the population estimates of the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE, 2017), for the same year, it can be seen that the distribution of libraries is not an ideal relationship, because in the three most populated regions of the country, the library/population relationship is inversely proportional. Thus, it is questioned the extent of access to knowledge by the library.

According to Goldsmith and Fonseca (2014), university libraries are important spaces to support educational and learning projects and as an educational system with student-centered environments. In Bhatnagar's (2017) thought, the importance of the physical university library overcomes the search for distance study, and the intention to contemplate external students with this benefit must be a constant attitude, mainly because, according to Bundy (2002), the services offered in this environment excel in equity.

2 METHODOLOGY

This study was carried out in the research group on Technology and Environment (TEMA), of the Graduate Program in Technology and Society (PPGTE), of the Federal Technological University of Paraná (UTFPR) - Curitiba Campus - during the year 2018. As a theoretical basis it presents the concepts advocated by Elinor Ostrom, Nobel Prize in economics in 2009, and one of the most important defenders of the *commons* for analysis of governance of knowledge *commons*.

Its objective is to identify if the university library can be considered a knowledge *commons*, through the comparative analysis of access to knowledge promoted by the

management of the sample of two Higher Education Institution (HEI) libraries in the city of Curitiba/PR. In this context, in addition to expanding libraries quantitatively, the capacity of governance to produce the common good must be observed, through the dissemination of knowledge from the access to the largest number of people.

The sample selected for the research is composed of libraries with distinct administrations, a public library and a private library of Higher Education Institution (HEI), both located in the city of Curitiba/PR. It should be noted that such sample does not become representative of the city, but constitutes an important base of information on the topic addressed.

The public Higher Education Institution (HEI) has 14 libraries distributed on its campuses, and in 2018 it had 29,935 enrollments, according to data from the National Institute of Educational Studies and Research Anísio Teixeira (INEP), linked to the Ministry of Education (MEC). The private HEI, on the other hand, had approximately 5,000 registrations that year considering its two units, according to data obtained from the librarian interviewed.

The survey participants were the librarians in charge of the respective HEI libraries: a public HEI librarian - with a library under his management, and a private HEI librarian in charge of managing the two libraries of the institution to which he is linked.

The interview technique was used for data collection. According to Marconi and Lakatos (2017), this type of interview is organized based on a script that includes aspects related to the research problem. Its main advantage is the freedom of the researcher/ interviewer, since it "probes reasons and motives, gives explanations, not obeying, strictly speaking, a formal structure" (MARCONI; LAKATOS, 2017, p. 90). The interview focused on the perspective of knowledge of the interviewee, contains a basic scheme, but is flexible, allowing the necessary adaptations to be made.

Based on the above, and in line with the assumptions emphasized by Creswell (2010), the survey has a qualitative character, since the data collected in the field are linked to the place where the participants experience the problem addressed, in addition to the emphasis on the meanings assigned by them (CRESWELL, 2010, p. 208-213).

In order to ensure credibility, as well as confidentiality (anonymity), reliability of information and respect for human dignity, this research had a Term of Free and Informed Consent and Use of Sound of Voice, signed by the participants (librarians), according to the guidelines of the National Health Council (CNS) and Committee on Ethics in Research involving Human Beings (CEP) of UTFPR. The interviews were recorded and transcribed, with feedback from participants authorizing the use of the information for academic purposes. Thus, even though the research did not go through the appreciation of the CEP, it had all the procedures that aim to guarantee the protection of human integrity, including the right of clarification and withdrawal during its course.

The data obtained were analyzed using comparative analysis (FACHIN, 2006), allowing the identification of what is common to libraries investigated from the concrete data collected through the instrument used.

3 DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The interviews conducted with two librarians, public and private for-profit HEI, were recorded, transcribed and are presented in summary form in Framework 2.

Framework 2. Summary of Interviews

	ISSUES	PUBLIC HEI	PRIVATE HEI
1	Dissemination of knowledge?	Library as something of extreme importance; it works with the internal and external community; library's role is to bring information to the user.	Library as a link between the user and all possible services to offer; responsibility to offer the information that is important to the user.
2	Knowledge values as a common good?	The library stimulates knowledge values as a common good; the library seeks out the user and captures students, teachers and administrative staff.	The library stimulates the values of knowledge as a common good; it is a means of interaction between people; in the exchange it improves information.
3	Are there rules, library management?	The library has rules; there is no user participation at all, but the user has some channels, such as the internal management system, to suggest, besides the personal contact; it is important to know what the user thinks.	The library has rules; there is no user participation at all, but we try to listen and serve him.
4	Actions to modernize access to the collection	There are actions to modernize access: commissions for cataloguing and external community; and improvement of the loan between campuses via the internal system.	There are actions to modernize access: allocation of resources to priority demands.
5	How are the rules for access and use of the collection developed and shared?	The rules are made available on the library page and presented in the classroom when there is training in the database; they were prepared jointly by the employees.	The rules are made available on the library link; an exhibition is held at the students' entrance; they have been prepared in agreement with other libraries.
6	Rules of "protection of the common good x broad sharing of knowledge?	The rules of access and use were elaborated aiming to promote the protection of the common good and the sharing of knowledge; campaigns for the preservation of the collection have already been carried out; guidelines in printed material and in the training courses held in the classroom; the National Library Book Week was held, promoting the collection and exchange of books.	The rules of access and use were designed to promote the protection of the common good and the sharing of knowledge; meeting the demands expressed by the students: increase in the number of materials and days of loan.
7	Promotion of events aimed at production and dissemination of knowledge?	There are no specific actions or events for users focused on the production and dissemination of knowledge; focus on the collection, dissemination and training in databases.	There have already been some actions that were interrupted due to lack of employees and resources; priority in the maintenance of the collection.
8	Action for production and dissemination or incentive to research?	There are no specific actions for the local community focused on production and dissemination or incentive to research; the training in the use of databases is the closest, because it will be the tool in the production of knowledge by students.	The library space can be used by students from other Higher Education Institutions.
9	Do you understand that the knowledge shared by the library may have a common good bias?	The knowledge shared by the library presents a bias of common good, being an instrument to stimulate the sharing of knowledge; relation of the library to the professional formation of the student and his relationship with society.	The knowledge shared by the library presents a common good bias, being an instrument to stimulate knowledge sharing; the more information is shared it will circulate better.

Source: The authors (2018).

The library, according to the precepts of *commons*, is an instrument of knowledge dissemination. The interviewees point out this practice in the conduct of the collaborators:

I see the library as something of extreme importance because we work not only with the internal community, but also with the external [...]. We are able to serve the user in many ways, not only in what is basic for him, which is the lending of books, but also in relation to the search for information. [...] The main objective of the library is to serve the user, finding the information he needs and even that information he does not know he needs. (Public Librarian HEI, 2018).

Promoting knowledge is not just a technical act, but the production of a democratic culture of access for all without distinction. The description of the public HEI librarian points in this direction, bringing the functions and activities carried out in the library as a broad action, not limited to offering users what they seek, but stimulating knowledge beyond what they think is necessary or need at the moment.

On the other hand, at the private HEI it tends towards pragmatism, with an understanding aimed at meeting the interests of each user:

I understand it as an essential link between the user and all the services that can be offered. So you have a range of responsibility that is to offer something that is really true, that has a basis and that is important to the person (Private Librarian HEI, 2018).

A certain distance between the library, the user and the knowledge is perceived, the latter as an element to be discovered from the stimulus to research, the new, the different that is largely the responsibility of the professionals who work with the user of the library and, especially, the way in which governance is worked in the educational institution and the library.

The common good is pointed out by the interviewees as a key element of libraries, and the understanding of the public HEI librarian is positive about stimulating knowledge as a common good.

The library goes after the user, not just waiting for him to contact it to say what the needs are. [...] the people who work in the library don't stay here just waiting for the user to look for them, but they go after him, the student, the teacher to train him too. (Public Librarian HEI, 2018).

The interviewee from the private library is also mentioned:

The library has long since ceased to be a [...] closed center itself. [...] With all these new ways of disseminating information, it has become more and more a means of interaction between people, in general, and the information it needs. [...] We notice a very fast exchange [...], today you have the means that allow you this [...], all those digital bases, the repositories [...]. That is, the complicity of exchanging information with someone you know and changing the information, because we keep improving the information. (Private Librarian HEI, 2018).

Regarding the rules and guidelines to encourage user participation in library management decisions, both respondents pointed out that there are limits to this participation:

The library has its rules. [...] I don't say that the user participates in everything [...] it is important to know what the user wants, what he thinks and what he misses. [...] [...] Our library management system is one of the channels that the user has for contact with the library, either to clear doubts, to complain, to suggest, besides personal contact. [...] (Public Librarian HEI, 2018).

We have the basic rules. [...] When there is a suggestion or clamor for something we try to solve this situation. [...] You participate, but you cannot give the power. [...] We try to be the closest to the user and try to listen to what he really wants for us to try to

answer. He is the one who will tell us what he needs, how he needs it. (Private Librarian HEI, 2018).

It is observed that there are instruments that stimulate and allow the participation of the user for complaints, suggestions, satisfaction surveys, however, there are no direct actions that promote the integration between the management and the user. The decisions tend to be exclusively administrative, using the perceptions about what the user wants, needs or requests to substantiate them.

In the sequence, these are the actions aimed at the modernization of access, which have demonstrated the issue as permanent in the management of libraries and aims to expand access and integrative partnerships.

We have the commission for cataloguing [...], the commission for the community. [...]. We are working, for example, on improving the loan between campuses [...] via the internal system, it is faster and more economical (Public Librarian HEI, 2018).

The notion that a public library should be community oriented is present in the interviewee's speech, which, on the other hand, points to a focus on the HEI internal community. In the private HEI the greatest interest is in technology.

Yes, we are always looking for improvements. [...] this demands many other things [...] having space, internet speed, [...] resources to maintain a digital base [...], some things we realize that we no longer need, for example, subscription to commercial journals [...] that resource has been allocated to another better situation (Private Librarian HEI, 2018).

In both HEIs, librarians reinforce the accessibility of the services they offer. It is important to emphasize that one of the basic elements of the common good and, especially in the case of the knowledge *commons*, are the rules for the use and sharing of the material offered by libraries, a subject that has also been dealt with in the interviews and which are part of the principles of governance.

In the public HEI, according to the interviewee, the rules are available to everyone on the library's website, where "the services the library offers, the rights and duties of the user are described", as well as such rules are exposed by a professional, via presentation, in the HEI classrooms. The interviewee also explains that "the elaboration of these rules was a joint work", without explaining, however, who was part of this set organized to elaborate them.

In the private HEI library, the information shows that the rules are exposed to everyone and there is also "initial contact with the student when he enters, you know, and then we make an exhibition". The elaboration of these rules in the private HEI does not mention the direct participation of users.

The common good, whatever it may be, needs protection and this is done through rules and awareness of everyone's responsibility for their care and dissemination without abuse (DARDOT; LAVAL, 2014). Thus, it was questioned whether in the elaboration and application of the rules, there is the care to maintain the relationship between the protection of the common good and the broad sharing of knowledge, especially in what concerns the physical collection.

Both libraries, according to the interviewees' statements, are very concerned about this issue, and the public library does "campaigns to preserve the collection because it is not only a matter of theft that we have to think about, but the handling of the material". This is also done in class, through explanatory folders and in events like the National Library Book Week". There is also a partnership with the Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) to foster knowledge dissemination and protection to the collection and knowledge itself, promoting "this kind of initiative to involve users, not only to have knowledge back, but also the understanding of how things work".

In the private HEI Library, information on awareness actions on the preservation of material and knowledge, without affecting their dissemination, is not clear, but it was observed the care in meeting users' needs and requests to expand the loan time and quantity of works lent to the same user at the same time.

Another important element that qualifies a library as a knowledge *commons* and adapts to the principles established by Ostrom (1990), concerns the actions of incentive or promotion of events aimed at the production and dissemination of knowledge, such as fairs and seminars. When questioned on this subject, both the public and private HEI interviewees informed that there is no specific activity for this purpose at the moment, but pointed out some important activities:

for the user, something we do for this purpose, no! [...] we have realized that it is important this work of dissemination of the databases, of training, because the access is increasing. [...] I've started to divulge synopses of the films periodically. I did statistics before the dissemination and statistics during and after and I realized that it increased a lot (Public HEI Librarian, 2018).

The attention of the public HEI library is to enhance information, via digital media, about the collection, especially to the one that, spontaneously, is not so well known. In the private HEI library, however, the speech points to effective actions already carried out, but without continuity due to the cost.

So, we had some moments that we did something different, unfortunately, now we are with a reduced picture and we lost some things. [...] You have to have personnel, you have to have availability, and many times you have to have some kind of resource. [...] We used to make a Coffee with Debate, so you'd bring people to the library environment, you'd make a café with cookies and stuff, in the center, and you'd bring some topic with someone to debate, very interesting [...] the focus ended [...] which is what we really have as a priority, which is to maintain the collection. [...] book fair, it is no longer done because, the publishers [...] can't sell. (Private HEI Librarian, 2018).

Financial and human resources issues, in addition to the publishers' lack of activity in knowledge promotion actions, have restricted the movement of knowledge dissemination by the private HEI library, indicating that there is still no culture of knowledge as a common good in its broad sense.

The same occurs when the issue is limited to information on actions aimed at production and dissemination, or encouraging research, studies, events held in and by the local community. Both interviewees point to the absence of movements in this sense. While at the public HEI the librarian informs that the only action "close to that is training in the use of databases because it is the tool he will use in the production of knowledge, in the elaboration of his work", at the private HEI the library is open to students from other institutions "[...] They come straight because they do not have there". Therefore, there are several limitations to the integration of libraries with the community in the production and stimulation of local knowledge.

In closing the interviews, the librarians were asked for their opinion on the library's role in the dissemination of knowledge as a common good. Both interviewees understand the importance of knowledge sharing, since "today the more information is shared the better, because it circulates better" (Private HEI Library) and the library has a primary function in this, since "the library is directly linked to what our student will do out there as a professional" (Public HEI Library).

Libraries, therefore, have a primary role in this process, and the way they organize their databases and databases, which make use of technology and human resources and plan and implement actions for sharing and integration, are the basis for promoting knowledge

sharing. The interviews observed the recognition of the function and means (networks, technology, governance) for the effective sharing of knowledge. However, the technical, economic and management limitations are observed from the research and especially in the process of building relationships that allow an effective process of integration and empathy that encourages the experience of the other and thus the sharing of knowledge.

The public HEI is identified as a form of governance by the collection, the loan granted only to students, servants and employees of outsourced companies, upon presentation of a badge. People with no ties to the institution may consult all the materials offered in the libraries personally, but without the possibility of borrowing. However, the collection has characteristics that meet the needs of academic users.

From the above it is understood that the production of knowledge at the public HEI, available at your library, is aligned with the concept of *commons* (OSTROM, 1990). In this sense, it could be said that there is a common of knowledge at HEI (HESS; OSTROM, 2007) in digital format, as it would meet the 8 principles of self-governance established by Ostrom (1990). Because its boundaries are circumscribed on a specific portal page, there is consistency between the rules of appropriation and provision with local conditions, the production of knowledge at HEI provides open access both to the academic community and to anyone anywhere in the world, there is recognition of the rules of the internal community and external authorities by documents made available on the institutional website, there is respect for the rules with clear penalties for offenders (gradual sanctions), there is minimum recognition of rights of organization (resolution of conflicts quickly), and there is inter-sectoral alignment and articulation in management (from private to general). However, there are no collective decision-making arrangements, the management parameters are defined administratively.

The private HEI shares management process, sharing and rules similar to the public HEI, with well-defined rules aligned with the sanctions. There is an understanding that rules should be modified according to the changing needs of users and that they should stimulate cooperation and sharing, spreading the idea of the common good. There is also interaction with other libraries, other fields and educational institutions and the recognition of the necessary intersectional articulation. User and community participation in management is limited, as well as there are significant limits in the diverse actions of dissemination and production of knowledge beyond the library space. Economic and human resources limitations are obstacles to the improvement and expansion of technological systems and especially to the expansion of the collection, through access to paid databases. Therefore, the rules of national and international databases influence the capacity of the library to expand the offer of knowledge to its users.

Both libraries focus on internal users (academics, professors and other professionals), but they open up so that everyone can use their databases and, according to Bundy (2002), this seems to be a cultural characteristic of university libraries that excel in equity and democratization of access to knowledge.

In the interviews, the clear perception that knowledge is a common good that develops from its sharing (DARDOT; LAVAL, 2014) is highlighted, and the access of all should be encouraged and stimulated, as well as the use of the material already produced and published to generate new knowledge, always respecting the rules of use.

However, it is observed that the structural, financial and management difficulties (especially in the issue of availability of human resources) prevent libraries from participating more broadly in discussions and promoting the production of knowledge by the community. And, especially, in the planning and implementation of broad actions to encourage everyone, not only the academic community, but society in general, to access and share knowledge. As Strauhs et al. (2012) explain, the governance of knowledge that focuses on precise sharing of

collectivity and interaction, therefore, clear and objective strategies are needed, pleasant working environments that enable the exchange of ideas and favor dialogue. According to Stewart (2001), the sharing of knowledge only occurs when people perceive the destiny of such knowledge, emphasizing the existence of the intention of knowledge, actions that can be carried out by libraries, through more productive, interactive activities and beyond the university gates or research spaces.

4 CONCLUSION

The research carried out pointed to the evolution of public and private libraries in order to meet the maximum purpose of common good. However, it is a process still under construction, and the digital collection is framed in the principles of governance of *commons*, however, regarding the distribution of the collection in the physical space, the principles are not all effectively met.

The most visible deficiencies indicated by the research are in principle three that deal with collective decision arrangements, not met in both libraries researched, which have the management decisions defined administratively.

Another deficient point indicated by the research realizes that, although there is theoretical knowledge and understanding about the importance and efficiency of the application of the principles of management of common goods, which enable the effectiveness of the knowledge *commons*, the economic and, consequently, technological limitations, of expansion of the collection and human resources, hinder the faster and broader evolution and transformation. It is also important to emphasize the need to promote publicity about the access of everyone to the collection, as well as to stimulate the community for a more effective participation in discussions and collections from public authorities about the production and dissemination of knowledge.

The results obtained in this research, besides being based on theoretical reference, allow the investigation of new models for library management, which are more adequate to the needs of users in HEIs and in accordance with the new learning perspectives and point to the difficulties encountered by the professionals who work in these spaces in fostering governance based on the principles of *Commons*.

More in-depth and extensive studies, involving library users, the community and experts can help find ways to expand actions focused on the *Commons* of Knowledge. It would be interesting a study analyzing the differences in the posture of public and private library users, in order to identify issues related to the profile of students and their goals, besides the limitations imposed by each type of HEI, either in the scope of the various types of accessibility or lack of mechanisms for knowledge exchange.

Another point that can be analyzed is the lack of knowledge of the academic community of the HEIs regarding the functioning, holdings, activities and their rights in relation to the libraries of the institutions.

REFERENCES

BETANCUR. Adriana M. La biblioteca pública en la perspectiva del desarrollo local: una estrategia para la democracia. In: IFLA COUNCIL AND GENERAL CONFERENCE, 68th, 2002. Available on: <https://archive.ifla.org/IV/ifla68/papers/124-084s.pdf>. Access at: 08 set. 2018.

BHATNAGAR, Hansa. Synthetic review paper on library: knowledge supplement for academic. **Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research**, v. 4, n. 12, p. 103-106, 2017. Available on: <http://www.jetir.org/papers/JETIR1712022.pdf>. Acesso: 03 set. 2018.

BISSET ALVAREZ, Edgar. **Sistemas de recomendação para bibliotecas universitárias: um aporte teórico da arquitetura da informação**. 2017. 181 p. Tese. Doutorado em Ciência da Informação. Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Marília, 2017. Available on: <https://urlless.in/z8Wlg>. Access at: 08 set. 2018.

BRASIL. Lei nº 12.244/2010. **Dispõe sobre a universalização das bibliotecas nas instituições de ensino do País**. Available on: <https://bit.ly/KsY2oo>. Access at: 02 set. 2018.

BUNDY, Alan. The University Library as educational change-agent: an Australian perspective. In: OECD: SEMINAR UNIVERSITIES AND LIBRARIES, 26-27. Paris, 2002. Available on: <http://www.oecd.org/education/imhe/23280039.PDF>. Access at: 06 set. 2018.

CASTELLS, Manoel. A sociedade em rede. Tradução: Roneide V. Majer e Klaus B. Gerhardt. 8. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2005.

CONDÉ, Mauro Lúcio Leitão. Paradigma versus Estilo de Pensamento na História da Ciência. In: CONDÉ, Mauro Lúcio Leitão. Ciência, História e Teoria. Belo Horizonte: Argumentum, 2005.

CRESWELL, John W. **Projeto de pesquisa: métodos qualitativo, quantitativo e misto**. Tradução de Magda Lopes. 3. ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2010.

CUNHA, Murilo Bastos. Construindo o futuro: a biblioteca universitária brasileira em 2010. **Ciência da Informação**, Brasília, v.29, n.1, 2000. Available on: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/ci/v29n1/v29n1a8>. Access at: 08 marc. 2019

DARDOT, Pierre; LAVAL, Crhistian. **Commun: essai sur la révolution au XXe siècle**. Paris: La Découverte, 2014.

FACHIN, Odila. **Fundamentos de metodologia**. 5. ed. [rev.] – São Paulo: Saraiva, 2006.

FLECK, Ludwik. La génesis y el desarrollo de un hecho científico. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1986.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Extensão ou comunicação?** Tradução de Rosisca Darcy de Oliveira. 7. ed. Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 1983.

GOLDSMITH, Melissa, FONSECA, Anthony J. **The academic library as an educational system**. [S.l.]: Chandos, 2014.

HARDIN, Garrett. The tragedy of the commons. **Science**, v. 162, n. 3859, p. 1243–1248, 13 dez., 1968. Available on: <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/sci/162/3859/1243.full.pdf>. Access at: 03 set. 2018.

HELLSTRÖM, Tomas. Governing the virtual academic commons. *Research Policy*, v. 32, n. 3, p. 391–401, 2003. Available on: <https://bit.ly/2xva5wE>. Access at: 03 set. 2018.

HESS, Charlotte; OSTROM, Elinor (ed.). Introduction: An Overview of the Knowledge Commons. In: **UNDERSTANDING knowledge as a commons: from theory to practice**, 2007. Access at: 03 set. 2018.

INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA. **Estimativas de população para 1º de julho de 2015**. 2017. Available on: <https://bit.ly/2O259sx>. Access at: 07 set. 2018.

MACHADO, Elisa *et al.* A biblioteca pública no espaço público: estratégias de mobilização cultural e atuação sócio-política do bibliotecário. **Perspectivas em Ciência da Informação**, Belo Horizonte, v.14, número especial, p.115-127, 2014. Available on: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/pci/v19nspe/10.pdf>. Access at: 22 set. 2018.

MACHADO, Nilson José. O conhecimento como um valor: as ideias de a-crescimento e de commons. **R. Cont. Fin.** – USP, São Paulo, v. 26, n. 67, p. 7-10, jan./fev./mar./abr., 2015. Available on: http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rcf/v26n67/pt_1519-7077-rcf-26-67-00007.pdf. Access at: 11 set. 2018.

MARCONI, Marina de Andrade. LAKATOS, Eva Maria. **Técnicas de Pesquisa**. 8. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2017.

MARTÍNEZ, Victor M.; SENSENEY, Megan F. The professional and his books: special libraries in the ancient world. In: KONIG, Jason; OIKONOMOPOULOU, Katerina; WOOLF, Greg (org.). **Ancient libraries**. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

MOCROSKY, Luciane Ferreira.; BICUDO, Maria. Um estudo filosófico-histórico da ciência e da tecnologia sustentando a compreensão de educação científico-tecnológica. **Acta Scientiae**, v.15, n.3, p. 406-419, 2013. Available on: <https://bit.ly/2xEbIIv>. Access at: 12 set. 2018.

OSTROM, Elinor. A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. **Science**, v. 325, n. 5939, p. 419–422, 2009. Available on: <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/325/5939/419.full>. Access at: 04 set. 2018.

OSTROM, Elinor. **Governing the commons: the evolution of institutions for collective action**. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

SANTOS, José H. A. **Origem e evolução das bibliotecas ao longo do tempo**. 2014. 68 f. TCC. Curso de Graduação em Biblioteconomia. Faculdade de Ciência da Informação da Universidade de Brasília. Brasília, 2014. Available on: <https://bit.ly/2zotaBX>. Access at: 22 set. 2018.

SCHIRRU, Luca. Os *commons* de conhecimento: conceito, distinções e uma análise sob o feixe de direitos. **PIDCC**, v. 10, n. 02, p. 167-182, 2016. Available on: <http://www.pidcc.com.br/artigos/102015/10022016.pdf>. Access at: 02 set. 2018.

SECRETARIA ESPECIAL DA CULTURA. Dados das Bibliotecas Públicas do Brasil. Informações das bibliotecas públicas. **Sistema Nacional de Bibliotecas Públicas**, s/data. Available on: <http://snbp.cultura.gov.br/bibliotecaspublicas/>. Access at: 07 set. 2018

STEWART, Thomas A. **The wealth of knowledge**: intellectual capital and the twenty-first century organization. New York: Doubleday/ Currency, 2001.

STRAUHS, Faimara do Rossio *et al.* **Gestão do conhecimento nas organizações**. Curitiba: Aymarã Educação, 2012.

SISTEMA DE BIBLIOTECAS PÚBLICAS DE MEDELLÍN. **Declaración de Caracas sobre la biblioteca pública como factor de desarrollo e instrumento de cambio en América Latina y el Caribe**. Caracas, 1985. Available on: <https://urless.in/5o1tO>. Access at: 07 set. 2018.



Article submitted to the similarity system

Submitted: 07/10/2020 - Accepted: 09/11/2020 - Published: 18/11/2020
