

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Samples of Guided Interview Protocol**

This appendix contains samples of guides used by the researcher when conducting interviews. In some cases, the guides served as a template for interviews with individuals who shared similar roles in Z39.50 development, and in others, the guides included very specific questions for a specific individual. In the former case, the guides provided continuity of questions asked across several interviewees. In the latter case, the guides intended to confirm or expand on specific issues directly related to a single individual.

The first two samples illustrate the use of an interview guide template where the same basic set of questions was used in interviews with individuals who shared similar roles. The example guides are for interviews with current or recent participants in the Z39.50 Implementors Group (ZIG) and with managers in organizations that were stakeholders of Z39.50 respectively. Following those, there are two more samples that reflect very specific guides developed for individuals chosen for interview to investigate quite specific topics related to an individual's particular role in Z39.50 development. The examples are for an interview with the former chair of Subcommittee D (SC D) and a member of SC D respectively.

The final sample guide indicates the types of questions asked during the debriefing interviews after ZIG meetings.

For each interview, however, the researcher was responsive to the interviewees desire to talk about other related issues and topics. In many cases, those "tangents" from the interview guide were more productive in identifying issues unknown to the researcher.

#### **Interview Guide Template for Interviews with Z39.50 Implementor Group (ZIG) Participants**

##### Background Information on Interviewee

Date:

Name:

What is your job title?

What primary functions does your job involve?

Can you tell me how the participation in the ZIG intersects with your job/work?

How do you describe the organization that you work for and that supports your participation in the ZIG (e.g., how do you characterize it)?

Do you generally have strong organizational support for your participation in the ZIG?

How would you describe the benefits to you and/or your organization of your participation in the ZIG?

How long have you been involved in the ZIG?

What percentage of ZIG meetings do you attend?:

25%      50%      75%      100%

##### General Questions Relating to ZIG

Some people have criticized the standards development process in developing information technology standards. What do you see as particular challenges for developing information technology standards and how does the ZIG respond to such challenges?

Why are you involved in the ZIG?

- What do you see as your role?
- What latitude do you have in what you do and say in the ZIG as a representative of \_\_\_\_\_?
- Whose interests do you bring or represent at the ZIG?

I'd like to understand how you see the ZIG—how it does its work. How do you characterize the workings of the ZIG?

- What gets dealt with by the ZIG and how is that determined?
- How do decisions get made?
- How does it fit into the formal standards process?
- What to you are the essential features of the ZIG as a standards development processes? Of the way in which it does its work?
- Can you think of an example—something that the ZIG has dealt with recently—that illustrates how it does its work?

What are the benefits and advantages of the ZIG as a standards development process?

- Is it possible to identify, define, or measure success factors?
- What are indicators for its success?

What are the limitations, liabilities, and disadvantages of the ZIG as a standards development process?

What were the ZIGs original goals? Have these goals and activities changed over time? Why?

Has the membership of the ZIG changed significantly over time?

- What types of people come to the ZIG?
- What do you think are primary motivations for people to attend?
- What sorts of values do the ZIG participants have related to their participation in the ZIG?
- Who are the key players in the ZIG?
- What do the others do that come to the meetings, but who are not key players?
- Participants
  - What do they bring to the meetings
  - What do they take away from the meetings?

Can you describe what you see would be the ideal standards development process for information technology standards?

## **Interview Guide Template for Interviews with Managers of Organizational Stakeholders of Z39.50**

Date of Interview:

Title:

Job Responsibilities:

Standards Involvement:

How would characterize your organization's support of standards activities?

What are the most important reasons why your organization supports standards activities, particularly Z39.50 activities?

- protecting current investments?
- shaping the technical solutions?
- developing a market? (anticipatory standards)

What benefits—tangible and intangible—can you identify that makes it worthwhile to support standards activities, in particular Z39.50 activities?

- monetary?
- information gathering?

What do you see as your organization's contributions to the standards process?

- technical needs
- proposed solutions?

What are your organization's expectations of the people it sends to standards committee meetings, particularly Z39.50 activities?

- representing organizational interests?
- information gathering?
- contribution of technical solutions?

Does your organization have a strategy regarding standards development activities, and if so, could you talk about that?

- when would you choose a proprietary approach as opposed to a standards-approach
- how to choose which standards activities to support?
- is this a top down or a bottoms up approach?
- does the money come out of R&D or Marketing, etc.?

Do you see that there is a community of interest among the organizations that are involved in specific standards activities, even though you might be nominal competitors?

## **Interview Guide for Interview with Wayne Davison, SC D Member**

How did you get involved with SC D?

- What years were you involved?
- Why were you chosen to represent your organization?
- What special expertise did you bring to SC D?
- Did you have previous experience in standards development?

What were your organization's expectations of your involvement?

- Were your activities "managed?"
- What did your organization want you to accomplish?

What responsibilities did you have in SC D?

- Did you take on certain responsibilities because of your expertise or interests?
- How did the SC D decide on who would do what?

What was the current status of Z39.50 development when you joined SC D?

- What activities was SC D involved with during your tenure?

What did you understand as SC D's goals?

Was there something different about the standards development that SC D was trying to accomplish?

What was the relationship between SC D and LASP/LSP?

What did you see as the major pressures on SC D while you were involved?

- did they change over time?

Were the appropriate people involved with SC D?

- appropriate expertise
- adequately supported to do the work of the committee?
- stakeholders represented?

What were the strengths and weaknesses of SC D?

Can you talk some about the 1984 and 1988 ballots?

- why did 1984 fail?
- what were problems with 1988, and why did it still pass?

Why was SC D disbanded?

Can you compare SC D and ZIG?

- in structure?
- in effectiveness?

What was the long-term importance of SC D?

## **Interview Guide for Follow-up Interview with David Hartmann, SC D Chair (1979-1984).**

Why did SC D get formed in 1979 and not before then? There was a recognized need for a standard way of communicating as early as 1976. What was the barrier to the formation of a standards track activity until 1979, and then why did it take so long for a standard to appear?

Did you try to get any other members of SC D initially? Were you satisfied with the initial makeup of the subcommittee?

It seems like members of the subcommittee did research and writing on particular topics that the members cared about and felt that they needed information about. For example, DCH writing up the "Search" paper, NF on file transfer, WB on Interlibrary Loan. Was this effective—in that people actually did quality work and that the work added to the knowledge base of the subcommittee?

How productive were those initial meetings—say from the first through the time that membership changed and WD and TB joined. The membership included WB, JB, NF, and RH. It seems like you were not really certain of which direction you would go—which protocol you would work on first.

Without the LSP work and the protocols required for that, do you think you would have decided to do Search and Retrieve first?

When you attempted to resign as SC D chair in early 1982 upon taking the job at MITRE, but then didn't, was this in part a desire on the part of LC to remain in control of SC D by having you as chair until Denenberg was ready to assume it?

You recommended either WD or RD to succeed you as chair of SC D—what do you think carried the day in RD's favor?

Do you remember how active you actually were on SC D after you resigned as the chair? Seems like you stopped going to meeting after about June 1985.

Do you have a sense of what happened in 1983—beginning with the decision to have only you, WD, and RD meet to discuss how you would get the draft standard ready for distribution for comment? Did that happen—the distribution for comment?

Do you remember back in 1984 as you, RD, and WD were preparing a draft for ballot, you distributed a revised version in April asking members to state whether or not they felt the standard was ready for balloting or whether another meeting was needed. MM responded fairly strongly that he did not support going out for ballot. Did you every resolve things with OCLC, or did you just go ahead and ballot the thing?

What did the PIPS test—was it an implementation of the NCLIS/NBS Protocol? Or was the analysis not based on any real implementation experience?

In Phil Long's study of message text formats—was there a sense that a translation would have to be done or that there could be some standardization of queries at each system?

In the document *Tasks Addressing Technical Issues*, there is a section on Standards and a task of Identifying Areas Where New Standards Are Needed. Was this task ever completed? Where did it get published?

Do you have a copy of "Search and Retrieval in a Computer-to-Computer Environment?" You presented this at the April 29, 1980 SC D meeting.

By the April 29, 1980 meeting, there appears in the minutes references to putting a "search query" into a MARC format, and putting a MARC format could be used to hold an ILL message and error/status type messages. How seriously were such considerations taken, and were these reflecting ideas of the SC members or the desire to hang a lot of these issues on a standard that was pretty well installed and operational?

What is your sense of the timing when Client Server terminology enters the vocabulary of the protocol developers.

## **Interview Guide for ZIG Debriefings**

Date:

Name:

What is your job title?

What primary functions does your job involve?

Can you tell me how the participation in the ZIG intersects with your job/work?

How do you describe the organization that you work for and that supports your participation in the ZIG (e.g., how do you characterize it)?

Do you generally have strong organizational support for your participation in the ZIG?

How would you describe the benefits to you and/or your organization of your participation in the ZIG?

How long have you been involved in the ZIG?

What percentage of ZIG meetings do you attend?:

25%      50%      75%      100%

About the meeting. I'm interested in getting your response and reaction—your perceptions—to the recent ZIG meeting.

Was this a "typical" ZIG meeting?

What was to you the most important issue or action that the ZIG dealt with that affects Z39.50? This is from your perspective. But it's your sense of an important issue or action not in how it affects you, but in terms of the standard.

The issue of the Z39.50 URL was one on which the ZIG spent considerable time. There were two alternative approaches to doing the Z-URL. Tell me how you saw the ZIG participants move from the beginning of that discussion to some level of resolution.

As part of that Z-URL discussion, there was some time spent on deciding whether the two Z-URLs would be labeled as Z39.50s and Z39.50r or Z39.50a and Z39.50r. What do you think was the importance of that discussion and its resolution?

Finally, a last question. Please pick one event, action, issue or whatever that occurred at the ZIG meeting, and tell me about it. It can be something that's particularly important to you and your company or implementation, or it could be something important to the development and use of the standard more generally. I'm interested in having you frame and describe this item, and what happened in the ZIG that dealt with it. Again, I'm interested in the aspects of the process as well as the thing itself.