

**Pamela J. McKenzie,**  
**Faculty of Information and Media Studies, The University of Western Ontario,**  
**London.**

**Rosamund K. Stooke,**  
**Faculty of Education, The University of Western Ontario, London.**

**Lynne (E.F.) McKechnie,**  
**Faculty of Information and Media Studies, The University of Western Ontario,**  
**London.**

## **Learning the library: The work of public library storytime participants**

**Abstract:** This study uses Lave and Wenger's concept of legitimate peripheral participation in a community of practice as an analytical framework for analyzing the ways that children, caregivers, and library staff members develop expertise in the ways of storytime and move from being novices to being full participants.

**Résumé :** Cette étude utilise le concept de Lave et Wenger sur la participation périphérique légitime dans une communauté de praticiens, comme cadre analytique pour analyser les manières avec lesquelles les enfants, les gardiens et les membres du personnel des bibliothèques développent leur expertise à l'aide de l'heure du conte et comment ces derniers passent de l'état de profane à celui de participant à part entière.

### **1. Introduction**

A library storytime programme for very young children and their adult caregivers is an example of a particular kind of space in which certain kinds of behaviour are expected (McKenzie et al. 2007). Lyn Lofland posits that the understanding of how to behave appropriately in particular locations is developed in childhood: "By example, admonitions, and tongue-lashings, the parent is teaching the child such crucial matters as these: ... that playgrounds are places to play, not to eliminate waste materials; that libraries are places to read, not to engage in shouting matches, and that one must learn to distinguish such places from one another" (Lofland 1973, 101-2). By verbally instructing their children and physically moving their bodies, caregivers share powerful consensual understandings about how one ought to behave (McKechnie et al., 2006; DeVault 2000).

This paper will present our observations of what we call "learning the library": the various ways that experienced library users and storytime attendees (most often, but not always, adults) provided opportunities for their novice colleagues (sometimes, but not always, young children) to learn how to use the library and how to "do" storytime.

### **2. Theoretical framework**

Our analysis draws on Lave and Wenger's theory of "situated learning", which attends to learning as "an evolving, continuously renewed set of relations" (Lave and Wenger 1991, 50). As do Lave and Wenger (1991), we locate learning "squarely in the processes of

coparticipation” (Hanks 1991, 14). In this theory, learning is a process of identification and belonging that depends on engagement in valued practices. Lave and Wenger identify activities as the salient unit of analysis and argue that “activities, tasks, functions, and understandings do not exist in isolation, they are part of broader systems of relations to which they have meaning” (Lave and Wenger 1991, 53). In discussions of learning in the library, schooled notions of learning have been given a privileged role. In contrast, our analysis employs the notion of learning embedded in social practice. Central to our thinking is Lave and Wenger’s (1991) construct of “legitimate peripheral participation,” a term used to describe the way newcomers interact in communities of practice:

In summary, rather than learning by replicating the performances of others or by acquiring knowledge transmitted in instruction, we suggest that learning occurs through centripetal participation in the learning curriculum of the ambient community. Because the place of knowledge is within a community of practice, questions of learning must be addressed within the developmental cycles of that community. . . (Lave and Wenger 1991, 100).

### **3. Methods**

Our data were collected as part of a naturalistic investigation of early learning programs for children from birth to three years of age and their caregivers. We observed “what people did” during program sessions in four storytime programmes held by public library staff in three regions in two Canadian provinces. Two of the programmes were held in neighbourhood public library branches in a mid-size Canadian city, one was situated in a downtown branch of a large urban public library system and one took place in a public library in a rural area. The programs comprised four to six weekly half-hour sessions with a formal activity period and one or more periods of informal socializing. There was also unstructured socializing time before and after each session. All programs were described by program leaders as free and universally accessible.

Although numbers of participants varied from program to program and from week to week, we typically expected between 8 and 16 babies and toddlers to attend each of the storytime programs with their caregivers each week. While most caregivers were mothers, our samples also included fathers, grandmothers, and paid babysitters. Older children also attended with some families. Three of the programmes were led by professional children’s librarians, and the fourth by a library assistant.

At each location, a research team consisting of one or more of the authors and one or more research assistants observed a complete sequence of storytime sessions. The team employed three data collection methods. First, we observed and audio-recorded program sessions (McKechnie 2006). During each storytime two or three observers stood or sat in various parts of the room as unobtrusively as possible and made field notes. Second, members of the team observed and talked informally with participants before and after storytime, and recorded these data in field notes. Finally, the team conducted semi-structured individual and focus group interviews with adult caregivers of children attending storytime. Interviews were semi-structured and questions were developed following the field observation. The study conforms to the ethical guidelines of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Non-Medical Research Ethics Board of The University of Western Ontario, and we have used pseudonyms throughout to protect anonymity.

We specifically chose a naturalistic research paradigm (Mellon 1990) as it will allow us to explore research questions about which little is now known, enable us to see and understand the programs through the eyes of the participants themselves, and will provide thick, rich descriptions of the processes involved. As participant observers we created field notes, recorded and transcribed what we saw and heard during the sessions and conducted informal interviews with adult participants, program leaders and planners. For this paper, we have analyzed our field notes for examples consistent with Lave and Wenger's (1991) concept of legitimate peripheral participation.

#### **4. Findings**

The work of helping novices "learn the library" was done by all types of participants at storytime. For example, we found that the caregivers of young children devoted much time and energy to supporting the program leader's work by ensuring that children could hear the story. In these cases, the caregivers' work both explained and constructed appropriate audience and performer behaviour: at times when children were to be the audience, adult caregivers gently turned small heads and bodies to co-ordinate the children's gaze. At times when an active tickle or bouncing rhyme required participation from adults and children alike, caregivers drew crawling babies to their laps, wiggled fingers and tickled toes. The program leaders, likewise, did work to instruct participants on how storytime works, to communicate important transitions and to indicate appropriate activities for various times and places, by demonstration, by explanation, and by physical movement of artifacts and bodies (Stooke 2004). For example, the end of storytime was marked in several locations by the bringing into view of some previously hidden object like cookies or soap bubbles (McKenzie and Stooke 2007). Adult caregivers advised one another as to the best places to sit, and reminded one another of forgotten words of rhymes and fingerplays. Younger and less experienced children observed the actions of older and more experienced children and often mimicked their behaviour.

Lave and Wenger (1991) have identified central characteristics of cognitive apprenticeship. The remainder of this paper uses these characteristics as a framework for organizing our observations of novice participation at storytime.

#### **Structuring resources for learning in practice**

In an apprenticeship, the relationship between masters and apprentices is less didactic than the relationship between a teacher and a student (Lave and Wenger 1991, 92). Masters are "old timers" in a community of practice and the work of the master is to facilitate legitimate peripheral participation of newcomers. Likewise, librarians and other library "old timers" make newcomers feel "at home" in the library. They convey that children can enjoy a storytime in their own way. They convey that the library is a place where one's personal reading tastes will be honored. This paper identifies some of the means by which this takes place.

#### **Learning the content**

To begin with, new members of the community are provided with opportunities to be in the group and watch others. "This uneven sketch of the enterprise . . . might include who is involved, what they do, what everyday life is like, how masters talk, walk, work, and generally conduct their lives; how people who are not part of the community interact with it; what other learners are doing; and what learners need to learn to become full practitioners" (Lave and Wenger, 95).

Most important, newcomers can see what the exemplary artifacts of a storytime might be. Such artifacts may be physical, linguistic, or symbolic. Physical artifacts include puppets, books and other realia. Linguistic artifacts include conversations among participants as well as rhymes and stories. Symbolic artifacts are semiotic in its broadest sense. For example, we have described elsewhere the semiotic function of the physical room setup (McKenzie and Stooke 2007). Here we argue too that a child crawling over to a librarian and sitting on the librarian's knee communicates that the child is moving toward full participation in the storytime activity. This action too, then, is a symbolic artifact.

We observed the use of several kinds of artifacts. These included nametags made by the programme leaders, which afforded conversations about the alphabet as well as being a visible marker of membership in the storytime group:

Toddler J's mum is talking to [four-year-old]. Says [J's name, possibly in response to "What's his name?"] J's mum and G both looking at J's back where his nametag is. J's Mum to [four-year-old]: Yes, there are lots of J names here. [Medium-sized city site 1]

Librarian: You'll notice that the babies' names are on the top of your nametags and underneath that is the name of the person who's brought the baby today, so it makes it easier to talk to them and get to know them a little bit. [Medium-sized city site 2]

Here are Toddler M and Toddler D and their mums. M's mum picks up both their nametags, and they sit in their usual spots. [Medium-sized city site 2]

Toddler S goes back into the hall. She has gotten hold of her mom's nametag, and when her mom carries her back into the room, she holds the nametag out to baby M. M has her mom's nametag too, and the two interact with them for a minute. [Medium-sized city site 2]

board books provided by library staff in displays for participants:

Baby R reaches for the book toddler J has left on his carpet square... R picks up the book and looks at it. R's mother says "Do you want to show how you turn the pages?" She starts reading the book and prompts R, "Turn the page." R turns the page. After a few pages R is ready to turn to the back of the book. R's mum says "This book is too long!" [Medium-sized city site 1]

Toddler J takes two books back to the display table to put them back. The table is about level with his chin so that he can see and reach things at the front of it but doesn't have much reach. He tries to stand the books up the way they were before. The adults are noticing this and comment. He is successful with the thicker book but can't get the thin book to balance on its pages. J returns to his mum. [Medium-sized city site 1]

Baby across the room in red suit squeals. Moms around her smile and laugh, acknowledging her. Mom with the crawling boy is trying to keep him focused as he roams from baby blanket to baby blanket, looking for interesting things to play with. She moves him close to the book shelf and takes Maisy Mouse board book down and gives it to him to look at. [Metropolis site]

[Four-year-old] is sitting on a chair reading *Max's toys*, looking at the page and saying "Maaax" as though she's trying to determine where the word is on the page.... Four-year-old: "It's a bird!" Caregiver: "Hold the pictures so everyone can see." Caregiver mimics holding the book up like the librarian does. [Medium-sized city site 1].

and the facilities of the library outside of the programme room:

Baby R's mother asks at the desk about placing holds and getting a card. R is fussing. R's mother says "I know baby." Library staff asks if e-mail notices are okay. R's mother okays and they talk about email filing and important messages. [Medium-sized city site 2].

In addition, we have noted elsewhere that the appearance or disappearance of physical artifacts may be used in storytime to signal a transition (McKenzie and Stooke 2007) and that linguistic artifacts may also have semiotic characteristics (lullabies are meant to soothe, some songs are meant to energize).

Babies are quiet. I am beginning to be able to predict the rhythm of the story time and the times in which babies will shriek, then go quiet, then shriek, then start to fuss and want to either feed or sleep or just be somewhere else. It fits the pattern of the 30 minutes: lively introduction, always the same song, then a book, then the "body" songs of Head and Shoulders and Grandfather Clocks and the Moon, then another story, then the counting songs, lullabies, another story and then the more lively Skinamarink and then a story then good-bye song. Do the babies predict this too? [Metropolis site]

Finally, participants attended to the placement of bodies, the movement of limbs, and the orientation of eyes as means of teaching and learning the setting:

New family arrive, baby, mom and grandma (probably?) Mom sits on the bench, grandma is on the floor with baby, who is standing up between Grandma's legs. Grandma moves baby's arms to the rhythm of the song. Mom comes over and takes baby's sweater off. [Metropolis site]

Babies are facing away from their caregivers. Librarian: "What's in the box?" Moms answer, Squeaky Mouse!" Baby in pink dress up to visit Librarian again. Hickory Dickory Dock. Lots of laughter. Baby on Librarian's knee starts to cry? Too much attention? Librarian gives her back to her mom. [Metropolis site]

Toast in the toaster: When they pop up Moms invariably check their babies'

faces if they are facing out, to gauge the reaction. [Metropolis site]

Jack in the box: “Go to sleep”. Librarian pretends to snore. Moms laugh and explain “ooh, aah” when Jack in the box hides and then pops back up. Reflection: Teaching their babies what to attend to in a story -- what is exciting or worthy of “ooh, aah,” when it is time to clap. [Metropolis site]

Same mom quickly moves to take Grandma’s coat and put it on the bench so Grandma doesn’t miss out on a part of the song. [Metropolis site]

### **The problem of access**

Access to participation is facilitated by the transparency of artifacts. Artifacts are transparent to the extent that their users can see their inner workings. For example working with bells and shakers draws on children’s love of rhythm, a near-universal characteristic. Bells and shakers are relatively transparent from a toddler’s point of view.

Bells are a new prop for storytime, and everyone seems very interested in them as Librarian passes them out. Baby L puts the bells directly in her mouth. Her mom doesn’t seem to mind, and holds her at the waist so she is standing. Baby J is sitting on her own for the first time. She turns the bells over in her hands for a minute, then puts them in her mouth. Baby M is also sitting on her own. She shakes the bells a few times on her own, without anyone showing her how. Then she, too, puts them in her mouth. Toddler S shakes the bells on her own a few times, and follows Librarian around the circle as she hands them out to the other babies. ...[Librarian begins to sing Baa baa black/white sheep.] Toddler S sits at the front, shaking the bells on her own. Baby L and Baby M’s moms help them shake their bells; M’s mom does so by tapping M’s left wrist (M is holding the bells in her left hand). Baby J keeps trying to put the bells in her mouth. Baby M is now shaking her bells on her own -- perhaps she has learned by watching Librarian or Toddler S that this is what you do with them. J’s mom taps on the bells that J is holding, much the way that M’s mom did. [Medium-sized city site 2]

Transparency, a term that denotes the extent to which the inner workings of an artifact can be seen by participants, facilitates participation. A tickle rhyme, for example, is relatively transparent and becomes a resource for inclusion. Program leaders sometimes provided instructions and information and modeled activities and so increased transparency for participants.

The Program Leader says that we are now going to do the bouncing rhyme, “Smooth Road to London Town.” She explains that bouncing rhymes provide a nice break between stories, are a great way to work with a baby with rhythm and are fun. She positions her stuffed bear (her “baby”) on her knees facing her and she suggests the parents do the same with their children. I watch Baby J (6 months) and his Mom. Mom joins in the singing when she can, contributing more the second time through. She bounces J who laughs loudly when they hit the “bumpy” road. [Rural site]

The Program Leader showed me a copy of the rhyme album she had made for each family and distributed last week and would distribute again this week (and in coming weeks) to families who had not attended . . . She said that this week (week 4) she would introduce a couple of new rhymes and then no more in weeks 5 and 6. She explained that this gives the parents a chance (through repetition) to practice and learn the rhymes. She talked about being surprised to learn that she could not assume that parents knew “the more common rhymes” even ones like This Little Piggy. She said that parents had told her this in other sessions. [Rural site]

It is not only the program leader who models storytime. Through watching others, activities seemed to become more transparent to all participants (children, caregivers and the program leader).

The Program Leader (PL) does “Peek-a-boo, I see you,” using a stick puppet where a little duck pops up and out of an inverted cone when she says peek-a-boo. She does it once while sitting, then she goes around the room (starting with Baby M1 and Mom T on her left and ending with Baby O and Dad T on the right hand end of the circle), repeating the rhyme and including each child’s own name. This is accompanied by lots of smiles and laughter on the part of most children and all caregivers. Baby J carefully watches the action, following PL and the puppet from Baby M2 and Baby M3 on his right, to himself and then through Baby J2 and Baby B. He smiles and laughs each time the duck pops up [Rural site].

Lave and Wenger (1991, p.101) observe that control and selection are always part of the work of a community of practice; consequently, legitimate peripherality may not always lead to legitimate peripheral participation. That is to say some newcomers will remain outsiders. Problems of access arise when old timers assume that what is transparent for them is transparent for everyone. Compare, for example, the following two examples of newcomers succeeding or not succeeding at claiming a space within the community.

A four-year-old sibling attending storytime goes up to [Librarian]. She points to the jumper she’s wearing, an Osh-Kosh number with people and sheep woven into the fabric. “This has ‘Mary had a little lamb’ on it.”  
Librarian to Four-year-old: “We’ll sing that!” [...Later that morning]  
Four-year-old: “Mary had a little lamb!” Librarian starts to sing Mary had a little lamb. Four-year-old looks very happy, beside librarian.  
[Medium-sized city site 1]

In the above example the child’s legitimate participation was never in question. Moreover, the librarian’s guess about the meaning of the lamb was correct. The following excerpt tells a different story.

The half-hour library program for babies is drawing to a close. The pace, which up to this point has been frenetic, slows dramatically as the librarian begins to croon a traditional Scottish lullaby. Most of the adults begin to stroke their babies’ backs or rock them gently in their arms. Some join the librarian in this ritualized “closing” song and the librarian makes a joke that they should call themselves “the mothers’ choir.” A few mothers seem happy to watch and listen and “be” with their babies. One fractious baby is carried swiftly into the hallway and several crawling babies are gently hauled back into their mothers’ arms. It is the middle of the afternoon, but a

milky, nursery night has descended upon this “multipurpose room.” Something draws me to watch the mother on my right. She is holding her baby in a detached way and staring into space. She does not move at the end of the song, nor when the librarian leaves the room and others are beginning to pack up blankets and toys. But all of a sudden she picks herself off the floor, holds her baby up high above her head and breaks into a wild song and dance. People continue to gather their things and a few mothers nurse their babies and chat to one another, but it seems as if nobody but me has noticed that one small space in the program room has been transformed into a nightclub. How to celebrate this small rebellion? The mother does not look at me. She finishes the song, sits her baby astride one hip and saunters confidently out of the room. [Metropolis site]

What did the lullabies mean to that mother? How did the lullabies constrain the mother’s participation in the storytime? We can only speculate, but concur with Lave and Wenger’s point that participation is constrained when the knowledge encoded in the artifact is not available for scrutiny. If, for example, a mother views the storytime program as a performance by the leader, she may not participate in the interactive rhymes introduced by the librarian and her baby’s participation will be constrained. Similarly, participation is constrained when an activity is not valued. The co-ordinator of a program based exclusively on rhymes was told by some Aboriginal parents that they were not interested in participating because rhymes are not used in the same ways within their culture as in Euro-Canadian traditions. One of us also notes that in her practice as a children’s librarian, some teen mothers appeared not to value some of the more traditional storytime activities (See also Stooke, McKenzie and Smythe forthcoming).

Once in the story room I sit on the left wall again, my usual spot, and the woman I spoke with on the first day, smiles at me as she sits on the floor with her son. The woman she seemed to know from the first day does not seem to have returned to the group and she doesn’t talk with parents as much as they others do. She is a little older than the other mothers, too. There is another woman who comes with her baby and she also seems older than most of the parents there, and also does not stay to chat at the end nor interacts much with other parents during the story time. I wonder if she will come today. [Metropolis site]

### **Discourse and practice**

It has been argued elsewhere (McKenzie and Stooke 2007) that storytime constitutes an emergent discourse community. A caregiver’s arrival at a storytime signals the existence of certain values and dispositions, shared ways of talking about children’s development and the role of caregivers, particular ways of enjoying books and other resources for meaning making. Some caregivers are eager to learn more about early childhood literacy and about their roles in supporting children’s development. Lave and Wenger nevertheless point out that it may be more important to learn *to* talk than to learn *from* talk. As Lave and Wenger point out (1991, 107), “didactic instruction” may have the unintended consequence of allowing people to talk the talk without full participation.

It is important to recognize that membership in a discourse community involves more than talk. The process of learning to speak as a full member of a community of practice provides face validity to a person’s membership. However, face validity is not a substitute for full

membership. That is, you can learn the talk without knowing how to “do” the practice -- or how to “be” in a community.

Lave and Wenger also note how important stories are in the development of communities of practice. Our data contain many stories, but we have been drawn to one story (Stooke, Smythe and McKenzie forthcoming; McKenzie and Stooke 2007) in particular because it exemplifies how having one’s story validated by the group functions to include an adoptive mother in a potentially exclusive community of birth mothers.

Mother 1: I love those shoes.

Mother 2: We got them in [other country], actually.

Mother 1: Really?

Mother 2: Oh my god, there were so many pairs of shoes ‘cause they were all - these were all leather shoes and they cost \$2.00.

Mother 1: Oh my gosh!

Mother 2: They’re so expensive here, so I got some for when she’s grown too.

Mother 1: ((inaudible)) She’s doing okay though?

Mother 2: Yeah, she’s doing really well. We’ve been together since [two months ago], so, uh, she seems to be attaching to me ((inaudible)). [baby cries]

Mother 1: How old was she?

Mother 2: She was 10 months.

Mother 1: Right. So did it take some time to adjust?

Mother 2: It was very hard. ((inaudible))

Mother 1: She looks very happy

Mother 2: Yeah, she’s got a great personality [Medium-sized city site 1]

### **Effects of participation on motivation and identity**

In their discussion of various apprenticeship practices, Lave and Wenger (1991, 110) observe that newcomers take on short, simple, low risk, low responsibility tasks. A caregiver who is a newcomer to storytime may sit quietly in the circle and listen for several weeks. A child may not stray far from the caregiver’s lap. The librarians we observed were all old timers, but there is evidence (Stooke, 2004) that librarians who are newcomers at their own storytimes may be obliged to learn from texts rather than models. One novice children’s librarian expressed her dismay at being handed the “storytime binder” and told to plan her programmes. We ourselves recall relying heavily on such aids as cue cards and other people’s programme plans.

Moving toward full participation involves more time, more commitment, more risk, but most importantly an increasing sense of identity as a master practitioner. Ironically, participation is not facilitated by formal instruction and assessment. “The sparsity of tests, praise, or blame typical of apprenticeship follows from the apprentice’s legitimacy as a participant” (Lave and Wenger 1991, 111). It is salient, then, that the instructions provided by librarians at storytime were rarely followed by the classic Initiate-Respond-Evaluate (IRE) conversational move so commonly used in formal instructional settings. As Lave and Wenger observed, “When the process of increasing participation is not the primary motivation for learning, it is often because ‘didactic caretakers’ assume responsibility for motivating newcomers.” (1991, 111-112).

When librarians provided direct instruction, it tended to include specific detail and to pair specific examples with inclusive language that fostered participation:

Librarian: Good! Next I'd like to do some tickle rhymes and I've got some little tickle finger puppets. We're going to start by going round and round the garden. Got your hands all ready? ... [recites rhyme] *Round and round the garden like a teddy bear. One step, two step, tickle me under there.* Do you want to do a tickle for the other arm now? Ready to go? [moms say rhyme with her] *Round and round the garden like a teddy bear. One step, two step, tickle me under there* on the other arm. [laughter, GBN] That's great! Now we're going to do "Pizza"... [Medium city site 2]

Time for another book. Spots, feathers and curly tails. Mom's all echo, "Oh, curly tails", and fall into chorus of IRE (Initiate Respond Evaluate) What has a curly tail? Mom's respond: "A pig has a curly tail!" Elie's baby shrieks, Librarian acknowledges him: "We have some amazing pig squealing happening here." The call/response format continues. Librarian: "What quacks?" Moms: "A duck quacks." Moms start quacking like ducks! [Metropolis site]

Program Leader: Let's do *Here sits Farmer Giles*. Put your baby sitting on top of your knees like this.

Observation note: Program Leader demonstrates and does this rhyme twice. The first time Baby J's Mom Lo and Baby M's Mom Li simply watch her without doing any of the actions. The second time through they do the actions with their babies. And after completing the repeat the Program Leader addresses both of the children. Program Leader: That's the way J! Look at you go. Did you like sliding down your Mom's knees M? K (program leader's stuffed bear) liked sliding down mine. [Rural site]

Failure to support the increasing participation of novices had serious implications for inclusion. The size of the group attending the Metropolitan library site made it difficult for the librarian to make social connections with any individual caregivers and we saw little evidence that the group functioned as a community. At another community site (outside the scope of this discussion) a mother whose first language was not English had difficulty with the oral sharing of rhymes. She complained that having no access to print versions of the rhymes made it almost impossible for her to commit the rhymes to memory.

## **5. Conclusion**

We have shown how *all* storytime participants contribute to the enactment of storytime as a social setting. In fact, it was often difficult to identify the contributions of individual participants in isolation from the work of all. We also contend that communities of practice are characterized by both continuity and change, each of which is as important as the other. "Newcomers are caught in a dilemma. On the one hand, they need to engage in the existing practice, which has developed over time; to understand it, to participate in it, and to become full members of the community in which it exists. On the other hand they have a stake in its development as they begin to establish their own identity" (Lave and Wenger 1991, 115).

One implication of this seeming contradiction is that “legitimate peripherality” is necessary to the development of the community while full participation is necessary for the community’s maintenance. Thus, inexperience is an asset to the full community as long as it is supported “by experienced practitioners who both understand its limitations and value its role” (Lave and Wenger 1991, 117).

Looking at learning the library as legitimate peripheral participation in a community of practice is congruent with the idea of the library as a “dynamic social spaces” (McKenzie *et al.* 2007). “In any given concrete community of practice the process of community reproduction -- a historically constructed, ongoing conflicting, synergistic structuring of activity and relations among practitioners -- must be deciphered in order to understand specific forms of legitimate peripheral participation through time.” (Lave and Wenger 1991, 56). Thus, “learning the library” is a community enterprise and not merely the task assigned to its youngest patrons. In fact, this preliminary analysis brings to the fore the question of exactly what kind of community enterprise storytime is. What is it that storytime apprentices of all types are apprenticing to be? Exploring these questions is one of our goals for future analysis of these data.

### **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the libraries, staff, caregivers, and young children for granting us access to their worlds. We would also like to acknowledge the assistance of our research assistants, Brandi Borman, Pam Harris, Kirsten Clement, Suzanne Smythe, Bruce Fyfe, Anne van Gilst, and Linda Bussière. We are grateful for the support of the American Library Association and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada through the ALA Carroll Preston Baber Research grant and a SSHRC standard research grant.

### **References**

- DeVault, Marjorie. 2000. Producing family time: practices of leisure activity beyond the home. *Qualitative Sociology* 23, no.4: 485-503.
- Hanks, William F. 1991. Foreword. In Lave, Jean and Wenger, Etienne. *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 13-24.
- Lave, Jean and Wenger, Etienne. 1991. *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lofland, Lyn H. 1973. *A world of strangers: order and action in urban public space*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mellon, Constance A. 1990. *Naturalistic inquiry for library science: methods and applications for research, evaluation, and teaching*. New York: Greenwood.
- McKechnie, Lynne. 2006. Observations of babies and toddlers in library settings. *Library Trends*. 55, no.1: 190-201
- McKechnie, Lynne (E.F.), Christopher M. Dixon, Jana Fear, and Angela Pollak. 2006. Rules of (mis)conduct: user behaviour in public libraries. *Information Science Revisited:*

*Approaches to Innovation. 34<sup>th</sup> annual conference of the Canadian Association for Information Science/L'Association canadienne des sciences de l'information (CAIS/ACSI), York University, Toronto, Ontario. June 1 - 3, 2006.* Editor: Haidar Moukdad. Available at: [http://www.cais-acsi.ca/proceedings/2006/mckechnie\\_2006.pdf](http://www.cais-acsi.ca/proceedings/2006/mckechnie_2006.pdf)

McKenzie, Pamela J. and Rosamund Stooke. 2007. Producing storytime: A collectivist analysis of work in a complex communicative space. *Library Quarterly* 77(1): 3-27.

McKenzie, Pamela J., Elena Prigoda, Kirsten Clement, and Lynne (E.F.) McKechnie. 2007. Behind the program-room door: the creation of parochial and private women's realms in a Canadian public library. In: *Library as place: history, community, and culture*, edited by Gloria Leckie and John Buschman, 117-134. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Stooke, Rosamund K. "Healthy, wealthy and ready for school: supporting young children's education and development in the era of the National Children's Agenda." Ph.D. diss., The University of Western Ontario, 2004.

Stooke, Rosamund K., Pamela J. McKenzie, and Suzanne Smythe. Forthcoming. Does all this actually make a difference? Supporting diverse forms of mothering in early literacy programs. *Technologies of Mothering: New Conceptions, New Deliveries*. Pegeen Reichert Powell and Jocelyn Fenton Stitt, Editors.

Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. 1998. *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.