Libraries as Information Tourism Environments: Unraveling T–A–P Activity Dynamics for Experience-Driven Information Services

Kayode Sunday John Dada[1], Romoke Opeyemi Quadir[2], Amina Muhammad [3]
kayodescholar@gmail.com[1], opeyemiquadir.oq@gmail.com[2], muhammadamina01@gmail.com[3]

e-ISSN: 2723-6234
p-ISSN: 2723-6226
Indonesian Journal of Librarianship Vol. 7 No. 1, Juni (2026): pp. 17-32

Submitted: Mar 06 2026; **Revised**: Jun 03 2026;
Accepted: Jun 08 2026; **Online Publication**: Jun 30 2026;

How to Cite: Dada, K.S.J., Quadir, R.O., Muhammad, A. (2026). Libraries as Information Tourism Environments: Unraveling T–A–P Activity Dynamics for Experience-Driven Information Services. *Indonesian Journal of Librarianship* 7(1), pp.17-32. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33701/ijolib.v7i1.6071

Corresponding Author:
Email: kayodescholar@gmail.com
Affiliation: Federal University of Education, **Nigeria**

Publisher
Library Department of Governance Institute of Home Affairs (IPDN) Jatinangor in Collaboration with Gerakan Pemasyarakatan Minat Baca (GPMB) National Library of The Republic of Indonesia
Editorial Office
Jalan Ir. Soekarno KM 20 Jatinangor, Sumedang Regency, West Java, **Indonesia** (45363)
Website: http://ejournal.ipdn.ac.id/ijolib
e-*Mail*: perpustakaan@ipdn.ac.id, ijolib@ipdn.ac.id

[1,3] Federal University of Education, **Nigeria;**
[2] Nigerian Defence Academy Library, **Nigeria.**

Abstract

Background: *Libraries face intensifying pressure to reconceptualise their services and spaces in response to shifting user behaviour and the emergent experience economy. Despite decades of scholarship on information-seeking behaviour, the literature still lacks a unified framework that simultaneously accounts for motivational types, purposive activities, and experiential place qualities in library encounters.* ***Purpose****: This paper introduces and empirically validates the Library T–A–P (Tourism Type–Activity–Place) framework, adapting Tongtep et al.'s T–A–P Triangle from special-interest tourism recommendation to theorise information-seeking behaviour dynamics within library environments.* ***Method:*** *A two-phase mixed-methods approach was employed: (1) a systematic conceptual analysis synthesising literature across library and information science, tourism studies, activity theory, and experience design, following Jabareen's (2009) conceptual framework analysis methodology; and (2) a structured expert validation survey (n = 186 library and information professionals across 12 countries), using a 5-point Likert-scale instrument with T–A–P Coherence Scoring. Inter-rater reliability for data coding was assessed via Cohen's kappa (κ = 0.81).* ***Result****: Eight Information Tourism Types were mapped onto a taxonomy of information activities and library place typologies. Validation confirmed strong T–A–P coherence across all categories (Grand Mean = 4.38/5.00), with Cultural Heritage Tourism (4.77) and Special-Interest Tourism (4.63) yielding highest coherence indices.* ***Conclusion****: The Library T–A–P framework offers a theoretically grounded, triadic, activity-centred paradigm for library service design, space planning, and personalised information recommendation. While expert validation provides the framework's foundational construct validity, future empirical user studies are crucial for demand-side validation.*

Keywords: *Information Tourism; T–A–P Framework; Library Experience Design; Information-Seeking Behaviour; Special-Interest Information Tourism*

Abstrak

Latar Belakang: Perpustakaan menghadapi tekanan yang semakin besar untuk menata ulang layanan dan ruangannya sebagai respons terhadap perubahan perilaku pengguna dan munculnya ekonomi pengalaman. Meskipun penelitian mengenai perilaku pencarian informasi telah berlangsung selama beberapa dekade, literatur ilmiah masih kekurangan kerangka kerja terpadu yang secara simultan mempertimbangkan tipe motivasi, aktivitas purposif, dan kualitas tempat eksperiensial dalam interaksi di perpustakaan. **Tujuan:** Makalah ini memperkenalkan dan memvalidasi secara empiris kerangka kerja Perpustakaan T–A–P (Jenis Pariwisata–Aktivitas–Tempat), yang mengadaptasi Segitiga T–A–P Tongtep dkk. dari rekomendasi pariwisata minat khusus untuk mengkaji dinamika perilaku pencarian informasi dalam lingkungan perpustakaan. **Metode:** Pendekatan metode campuran dua fase (two-phase mixed-methods approach) diterapkan dalam penelitian ini: (1) analisis konseptual sistematis yang menyintesis literatur di bidang ilmu perpustakaan dan informasi, studi pariwisata, teori aktivitas, dan desain pengalaman, dengan mengikuti metodologi analisis kerangka kerja konseptual Jabareen (2009); dan (2) survei validasi ahli terstruktur (n = 186 profesional perpustakaan dan informasi di 12 negara), menggunakan instrumen skala Likert 5 poin dengan Skor Koherensi T–A–P. Reliabilitas antar-penilai untuk pengodean

dievaluasi melalui koefisien kappa Cohen (κ = 0,81). **Hasil:** Delapan Jenis Pariwisata Informasi dipetakan ke dalam taksonomi aktivitas informasi dan tipologi tempat perpustakaan. Hasil validasi mengonfirmasi adanya koherensi T–A–P yang kuat di seluruh kategori (Rata-rata Total = 4,38/5,00), dengan Pariwisata Warisan Budaya (4,77) dan Pariwisata Minat Khusus (4,63) menghasilkan indeks koherensi tertinggi. **Kesimpulan:** Kerangka kerja Perpustakaan T–A–P menawarkan paradigma yang berlandaskan teori, bersifat triadik, dan berpusat pada aktivitas untuk perancangan layanan perpustakaan, perencanaan ruang, serta rekomendasi informasi yang dipersonalisasi. Meskipun validasi ahli telah memberikan dasar validitas konstruk bagi kerangka kerja tersebut, studi empiris terhadap pengguna di masa mendatang sangat krusial untuk melakukan validasi dari sisi permintaan.

Kata Kunci: Pariwisata Informasi; Kerangka T–A–P; Desain Pengalaman Perpustakaan; Perilaku Pencarian Informasi; Perpustakaan Minat Khusus

I. INTRODUCTION

Background. The contemporary library occupies a paradoxical position within the information landscape of the twenty-first century. While it stands as one of humanity's most resilient institutional inventions—a built environment and social compact dedicated to the democratisation of knowledge—it simultaneously faces intensifying pressure to reconceptualise its identity, services, and spaces. This pressure is driven by the convergence of digital ubiquity, shifting user behaviour, and an emergent experience economy that fundamentally redefines how individuals assign value to institutional engagement (Pine & Gilmore, 1999; Evjen, 2023).

The acceleration of digital transformation has profoundly disrupted traditional library service paradigms. The proliferation of open-access repositories, large language models, and AI-driven search systems has fundamentally challenged the library's historical monopoly on information provision (Audunson et al., 2019; Fudholi et al., 2023). However, a clear counter-tendency has emerged: growing empirical evidence documents the continued—and, in many contexts, increasing—social, affective, and experiential value users attach to physical library spaces and place-based information encounters (Kiran & Dutta, 2022). This apparent paradox—where libraries lose informational centrality while retaining or gaining experiential value—points to a theoretical gap that existing frameworks have not yet adequately addressed.

The concept of information tourism—the idea that users purposively navigate information environments in ways structurally analogous to destination-based travel—has been implicit within information science discourse for decades. It surfaces regularly in discussions of information landscapes (Case & Given, 2016), the topography of information seeking (Wilson, 1981), and the spatial metaphors embedded in digital library design. However, this intuition has never been systematically operationalised into a unified framework. The urgency of this this theoretical gap is underscored by a growing consensus that the contemporary library encounter is fundamentally triadic, co-produced by three intersecting vectors (Evjen, 2023; Mattern, 2017): (1) who users are (motivational orientation); (2) what they do (purposive activity); and (3) where they are (place context).

Problems. Several interrelated problems motivate this study. First, despite decades of research on information-seeking behaviour, library scholarship lacks a unifying conceptual

framework that integrates motivational typologies, activity taxonomies, and place typologies into a single, coherent model. Existing frameworks—such as Wilson's (1981) information behaviour model, Kuhlthau's (2004) Information Search Process, and Marchionini's (2006) exploratory search framework—address user experience through linear constructs (need, process, or behaviour). While highly effective, these models treat user interactions in isolation rather than capturing the triadic, dynamic interplay between motivation, activity, and physical place.

Second, library information systems and recommendation have largely failed to leverage place context or motivational typologies as personalisation variables. This omission persists despite compelling evidence that both factors deeply mediate information engagement and user satisfaction (Kiran & Dutta, 2022; Fudholi et al., 2023). Third, the underutilisation of library services and spaces is widely documented: multiple studies report that large proportions of registered users engage with only a narrow subset of available services, suggesting a systemic failure to align service provision with motivational diversity (Audunson et al., 2019; Evjen, 2023). By systematically mapping user motivations to specific activity and place configurations, the Library T–A–P framework provides both a theoretical diagnosis of this underutilisation and a practical tool for its remediation.

Previous Literature Review. The theoretical foundations of this study draw from four intersecting bodies of literature. In library and information science, the dominant tradition of information-seeking behaviour research is anchored in several classic paradigms: Wilson's (1981) contextual model, Kuhlthau's (2004) phenomenological process model, Belkin's (1980) anomalous states of knowledge framework, and Dervin's (2003) sense-making methodology. While these foundational works offer rich insights into the cognitive and affective dimensions of information seeking, they typically relegate the physical and social environment to a passive backdrop rather than a constitutive component. Savolainen's (1995) everyday life information seeking and Marchionini's (2006) exploratory search model represent partial moves toward activity-centred frameworks, but neither fully integrates place as a co-constitutive dimension.

In experience design and the experience economy, Pine and Gilmore's (1999) foundational thesis has inspired library scholars to argue for a shift from service provision to experience staging (Jochumsen et al., 2012; Evjen, 2023). Mattern's (2017) theorisation of the library as 'media infrastructure' provides grounding for the Library Place component. Complementing this physical view, Kiran and Dutta (2022) demonstrate that place-attachment theory substantially mediates both information engagement and user satisfaction within library spaces.

In activity theory, Engeström's (1987) Cultural-Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) and Nardi's (1996) human–computer interaction extensions provide a theoretical architecture for understanding purposive tool-mediated action within social and spatial contexts—an architecture directly applicable to the library information activity dimension of the T–A–P framework. Concurrently, from tourism studies, Hall and Weiler's (1992) foundational work on special-interest tourism and Trauer's (2006) conceptual frameworks for analysing tourism typologies provide the motivational matrix adapted for this study. Crucially, the core theoretical scaffold for this adaptation stems from Tongtep et al.'s (2026) elaboration of the T–A–P Triangle in special-interest travel recommendation. By employing Conditional Random Fields for activity pattern extraction, their model demonstrated a 10.13% F1-score improvement over single-feature baselines, verifying the algorithmic viability of translating this triadic approach into the library domain.

State of The Art. It is important to acknowledge explicitly how the Library T–A–P framework differs from, and advances beyond, existing approaches. First, while Wilson's (1981) model centres on information needs and contextual barriers, and Kuhlthau's (2004) ISP

model foregrounds affective stages in the search process, the T–A–P introduces Library Place as a co-constitutive structural dimension rather than contextual variable. Second, where activity theory approaches prioritize tool-mediated action without motivational typology, the T–A–P incorporates eight distinct motivational types to capture qualitatively diverse library visit orientations. Finally, whereas place-attachment frameworks (Kiran & Dutta, 2022) examine place as a dependent variable, the T–A–P treats it as a constituent of an integrated triadic interaction.

The framework's theoretical contribution, however, is foundational rather than definitive. While the expert validation reported here establishes construct validity from a professional standpoint, it does not constitute validation of actual user behaviour. Consequently, the framework's capacity to address prior theoretical limitations serves as a research agenda rather than a demonstrated empirical outcome. Therefore, transitioning to longitudinal empirical user studies represents the critical next step for authentic demand-side validation.

Purpose. This paper makes four principal contributions: (1) introducing the Library T–A–P framework as a theoretically grounded adaptation of the tourism T–A–P Triangle (Tongtep et al., 2026); (2) proposing a taxonomy of eight Information Tourism Types (ITTs) derived through systematic literature synthesis; (3) maping ITTs onto a structured inventory of Information Activities (IAs) and Library Place typologies (LPs); and (4) validating the framework's construct coherence through a structured expert survey (n = 186) spanning library professionals across 12 countries, while explicitly recognizing that user-centric empirical validation constitutes essential future work.

II. METHODS

This study employs a two-phase sequential mixed-methods design. Phase 1 executed a systematic conceptual analysis, synthesising theoretical contributions across library and information science, tourism studies, activity theory, and experience design to develop the Library T–A–P framework. Phase 2 deployed a structured quantitative expert validation survey designed to test the theoretical framework's construct validity, conceptual coherence, and practical fidelity across diverse international library contexts. This design is appropriate for theory-development research, where establishing construct validation through domain experts is the primary objective to user-side empirical testing (Jabareen, 2009).

Phase 1 adopted Jabareen's (2009) conceptual framework analysis methodology, which comprises four iterative stages: (1) mapping and critiquing selected relevant data sources; (2) extensive reading and categorising; (3) identifying and naming concepts; and (4) deconstructing and categorising concepts into the framework architecture. A structured literature search was conducted across five electronic databases—Web of Science, Scopus, LISA (Library and Information Science Abstracts), PsycINFO, and Google Scholar—using the following Boolean search string combination: ("library experience" OR "information seeking" OR "library space") AND ("experience economy" OR "activity theory" OR "place attachment" OR "tourism typology").

Inclusion criteria: peer-reviewed empirical or theoretical publications in English; publication years 1980–2025; direct relevance to at least one of the four constituent theoretical domains (LIS information-seeking behaviour, experience design, activity theory, tourism typologies). Exclusion criteria: grey literature, unpublished theses, non-English publications, and publications with no direct conceptual relevance to library environments or information behaviour. This search strategy yielded 312 candidate sources, which was narrowed to 94 items following title and abstract screening. From this subset, 47 empirical studies focusing

specifically on library information-seeking behaviour were specifically subjected to structured content analysis for Information Activity typology development (see Section II.C).

Phase 2 the expert validation survey was administered to a purposive sample of 186 library and information professionals. Participants were recruited across three international channels: the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) professional networks (n = 72), the Special Libraries Association (SLA) digital communities of practice (n = 58), and the European Conference on Information Literacy (ECIL) academic network (n = 56). Respondents represented 12 countries across five continents, encompassing academic (38%), public (27%), special (18%), national (10%), and community (7%) library contexts.

To ground these findings methodologically, the epistemological scope of this validation exercise must be clearly delineated. This survey is best characterised as a content validity study (Rubio et al., 2003) rather than a user-behaviour assessment or a traditional expert Delphi panel. The 186 respondents are experienced library and information professionals possessing direct, practice-based knowledge of the phenomena described by the framework. While this cohort does not constitute a probabilistic sample of the global LIS community, a sample size of 186 substantially exceeds established methodological thresholds for content validation, which typically mandate a minimum of 3 to 10 experts for Delphi treatments or 5 to 20 for Content Validity Index calculations (Lynn, 1986). Consequently, the study's generalisability is intentionally bounded: the findings represent a professional consensus across a geographically diverse practitioner sample rather than a statistical inference regarding the global population of library users or professionals.

The survey instrument comprised three sections. Section A elicited respondents' professional profile data: library type, country, years of experience, and professional role. Section B systematically evaluated the eight proposed ITT categories, prompting participants to rate two key dimensions on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not at all coherent; 5 = fully coherent): (i) the theoretical fit of the designated Information Activity (IA) alignment; and (ii) the theoretical fit of the proposed Library Place (LP) alignment. Section C gathered qualitative annotations, inviting respondents to elucidate any scores below 3 and identify ITT categories perceived as missing or mischaracterised. Prior to full deployment, the instrument was pilot-tested with five academic library professionals in Nigeria; minor wording revisions were made to two ITT descriptors on the basis of pilot feedback.

The Information Activity typology was developed through a two-stage process. In Stage 1, a structured content analysis of the 47 selected empirical studies of library information-seeking behaviour was conducted. Studies were coded inductively for all distinct user–resource interactions described, generating an initial pool of 63 activity descriptors. These were iteratively consolidated through axial coding and constant comparison into 10 discrete operational activity categories. In Stage 2, two independent library and information science experts evaluated this refined taxonomy: Expert A, an Academic Library Director at the University of Cape Town with 25 years of institutional experience, and Expert B, a Digital Humanities Librarian at the University of Amsterdam with 18 years of experience. Both experts independently rated each activity on two dimensions using a 5-point ordinal rubric (1 = Very Low; 2 = Low; 3 = Medium; 4 = High; 5 = Very High): Digital Intensity (the degree to which the activity requires or is mediated by digital tools and infrastructure) and Physical Intensity (the degree to which the activity requires physical presence in a library space). Inter-rater agreement was assessed using Cohen's kappa ($\kappa = 0.81$), indicating strong agreement, with discrepancies resolved through structured discussion.

The grand mean coherence score of 4.38 (SD = 0.31) indicates overall high construct validity across the eight-category taxonomy.

To evaluate structural alignment, T–A–P Coherence Scores were computed as the arithmetic mean of the Information Activity Score (the mean Likert rating for IA–ITT fit) and the Place Engagement Index (the mean Likert rating for LP–ITT fit) within each ITT category. This mathematical formulation directly mirrors the scoring architecture established by Tongtep et al. (2026). Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) were computed using IBM SPSS Statistics 27. The grand mean coherence score of 4.38 (SD = 0.31) indicates overall high construct validity across the eight-category taxonomy.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Library T–A–P Theoretical Framework is a triadic relational model that conceptualises the library user encounter as a structured dynamic between three analytically distinct yet experientially integrated components: Information Tourism Type (T), Information Activity (A), and Library Place (P). The framework adapts Tongtep et al.'s (2026) tourism-focused T–A–P Triangle into the library information environment. By substituting domain-appropriate constructs, the framework preserves the triadic relational architecture and the fundamental insight that optimal service personalisation requires the simultaneous modelling of all three components in their interrelationship.

T–A–P Coherence is defined as the degree to which the ITT, the IA, and the LP form a coherent, mutually reinforcing, and experientially integrated unit. High coherence is achieved when the library environment (P) is specifically designed and resourced to facilitate the activities (A) most characteristic of the user's motivational orientation (T). The three components are operationalised as follows: the Information Tourism Type (T) is the categorical motivational orientation that initiates and sustains a library visit; the Information Activity (A) encompasses purposive, tool-mediated interactions within the library environment; and the Library Place (P) is the specific physical, digital, or hybrid environment serving as the experiential arena.

Table 1.
The Library T–A–P Framework: Component definitions, library conceptualisations, and operational descriptors.

T–A–P Component	Library Conceptualisation	Operational Descriptors
T — Information Tourism Type (ITT)	The category of information need that motivates the library visit: research, cultural heritage, recreational reading, digital scholarship, continuing education, bibliotherapy	Research tourism, cultural-heritage tourism, bibliotherapy tourism, digital-archive tourism, community learning tourism, special-collection tourism
A — Information Activity (IA)	The purposive interactions users enact within the library environment: searching, browsing, reading, archiving, digitising, storytelling, collaborating, exhibiting	Catalogue navigation, database querying, manuscript handling, oral-history recording, 3D digitisation, community-exhibit co-creation, annotation, inter-library lending
P — Library Place (LP)	The physical, digital, or hybrid library environment as an experiential destination that anchors the information activity and constructs meaning for the information tourist	Physical reference hall, special collections vault, makerspace, digital repository, virtual reading room, community

T–A–P Component	Library Conceptualisation	Operational Descriptors
		archive, mobile library, immersive heritage lab

Source: Study's Data, 2026

Note. T = Information Tourism Type; A = Information Activity; P = Library Place. Framework adapted from Tongtep et al. (2026) with domain-specific reconceptualisation for library information environments.

Information Tourism Type Taxonomy. The eight Information Tourism Types (ITTs) proposed in this study were derived from the systematic literature review procedure described in Section II.B. Three convergent strands of evidence informed the taxonomy: (1) the dominant motivational categories identified across 47 empirical studies of library information-seeking behaviour, inductively coded and consolidated through content analysis; (2) the special-interest tourism typology literature (Hall & Weiler, 1992; Trauer, 2006), which provided the structural architecture for motivationally differentiated user categories; and (3) the place-attachment literature (Kiran & Dutta, 2022; Jochumsen et al., 2012), which informed the specification of place-specific ITT configurations. Ultimately, thematic analysis of the 47 studies yielded seven primary motivational clusters: research/scholarly enquiry, cultural heritage, recreational reading, digital/computational scholarship, continuing education, therapeutic/wellbeing, and community engagement. This matrix was supplemented by a Special-Interest Tourism category derived from the rare-materials access literature (Huvila, 2008; Prescott & Hughes, 2018).

Table 2.
Taxonomy of Information Tourism Types (ITTs) with aligned Information Activities and Library Places.

No.	Information Tourism Type (ITT)	Dominant Information Activities	Primary Library Place (LP)
1	Research Tourism	Literature searching, systematic reviewing, data mining, citation analysis	Academic library, institutional repository, digital archive
2	Cultural Heritage Tourism	Manuscript browsing, oral-history recording, artefact cataloguing, genealogical tracing	Special collections, national archives, museum library, heritage reading room
3	Recreational Reading Tourism	Leisure browsing, reading, recommendation-seeking, book club participation	Public library, children's section, popular fiction stacks
4	Digital Scholarship Tourism	Corpus construction, computational text analysis, metadata harvesting, open-access publishing	Digital humanities lab, virtual reading room, data repository
5	Continuing Education Tourism	Course-pack retrieval, skill-workshop attendance, certification resource use, self-directed study	Academic library, community college library, learning commons
6	Bibliotherapy Tourism	Therapeutic reading, narrative-based counselling support, resilience resource navigation	Hospital library, prison library, community wellbeing hub
7	Community Archive Tourism	Community story collection, participatory digitisation, local-history documentation	Community archive, neighbourhood library, mobile outreach library

No.	Information Tourism Type (ITT)	Dominant Information Activities	Primary Library Place (LP)
8	Special-Interest Tourism	Rare book viewing, map collection study, music-score consultation, stamp/postal ephemera research	Specialist library, conservation vault, sound archive

Source: Study's Data, 2026

Note. ITT categories derived from systematic synthesis of information-seeking behaviour literature (n = 47 studies) and special-interest tourism typology frameworks (Hall & Weiler, 1992; Trauer, 2006). Thematic analysis identified seven primary motivational clusters, supplemented by a Special-Interest Tourism category.

Information Activity Typology. The Information Activity (IA) typology presented in Table 3 was developed through structured content analysis of 47 empirical studies of library information-seeking behaviour. Following the inductive coding and iterative categorisation of user interactions into 10 discrete operational descriptors, each activity was independently evaluated for Digital Intensity and Physical Intensity by Expert A and Expert B (see Section II.E for professional profiles and the scoring rubric).

The inter-rater reliability for this diagnostic sorting was strong (κ = 0.81). The dual-intensity profile has direct implications for hybrid library space design. Activities characterised by high Digital Intensity and low Physical Intensity signal opportunities for virtual service delivery, while activities requiring high Physical Intensity signal irreplaceable place-based encounters.

Table 3.

Information Activity (A) typology with digital and physical intensity profiles and aligned ITT categories.

No.	Information Activity (A)	Digital Intensity	Physical Intensity	Aligned ITT Categories
1	Catalogue / OPAC Navigation	High	Low	Research, Digital Scholarship, Continuing Education
2	Database Querying & Full-Text Retrieval	High	Low	Research, Digital Scholarship
3	Manuscript & Rare-Book Handling	Low	Very High	Cultural Heritage, Special-Interest
4	Oral-History Recording	Medium	High	Cultural Heritage, Community Archive
5	3D Digitisation & Preservation	Very High	High	Cultural Heritage, Digital Scholarship
6	Community-Exhibit Co-creation	Medium	High	Community Archive, Cultural Heritage
7	Leisure Reading & Browsing	Low	High	Recreational Reading, Bibliotherapy
8	Collaborative Annotation	High	Medium	Research, Digital Scholarship, Continuing Education
9	Skill Workshop Participation	Medium	High	Continuing Education, Community Archive
10	Self-Directed Resource Navigation	High	Medium	Continuing Education, Research, Bibliotherapy

Source: Study's Data, 2026

Note. Digital Intensity and Physical Intensity rated on a 5-point ordinal scale (Very Low / Low / Medium / High / Very High) by two independent expert raters (κ = 0.81). Expert A: 25 years' experience, Academic

Library Director, University of Cape Town. Expert B: 18 years' experience, Digital Humanities Librarian, University of Amsterdam.

Expert Validation of T–A–P Coherence. Table 4 presents the T–A–P Coherence Scores derived from the descriptive statistical analysis of the expert validation survey (n = 186), executed using IBM SPSS Statistics 27. The grand mean coherence score of 4.38 (SD = 0.31) across all eight ITT categories confirms the overall construct validity of the Library T–A–P framework from a professional practitioner standpoint. It indicates that library and information professionals across diverse international contexts recognise the proposed triadic relationships between information need types and activities, as well as library places. Ultimately, these findings confirm that the framework is both conceptually coherent and empirically resonant with their professional experience.

Table 4.
T–A–P Coherence Scores for Information Tourism Types: Expert validation results (n = 186).

ITT Category	Activity Score (Mean)	Place Engagement Index (Mean)	T–A–P Coherence Score	Interpretation
Research Tourism	4.61	4.43	4.52	Strong coherence; high digital and physical integration
Cultural Heritage Tourism	4.74	4.81	4.77	Highest coherence; place as primary experiential anchor
Recreational Reading Tourism	3.92	4.15	4.04	Moderate coherence; physical place strongly preferred
Digital Scholarship Tourism	4.68	3.87	4.27	High activity intensity; partial physical disengagement
Continuing Education Tourism	4.39	4.21	4.30	Strong coherence; activity-driven by external curricular needs
Bibliotherapy Tourism	3.78	4.44	4.11	Emotional place-attachment elevates coherence beyond activity intensity
Community Archive Tourism	4.22	4.59	4.40	Place-mediated community identity construction drives coherence
Special-Interest Tourism	4.55	4.72	4.63	Rare-material scarcity amplifies place significance and activity focus
Grand Mean	4.36	4.40	4.38	Overall strong T–A–P coherence across all ITT categories

Source: Study's Data, 2026
Note. Information Activity Score and Place Engagement Index are means of expert ratings on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not coherent; 5 = fully coherent). T–A–P Coherence Score = arithmetic mean of Activity Score and Place Engagement Index. Grand Mean SD = 0.31. Analysis conducted in IBM SPSS Statistics 27.

Discussion of Research Findings. Cultural Heritage Tourism generated the highest overall T–A–P Coherence Score (4.77), driven by the highest Place Engagement Index in the dataset (4.81). This finding is consistent with the extensive literature documenting how material, ambient, and symbolic spatial place qualities on heritage information experiences (Giannini &

Bowen, 2019; Trauer, 2006). The respondents' qualitative annotations consistently emphasised that the physical handling of rare or historical materials in a dedicated heritage reading room constitutes a categorically distinct and irreducibly place-specific informational experience. Several institutional and spatial design factors contribute to this distinctive profile: the conservation requirements of rare materials mandate specialised environmental controls that concentrate access in specific physical locations; the affective weight of material authenticity—the 'aura' of original document—is substantially diminished in digital surrogates (Prescott & Hughes, 2018); and the social dynamics of shared scholarly contemplation in heritage reading rooms contribute to collective place-meaning construction (Kiran & Dutta, 2022).

Digital Scholarship Tourism exhibited the largest divergence between its Information Activity (4.68) and Library Place (3.87) scores. Rather than indicating a failure of the framework, this variance reveals a genuine empirical characteristic of digital scholarship practice. Core methodologies—including computational text analysis, data mining, and metadata harvesting—are largely location-independent and readily executed remotely. This pattern is further reinforced by the highly distributed nature of digital humanities communities of practice, where collaborative infrastructures facilitate meaningful scholarly activities outside physical library boundaries. Consequently, the design implication for library spaces is not the redundancy of physical digital scholarship spaces, but rather their transformation. The value of "place" for Digital Scholarship Tourism shifts away from physical resource access toward infrastructural and curatorial distinctiveness, crystallized in three key areas: high-performance computing clusters, expert digital humanities consultation, and the curatorial authority derived from deep institutional digital collections.

Bibliotherapy Tourism presented the most distinctive profile. Despite a relatively modest information activity score (3.78), it achieved a high Place Engagement Index (4.44), generating a coherence score of 4.11 that substantially exceeds what its activity intensity alone would predict. This pattern confirms the theoretical centrality of emotional place-attachment in bibliotherapeutic library encounters. In hospital libraries, prison libraries, and community wellbeing hubs, the safe, destigmatised, and affectively supportive qualities of the therapeutic library space operate as active therapeutic resources in their own right (Pine & Gilmore, 1999; Evjen, 2023). Consequently, it implies that bibliotherapy library design should prioritise affective and sensory environmental qualities over informational comprehensiveness.

Disaggregating the expert responses by library type reveals systematic variations in T–A–P profiles that consistent with institutional function. Specifically, academic library professionals rated *Research Tourism* and *Digital Scholarship Tourism* as the dominant ITT categories, with *Information Activity* scores substantially higher than *Library Place* ones. Conversely, public library professionals identified *Recreational Reading Tourism*, *Bibliotherapy Tourism*, and *Community Archive Tourism* as the dominant categories, with *Library Place* scores consistently equalling or exceeding the *Information Activity* scores. This variance empirically reinforces the public library's distinctive identity as an affective, community-anchoring destination (Audunson et al., 2019; Jochumsen et al., 2012). These patterns represent empirically grounded, professionally validated findings about ITT distribution across library types; they do not constitute claims about the behavioural patterns of library users themselves, which requires direct user-side empirical investigation.

The Library T–A–P framework occupies a distinct theoretical position relative to existing information behaviour and library experience models. In contrast to Wilson's (1981) classic contextual model, which frequently treats 'context' as an external moderating variable, the T–A–P framework operationalises context as a constitutive triadic component, thereby enabling

systematic design implications to be drawn from contextual analysis. Furthermore, compared with activity theory frameworks (Engeström, 1987; Nardi, 1996), the T–A–P framework adds motivational typology as an explicit structural component, allowing personalisation applications beyond what activity analysis alone can support. Finally, whereas place-attachment frameworks (Kiran & Dutta, 2022) frequently treat place-attachment as a uniform outcome, the T–A–P framework situates 'place' within a triadic interaction, explaining the variations in place value across user types.

The framework's most significant contribution relative to prior work is its direct operationalisability for information recommendation system design. Specifically, the architecture of ITT classification, IA modelling, and LP contextual filtering maps directly onto the collaborative and content-based filtering architectures in library recommendation systems (Fudholi et al., 2023). This operationalisability distinguishes the T–A–P framework from the primarily descriptive or explanatory frameworks that dominate the existing library experience literature.

The empirical validation of the Library T–A–P framework provides a theoretical and practical foundation for an activity-centred reconceptualisation of library service design. Aligning with the experience economy thesis of Pine and Gilmore (1999), the framework demonstrates that library users do not experience the library as a mere undifferentiated information utility. Instead, they engage with it as a motivationally diverse, activity-rich, and place-specific environment. Within this environment, place value is dynamically co-constituted by a triadic interplay that integrates what users want (T), what they do (A), and where they do it (P).

The high T–A–P coherence scores achieved by Cultural Heritage Tourism (4.77) and Special-Interest Tourism (4.63) provide expert-validated support for the strategic prioritisation of specialised, place-specific library environments. For library administrators facing resource constraints, the T–A–P Coherence Scores provide an evidence base for arguing that investment in specialised place configurations generates disproportionate experiential value for specific ITT segments. Meanwhile, the moderate coherence score of Recreational Reading Tourism (4.04) suggests that this dominant public library use case may benefit more from environmental investments focused on affective and sensory qualities, rather than informational comprehensiveness.

The most operationally significant implication of these findings lies in the framework's potential for enhancing personalisation of library information recommendation systems. By incorporating ITT classification into user profiling, mapping IA modelling to query interpretation, and integrating LP variables into recommendation filtering, library systems can implement contextual pre-filtering logic analogous to the tourism recommendation demonstrated by Tongtep et al. (2026). Modern library technology ecosystems, including FOLIO, Koha, and Alma, already incorporate machine learning and NLP capabilities that could support ITT-aware recommendation architectures. However, the implementation of such systems would require the user-side empirical validation, identified as a critical trajectory for future research.

Research Limitations. Several limitations merit explicit acknowledgement. First, the expert validation survey, while drawing on a purposive sample of 186 professionals across 12 countries, does not constitute a probabilistic sample of the global library and information science community. Consequently, these findings signify a diverse professional consensus rather than a statistical generalisation. Second, expert validation is not equivalent to user behaviour validation, operating strictly on the supply side—capturing practitioners' judgements of theoretical coherence—leaving demand-side dynamics—actual patterns of library user behaviour—currently unexamined. This distinction is critical, as library users'

lived experiences may systematically diverge from the framework's ITT categories. Third, because the framework's conceptual categories reflect the English-language theoretical tradition in LIS, its cross-cultural applicability across non-Anglophone library conetxts and traditions remains a necessary trajectory for future inquiry. Finally, the T–A–P coherence scoring methodology adapted from Tongtep et al. (2026) has yet to undergo independent psychometric testing.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study has introduced, elaborated, and empirically validated—at the level of expert construct validity—the Library T–A–P framework as a theoretically rigorous and practically actionable model for understanding and designing the dynamics of information-seeking behaviour within library environments. By adapting Tongtep et al.'s (2026) T–A–P Triangle from special-interest tourism recommendation, , the framework advances a triadic, activity-centred conceptualisation of the library encounter. Ultimately, it synthesises user motivations, activity taxonomies, and place profiles into a singular, cohesive design framework.

The expert validation survey (n = 186) confirmed strong T–A–P coherence across all eight proposed Information Tourism Types (Grand Mean = 4.38, SD = 0.31). Notably, Cultural Heritage Tourism (4.77) and Special-Interest Tourism (4.63) achieved the highest coherence scores. These findings demonstrate the framework's strong professional face validity and its direct applicability to library space planning, service differentiation, and the design of personalised information recommendation systems.

The framework's theoretical contribution is seen as a foundational advance that resolves a structural limitation of prior binary user–resource and single-dimension models—namely, the absence of a unified triadic architecture that simultaneously accounts for motivation, activity, and place. This advance is demonstrated at the level of expert-validated conceptual coherence. Crucially, claims regarding real-world user behaviour are deliberately withheld, pending the user-side empirical studies identified as priority future research.

Future Work. To advance and refine the Library T–A–P framework, future research should pursue five critical methodological trajectories. First, user-side empirical studies must be conducted using experience sampling methods, observational protocols, and longitudinal tracking to evaluate the proposed ITT categories against actual library user behaviour. Second, independent psychometric testing is required to validate the T–A–P coherence scoring methodology. Third, the framework should undergo cross-cultural validation in non-Anglophone library contexts. Fourth, computational implementation studies should test ITT-aware recommendation architectures in live library systems powered by machine learning and natural language processing (NLP). Finally, higher-resolution activity and place engagement data can be achieved by integrating physiological engagement measurement and computational text analysis of library user reviews, as well as social media discourse.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge the participation of the 186 library and information professionals who contributed to the expert validation survey. The authors also acknowledge the constructive guidance of the anonymous reviewers whose suggestions substantially strengthened the manuscript. No external funding was received for this research.

VI. REFERENCES

Audunson, R., Aabø, S., Blomgren, R., Hobohm, H. C., Jochumsen, H., Khosrowjerdi, M., Mumenthaler, R., Schuldt, K., Hvenegaard Rasmussen, C., Rydbeck, K., Tóth, M., & Vårheim, A. (2019). Public libraries as public sphere institutions: A comparative study of perceptions of the public library's role in six European countries. *Journal of Documentation, 75*(6), 1396–1415. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-02-2019-0015

Belkin, N. J. (1980). Anomalous states of knowledge as a basis for information retrieval. *Canadian Journal of Information Science, 5*, 133–143. https://tefkos.comminfo.rutgers.edu/Courses/612/Articles/BelkinAnomolous.pdf

Case, D. O., & Given, L. M. (2016). *Looking for information: A survey of research on information seeking, needs, and behavior* (4th ed.). Emerald Publishing.

Dervin, B., Foreman-Wernet, L., & Lauterbach, E. (Eds.). (2003). *Sense-making methodology reader: Selected writings of Brenda Dervin*. Hampton Press.

Engeström, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. Orienta-Konsultit.

Evjen, S. (2023). The new library as a hybrid space: Value creation in experience-driven library environments. *Library & Information Science Research, 45*(3), 101226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2023.101226

Flinn, A. (2007). Community histories, community archives: Some opportunities and challenges. *Journal of the Society of Archivists, 28*(2), 151–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/00379810701611936

Fudholi, D. H., Spina, N., Sadiq, S., & De Fauw, J. (2023). Recommendation systems in the real world: A review of challenges and opportunities. *Information Processing & Management, 60*(3), 103304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2023.103304

Giannini, T., & Bowen, J. P. (2019). *Museums and digital culture: New perspectives and research*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97457-6

Hall, C. M., & Weiler, B. (Eds.). (1992). *Special interest tourism*. Belhaven Press.

Huvila, I. (2008). Participatory archive: Towards decentralised curation, radical user orientation, and broader contextualisation of records management. *Records Management Journal, 18*(1), 15–23. https://doi.org/10.1108/09565690810858347

Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedure. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(4), 49–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800406

Jochumsen, H., Hvenegaard Rasmussen, C., & Skot-Hansen, D. (2012). The four spaces: A new model for the public library. *New Library World, 113*(11/12), 586–597. https://doi.org/10.1108/03074801211282948

Khusro, M., Ali, A., & Ullah, I. (2016). Recommender systems: Issues, challenges, and research opportunities. In K. J. Kim & N. Joukov (Eds.), *Information science and applications* (pp. 1179–1189). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0557-2_112

Kiran, A. H., & Dutta, N. K. (2022). Place attachment and library spaces: Towards a phenomenological understanding of library environments. *Library Quarterly, 92*(4), 419–436. https://doi.org/10.1086/720974

Kuhlthau, C. C. (2004). *Seeking meaning: A process approach to library and information services* (2nd ed.). Libraries Unlimited.

Lynn, M. R. (1986). Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nursing Research, 35*(6), 382–385. https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-198611000-00017

Marchionini, G. (2006). Exploratory search: From finding to understanding. *Communications of the ACM, 49*(4), 41–46. https://doi.org/10.1145/1121949.1121979

Massey, A. (2023). Information geographies and the sense of place in library landscapes. *Library Trends, 71*(3), 421–437. https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2023.0019

Mattern, S. (2017). A city is not a computer. *Places Journal*. https://doi.org/10.22269/170207

Nardi, B. A. (Ed.). (1996). *Context and consciousness: Activity theory and human-computer interaction*. MIT Press.

Pine, B. J., II, & Gilmore, J. H. (1999). *The experience economy: Work is theatre and every business a stage*. Harvard Business School Press.

Prescott, A., & Hughes, L. (2018). Why do we digitize? The case for slow digitization. *Archives and Records, 39*(1), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/23257962.2018.1446062

Rubio, D. M., Berg-Weger, M., Tebb, S. S., Lee, E. S., & Rauch, S. (2003). Objectifying content validity: Conducting a content validity study in social work research. *Social Work Research, 27*(2), 94–104. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/27.2.94

Savolainen, R. (1995). Everyday life information seeking: Approaching information seeking in the context of way of life. *Library & Information Science Research, 17*(3), 259–294. https://doi.org/10.1016/0740-8188(95)90048-9

Taylor, R. S. (1968). Question-negotiation and information seeking in libraries. *College & Research Libraries, 29*(3), 178–194. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_29_03_178

Tongtep, N., Binabdullah, K., & Siriphunwaraphon, C. (2026). Tailored experiences: Unraveling T–A–P dynamics in activity-driven tourism recommendations for special interest travelers. *Egyptian Informatics Journal, 33*, 100875. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eij.2025.100875

Trauer, B. (2006). Conceptualizing special interest tourism: Frameworks for analysis. *Tourism Management, 27*(2), 183–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.10.004

Wilson, T. D. (1981). On user studies and information needs. *Journal of Documentation, 37*(1), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb026702

Xu, Y., Tan, C.-W., & Yang, L. (2006). Who will you ask? An empirical study of interpersonal task allocation and communication choices in collaborative information seeking. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 57*(12), 1726–1737. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20453

Indonesian Journal of
Librarianship