

# A comparison of public disclosure in archives and libraries using *TransPa\_BA*

Ana R. Pacios; Sara Martínez-Cardama

**Nota:** Este artículo se puede leer en español en:  
<https://revista.profesionaldelainformacion.com/index.php/EPI/article/view/87026>

Recommended citation:

**Pacios, Ana R.; Martínez-Cardama, Sara (2023).** "A comparison of public disclosure in archives and libraries using *TransPa\_BA*". *Profesional de la información*, v. 32, n. 1, e320101.  
<https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2023.ene.01>

Manuscript received on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2022  
Accepted on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2022



**Ana R. Pacios** ✉  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2887-882X>  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
Departamento de Biblioteconomía y Documentación  
Madrid, 126-128  
28903 Getafe (Madrid), Spain  
[areyes@bib.uc3m.es](mailto:areyes@bib.uc3m.es)



**Sara Martínez-Cardama**  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7035-5884>  
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid  
Departamento de Biblioteconomía y Documentación  
Madrid, 126-128  
28903 Getafe (Madrid), Spain  
[smarti1@bib.uc3m.es](mailto:smarti1@bib.uc3m.es)

## Abstract

Transparency has drawn considerable international attention as an umbrella term covering issues relating to the struggle against corruption, the design of more open and participatory government and institutional, corporate, and social agent accountability. It is likewise associated with open data and guaranteed access to public information. However, transparency also has a second important dimension, viz. public disclosure, whereby institutions are required to furnish citizens with public information in their interest. Assessment of both dimensions of transparency poses problems and difficulties. The present article discusses the results of applying the *TransPa\_BA* tool to assess public disclosure in 202 archives and libraries (information units) under the aegis of different government bodies. This tool proposes a series of indicators to measure active disclosure by public libraries and archives in keeping with the provisions of Spanish Act 19/2013 of 9 December on Transparency, Access to Public Information and Good Governance. The indicators and their respective parameters (content, form, reusability, accessibility, dating and updating/validity) establish general outlines enabling these institutions to enhance their transparency by furnishing not only society in general, but also their stakeholders, with information regarding their activities and performance. Accessibility of active public disclosure-related documents was found to be wanting in all but university libraries. As a collective learning tool for information unit managers, *TransPa\_BA* can be used to monitor and gradually improve transparency in libraries and archives.

## Keywords

Active disclosure; Public disclosure; Methodologies; Evaluation; Transparency; Transparency assessment; Libraries; Archives; Web; *TransPa\_BA*.

## Funding

The research reported in this article was funded by the Spanish *Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities*, MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033/ under the project RTI2018-095187-B-I00, and by the *European Commission (ERDF)* 'A way to make Europe'.

## 1. Introduction

Conceptually speaking, transparency is multidimensional. Beyond its condition as a 'buzzword' commonly found in contemporary political strategy and discourse, in today's rhetoric the word has acquired quasi-ideological overtones (Han, 2015; Valdovinos, 2018). It tends to be conceived as a moral value in democratic societies and as a 'critical ingredient for efficient and well-functioning economic and political markets' (Cucciniello; Nasi; Valotti, 2012, p. 2451).



**Burke** (2016) tried to classify research on the definition of transparency under three main headings:

- the openness of governmental decision-making and procedures, known as open government (**Obama**, 2009; **Bannister**; **Connolly**, 2012);
- the implementation of practices and philosophies that guarantee the openness of information in the public interest such as the open data movement (**O'Hara**, 2012; **Mayernik**, 2017); and
- the use of such mechanisms in institutional accountability reports and to enhance the efficiency of resource use (**Leão-Lyrio**; **Lunkes**; **Taliani**, 2018).

**Kosack** and **Fung** (2014) identified a conceptual dichotomy in transparency:

- on the one hand, movements for the approval of laws that guarantee freedom of information (FOI) in connection with more general interests for the development of an informed citizenry; and
- on the other, trends that, practically speaking, are much broader than the concept 'citizens' right to know', which are aligned with specific results or the detection of interference and obstacles to implementation.

Active disclosure is one of the practical dimensions of transparency. It refers to information that must be openly accessible in institution's websites, obviating the need to lodge any specific request. In Spain *Act 19/2013 of 9 December on Transparency, access to public information and good governance* (hereafter *Ltapiigg*) (*España*, 2013), it is deemed an obligation to enhance and reinforce governmental and public body transparency. It consequently differs from freedom of information, which guarantees citizens' legal right to request such information.

For authors such as **Villeneuve** (2014, p. 557), active disclosure entails 'the pro-active, open and unobstructed communication of the concepts and tools set in place to promote or to achieve transparency, underscoring the inherent rights and obligations of administrations and citizens alike'. In his words, it is the 'transparency of transparency (ToT)'. It is an element less studied and assessed by researchers but indispensable to ensure that public institutions guarantee citizens efficacy and efficiency in the exercise of their duties.

One of the most prominent points stressed by **Villeneuve** (2014) is the conviction that neither transparency laws nor the tools developed in their wake need necessarily be transparent.

Transparency is conceived as the

'incremental flow of timely and reliable economic, social and political information accessible to all pertinent actors' (**Kauffman**; **Kraay**, 2002, as quoted in **Villoria**, 2014).

In the public sphere such information should enable those making or participating in or constituting the object of the respective decisions to assess the institutions providing it and form a rational, soundly supported opinion (**Villoria**, 2014, p. 87). Transparency so understood may fuel improvement in service quality and efficiency (**Cunill-Grau**, 2006, pp. 24, 27). Furthermore, transparent communication may encourage change or improvement.

One of the approaches of choice to attain greater transparency is the proactive disclosure of information and documents (**Villeneuve**, 2014). Providing such data voluntarily where not legally mandated implies a specific conviction and commitment on the part of the institution or organisation, attesting to its credibility. Such institutions would thus acknowledge stakeholders' right to be informed (**Fontrodona**; **Muller**, 2020, pp. 12-13). **Pasquier** and **Villeneuve** (2007) claim that such proactive attitudes may ensure transparency effectively and fairly inexpensively, favouring not only document dissemination but the process by which such materials are generated.

Websites have been put forward as the most effective dissemination tools for the exercise of active disclosure. The disclosure of public information through government websites has been frequently assessed since the turn of the century (**Holzer**; **Kim**, 2005; **Armstrong**, 2011; **Tavares**; **Da-Cruz**, 2020; **Pina**; **Torres**; **Royo**, 2007).

The object of such research has often been governmental institutions and local, regional or national public administrations. Active disclosure by libraries and archives, however, the object of the present study, has seldom been evaluated. Academic and professional literature normally stresses their role in 'facilitating transparency' rather than as institutions responsible for disseminating institutional, organisational, planning, legal, economic, budgetary and statistical information of their own, as mandated in Sections 5, 6 and 7 of the *Ltapiigg*, to which bodies with a specific legal personality are subject.

Ordinarily, the emphasis is on such entities' role in enhancing the accessibility of the information actively disclosed by the institutions to which they render their services, particularly in the case of archives (**Rizkyantha**, 2017). That view is defended by **De-Andrés-Díaz** (2018), who contended the existence of a relationship between archives and the attainment of the transparency incumbent upon public administrations as a mechanism to empower the citizenry. In a nutshell, the literature normally deems archives as guarantors of institutional transparency (**Capellades-Riera**, 2019; **Aguilera-Murguía**, 2019). The heading to the entry on the *Andalusian Government's Regional Ministry of Culture and Historic Heritage* website, composed by **Melero** (2013), alludes clearly to that particular:

'What is transparency? Without archives, transparency is demagoguery'.

Libraries and archives, institutions benefitting from public funding, provide public services of utmost importance. That public status and national interest are endorsed by Spain's 1978 *Constitution* (section 149.1.28) and 1985 *Act on Spanish historic heritage*. They must consequently abide by the *Ltapigg* in terms of the transparent reporting of their activity.

Libraries and archives seldom group this information under a single link or page containing all active disclosure-related documents

Active disclosure by libraries and archives in the form of information on their websites has been linked to accountability and improved efficiency. That relationship has been discussed by **Sturges** and **Crnogorac** (2012), **Burke** (2016) and **Pacios** (2016), the latter two of which also propose assessment indicators for public and university libraries, respectively. The same type of documents, such as annual reports, plans and budgets, may be associated with different transparency indicators.

Today's digital technologies make it perfectly viable for libraries and archives to upload information stored on physical media to their websites in accessible and reusable formats. That practice provides stakeholders with information and enables them to generate their own products, put forward supplementary proposals and furnish other data. The information involved may be accessible from a number of pathways on the institution's own website (preferably on a page devoted to transparency) or on others: the statistics provided by the Spanish *Ministry of Culture* on national public libraries would be one example of the latter.

## 2. Transparency assessment methodologies

Although transparency discourse has been adopted as one of the values inspiring public administration and governance today (**Piotrowski**, 2010), research has failed to produce tools able to adequately assess success and compare implementation of the concept. On the whole the instruments forthcoming are imprecise and scantily aligned with the perspective of stakeholders or interested citizens (**Da-Cruz et al.**, 2015; **Bertot et al.**, 2010). Some authors have deemed such assessment to be vague and based on experts' subjective data (**Hollyer; Rosendorff; Vreeland**, 2014).

**Williams** (2014) contended that in transnational studies transparency assessment methodologies have been obstructed by a lack of consensus on the meaning of the concept and the issues arising around the choice of indicators. To date, the initial stage in transparency assessment has consisted in reviewing the laws guaranteeing its implementation (known as *Freedom of information laws* or *Foils*) and other types of democratic institutions, normally supplemented with the analysis of economic data. That endeavour led to the development of the most widely known transparency assessment indices, such as Transparency International's CPI (corruption perception index), multi-dimensional measurements that merge a number of data sources with expert assessments. Nonetheless, no single indicator devoid of subjective elements such as 'perception' and able to exhaustively measure corruption or transparency has yet been forthcoming. Authors such as **Meijer, Hart** and **Worthy** (2018) reinforced that broadly accepted view of assessment by disregarding univocal assessment tools in favour of more complex interpretational approaches adapted to a number of political contexts. The complexity of assessing compliance with transparency standards was identified by **Michener, Coelho** and **Michener** (2021) in their analysis of 265 transparency audits performed over 15 years in Latin American countries. They observed compliance with so-called 'active' transparency, i.e., website-based disclosure, to be higher than with the response to citizens' direct requests for transparency. Another element that hinders the adoption of uniform assessment methodologies is the communicational dimension of transparency itself, understood as the measure of particulars such as encouraging greater trust or participation (**Auger**, 2014). Added to that is a third type of parameters found in the literature (so-called critical transparency studies) such as the veracity or plurality of the information provided, whose heavily subjective component entails an exhaustive review of new perspectives on transparency as a socio-cultural entity (**Alloa; Thomä**, 2018).

Bearing such nuances in mind, in her assessment **Auger** (2014) identified two types of transparency: organisational and communicational, the measurement of some of whose elements would require target audience participation or valuation of trust in institutions. That notwithstanding, the author defined the communicational sphere to include the perspective of transparency directly related to active disclosure as addressed in this article: the provision of full and relevant information.

Active disclosure is essential to assessing how institutions represent their transparency. In 2006, **Islam** contended that a relationship can be found between enhanced disclosure of information and improved governance. Although it may be simpler to assess active disclosure (thanks to the larger amounts of quantitative information available) than other forms of transparency, that exercise entails significant dilemmas. **Michener, Coelho** and **Michener** (2021) found the definition of indicators based on binary measurements (absence or presence of a certain type of information, for instance) or the use of scaled scoring for certain parameters to be controversial.

Such problems in assessing transparency have been observed to be common in all the regions analysed, Spain among them. Assessment proposals in place for Spain are also based on common indicators that weigh the information published, normally on institutional websites.

The proposals in that regard that began to appear in Spain in 2008, i.e., prior to the enactment of the 2013 *Ltapiigg*, tended to replicate the indices set out by *Transparency International Spain* (Ros-Medina, 2018, p. 47). *Compromiso y Transparencia*, today *Fundación Haz*, published the first report on the transparency of Spanish foundations in 2009. In 2016 the *Council for Transparency and Good Governance* and the *State Agency on Assessment of Public Policy and Service Quality* (Spanish acronym *Aeval*) developed the *Metodología de evaluación y seguimiento de la transparencia en la actividad pública* (*Methodology for assessing and monitoring transparency in public action*, abbreviated as *Mesta*), the Spanish State's first official methodology focusing on compliance with the active transparency obligations set out in the *Ltapiigg* (Aeval, 2016). Its improvement on prior assessment systems lay in the introduction of variables assessed in terms of the information published. The results of its application to the foremost State bodies were made public in 2017 (Arizmendi-Gutiérrez, 2017). Further to the regional legislation on transparency and the experience acquired in applying *Mesta*, the method was modified and adapted, leading to versions such as the *Metodología del índice de transparencia de Canarias* (*Canary Islands transparency index method*, *ITCanarias*) developed by the regional *Commission on Transparency and Access to Public Information*. Despite the limitations in and room for improving on this methodology and the scant number of times it has been applied, Ros-Medina (2020) acknowledged it to constitute a useful improvement and hold ample potential for evolution and growth.

“The relationship between transparency and quality attests to the huge impact that transparency and accountability have on today's model for the provision of public services and to the conviction that ‘quality’ is incomprehensible if not governed by the principle of transparency”

Other methods have been forthcoming in the form of civil society audits of governmental transparency with a view to social utility. One example is to be found in *Infoparticipa*, which deploys ‘information and communication quality criteria that would enable governments to constitute sources of transparent information favouring citizen participation’ (Molina-Rodríguez-Navas; Simelio-Solà; Corcoy-Rius, 2017, p. 825). The results of the respective assessments can be gleaned from the *Infoparticipa* map, which also enables anyone interested in participating in the process to contact the method's managers to express their opinion.

*TransPa\_BA*, a tool geared to libraries and archives, was created in an effort to broaden and improve on the assessment of active disclosure by public cultural institutions.

[https://www.uc3m.es/investigacion/en/transpa\\_ba/herramienta](https://www.uc3m.es/investigacion/en/transpa_ba/herramienta)

It is designed to enable managers to progressively and voluntarily self-diagnose performance in that regard (Pacios; Vianello; De-la-Mano, 2020). It includes a bank of transparency-related information indicators drawn from *Mesta* whose number varies depending on the type of information unit: 20 for public libraries, 21 for university libraries and 22 for archives (Table 1). The indicators are grouped under eight headings: 1. Purpose of the service and objectives pursued; 2. Governing bodies and operating regulations; 3. Service offering; 4. Documents / collections; 5. Staff; 6. Results; 7. Financial information; and 8. Collaboration/cooperation. Area 4 is the only one in which the indicators vary depending on type of information unit. Its single common item is the review of the document/collection management policy or programme. The indicators defined under all the other areas are the same for libraries and archives.

Seeking to avoid absolute binary values (yes/no, published/not published), *TransPa\_BA* envisages a series of parameters with which to judge information transparency, including: content, form, reusability, accessibility, dating and updating/validity (Pacios; Vianello; De-la-Mano, 2020). The inference is that the characteristics of the information and compliance therewith are nearly as important as the information itself. With a view to suitably defining each indicator, including qualitative assessment based on the perception of transparency, the tool's developers asked Spanish library and archive managers to assess each as well as the respective areas (Pacios; Núñez; Ramos-Simón, 2021). The outcome was a more personalised tool adapted to the viewpoints of the professionals that head the services to be assessed, from which de-contextualised items indicative of formal assessment only were removed.

Four versions of *TransPa\_BA* were established, one per type of institution or service: public libraries, historic archives, university libraries and university archives. The intention was to adapt the method to the features of the transparency demanded of each information unit. Active disclosure indicators and parameters are scored on a 100-point scale that provides the information unit seeking to improve its performance with a general idea of its present status. Application of the approach to different types of archives and libraries has led to the identification of their strong and weak points, as well as areas for improvement to be borne in mind to raise their scores (Pacios; Martínez-Cardama; Moro-Cabero, 2021; Pacios; García-López; Morales-García, 2021; Pacios; Pérez-Pulido; Vianello, 2022 and Pacios *et al.*, 2022).

The design of *TransPa\_BA* and in particular the choice of the informational parameters to be used ruled out any that could entail subjectivity, such as the clarity/understandability of the language describing active disclosure (Pacios; Vianello; De-la-Mano, 2020). Objective assessment of clarity was deemed to have to require input from the information targets (library and archive users rather than the managers of such institutions or tool users who may have participated in drafting the respective items). Account was also taken of Parodi's (2011) contention that the understandability of written texts is a multi-dimensional macroprocess where different types of information, relationships, processes and



subprocesses converge, while also involving other significant elements such as certain kinds of explicit or implicit information or each individual's needs in connection with context-mandated demands. The combined effect of such particulars is that the assessment of written text clarity/understandability calls for specific tools as well as mindfulness of the profiles of the citizens for which the content is intended. It is consequently a parameter whose assessment necessitates specific treatment outside the scope of the present study but which will be broached in future. The automatic analysis of text clarity using natural language processing and machine learning techniques is an alternative that cannot be ruled out.

“Differences and similarities in the presence/absence of some of the indicators are closely related to how statistical information is sourced”

This paper compares the results of compliance with active disclosure requirements by 202 national public libraries, provincial historic archives and university libraries and archives. The three research questions addressed were as follows.

RQ1. Does the *TransPa\_BA* assessment tool identify active disclosure likenesses and differences between libraries and archives?

RQ2. Where can under-compliance with active disclosure standards be identified and which areas should libraries and archives focus on?

RQ3. Is *TransPa\_BA* a valid tool and can it be reused by the professional community to enhance active disclosure?

### 3. Methodology

The comparison of active disclosure discussed hereunder drew from the results of applying *TransPa\_BA* to a population of 202 information units, broken down as follows:

- 53 historic archives (AH)
- 53 state public libraries (BPE)
- 50 university libraries (BU)
- 46 university archives (AU).

Their respective websites were reviewed to identify and assess active disclosure-related information at different times in 2020 and 2021: (BPE, December 2019 to February 2020; AH, February and March 2021; BU, May and June 2021; AU, September and October 2021).

The information gathered was uploaded into the tool in the form of an Excel spreadsheet with the informational obligations defining active disclosure (as indicators) as drawn from *Ltapiigg* Chapter II, sections 6, 7, and 8. It was supplemented with instructions on how to appraise the six parameters defining the informational parameters (content, form, reusability, accessibility, dating and updating/validity) deemed to merit consideration.

The scores for each ranged from 0 to 10 with two exceptions, dating and updating/validity, where the scale ran from 0 to 5. The highest score for a given indicator was consequently 50 points. Location, meaning the place on the site where the information was found and on which its visibility largely depended, was also assessed. Ten points were awarded when the library's or archive's website contained a section or page specifically devoted to transparency.

The parameters scored under each indicator were assessed on the grounds explained below.

**Content.** This parameter constitutes the 'document', understood as defined in *Act 18/2015 of 9 July on the reuse of public sector information (España, 2015)* as 'all information regardless of medium (physical or digital) and format (graphic, audio or video)', and therefore includes the most finely itemised or "rawest" data'. Just two scores were awarded, i.e., the absence (0) or presence (10) of the parameter.

**Form.** This parameter appraises how information is accessed. It was deemed 'direct' when the content was found on the home page or through a link carrying users to the content itself: for instance, references to annual reports or strategic plans that included the link to the specific document with no further searching needed. It was deemed 'indirect' when the link directed users to another website bearing the information, which then had to be actively searched to find the text at issue.

**Reusability.** Given the variety of opinions and around weighting criteria for open data put forward since the **Berners-Lee** (2006) proposal, just two scores (0 or 10) rather than a more detailed breakdown are envisaged in this parameter. Consequently, a score of 10 was awarded for structured formats (xls, csv, xml), i.e., those requiring no extra techniques or effort for document reuse, and 0 for all others.

**Accessibility.** This parameter measures the number of clicks required to reach information on the indicator. The values awarded ranged from 10 (for three or fewer) to 0 (for more than 12) and proportionally in between.

**Dating.** This parameter addresses the need for any information or document published to be duly dated to enable users to determine the time lapsing since it was generated. Where a date was provided the score awarded was 5 and 0 otherwise.

**Updating/validity.** The year 2019 is defined as the expiration date. It was not applied to all the available information, however, for some of indicators proposed, such as user charters or strategic plans, need not be updated yearly. In such cases assessment was based on the currency of the information, i.e., whether it was valid on the date the site was visited. The same criterion was applied to all information units: where the respective document was updated in 2019 or later, the indicator scored 5 and 0 otherwise.

After all the indices had been obtained for each library or archive, the outcomes were compared to identify best practice as well as any missing indicators to establish future areas for improvement.

## 4. Results and discussion

The results of *TransPa\_BA* assessment of the information and best practice for active disclosure identified are discussed below parameter by parameter. The scores awarded to each archive and library analysed are available in the results section on:

[https://www.uc3m.es/research/transpa\\_ba](https://www.uc3m.es/research/transpa_ba)

### 4.1. Location

Libraries and archives seldom group this information under a single link or page containing all active disclosure-related documents. In this study only one institution was found to do so, although two others published other indicator-related information on their transparency sites.

The *University of Zaragoza* library, the sole unit that provided a specific site containing all the pertinent information, epitomised best practice (Figure 1). In the interim between the review and its write-up, however, transparency portals were uploaded by *University of Seville (US)* and *Complutense University of Madrid (UCM)*, an indication of the beneficial effect of studies such as this and their contribution to improving institutional transparency.

In the past some libraries had a single page listing a number of transparency indicators such as strategic plans, annual reports and similar (Rey-Martín *et al.*, 2020, p. 5). Other examples of interest were also identified, such as the *Guadalajara Public Library* (Figure 2). Information accessibility was observed to be less than ideal, however, for users must open the 'Standards of use' section to find the place that links to the *Ministry of Culture's* page where the library's statistics are listed. This same issue was consistently observed in many other information units.

Of all the archives analysed, the *University of Almería's* was found to be the most compliant in this regard. Its site contains a page titled 'Transparency and quality' with documents such as user charters, monitoring reports and satisfaction surveys, all of which help measure the quality of its service.

The relationship between transparency and quality attests to the huge impact that transparency and accountability have on today's model for the provision of public services (Joshi, 2013) and to the conviction that 'quality' is incomprehensible if not governed by the principle of transparency. Assignment of the respective competencies to the same area, department or service in different institutions (a circumstance observed in the *Regional Governments of Madrid, Andalusia and Extremadura*, the *Complutense University of Madrid* and the *University of Almería*, to name a few) stands as evidence of that interconnection. A similar situation can be observed in the case of certain types of management documents such as 'user charters' (e.g., the *Spanish Senate services charter*).

### 4.2. Content

This parameter evaluated the existence or otherwise of the indicator itself on the archive's or library's website. Judging by absolute number of indicators, university libraries, with 604 documents or information items, were by far the units most firmly committed to transparency. That is particularly significant in the case of university libraries, for as services under the aegis of each institution they would not initially be required by law to make this information publicly accessible. Rather, pursuant to section 2 of the *Act*, responsibility for website-based disclosure would be incumbent upon the parent university. The inference is that transparency should constitute a proactive attitude contributing both to public service management and the community it serves.

Public libraries totalled a much smaller number of items, 285, university archives 259 and historic archives 229. Table 1 lists the percentage of documents or information items per indicator found on the four types of information units' websites.



Figure 1. *University of Zaragoza* transparency portal.  
<https://biblioteca.unizar.es/conocenos/transparencia>

Biblioteca Pública del Estado en Guadalajara  
BPE Guadalajara

Localización y horarios

Red de sedes web biblioteca pública

Conócenos ▾ Servicios digitales ▾ Agenda cultural ▾ Recomendaciones ▾ Infantil ▾

Buscar en: Catálogo

Home / Conócenos / Normas de uso

Soy tu Biblioteca

¿Qué hacemos?

Servicios

Nuestras colecciones

Sección Local de Guadalajara

Nuestra historia

Nuestro palacio

## Normas de uso y funcionamiento

La Biblioteca Pública es, ante todo, un espacio de convivencia abierto a todos los ciudadanos; un **servicio público y gratuito** del que tanto el personal que lo presta como los usuarios que lo disfrutan deben responsabilizarse como parte de la comunidad en la que se asienta.

Al usar las instalaciones, recursos y documentos que la biblioteca pone a tu disposición, te comprometes a respetarlos, a velar por su integridad física y a manejarlos con corrección, solicitando la asistencia del personal de la biblioteca cuando así lo necesitas.

**Civismo y respeto** son comportamientos exigibles a cualquier visitante que haga uso de las instalaciones y de los servicios de la biblioteca. La conducta

**Transparencia**  
Conoce el volumen de nuestros fondos, préstamos y actividades, así como los recursos humanos y materiales de la biblioteca a través de los datos estadísticos recopilados por el [Ministerio de](#)

Figure 2. Public Library of Guadalajara transparency section on the page specifying its standards of use. <https://www.bibliotecaspublicas.es/guadalajara/conocenos/normas-de-uso.html>

Table 1. Percentage of documents or information items associated with active disclosure indicators located in each type of information unit (AHP = provincial historic archives, BPE = state public libraries; AU = university archives; BU = university libraries; NA = not applicable).

INDICATORS	AHP (n=53) %	BPE (n=53) %	AU (n=46) %	BU (n=50) %
1.1. Definition of mission	43.40	73.58	50.00	92.00
1.2. Strategic plan	0.00	7.55	6.52	48.00
2.1. Identity of library's management board members	0.00	0.00	17.39	22.00
2.2. Regulations	1.89	41.51	60.87	90.00
2.3. Specific regulations on service provision	37.74	94.34	67.39	92.00
2.4. Code of ethics, values or good practice	1.89	13.21	19.57	54.00
3.1. User charter	35.85	39.62	36.96	80.00
4.1. Collection/documents management policy or programme	7.55	0.00	19.57	26.00
4.2. Document classification chart (only Archives)	92.45	NA	65.22	NA
4.2. Institutional open access policy (only University libraries)	NA	NA	NA	58.00
4.3. Conservation calendar (only Archives)	16.98	NA	34.78	NA
5.1. Organisational chart	1.89	0.00	10.87	46.00
5.2. Staff directory	18.87	56.60	71.74	86.00
6.1. Management indicators (scoreboard)	11.32	3.77	4.35	50.00
6.2. User satisfaction surveys	9.43	5.66	2.17	56.00
6.3. Annual report or report of activities	20.75	7.55	21.74	70.00
6.4. Distinctions, prizes, certifications	0.00	1.89	10.87	46.00
6.5. Statistics	64.15	54.72	19.57	78.00
7.1. Budget implemented	1.89	41.51	4.35	64.00
7.2. Tenders, contracts and bidding	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
7.3. Subsidies and assistance awarded	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.00
8.1. Partnering networks, task forces, commissions	66.04	96.23	36.96	92.00
8.2. Agreements	0.00	0.00	2.17	42.00
Average	19.64	26.89	25.59	57.52

A number of likenesses among the units were identified in connection with the eight areas envisaged, weighted by the number of indicators in each area. Area 8 (Collaboration and cooperation), for instance, was the one most often mentioned by both historic archives and national public libraries (under item 8.1, the indicator informing about the networks and

working groups with which they partner, data commonly provided as well by university libraries). One typical example can be found in the public libraries in Andalusia, which describe such partnering under the title 'Cooperation'. Area 7 (Economic information), in turn, was the one with the scantiest information in all the units assessed, even though university libraries repeatedly referred to the budget, particularly in their annual reports. The low score was due to the paucity of information furnished on tendering and subsidies. Tendering would not normally be specified on university libraries' and archives' but on the contracting party's, i.e., the parent institutions', websites. That notwithstanding, furnishing such data on each individual unit's site would prove useful to other information professionals organising a similar tender for goods or services. Awardee identity would also be helpful as guidance in similar processes.

Disclosure of documents would provide citizens with specifics on the actual operation of these entities, the success or otherwise of their activities, the measures adopted and service provision efficacy and efficiency

The indicators most frequently found in each type of unit are shown in red in Table 1: the purpose of the service and its objectives (mission), its governing bodies and operating regulations (service rules and regulations), document and collection management (classification chart in archives), staff (directory), results (statistics) and partnering networks and working groups.

Such differences and similarities in the presence/absence of some of the indicators are closely related to how statistical information is sourced. Spanish national public and public university libraries are in possession of statistics that track their development and operation and provide citizens with detailed information on those items. The *Ministry of Culture and Sport's* portal includes a publicly accessible page titled '*Panorámica*' (overview) that contains all manner of statistics on the 53 national public libraries. Many libraries carry links to that page on their own sites. A similarly openly accessible page on the *Red de Bibliotecas Universitarias (Rebiun)* portal provides statistics on public university libraries.

Although under the aegis of the same *Ministry of Culture*, provincial historic archives differ from libraries in that the information is not broken down pursuant to the same criteria. Rather where such data exist, they must be sought region-by-region. The information furnished on the *Ministry's* site under the title '*Estadística de archivos*' (archive statistics) is confined to its annual reports, the latest published referring to target year 2016. The data provided on deposits, documentary collections, services, activities and staff are pooled for all state archives and those run by the *Ministry of Defence*. That notable weak point in the statistics reported by historic archives was also identified in an earlier study (Pérez-Santana, 2018).

University archives, affiliated with the *Spanish University Archivist Conference* (Spanish acronym, *ACU*), a section of the *Conference of Spanish Vice-Chancellors (CRUE)*, are similarly wanting in this respect, with no database comparable to *Rebiun's* for university libraries.

In line with the preceding but with no intention of generalising, a series of indicators where the units analysed should improve more intensely are identified below.

The provincial historic archives, characterised by a paucity of indicators, are the information units in greatest need of improvement. They scored zero in six indicators (i.e., all except the classification chart, participation in networks and statistics), even in one as essential as the strategic plan. The next lowest score was observed for university archives. Issues were encountered for these units around visibility, denomination and institutional aegis, as signified earlier by Pacios, Torreiro-Rodríguez and Moro-Cabero (2019). Nonetheless, merit is due to other particulars such as the inclusion of directories or service rules and regulations as well as classification charts.

National public libraries earned the minimum score in five items, which surprisingly included the disclosure of information on collection management programmes. Whilst all items were found on university library websites taken as a whole, indicators such as contracts, subsidies and collection management policy or programmes were less generally present. That notwithstanding, budgetary data were accessible in the form of a link to the *Rebiun* statistics page.

As a general comment, information units would do well to devote greater effort to active disclosure on their sites through key elements for service management, transparency and assessment such as: plans, regulations, annual reports, statistics and satisfaction surveys. Disclosure of such documents would provide citizens with specifics on the actual operation of these entities, the success or otherwise of their activities, the measures adopted and service provision efficacy and efficiency.

### 4.3. Form

Based on the items covered by this parameter, namely the position of information and how it is reached, direct prevailed over indirect access in all four types of information units analysed. Units were deemed to provide indirect access when one indicator was found within another rather than in a section of its own: for instance, where their mission was set out in a user charter or strategic plan, or their budget in an annual report.

Historic archives were the information units with the largest share of documents whose access called for additional searching on their sites, pages or documents (43.23%). The next highest percentage of indirectly accessible indicators was found for public libraries (35.78%), followed by university libraries (27.81%) and university archives (16.6%).





Figure 3. *Ávila Public Library* website with the (barely visible) 'B' icon at the upper right, from which statistics on libraries in Castilla y León can be accessed.

<https://bibliotecas.jcyl.es/web/es/bibliotecaavila/biblioteca-publica-avila.html>

#### 4.4. Reusability

This parameter flagged a weak point in all the units analysed and a future line of work to be undertaken in connection with active disclosure. Analysis revealed that information reusability is not envisaged. This failing was observed earlier (**Ramos-Simón; Pacios, 2021**) with respect to national public university sites as well as the portals set up by provincial historic archives, which are under the aegis of the *Ministry of Culture*. That circumstance was observed despite the stipulation in *Ltapigg* chapter II, section 5.4, to the effect that 'the information subject to transparency obligations shall be published on the respective electronic portals or websites in a manner that is clear, structured and understandable for those concerned, and preferably in reusable formats'.

The formats of choice on the websites of the information units analysed were PDF and HTML. Their non-reusability is an indication of an unenthusiastic or non-existent pursuit of transparency. According to **Camacho (2016)**,

'PDF is to transparency as stipple paint is to painting',

meaning that it is less than ideal given how difficult it is to edit, particularly in the open-access version of the application. The author suggested supplementing PDF documents with analogous files in reusable formats such as XML, CSV, XLS or DOC. Albeit exceptionally, some libraries and archives do envisage the reuse of the information published. That is normally contingent upon the existence of a link on the unit's site to another containing statistics such as *Rebiun's* or a regional department of culture's from which specific data on a library or archive can be downloaded in formats such as XLS or CSV. One example is to be found in the statistics furnished by the historic archives in Castilla y León, which can be downloaded in such formats from the '*Actividades y recursos*' (activities and resources) tab on the banner at the top of their sites, which affords access to another denominated '*Datos abiertos de archivos*' (archives' open data). Similarly, a link on most of the Andalusian historic archives' websites, '*El archivo en cifras*' (archive facts and figures) carries users to a page containing the statistics on archives posted by the *Regional Department of Culture and Heritage* in XLS format. Such information may at times be scantily visible and equivocally located. A case in point is the 'B' icon used by public libraries in the Castilla y León region (Figure 3) which provides access to a link titled '*Datos estadísticos*' (statistical data). The page then opened contains a link to another with a link to the regional statistics yearbook that carries data on libraries, archives and museums in XLS format. The pathway to such information from each library's website is notoriously convoluted, although in a context of such narrow reusability of institutional information, the efforts of certain regional cultural bodies to enhance transparency and reusability should not be undervalued.

Several university libraries, such as *University Carlos III de Madrid (UC3M)*, *University Pablo de Olvide (UPO)* and *University of Cádiz (UCA)*, also use this system to furnish access to their statistics in reusable formats through links to the respective *Rebiun* page. The *University of Valladolid (UVA)* library data can be downloaded in CSV from a similar page on the *Rebiun* site, while the *Complutense University of Madrid (UCM)* library also provides data and indicators in reusable formats.

Similarly, the libraries under the aegis of *University of Jaén (UJaen)* and *Polytechnical University of Catalonia (UPC)* publish some indicators in reusable formats, including satisfaction surveys, classification charts and the conservation timetable.

#### 4.5. Accessibility

This parameter scored highly in all the indicators located, for most of the information was accessible within three clicks. Such good results down to the large percentage of documents meeting that criterion in all types of information units: university archives (98.47%), provincial historic archives (96.07%), national public libraries (92.98%) and university libraries (74.66%). Nonetheless, a few university library documents were found to require six and even up to nine clicks (107, nine; 33, eight; 4, seven; and 4, six) to reach the information sought. In most cases the data involved were located in repositories such as annual reports. Failure to group all the information in the same place, such as a transparency page, detracted from accessibility, as it translated into a larger number of steps needed to find documents.

“ The formats of choice on the websites of the information units analysed were PDF and HTML. Their non-reusability is an indication of an unenthusiastic or non-existent pursuit of transparency ”

#### 4.6. Dating

This is an essential element, for all documents and information available should be dated to enable users to know when they were formulated. It should constitute standard practice, particularly among professionals engaging in information management. University libraries were observed to be the units to most consistently comply with that criterion, with 84.6% of the items bearing a date. At the opposite end of the scale, public libraries were the ones with the highest percentage of undated documents (55.09%). Among the archives, they are the university ones with the highest number of dated documents (61.78%), while the historic ones have just over half (53.28%).

#### 4.7. Updating/Validity

The expiration date established under this parameter was 2019, although obviously the validity of certain documents such as strategic plans and user charters was determined on the grounds of the implementation dates and legal stipulations, respectively. On a number of occasions the institution itself specified when a given document was to be reviewed and updated. On the whole the findings attested to the lack of importance accorded this parameter. That not all documents need be updated yearly was borne in mind when assessing items such as regulations generated in the target or subsequent years, for instance.

With 52.48% of their items current, especially their statistics and annual reports, university libraries were found to be most attentive to dates. University archives ranked second, with 25.87%, and historic archives (24.45%). Very low percentages were observed for public libraries (20%), i.e., only 57 of 285 of the BPE documents were up-to-date, denoting considerable room for improvement in this regard.

#### 4.8. Active disclosure index

*TransPa\_BA* also delivers an overall score for active disclosure based on a 100-point scale. Its application to the four types of information units studied identified the best performers in this regard, i.e., the ones with the highest scores. The respective values also denoted differences in connection with the presence or otherwise of active disclosure-related indicators on their websites. The three institutions scoring highest under each category of information unit are listed in Table 2.

The *TransPa\_BA* tool computed a global active disclosure index for each library or archive. The respective scores for the parameters under each indicator were summed to establish definitive transparency indices for the 53 provincial historic archives (Pacios; García-López; Morales-García, 2021), 53 national public libraries (Pacios; García-López; Morales-García, 2021), 46 historic archives (Pacios; Martínez-Cardama; Moro-Cabero, 2021), and 50 university libraries (Pacios; Pérez-Pulido; Vianello, 2022).

The highest active disclosure index values are given in Table 2. They were earned by university libraries (*University of Zaragoza - Unizar* with 68.97 points and 20 indicators), followed by a national public library (*Toledo* with 47.82 points and 13 indicators), university archives (*Unizar* with 45.88 points and 14 indicators) and a historic archive (*Murcia* with 31.19 points and nine indicators). Generally speaking, with the exception of university libraries, the indices (over a total possible of 100) were low, particularly for archives, where some parameters such as reusability, dating and updating/validity were awarded scores of 0. Although as a rule a larger number of indicators was associated with a higher transparency index, in this study different active disclosure indices were found for a given number of indicators, inasmuch as the appraisal entailed assessing not only the indicator but its respective parameters. An example of that circumstance can be seen in the *Almería* and *Granada* historic archives, both of which had seven indicators but different active disclosure indices (Table 2).

The higher transparency indices obtained by university libraries may be associated with greater budgetary decision-making and management independence, which favours more direct accountability and greater transparency. The findings also showed, however, that active disclosure is an attitude that influences the decision to make information accessible. That was observed in pages pertaining to archives and libraries managed by the same regional authority which therefore used the same structure or template but nonetheless posted substantially different information whose validity also varied (such as in *Andalusian Provincial Historic Archives*).

Table 2. Highest active disclosure indices (IPA) in Spanish libraries and archives

	IPA	No. of indicators
<b>University libraries (BU)</b>		
<i>U. of Zaragoza</i>	68.97	20
<i>U. of Barcelona</i>	66.40	19
<i>U. of Sevilla</i>	64.69	17
<b>State public libraries (BPE)</b>		
<i>Toledo</i>	47.82	13
<i>Valladolid</i>	31.49	9
<i>Cáceres</i>	31.22	8
<b>University archives (AU)</b>		
<i>U. of Zaragoza</i>	45.88	14
<i>U. of Navarra</i>	43.28	13
<i>U. of Valladolid</i>	42.74	10
<b>Provincial historic archives (AHP)</b>		
<i>Murcia</i>	31.19	9
<i>Almería</i>	27.09	7
<i>Granada</i>	26.76	7

Further to the present findings, good practice need not necessarily be equated to the most commonly repeated indicators, for other exceptional or unique examples were identified that merit mention.

In the institutions analysed, overall best practice was observed in university libraries. They were by far the institutions most finely attuned to an active disclosure culture. Their websites contain documents and information such as user charters, strategic plans and annual reports, all of great interest to stakeholders seeking data on institutions' commitments, future plans and results. The consistency in publishing annual reports year after year is indicative of an ingrained habit (Pacios; Serna, 2019). Reporting comprehensive information on staff also denotes interest in favouring communication with users. Mention is likewise in order here of exceptional and unique findings, such as the very thorough scorecards on the *University of Jaén (Ujaen)*, *University of Zaragoza (Unizar)*, and *Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF)* websites or links to university contracting portals, such as provided by the *University of Zaragoza* library.

The above findings answer two of the research questions (RQ) posed.

The *TransPa\_BA* tool proved able to detect bias in the active disclosure practised by the documentary institutions analysed (RQ1). It also revealed likenesses and differences between the two main types of institutions analysed: libraries and archives, with the former observed to be more active. The public disclosure indices found were low, however, due both to the absence of certain indicators and the failure to address specific parameters such as dating or reusability. With some exceptions among university libraries in particular, poor content organisation on the websites of the institutions analysed proved to be an obstacle to transparency assessment, for the respective information was not set out on a single page or section but masked in or scattered over several.

The study likewise revealed differences in terms of the type of content furnished depending on the type of cultural institution. Archives, for instance, frequently use documents such as the classification chart to describe how their collections are organised. That differs from library practice, geared more toward service features, with a focus on operating rules and regulations. University archives also handle the latter otherwise, further supporting the deterministic nature of institutional aegis and immersion in transparency culture. In that regard, the institutions under the aegis of universities perform notoriously better than those affiliated with the *Ministry of Culture and Sport*. University archives are nonetheless urged to emulate the good transparency practice that university libraries began to apply even prior to enactment of transparency legislation (Pacios, 2003).

Likenesses among all four types of institutions analysed were also observed, such as the definition of their respective missions (area 1). Other items also, although somewhat less, frequently covered in all the institutions analysed included service operating rules, participation in networks and working groups and statistics.

The analysis of these likenesses detected shortfalls in active disclosure, thereby responding to RQ2. Research conducted to date has led to the identification of a pool of basic indicators drawn from the *Ltapigg*, chapter II, that can be recommended to substantially improve active disclosure and that should be borne in mind by archives and libraries newly committing to transparency. They essentially describe past, present and future institutional management, giving the citizenry an account of their operation in the form of the following documents.

- Operating rules, imperative for citizens to know how to proceed to access the services offered.
- Directory and organisational chart, identifying management and staff. Both constitute publicity for the information professionals involved. -Libraries and archives should provide contact details for the professionals in their employ, while their organisational charts should depict their overall structure and departmental or unit inter-relationships. Although the paucity of professionals in archives might be thought to favour dispensing with this element, good practice was observed in some units, such as in *Madrid's Historic Protocol Archive*.
- Strategic plan, essential for citizens seeking information on an institution's priorities and lines of action. It should cover mission, values and objectives to be reached in a specific timeframe, but was observed to constitute standard practice in university library websites only. The respective information should also address plan compliance with its objectives as measured by the indicators defined.
- Annual reports, another management and accountability document essential to a description of the information unit's activities in the target year. Such reports should carry details of all the institution's activities and respective statistics. They contribute to transparency substantially, as they describe the institution's performance in the target year, highlighting its projects and describing its routine operation through statistics, budgetary data and similar.
- Agreements concluded, specifying contracting parties, purpose, term and obligations contracted.
- Subsidies and aid, specifying amount, purpose and beneficiaries.
- User charters, a key document that sets out institutional commitments, quality standards and measurement indicators. As such information should be up-to-date, the general recommendation is to address parameters such as dating and updating/validity. Although no mention whatsoever is made of these factors in the *Ltapigg*, they indisputably form an integral part of public service compliance and quality measurement and are consequently associated with plans, programmes and their assessment. Hence their inclusion in Spanish governmental transparency portals.

On the whole, budgetary and financial information is underreported by all four types of institutions (with the exception of university libraries concerning budgets) and missing altogether in archives, as noted in earlier studies (Pacios; Martínez-Cardama, 2021). Disclosure of such information is recommended for it provides a measure of effective budgetary management and provides for inter-institutional comparison. A further indicator to be borne in mind is tendering, useful to determine prices and compare the efficiency of unit management.

“ All documents and information available should be dated to enable users to know when they were formulated. It should constitute standard practice, particularly among professionals engaging in information management ”

In response to RQ3, the findings show that *TransPa\_BA* is a valid tool, reusable by part of the professional community. Its application by unit managers favours the establishment of a general model for improving on active disclosure, identifying areas where most effort is required. *TransPa\_BA*, pursuant to *Ltapiigg* stipulations, is based solely on the information publicly available on websites: only the information visible there is assessed. In-house use of the tool may therefore identify an institution's internal documents whose public disclosure is deemed useful. One limitation, referred to as assessing indicator content, is that mechanisms have not been established to evaluate the thoroughness of all such items. Strategic plans constitute a prominent example: with their mere existence the information unit is awarded the highest score for content, irrespective of plan quality or extent of implementation. Future research may be geared to defining scales with intermediate values to score each indicator on the grounds of actual content.

## 5. Conclusions and recommendations

Active disclosure assessment is one of the mainstays of transparency assessment. *TransPa\_BA*, like other active disclosure indices, synthesises the quantity and quality of information uploaded on websites in the form of a single final score. In addition to its inherent academic value, it is useful for driving improvement in the information published on library and archive websites, with an impact on various stakeholders (library/archive users and staff). Its implementation indisputably ‘contributes to strengthening the institution, ensuring its sustainability and generating societal trust’, as noted by some specialists (Barrio; Martín-Cavanna; Martínez, 2019, p. 48). It likewise contributes to the sustainable development goals, SDG 16 in particular, one of whose targets is to ‘develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels’ (Iffa 2021).

When applied to the 202 libraries and archives reviewed, *TransPa\_BA* detected shortfalls in active disclosure in terms of both the indicators and their respective parameters. The low active disclosure scores observed in all units except university libraries are indicative of less than optimal reporting, even though indicators were addressed in some cases, for parameters such as updating/validity, dating and reusability were found to be wanting. Libraries and archives are urged to review the information parameters provided to enhance citizens' belief and trust in such institutions. The failure to realise that any and all documents uploaded onto library or archive websites should be dated and reusable is somewhat surprising in information professionals. Where information is furnished in reusable format it serves as a model, enabling other institutions to formulate similar products and modify content as necessary, with a concomitant savings in time and resources. Paradoxically, even when available, reusable information tends to be posted either separately from the data furnished by libraries and archives directly or positioned on pages or sections with convoluted access pathways. Such practice is difficult to understand in cultural institutions. Adoption of a common policy on the reusability of such their information by the national or regional governments to which some of these entities are accountable would be wholly desirable, although the effort deployed by some regional cultural bodies in favour of transparency and reusability must not be undervalued.

The use of *TransPa\_BA* has revealed shortfalls in active disclosure, particularly in the case of historic archives which have prioritised digitation of their collections (Capellades-Riera, 2019), imperative to ensuring access to and dissemination of their *acquis* as well as for institutional transparency. That does not excuse them, however, from neglecting their own transparency as cultural entities. Information was observed to be more openly available in libraries than in archives as a rule. Moreover, the information on the institutions under the aegis of the national government is treated differently by the Ministry in ways that facilitate disclosure more by public libraries than archives. The former model should also be applied to provincial historic archives.

The future will tell if *TransPa\_BA* becomes a distinctive reference for determining the information to be uploaded by libraries and archives onto their websites. To date the analyses of such institutions' active disclosure practices conducted with the tool have had a visible effect. The development of new transparency portals by some university libraries, such as *University of Seville* and *Complutense University of Madrid*, that previously had none attests to the transfer of research findings to Spanish library and archive professional practice. Ideally, the active disclosure indices for the information units analysed here should be verified in a few years' time to determine whether the

“ The higher transparency indices obtained by university libraries may be associated with greater budgetary decision-making and management independence, which favours more direct accountability and greater transparency. ”



tool has led to improvements. In the interim, it can be used by institutions to monitor their performance if they wish, inasmuch as the four versions (one for each type of information unit) are available on the project website: [https://www.uc3m.es/investigacion/TransPa\\_BA](https://www.uc3m.es/investigacion/TransPa_BA)

*TransPa\_BA* is designed as a modifiable open-access tool, for the aim is to incorporate professionals' suggestions along with any updates introduced in the *Metodología de la Evaluación de la Transparencia (Mesta)* by the *Transparency and Good Governance Council*. The use of *TransPa\_BA* to determine active disclosure indices for information published by libraries and archives is therefore intended to be a collective learning mechanism and the tool itself an incentive for ongoing improvement.

Reiterating an earlier observation, research has shown active disclosure to be a question of attitude toward publicly accessible information, for differences have been observed in the type of information uploaded to library or archive websites patterned to one and the same model.

Irrespective of the institution to which an information unit renders its services, heading one calls for management and leadership acumen. That in turn is associated with a series of duties above and beyond document and information management, including organisational obligations such as planning, assessment, marketing and communication. Performance of those tasks goes hand-in-hand with the generation of a series of documents. Some, associated with organisational, economic, budgetary and statistical information (stipulated by the *Ltapiigg* as mandatory content on institutional websites) must be made publicly available to afford citizens comprehensive knowledge of libraries' and archives' priorities and the resources at hand to meet them. Transparency and accountability should consequently be attitudes assumed by their leaders and managers.

## 6. References

- Aeval (2016). *Metodología de evaluación y seguimiento de la transparencia de la actividad pública*. Madrid: Agencia Estatal de Evaluación de las Políticas Públicas y la Calidad de los Servicios; Consejo de Transparencia y Buen Gobierno. NIPO: 171 17 002 7  
[http://www.aeval.es/es/difusion\\_y\\_comunicacion/publicaciones/Informes/Informes\\_de\\_Evaluacion/Evaluaciones\\_2016/E42.html](http://www.aeval.es/es/difusion_y_comunicacion/publicaciones/Informes/Informes_de_Evaluacion/Evaluaciones_2016/E42.html)
- Aguilera-Murguía, Ramón (2019). "Los archivos, el gran aliado de la transparencia y el acceso a la información". *Inflexiones. Revista de ciencias sociales y humanidades*, n. 3, pp. 103-117.  
<http://inflexiones.unam.mx/ojs/index.php/inflexiones/article/view/75>
- Alloa, Emmanuel; Thomä, Dieter (eds.) (2018). *Transparency, society and subjectivity: Critical perspectives*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN: 978 3 0300 8385 4
- Arizmendi-Gutiérrez, María-Esther (2017). "Metodología de evaluación y seguimiento de la transparencia de la actividad pública (Mesta)". *Revista española de la transparencia*, n. 4, pp. 40-44.  
<https://revistatransparencia.com/ojs/index.php/ret/article/view/175>
- Armstrong, Cory L. (2011). "Providing a clearer view: An examination of transparency on local government websites". *Government information quarterly*, v. 28, n. 1, pp. 11-16.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2010.07.006>
- Auger, Giselle A. (2014). "Trust me, trust me not: An experimental analysis of the effect of transparency on organizations". *Journal of public relations research*, v. 26, n. 4, pp. 325-343.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2014.908722>
- Bannister, Frank; Connolly, Regina (2014). "ICT, public values and transformative government: A framework and programme for research". *Government information quarterly*, v. 31, n. 1, pp. 119-128.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.06.002>
- Barrio, Esther; Martín-Cavanna, Javier; Martínez, Pablo (2019). *Examen de transparencia 2018. Informe de transparencia voluntaria en la web de las universidades españolas*. Madrid: Fundación Compromiso y Transparencia (Haz Fundación).  
<https://www.hazfundacion.org/informes/examen-de-transparencia-2018-informe-de-transparencia-voluntaria-en-la-web-de-las-universidades-espanolas>
- Berners-Lee, Tim (2006). *Linked data*.  
<https://www.w3.org/DesignIssues/LinkedData.html>
- Bertot, John-Carlo; Jaeger, Paul T.; Munson, Sean; Glaisyer, Tom (2010). "Social media technology and government transparency". *Computer*, v. 43, n. 11, pp. 53-59.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2010.325>

- Burke, Susan K.** (2016). "Public library administration: transparency on the website". *The library quarterly*, v. 86, n. 4, pp. 449-467.  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/688033>
- Camacho, Rafael** (2016). "Del derecho a saber al derecho a conocer. Supervillanos del acceso a la información pública: Pdfman". *Melián Abogados*, 22 noviembre.  
<https://mymabogados.com/pdf-transparencia>
- Capellades-Riera, Alan** (2019). "La necesaria transformación de los archivos históricos". *Boletín jurídico*.  
<https://www.gtt.es/boletinjuridico/la-necesaria-transformacion-de-los-archivos-historicos>
- Cucciniello, Maria; Nasi, Greta; Valotti, Giovanni** (2012). "Assessing transparency in government: rhetoric, reality and desire". In: *2012 45th Hawaii international conference on system sciences*, IEEE, pp. 2451-2461.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2012.123>
- Cunill-Grau, Nuria** (2006). "Transparencia en la gestión pública ¿cómo construirle viabilidad?". *Estado, gobierno, gestión pública: Revista chilena de administración pública*, v. 8, pp. 22-44.  
<https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=2315250>
- Da-Cruz, Nuno-Ferreira; Tavares, Antoni F.; Marques, Rui-Cunha; Jorge, Susana; De-Sousa, Luís** (2016). "Measuring local government transparency". *Public management review*, v. 18, n. 6, pp. 866-893.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1051572>
- De-Andrés-Díaz, Rosana** (2018). "Sistemas de gestión de documentos y archivos para la transparencia y contra la corrupción". En: De-Andrés-Díaz, Rosana; Sierra-Rodríguez, Javier (eds.). *La función de archivo y la transparencia en España*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, pp. 31-40. ISBN: 978 84 09 05223 3  
[https://drive.google.com/file/d/12nLm\\_udlggj4-YfN99GfsJXXUSsv9uQE/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/12nLm_udlggj4-YfN99GfsJXXUSsv9uQE/view)
- España (2013). *Ley 19/2013, de 9 de diciembre, de transparencia, acceso a la información pública y buen gobierno*.  
<https://www.boe.es/eli/es/l/2013/12/09/19/con>
- España (2015). *Ley 18/2015, de 9 de julio, por la que se modifica la Ley 37/2007, de 16 de noviembre, sobre reutilización de la información del sector público*.  
<https://www.boe.es/eli/es/l/2015/07/09/18>
- Fontrodona, Joan; Muller, Philip** (2020). "Reputación corporativa, transparencia y calidad informativa". *Cuadernos de la cátedra CaixaBank de responsabilidad social corporativa*, n. 44.  
<https://media.iese.edu/research/pdfs/ST-0539.pdf>
- Han, Byung-Chul** (2015). *The transparency society*. California: Stanford University Press. ISBN: 978 0 8047 9460 2
- Hollyer, James R.; Rosendorff, B. Peter; Vreeland, James-Raymon** (2014). "Measuring transparency". *Political analysis*, v. 22, n. 4, pp. 413-434.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpu001>
- Holzer, Marc; Kim, Seang-Tae** (2005). *Digital governance in municipalities worldwide (2005): a longitudinal assessment of municipal websites throughout the world*. The American Society for Public Administration.  
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.394.1774&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- IFLA (2021). *Toolkit: Libraries, development and the United Nations 2030 Agenda*.  
<https://www.ifla.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/assets/hq/topics/libraries-development/documents/libraries-un-2030-agenda-toolkit-2021.pdf>
- Islam, Roumeen** (2006). "Does more transparency go along with better governance?". *Economics & politics*, v. 18, n. 2, pp. 121-167.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0343.2006.00166.x>
- Joshi, Anuradha** (2013). "Do they work? Assessing the impact of transparency and accountability initiatives in service delivery". *Development policy review*, v. 31, s1, pp. 29-48.
- Kosack, Stephen; Fung, Archon** (2014). "Does transparency improve governance?". *Annual review of political science*, v. 17, pp. 65-87.  
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-032210-144356>
- Leão-Lyrio, Maurício-Vasconcellos; Lunkes, Rogério-João; Taliani, Emma-Teresa** (2018). "Thirty years of studies on transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector: The state of the art and opportunities for future research". *Public integrity*, v. 20, n. 5, pp. 512-533.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2017.1416537>

- Mayernik, Matthew S.** (2017). "Open data: Accountability and transparency". *Big data & society*, v. 4, n. 2, 2053951717718853.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717718853>
- Meijer, Albert; Hart, Paul 't; Worthy, Ben** (2018). "Assessing government transparency: an interpretive framework". *Administration & society*, v. 50, n. 4, pp. 501-526.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399715598341>
- Melero, Ana** (2013). "¿Qué es la transparencia? Sin archivos, la transparencia es demagogia". *Cultura*.  
<https://www.juntadeandalucia.es/cultura/blog/que-es-la-transparencia-sin-archivos-la-transparencia-es-demagogia>
- Michener, Gregory; Coelho, Jonas; Moreira, Davi** (2021). "Are governments complying with transparency? Findings from 15 years of evaluation". *Government information quarterly*, v. 38, n. 2, 101565.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101565>
- Molina-Rodríguez-Navas, Pedro; Simelio-Solà, Núria; Corcoy-Rius, Marta** (2017). "Metodologías de evaluación de la transparencia: procedimientos y problemas". *Revista latina de comunicación social*, n. 72, pp. 818-831.  
<https://doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2017-1194>
- Obama, Barack** (2009). "Transparency and open government". In: *Memorandum for the heads of executive departments and agencies*.  
<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/transparency-and-open-government>
- O'Hara, Kieron** (2012). "Transparency, open data and trust in government: shaping the infosphere". In: *WebSci '12: Proceedings of the 4th annual ACM web science conference*. New York: Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 223-232.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/2380718.2380747>
- Pacios, Ana R.** (2003). "Management-related information on Spanish university library web pages". *The electronic library*, v. 21, n. 6, pp. 528-537.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02640470310509081>
- Pacios, Ana R.** (2016). "Universidades transparentes con bibliotecas transparentes". *Revista de investigación bibliotecológica*, v. 70, n. 70, pp. 105-128.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibbai.2016.10.006>
- Pacios, Ana R.; García-López, Fátima; Morales-García, Ana-María** (2021). "Evaluación de la transparencia en las Bibliotecas Públicas del Estado". *Métodos de información*, v. 12, n. 22, pp. 58-85.  
<https://doi.org/10.5557/IIMEI12-N22-058085>
- Pacios, Ana R.; Martínez-Cardama, Sara** (2021). "Active disclosure of Spanish historic archives' economic-financial information". *Archives and records*, v. 42, n. 2, pp. 183-200.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23257962.2020.1804342>
- Pacios, Ana R.; Martínez-Cardama, Sara; Moro-Cabero, Manuela** (2021). "Evaluación de la transparencia en los archivos históricos provinciales". *Anales de documentación*, v. 24, n. 2.  
<https://doi.org/10.6018/analesdoc>
- Pacios, Ana R.; Núñez, Manuel; Ramos-Simón, Luis-Fernando** (2022). "Transparency as social responsibility: librarians' and archivists' standpoints on active public disclosure as a mechanism for transparency". In: Calzada-Prado, Francisco-Javier (ed.). *Boosting the knowledge economy: Key contributions from information services in educational, cultural, and corporate environments*. Elsevier, pp. 159-187. ISBN: 978 1 8433 4772 9
- Pacios, Ana R.; Pérez-Pulido, Margarita; Vianello, Marina** (2022). "Voluntary transparency in Spanish university libraries". *JLIS.it. Italian journal of library, archives and information science*, v. 13, n. 2, pp. 74-91.  
<https://doi.org/10.36253/jlis.it-457>
- Pacios, Ana R.; Ramos-Simón, Luis-Fernando; Calzada-Prado, Francisco-Javier; Torreiro-Rodríguez, Iria** (2022). "Transparencia voluntaria en los archivos universitarios españoles". *Bibliotecas. Anales de investigación*, v. 18, n. 2.
- Pacios, Ana R.; Serna, Ignacio** (2020). "The annual report, indicator of library transparency". *International information & library review*, v. 52, n. 4, pp. 253-262.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2020.1728176>
- Pacios, Ana R.; Torreiro-Rodríguez, Iria; Moro-Cabero, María-Manuela** (2019). "Comunicar transparencia. El caso de los archivos universitarios españoles". *Revista general de información y documentación*, v. 29, n. 2, pp. 527-551.  
<https://doi.org/10.5209/rgid.66980>
- Pacios, Ana R.; Vianello, Marina; De-la-Mano, Marta** (2020). "*TransPa\_BA*: una herramienta para la mejora de la publicidad activa en bibliotecas y archivos". *Ibersid*, v. 14, n. 2, pp. 57-66.  
<https://doi.org/10.54886/ibersid.v14i2.4684>

- Parodi, Giovanni** (2011). "La Teoría de la Comunicabilidad: Notas para una concepción integral de la comprensión de textos escritos". *Revista signos. Estudios de lingüística*, v. 44, n. 76, pp. 145-167.  
<https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342011000200004>
- Pasquier, Martial; Villeneuve, Jean-Patrick** (2007). "Organizational barriers to transparency: A typology and analysis of organizational behaviour tending to prevent or restrict access to information". *International review of administrative sciences*, v. 73, n. 1, pp. 147-162.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852307075701>
- Pérez-Santana, Juan-Fernando** (2018). "La estadística de archivos en el marco de la transparencia. Radiografía de 2017". In: De-Andrés-Díaz, Rosana; Sierra-Rodríguez, Javier (eds.). *La función de archivo y la transparencia en España*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, pp. 99-124. ISBN: 978 84 09 05223 3  
[https://drive.google.com/file/d/12nLm\\_udlggj4-YfN99GfsJXXUSsv9uQE/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/12nLm_udlggj4-YfN99GfsJXXUSsv9uQE/view)
- Pina, Vicente; Torres, Lourdes; Royo, Sonia** (2007). "Are ICTs improving transparency and accountability in the EU regional and local governments? An empirical study". *Public administration*, v. 85, n. 2, pp. 449-472.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2007.00654.x>
- Piotrowski, Suzanne J.** (2010). *Transparency and secrecy: A reader linking literature and contemporary debate*. Lexington Books. ISBN: 978 0 7391 2752 0
- Ramos-Simón, Luis-Fernando; Pacios, Ana R.** (2022). "Reuse of the transparency-related information posted on Spanish library and archive websites". *Journal of information science*,  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515211059774>
- Rey-Martín, Carina; Parada, Concepción; Pacios, Ana R.; Rodríguez-Bravo, Blanca; Vianello, Marina** (2020). "Transparency in the management of Spanish public university libraries through the internet". *Libri*, v. 70, n. 3, p. 239-250.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/libri-2019-0051>
- Rizkyantha, Okky** (2017). "The roles of archive institution on Indonesia public information disclosure". *Digital era. Pustabilia: Journal of library and information science*, v. 1, n. 1, pp. 139-153.  
<https://doi.org/10.18326/pustabilia.v1i2.139-154>
- Ros-Medina, José-Luis** (2018). "La evaluación de la transparencia en España a debate metodológico: Mesta e índices de transparencia internacional". *Revista internacional transparencia e integridad*, n. 6.  
[http://www.encuentros-multidisciplinares.org/revista-66/jose\\_luis\\_ros.pdf](http://www.encuentros-multidisciplinares.org/revista-66/jose_luis_ros.pdf)
- Ros-Medina, José-Luis** (2020). "¿Es Mesta el sistema definitivo de evaluación de la transparencia en España? Revisión de la aplicación práctica de esta metodología". *Revista española de transparencia*, n. 11, pp. 45-73.  
<https://doi.org/10.51915/ret.105>
- Sturges, Paul; Crnogorac, Vesna** (2012). "The library and transparency". *Alexandria*, v. 23, n. 1, pp. 44-54.  
<https://doi.org/10.7227/ALX.23.1.6>
- Tavares, António F.; Da-Cruz, Nuno F.** (2020). "Explaining the transparency of local government websites through a political market framework". *Government information quarterly*, v. 37, n. 3, 101249.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2017.08.005>
- Valdovinos, Jorge I.** (2018). "Transparency as ideology, ideology as transparency: towards a critique of the meta-aesthetics of neoliberal hegemony". *Open cultural studies*, v. 2, n. 1, pp. 654-667.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/culture-2018-0059>
- Villeneuve, Jean-Patrick** (2014). "Transparency of transparency: The pro-active disclosure of the rules governing access to information as a gauge of organisational cultural transformation. The case of the Swiss transparency regime". *Government information quarterly*, v. 31, n. 4, pp. 556-562.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.10.010>
- Villoria, Manuel** (2014). La transparencia como política pública en España: algunas reflexiones. *Eunomía. Revista en cultura de la legalidad*, n. 7, pp. 85-103.  
<https://e-revistas.uc3m.es/index.php/EUNOM/article/view/2234>
- Williams, Andrew** (2014). *A global index of information and political transparency*. Business School-Economics, University of Western Australia. Discussion paper 14.07.  
<https://api.research-repository.uwa.edu.au/ws/portalfiles/portal/96621994/14-07AGlobalIndexofInformationandPoliticalTransparency.pdf>