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Introduction and Scope

The proceeding bibliography covers the advantages, disadvantages, and uses of Web 2.0—sometimes referred to as Library 2.0—in both academic and public libraries. Articles discuss various Web 2.0 applications, particularly social networking, blogging, wikis, and social tagging. Several articles discuss the reception of Web 2.0 technology, both from the perspective of the librarians as well as that of the patrons. The articles were published from 2006 to 2011. Web 2.0 in library use, and the currency of the articles reflects the nature of this emerging field in library science. It is especially important that libraries understand the nature and uses of Web 2.0 technology in libraries, as well as the limitations of such technology in addressing the needs of its patrons. The articles were published in scholarly journals spanning the globe, as this issue relates to all libraries, not merely those within the United States.

Description

While not a completely new technology, Web 2.0 has enjoyed a transformative effect on the way internet users interact with websites. Instead of static websites that merely provided information in a passive setting, Web 2.0 software, such as Facebook, social tagging, wikis, and blogging, have created an active and interconnected way to utilize the web, and to share connections with other users in a much more personal way. Indeed, Web 2.0 “is not a web of textual publication, but a web of multi-sensory communication. It is a matrix of dialogues, not a collection of monologues. It is a user-centered Web in ways it has not been thus far” (Maness, 2006). According to the article “Towards Library 2.0: The Adoption of Web 2.0 Technologies in Public Libraries,” “The derivative term Library 2.0 was proposed in the mid-2000s” (Anttiroiko, 2011, p. 87). As Curran, Murray, and Christian state, the Library 2.0 approach to libraries “will make information available wherever and whenever the user requires it” (as cited in Chad and Miller, 2005). Indeed, Web 2.0 technologies “offer libraries many opportunities to better serve their existing audiences and to reach out beyond the walls of the institution to reach potential beneficiaries where they happen to be, and in association with the task that they happen to be undertaking” (Curran et al, 2007, p. 288)
Summary of Findings

The recently explosion of Web 2.0 technology on the web has changed forever the way users today view the internet. According to Kroski (2007), Web 2.0 can “be loosely defined as the evolution of a social and interactive Web that gives everyone the chance to participate—not just those with programming skills” (p. 1). Instead of a static website that merely provides information, websites today are dynamic, and allow users to interact with the website and with other users and user created information in a new and exciting way. Advancements in technologies, such as iPhones and iPads have also contributed to the feeling of a constant interconnection with information and other users, thus creating an ever-expanding social network.

Libraries have only just begun to realize the potential of this new approach to the web, and to tap into its potential. According to Maness (2006), the term for this is Library 2.0, and was first coined by Michael Casey on his LibraryCrunch blog (as cited in Miller 2005). Maness defines Library 2.0 as “the application of interactive, collaborative, and multi-media web-based technologies to web-based library services and collections” (2006). Much of the research in this field involves the uses of the various forms and types of social media, or Web 2.0 technology. Two of the studies utilized a theory framework for how to approach implementing Library 2.0 into libraries, namely the Maness (2006) and the Lankes, Silverstein, and Nicholson (2007) studies. Less focus has been given as to the overall usage of social media in libraries, while very few studies considered the reception of Library 2.0 among librarians and patrons.

As a frame to understand how Library 2.0 should be approached, two theories were offered. In his essay, Lankes et al argued that “without a framework, the field [of Library 2.0] becomes open to the influence of personalities and trendy technology” (2007, p. 17). This can be seen in some of the dangers of incorrect use of this technology, mentioned in other studies, noticeably those by Dickson (2010), Connell (2009), and Chu M (2008). Lankes theory focuses on the idea of the library’s role in creating knowledge. According to him, “Knowledge is created through conversation. Libraries are in the knowledge business. Therefore, libraries are in the conversation business” (Lankes 2007, p. 17). In a similar vein, Maness’s theory seeks to create a definition of Library 2.0 that mirrors the function of Web 2.0 technology. He states that “a theory of Library 2.0 could be understood to have these four elements:
**It is user-centered.** Users participate in the creation of the content and services they view within the library's web-presence, OPAC, etc. …

**It provides a multi-media experience.** Both the collections and services of Library 2.0 contain video and audio components. …

**It is socially rich.** The library's web-presence includes users' presences. There are both synchronous (e.g. IM) and asynchronous (e.g. wikis) ways for users to communicate with one another and with librarians.

**It is communally innovative.** This is perhaps the single most important aspect of Library 2.0. It rests on the foundation of libraries as a community service, but understands that as communities change, libraries must not only change with them, [but] must allow users to change the library. (Maness 2006)

These two theories seek to place the role of Web 2.0 technology within a framework for understanding how to implement it in traditional library functions.

The types of Web 2.0 technology can be divided into four categories, reflecting their function: Content Collaboration, Social Bookmarking, Media Sharing, and Social Networking (Kroski 2007). Various types of software exist to facilitate these features on the web. Content Collaboration includes such Web 2.0 technologies as blogs and wikis. Kroski (2007) defines wiki as “a collaborative online tool that enables a community of contributors to create Websites and documents quickly and easily. Linh (2008) states that wikis are not utilized in Australian libraries, which often favor blogs because of their ease of managing spam and being cheaper to implement than wikis. Wikis can be used for Intranets in libraries, as training tools, for event planning, for creating websites, for sharing documents, and for creating subject guides (Kroski 2007, p. 2014). In addition to the reasons listed above, Chu cites dozens of articles that state wikis also save time, enhance efficiency, and aid in the creation of an online community (2009, pp. 170-171). Similarly, Aharony (2010) lists several of the same uses for blogs, such as marketing, (promotion (Sauers 2006), and for disseminating opinion (as cited in Bar-Ilan 2007). In addition to Content Collaboration, Social Bookmarking (which also includes social tagging) also aid in creating online community and knowledge. In Brantley (2010), social tagging is likened to users “cataloging and finding information by creating tags with terms they can easily understand” (as cited in Burger 2007). Brantley also states that criticism of social tagging lies in two veins: it reduces “the power of descriptive indexing” and it “overly optimistic…in mak[ing]
users instantly more adept at search and retrieval” (2010, p. 354). Both Kroski(2007) and Dickson and Holley(2010), in referring to social booking, cite several software sites as options (such as Library Thing and Delicious), and state that social bookmarking could be used in creating lists of course readings, subject guides, and even allowing students to share bookmarks within and outside of coursework (2007). Anttiroiki remarks that “allowing users to comment, write reviews, create their own tags and ratings, and share them with others through a more versatile OPAC interface, may enhance the catalogue (as cited in Casey and Sevastinuk 2006, 41). Additionally, Maggio et al cited social tagging as beneficial to teaching bibliographical instruction to medical students. In a course designed to teach medical students MeSH and the importance of a controlled vocabulary, instructors utilized a pre-course social tagging exercise as a frame of reference for discussing search strategy, weaknesses of natural language searching (such as synonymy, misspellings and variations, and specificity), and the concept of a controlled vocabulary. Use of social tagging as a tool increased the ease of students to understand the MeSH searching concept (Maggio et al 2009).

Media Sharing, the third concept mentioned, includes such Web 2.0 technology as podcasts, streaming media, and photosharing. These technologies also have several software programs available, such as YouTube, Flickr, and Photobucket (Maness 2006). The literature reviewed spent less time discussing such technologies. However, Linh’s study indicated that podcasts received modest use, far less than blogs. The reasons she states for this are: “podcasts require libraries to have sound recorders, accompanying equipment as well as soundproof rooms. Also, the audio files are normally quite large for users to download or listen to online” (Linh 2008, p. 642). Some uses for Media Sharing technologies are library tours, historical collections, instruction, and marketing (Kroski 2007).

The last area of Web 2.0 mentioned, Social Networking, received the most attention of any of the Web 2.0 technologies. Charnigo and Barnett-Ellis (2007) cite Facebook as helping to create generations of tech savvy college students and graduates. However, Facebook has had little impact on library resources and bandwidth overall, and has only affected lab computer availability to a larger degree (Charnigo and Barnett-Ellis 2007, p. 29). And according to Chu M (2008), a library profile on Facebook can help to strengthen ties with patrons in academic libraries or to create weak ties, although it does serve to lessen face-to-face contact (as cited in Wellman, Haase, Witte, and Hampton 2011). Another important use for Facebook in particular,
but also other Social Networking software, is the creation of another portal for the library. This can be in the form of a link to the library page from Facebook that would appear in an online search, or in the form of embedded library catalog (as cited in Farkas 2007), subject guides (as cited in iLibrarian 2007), and ask-the-librarian features (Dickson and Holley 2010, 471). On a similar note, the Social Networking site Second Life, a virtual online game, also allows libraries to create a virtual library service, particularly reference service (Dickson and Holley 2010, 473). Indeed, Dickson and Holley (2010) also state that Second Life “provide[s] a 3-D environment with the potential to include video tutorials, audio players, subject guides, database and catalog searching, live assistance, instructional sessions, meeting areas, and other features” (as cited in Mathews 2007, p.10). However, Social Networking must be utilized with some caution. While the majority of students surveyed in a study by Connell indicated that they would accept a friend request from a librarian, most voiced that Facebook, for instance, had no academic use, and that mass friend requests by librarians could be seen as creepy (Connell 2009, p. 28). In addition, students in a study by Dickson Holley indicated that “54 percent of librarians indicated that Facebook has no academic purpose” (2010, p. 475). For such Web 2.0 technologies to be successfully implemented in libraries, librarians will have to be aware of the risks of Social Networking, as well as supportive of its beneficial uses to promote the library beyond the physical walls.

Clearly, much research still needs to be conducted on Library 2.0, and how best to utilize technologies that aid in that approach. With the shifting winds from the traditional, print oriented libraries of the past towards the digital oriented libraries of the future, the need to adapt and to integrate libraries into the flow of society is vital to their remaining relevant to future generations of patrons. As show by Chua and Goh (2010), Web 2.0 technology has the potential to enhance the experience and to improve quality of library websites for users. It can enhance function, increase visibility, improve responsiveness and aid in ease of access (Chua and Goh 2010). Since their creation, libraries have played a role in the conversations of knowledge creation. Utilizing a Library 2.0 approach, libraries can continue to be present at the “instant of insight” where knowledge is ultimately created (Lankes et al 2007, p. 23).
Abstract: “Blogging, though a relatively new phenomenon, has gained vast popularity, and blogs have become a central feature and an essential information channel in the Web 2.0 information world. The current research seeks to expand our understanding, and examine comments written by readers of LIS blogs. The researcher examined the comments assigned to the posts and the analysis was conducted in two phases: (1) statistical descriptive analysis and (2) content analysis. The primary research questions are: What type of language do comment writers use? What type of information is found in the comments? What is the content of the comments? The research findings are relevant for librarians and information scientists as they cause them to better understand and explore the LIS blogosphere.”

Annotation: This article is unique because it examines the use of blogs by professional librarians. The study surveyed blogs spanning among a number of countries, and by offering a statistical analysis, it provides useful data for determining the potential gains and pitfalls of blogs in a library setting.

Search Strategy: I chose to locate the journal *Libri* from the Drexel Library website after locating the article by Anttiroiko in that journal to see if the journal held any other similar articles. I used the e-journal interface because I was seeking a specific journal. Since I was seeking a specific journal title and not an article or author, this was the most effective method.


Search String: Clicked on e-journals. Typed Libri into the journal search with “Title begins with” selected. Selected the first entry, under the option Library Literature & Information Science Full Text option.

Scholarly/Refereed Status: After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it aims at “keeping the traditional high standard of academic writing and publishing.”


Abstract: “Web 2.0 is the general term for new technologies, applications and services that enable users to interact and personalize websites. The derivative term Library 2.0 was proposed in the mid-2000s. This article reviews how public libraries have made attempts to renew their
services by adopting Web 2.0 technologies. The research material mainly consists of articles and reports discussing the developments of Library 2.0. In addition, the study makes use of data obtained from the websites of public libraries that have pioneered in the field of Library 2.0. The study identified four main purposes for which public libraries have adopted Web 2.0 technologies: communication, content sharing, social networking, and crowdsourcing. Overall, the findings indicate that experiences gained from the utilization of Web 2.0 applications are fairly positive and are thus encouraging for the development of Public Library 2.0.”

Annotation: This article provided statistical support for various Web 2.0 technologies currently being employed in libraries. After first providing a working definition for both Web 2.0 and Library 2.0, it provides insight into the effectiveness of such technologies presently being used in libraries. Because it is current (2011), it also provides up-to-date data on these technologies, and provides counter-balance to the older articles in this literature review.

Search Strategy: After locating several articles using a keyword search in Dialog, I decided to try searching for other authors that has cited the author A.Y.K. Chua because I was interested in possible other articles related to MySpace and Facebook in a library setting. I decided to search for this citation in infosci, but not 47 or 148, which are the Gale databases. These two contain news articles that are not considered scholarly.

Database: Social SciSearch in Dialog

Method of Searching: Citation Searching in Dialog

Search String: b infosci, not 47, 148
E ca=chua ayk
S e3

Scholarly/Refereed Status: After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it aims at “keeping the traditional high standard of academic writing and publishing.”


Abstract. “Library 2.0 literature has described many of the possibilities Web 2.0 technologies offer to libraries. Case studies have assessed local use, but no studies have measured the Library 2.0 phenomenon by searching public social networking sites. This study used library-specific terms to search public social networking sites, blog search engines, and social bookmarking sites for activity associated with librarians and library users. These exploratory results can be used as a starting point for future studies. Librarians who use tags to describe Web-based content might use these findings to select more effective tags. Librarians implementing a blog or
a social networking presence might use this study to balance the benefits with the amount of work required to maintain an up-to-date presence.”

**Annotation:** The article by Brantley focused on blogging, social tagging, and social bookmarking, and provided key insight into what technologies libraries should focus their efforts and resources on. By focusing on the use of such technologies and gathering data, and introducing the key concept of Chris Anderson’s “long tail” effect, and its implications for what technologies libraries should focus on utilizing.

**Search Strategy:** I selected Infosci in Dialog because this covered several major library science databases. After using the set detail on function, I chose only three databases to utilize, as those had the most hits, and they were also considered to contain mostly scholarly resources. These three were Eric, Inspec, and Social SciSearch. This was an initial search using these databases so I chose a keyword approach.

**Database:** Eric in Dialog

**Method of Searching:** Keyword searching in Dialog

**Search String:**

```
b infosci
Set detail on
S (social(w)networking) and (wiki or blog or social()tagging) and
(academic or public and library???)
B 1,2,7
S (social(w)networking) and (wiki or blog or social()tagging) and
(academic or public and library???)
Rd
```

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it is “an international, peer-reviewed journal.”


**Abstract.** “While the burgeoning trend in online social networks has gained much attention from the media, few studies in library science have yet to address the topic in depth. This article reports on a survey of 126 academic librarians concerning their perspectives toward Facebook.com, an online network for students. Findings suggest that librarians are overwhelmingly aware of the ‘Facebook phenomenon.’ While some librarians were excited about the possibilities of Facebook, the majority surveyed appeared to consider Facebook outside the purview of professional librarianship.”
Annotation: One area lacking in most of the studies was the impact social networking technology had on libraries. Charnigo’s study provided a key source for data concerning the impact of Facebook in its initial release and introduction into academic libraries. The article examined Facebook from the standpoint of library resource impact.

Search Strategy: I read through the article by Dickson and Holley on social networking in academic libraries, and wanted to know if the authors cited any more articles related to this topic or perhaps a related one to my studies. I checked the references and located a number of articles on several topics, including this one. I then went to the library website and searched in the Library Literature and Information Full Text database, as a likely source to have the article. I was able to access the full text of the article through this database.

Database: N/A

Method of Searching: Footnote Chasing

Search String: Referenced in:

Scholarly/Refereed Status: After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it is “a refereed journal published quarterly.”


Abstract. “How are college students using and communicating with online social networking? How can these technologies be utilized by libraries and librarians? A review of the literature provides current context of social networking sites, the usage and viability of related technologies in academic libraries, and the role of computer-mediated communication (CMC) in facilitating student learning. Data from a survey and focus group provide insight into how students are using MySpace and Facebook, two widely adopted social networking sites. Findings are discussed to consider appropriate implementations of MySpace/Facebook in a university library setting, specifically on the pedagogical and practical feasibility of integrating social software in library instruction, reference, and outreach.”

Annotation: This article provided a review of the literature concerning Facebook and MySpace usage in libraries, and was key in identifying the key problems and potentials of such sites in an academic library setting, as well as an evaluation of how it can be utilized in that setting.
Search Strategy: I read through the article by Dickson and Holley on social networking in academic libraries, and wanted to know if the authors cited any more articles related to this topic or perhaps a related one to my studies. I checked the references and located a number of articles on several topics, including this one. I then went to the library website and searched in the Library Literature and Information Full Text database, as a likely source to have the article. I was able to access the full text of the article through this database.

Database: N/A

Method of Searching: Footnote Chasing

Search String: Referenced in:

Scholarly/Refereed Status: After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it is a “peer-reviewed quarterly journal.”


Abstract: “This is an exploratory study investigating the use of wikis in academic libraries. Reasons for using and not using wikis, level of control exerted on wikis users and perceived benefits and costs of using wikis are the major areas examined. Sixty universities were selected to complete either survey 1 or survey 2, depending on their usage of wikis at the time the study was conducted. Despite the fact that costs are incurred in creating wikis, current users found that the benefits outweigh the costs. It is hoped that this study can provide insights for making informed decisions in applying wikis in academic libraries.”

Annotation: This article provided a key, indepth look at wiki and wiki use in academic libraries. It gave grounding in defining what wikis are, and an evaluation why some libraries may not be as quick in embracing wikis on their websites. It also supported the conclusions by other articles in the popularity of blogs and other Web 2.0 technology over wikis.

Search Strategy: I read through the article by Dickson and Holley on social networking in academic libraries, and wanted to know if the authors cited any more articles related to this topic or perhaps a related one to my studies. I checked the references and located a number of articles on several topics, including this one. I then went to the library website...
and searched in the Library Literature and Information Full Text database, as a likely source to have the article. I was able to access the full text of the article through this database.

Database: N/A

Method of Searching: Footnote Chasing

Search String: Referenced in:

Scholarly/Refereed Status: After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it is “an international and refereed journal.”


Abstract. “Web 2.0 represents an emerging suite of applications that hold immense potential in enriching communication, enabling collaboration and fostering innovation. However, little work has been done hitherto to research Web 2.0 applications in library websites. This paper addresses the following three research questions: (a) To what extent are Web 2.0 applications prevalent in libraries?; (b) In what ways have Web 2.0 applications been used in libraries?; and (c) Does the presence of Web 2.0 applications enhance the quality of library websites? Divided equally between public and academic, 120 libraries' websites from North America, Europe and Asia were sampled and analyzed using a three-step content analysis method. This paper concludes by highlighting implications for both librarians and scholars interested to delve deeper into the implementation of Web 2.0 applications.”

Annotation: This article filled a key gap in the research presented here by providing an evaluation of library websites. By focusing exclusively on the websites overall functions, and evaluating the effect of Web 2.0 technologies on those websites by a set criteria, it gave a broader picture of the overall effect of Web 2.0 technologies on user interaction with libraries online.

Search Strategy: I selected Infosci in Dialog because this covered several major library science databases. After using the set detail on function, I chose only three databases to utilize, as those had the most hits, and they were also considered to contain mostly scholarly resources. These three were Eric, Inspec, and Social SciSearch. This was an initial search using these databases so I chose a keyword approach.

Database: INSPEC in Dialog
Method of Searching:  Keyword searching in Dialog

Search String:  
b infosci
Set detail on
S (social(w)networking) and (wiki or blog or social()tagging) and
(academic or public and library???)
B 1,2,7
S (social(w)networking) and (wiki or blog or social()tagging) and
(academic or public and library???)
Rd

Scholarly/Refereed Status:  After locating the article through the above steps, the article was
also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and
that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it is “a cross-
disciplinary and refereed journal.”


Abstract. “This study surveyed 366 Valparaiso University freshmen to discover their feelings
about librarians using Facebook and MySpace as outreach tools. The vast majority of
respondents had online social network profiles. Most indicated that they would be accepting of
library contact through those Web sites, but a sizable minority reacted negatively to the concept.
Because of the potential to infringe on students’ sense of personal privacy, it is recommended
that librarians proceed with caution when implementing online social network profiles.”

Annotation:  This article was a counterpoint to most of the other articles in this research,
providing Facebook and MySpace usage among libraries from the
perspective of the student or patron. By focusing on the views and
reactions of students, it highlighted a concern often overlooked in the other
research, which is how such social networking usage can affect the image of
the library as seen by students.

Search Strategy:  I read through the article by Dickson and Holley on social networking
in academic libraries, and wanted to know if the authors cited any
more articles related to this topic or perhaps a related one to my
studies. I checked the references and located a number of articles on
several topics, including this one. I then went to the library website
and searched in the Library Literature and Information Full Text
database, as a likely source to have the article. I was able to access the
full text of the article through this database.

Database:  N/A

Method of Searching:  Footnote Chasing

Search String:  Referenced in:

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it “includes peer-reviewed articles.”


**Abstract:** “Libraries as they are known today can be defined by the term Library 1.0. This defines the way resources are kept on shelves or at a computer behind a login. These resources can be taken from a shelf, checked out to the librarian, taken home for a certain length of time and absorbed, and then taken back to the library for someone else to use. Library 1.0 is a one-directional service that takes people to the information that they require. Library 2.0 – or L2 as it is now more commonly addressed as – aims to take the information to the people by bringing the library service to the internet and getting the users more involved by encouraging feedback participation. This paper seeks to present an overview of Library 2.0.”

**Annotation:** This article gave a brief overview of the history of Web 2.0 technology, and more importantly, provided insight into how that technology affected not only websites, but also the Online Public Access Catalogue. It discussed the key differences between websites before Web 2.0 and those after its introduction, focusing on various types of library services that this technology makes more effective.

**Search Strategy:** I read through the article by Anttiroiko, A., & Savolainen, R. on library 2.0 technologies in public libraries, and wanted to know if the authors cited any more articles related to this topic or perhaps a related one to my studies. I checked the references and located a number of articles on several topics, including this one. I then went to the library website and searched in the Library Literature and Information Full Text database, as a likely source to have the article. I was able to access the full text of the article through the Emerald Insight website through the Get It link.

**Database:** N/A

**Method of Searching:** Footnote Chasing

**Search String:** Referenced in:

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and

**Abstract.** "The goal of this paper is to examine the use of the major social networking tools in academic libraries in the USA. As college students are heavy users of social networking, such efforts provide academic libraries with outreach possibilities to students who do not use the physical library. The paper also seeks to examine the concerns about their use both from students and within the academic library. [It] provides a snapshot on the use of social networking in academic libraries through a thorough review of the available literature and an examination of the libraries' presence on the most popular social networking sites. It also provides help for academic libraries wishing to implement social networking."

**Annotation:** This article, in focusing exclusively on Social Networking, provided a greater depth of analysis in how such Web 2.0 technology has been utilized by libraries, including a wider range of Social Networking software than other sources. It also provided key statistics concerning the reception of such technologies by patrons and librarians.

**Search Strategy:** I selected Infosci in Dialog because this covered several major library science databases. After using the set detail on function, I chose only three databases to utilize, as those had the most hits, and they were also considered to contain mostly scholarly resources. These three were Eric, Inspec, and Social SciSearch. This was an initial search using these databases so I chose a keyword approach.

**Database:** INSPEC in Dialog

**Method of Searching:** Keyword searching in Dialog

**Search String:** b infosci
Set detail on
S (social(w)networking) and (wiki or blog or social()tagging) and (academic or public and library???)
B 1,2,7
S (social(w)networking) and (wiki or blog or social()tagging) and (academic or public and library???)
Rd

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it is “a member of COPE.” COPE’s website lists the organization as “a

**Abstract.** “Social bookmarking Web sites provide browser buttons, called ‘bookmarklets,’ which are easily installed and facilitate adding new favorites with the ease of a click. As members browse the Web, they may bookmark new resources by tapping the bookmarklet button. The applications automatically acquire the Web site URL and page name for the resource and move them into an editable form with spaces for members to add notes and keywords.”

**Annotation:** This article provided a basic framework for discussing the types of Web 2.0 technology discussed here. It gave a brief overview of each type, what types of software existed for each type, and gave indepth uses for each type in an academic library setting.

**Search Strategy:** I read through the article by Dickson and Holley on social networking in academic libraries, and wanted to know if the authors cited any more articles related to this topic or perhaps a related one to my studies. I checked the references and located a number of articles on several topics, including this one. I then went to the library website and searched in the Library Literature and Information Full Text database, as a likely source to have the article. I was able to access the full text of the article through this database.

**Database:** N/A

**Method of Searching:** Footnote Chasing

**Search String:** Referenced in:

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed.


**Abstract.** “The goal of the technology brief is to familiarize library decision-makers with the opportunities and challenges of participatory networks. In order to accomplish this goal the brief is divided into four sections (excluding an overview and a detailed statement of goal):
a conceptual framework for understanding and evaluating participatory networks;  
a discussion of key concepts and technologies in participatory networks drawn primarily from Web 2.0 and Library 2.0;  
a merging of the conceptual framework with the technological discussion to present a roadmap for library systems development; and  
in a set of recommendations to foster greater discussion and action on the topic of participatory networks and, more broadly, participatory librarianship.

This summary will highlight the discussions in each of these four topics. For consistency, the section numbers and titles from the full brief are used.”

Annotation: This article provided an overarching theory for how Web 2.0 technology relates to what libraries do, and provided insight into the challenges faced by libraries in integrating such technologies, focusing more on the software and hardware obstacles faced by libraries.

Search Strategy: I read through the article by Anttiroiko, A., & Savolainen, R. on library 2.0 technologies in public libraries, and wanted to know if the authors cited any more articles related to this topic or perhaps a related one to my studies. I checked the references and located a number of articles on several topics, including this one. I then went to the library website and searched in the Library Literature and Information Full Text database, as a likely source to have the article. I was able to access the full text of the article through this database.

Database: N/A

Method of Searching: Footnote Chasing


Scholarly/Refereed Status: After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it is “a refereed journal published quarterly.”


Abstract. “This paper aims to provide an overall picture of the application of Web 2.0 technologies in Australasian university libraries. The focus of the research was what types of Web 2.0 technologies were applied in such libraries as well as their purposes and features. This unique study explores the application of Web 2.0 in a wide scope including any Australasian university libraries that deployed any types of Web 2.0 technologies. This study is useful for Australasian university libraries in evaluating/deploying Web 2.0. Library managers, librarians
and other university libraries may also find this helpful once they want to implement such
technologies in their libraries.”

**Annotation:** This article provided a focused study of Web 2.0 use in Australian libraries. By grounding the study in statistics and percentages of how many libraries utilized each type of Web 2.0 technology, it provided a greater depth to discussing why each technology might or might not have been embraced by Australian libraries, and likewise, what this might say about libraries beyond the focus of this study.

**Search Strategy:** I read through the article by Anttiroiko, A., & Savolainen, R. on library 2.0 technologies in public libraries, and wanted to know if the authors cited any more articles related to this topic or perhaps a related one to my studies. I checked the references and located a number of articles on several topics, including this one. I then went to the library website and searched in the Library Literature and Information Full Text database, as a likely source to have the article. I was able to access the full text of the article through the Emerald Insight website through the Get It link.

**Database:** N/A

**Method of Searching:** Footnote Chasing

**Search String:** Referenced in:


**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it is “a member of COPE.” COPE’s website lists the organization as “a forum for editors and publishers of peer-reviewed journals to discuss all aspects of publication ethics.”


**Abstract:** “In exploring new ways of teaching students how to use medical subject headings (MeSH), librarians at Boston University’s Alumni Medical Library (AML) integrated social tagging into their instruction. These activities were incorporated into the two-credit graduate course, "GMS MS 640: Introduction to Biomedical Information," required for all students in the graduate medical science program. Hands-on assignments and in-class exercises enabled librarians to present MeSH and the concept of a controlled vocabulary in a familiar and relevant context for the course’s generation Y student population and provided students the opportunity to actively participate in creating their education. At the conclusion of these activities, students
were surveyed regarding the clarity of the presentation of the MeSH vocabulary. Analysis of survey responses indicated that 46% found the concept of MeSH to be the clearest concept presented in the in-class intervention.”

Annotation: As the sole article focusing on bibliographic instruction, it provides key insight into how a Web 2.0 technology can be used to serve a traditional role in library service. It also highlights an approach to Web 2.0 technologies as a means to an end, a point not often considered explicitly by other articles in this study.

Search Strategy: I selected Infosci in Dialog because this covered several major library science databases. After using the set detail on function, I chose only three databases to utilize, as those had the most hits, and they were also considered to contain mostly scholarly resources. These three were Eric, Inspec, and Social SciSearch. This was an initial search using these databases so I chose a keyword approach.

Database: INSPEC in Dialog

Method of Searching: Keyword searching in Dialog

Search String: b infosci
Set detail on
S (social(w)networking) and (wiki or blog or social()tagging) and
(academic or public and library???)
B 1,2,7
S (social(w)networking) and (wiki or blog or social()tagging) and
(academic or public and library???)
Rd

Scholarly/Refereed Status: After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it is “an international, peer-reviewed journal.”


Abstract. “This article posits a definition and theory for "Library 2.0". It suggests that recent thinking describing the changing Web as "Web 2.0" will have substantial implications for libraries, and recognizes that while these implications keep very close to the history and mission of libraries, they still necessitate a new paradigm for librarianship. The paper applies the theory and definition to the practice of librarianship, specifically addressing how Web 2.0 technologies such as synchronous messaging and streaming media, blogs, wikis, social networks, tagging, RSS feeds, and mashups might intimate changes in how libraries provide access to their collections and user support for that access.”
This article was vital in defining Library 2.0, and grounding this study in an overarching theory of Library 2.0. By providing such a theory, this essay gave a means to discuss and evaluate what purposes each type of Web 2.0 technology serves in the larger theory it provided.

I read through the article by Anttiroiko, A., & Savolainen, R. on library 2.0 technologies in public libraries, and wanted to know if the authors cited any more articles related to this topic or perhaps a related one to my studies. I checked the references and located a number of articles on several topics, including this one. I then went to the library website and searched in the e-journal listings to locate the journal *Webology*. I was able to access the full text of the article through the *Webology* website.

N/A

Footnote Chasing

Referenced in:

After locating the article through the above steps, the article was also located in Ulrich’s lists; it was listed as a scholarly journal and that it’s refereed. According to the journal’s website, it is “an international peer-reviewed journal.”