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**Introduction and Scope:**

The following bibliography provides an overview of recent studies done on the use of Web 2.0 technologies in the academic library setting. Articles include case studies of specific groups of libraries, evaluations of the use of Web 2.0 technologies in Academic Libraries, and pedagogical surveys on the use of Web 2.0 in Information Literacy Instruction (ILI). They also run the gamut of social media platforms from Facebook and Twitter to Pinterest and YouTube with even a look at Alternative Reality Games. Because of the rapidly changing face of social media, only articles published from 2010 to 2012 were included. While this might have eliminated some useful perspectives, an emphasis was placed on recent research in order to better focus on current trends and eliminate out of date information that might skew the understanding of the present shape of this topic. Nearly all articles focus on academic libraries in the United States with two exceptions. Harinarayana and Raju’s (2010) study provides an overview of the top rated universities in the world, but focuses only on English speaking universities. Click and Petit’s (2010) article compares the use of Web 2.0 in various U.S. institutions with its use at the American University of Cairo as well as the way Web 2.0 has been used in general around the world. However, both of these retain enough of a focus on U.S. academic libraries to be valuable additions to the scope of this bibliography.

**Description:**

The explosive growth of Web 2.0 immediately began to change the scope and face of academic libraries. With the almost daily changes in technology many librarians have found it challenging to keep up with the latest trends. According to studies reported by Luo (2010), over “80% of [college] students [spent] at least some time on social networking sites each week” and since platforms like Facebook and Twitter have continued to grow in popularity, the number is likely higher now (p. 32). Librarians are often on the forefront of technological advancement and are always looking for new ways to meet their users where they are. Therefore, it seems only natural for academic libraries to establish a presence in these interactive Internet communities. However, this raises several questions that must be addressed: How should libraries engage in social media? How do users perceive libraries’ presence there? How effective is this engagement? Is it worth the investment to establish this kind of online presence? These are not easy questions with simple answers and, as the shifting world of social media continues to
change, the answers will change as well. What is important is for academic libraries to understand their present status in the Web 2.0 environment. Learning from current successes and failures will allow more academic libraries to move forward as effective members of the social media arena.

Summary of Findings:

Web 2.0, which is a term used to reference interactive Internet sites such as social networking platforms, social media, and community websites, has expanded with great rapidity over the last few years. As more and more students flock to these sites, libraries have followed in an attempt to stay technologically current and accessible. This is particularly true in academic libraries whose user base is also the main user base of social media sites. With this rise also came the need for academic studies, overviews, and evaluations to assess how effective current use is, how users perceive the libraries’ presence, and which tools can be used to greater advantage.

There is a fairly wide variety of opinions on library use of Web 2.0 technology. While the overall sense from the literature is that using social media tools in libraries is positive and widespread, the numbers show a surprising lack of library involvement. Mahmood and Richardson’s (2011) survey of Academic and Research Libraries (ARL) found that even within the most popular Web 2.0 tool, instant messaging, only 43.7 libraries in their study had a presence (p. 366). Harinarayana and Raju (2010) looked at the top 100 universities in the world and found that only 57 of their libraries had at least 1 Web 2.0 tool present on their website (p. 75). Phillips (2011) focused on Facebook use within four year colleges in the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois. Out of the 30 schools she found that only 19 of those had a real presence on Facebook – around 67% (p. 513-514). With newer sites such as Pinterest, which discussed by Thornton (2012), the percentages were even smaller with only 57 academic U.S. libraries having accounts at the time of the study (p. 168).

While these numbers can change almost daily as academic libraries add and discontinue use of these technologies, this brief overview shows that Web 2.0, even though an established part of the life of a majority of students, has been adopted by a smaller percentage of academic libraries than might be expected. In their study on the use of Twitter by academic libraries Del Bosque, Leif, and Skarl (2012) pointed out that, from their random sample, only a third of the libraries were using Twitter at all, and many of them were not using it very effectively (p. 211).
Jacobson (2011) addressed this issue in regards to Facebook as well. Focusing only on libraries that regularly updated their pages and using input from college librarians, Jacobson attempted to identify the difference between perceived and actual use of Facebook by 12 Facebook-active libraries. Overall, the lack of regularly updated pages available to include in the study states more about libraries’ perception of Facebook’s usefulness than it does about student use. The conclusion is that librarians “may be more ambitious in our hopes for our Facebook presence than we can actually materialize” a conclusion many of the articles, whether positive or negative in their view of social media, corroborate (Jacobson, 2011, p. 87).

A number of articles raise questions as to the value of using Web 2.0 tools in general, but social networking sites in particular. Hicks and Graber (2010) pointed out how reticent faculty can be about libraries moving away from what is perceived as the academic arena and into the social world and, while they don’t push libraries away from Web 2.0 tools, they do warn that outside perception must be taken into account. Dickson and Holley (2010) addressed the issue of value when they questioned whether there was enough student usage of the currently library offered Web 2.0 tools to warrant further involvement. Acknowledging the fact that social networking is becoming increasingly important, they are still hesitant as to how important it is for libraries to spend the time and money necessary to build an effective present. They even go so far as to warn that library outreach into social media sites could be perceived as “stalking” by the student population (Dickson & Holley, 2010, p. 475). While this perspective was in the minority overall, it is an interesting angle on library use of social media. Cassidy et al. (2011) looked at this issue from the users’ perspective to see whether students were familiar with different Web 2.0 tools and if they would like their academic libraries to use them and have a social media presence. Their main conclusion was that “libraries cannot necessarily follow popular trends without studying the local population” (Cassidy et al., 2011, p. 390). Different aspects of Web 2.0 will work differently with differing user groups and libraries need to take this into consideration before putting effort into building a presence. However, their study also shows that many students do want libraries to be present on social media sites for easier access, which counters Dickson and Holley’s warning. Click and Petit (2010) pointed to a few challenges of Web 2.0, but in concluding their argument state that “the benefits of these technologies strongly outweigh the concerns” because “our users are already there” (p. 142). They present no reticence in library use of social media and strongly encourage libraries to lead the way into these new
technologies. In contrast, Lilburn (2012) was really the only author to raise questions about the larger implications of library use of social media. Pointing out that all major social networking sites and most Web 2.0 technologies are founded in or produced by corporations, Lilburn questions the ethical nature of library endorsement or use of such sites. Acknowledging that more users expect their information needs to be met through these new technologies, Lilburn still cautions libraries from jumping into Web 2.0 without careful consideration.

While all of the above articles focused on evaluating the use of Web 2.0, most articles on the topic, including several of those already mentioned, were focused more on presenting how libraries are using these tools now and offering suggestions as to how other libraries can integrate them as well. For example, Petit (2011) focuses on the conversations that Twitter and Facebook can generate and how libraries are encouraging their users to offer feedback on services, and Cassidy et al. (2011) walk through each of the major Web 2.0 tools to show how libraries are using them and whether users are responding. Del Bosque, Leif, and Skarl (2012) not only evaluate the effectiveness of Twitter, but also provide some helpful hints for libraries who wish to venture into that world and Thornton (2012) reserves the last section of her article on Pinterest for suggestions on how to build effective pinboards. However, the largest segment of these articles focused on the ways that academic libraries can use Web 2.0 to enhance their Information Literacy Instruction (ILI) and make it more relevant to modern students.

Luo (2010) studied a range of IL librarians to evaluate the ways they were utilizing Web 2.0 technologies in their instruction. She looks at a variety of social media tools and presents quotes from the members of the survey group to illustrate how librarians now are using these tools. Bobish (2011) also provided a broader overview of the ways IL librarians are incorporating Web 2.0 into their classes. Specifically utilizing ACRL IL standards as a framework for his study, Bobish presents examples and suggestions on how IL instructors can use social media that students are already familiar with to enhance their understanding of academic information. Witek and Grettano (2012) focus more specifically on Facebook, but follow a similar pattern to Bobish in listing specific ways that IL instructors are using and can use Facebook to teach some of the more challenging concepts behind evaluating and selecting information in a college setting while Deitering and Gronemyer (2011) show how this can be done with the use of blogs. Deitering and Gronemyer’s (2011) goal is to present practical ways IL instructors can help students learn more about the creation and dissemination of information
in order to see it as a dynamic rather than a static entity. Battles, Glenn, and Shedd (2011) carry this to a whole new level as they describe the process of developing and implementing an Alternate Reality Game (ARG) to introduce students to library resources and tools. While the concept is interesting and should lead to other attempts along these lines, the authors admit that the overall success of the ARG was limited by a number of development issues and lack of longevity considerations. Whether using Facebook, Twitter, blogs, ARGs or other social media tools, these authors build their articles to provide useful tips and suggestions for future practitioners to consider.

While each article approached library use of Web 2.0 technologies from a different angle, all of them held one thing in common: the importance of the relationship between user and library. Even Lilburn (2012), the most reticent to accept library use of Web 2.0, hesitates because of his fear that these tools “could undermine library efforts to provide users with spaces that are truly open, user-centered, and participatory” (p. 150). Whether cautioning a whole-hearted acceptance of social media or pointing out the many opportunities for connection social media provides, each author keeps the user at the focus of their study. As long as this remains the constant, academic libraries will move forward in their use (or non-use) of Web 2.0 in a conscious way that will benefit the profession as a whole.

**Bibliography:**

**Entry 1:**

**Abstract:** “In recent years, libraries have made efforts to create games, often for the purpose of information literacy instruction. Games can provide an interactive alternative to traditional instruction by introducing research tools and resources while also teaching problem solving skills within a collaborative learning environment. Despite the benefits, the limited resources of most libraries make it difficult to build games that appeal to a generation of students accustomed to games like World of Warcraft. It is a challenge to find a balance between the right format and the available skills and assets. The desire to create an engaging game within the confines of existing resources led the University of Alabama Libraries to create the Web-based alternate reality game
Project Velius. Serving the research needs of faculty and more than 30,000 students, the University Libraries are a vital part of Alabama’s oldest public university. University of Alabama librarians leveraged popular social media sites and applications, including Facebook and YouTube, along with the story-driven alternate reality game format, to build a game that would engage undergraduate students. The game’s two main goals were to provide informal information literacy instruction and highlight important library resources, balanced with the desire to provide a fun and interesting game experience. In the creation and execution of Project Velius, the librarians-turned-game developers learned much about this new medium, including the complexity of writing a compelling story, the importance of precisely tracking player progress, and the need for an easily re-playable game. Looking forward, the successes and shortcomings of this initial project will guide the plans and, through this article, hopefully help colleagues understand some of the challenges and rewards.”

**Annotation:** By trying to tap into the interactive gaming experience, this library designed and ran an Alternative Reality Game (ARG) to introduce library tools and resources to students. This article is basically just a summary of the process and experience. It provides tips and suggestions for future use of this kind of tool, but its focus on one school and the rather underwhelming success of the project makes this more of a cautionary tale than a blueprint for future use.

**Search Strategy:** Since I narrowed my focus from libraries in general to academic libraries I thought that the Education Resources Information Center might provide a different selection of articles from an education angle rather than just a library angle. Full text was not available through Drexel, but I was able to access it through Seton Hall University’s e-journals since I am an adjunct there. Otherwise I would have requested it through ILLiad.

**Database:** Education Resources Information Center

**Method of Searching:** Controlled Vocabulary

**Search String:** Thesaurus Terms: “Academic Libraries” AND “Social Networks”
**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** When searching with the thesaurus terms I also applied the limit of Peer Reviewed to my search results. The website lists the journal as peer-reviewed and it is also listed in Ulrich’s as a refereed journal.

**Entry 2:**

**Abstract:** “This article examines the connection between ACRL information literacy standards and constructivist pedagogy. This connection is used to support use of Web 2.0 tools for information literacy instruction. Sample exercises using these tools are provided for each ACRL learning outcome, and the tools' suitability for the constructivist approach is reasserted.”

**Annotation:** Connecting social media tools directly to learning outcomes, this article points out the necessity of having specific goals. It references many of the pitfalls of using new tools simply because they are new and encourages information literacy instructors to seriously consider why and how they use Web 2.0 tools. Bobish establishes the learning theories on which his recommendations are based and applies them to his discussion of the use of Web 2.0 in the classroom. Each ACRL literacy standard is addressed individual with specific suggestions for integrating social media into the learning process in a more conscious way.

**Search Strategy:** Lilburn was the strongest voice of warning against the problems of social media use so I checked his sources to try to expand the range of opinions on my topic. After locating the citation on the article I found the full-text through the e-journal holdings on the Hagerty website.

**Database:** N/A
Method of Searching: Footnote chasing

Search String: Cited in:

Scholarly/Refereed Status: The journal is listed in Ulrich’s as refereed and its website says it is a refereed journal.

Entry 3:

Abstract: “This article examines technology trends in higher education and how they impact student habits and preferences in college libraries. A study was conducted among students at the Sam Houston State University in East Texas to investigate their usage of electronic devices and technologies such as text messaging, Twitter, podcasts, Really Simple Syndication (RSS) feeds, and social networks. Results indicate that students do wish that basic library services were available through the most popular social networking sites and Internet technologies. Topics include a review of literature consulted, methods used, and the demographics of the student body researched.”

Annotation: Focusing on one student body, this study is limited by geographical location and number of students who responded. Both of these factors could impact the study’s application on a larger scale. However, the initial results are intriguing. The survey first asked if the student was familiar with a particular social media such as Facebook, YouTube, or Twitter and then asked if they would be interested in library services through that media. The positive and negative responses provide an interesting perspective for libraries to consider when developing a social media platform. The conclusion is that libraries should consciously consider which, if any, social
media sites they should use, but with the acknowledgment that many students expect their libraries to have a presence.

**Search Strategy:** This study was referenced in Del Bosque, Leif, & Skarl’s article and seemed a pertinent study to my topic. I checked the references for the citation and then found the journal through the Hagerty e-journal holdings. I was able to access the full-text of the article through Library Literature & Information Science Full Text (H.W. Wilson) Publications.

**Database:** N/A

**Method of Searching:** Footnote Chasing

**Search String:** Article cited in:

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** The Journal website states that all articles go through blind refereeing. Ulrich’s lists the print version of the journal as refereed, but does not list the online version as refereed even though the site clearly states that it continues to peer-review all content.

**Entry 4:**

**Abstract:** “This paper discusses free online and Internet tools that can be adapted by librarians for use with library instruction and information literacy training, with a focus on social media and Web 2.0 technologies, including social networking websites Facebook and twitter, blogs, RSS, wikis, and video sharing. Many students already use these technologies and are readily
engaged with the library when the technologies are incorporated into library websites and classes. There are challenges in using these technologies, especially in countries with oppressive governments. This paper is based, in part, on a presentation the authors gave at the UNESCO Training the Trainers in Information Literacy Workshop at the Bibliotheca Alexandrina in Alexandria, Egypt in November 2008.”

**Annotation:** This article provides a broad overview of the various kinds of social media and how libraries are using it to enhance their services. While the title makes it sound like it focuses on academic libraries and information literacy, the article actually covers a wide variety of libraries and their varying use of tools like Facebook, Twitter, wikis, and blogs to reach out to younger users particularly. It does provide a number of suggestions on how social media can be used to introduce college students to more complicated library interfaces such as controlled vocabulary. It encourages librarians to stay on the forefront of rapidly-changing technological interfaces to better connect to students and other patrons. It is basically an overview and summary rather than an in-depth look at social media use in libraries.

**Search Strategy:** I selected Library and Information Science Abstracts because it would contain the largest number of articles pertinent to my topic. This was an initial search so I used keywords to begin.

**Database:** LISA (ProQuest)

**Method of Searching:** Keyword

**Search String:** SS (social network*) OR (social software*) OR (social media*) OR (*blog*) OR (*wiki*) OR (“web 2.0”) OR (facebook) OR (twitter*) OR (linkedin)

SS librar*

S 2 AND 3
Scholarly/Refereed Status: The article was located with the limits of peer-reviewed and academic journals. The journal’s website declares itself a peer-reviewed journal and it is listed in Ulrich’s as refereed.

Entry 5:

Abstract: “Undergraduate students are expected to find, evaluate, and use peer-reviewed or scholarly literature, but they rarely learn about the process of creating new knowledge or the roles the literature plays in the work of scholars. A desired outcome of undergraduate education is the understanding that knowledge is created, evolving, and contextual rather than discovered, static, and universal. There is some evidence that explicit instruction can facilitate this understanding. As scholars use the participatory Web to talk about the work that they do, they also create places where students can look in on the knowledge creation process.”

Annotation: By evaluating the learning process of undergraduates, this article explores the ways librarians and faculty need to help their students understand the ways information is created and why this is important rather than just telling them they have to use certain sources. It looks at academic writing as a conversation and suggests ways librarians can get students engaged in the conversation to better understand it in order to more effectively apply those skills to their own academic careers. The main focus of this article is student engagement in the blogs of scholars located on the internet. It collects a list of multiple scholarly blogging platforms and shows how some professors have used them in the past to enrich student learning.

Search Strategy: After discovering this journal, I decided to browse the last couple of volumes because of its focus on academic libraries.

Database: N/A
**Method of Searching:** Browsing

**Search String:** Found when browsing after locating:

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** Ulrich’s lists this as a refereed journal. It is associated with The Johns Hopkins University Press and the website states that it is peer-reviewed.

**Entry 6:**

**Abstract:** “Purpose – This paper aims to present an overview of how libraries are using twitter in an academic setting. Design/methodology/approach – This study analyzed the current state of 296 Twitter accounts from a random sample of academic libraries. A total of 19 different criteria were explored, with an emphasis on the following three categories: layout and design, content and number of tweets, and account followers. Findings – Only 34 per cent of libraries in the study had a Twitter account and characteristics varied widely among libraries, however, it is evident that it is possible to successfully communicate with patrons via Twitter. Research limitations/implications – A primary limitation for this study is the frequency with which Twitter can change. Practical implications – This paper provides a snapshot of how libraries are currently using Twitter, which can be of assistance to libraries seeking to implement a Twitter presence. Originality/value – The paper presents an overview of trends in academic library Twitter accounts, which could be useful to librarians who are considering launching a Twitter account for their library.”

**Annotation:** This article provides an overview of basic ways that libraries in general are using Twitter to reach their patrons. It also has an in depth study of a selection of academic libraries
and their Twitter availability and usage including which libraries had a Twitter account, how many times a month they tweeted, how many followers they had, and whether they had a Twitter logo displayed on the library page. The study found that over half of the libraries with accounts interacted with their patrons and analyzed which seemed to be the most effective ways of doing so. The data is collected from a fairly small group and the initial randomly selected group of colleges did not all have Twitter accounts. They acknowledge the limitations, but their end results could be slightly skewed because of these limitations. A larger pool of universities would have made the research more useful.

**Search Strategy:** When accessing the full text of Witek & Grettano’s article on the journal’s website, I found this article in the same issue of *Reference Services Review*. The title caught my attention and looked quite relevant to my topic.

**Database:** N/A

**Method of Searching:** Browsing

**Search String:** Found when accessing:


**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** This journal is listed in Ulrich’s as a refereed journal and the journal website declares that it is refereed.

**Entry 7:**


**Abstract:** “Purpose -- 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. Design/methodology/approach -- The paper
summarizes findings from articles published since 2006 found in the Library Literature and
Information Full Text database. The first author also examined librarian blogs and
library accounts in various social networking sites. Findings -- Social networking can be an
effective method of student outreach in academic libraries if libraries take care to respect student
privacy and to provide equal coverage for all subject areas. Research limitations/implications --
Most information about social networking is anecdotal with very little statistical analysis of its
effectiveness. The popularity of the various social networking sites can change quickly. Practical
implications -- Academic libraries should consider using social networking as an outreach effort
but take care to avoid the potential negative consequences. Originality/value -- This paper
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: A large part of this article is a review of the recent articles and discussion about
social networking. Since the article was written in 2010, the studies it refers to are already
starting to be out of date. However, the collection of information about the ways Web 2.0 was
being used is useful to establish the trends in social media use in academic libraries. It also
provides a significant section on the drawbacks to social media use as well, something that isn’t
always well-balanced in much of the literature on this topic. It points out the large amounts of
time and effort that must be put in to build an effective outreach to students and raises the
question of whether there is enough student response to warrant the effort.

Search Strategy: Since “Libraries atwitter” was such a recent article I was curious as to
what other sources they referred to. Browsing the list of sources this
article seemed pertinent to my project. After obtaining the citation I
located the article in full-text through LISA (ProQuest).
Database: N/A

Method of Searching: Footnote chasing

Search String: This article was cited in:

Scholarly/Refereed Status: The journal website states that all articles go through a peer review process and it is listed in Ulrich’s as a refereed journal.

Entry 8:

Abstract: “Purpose - The purpose of this paper is to explore recent trends in the application of Web 2.0 and Library 2.0 features as exemplified through university library web sites around the world. Design/methodology/approach - The top 100 universities from the ranked list of 200 provided on the Times Higher Education web site were considered for collection of data and from this list a selection was made of 57 of these universities. This selection was based on whether the site was in English and whether it had at least one Web 2.0 feature. For each of these universities their web sites were visited and data on their Web 2.0 features (such as Blogs, RSS, Instant Messaging, Wikis and the like) were collected and analyzed. Findings - Results reveal that 37 university libraries use RSS feeds for dissemination of library news, events and announcements and 15 university libraries provide blog space for users. Whereas wiki is the least applied Web 2.0 technology, with only one university using it, Instant Messaging is another most widely applied feature with 37 libraries already providing reference service through it. Podcast (used in three libraries) and Vidcast (used in six libraries) are yet to become popular facilities to be offered in university library web sites. Research limitations/implications - The study is based on the university ranking for 2007, as the World Top 200 Universities 2008 was not published.
until October 2008 when this article was being finalized. However, this does not affect the outcome of the Web 2.0 features being utilized by the universities. Originality/value - Most of the earlier studies on the subject deal with Web 2.0 tools and how they could be used in the library context. The present paper, however, provides concrete evidence of the application of Web 2.0 in university libraries. As such it should prove of interest to all types of libraries, even though its context is university libraries.”

Annotation: This article is focused on the top world university libraries, but limits to sites in English. Even though it was published in 2010, the research is based off information from 2007 and 2008, which restricts the currency of the information. This project was not to evaluate the way library sites used Web 2.0 technology but to see how they were using it and to what extent. It provides a limited overview and fails to draw any kind of larger conclusion except that Web 2.0 technology will continue to become more important and will probably become a more consistent part of academic libraries in future.

Search Strategy: After starting with a general search for libraries in relation to social media, I quickly narrowed my focus to academic libraries in particular. I wanted to keep my search fairly broad, so I stayed with keywords. After locating the citation in ProQuest Library Science I found the full text through Emerald Journals in Hagerty’s e-journal collection.

Database: ProQuest Library Science

Method of Searching: Keyword

Search String: SS (social network*) OR (social software*) OR (social media*) OR (*blog*) OR (*wiki*) OR (“web 2.0”) OR (facebook) OR (twitter*) OR (linkedin)

SS librar*

SS TI,SU,AB(academic OR universit* OR college*)

S 1 AND 2 AND 8
Scholarly/Refereed Status: After using the listed keyword search I limited the results by Peer reviewed and scholarly journals. According to Ulrich’s this is a refereed journal. The website states that all articles go through the editor and then 2 blind referees.

Entry 9:

Abstract: “Purpose - This paper seeks to re-conceptualize Web 2.0 tools within the intellectual and theoretical frameworks currently driving changes in academic learning communities and to explore the effect of this paradigm shift on academic libraries. Design/methodology/approach - The paper explores an intellectually rather than technologically driven definition of Web 2.0 and its potential effect on teaching and learning in libraries. Reflections are based on paradigm shifts in learning theories implicit in the adoption and implementation of Web 2.0 technologies. The paper also discusses applications of Web 2.0 designed to improve student and faculty engagement in the research process. Findings - The paper encourages librarians to think beyond the technology and to consider how Web 2.0 can support intellectual teaching and learning objectives in an academic library. Practical implications - The paper discusses applications of Web 2.0 designed to improve student and faculty engagement in the research process. Originality/value - The paper offers insights into rethinking current conceptions of Web 2.0 based on participation in and collaboration with faculty during a summer institute session. It provides a common conceptual framework of teaching and learning theory for librarians to use when implementing Web 2.0 tools and applications.”

Annotation: The shift in information usage from Web 1.0 to Web 2.0 provides a foundation for this analysis of higher education and library use of the ever-changing world of social media. Rather than looking at how individual libraries or universities are using the technology, this article analyzes the shift in technology and the dangers and possibilities Web 2.0 opens up. It particularly warns against simply trying to shift old pedagogies into new formats; instead,
librarians and instructors must themselves shift with the technology in order to best reach their users and students.

**Search Strategy:** After starting with a general search for libraries in relation to social media, I quickly narrowed my focus to academic libraries in particular. I wanted to keep my search fairly broad, so I stayed with keywords. The full-text was available through ProQuest.

**Database:** ProQuest Library Science

**Method of Searching:** Keyword

**Search String:** SS (social network*) OR (social software*) OR (social media*) OR (*blog*) OR (*wiki*) OR (“web 2.0”) OR (facebook) OR (twitter*) OR (linkedin)

SS librar*

SS TI,SU,AB(academic OR universit* OR college*)

S 1 AND 2 AND 8

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** After performing the above keyword search I also limited the results by peer reviewed and scholarly journals. This journal is listed in Ulrich’s as a refereed journal and the journal website declares that it is refereed.

**Entry 10:**


**Abstract:** “As Facebook has come to dominate the social networking site arena, more libraries have created their own library pages on Facebook to create library awareness and to function as a marketing tool. This paper examines reported versus actual use of Facebook in libraries to
identify discrepancies between intended goals and actual use. The results of a 2009 study about the use of Facebook in libraries are used as a guide to gauge the perceived and actual uses for Facebook in this study. Results of the test reveal that the two ranks are not statistically different, but that there is a noticeable difference when looking at the perceived and actual rankings qualitatively.

In the past few years, libraries have begun to examine the possibilities available to them through social networking sites like Twitter and Facebook as a tool for library awareness and marketing. As Facebook has come to dominate the social networking site arena, more libraries have created their own library pages on Facebook to create library awareness and to function as a marketing tool. This has spurred a large number of how-to articles about the uses for Facebook in libraries as well as research about how librarians and libraries use Facebook. This paper examines reported versus actual use of Facebook in libraries to identify discrepancies between intended goals and actual use. The results of the 2009 study by Hendrix, Chiarella, Hasman, Murphy and Zafron, about the use of Facebook in libraries, is used as a guide to gauge the perceived and actual uses for Facebook in this study.”

**Annotation:** Looking to fill a hole in research about library use of Facebook, this study creates a carefully selected group of libraries which regularly updated their pages in order to build a more effective analysis of how Facebook is being used by academic libraries. This resulted in only 12 libraries being chosen, which limits the widespread applicability, but also ensures that those libraries being examined aren’t skewing the results because of non-use. The results show that it is possible that libraries believe they are being more active in their use of Facebook than they actually are. It also stresses the importance of regular maintenance in order to have an effective Facebook presence that will generate interest and interaction from users.

**Search Strategy:** Since Lilburn’s article provided a caution that was not present in many of the other articles, I decided it would be good to explore some of the sources used in that article. After locating the citation I found the e-journal available with full-text through the Hagerty library.

**Database:** N/A
Method of Searching: Footnote Chasing

Search String: Cited in:

Scholarly/Refereed Status: Ulrich’s lists this as an academic, refereed journal and the journal itself is connected to ACRL and the website states that it is refereed and goes through a double-blind review process.

Entry 11:

Abstract: “Recent scholarship challenges the celebratory discourse surrounding Web 2.0. This paper engages with this scholarship to examine critically the implications of academic libraries’ presence within commercially owned social media spaces. It considers the apparent contradiction between work to promote the principles of open access and the idea of the commons, and engagement with commercial social media that may be contributing to the enclosure of the commons. It also examines whether the form of participation permitted within commercial social media sites may be limited and subordinating. The paper concludes with possible directions for further research and analysis.”

Annotation: This article challenges the premise that libraries should be a part of popular social networking platforms. It does so through the apparent contradiction of libraries as proponents of free access while becoming a part of corporation owned and operated social media sites that gather information for marketing and other commercial purposes. While it doesn’t condemn libraries’ use of social media outright, it does present a fairly unique perspective of challenging
the discipline to look at this issue in a more critical fashion and consider all of the implications library participation in social media has on the information commons.

**Search Strategy:** Since I narrowed my focus from libraries in general to academic libraries I thought that the Education Resources Information Center might provide a different selection of articles from an education angle rather than just a library angle. After finding the citation on ERIC I accessed the journal’s website through Ulrich’s as I was checking for referee status. Project MUSE via the library allows full-text access.

**Database:** Education Resources Information Center

**Method of Searching:** Controlled Vocabulary

**Search String:** Thesaurus Terms: “Academic Libraries” AND “Social Networks”

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** After searching with the thesaurus terms I also limited my results by Peer Reviewed. Ulrich’s lists this as a refereed journal. It is associated with The Johns Hopkins University Press and the website states that it is peer-reviewed.

**Entry 12:**

**Abstract:** “Survey and semi-structured interviews were conducted in this study to examine the adoption of the Web 2.0 technology in information literacy instruction. Findings suggest that librarians use Web 2.0 tools in three different levels, and overall it has a positive impact on teaching and learning.”
Annotation: Focusing on Information Literacy Instruction (ILI) this article evaluates the shifting world of Web 2.0 and how it is being and can be used in library pedagogy. It looks at the issue from an overview perspective rather than narrowing in on a specific group or institution in order to better understand the issue. The surveys and responses presented provide a valuable look into how faculty and library staff are utilizing Web 2.0 tools and what is seen as effective or ineffective.

Search Strategy: When I got to the end of Bobish’s article, this was listed in the references and I thought it would be useful as an overview of my topic. After getting the citation from the article I found the full-text through the e-journal holdings on Hagerty.

Database: N/A

Method of Searching: Footnote chasing


Scholarly/Refereed Status: This journal states that it is a peer reviewed journal and is also listed as refereed in Ulrich’s.

Entry 13:

Abstract: “Purpose – This paper aims to survey the web sites of the academic libraries of the Association of Research Libraries (USA) regarding the adoption of Web 2.0 technologies. Design/methodology/approach – The websites of 100 member academic libraries of the
Association of Research Libraries (USA) were surveyed. Findings – All libraries were found to be using various tools of Web 2.0. Blogs, microblogs, RSS, instant messaging, social networking sites, mashups, podcasts, and vodcasts were widely adopted, while wikis, photo sharing, presentation sharing, virtual worlds, customized webpage and vertical search engines were used less. Libraries were using these tools for sharing news, marketing their services, providing information literacy instruction, providing information about print and digital resources, and soliciting feedback of users. Originality/value – The paper is useful for future planning of Web 2.0 use in academic libraries.”

Annotation: The authors make it clear that this is a limited study and that therefore the results cannot be generalized, making their discussion more creditable as they acknowledge the limitations. They look specifically at academic libraries that are a part of the Association of Research Libraries to explore how these libraries are and are not utilizing various social media tools. The focus is on the libraries as opposed to the students’ use of these tools. Overall they found that academic libraries had a presence in multiple Web 2.0 platforms, but do not draw any larger conclusions, instead pointing to other research studies that will need to be done in order to fully address this issue.

Search Strategy: This article was referenced in Del Bosque, Leif, & Skarl’s article. I found the citation in the references. The full text is available through Emerald Management 40 via the Hagerty e-journals.

Database: N/A

Method of Searching: Footnote Chasing

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** This journal is listed in Ulrich’s as a refereed journal and the journal website states that it is refereed.

**Entry 14:**

**Abstract:** “Libraries are offering more services through social media Web sites like Twitter and Facebook, and this presence online is encouraging more conversation between libraries and patrons, including collection development requests. A review of popular Twitter and Facebook library profiles reveals the most successful accounts to be those where the library actively engages its users online. Through these media, libraries can have direct, immediate conversations with patrons that result in patron-initiated material requests.”

**Annotation:** This brief article takes a look at the academic library presence on Twitter and Facebook. It provides evaluation of the most effective ways libraries are using and can use these social media tools to enhance their connection with their patrons. Its main focus is on how libraries have used social media to allow users to make requests and provide input on collection development. It contains more suggestions than research, but is an interesting angle on library social media use.

**Search Strategy:** After starting with a general search for libraries in relation to social media, I quickly narrowed my focus to academic libraries in particular. I was still doing an initial search, so I stayed with keywords. After locating the citation on LISA I found the full text through Informaworld Journals in Hagerty’s e-journal collection.

**Database:** Library and Information Science Abstracts (ProQuest)

**Method of Searching:** Keyword
Search String:  SS (social network*) OR (social software*) OR (social media*) OR (*blog*) OR (*wiki*) OR (“web 2.0”) OR (facebook) OR (twitter*) OR (linkedin)  
SS librar*  
SS TI,SU,AB(academic OR universit* OR college*)  
S 1 AND 2 AND 8

Scholarly/Refereed Status:  After performing the keyword search I also applied the limits of peer reviewed and scholarly journals. The journal is listed in Ulrich’s as a refereed and academic journal. The website of the journal also lists it as a refereed journal.

Entry 15:  
*Journal of Academic Librarianship, 37*(6), 512-522.

Abstract:  “A content analysis was conducted of status messages posted by academic libraries on seventeen Facebook pages. In addition to being informational, libraries attempt to engage and establish rapport with students through Facebook. The university setting not only creates a context for messages, but also offers a mutual set of experiences and values shared by libraries and students.”

Annotation:  As opposed to many of the other articles about libraries and social media, this study focuses on the relationships that Facebook can help academic libraries build with students. The study examines the ways a small group of academic libraries are using Facebook to interact with students and how effective this interaction is. The extremely small sample makes it difficult to apply this to a larger setting, but the unique focus on relationships makes this a study worth considering in the larger context of academic library use of social media.

Search Strategy:  Since I narrowed my focus from libraries in general to academic libraries I thought that the Education Resources Information Center might provide a
different selection of articles from an education angle rather than just a
library angle. After finding the citation on ERIC I accessed the e-journal
through the library. The full-text is available through ScienceDirect
Freedom Collection 2012.

**Database:** Education Resources Information Center

**Method of Searching:** Controlled Vocabulary

**Search String:** Thesaurus Terms: “Academic Libraries” AND “Social Networks”

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** After searching with the thesaurus terms I also limited the results
to Peer Reviewed. The journal is listed in Ulrich’s as refereed and
its website says it is a refereed journal.

**Entry 16:**
of Web Librarianship*, 6(3), 164-175.

**Abstract:** “Academic libraries are flocking to online social networking sites in an effort to meet
users where they are. Pinterest is the latest of these rapidly growing online social networking
tools. The author of this article reports results from a survey on academic libraries’ presence on
Pinterest. The survey found most academic library pinboards are in their infancy. Findings
suggest that before establishing a presence on Pinterest, libraries should focus on planning
institutional profiles and boards. Example institutions are highlighted, and tips are offered for
setting up profiles and pinning, based on information from the survey.”

**Annotation:** This article stands out as one of the first, if not only academic articles on Pinterest
use in academic libraries. It collects information about ways libraries are using Pinterest to reach
out to their users and evaluates how effective they seem to be. After an evaluation of existing
Pinboards, the author provides a list of tips for libraries to build a useful and effective Pinterest presence. While it provides research, this article serves more as a trade tool.

**Search Strategy:** Since I narrowed my focus from libraries in general to academic libraries I thought that the Education Resources Information Center might provide a different selection of articles from an education angle rather than just a library angle. Full text was not available through Drexel, but I was able to access it through Seton Hall University’s e-journals since I am an adjunct there. Otherwise I would have requested it through ILLiad.

**Database:** Education Resources Information Center

**Method of Searching:** Controlled Vocabulary

**Search String:** Thesaurus Terms: “Academic Libraries” AND “Web 2.0 Technologies”

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** After searching for the thesaurus terms I also applied the limit of Peer Reviewed to the results. The website lists the journal as peer-reviewed and it is also listed in Ulrich’s as a refereed journal.

**Entry 17:**


**Abstract:** “Purpose – This analysis, being part one of a two-part study, aims to illustrate the attitudes and patterns users are being habituated to through the functionality of Facebook, relate them to information literate practices and behaviors, and speculate their application to information literacy instruction within an academic context. It also aims to lay the groundwork for part two, which is to be reported on in a later issue of this journal.

Design/methodology/approach – For this first part of the study, the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education
have been aligned with common behaviors on Facebook, examining each standard, performance indicator, and outcome for possible parallels in common Facebook tools and behaviors. These behaviors have then been connected to the process of conducting research in an academic context. Findings – Three Facebook functions – Feeds, Share, and Comment – emerged as the primary means by which information literate practices and behaviors are developed and exhibited on Facebook. In addition, information literacy in the age of social media requires a “meta-literacy”: a critical awareness of why we do what we do with information. Research limitations/implications – This analysis (part one) presents the conceptual framework on which the data collection portion of the study (part two) is based. In doing so, it lays the groundwork for a reexamination of what it means to be information literate in light of social media practices and behaviors. Originality/value – This paper is valuable to information literacy instructors and researchers because it offers the first extended analysis that deliberately reads Facebook through the lens of the ACRL Standards.”

Annotation: Since most students are familiar with the Facebook interface, this article examines ways that information literacy programs can use that familiarity to their advantage. The authors acknowledge that Facebook changes frequently and so, although they talk about specific tools, they try to limit their discussion to the main components of Facebook that will not change. Using feed limiters to explain database limiters and the Facebook sort function to illustrate sorting article search results are just two of the ways the authors suggest these connections could be made. The article provides clear explanations of their ideas and points out the relevance of this topic and the lack of research in this area.

Search Strategy: After reading Click & Petit’s article I was curious as to who had cited their work. In LISA I clicked on the “others cited” link which led me to this article included in the short list of works. I located the journal through e-journals in the library holdings. The full text was available through Emerald Management 40

Database: N/A
**Method of Searching:** Reverse Footnote Chasing

**Search String:** This article cited Click, A. & Petit, J. (2010). Social Networking and Web 2.0 in Information Literacy. *The International Information & Library Review, 42*(2), 137-142.

**Scholarly/Refereed Status:** This journal is listed in Ulrich’s as a refereed journal and the journal website declares that it is refereed.

**Conclusion and Personal Statement:**

I was honestly surprised at the wide variety of opinions on the use of Web 2.0 technologies in academic libraries. I think I was expecting a much broader acceptance than I discovered. While all of the authors admit that these technologies have changed libraries and will continue to do so, the gamut of responses from wholehearted and enthusiastic claiming to hesitant acceptance to downright skepticism was eye-opening. Those that presented the cautions were the articles that stood out most to me and showed me implications and ramifications I hadn’t considered before.

With my personal interest in academic librarianship I found all of the articles on ILI particularly fascinating. While the overview articles that looked at whether libraries were using social media or not were interesting, they were not nearly as useful in their scope. Reading all of the suggestions for integrating Web 2.0 into ILI has already provided me with ideas on how I can better reach my students now. But the cautionary aspects of many of these articles will affect my interaction with social media as well. Simply using popular technology to use it is not enough. A specific plan and purpose must be in place in order to make the use effective and necessary.

The searching was certainly a challenge. I appreciated being able to put the search strategies we’ve been learning all quarter to use on a topic of my choice. I found that I am much more thoughtful when it comes to performing a search and I usually end up having to do less searches as the ones I do perform are more pointed and considerate of the limitations of the system. Controlled vocabulary can be incredibly helpful, especially when working in a database with which you are unfamiliar. But citation chasing, both backwards and forwards, was the tool that I found most helpful and useful for this assignment. However, having all of these tools at my
fingertips made me much more confident as my research progressed and, I believe, helped me to find a wide variety of pertinent sources to build this bibliography.

Overall I found this to be an extremely useful assignment. Not only did it give me practical experience putting my new skills to work, but it also allowed me to learn more about a topic for which I have a lot of personal interest. As my main focus is IL and academic libraries, I feel more informed and even more interested in my chosen field of study as a result of this assignment.

**Honesty Statement:**

I certify that:

- This assignment is entirely my own work.

- I have not quoted the words of any other person from a printed source or a website without indicating what has been quoted and providing an appropriate citation.

- I have not submitted this assignment to satisfy the requirements of any other course.
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