Masters of the Bibliographic Universe?

The Promises and Pitfalls of Digital Scholarship in the Age of Googlepedia

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Masters_of_the_University
Where we’re headed...

- Digital scholarship
- Bibliographic universe
- Googlepedia
- Demo of Zotero etc.
- The promises and pitfalls

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Masters_of_the_Universe
I claim that... because of these reasons... which I base on this evidence...

I acknowledge these questions, objections, and alternatives, and I respond to them with these arguments...

The Bibliographic Universe...

searching FINDING

organising ANNOTATING

publishing DRAFTING
For example...

- **Claim:** Bibliographic practices are being transformed through the convergence of specific socio-technical factors, e.g. ‘Googlepedia’
- **Reason:** Scholarship now takes place in print and digital media, but is increasingly disseminated through the Web. Therefore scholarly citation and hyperlinking are co-evolving practices/technologies...
- **Evidence:** Watch this space...
RDIF
Radio Frequency Identification
The Evidence
Starting an Information Search
Where Electronic Information Searches Begin —
by Total Respondents

Where do you typically begin your search for information on a particular topic?

- Search engine: 84%
- E-mail: 6%
- Topic-specific Web sites: 2%
- E-mail information subscriptions: 2%
- Online news: 2%
- Instant messaging/online chat: 1%
- Online bookstore: 1%
- Online database: 1%
- Library Web site: 1%

Earlier you stated you typically begin your search for information using search engines. Which search engine did you use for your most recent search?

Base: Respondents who begin their search using a search engine, question 520.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Engine</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Google.com</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahoo.com</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSN Search</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask Jeeves.com</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOL Search</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogpile.com</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netscape Search</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AltaVista.com</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excite.com</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iWon.com</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycos.com</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning about Electronic Information Sources—by Total Respondents

Other than search engines, how do you learn about electronic information sources? (Select all that apply.)

- Friend: 61%
- Links from electronic information sources or Web sites: 59%
- News media: 52%
- Promotions/advertising: 39%
- Online news: 38%
- Relative: 37%
- Coworker/professional colleague: 35%
- Instant messaging/online chat: 22%
- Reference from a library Web site: 15%
- Teacher: 11%
- Blogs: 9%
- Librarian: 8%

Cross-referencing Sources to Validate Information—
by College Students across all Regions

What other source(s) do you use to validate the information?
Base: Respondents selecting “find the information on multiple sites/cross-referencing” in question 725.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>College Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Web sites with similar information</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print material</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert in the field of interest</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library materials</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker/professional colleague</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/professor</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“It is immediately clear that Wikipedia is very popular with usage ranging between 70 and 84 percent across all age groups. This is mainly individuals reading content rather than contributing, although the ratio of contribution to lurking across all collaborative authoring tools is 1 to 4. Around 50 percent of Wikipedia use is for study, which represents a huge amount of students and researchers who probably use Wikipedia as their first (and possibly only) source of reference.”

David White, ‘Results and analysis of the Web 2.0 services survey undertaken by the SPIRE project’, JISC 2007.

http://spire.conted.ox.ac.uk/trac_images/spire/SPIRESurvey.pdf
Figure: Wikipedia referrals to UW Libraries Digital Collections, October 2005 - September 2006

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Willis_Sayre

Demo: Bibliography 1.0

Microsoft Word and Endnote
Bib 1.0: the scholars perspective...

- **OPAC**
- **WEB**
- **searching** (FINDING)
- **organising** (ANNOTATING)
- **publishing** (DRAFTING)

**Connections**:
- **z39.50**
- **Desktop publishing**
- **Word-processor**
- **Database**
- **Text file**
- **Bibliographic Software** e.g. Endnote
EndNote Tutorial

Getting Started

Transferring from Databases

EndNote and Word

Managing Your Library

FAQs, Tips & Help

© University of Newcastle Library
Demo: Bibliography 2.0

Firefox and Zotero
Bib 2.0: the scholars perspective...

Libraries Australia

Google

Wikipedia

GoogleDocs

OpenOffice

Blogs/wiki

Endnote

Zotero

Carmun

Worldcat

searching FINDING

organising ANNOTATING

publishing DRAFTING

SRW/U RSS OpenURL OpenSearch

Compatible standards and software for Zotero

**Standards**
- ContextObjects in Spans (COinS)
  [http://ocoins.info/](http://ocoins.info/)
- Embedded RDF
- Dublin Core XML
- MARC

**Software**
- Voyager (WebVoyage)
- InnoPAC
- SIRSI
- Aleph
- Dynix
- VTLS
- DRA
- ...
Conclusion

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Masters_of_the_ Universe
Promises of Googlepedia

- Scholarly information any time and any where: ambient library made good...
- Complex knowledge organization: Semantic Web made good...
- Complex searches: FRBR made good...
- Permanent: digital repositories made good...
Pitfalls of Googlepedia

- Accuracy and reliability of Wikipedia an ongoing issue
- *Googlepedia* hyperlinks lack durability and persistence
- Information overload: trusted information filtering and recommendation services are needed
- Skills and knowledge gaps of students and academic staff
Bibliography 2.0, maybe...

- Scholarly communications is becoming dependent upon ‘free’ Bib 2.0 services offered by the big info utilities i.e. Google, Amazon.com, OCLC

- Growing gap between local campus-based Bib 1.0 and global Bib 2.0 practices