The Biblioblogosphere: A Comparison of Communication and Preservation Perceptions and Practices between Blogging LIS Scholar-Practitioners and LIS Scholar-Researchers

While most ... new genres are too informal to have been considered publications in a print realm, they do contain important discussions, facts, and reports that are part of the scholarly discourse of a field. Furthermore, they can be captured because digital communications leave a trace.
- Borgman, 2007, p. 99

I. INTRODUCTION

Characterizations of the system of scholarly communication as transformed or evolved in the digital age are ubiquitous. It can also, however, be characterized as something of a fender-bender, with traditional and untraditional units and channels of communication colliding in the infosphere. Scholars’ adoption of blogs provides one orientation from which to consider this transformation. Several neologisms have emerged reflecting this trend, including bloggership in the legal scholarship realm (e.g., Caron, 2006; Smith, 2006), and blogademia for academe in general (Saper, 2006). Our field has its own: the biblioblogosphere. This neologism, first introduced by Schneider in 2004, as cited by Stephens (2008), comprises the institutional publication of blogs of libraries and the personal, typically professionally-oriented publication of blogs by scholar-librarians. From a casual review of biblioblog directories published to the open Web, it also extends to blogs published to by library and information science (LIS)-aligned educators and researchers.¹

The phrase, Scholarly Communication 2.0, in part, reflects scholars’ adoption of new media, including blogs, for creating, sharing, and interacting in the infosphere. Halavais (2006), in borrowing from Oldenburg (1999), describes the blogs of scholars as, “shaping a new ‘third’ place for academic discourse,” comparable to other informal channels of communication” (p. 117). In consideration of this “informal” nature, is it appropriate to recast Scholarly Communication 2.0 as Scholarship 2.0? Simply, is a scholar’s blog a unit of scholarship? This is a compelling inquiry when considering the aggregate functions of the system of scholarly communication, summarized by Borgman (2007) as legitimization, dissemination, and access, preservation, and curation. Perceptions on the value and impact of scholars’ blogs have implications not just for the current use environment, but, potentially, as candidates for future access and use in a preservation environment. Blogs are a co-produced medium, representing a mix of code, content and co-producers, comprised not only of bloggers, both the known and the anonymous, but also their readers, service providers, and other contributors. In consideration of the goals of digital preservation – summarized by Caplan (2008) as acquiring, describing, interpreting, securing, authenticating, accessing and performing – this multiplicity of producers complicates blog preservation actions, necessitating negotiations in a complex landscape of associated procedural, social, technical, and regulatory issues.

¹ For examoles of bibliobloe directories. see the LIS Wiki’s “Webloes” daee. available at: http://liswiki.org/wiki/Webloes#Other Directories.
The biblioblogosphere presents an excellent opportunity to explore these considerations impacting scholarly communication, both today and into tomorrow. From a research perspective, per Borgman (1990), “by scholarly communication we mean the study of how scholars in any field (e.g., physical, biological social, and behavioral science, humanities, technology) use and disseminate information through formal and informal channels ... the growth of scholarly information, the relationships among research areas and disciplines, the information needs and uses of individual user groups, and the relationships among formal and informal communications” (p. 13-14). While scholarly communication is an active research area in LIS, covering a range of disciplinary-orientations, this proposal presents opportunity for an inward examination of the communicative activities of our own discipline. LIS is particularly suited for this examination given the dichotomous relationship of those producing scholarship in the field: 1) scholar-practitioners, that is, people who contribute to scholarship, but for whom practice is their primary occupation; and 2) scholar-educators/researchers, contributors to LIS literature for whom education and research are their primary duties. Descriptive data has demonstrated differences in the publication practices of these two groups in terms of frequency of publishing (Wiberly, Hurd, & Weller, 2006; Klobas & Clyde, 2010), perceived support and encouragement to publish (Klobas & Clyde, 2010; Cosgriff, Kenney, & McMillan, 1990), tenure requirements (Mitchell & Reichel, 1999; Floyd & Phillips, 1997), and perception of scholarly ability and identity (Fox, 2007). Furthermore, it has been suggested that the traditional formal venues for dissemination of results are not the most appropriate for a technologically-driven profession. As Gilman (2008) questioned: “Libraries are largely dependent on and competitive with technologies that change every nine months. How are we supposed to progress as a profession when it still takes a year and a half for an article to progress from submission to publication?” (p. 15). Gilman suggests that blogs may be a more appropriate venue for scholar-practitioners; however, the perceptions of these two groups and their distinct needs and practices have not yet received treatment.

This proposal represents an “across-the-border” collaboration between two early career researchers, leveraging their respective expertise in scholarly communication, citation analysis, blogging, and preservation: Dr. Carolyn Hank, Principle Investigator (PI), McGill University (Canada), and Dr. Cassidy Sugimoto, Co-PI, Indiana University Bloomington (IUB) (US). Through qualitative and quantitative data collection activities, this proposed research study adopts a mixed-methods approach to examine the practices, perceptions, and preferences of select members of the biblioblogosphere – blogging librarians and LIS researchers and educators – and their respective blogs. The intent is to provide empirical evidence in response to four primary research questions: 1) how do bibliobloggers perceive their blogs in relation to their cumulative scholarly record; 2) has blog publishing contributed to an increase or decrease in bibliobloggers’ publication of traditional units of communication after establishment of their respective blog; 3) how do bibliobloggers perceive their blog in relation to long-term stewardship and, subsequently, who, if anyone, do they
perceive as responsible as well as capable for blog preservation; and 4) how do blog characteristics and blogger publishing behaviors and preferences impact preservation action? And, underlying these questions is the issue of how, if at all, do these perceptions, preferences, behaviors, and characteristics converge or diverge between two distinct groups of bibliobloggers – scholar-practitioners and scholar-educators/researchers?

II. NEED, INNOVATION & SIGNIFICANCE

While much has been written on blogging as a channel of scholarly communication, primarily via anecdotal reporting, there is limited empirical reporting on blogs as representative units of scholarship. Braxton, Luckey, and Helland (2002) include “unpublished scholarly outcomes and publications” in their definition of scholarship, continuing that, “unpublished scholarly outcomes fully meet the definition of scholarship if they appear in a publicly observable form” (p. 141). The three parameters for this form are that, “it must be public, subject to critical review, and in a form that allows use and exchange by other members of the scholarly community” (Braxton et al., 2002, p. 141). In a recent study of blogging scholars in the fields of history, economics, law, biology, chemistry and physics conducted by this proposal’s PI, 66% (n=153) of questionnaire respondents agreed that their respective blogs satisfied these criteria (Hank, 2011).

What, then, might bibliobloggers’ perceptions be when presented with the same criteria? This is particularly compelling when considering the findings from a recent study of academic librarians’ perceptions of blogs as scholarship (Hendricks, 2010). Only 17% of respondents (N=67) characterized blogs as scholarly. However, a possible limitation to this study design may be the lack of explicit criteria for what is meant by scholarly. In the questionnaire portion of this PI’s study, participants were presented with an explicit definition of the “scholarly record,” as defined by the ARL (Hank, 2011). A clear majority of respondents – 80% (n=152) – agreed their blogs are part of their scholarly record (Hank, 2011). Maron and Smith (2008) provide further insight into the perceptions of scholarship across multiple units of communication. In their study of faculty perceptions on the value of digital scholarly works, eight types of valued scholarly resources emerged, of which blogs were one type. In describing their study approach, Maron and Smith (2008) used the ARL parameter of “original and scholarly works,” concluding that these eight content types qualified as “scholarly resources” (p. 7). Hendricks’ (2010) study is the first to examine academic librarians’ perceptions of blogs as scholarly units of communication exclusively. However, in considering the gap between his findings and those of this PI (Hank, 2011) and Maron and Smith (2008), it provides evidence that further, systematic investigation is needed.

While scholar bloggers in history, economics, law, biology, chemistry and physics, as found by Hank (2011), may agree their blogs meet the criteria for scholarship and are a component of their scholarly record, that does not translate to agreement as to the impact of blogging in relation to the system of promotion and tenure. Findings from Hendricks (2010) and this PI converge around
this point. Respondents to Hendricks’ (2010) study viewed blogs as more appropriate for assessing and recognizing professional service as opposed to scholarly publication and that, “at this point in time, most academic library promotion and tenure committees do not weigh publishing a blog the same as publishing a peer-reviewed article” (para. 30). This was confirmed in this PI’s study. Most respondents (66%; n=152) felt their blogs neither improved nor impaired opportunities for promotion at their respective institutions (Hank, 2011). A majority of respondents did, however, report improvement across eight other aspects of their scholarly lives (Hank, 2011). Further, over eight out of ten (82%) reported that s/he felt their respective blogs led to invitations to publish other units of communication.

This connection between scholars’ blog publishing as a facilitating factor, or even impediment, to other forms of traditional and untraditional publishing is an under-examined area of inquiry. Publication patterns of scholars are often used to demarcate the boundaries of a discipline, evaluating not only the shared content of the field, but whether the field has a coherent core of contributing authors and the associations of these authors. In an examination of LIS journals, Wiberyly, Hurd and Weller (2006) found a decrease in contributions from practitioners to the LIS literature. In the LIS literature, as with other fields that balance between academic and practitioner contributions, it is often important to evaluate evolved channels and units of scholarly contribution that may favor one type of contribution or contributor. We do not know if there is an overall decrease in practitioners’ publishing to the LIS literature as journals represent only one form of scholarly communication – and one that may not be the most efficient or appropriate genre for meeting the needs of either practitioner contributors or a practitioner audience. This proposed study aims to alleviate this gap in understanding.

While it was recently found that there has been a decline in the number of active blogs within the biblioblogosphere, publication via posting was found to remain stable (Torres-Salinas et al., 2011). Hence, the perceptions, preferences, and behaviors of bibliobloggers remains a contemporary and engaging area of inquiry. But, will these biblioblogs remain stable and available into the future? As noted by Borgman (2007) at the beginning of this proposal, “digital communications leave a trace” (p. 99), but when considering the nature of the blog form as well as the technical, regulatory and social frameworks in which blogging takes place, for how long? Rothenberg (1995), an early leader in advocating technical approaches for the preservation of digital records, cautioned that, “the significance of many digital documents we consider too unimportant to archive become apparent only long after they become unreadable. Unfortunately, many of the traditional methods developed for printed matter are not applicable to electronic files. The content and historical value of thousands of records, databases and personal documents may be irretrievably lost to future generations if we do not take steps to preserve them now” (p. 42). Without deliberate personal or programmatic approaches to the long-term stewardship of these digital communications, the biblioblogs of today may be unavailable into the future.
III. METHOD

In response to these gaps in understanding, we propose a descriptive study investigating: a) bibliobloggers’ perceptions of their blogs in relation to their cumulative scholarly record; b) their publication history, before and after establishment of their respective blogs; c) their perceptions and preferences regarding the long-term stewardship of their blogs and, subsequently, who, if anyone, do they perceive as responsible as well as capable of preservation; and 4) their blog publishing behaviors and biblioblog characteristics impacting preservation action.

**Units of analysis.** This study takes a triangulated approach, investigating three units of analysis: bibliobloggers, their blogs, and their CVs.

**Approach.** This study will adopt a mixed-methods approach, employing survey research and content and citation analysis procedures.

**Cases.** Bibliobloggers and biblioblogs will be identified through purposive sampling. We will compile an initial sampling frame by drawing from two directory listings of approximately 2000 biblioblogs, removing for duplicates: LIS Wiki Weblogs\(^2\) and LISZEN\(^3\). A sampling code book will be derived and these listings will be analyzed to determine eligibility for inclusion in the study based on an ordered series of criteria concerning blog access, language, style, age, currency, and blogger occupation and contact information. This is done to enhance homogeneity among the cases. From these procedures, two sampling frames will be compiled, one for biblioblogs and, subsequently, one for bibliobloggers. The resulting sampling frames will be clustered based on characteristics across two dimensions: Blog authorship (single or collaborative), and Profession (Scholar-Librarian or Scholar-Faculty/Researcher).

**Data Collection and Instrumentation.** Four data collection activities are planned, two to run concurrently (questionnaire and blog analysis) and the remaining two to run consequently (interviews and CV analysis).

**Questionnaires.** Due to differences in authorship, which will impact wording of question stems and response categories, two questionnaires will be designed and administered: questionnaire I for single-bloggers, and questionnaire II for co-bloggers. Additionally, QII has four additional questions concerning issues of co-authorship. Otherwise, QI and QII are nearly identical. All bibliobloggers listed to the blogger sampling frame will be invited to respond to the questionnaire. The questionnaires will be comprised of primarily closed-ended questions and will be organized into ten sections: 1) background; 2) scholarly publishing history; 3) blogging and scholarly communication; 4) blogging activity, identity, and audience; 5) blog publishing behaviors and preferences; 6) blog revision history; 7) blog preservation behavior; 8) blog preservation preferences; 9) other blogging activities;

\(^2\) http://liswiki.org/wiki/Weblogs#Other_Directories

\(^3\) http://libraryzen.com/wiki/index.php?title=ISZEN
and 10) demographics. Additionally, the questionnaire will contain two questions to identity participants for the interview and CV analysis stages of the study.

**Blog Analysis.** Concurrent to the questionnaire stage of the study, a random sample of blogs listed to the blog sampling frame will be drawn at, approximately, a 30 to 50% sampling ratio. Due to differences in authorship, two blog coding systems will ultimately be devised. The coding system for co-blogs will capture data points across six categories: 1) blog elements and features; 2) rights and disclaimers; 3) authority and audience; 4) blog publishing activity; 5) post features; and 6) archiving. The coding system for single-blogs is the same as the co-blog coding system except for the addition of one other category – authorship. Additionally, each coding system will have a data management section, capturing essential data points for facilitating data collection (e.g., date of coding, unique blog ID, name of coder, etc.).

**Interviews.** Interview participants will be identified from respondents’ returning completed questionnaires. The semi-structured interview schedule, anticipated to take between 20 to 30 minutes to complete, will be designed to clarify initial findings from the questionnaire phase of the study and to further explore respondents’ perceptions on blogging, scholarly communication, publishing, and digital preservation. Additionally, an interview debriefing sheet will be completed after each interview. It will provide supporting documentation of each interview and aid in identification of problems and issues, if any, impacting data collection. All interviews will be conducted by telephone via a landline and recorded. At this time, we approximate conducting between 25 to 40 interviews.

**CV Analysis.** Units for this phase of the study will be collected from those respondents’ returning completed questionnaires who indicated willingness to share their CV. The CVs will be gathered and checked for completeness using Thomson Reuters Web of Knowledge and GoogleScholar (the Co-PI’s prior experience in this type of data collection demonstrates that scholars consistently omit publications on their formal CVs, primarily for unintentional reasons). Analysis of the CVs will draw comparisons between publication practices (frequency, type, collaborative behavior) before and after they began blogging. In addition, topic analysis will be used to examine the differences between the topics of their publications across formal and informal channels. In particular, we will examine lead-lag phenomenon across publication types, to determine if the topics of blog posts anticipate or follow topics in other communication channels. Findings from this phase of the data collection will be supplemented with results from the questionnaire phase of the study.

**Pre-Testing and Inter-Rater Reliability.** All instrumentation – sampling code book, questionnaires, blog analysis code book, interview schedule, and CV analysis code book – will be pre-tested prior to data collection. Further, inter-rater reliability procedures will be performed during and after the sampling, blog analysis and CV analysis stages of the study.
**Analysis.** Quantitative data from the questionnaire, blog analysis and CV analysis stages of the study will be analyzed using univariate and bivariate descriptive statistics, including frequency distributions, central tendency measures, measures of variability and correlation statistics. The overall goal of this study is to describe attributes, perceptions, preferences and practices of a particular community of bibliobloggers. Analysis will rely heavily on descriptive measures. Results will be reflective of respondents, as a whole, as well as comparisons among groupings incorporated into the research design (e.g., occupation; authorship – single or collaborative; professional age, etc.). Qualitative data from the interview portion of the study will be analyzed using manifest and latent coding techniques. The goal is to identify themes emerging from responses through consideration of frequency, direction and intensity (e.g., Bauer, 2000; Berg, 2004; Neuman, 2006). Primary applications to be used in data analysis are Excel, SPSS and NVivo. Full transcripts will be prepared from all interviews.

**IV. DISSEMINATION PLAN**

The nature of this proposal’s inquiry facilitates extensive dissemination activities to particular audiences within the LIS domain – e.g., librarians, library administrators, LIS educators and administrators, and depending on their title, digital curators, digital archivists, and digital preservationists – as well as related domains or other specialized areas – e.g., communication studies and scholarly publishing. Five conferences are to be targeted for dissemination of preliminary research results, including ALISE 2013, as required by the granting agencies. These were selected as they allow us to target specific audiences and, as a Canadian-US collaboration, allow us to present on both sides of the border: 1) 2012 ALA Annual Conference, June 21-26, 2012 (Anaheim CA); 2) 2013 ALISE Annual Conference, January 22-25, 2013 (Seattle WA); 3) 2012 ASIS&T Annual Meeting, October 26-31, 2012 (Baltimore MD); 4) 2012 Canadian Association of Information Science (CAIS) Annual Conference, TBA (TBA); and 5) iPRES 2012: 9th International Conference on Preservation of Digital Objects, TBA (Toronto, ON).

At the termination of the project, results from this research will be submitted to high impact journals, in compliance with the granting agencies’ requirements, targeted at: 1) academic librarians (e.g., *Library Trends, Journal of Academic Librarianship, College & Research Libraries*); 2) library and information scientists (e.g., *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology, Library & Information Science Research*); 3) scientometricians (e.g., *Scientometrics, Research Evaluation*); 4) digital preservationists (e.g., *International Journal of Digital Curation, Journal of Digital Information*); 5) Internet researchers (e.g., *First Monday, Internet Research, New Media and Society*) and 6) scholarly communication researchers (e.g., *Journal of Scholarly Publishing, Journal of Electronic Publishing, Learned Publishing*).

In addition to these formal avenues of dissemination, we will keep a project website that will provide access to our data collection instrumentation, internal reports, progress updates, and other timely information. We also plan to make our resulting
datasets available, as allowed by institutional research board regulations, through deposit to the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) data archive.\(^4\) (http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/index.jsp). Lastly, in line with the requirements of the granting program, we will deliver a detailed, final project report to OCLC. All dissemination activities will comply with the requirements set forth by the granting agencies.

V. EVALUATION

We will use multiple means to evaluate the success of the project both during and after the grant period. To facilitate our work during the grant, we have devised an extensive, detailed schedule of completion. We will use this schedule to track our progress and ensure timely completion of project milestones. We will hold regular, weekly meetings between the two project sites (McGill and IUB) throughout the duration of the project, scheduled to run from January 30, 2012 through December 22, 2012. We will also hold two extended, in-person working meetings, to take place over a two-day period, between the PI and Co-PI, one at McGill and the other at IUB.

We will evaluate the success of our data collection activities through multiple measures, including outcome rates for the questionnaire portion of the study, and inter-rater reliability for the sample frame construction and inter-coder reliability for the content analysis. The findings will be evaluated for success by validation through critical peer review during the submission process to conferences and journals. Impact evaluation will be conducted by tracking citations garnered on the work and visitors and downloads from our project website (using GoogleAnalytics).

VI. PROJECT RESOURCES, SUPPORT & EXPERTISE

The study is collaborative, with the sites of inquiry based at McGill University (Montreal), home institution for the PI, and Indiana University Bloomington, home institution of the Co-PI. We have support for this research from both institutions. As elaborated on in the detailed budget (see attachment), data collection administration support will be provided by graduate assistants at each site location. This study extends the earlier work of PI Hank, targeting a new community of bloggers. The administration procedures and the instrumentation will be derived, in part, from her earlier, successful study of scholar bloggers in history, economics, law, biology, chemistry and physics (Hank, 2011). She has been invited to present on her research both domestically as well as abroad, as well as to provide her expertise in a current, €3 million European Union-funded project, BlogForever (http://blogforever.eu/). Co-PI Sugimoto brings two main areas of expertise to this research project. The first is her extensive knowledge and use of scientometric research methods, acknowledged in part by her receipt of a Thomson Reuter’s Citation Analysis Grant. She also brings a strong knowledge of the LIS research domain to the project. Of particular relevance are her

\(^4\) http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/index.jsp
studies examining the evolution of topics in LIS. See the brief PI and Co-PI bios and excerpted CVs provided in the supporting materials portion of this proposal for more information on their expertise and experience.

VI. IMPACT

This particular class of blogs and bloggers presents an excellent opportunity to better understand the phenomenon of blogging in academe, the representativeness of blogs within academia’s collective scholarly record, and implications for long-term stewardship of this form. Bibliobloggers present an exceptional case to study these issues when considering their dual role as publishers contributing to this record and, in reflection of their professional roles, ultimately as guardians of the record. Bibliobloggers both contribute to the scholarly record and facilitate stewardship of the scholarly record, whether from an active, hands-on role as library professionals, as educators, preparing the next generation of library professionals, or as researchers, examining compelling issues related to the information use environment. Specifically, findings will inform how blogs fit within the scholarly communication activities of bibliobloggers. This will inform how participants within the system of scholarly communication perceive and make use of these forms, in consideration of multiple actor-roles: author, publisher, broker, user, and steward. When considering the reward function of the system, this research will contribute to enhancing understanding of the form for administrators, peers, and others involved in decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and other extrinsic rewards and forms of academic capital.

There is an abundance of terms to describe the evolution of media, tools, and procedures impacting scholarly communication practices and products (e.g., information explosion, information overload, information asphyxiation, data deluge). Garvey and Griffith described the “information crisis” in scholarly communication in 1971; this concern continues thirty years hence. Roosendaal et al. (2001) comment, “indeed we seem to suffer from abundance, rather than from a scarcity of information and data” (p. 14). The challenge of what is of use in our current information-seeking environment is a consistent and integral area of study in our field. Further compelling: what will be of use tomorrow, and the next day, and on into the indefinite future? Findings from this proposal will help to inform decision-making, today, on selection and appraisal of biblioblogs for access and use into the future.

We will also contribute to others’ investigations of the objectives addressed in our study by making our data collection instruments, as well as our resulting datasets, publicly available. The first will be accomplished through publications as well as via the project Website. The second will be accomplished through deposit of the datasets to the ICPSR data archive.

Overall, multiple audiences will benefit from the results of this proposed research, including: 1) bibliobloggers interested in personal preservation of their blog content; 2) organizations with current, piloted or planned digital preservation initiatives who are considering the medium; 3) organizations without planned digital preservation initiatives, in order to inform future, strategic
collection policy decisions; 4) multiple actors in the system of scholarly communication, including authors, readers, publishers, and brokers; 5) key decision-makers facilitating the reward function within the system; 6) researchers interested in the evolution of scholarly communication, particularly in relation to social media; and 7) lastly, the digital preservation community in general. In their investigation of outstanding research areas, DigitalPreservationEurope (2007) cautions that while research in the area of digital preservation has been ongoing for nearly twenty years, “our heritage may now be at greater risk because many in our community believe that we are making progress towards solving the preservation challenges” (p. 1). It is hoped that the findings resulting from this proposal may contribute in some way to this ongoing need for continued progress.

V. FUTURE WORK

When considering the potential for future work resulting from this proposed study, it merits noting that this proposal itself continues the work of two other studies by this PI, dating back to 2006. This is demonstration of the ongoing need to examine the ways in which we communicate via social media in the contemporary information landscape, its impact on our scholarly and professional lives, and implications for current and future access and use.

In specific reference to the data to be collected in this study, as we will capture a snapshot in time of both active and inactive biblioblogs and bibliobloggers during our sampling procedures, there are several opportunities for extending analysis of the data, whether by members of the project team or others gaining access via our archived data sets and instrumentation. It provides a baseline and extensive set of cases from which to do a longitudinal investigation of the continued availability and publishing activity of these blogs. This will support continued examinations of trends in biblioblog publishing. Additionally, in regard to access and use, the intersection between blog availability and inactive publishing provides opportunity to consider these “digital traces” that are left behind in the biblioblogosphere after the respective blogger no longer publishes to or intentionally maintains their blog.

There is also opportunity to extend work regarding a suite of new media, available to bibliobloggers, as biblioblogs represent just one form among many (e.g., wikis, Twitter, Facebook, etc.). Garvey and Griffith (1971) constructed an oft-cited dissemination model for scientific communication in the domain of psychology, reflecting a continuum of scholarly communication channels. This was later revised and updated by Borgman (2007), regardless of domain specificity. Future work placing evolved channels of LIS communication within this continuum, building from the model of Borgman (2007), would be compelling, particularly considering the growth in popularity of existing channels and the emergence of new media since the time of Borgman’s publication. Further, in reflection of Hank’s (2011) findings that scholars in select disciplines felt their respective blogs meet the three criteria for scholarship, as proposed by Braxton et al. (2002), the criterion for “critical review” was selected less frequently than the criteria for public availability, use, and exchange. No definition of what was meant by critical review was provided in the study. However,
considering respondents’ well-established traditional publishing history, it was assumed respondents’ would reply based on their personal interpretation of critical review from their multiple actor-roles as authors, informal and formal reviewers, gatekeepers, and consumers. Future investigation of blogs, as well as other new media, in consideration of critical review may serve to inform placement of these forms within a continuum of scholarly communication, as well as further inform practices related to extrinsic rewards and formal recognition.

The attitudes and preferences of non-blogging LIS practitioners, educators, and researchers are beyond the scope of this study. An investigation of this population would be informative on perceptions of blogs within the system of scholarly communication and preferences for preservation. It could be assumed that non-blogging scholars would be less inclined to view blogging as a product and process of scholarship, as well as less inclined to support preservation. It would potentially contribute to interesting comparisons between LIS professionals who do not blog and their counterparts who do.

Blog preservation raises a number of regulatory and legal issues, with intellectual property rights being a significant issue. While the PI and Co-PI are familiar with issues of copyright, neither are copyright scholars. Future examinations of copyright-related issues would be welcomed by parties with such expertise. This is particularly compelling when we consider the co-dependencies between bloggers and service providers. In a previous study, this PI found that a majority of bloggers use a free blog publishing and hosting service (e.g., Blogger, WordPress.com) (Hank, 2011). An examination of terms of service agreements, and bibliobloggers’ interpretations of these terms, could provide interesting findings in regard to the divide between what providers’ promise and what consumers expect in regard to provider-facilitated blog archiving, including who (blogger or service provider) holds the copyright to what (content, code and structure of the blog).

Borgman (2007) signed off with the invitation, “Let the conversation begin,” in the preface to her book on scholarship in a digital world (p. xix). The biblioblogs of scholar-practitioners and scholar-faculty/researchers provides an informative lens from which to consider the current state of scholarly communication, whether described as an evolution, transformation, collision, or other descriptor. The conclusions and recommendations to be drawn from this proposed study will serve to continue this conversation.
DETAILED BUDGET

I. BUDGET SUMMARY: We are requesting $XXXXX (USD) from OCLC/ALISE LISPRG to be used during the duration of the project (start date: January 30, 2012; end date: December 22, 2012). Approximately $3017 (USD) in institutional support is provided, primarily through the PI and Co-PI’s respective research start-up funds. (NOTE: BUDGET DETAILS REMOVED FOR INSC 590: DMP ASSIGNMENT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDS REQUESTED FROM OCLC/ALISE LISPRG</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COST CATEGORY</td>
<td>RATE¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Hires, McGill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly employee, IUB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Subsistence Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 ALISE Conference: Airfare, hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 ALA Conference: Airfare, hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 ASIS&amp;T Conference: Airfare, hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 iPRES Conference: Train, hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 CAIS Conference: Transportation TBD, Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project meetings: Airfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Disposable Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Monitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualtrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Amounts in USD.

II. BUDGET JUSTIFICATION: Personnel. Dr. Carolyn Hank will serve as PI for this project. In this role, she will: direct the project; oversee the administration of the grant; hire and manage two McGill casual student hires; contribute to data collection through leading in instrument construction and testing, sampling frame construction, development of recruitment and sampling procedures and protocols; and oversee all data analysis activities. She is hired on a 12-month contract with McGill and is not permitted, by her institution, to engage in cost-sharing. She does anticipate devoting 12% of her time to the project while employed by the university.

Dr. Cassidy Sugimoto will serve as Co-PI. In this capacity, she will: hire and manage one student employee; assist with administration of the grant; participate in data collection, analysis, and dissemination, leading the CV analysis portion of the study; and oversee and manage dissemination activities. She is hired on a 10-month contract with Indiana University Bloomington (IUB) and will contribute 8% of her time during the year to the project.
Two casual hires will be made at McGill to assist with sampling, data collection and analysis. Both will be hired for 10 hours a week (for ten weeks), one in Spring 2012 and one in Summer 2012. The rate for master’s students at McGill is $15.00 plus $0.60 (4% for vacation pay) and $1.80 (12% for health insurance), for a total of $17.40 per hour. The total hire in CAD is $1740 each, which converts to $1755.65 USD (as of September 13, 2011). Two hourly IUB student employees will be hired to assist with data analysis and dissemination for 10 hours a week (for 14 weeks), one in Summer 2012 and one in Fall 2012. No benefits or fringe are required for these students.

**Travel and Subsistence Costs.** Travel to the 2013 ALISE conference is requested for the PI and Co-PI. The average rate of travel (transportation, lodging, and per diem) is estimated at $1300 per person. We are requesting $1000 to cover travel to the 2012 ALA Annual Conference for one member of the project team to disseminate research results (of particular interest is the Research Roundtable). We anticipate submitting a conference paper and workshop proposal to ASIS&T 2012, budgeting $1500 for the PI to attend. Two in-person, project meetings are scheduled: February 2012 (at IUB) to initiate the project and September 2012 (at McGill) to work on dissemination. Each trip is budgeted at $750. During non-meeting hours, the PI and Co-PI will guest lecture at the respective host institution in their area of expertise (blog preservation for PI Hank, and scientometrics for Co-PI Sugimoto), and meet informally with faculty and students to foster opportunities for further collaborations between the project sites.

**Non-Disposable Equipment.** Sampling frame construction, and blog and CV coding necessitates two monitor displays for efficient and effective coding. We are requesting $150 to purchase a monitor for the McGill site.

**Other Expenses.** Qualtrics survey software will be used for this project. Both the PI and Co-PI have extensive experience using web-based survey research software, with a particular preference for Qualtrics. Based on the researchers’ experience, Qualtrics has improved capabilities for skip-logic, a questionnaire design feature essential to this study. The $1500 provides 3 user licenses, unlimited surveys and responses, 1 custom branded survey template, a custom URL, and data encryption. This cost was quoted from Qualtrics. A professional transcriber will be hired to do transcriptions of approximately 1,200 minutes of interviews.

**III. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT.** Approximately $3017 (USD) in institutional support is provided. These monies will be used by the PI to support travel to two conferences, one targeting Canadian ILS professionals (CAIS 2012) and the other targeting digital preservation specialists (IPRES 2012). The Co-PI will use her funds to support travel to ASIST 2012, as well as to purchase a computer monitor for use at the IUB site. Both the PI and Co-PI will use their respective funds to pay for long-distance telephone calls, as needed, for regularly scheduled, weekly project meetings, approximated to be 240 minutes per month, or 2640 minutes during the life of the project. They will also use their funds to pay for long-distance telephone calls, as needed, for the interview portion of the study, approximated to be 1200 minutes. It should also be noted that other resources will be used in this project, but are not specifically...
budgeted as they are already owned by the research team. This includes recording equipment, laptop computers, and back-up server storage.

**CAROLYN HANK (PI): BIO AND EXCERPTED CV**

Carolyn Hank joined the School of Information Studies at McGill University as a tenure-track, Assistant Professor in November 2010. She received her Ph.D. from the School of Information and Library Science (SILS) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH). Dr. Hank is a 2010 recipient of a Eugene Garfield Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship from Beta Phi Mu for her dissertation research that examined scholar bloggers in the areas of history, economics, law, biology, physics, and chemistry. Currently, she serves as the consulting North American academic expert on blog preservation for BlogForever (http://blogforever.eu/), a 30-month, collaborative grant project co-funded by the European Union under the Information and Communication Technologies theme of the 7th Framework Programme for R&D. She is also an instructor in the DigCCurr Professional Institute: Curation Practices for the Digital Object Lifecycle, a component of a four-year (2008-2012), IMLS-funded project, Digital Curation Curriculum (DigCCurr) II. She previously served as project manager for DigCCurr I (2006-2010), an IMLS-funded project to prepare students to work in the 21st century environment of trusted digital and data repositories. In her research, she examines ways in which our digital production behaviors impact future communications of our scholarly and cultural record, both in terms of the informational value and the associated technical and regulatory frameworks in which these activities take place. This perspective is particularly relevant when considering the need to negotiate between a climate of finite resources and the infrastructures required to support lifecycle management of digital content.

**SELECT PUBLICATIONS**


SELECT INVITED PRESENTATIONS


“One Less To-Do: Perceptions on the Role of Archives and Libraries in the Preservation of Scholars’ Blogs.” 2011 Archival Education and Research Institute, Simmons College, Boston, MA, July 12, 2011.


“Scholars, their Blogs and Digital Preservation: Reflections on Research Design.” Speaker Series, School of Information Studies, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, January 28, 2011.


SELECT TEACHING ACTIVITIES

School of Information Studies, McGill University (2011-Present)

GLIS 611: Research Principles and Analysis (Graduate Requirement)
Semester Taught: Winter 2011

GLIS 642: Preservation Management (Archival Stream Requirement)
Semester Taught: Winter 2011

GLIS 601: Information and Society (Graduate Requirement)
Semester Taught: Fall 2011

School of Information & Library Science, Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2007 – 2010)

INLS 500: Human Information Interactions (Graduate Requirement)
Semesters Taught: Fall 2010 [online], Summer 2010, Spring 2010, Summer 2009

INLS 752: Digital Preservation and Access (Graduate Elective)
Semesters Taught: Fall 2009, Fall 2008, Fall 2007
CASSIDY R. SUGIMOTO (CO-PI): BIO AND EXCERPTED CV

Cassidy R. Sugimoto is an Assistant Professor at Indiana University Bloomington. She received her doctoral degree in Library and Information Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 2010, and was awarded the ALISE/Eugene Garfield Doctoral Dissertation award for her work on mentoring, collaboration and interdisciplinarity in LIS doctoral studies. Sugimoto’s research focuses on the birth, maturation, and interaction of disciplines, primarily informed by quantitative indicators and the traces of scholarly communication. She is interested in how the introduction of new modes of communicating change the way in which knowledge is created, disseminated, and consumed. Her work on indicators of interdisciplinarity garnered the Thomson Reuters Citation Analysis Research Award from the American Society for Information Science & Technology in 2009. She is widely published in the top-ranking journals and conferences in the field and serves as a reviewer for a number of these. She is active in the American Society for Information Science & Technology, serving on the Board of Directors as well as chairing and serving on multiple special interest groups and chapters. Her service was recognized by the James M. Crestos Leadership Award from ASIS&T in 2009.

SELECT PUBLICATIONS


**SELECT INVITED PRESENTATIONS & CONFERENCE PAPERS**


“Conceptualizing and operationalizing disciplinarity.” Department of Information Science, City University, London and Statistical Cybermetrics Research Group, University of Wolverhampton, UK, May, 2011.


**SELECT SERVICE ACTIVITIES**

**American Society for Information Science & Technology**

Chapter Assembly Director (and previously Deputy Director) (2008-current)
Chair, SIG-ED (2009-current)
Programming Officer, SIG-MET (2010-current)
Member, Membership Committee (2006-current)
Communications Officer, SIG-ED (2008-2009)
Chair, Carolinas Chapter of ASIS&T (2008-2009)
Member, Watson Davis Award Committee (2008)
Secretary and Co-Founder, Carolinas Chapter of ASIS&T (2007-2008)

**Association for Library and Information Science Education**

Member, ALISE Methodology Competition Committee (2010-current)

**SELECT TEACHING ACTIVITIES**

**School of Library and Information Science, Indiana University Bloomington (2010-Present)**

S505: Evaluation of Resources and Services (MLS Requirement)
*Semesters Taught:* Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Summer 2011, Fall 2010

S604: Scholarly Communication (Fulfills Doctoral Seminar Requirement)
*Semester Taught:* Spring 2011


