1-2018

Bloggership Part Two: A Survey of Academic Librarians

Arthur Hendricks
Portland State University, bvah@pdx.edu

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/ulib_fac

 Part of the Scholarly Communication Commons

Bloggership Part Two: A Survey of Academic Librarians

Arthur Hendricks

bvah@pdx.edu

Branford Price Millar Library

Portland State University

Portland

Oregon

USA

Abstract: In 2009, the author sent a link to a questionnaire to several email lists, inviting academic librarians to answer a short survey regarding whether blogging should count as scholarship. The author wondered if, seven years later, blogs had gained more traction as a viable form of scholarship, or whether interest in blogging was waning. A similar survey was distributed to several email lists again.

To see whether there has been a change in how blogging counts as scholarship or a creative activity in academic promotion and tenure, the author sent a link to a questionnaire to several e-mail lists, inviting academic librarians to answer a short survey. The survey was nearly identical to the last blogging survey, with the difference being that an additional question was asked.

23.9% of respondents indicated that their institution expects them to engage in scholarship. Respondents were asked whether performance review committees at their institution believe publishing a blog is weighted the same as publishing an article in a peer-reviewed journal. Only 3.1% indicated yes, while 68.5% indicated no. 19.2% selected unsure,

and 9.2% indicated other. 20 respondents skipped this question. In the 2010 survey, 53.7%

indicated no and 31.3% indicated unsure, so it seems committees now are no more likely to

consider blogging as scholarship than 7 years ago.

Keywords: Academic libraries, Communication, Career development, Academic staff, Internet

<u>Introduction</u>

In 2009, the author sent a link to a questionnaire to several email lists, inviting academic librarians to answer a short survey regarding whether blogging should count as scholarship (Hendricks, 2010). With the decline in library-related publishing, the author wondered if, seven years later, blogs had gained more traction as a viable form of scholarship, or whether interest in blogging was waning. To determine this, a survey similar to the earlier one was distributed to several email lists.

<u>Literature Review</u>

Research into the decline of library publishing is examined in "Disciplinary, National, and Departmental Contributions to the Literature of Library and Information Science, 2007–2012," which found that librarians contribute 23% of all LIS articles and nearly 70% of the articles published in the practice-oriented journals (Walters and Wilder, 2016). Their explanation for this decline is that the expanding scope of the discipline and the increasingly technological focus in LIS research is to blame. Also, librarians may be at a technical disadvantage relative to contributors like computer scientists. "Recent studies of librarians' contributions often include journals that did not even exist in earlier decades, some of them focusing on topics outside the traditional scope of library science. The relative number of studies devoted to library and information services has declined significantly since 1965" (Walters and Wilder, 2016).

Although strictly not about blogging, "Publish or Practice? An Examination of Librarians' Contributions to Research" deals with the trend of declining publication by academic librarians (Finlay et al, 2013). One possible explanation for this trend is that academic librarians are blogging more than publishing in peer-reviewed journals because library research is more

practical than theoretical. The delay in traditional publishing may be driving librarians to immediate publication through blogs.

Hollister's (2016) examination in the scholarship of tenure-track academic librarians unsurprisingly found that peer-reviewed articles carried the most weight in helping to earn tenure and gain promotion in rank. In his survey, many respondents indicated that they felt blogging was an emergent and favored form of non-referred publication, which might have a negative impact on collective practitioner scholarship.

In "Negotiating Self-presentation, Identity, Ethics, Readership and Privacy in the LIS Blogosphere: A Review of the Literature," Greenland (2013) makes a distinction between a library blog and blog by a librarian. The latter is written by librarians for librarians rather than library users while the former is meant for official library business.   The literature review reveals that blogging supposedly generates informal networks and allows for more efficient discussions than slower, traditional publishing.

Adam's "Blogging in context: reviewing the academic library blogosphere," deals with blogs by libraries and offers advice on how to successfully maintain a blog. From reviewing literature, she found that "a significant body of evidence from the literature and survey responses, backed up by activity in the content analysis, that blogs are useful within the academic library environment, and that as long as they are well planned and sufficiently resourced they are valuable additions to any library portfolio" (Adams 2013).

In "Beyond Gatekeepers of Knowledge: Scholarly Communication Practices of Academic Librarians and Archivists at ARL Institutions," Sugimoto et al (2014) surveyed 91 ARL institutions to discover academic librarians' scholarly reading and publication practices. The researchers found that respondents used blogs, Twitter, and Facebook to consume information as well as disseminate it. However, conferences and journal articles were cited more than social media as

a means for scholarly consumption and dissemination. The authors note that, "respondents wrote that the length and format of print publications were deterrents to publishing in those venues. By contrast, the format of blogs was often considered to be appropriate for the type of scholarship disseminated by information professionals" (Sugimoto et al, 2014).

In the Humanities, the larger term digital scholarship is used (see Cheverie et al, 2009). Aimée Morrison, in a chapter entitled Blogs and Blogging: Text and Practice, writes that "Blogging has its attractions for scholars, as a venue for writing, teaching, and occasionally primary and (more occasionally still) secondary research" (Morrison, 2007). She does not discuss whether blogging should count the same as publishing in a peer-reviewed journal, however.

In "The Structure of the Biblioblogosphere: An Examination of the Linking Practices of Institutional and Personal Library Blogs," the researchers used a wiki called Blogging Libraries Wiki (which at this date seems to be defunct) in order to find a list of library-related blogs that they could analyze (Finlay et al, 2013). With the idea being that blogs allow interaction, this study hoped to find linking between blogs. Instead, it did not find inbound or outbound links between library blogs.

Attitudes toward blogging in other disciplines has attracted the interest of researchers (e.g., Jackson-Brown, 2017, Yang and Spear, 2017).

Ellen S. Podgor, a legal scholar, writes in her article, "Blogs and the Promotion and Tenure Letter," that blogs can be factored into the promotion and tenure letter and that the focus should be on the content, not the medium (Podgor, 2006). She writes, "Blogs, without doubt, fit the category of 'service' in the candidate's portfolio" (Podgor, 2006). She also states that the weight the external reviewer can give to a blog depends on the institution's policies.

There is no discussion as to actual instances where a blog was counted the same as publishing an article, however.

A survey of chairs of US and Canadian medicine and pediatric departments regarding their attitudes toward faculty blogging in the promotion and tenure process found that only a minority perceive value in faculty blogging (Cameron et al, 2016). Chairs were more supportive of journal-based blogging rather than personal blogs. The authors wrote, "The low level of blogging (blog authorship) in academic medicine may reflect uncertainty among faculty about the role of blogs in relation to traditional forms of scholarship. Prior research has found that faculty work effort and publication patterns are heavily shaped by promotion and tenure requirements, which traditionally emphasize peer-reviewed publications as the benchmark for career advancement" (Cameron et al, 2016).

Medical education researchers, attempting to create a standard to evaluate digital scholarship by surveying experts in the field of emergency medicine and critical care, were able to establish a list of quality indicators for blogs and podcasts (Thoma et al., 2015). They proposed 3 themes: credibility, content, and design as a guide for content creators as well as consumers. Some of the quality indicators fall under basic information literacy: is the resource credible; does the resource cite its sources, etc…

In Pausé and Russels' "The Use of Social Media in the 21st Century Academy," the authors posit that social media has changed scholarship, making it more accessible to scholars and non-scholars. "Moreover, social media channels are personal in a way that journal articles are often not: they are written in the first person, locating knowledge in the speaker and the conversation, not in some abstract Platonic Form which may be accessed only by the wise" (Pausé and Russel, 2016). The authors suggest that to make blogging count as legitimate

scholarship, the scholar's institution should internally acknowledge it and professional associations should also acknowledge it.

Carolyn Hank's "Communications in Blogademia: An Assessment of Scholar Blogs' Attributes and Functions," surveyed scholars who blogged (Hank, 2013). None of them were librarians, however. Respondents had at least a Master's degree and most were tenured faculty who published in peer-reviewed journals and other traditional media. These bloggers were asked to evaluate their blogs based on the Association of Research Libraries' definition of the scholarly record, and 68% thought their blogs were subject to critical review, which is unsurprising considering that they no doubt considered their blogs scholarly to begin with (Hank, 2013). The fact that readers could comment publicly on the blog post counted as critical review to most of the bloggers. Bloggers also reported that their blogs led to invitations to work collaboratively with others on research. Only 26% of respondents felt blogging helped with promotion. As this author found in 2010, the two respondents who used their blog in promotion and tenure listed their work under service rather than scholarship.

In "Why do Academics Blog? An Analysis of Audiences, Purposes and Challenges," the authors generated a list of 100 academic blogs and analyzed them (Mewburn and Thomson, 2013). Library-related blogs didn't seem to be among those 100. The authors, who blog themselves, used their blog roll to generate a list of blogs to examine. From these, they conducted content analysis and came up with 7 types, including informal essay and formal essay. They discovered more formal scholarly writing than they expected; 52% of the blogs were tagged as informal essay, followed by 41% formal essay. The bloggers' intended audience were other academics rather than the public.

In "Academic Blogging: Academic Practice and Academic Identity"," Kirkup (2010) posits that scholarship, including blogging, is a form of academic identity. The author interviewed a

few colleagues in her department (educational technology) to find out why they blogged. She found that all but one of her interviewees had taken up blogging because they wanted to write about their subject/research area but in a less formal medium. Two educational technology academics felt that blogging was an activity they needed to experience as a professional in their discipline. She concludes that, "blogging is an emerging academic practice, and a new genre of scholarly writing, which could become an important activity for a professional academic. The possibility exists of creating a significant intellectual identity through a blog. If the formal structure of academic value refuses to engage with blogs – and other media – then academics will struggle to engage as twenty-first century public intellectuals. Writing for blogs needs to be awarded academic esteem as well as public esteem" (Kirkup, 2010).

Survey

A previous survey (Hendricks, 2010) of how academic libraries and/or their parent institutions weighted blogs in granting promotion and tenure found that most academic institutions did not count blogs as scholarship. A new survey was undertaken to see if there was a change in seven years. Two new questions were added to the previous survey. The survey instrument was created with Qualtrics, a web-based survey creation package. The survey was dynamic, showing questions based on the answers given. The complete list of questions was:

- What is your title?

- Is this a staff, faculty, or administrative position?

- If you are faculty or administrative, what is your rank?

- Is this a tenure-track position?

- What is your age?

- How many years have you held this position?

- How many years have you been at your current institution?

- Does your institution expect you to publish scholarly articles and/or engage in scholarly activities?

- Please list which library blogs you regularly read.

- Of these blogs, do you consider any of them scholarly?

- If you consider the above blogs to be scholarly (equal to an article published in a peer-reviewed journal) please describe why.

- At your institution, do performance review committees (or promotion and tenure committee) believe publishing a blog is weighted the same as publishing an article in a peer-reviewed journal?

- Do you publish a blog?

- Did you publish a blog in the past and then stop? (new question)

- Why did you stop publishing a blog? (new question)

- If you do publish a blog, do you believe it should count as scholarship?

- Please explain.

- Do you have any other thoughts on blogs and scholarship?

An invitation to participate was sent to 9 lists, collib-l, lital-l, rusa-l, code4lib, acrl-frm, acr-igdsc, uls-l, ifla-l and libs-or. A total of 150 complete responses were received, but due to the nature of lists it is hard to report with any accuracy the return rate.

<u>Analysis of Results</u>

The most common response to the question about title was "Librarian" at 9.3%, which is similar to the results from the first survey. Other responses are listed in Table I. Since the second survey had more respondents, the variety of job titles was larger than the first.

The next question was whether the respondent was staff, faculty, or administrative. The distribution of the positions can be seen in Table II. Similar to the last survey, the majority (82.7%) selected faculty. There were 7 Other responses, and the most common theme is that librarian positions have academic status which is similar to faculty but not exactly the same. As for rank, the results can be seen in Table III. Unfortunately, 42.8% of respondents skipped this question. 18.8% identified as Assistant Professor, followed by 13% identified as Associate Professor. 8% identified as Professor, and 17.4% selected Other.

Next, respondents were asked if they were on a tenure track. Results can be seen in Table IV. The majority (79.1%) indicated that they are in a tenure-track position. Ten respondents gave various responses, such as they have continuing appointments.

Respondents were next asked to select their age from a range. The results are found in Table V. The majority (36.7%) were from 31 to 40 years old. In contrast, the majority of the earlier survey respondents (40.3%) were more than 51 years old. Based on this, it would appear the profession is getting younger.

Respondents on average have held their current position for 6.19 years. Most respondents have been at their current institution for less than 5 years, which suggests they are in the tenure/promotion stage of their careers. They were asked how long they had been at their current institution, and the average was 9.1 years. The minimum was 0 years to a maximum of 44.

Respondents were asked if they were expected to publish or engage in scholarly activities. The results can be seen in Table VI. The vast majority (81.9%) said yes. Six respondents skipped this question. Among the "Other" responses, one wrote, "We are encouraged, [but] not expected. We have release time and publication is part of our 10% professional development merit review. There is no reward or demotion connected to publishing.

Respondents were next asked to list library-related blogs they regularly read. The top twelve most-listed blogs can be seen in Table VII. This is similar to the last survey, where ACRLog and In the Library with the Lead Pipe were cited as being popular and scholarly blogs.

Respondents were next asked whether they consider the blogs they listed to be scholarly. 23.9% indicated yes while 45.9% said no; 30.3% selected Other. 41 respondents skipped this question. Most of the 'other' comments did not fall into any real pattern, although some indicated that it depended on the post. One respondent wrote, "I think of these blogs as pre-cursors to scholarship - people working out ideas and thoughts. They are scholarly in that sense, but not in the sense that I consider them to be equal in weight to peer-reviewed articles." Another comment was, "I think many of them are, though they would probably not be valuable for tenure purposes at my institution." Another wrote, "Ravitch yes, the others - a stretch... what is scholarly? show me how many librarians have published in a journal that is not 'librarian?'"

Respondents were then asked, "If you consider the above blogs to be scholarly (equal to an article published in a peer-reviewed journal), please describe why." 25 respondents answered this question, and 4 of them indicated in some way that In the Library with the Lead Pipe is peer-reviewed. Interestingly, one respondent thought that its peer-reviewed status is questionable. The respondent wrote, "I do not think that 'scholarly' and 'equal to an article

published in a peer-reviewed journal' are equivalent terms. None of the previously mentioned blogs are equal to a peer-reviewed article (I question whether ITLWTLP is effectively peer-reviewed)." It should be noted that In the Library with the Lead pipe uses open peer review, which means the reviewer and author are not anonymous to each other.

Another respondent wrote, "The writers of ACRL Techblog and ACRLog seem to go through a vetting process. Typically, guest contributors have a reputation in the library community." Another respondent wrote, "I don't know that a blog post can be the scholarly equivalent of a peer-reviewed journal article (though some peer-reviewed journal articles are certainly less robust than some blog posts!). But several of the blogs include scholarly essays, reports, and reflections, or link out to scholarly content hosted elsewhere."

Respondents were next asked whether performance review committees at their institution believe publishing a blog is weighted the same as publishing an article in a peer-reviewed journal. Only 3.1% indicated yes, while 68.5% indicated no. 19.2% selected unsure, and 9.2% indicated Other. 20 respondents skipped this question. In the 2010 survey, 53.7% indicated no and 31.3% indicated unsure, so it seems committees now are no more likely to consider blogging as scholarship than 7 years ago. The other comments varied, with one respondent writing, "Our department has equivalencies for publications which possibly could include a blog or grant or digital learning object. There are 3 requirements for something to count as an equivalent to [a] peer review pub: 1. published in well known publication within the field. 2. peer reviewed 3. a demonstration in your area of expertise." Another respondent wrote, "Working to get blogs, webinars, etc. on the T&P scholarly products list." Another wrote, "I just asked two who sit on T&R. One said she didn't know and the other said depends on the blog, which would be reviewed for a determination, when the issue comes up." Someone else wrote, "Blogs are not peer-reviewed journals, and are not viewed as a scholarly pursuit."

Respondents were next asked if they publish a blog. Most (69.2%) said no, and only 23.8%, yes. One respondent wrote "I have a blog and make occasional posts. If my institution gave blogs ANY consideration at all, I might have more motivation to update it regularly." Two respondents indicated that they contribute to their library's blog. Another wrote, "Yes, but it's purely to open a line of communication with faculty on campus, and to spread library news and events to campus. So definitely not scholarly."

As for the next question, "Did you publish a blog in the past and then stop?" 20 respondents failed to answer the question. 28.7% indicated yes, while 51.3% indicated no. 6.7% selected Other, with one respondent writing, "I did for a few semesters but the stats suggested I should find a more productive activity, so I gave it up." Another wrote, "Briefly as a class requirement." Another comment was, "Yes. I decided I would be better off with a Facebook page." Two others indicated that they stopped publishing a personal blog that was not related to librarianship. There was a correlation between age and stopping publishing a blog. Respondents in the 22-30 year range were about equally divided: 50% said yes, while 43.8% said no. The majority of the respondents indicated they did not publish a blog. Among those in the 31-40 year range, 60.9% said no, while 34.8% said yes. From some of the comments, it could be that younger respondents created a blog while in library school and then stopped, whereas older respondents did not start a blog in library school.

Next, respondents were asked, if you do publish a blog, do you believe it should count as scholarship? 32.5% indicated yes, 25% indicated unsure, and 5% said no. 37.5% selected Other. There were various responses that didn't follow a pattern, although some indicated that their blogs were personal and not meant to be scholarly. One respondent wrote, "It depends on the nature of the blog. I think most opinion pieces probably shouldn't count. In-depth technical 'how-to' pieces probably should. People in non-technical fields often don't appreciate how long

it takes to find and/or develop solutions to difficult problems. It's common to research a problem for many hours and test multiple solutions before arriving at a fix for a given issue. All of that research takes time away from other publishable research. As a result, colleagues in public services areas are able to generate more published peer-reviewed articles. There are some heavily-researched blogs that should count as scholarship, but perhaps not at the same level as a peer-reviewed article. PERHAPS. The library field is flooded with 'how-we-did-good' pieces that don't really add much to the field of knowledge."

Another wrote, "I think it should be considered as part of the dossier if there is work that connects research to practitioners and engages in the library scholarly community. Something like the ACRL Tech Connect pieces should certainly be included and considered. The book review I wrote recently, probably not."

Age seemed to play a role in how respondents answered in regards to whether their blog should count as scholarship. Among those in the 22-30 year range, 62.5% thought their blog should count as scholarship. As in the past survey, those who do think their blog should count as scholarship found others' blogs to be scholarly as well. The previous survey also found that younger bloggers were more apt to believe their blogs should count.

Respondents were asked to explain why they thought their blogs should or shouldn't be considered as scholarly. One wrote, "We measure impact and since my blog is regularly cited in peer-reviewed papers and conference presentations, it was worth some credit. However, the entire blog was treated as one publication for the purposes of tenure; I could not count individual posts as separate publications."

Another respondent wrote, "I find that our P&T processes remain mired in the scholarly communication processes and systems that we are also actively working to critique and disrupt. There are certainly questions about evaluation and assessment that are raised by platforms like

blogs. But peer-reviewed journal articles, too, incur these questions. We have outsourced our own reading and analysis of our colleagues' work for P&T evaluation and need to focus more on the work than the venue."

Another comment was, "Blogs, for the most part, are not peer-reviewed. They should not count as peer-reviewed publications (unless they actually are peer-reviewed, which would require an explanation on one's CV). I would consider the blogs I read and write as 'professional.' They contribute to my professional development as a librarian. At my place of employment, blogs are considered as appropriate to list on one's CV, but they 'count for' less than peer-reviewed articles."

Finally, respondents were asked if they had other comments to share about blogs and scholarship. 77 respondents replied, and some of the comments did fall into patterns. 28.5% reiterated that blogs are not peer-reviewed and shouldn't weigh the same as an article published in a peer-reviewed article. 16.8% indicated that blogs had the potential to be scholarly (or equivalent to an article published in a peer-reviewed journal). 7.7% indicated that they thought blogs are not scholarly. 3.9% indicated that they thought blogs count more as service rather than scholarship. 2.6% thought that instead of using the word blog, people should call them online publications. Another 2.6% indicated that blogs were more like a trade publication rather than a scholarly journal.

One respondent wrote, "Perhaps if the profession could change people's minds that this is professional publication of a sort. Maybe referring less to 'blogs' and more to 'online publications' would help. When I think of the word blog I think of a free online website that anyone in the world can start. Anyone can type stuff and hit send, is that scholarship? So another issue is peer-review of online publications, in whatever format or system they reside. Digital humanists fight against negative sentiment from administrators, who see online

scholarship as less-than academic journal article publishing. And of course the whole open source online journal movement as less-than 'tried and true' extant journals."

Another wrote, "I don't think you can make a blanket statement about whether a blog *should* count. A blog is a medium, not a prescription for the format or quality of content therein. When we talk about what we can get credit for as 'scholarly,' we generally mean something at least edited by someone else or even peer-reviewed. Personal blogs are not peer reviewed, no matter how scholarly they may be in intention and execution, so they're not likely to get much traction as 'scholarship.' An edited blog with an LIS focus perhaps would, and at my institution it wouldn't be hard to frame it as such for tenure and promotion."

Another comment was, "Well, if I was not clear so far with my responses, the issue might be much bigger. Blogs certainly apply to the new trend to 'measure' scholarship not by the number of published articles, but by the impact they make on the readers. Blog analytics is certainly a step ahead of the traditional peer reviewed publications. On the other hand, my esteemed colleagues and the rest of the conservative part of the guild will argue that other Web 2.0 tools, namely social media must be also considered scholarship. And why not? Twitter influencers and LinkedIn groups are the 'kitchen' where the meals are cooked long before these meals are served in the peer-reviewed journals and for an increasing number of disciplines time of sharing the information is of an essence."

Another wrote, "Blogs are pointless wastes of time, used by people to vent and voice their opinion when no one else will listen to them."

Discussion

Academia can be slow to change, whereas technology changes quickly. It is possible that in the next decade blogs or some form of online publishing will become recognized by more

promotion and tenure committees in academic libraries. It is clear from the survey responses

that seven years later, most academic library promotion and tenure committees still do not

weigh publishing a blog the same as publishing a peer-reviewed article. Some recognize it as

service toward the profession, especially if it is related to the scholar's library. At least one

respondent indicated that their institution is working to address blogging in the tenure and

promotion process.

The data suggests that most of the respondents are tenure-track academic librarians

who are expected to produce scholarship if they are to receive tenure and promotion. Most

respondents don't publish a blog and don't believe it has the same weight as publishing in a

traditional peer-reviewed journal. Most don't think of the blogs they read as scholarly but

rather more as professional. Some have moved on from blogging to other forms of social

media. This might suggest that blogs are becoming less popular and that academics are staying

with peer-reviewed journals or open access journals. As before, those who do publish a blog are

more inclined to argue that they are scholarly and should count. This group is younger.

There is a tension between the medium and the content. Digital scholarship sounds

more professional than blogging, and this was reflected in some of the respondents' comments.

Another issue is that there are several types of blogs, such as institution-sponsored, personal,

and scholarly. Producing a blog for one's library is more service rather than scholarship. Also,

Web 2.0 promises an exchange of ideas, that readers (users) can interact with the author of a

blog post or Facebook post, but that isn't occurring.

If academic blogging were growing, one would expect to find more publications like In

the Library With the Lead Pipe. Instead, it seems some bloggers have switched to other Web 2.0

media, such as Facebook, Twitter, and Pinterest. As one respondent wrote, "There are very few

people who can come up with original thoughts often enough to keep a blog going. It is much

better to participate in online communities--to make the posts contribute more to a conversation. Of course, I agree that lots of different options are needed in an information landscape but a vetted scholarly article is much different than a blog--and should be treated as such by tenure and promotion committees."

<u>Conclusion</u>

In 2010, the author found that most academic library promotion and tenure committees did not weigh publishing a blog the same as publishing a peer-reviewed article, and from this newer survey, this has not changed. One would expect other scholarly blogs to follow in the footsteps of a blog such as In the Library with the Lead Pipe and ACRLog, but from the survey responses, this has not happened. As Finlay et al (2013) and Walters and Wilder (2016) found, academic librarian publishing is showing a steady decline; it might be that academic librarians are simply not engaging in as much scholarship and that expectations for the amount of written scholarship for tenure and promotion are changing.

Academic librarian scholarship will most likely become more web-based. One respondent indicated that his/her institution was working on adding blogging as a scholarly pursuit. Perhaps in the future, most publishing will be online or on whatever new technology emerges. As technology changes, academics will need to reassess what constitutes scholarship.

References

Adams, R., (2013). "Blogging in context: reviewing the academic library blogosphere", *The electronic library*, 31(5), pp.664-677.

Cameron, C.B., Nair, V., Varma, M., Adams, M., Jhaveri, K.D. and Sparks, M.A. (2016). "Does Academic Blogging Enhance Promotion and Tenure? A Survey of US and Canadian Medicine and Pediatric Department Chairs", *JMIR Medical Education*, 2(1).

Cheverie, J. et al. (2009), "Digital Scholarship in the University Tenure and Promotion Process: A report on the Sixth Scholarly Communication Symposium at Georgetown University library", Journal of Scholarly Publishing, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 219-230.

Finlay, S.C., Hank, C., Sugimoto, C.R. and Johnson, M. (2013). "The Structure of the Biblioblogosphere: An Examination of the Linking Practices of Institutional and Personal Library Blogs", *Journal of Web Librarianship*, 7(1), pp.20-36.

Finlay, S.C., Ni, C., Tsou, A. and Sugimoto, C.R. (2013). "Publish or Practice? an Examination of Librarians' Contributions to Research", portal: *Libraries and the Academy*, 13(4), pp.403-421.

Greenland, K. (2013). "Negotiating Self-presentation, Identity, Ethics, Readership and Privacy in the LIS Blogosphere: A Review of the Literature", *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, 44(4), pp.217-225.

Hank, C. (2013). "Communications in Blogademia: An Assessment of Scholar Blogs' Attributes and Functions", *New Review of Information Networking*, 18(2), pp.51-69.

Hendricks, A, (2010). "Bloggership, or is Publishing a Blog Scholarship? A Survey of Academic Librarians", *Library Hi Tech*, 28(3), pp.470-477.

Hollister, C.V., (2016). "An exploratory study on post-tenure research productivity among academic librarians", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 42(4), pp.368-381.

Jackson-Brown, G.M., (2017). "An Exploratory Examination and Critique of Academic Law Librarian Blogs: A Look into an Evolving Reference Communication Practice", *The Reference Librarian*, *58*(2), pp.136-151.

Kirkup, G. (2010). "Academic Blogging: Academic Practice and Academic Identity", *London Review of Education*, 8(1), pp.75-84.

Mewburn, I. and Thomson, P. (2013). "Why do Academics Blog? An Analysis of Audiences, Purposes and Challenges", *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(8), pp.1105-1119.

Morrison, A. (2007), "Blogs and Blogging: Text and Practice", Siemens, R. and Schreibman, S. (Eds.), *A Companion to Digital Literary Studies*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA, pp. 369-387.

Pausé, C. and Russell, D. (2016). "Sociable scholarship: The use of Social Media in the 21st Century Academy", *Journal of Applied Social Theory*, 1(1).

Podgor, E. (2006), "Blogs and the Promotion and Tenure Letter", *Washington University Law Review*, 1109, available at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1120817 (accessed 22 April 2009).

Sugimoto C.R., et al. (2014). "Beyond Gatekeepers of Knowledge: Scholarly Communication Practices of Academic Librarians and Archivists at ARL Institutions", *College and Research Libraries*. 75, 145-161.

Thoma, B., Chan, T.M., Paterson, Q.S., Milne, W.K., Sanders, J.L. and Lin, M. (2015). "Emergency Medicine and Critical Care Blogs and Podcasts: Establishing an International Consensus on Quality", *Annals of emergency medicine*, 66(4), pp.396-402.

Walters, W.H. and Wilder, E.I., (2016). "Disciplinary, national, and departmental contributions to the literature of library and information science, 2007–2012", *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(6), pp.1487-1506.

Yang, D. and Spear, C.E., (2017). "The Effects of Faculty Status, Faculty Gender, Field of Study, and Class Size on the Use of Blogs, Wikis, and Discussion Boards", *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education (IJICTE)*, *13*(2), pp.52-64.

Table I

What is Your Title?		
Title	%	Count
Librarian	9%	14
Reference Librarian	4%	6
Business Librarian	3%	5
Assistant Librarian	3%	5
Library Director	3%	5
Associate Librarian	3%	4
Reference and Instruction Librarian	3%	4
Web Services Librarian	3%	4
Systems Librarian	2%	3
Head of Research and Instruction	2%	3
Scholarly Communications Librarian	2%	3
Digital Initiatives Librarian	2%	3
Head of Cataloging	2%	3
Research Librarian	2%	3
Digital Scholarship Librarian	2%	3
Assistant Head of Acquisitions	1%	1
Social Studies and Data Services Librarian	1%	1
Head of Collections & Systems	1%	1
Collection Development & Acquisitions Librarian	1%	1
Associate Professor	1%	1
Associate Director and Coordinator of Education & Instruction	1%	1
Acquisitions/Collection Development Librarian	1%	1
Access and Public Services Librarian	1%	1
Professional Librarian	1%	1
ILS Administrator	1%	1
Communications Outreach Librarian	1%	2
Cataloging and Metadata Librarian	1%	1
Library Manager	1%	1
Assessment Librarian	1%	2
Head of Digital Resources and Discovery Services	1%	1
Librarian/Director of Alumni	1%	1

Head, Space and Stacks Management	1%	1
First Year Experience Librarian	1%	1
Information Specialist	1%	1
Chief Special Collections	1%	1
Research and Instruction Librarian	1%	2
Distance Education Librarian	1%	1
Assessment and Marketing Librarian	1%	1
Head, Office of Scholarly Communications	1%	2
Humanities Librarian	1%	1
Asst. Prof. and Research Services & Resources Librarian	1%	1
Assistant Director of Library Services	1%	1
Copyright and Reference Coordinator	1%	2
Life Sciences Librarian	1%	1
Outreach Librarian	1%	1
Head of IT	1%	1
Dean	1%	1
Miss	1%	1
Senior Librarian	1%	1
Scholarly Analytics Librarian	1%	1
Director of Library Instruction	1%	1
Associate Professor of Library Science and Library Instruction Coordinator	1%	1
Collection Management Librarian	1%	1
Graduate Research Instruction Librarian	1%	1
Reference & Theological Librarian	1%	1
Digital Humanities Librarian	1%	2
Instruction Librarian	1%	1
Public Services Librarian	1%	1
Graduate Librarian	1%	1
Visual Resources Librarian	1%	1
FYE Librarian	1%	1
Assistant Professor	1%	2
Designing Technology Based Information Services	1%	1
Senior Assistant Librarian	1%	2

Head of Research Services	1%	1
Undergraduate Experience Librarian	1%	1
Head of Library Information Technology	1%	1
Head of Public Services	1%	1
Associate Chief Librarian	1%	1
Documentalist Archivist	1%	1
Access Services Coordinator and Scholarly Communications Librarian	1%	1
Director, Scholarly Communication	1%	1
Cataloguing Librarian	1%	1
First Year Initiatives Coordinator	1%	1
Reference Services and Outreach Coordinator for Special Collections	1%	1
Emerging Technologies Librarian	1%	2
Assistant Professor of Library Services	1%	1
University Archivist	1%	1
Digital Content Librarian	1%	1
Coordinator of Outreach and Engagement	1%	1
Liaison Librarian	1%	1
Chief Librarian	1%	1
Electronic Resources Librarian	1%	1
Information Services Librarian	1%	1
Associate Librarian, Cataloging	1%	1
Director of Public Services	1%	1
Associate University Librarian	1%	1
Discovery & Integrated Services Librarian	1%	1
Total	100%	150

Table II

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Is this a staff, faculty, or administrative position?					
Valid	staff	6	4.0	4.0	4.0
	faculty	124	82.7	82.7	86.7
	administrative	13	8.7	8.7	95.3
	other	7	4.7	4.7	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Table III

What is your rank?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Refused	59	39.3	42.8	42.8
	Assistant Professor	26	17.3	18.8	61.6
	Associate Professor	18	12.0	13.0	74.6
	Professor	11	7.3	8.0	82.6
	Other	24	16.0	17.4	100.0
	Total	138	92.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	8.0		
Total		150	100.0		

Table IV

Is this a tenure-track position?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	117	78.0	79.1	79.1
	No	21	14.0	14.2	93.2
	Other	10	6.7	6.8	100.0
	Total	148	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.3		
Total		150	100.0		

Table V

What is your age?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	22 to 30 years	19	12.7	12.9	12.9
	31 to 40 years	54	36.0	36.7	49.7
	41 to 50 years	31	20.7	21.1	70.7
	More than 51 years old	43	28.7	29.3	100.0
	Total	147	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	3	2.0		
Total		150	100.0		

Table VI

Does your institution expect you to publish scholarly articles and/or engage in scholarly activities?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	118	78.7	81.9	81.9
	No	20	13.3	13.9	95.8
	Other	6	4.0	4.2	100.0
	Total	144	96.0	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.0		
Total		150	100.0		

Table VII

Please list which library blogs you regularly read.		
Blog	Frequency	Percent
In the Library with the Lead Pipe	21	19
ACRlog	14	12.7
Babelfish	8	7.2
Librarian in Black	7	6.3
Information Wants to be Free	6	5.4
LITA blog	6	5.4
Scholarly Kitchen	6	5.4
Academic Librarian	5	4.5
Annoyed Librarian	5	4.5
Attempting Elegance	5	4.5
Free Range Librarian	5	4.5
Barbara Fister	4	3.6
none	29	26.3