2009

Review of Library Technology Reports: Collaboration 2.0

Alison Hicks

University of Colorado Boulder, alison.hicks@colorado.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/collaborativelibrarianship>

Part of the [Information Literacy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hicks, Alison (2009) "Review of Library Technology Reports: Collaboration 2.0," *Collaborative Librarianship*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 4 , Article 11.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29087/2009.1.4.11>

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/collaborativelibrarianship/vol1/iss4/11>

This Review is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Collaborative Librarianship by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

Review of *Library Technology Reports: Collaboration 2.0*

Alison Hicks (alison.hicks@colorado.edu)

Humanities Research and Instruction Librarian, University of Colorado at Boulder

We've had the Academic Library 2.0 Conference as well as the Library 2.0 Symposium. The 2.0 Movers and Shakers have been named, the 2.0 blogs have been listed, and yes, you can even get the Library 2.0 t-shirt. Library 2.0 is the buzzword that has been sustaining conferences, journals, the reference desk, and the blogosphere ever since its inception a mere five years ago. In fact, so much has been written about the topic that it was surprising that *Library Technology Reports* dedicated the May 2009 issue (Volume 45 Issue 4) to library 2.0., albeit re-packaged under the underlying theme of collaboration.

This special edition, "Collaboration 2.0," aims to inform library managers about potential tools in order to encourage collaborative work among staff in the library. To this end, it provides simple, easy to read introductions for several web 2.0 tools, including cloud computing and groupware, as well as the more traditional blogs, wikis, and social networking. Chapters either impart a theoretical introduction to a new concept (for example, collaboration 2.0), or supply examples of specific tools and how they can be used in the library (for example, group calendars). Clearly set out, each chapter is attractively illustrated with examples and handy web address text boxes. Most importantly, each chapter also covers the Terms of Service of each web tool, a good reminder for us to think about our data and the effects of outsourcing it to the web.

If this had been the first written guide to Library 2.0, it would have been an excellent source of information for library managers and staff. Yet it has been three years since "Five Weeks to a Social Library" was published. WorldCat lists more than one thousand items with the keyword "library 2.0." There is no shortage of library 2.0 publications, especially for basic introductions such

as this one. Even the thin veneer of "collaboration" fails to improve the sparse content. Few practical examples of why or how library staff should collaborate are given, and with the exception of cloud computing, the potential of most of these tools has been covered extensively in other publications.

After reading this, a library manager would have more of an idea about the popular web 2.0 tools; but, more worryingly, he/she would have little idea of the theory behind library 2.0 or the practical application of the programs. And while it is stated that this is beyond the scope of the publication, library 2.0 does not exist in a vacuum. Failure to understand the purpose and reasoning behind Web 2.0 is one of the reasons that Web 2.0 in academia has failed to take off as spectacularly as hoped. Web 2.0 is not just a set of tools; it is a mindset. Adoption of tag clouds, for example, will not succeed unless the practical and philosophical background of web 2.0 is also understood.

During the previous five years, libraries have discovered that more assessment of 2.0 tools is necessary, that the library's institutional culture needs to adapt itself to the 2.0 mindset before it can implement 2.0 tools, and that often our patrons aren't interested in these tools anyway. This report fails to cover any of these questions and, as such, falls short of expectations. It is a shame that this report fails to live up to its promise since collaboration, as any reader of *Library 2.0* publications knows, is a major pillar in the concept of Web 2.0. Furthermore, it is one that is often forgotten in the rush for putting a wiki, a blog and a social network on the library homepage. *Library 2.0* in 2009 is reflective, yet the associated literature needs to progress as much remains to be written on this exciting topic.