

12-1-2017

Exploring the Value of Citation Management Tools in the Academic Library

Julia Glauberman

Binghamton University--SUNY, jglauber@binghamton.edu


Follow this and additional works at: https://orb.binghamton.edu/librarian_fac

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Glauberman, Julia. "Exploring the Value of Citation Management Tools in the Academic Library." Presented at ACRL/NY Symposium: The Mission, New York, NY, December 2017. https://orb.binghamton.edu/librarian_fac/42

This Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Scholarship by an authorized administrator of The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). For more information, please contact ORB@binghamton.edu.



Exploring the Value of Citation Management Tools in the Academic Library

Julia Glauberman
Binghamton University Libraries
ACRL/NY Annual Symposium
December 1, 2017



The Survey

- Institutional info (FTE, Carnegie Classification)
- Purchase or subscription costs for paid tools
- Library support for paid tools
- Library support for free tools
- Communication with vendors
- Satisfaction with tools
- Comments (open-ended)







The Respondents (364)


Affiliation	
Public	208
Private, not-for-profit	145
Private, for-profit	4
[no answer]	5

FTE	
<2,000	56
2,000–4,999	79
5,000–9,999	67
10,000–19,999	62
20,000–29,999	34
30,000+	60
[no answer]	4




Carnegie Classification	
Associate's Colleges	36
Baccalaureate Colleges	65
Master's Colleges/ Universities	97
Doctoral Universities	146
Special Focus Institutions	10
Tribal Colleges	0
[no answer]	8


Access to paid tools/ support for free tools

-  Paid tools only
-  Paid and free tools
-  Free tools only
-  No tools



Are you legally allowed to disclose the price your institution pays for this tool?

-  Yes
-  No
-  I'm not sure





Pricing (according to those 7 people)

\$24,000/year

“but I don't know what we paid”

\$23,000/year


“beats me”

\$5,310/year


“?”

\$360

Communication w/ vendors



Types of support





Satisfaction

- Usability
- Accuracy of citations produced
- Integration with other research tools
- Integration with word processors
- Clarity of privacy policy and/or terms of service agreement



Satisfaction (paid tools)

- Usability
- Accuracy of citations produced
- Integration with other research tools
- Integration with word processors
- Clarity of privacy policy and/or terms of service agreement
- **Vendor support for technical troubleshooting**
- **Vendor response to feature requests**
- **Vendor transparency regarding product development**
- **Vendor-provided training materials**
- **Vendor-provided promotional materials**
- **Price**



Satisfaction (free tools)


- Usability
- Accuracy of citations produced
- Integration with other research tools
- Integration with word processors
- Clarity of privacy policy and/or terms of service agreement
- **Existing technical documentation (excludes documentation produced at your institution)**

Usability



Accuracy


■ Paid ■ Free



Integration

w/ other research tools


■ Paid ■ Free



Integration


w/ word processors

■ Paid ■ Free




Privacy/ToS


■ Paid ■ Free




Existing documentation




Vendor support for troubleshooting




Vendor response to feature requests




Vendor transparency regarding product development




Vendor-provided training materials



Vendor-provided promotional materials



Price





Open-ended comments

- Insufficient time, staffing, budget
- Library “values” (OA)
- User choice (disciplinary influence)
- Usefulness/accuracy



Acquisitions of free tools

RefWorks → **ProQuest**

Mendeley → **Elsevier**

Papers → **Springer Nature**

Papers [Springer] → **ReadCube (Digital Science)**

Imagine Easy (EasyBib, Citation Machine, BibMe, Cite This For Me) → **Chegg**



So what?

- Connections between tools and educational/research goals
- Reevaluation of librarian expectations of vendors
- Transparency in pricing (public disclosure rules)
- Consortial support for citation tools