

8-20-2020

OhioLINK Librarians and Google Scholar Over Time: A Longitudinal Analysis of Attitudes and Uses

David Luftig
Washington State University

Joan Plungis
University of Dayton, jplungis1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/roesch_fac



Part of the [Scholarly Communication Commons](#)

eCommons Citation

David Luftig and Joan Plungis (2020). OhioLINK Librarians and Google Scholar Over Time: A Longitudinal Analysis of Attitudes and Uses. *Reference Services Review*. , https://ecommons.udayton.edu/roesch_fac/67

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Roesch Library at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Roesch Library Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

OhioLINK Librarians and Google Scholar Over Time: A Longitudinal Analysis of Attitudes and Uses

This study provides a longitudinal analysis of the opinions and uses of Google Scholar by members of the OhioLINK consortium of libraries. Using survey data collected in 2007, 2014, and 2019 via the OhioLINK Listserv, this study explores how librarians use and promote Google Scholar within their library instruction sessions and how Google Scholar and its Library Links feature are promoted on library websites. This information is then analyzed across the three date ranges. The results of this research suggested that there were significant changes in the use and opinions of Google Scholar between 2007 and 2014 with more normalization of uses and opinions occurring between 2014 and 2019.

Google Scholar Background

The beta launch of Google Scholar™ a little over fifteen years ago introduced a new resource into the world of academic search tools. If academic librarians would embrace this upstart as a worthy and welcome complement to existing discovery methods -- or not, and whether they would ultimately help their users understand its strengths and weaknesses, were questions posed early and often in the literature.

A Google engineer, Anurag Acharya, initially conceptualized GS as a one-stop place to find scholarly information across disciplines and languages (Giles, 2005). Since its inception in 2004, Google Scholar (GS) has claimed to provide “a simple way to broadly search for scholarly literature” across disciplines so as to locate “articles, theses, books, abstracts and court opinions, from academic publishers, professional societies, online repositories, universities and other web sites” (Google, 2020a). Since 2004, both the popularity and the number of indexed materials within GS have continued to grow (Cothran, 2011; De Winter, Zadpoor and Dodou, 2014; Harzing & Alakangas, 2015; Fagan, 2017; Cole, Davis, Eyer and Meier, 2018;

1
2
3 Gusenbauer, 2018; Oh & Colón-Aguirre, 2019). The amount and quality of documents within GS
4
5 is often equal to or better than that of the well-known scholarly subscription databases that
6
7 many academic libraries subscribe to such as Scopus, Web of Science, and Compendex (De
8
9 Winter, Zapdoor, & Dodou 2014; Wu & Chen, 2014; Harzing & Alakangas, 2015).

11 GS also allows libraries to make their electronic resources discoverable and accessible
12
13 through the GS interface. This means that a library's subscription resources can be searched,
14
15 located, and linked to via the GS interface. Such library search software is typically referred to
16
17 as a discovery layer. Researchers have observed that GS provides more or equally salient
18
19 search results as other proprietary systems such as Ex Libris Primo and Summon (Zhang,
20
21 2013; Namei & Yang, 2015).

24 Since 2005, OhioLINK has shared its link resolver information with GS. OhioLINK is a
25
26 consortium of over one hundred university and college libraries located among 88 member
27
28 institutions in the State of Ohio. The State of Ohio Library is the only non-academic library within
29
30 OhioLINK. OhioLINK membership includes 16 public university libraries, 51 independent college
31
32 libraries, 23 two-year college libraries, 16 regional campus libraries, 8 law school libraries, and 5
33
34 medical school libraries. (OhioLINK, 2019b.) This study presents longitudinal research that
35
36 examines the opinions and uses of GS by OhioLINK librarians¹. It seeks to understand how
37
38 librarians and their institutions teach, promote, and view GS. Furthermore, it looks to understand
39
40 how these factors have changed over time. This data was collected through a mixed
41
42 quantitative and qualitative survey of OhioLINK librarians that was sent out on the consortium
43
44 listserv in 2007, 2014, and 2019. Although there have been numerous studies that examine the
45
46 efficacy of GS, there is a lack of longitudinal research regarding librarian opinions and uses of
47
48 GS.
49
50
51
52
53

54 ¹ We are using the term librarians to refer to members of the OhioLINK listserv who responded to the
55 invitation to complete the survey. The survey did not ask for job title, function, or rank, so responses likely
56 came from both librarians and staff members at OhioLINK libraries.
57
58
59
60

Literature Review

Google Scholar (GS) was introduced in 2004 as an open research database that indexes scholarly abstracts, research articles, law reviews, gray literature, books, materials within institutional repositories, and more through Google's search interface (Giles, 2005; Zhang, 2013, Google, 2020b). The number of documents indexed by GS is unclear, but researchers have estimated the number to be above 160 million records across all languages and disciplines (Orduna-Malea et al., 2015; Gusenbauer, 2018). In 2020, the quantity and scope of indexed materials within GS compares favorably to subscription databases such as Compendex (Cusker, 2013; Cole, Davis, Eyer and Meier, 2018), Web of Science, (De Winter, Zadpoor, Dodou, 2014; Harzing and Alakangas 2015; Martin-Martin, Orduna-Malea, Thelwall, Lopez-Cozar; 2018), and Scopus (Harzing and Alakangas 2015; Martin-Martin, Orduna-Malea, Thelwall, Lopez-Cozar; 2018).

Librarian Reception of Google Scholar

In the immediate years following the release of GS, librarians' opinions were often mixed (Cathcart and Roberts, 2005; York, 2005; Kesselman and Watstein, 2006; Pomeranz, 2006; Taylor, 2007; Giglierano, 2008; Antell, Strothmann, Chen, & O'Kelly, 2013). In Cathcart and Roberts' (2005) evaluation of GS, the authors voiced enthusiasm that GS could be an easy to use and monetarily free research tool but they also feared that GS could lure students away from library resources.. According to Cathcart and Roberts' (2005), this was especially troubling because GS did not provide their indexing methodology. This sentiment was echoed by Kesselman and Watstein (2006) who valued GS's easy to use interface and lack of subscription cost but were also concerned that GS would be the only place students would go to find research. Donlan and Cooke (2005) also noted that GS lacked transparency regarding data retrieval and display, but they also stated that GS has the potential to be a popular and useful tool. In Giglierano's (2008) survey of fifty OhioLINK librarians, respondents typically stated that they were concerned that users would abandon the library's subscription resources for a

1
2
3 platform that was inferior. Ashmore and Grogg (2006) opined that the commercial nature of
4 Google and the subsequent growth of GS may change the way libraries provide information in
5 unforeseen ways.
6
7
8

9 Many librarians did show enthusiasm for GS during the early days. Much of that
10 enthusiasm was generated by GS's quest to index an unprecedented scope of materials to go
11 along with their easy-to-use search interface (Tenopir, 2005; Friend, 2006; Norris, 2006;
12 Pomeranz, 2006; Arendt, 2008). Tenopir (2005) noted that that GS "has real potential to provide
13 easy, one-stop access to articles in both subscription journals and items in institutional
14 repositories, open access journals, and e-print servers (p. 32)." Friend (2006) posited that GS
15 would encourage more open-access content while simultaneously indexing unprecedented
16 amounts of materials. Giles (2005) noted that GS is a multilingual and multidisciplinary
17 repository that may assist researchers from around the world. Cathcart and Roberts (2005)
18 noted that although GS does have its flaws, the articles returned within their searches compared
19 favorably to PubMed.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Today, GS is often viewed by librarians as one useful research resource among many
33 (Antell, Strothmann, Chen, & O'Kelly, 2013; Karlsson, 2014; Namei & Young, 2015). Librarians'
34 acceptance of GS corresponds to the tremendous growth in research regarding the platform.
35 Such research has demonstrated that GS has continued to grow their indexed materials and
36 work on metadata problems while maintaining their familiar search interface (Cothran, 2011; De
37 Winter, Zadpoor & Dodou, 2014; Harzing, 2014; Harzing & Alakangas, 2015; Waltman, 2016;
38 Fagan, 2017; Cole, Davis, Eyer, & Meier, 2018; Gusenbauer, 2018; Oh & Colón-Aguirre, 2019).
39 Furthermore, GS has introduced popular features such as research impact indicators and
40 citation alerts, which continue to make GS one of the top resources for researchers across all
41 levels and disciplines (Cothran, 2011, Wu & Chen, 2014, Waltman, 2016, Thoma & Chan, 2019;
42 Google, 2020c).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Although GS indexes many open-access resources, many other resources require a
4 subscription. Martín-Martín, Orduna-Malea, and Ayllon (2016) observed that about 40 percent of
5 the resources they collected were freely available via GS. The open-access content that is
6 available within GS has been observed to fall across a broad spectrum of scholarliness. This
7 spectrum includes peer-reviewed journals and conference proceedings as well as non-scholarly
8 materials found in academic and disciplinary repositories and elsewhere (Haddaway, Collins,
9 Coughlin, & Kirk, 2015; Fagan, 2017).

17 *Google Scholar Library Links Integration*

19
20 Beginning in February 2005, Google introduced GS Library Links. Library Links utilizes a
21 library's OpenURL link resolver (such as Ex Libris' SFX or EBSCO's Link Source) to allow users
22 to discover and access their library's subscription resources (Oder, 2005; Ashmore & Grogg,
23 2006; Friend, 2006; Google, 2020d). If the user is on-campus such access through GS is
24 typically automatic. If the user is off-campus, they must either access GS through their library's
25 custom portal or they must set their GS settings to recognize their participating library.

26
27 Librarian opinions of GS Library Links within the first few years of its inception were
28 mixed. Some assessed that Library Links returned unsatisfactory search results when
29 compared to other discovery layers (Donlan & Cooke, 2005; Friend, 2006; Jacsó, 2008; Asher,
30 Duke, & Wilson, 2013). Other librarians saw the potential and benefits of GS Library Links. For
31 example, some librarians observed that users using GS Library Links had higher satisfaction
32 than when using other library resources to link to journal articles (Dixon, Duncan, Fagan,
33 Mandernach, and Warlick, 2010; Wang and Howard, 2011). Librarians also noticed an increase
34 in the library's web traffic when implementing Library Links (Ashmore & Grogg, 2006; Dewan,
35 2012). More recent research has suggested that GS's link resolver provides equally salient
36 search results when compared to traditional discovery layers, such as Ex Libris Primo (Wang
37 and Howard, 2011; Zhang, 2013; Namei & Young, 2015; Oh & Colón-Aguirre, 2019).

1
2
3 One way to observe the changes in opinions of GS by libraries over time is through
4 changes regarding how libraries promote GS on their website (Mullen & Hartman, 2006;
5 Neuhaus, Neuhaus, & Asher, 2008). This is because a library providing links to GS is, in a
6 sense, endorsing its use (as libraries typically do not intentionally provide links to low-quality
7 databases on their websites). Researchers during the first five years of GS observed that the
8 majority of academic libraries did not have links to GS anywhere on their websites (including on
9 their subject guides and alphabetical database list) (Mullen & Hartman, 2006; Giglierano, 2008;
10 Neuhaus, Neuhaus, & Asher, 2008). Hartman and Bowering Mullen (2008) analyzed 113
11 academic library homepages and observed that between 2005 and 2008, the number of links to
12 GS from library web pages, as well as the number of libraries utilizing Library Links, more than
13 doubled. Hartman and Bowering Mullen (2008) noticed a significant rise in GS links on the
14 alphabetical databases lists during this period (from 24 percent to 68 percent), subject database
15 lists (from 14 percent to 32 percent), subject guides (from 12.5 percent to 38 percent), and
16 directly on their library homepage (from 5 percent to 11 percent). There have not been more
17 recent studies examining where, and how often, libraries provide GS links on their websites.

34 *Google Scholar in Library Instruction*

35
36
37 Early opinions on providing assistance with GS within library instruction sessions were
38 also mixed (Ettinger, 2008; Giglierano, 2008; Jacsó, 2008). Giglierano (2008) observed that
39 among libraries in the OhioLINK consortium surveyed, 58 percent of respondents stated that
40 they did not mention GS in undergraduate instruction sessions, and 62 percent said they did not
41 mention GS in graduate instruction sessions. Often the reasons for not providing resources
42 regarding GS within library instruction classes were that GS was flawed or that there were too
43 many other, stronger resources to cover (Giglierano, 2008; Ettinger, 2008). Currently there is a
44 lack of research regarding how GS is utilized and promoted within library instruction sessions.

45
46
47 Early on, Cathcart & Roberts (2005) posited that GS that it was a resource worth
48 teaching within information literacy classes due to its ease of use, large index, and lack of a paid
49

1
2
3 subscription. Since then, studies have continued to show the desire of researchers of all levels
4 to use and learn about GS (Cothran, 2011, Wu & Chen, 2014, Waltman, 2016, Thoma & Chan,
5 2019). Such popularity is due to the ease of use and how it compares favorably to many
6
7 subscription databases (see De Winter, Zapdoor, & Dodou 2014; Wu & Chen, 2014; Harzing &
8
9 Alakangas, 2015; Fagan, 2017) as various discovery layers (Wang and Howard, 2011; Namei &
10
11 Young, 2015; Oh & Colón-Aguirre, 2019). Because GS has continued to grow its index while
12
13 addressing metadata and other problems, GS may continue to be a popular platform among
14
15 researchers. Such popularity may increase as libraries face budgetary shortfalls, due in large
16
17 part to the COVID-19 pandemic, which may force them to cancel subscription databases and
18
19 pay more attention to GS as a resource.
20
21
22
23

24 Although GS has been the subject of much research, no recent studies have examined
25
26 longitudinal opinions and uses of GS from within one group. Therefore, this research project
27
28 examines the opinions and uses of GS by OhioLINK consortium library respondents over three
29
30 time periods: 2007, 2014, and 2019. This project builds upon Giglierano's (2008) original study.
31
32

33 **Methods**

34
35 This research project was a longitudinal study in which OhioLINK librarians were invited
36
37 to participate in an identical survey in 2007, 2014, and 2019. OhioLINK is a consortium of 116
38
39 private and public academic libraries and the State Library of Ohio (OhioLink 2019a; OhioLink
40
41 2019b). The institutional sizes of OhioLINK schools vary considerably. Schools range from a
42
43 total enrollment of only a few hundred students. to universities such as The Ohio State
44
45 University with tens of thousands of students. The scope of colleges and universities in
46
47 OhioLINK also vary ranging from theological schools, art, and design institutions, two-year
48
49 community colleges, technical schools, and agricultural institutes, small liberal arts colleges,
50
51 mid-sized universities, and Research I institutions. The OhioLINK consortium began in 1992 and
52
53 began sharing link resolver information with GS in 2005. The invitation to participate in the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 survey was posted on the OhioLINK listserv, ohiolink@lists.ohiolink.edu, which is open to all
4
5 staff at OhioLINK member libraries (OhioLINK, 2019c).
6

7 The survey contained seven questions. Six of those questions were multiple choice (with
8
9 a chance to write in more elaborate answers) and one question was a short answer prompting
10
11 respondents to share their comments regarding the promotion of GS. None of the questions
12
13 were required, and not all respondents answered every question. The survey was administered
14
15 via SurveyMonkey in July 2007 (n=50) and November 2014 (n=65) and in July 2019 via Google
16
17 Forms (n=58). It was the intention that the 2014 data be analyzed at the time but it was not due
18
19 to other work demands.
20
21

22 In the 2019 data set, a survey with an error in the second question was distributed for
23
24 two days. In that survey, respondents could not select more than one answer from a multiple-
25
26 choice list. Because of this error, twelve surveys were discarded, and a new, corrected, survey
27
28 was distributed to the list. The data sets were then compared to analyze trends in how, why,
29
30 and where OhioLINK librarians provided GS resources within their institutions. Qualitative
31
32 responses were evaluated using thematic analysis.
33
34

35 **Results**

36 ***Increase and standardization in libraries linking to Google Scholar***

37
38 Over the fifteen-year period, the survey results show the percentages of libraries linking
39
40 to GS from their websites had flipped (Table 1). Although the percentage changes from 2007 to
41
42 2014 were dramatic, they were relatively minimal between 2014 and 2019. In 2007, 36.4
43
44 percent of those responding said there were links to GS on their library's website; which rose to
45
46 58.5 percent in 2014; and remained a relatively stable 60.3 percent by 2019.
47
48

49 Table I.

50
51 In the 2007 results, GS links were most often provided on the library home page, in an
52
53 internet resources or other search engines list, in an alphabetical database list or a subject
54
55 database list, or in other unspecified locations (Table 2). Between 2007 and 2014, the
56
57
58
59
60

percentage of reporting libraries providing links to GS via their alphabetical database list (often called A-Z Databases) more than doubled (from 18.8 percent to 38.9 percent). These percentages are nearly identical between 2014 and 2019 (from 38.9 percent to 39.6 percent).

Table II.

Springshare LibGuides were new to the library landscape in 2007; when survey respondents stated that their libraries listed GS links in “other resources,” none of these links were reported to be on research or library guides. Since that time, LibGuides have become a prevalent platform for libraries wishing to create online guides that promote their research resources (Bushhousen, 2009; Springshare, 2020a; Springshare 2020b). Responses to the 2014 and 2019 surveys reflect such popularity, indicating that GS links were shared almost entirely within research/library guides after 2007 (Table 3).

Table III.

Reasons for not Promoting Google Scholar via Online Library Resources

Overall, there were several reasons given by librarians who stated that their library did not link to GS. Such responses were written in by the respondents and could be easily grouped into one of four overarching themes (Table 4). By far, the main reason for not linking to GS, over all time periods, was due to a belief that such promotion would interfere with providing support for better, typically subscription, research resources (88.4 percent in 2007; 73.9 percent in 2014, 81.2 percent in 2019).

Table IV.

Some of the written responses that typified this belief include a 2007 respondent who stated, “I’m not sure it’s been seriously tabled for discussion to include Google Scholar on our web site, but it seems to be the general consensus amongst our staff that Google Scholar does not really compare to the versatility and access provided by our subscription databases.” In 2019, a respondent stated that they “assume the idea is to teach students to use other resources with more tools for finding peer-reviewed and evidence-based material.”

1
2
3 Although the belief that providing links to GS takes away from promoting better
4 resources (or GS is simply too flawed to promote) was the most common written response for
5 respondents whose libraries did not promote GS on their website, other themes did emerge.
6
7 Between 2007 and 2014, some respondents stated that their libraries had not considered, or
8 had just begun considering, promoting GS (3.8 percent in 2009 and 17.3 percent in 2014). By
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Other respondents stated that they did not know why their library did not promote GS on their website. Such responses are an indication of the many different roles and responsibilities of the respondents on the OhioLINK listserv. For example, a respondent in 2019 stated, "I am not on the web team and couldn't answer that."

In 2019, ten out of twenty-four written responses pointed out flaws with GS or stated that it took away from providing better resources. By 2014, the idea emerged that GS can be one useful tool among many. For example, one respondent stated:

We don't promote it so much as mention it as one of several "most reliable" tools - EDS, the library's catalog, Journal Finder (A-Z), databases, Google Scholar. To our librarians and most of our students, it is a tool for finding full text when other resources have not provided it rather than as a preferred tool for search/research.

A similar theme was echoed in 2019:

I encourage triangulation of research strategies including Google Scholar when appropriate. However, I give preferences to subscription databases. In my experience, once students overcome the initial hurdle of using a new interface, they got much better results than they would from Google Scholar, and they prefer the subscription databases.

Still, others see the value of GS as a standalone tool or even a resource that could potentially replace some of the costlier subscription resources. In 2014, a respondent stated that

1
2
3 “Google Scholar is one of the better engineering content databases. With the cancellation of
4 Compendex, I am mentioning it more and more.” Another respondent in 2019 stated, “I love
5 google scholar and use it in my own research. It's far better than any library catalog or database
6 I've ever used.”
7
8
9
10

11 A few responses fell into the “other” category. In 2014, a respondent stated, “[there is an]
12 assumption that people know about it, I guess.” In 2019, a respondent stated that it was most
13 likely the website design that was preventing the library from providing links to GS on its
14 website.
15
16
17
18
19

20 ***Most Libraries Do Not Provide Resources for Setting up Google Scholar Library Links***

21 One way that libraries promote and utilize GS online, and a powerful way libraries can
22 integrate their content into GS, is by making it available via GS Library Links (Google, 2020d).
23 By setting up GS Library Links, users can locate and access their library's subscription
24 resources within the GS interface (while simultaneously utilizing all of the other aspects of GS).
25
26
27
28
29

30 Although such library integration within GS may be automatic when on campus, it must
31 be set up by the user when off campus. GS Library Links usually only need to be configured
32 once, but it does require several steps that may not be intuitive. GS does not provide a guide to
33 doing this so libraries often provide personalized guides for integrating their content (see The
34 Ohio State University, 2020; Tiffin University, 2020).
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The majority of the responses indicate that respondents' libraries did not include
42 instructions or assistance regarding the setting up of GS Library Links (Table 5). In all surveys,
43 over half of libraries did not provide assistance to setting up GS Library Links (68.2 percent in
44 2007; 60.0 percent in 2014; and 56.4 percent in 2019).
45
46
47
48
49

50 Table V.

51 ***Google Scholar within the Undergraduate Classroom***

52 The survey also asked if GS was routinely mentioned in undergraduate instruction
53 classes (Table 6). It was at the respondent's discretion as to how they interpreted "routinely."
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Unfortunately, the researchers do not have a sense regarding how the term routinely was
4 interpreted by respondents. Between 2007 and 2014, there was an increase in respondents
5 who discussed GS with their undergraduate classes (from 23.3 percent to 38.1 percent), but
6 that percentage decreased between 2014 to 2019 (from 38.1 percent to 29.3 percent).
7
8 Additionally, there was a steady decrease of respondents who did not regularly mention GS to
9 their undergraduate classes (58.1 percent in 2007; 34.9 percent in 2014; and then to 25.9
10 percent in 2019).
11
12

13
14
15
16
17
18 Table VI.

19
20 The written responses regarding the reasons that respondents did not routinely mention
21 GS in undergraduate classes were grouped into one of five mutually exclusive themes (Table
22 7). For those respondents who did not routinely mention GS in undergraduate-level instruction
23 classes their reasons for not doing so were overwhelmingly because they viewed GS negatively
24 and/or it was not worth the limited time to mention in a class (71.4 percent in 2007; 45.0 percent
25 in 2014; and 53.8 percent in 2019).
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Table VII.

34
35 In 2007, twenty-one of twenty-nine written responses mentioned that either they do not
36 promote GS because they, or other faculty, had a negative view of GS. One respondent stated,
37 "We use GS sometimes in helping students do research, but we do not do any promoting of it.
38 We still find that GS is still weak in providing current articles and information." Another
39 respondent in 2007 seemed to sense the usefulness of GS, even if it was not widely accepted
40 by faculty or other librarians, stating:
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 I have used Google Scholar with students during a reference transaction. I don't promote
48 it regularly because many of the faculty have advised their students "not to use Google."
49 ...I think for Google Scholar to be successful locally, our faculty have to buy in that it is a
50 valuable resource.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 By 2014, only nine out of twenty-nine written responses mentioned that GS was either
4 flawed or took away from time that could be better allocated teaching other resources. One
5 respondent stated:
6
7

8
9 I have a limited time to explain to students on how to effectively research. I want to
10 spend most of my time in the classroom teaching the resources we have through the
11 library. In reality, Google Scholar is a great tool but it is much more effective to go
12 straight to the source. Additionally, I spend a lot of time teaching subject searching and
13 this is not possible with Google Scholar.
14
15
16
17
18

19
20 The newness of GS in 2007 and the subsequent time that has passed since seems to be
21 reflected within the data. For example, a 2007 respondent stated that their reason for not
22 mentioning GS within their undergraduate classrooms was that "(GS) has yet to prove itself as a
23 viable pedagogical tool." 2007 was also the only year that any respondents stated that their
24 reason for not routinely mentioning GS within undergraduate classes was that they did not know
25 enough about GS to teach it (9.5 percent of responses).
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Another theme that emerged from the written responses was that whether to mention
34 GS or not varied from class to class with 2007 being the only year that there were no responses
35 (0 percent in 2007; 15.0 percent in 2014; and 15.4 percent in 2019). For example, a 2014
36 respondent wrote that "some mention it...others do not. It depends on the needs of the class
37 being taught."
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Finally, some respondents stated that they either did not know if GS was being taught
45 within undergraduate classes or that the question was not applicable to the respondent's
46 institution. For example, one respondent in 2014 stated, "I'm a cataloger. I virtually have no idea
47 if any of the reference staff mentions Google Scholar." This seems reflective of the OhioLINK
48 consortium listserv, where membership is open to different types of academic institutions as well
49 as different job classifications.
50
51
52
53
54

55 ***Google Scholar Within the Graduate Classroom***

56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In answering if GS is routinely mentioned within graduate-level classes, it was at the
4 respondent's discretion as to how they interpreted "routinely" on the survey. Unfortunately, the
5 response rates to this question were very low, which may have had significant effects on the
6 results (Table 8). One of the main reasons for such a low response rate was that many
7 respondents were from institutions that did not have graduate programs.
8
9
10
11
12

13 Table VIII.

14
15 With regard to if GS was routinely mentioned in graduate-level classes, there was a
16 substantial increase in those stating that they did mention GS from 2007 to 2014, which
17 stabilized by 2019 (from 18.6 percent in 2007; to 36.5 percent in 2014; to 33.8 percent in 2019).
18 Interestingly, there was a dramatic decline among those who said that they did not routinely
19 mention GS to graduate-level classes (from 62.8 percent in 2007; to 41.3 percent in 2014; to
20 10.7 percent in 2019). There was also an increase in respondents who did not know if GS was
21 routinely mentioned to graduate-level classes (from 18.6 percent in 2007; to 22.2 percent in
22 2014; to 30.4 percent in 2019). Such uncertainty could, once again, be reflective of the many
23 potential roles and positions of those on the OhioLINK listserv.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Respondents once again had the opportunity to write a reason that librarians did not
36 routinely mention GS within graduate-level classes (Table 9). These responses were easily
37 grouped into one of four themes. For many, the question was simply not applicable to the
38 respondent's university or instruction sessions (58.8 percent in 2007; 59.0 percent in 2014; and
39 16.8 percent in 2019). As with previous responses, a popular theme given for not routinely
40 mentioning GS within graduate-level classes was that the time would either be better spent
41 examining other research resources or that GS was too flawed to discuss. The percentages of
42 such responses remained relatively consistent over the surveys with the caveat that only six
43 responded to the question in 2019 (from 35.2 percent in 2007; to 31.8 percent in 2014, to 16.6
44 percent in 2019).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Table IX.

1
2
3 By 2014, more responses demonstrate a positive, or at least a not so negative, view of
4 GS. They also mention faculty and graduate assistants promoting GS to students. For example,
5 one respondent stated that “we think Google Scholar represents an interesting half-way house
6 between Google search and scholarly resources. It also represents another opportunity to teach
7 evaluation.” Another respondent from 2014 asserted that:
8
9
10
11
12

13 I typically do not promote Google Scholar, but students come in for research
14 help and say they started with Google Scholar because that is what their
15 professor told them. I think some faculty (particularly graduate assistants that
16 teach introductory courses) use Google Scholar a lot so they show their
17 students how to use it outside of the library instruction session.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Some respondents did not know if others were using GS within their graduate-level
25 classes (0 percent in 2007; 4.5 percent in 2014; and 50.0 percent in 2019). Although there is a
26 dramatic jump in the percentages, this might be explained due to the low response rate for this
27 question as well as the varied roles of librarians on the OhioLINK listserv. Within each of the
28 three surveys there was one response that fell into the “other” category. In 2007, a respondent
29 stated that “the instructions for linking from GS to OhioLINK were recently posted, so we will
30 include this information in future graduate instruction classes.” In 2014, a respondent stated that
31 the reason “depends entirely on the librarian and discipline.” In 2019, a respondent stated,
32 without any context, that the reason for not routinely mentioning GS within graduate-level
33 classes was simply “institutional inertia.”
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Discussion**

46
47 The purpose of this research was to ascertain the level of acceptance, over time, of the
48 new discovery tool, Google Scholar, among members of an academic library consortium: To
49 determine if, and how, attitudes of librarians and other library staff changed toward promoting it
50 to their users on library websites and by teaching it in undergraduate and graduate classes.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 different survey invitations, the percentages of positive and negative responses to the same
4 questions, along with the qualitative comments, provided the insight we sought.
5
6

7 In his foreword to a recent book on resource discovery in twenty-first-century libraries,
8 Lorcan Dempsey outlines three broad trends in the current information ecosystem: "discovery
9 often happens elsewhere"; the library collection is not necessarily the central, nor the first used,
10 part of the library's information universe; and, researchers expect library resources to fit into
11 their workflows, which now include many additional resources within the information network.
12 He includes a graphic showing the evolution of library services, from "owned" and "licensed"
13 collections -- materials purchased and stored -- to "facilitated" collections, including external
14 resources such as Google Scholar, free e-books, open access, and web resources, which meet
15 research and learning needs in the best way (Dempsey, 2020).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The responses in the three surveys provide an interesting juxtaposition to these trends,
27 conveying the viewpoints of individuals currently working in the rapidly evolving information
28 universe within a consortium made up of a diversity of types of academic libraries. This research
29 shows a consistent mix of attitudes toward GS over the years of its existence. Many people
30 responded in each survey that they did not promote or tell users about GS because they wanted
31 them to use the resources their libraries paid for (Dempsey's "licensed" collection). There were
32 also those with a profound distrust of anything Google. Others embraced GS, seeing it as a tool
33 that could be better for many types of research, and that could be integrated with their libraries'
34 link resolvers to meet their users where they were (Dempsey's "facilitated" collection). GS is far
35 from universally accepted by OhioLINK librarians, even if the faculty and students they work
36 with often start with it and find it perfectly fits their needs. This mix of attitudes was not entirely a
37 surprise, given the independent thinking characteristic of librarians when it comes to the quality
38 of resources. However, it is somewhat surprising how many respondents cling fiercely to the
39 idea that the sources their institutions pay for are most worthy of teaching and promoting, and
40 have not moved to more of the facilitated collection mindset.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Opinions regarding GS from librarians have changed since 2007, with more librarians
4 seeing the benefits of using GS (either as one of several research resources or as a standalone
5 resource). Despite these changes in opinions, many continue to believe that GS takes away
6 from time that would be better spent promoting other, often subscription, research resources.
7
8
9

10 11 **Limitations of the Study**

12 Respondents were not asked for the type of library where they work or to identify their
13 position within their libraries, which necessarily limits the conclusions that can be drawn from
14 the survey responses. In retrospect, limiting the sample to instruction librarians or faculty
15 librarians might have yielded more meaningful results. However, the trends noted in the survey
16 results concur with the gradual incorporation of GS into the research routines of today's
17 students and faculty, and the willingness of many libraries to leverage its capabilities.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Additionally, this project did not evaluate the uses and opinions of librarians using GS at
27 the reference desk. By providing this information it would be easier to understand the uses and
28 opinions of librarians about GS.
29
30
31

32 **Conclusion**

33 This research project examined how librarians at OhioLINK institutions viewed and used
34 GS over three times, 2007, 2014, and 2019. Overall, the results indicate that between 2007 and
35 2014 there was still much experimentation, if not apprehension, regarding GS from librarians.
36 By 2014, GS seems to be more accepted as a research resource by librarians. There were no
37 significant changes between 2014 and 2019 regarding the uses and opinions of GS by
38 librarians.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 For example, between 2007 and 2014 there was more experimentation regarding if,
48 how, and where to provide links to GS within library websites when compared to 2014 to 2019.
49 In 2007, the majority of respondents stated that their libraries did not provide links to GS from
50 their websites. By 2014, the majority of libraries were providing links to GS from their website.
51 Those percentages remained relatively consistent from 2014 to 2019.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Although there was a significant increase in the number of library websites that provided
4 links to GS after 2007, the number of libraries that provided online assistance to their users
5 regarding setting up GS Library Links did not change significantly. Over the three surveys, the
6 percentage of libraries that provided assistance to users regarding setting up GS Library Links
7 was between 20.5 percent and 26.2 percent. It is unclear as to why there was never an
8 increase, but it may reflect a belief that paid subscription resources are better curated and less
9 confusing to novice researchers.
10
11

12
13 The results of the three surveys also suggest that as time went on, more librarians were
14 mentioning GS within both undergraduate and graduate-level classes. Between 2007 and 2019,
15 the percentage of respondents who did not mention GS within either their undergraduate or
16 graduate-level instruction classes declined precipitously. In 2014, written responses indicated
17 librarians see GS as a useful research resource when utilized alongside other resources,
18 echoing findings of other researchers (Antell, Strothmann, Chen, & O'Kelly, 2013; Karlsson,
19 2014; Namei & Young, 2015).
20
21

22 Starting in 2014, there appears to be a less overt cynicism regarding GS. Such changes
23 in opinion are reflected within the written comments of the survey and may have been caused
24 by the respondents' increasing familiarity with GS as time went by, the large number of studies
25 that have evaluated GS, the indexing and metadata improvements made to GS since 2007, and
26 the increase of materials indexed within GS (See Harzing, 2014; De Winter, Zadpoor & Dodou,
27 2014; Orduna-Malea et al., 2015; Fagan, 2017). Another factor in play could be the perspectives
28 of newer librarians who grew up with GS as a fixture in the research environment.
29
30

31 Although librarians may view GS with less suspicion than when the product was new,
32 there remains a dominant opinion among librarians that teaching GS does take away valuable
33 time and resources that would be better spent promoting other, typically subscription, research
34 resources. Looking toward the future, it will be interesting to see if opinions and uses of GS
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

change as more libraries face budget setbacks which may force them to cancel some of their subscription research resources.

References

- Antell, K., Strothmann, M., Chen, X. and O’Kelly, K. (2013), “Cross-Examining Google Scholar”, *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, Vol. 52 No. 4, pp. 279–282.
- Arendt, J. (2013), “Imperfect Tools: Google Scholar vs. Traditional Commercial Library Databases”, *Against the Grain*, Vol. 20 No. 2, available at: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.2737>.
- Asher, A.D., Duke, L.M. and Wilson, S. (2013), “Paths of Discovery: Comparing the Search Effectiveness of EBSCO Discovery Service, Summon, Google Scholar, and Conventional Library Resources”, *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 74 No. 5, pp. 464–488.
- Ashmore, B. and Grogg, J.E. (2006), “Google and OCLC open libraries on the open web”, *Searcher*, Vol. 14 No. 10, pp. 44–52.
- Bushhousen, E. (2009), “LibGuides”, *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA*, Vol. 97 No. 1, pp. 68–69.
- Cathcart, R. and Roberts, A. (2005), “Evaluating Google Scholar as a Tool for Information Literacy”, *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, Vol. 10 No. 3–4, pp. 167–176.
- Cole, C., Davis, A.R., Eyer, V. and Meier, J.J. (2018), “Google Scholar’s Coverage of the Engineering Literature 10 years Later”, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 44 No. 3, pp. 419–425.
- Cothran, T. (2011), “Google Scholar acceptance and use among graduate students: A quantitative study”, *Library & Information Science Research*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 293–301.
- Cusker, J. (2013), “Elsevier Compendex and Google Scholar: A Quantitative Comparison of Two Resources for Engineering Research and an Update to Prior Comparisons”, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 241–243.

- 1
2
3 De Winter, J.C.F., Zadpoor, A.A. and Dodou, D. (2014), “The expansion of Google Scholar versus
4 Web of Science: a longitudinal study”, *Scientometrics*, Vol. 98 No. 2, pp. 1547–1565.
5
6
7
8 Dempsey, L. (2020). “Library discovery directions.” In S. McLeish (Ed.), *Resource discovery for the*
9
10 *twenty-first century library: Case studies and perspectives on the role of IT in user engagement*
11 *and empowerment* (pp. 4-13). Facet Publishing.
12
13 [14 https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2020/oclcresearch-library-discovery-](https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2020/oclcresearch-library-discovery-)
15 [16 directions-preprint.pdf](https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2020/oclcresearch-library-discovery-)
17
18
19 Dewan, P. (2012), “Making the Most of Google Scholar in Academic Libraries”, *Feliciter*, Vol. 58
20
21 No. 6, pp. 41–42.
22
23
24 Dixon, L., Duncan, C., Fagan, J.C., Mandernach, M. and Warlick, S.E. (2010), “Finding Articles and
25
26 Journals via Google Scholar, Journal Portals, and Link Resolvers”, *Reference & User Services*
27 *Quarterly*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 170–181.
28
29
30
31 Donlan, R. and Cooke, R. (2005), “Running with the Devil: Accessing Library-Licensed Full Text
32
33 Holdings Through Google Scholar”, *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, Vol. 10 No. 3–4, pp.
34
35 149–157.
36
37
38 Ettinger, D. (2008), “The Triumph of Expediency: The Impact of Google Scholar on Library
39
40 Instruction”, *Journal of Library Administration*, Vol. 46 No. 3–4, pp. 65–72.
41
42
43 Fagan, J.C. (2017), “An Evidence-Based Review of Academic Web Search Engines, 2014-2016:
44
45 Implications for Librarians’ Practice and Research Agenda”, *Information Technology and*
46 *Libraries*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 7–47.
47
48
49 Friend, F.J. (2006), “Google Scholar: Potentially Good for Users of Academic Information”, *The*
50 *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, Vol. 9 No. 1, available at:
51
52 [53 https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0009.105](https://doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0009.105).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Giglierano, J. (2008), "Attitudes of OhioLINK Librarians Toward Google Scholar", *Journal of*
4
5 *Library Administration*, Vol. 47 No. 1–2, pp. 101–113.
6
7
8 Giles, J. (2005), "Start your engines", *Nature*, Vol. 438 No. 7068, pp. 554–555.
9
10 Google. (2020a), "About Google Scholar", *About Google Scholar*, available at:
11
12 <https://scholar.google.com/intl/en/scholar/about.html> (accessed 27 March 2020).
13
14 Google. (2020b), "Inclusion Guidelines for Webmasters", *Inclusion Guidelines for Webmasters*,
15
16 available at: <https://scholar.google.com/intl/en/scholar/inclusion.html#content> (accessed 27
17
18 March 2020).
19
20
21 Google. (2020c), "Google Scholar Citations", *Google Scholar Citations*, available at:
22
23 <https://scholar.google.com/intl/en/scholar/citations.html#citations> (accessed 27 March 2020).
24
25
26 Google. (2020d), "Library Support", *Library Support*, available at:
27
28 <https://scholar.google.com/scholar/libraries.html> (accessed 27 March 2020).
29
30
31 Gusenbauer, M. (2019), "Google Scholar to overshadow them all? Comparing the sizes of 12
32
33 academic search engines and bibliographic databases", *Scientometrics*, Vol. 118 No. 1, pp. 177–
34
35 214.
36
37
38 Haddaway, N.R., Collins, A.M., Coughlin, D. and Kirk, S. (2015). "The Role of Google Scholar in
39
40 evidence reviews and its applicability to grey literature searching", *PLoS One*, Vol. 10 No. 9.
41
42
43 Hartman, K.A. and Bowering Mullen, L. (2008), "Google Scholar and academic libraries: an update",
44
45 *New Library World*, Vol. 109 No. 5/6, pp. 211–222.
46
47
48 Harzing, A.W. (2014), "A longitudinal study of Google Scholar coverage between 2012 and 2013",
49
50 *Scientometrics*, Vol. 98 No. 1, pp. 565–575.
51
52
53 Harzing, A.W. and Alakangas, S. (2016), "Google Scholar, Scopus and the Web of Science: a
54
55 longitudinal and cross-disciplinary comparison", *Scientometrics*, Vol. 106 No. 2, pp. 787–804.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Jacsó, P. (2008), “Google Scholar revisited”, *Online Information Review*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 102–114.
4
5
6 Karlsson, N. (2014), “The crossroads of academic electronic availability: How well does Google
7
8 Scholar measure up against a university-based metadata system in 2014?”, *Current Science*, Vol.
9
10 107 No. 10, pp. 1661–1665.
11
12 Kesselman, M. and Watstein, S. (2005), “Google Scholar™ and libraries: point/counterpoint”,
13
14 *Reference Services Review*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 380–387.
15
16
17 Martín-Martín, A., Orduna-Malea, E. and Ayllon, J. (2016), “A two-sided academic
18
19 landscape: Portrait of highly-cited documents in Google Scholar (1950-2013)”, *Revista*
20
21 *Española de Documentación Científica (Preprint)*, Vol. 39 No. 4.
22
23
24 Martín-Martín, A., Orduna-Malea, E., Thelwall, M. and Delgado López-Cózar, E. (2018), “Google
25
26 Scholar, Web of Science, and Scopus: A systematic comparison of citations in 252 subject
27
28 categories”, *Journal of Informetrics*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 1160–1177.
29
30
31 Mullen, L.B. and Hartman, K.A. (2006), “Google Scholar and the Library Web Site: The Early
32
33 Response by ARL Libraries”, available at: <https://doi.org/10.7282/T3KH0KQ0>.
34
35
36 Namei, E. and Young, C.A. (2015), “Measuring Our Relevancy: Comparing Results in a Web-Scale
37
38 Discovery Tool, Google & Google Scholar”, *Proceedings of ACRL*, Portland, OR, pp. 522–535.
39
40
41 Neuhaus, C., Neuhaus, E. and Asher, A. (2008), “Google Scholar Goes to School: The Presence of
42
43 Google Scholar on College and University Web Sites”, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*,
44
45 Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 39–51.
46
47
48 Norris, B.P. (2006), “Google: Its Impact on the Library”, *Library Hi Tech News*, Vol. 23 No. 9, pp. 9–
49
50 11.
51
52 Oder, N. (2005), “Google Scholar Links with Libs.”, *Library Journal*, Vol. 130 No. 7, pp. 17–18.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Oh, K. and Colón-Aguirre, M. (2019), “A Comparative Study of Perceptions and Use of Google
4 Scholar and Academic Library Discovery Systems”, *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 80 No.
5 6, pp. 876–891.
6
7
8
9
- 10 OhioLINK. (2020a), “OhioLINK history”, *OhioLINK History*, available at:
11 <https://www.ohiolink.edu/content/history> (accessed 30 June 2020).
12
13
- 14 OhioLINK. (2020b). “About OhioLINK”, *About OhioLINK*, available at:
15 https://www.ohiolink.edu/content/about_ohiolink (accessed 30 June 2020).
16
17
18
- 19 OhioLINK. (2020c), “OhioLINK email listserv assistance”, *OhioLINK Email Listserv Assistance*,
20 available at: https://www.ohiolink.edu/forms/ohiolink_email_listserv_assistance (accessed 30
21 June 2020).
22
23
24
25
- 26 Orduna-Malea, E., Ayllón, J.M., Martín-Martín, A. and Delgado López-Cózar, E. (2015), “Methods
27 for estimating the size of Google Scholar”, *Scientometrics*, Vol. 104 No. 3, pp. 931–949.
28
29
- 30 Pomeranz, J. (2006), “Google Scholar and 100 percent availability of information”, *Information
31 Technology and Libraries*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 52–56.
32
33
34
- 35 Springshare. (2020a), “About Springshare”, *About Springshare*, available at:
36 <https://springshare.com/about.html> (accessed 8 July 2020).
37
38
39
- 40 Springshare. (2020b), “LibGuides”, *LibGuides*, available at: <https://springshare.com/libguides/>
41 (accessed 27 March 2020).
42
43
- 44 Taylor, S. (2007), “Google Scholar – friend or foe?”, *Interlending & Document Supply*, Vol. 35 No. 1,
45 pp. 4–6.
46
47
48
- 49 Tenopir, C. (2005), “Google in the academic library”, *Library Journal*, Vol. 130 No. 2, p. 32.
50
51
- 52 The Ohio State University. (2020), “Make Google Scholar work for you”, 8 July, available at:
53 <http://guides.osu.edu/c.php?g=833138>.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Thoma, B. and Chan, T.M. (2019), "Using Google Scholar to track the scholarly output of research
4 groups", *Perspectives on Medical Education*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 201–205.
5
6
7
8 Tiffin University. (2020), "Using Google Scholar", *Using Google Scholar*, available at:
9
10 <https://library.tiffin.edu/googles/setup> (accessed 8 July 2020).
11
12 Waltman, L. (2016), "A review of the literature on citation impact indicators", *Journal of*
13 *Informetrics*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 365–391.
14
15 Wang, Y. and Howard, P. (2012), "Google Scholar Usage: An Academic Library's Experience",
16
17 *Journal of Web Librarianship*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 94–108.
18
19
20 Wu, M. and Chen, S. (2014), "Graduate students appreciate Google Scholar, but still find use for
21
22 libraries", *The Electronic Library*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 375–389.
23
24
25
26 York, M.C. (2005), "Calling the Scholars Home: Google Scholar as a Tool for Rediscovering the
27
28 Academic Library", *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, Vol. 10 No. 3–4, pp. 117–133.
29
30
31 Zhang, T. (2013), "User-Centered Evaluation of a Discovery Layer System with Google Scholar", in
32
33 Marcus, A. (Ed.), *Design, User Experience, and Usability. Web, Mobile, and Product Design*,
34
35 Vol. 8015, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 313–322.
36
37

Appendix

Survey Instrument:

- 38
39
40
41 1. Does your library's web site link to Google Scholar?
42
43
44 2. If yes, please select as many as applicable from the following:
45
46 [Link from library home page]
47
48 [Link from alphabetical databases list]
49
50 [Link from subject databases list(s)]
51
52 [Link from Internet resources or search engines list]
53
54 [Widget on page]
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 [Other] If other, please specify
4

5 3. If you do not link to Google Scholar from your library's web site, why not?
6

7 4. Does your library's web site include instructions about setting up preferences so Library Links
8 will show in Google Scholar results? (See <https://bit.ly/2xYEanT> for information on Library
9 Links.)
10
11

12
13 5. Do instruction librarians at your library routinely mention Google Scholar in undergraduate
14 instruction classes? If no, please explain
15

16 6. Do instruction librarians at your library routinely mention Google Scholar in graduate
17 instruction classes? If no, please explain
18
19

20 7. Please share any other comments you have about your library's decision to promote Google
21 Scholar to your users, or not to do so.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table I. Does your library's website link to Google Scholar?

Year	Yes	No	Don't know	n=
2007	36.4%	63.6%	0%	44
2014	58.5%	40.0%	1.5%	65
2019	60.3%	32.8%	4%	58

Table II. If your library does link to GS from its web site, where is that link located?

Users selected all answers that are applicable

Year	Library homepage	Alphabetical database list	Subject database list	Internet resources or other search engine list	Other resources (See Table 3)	n=
2007	31.3%	18.8%	18.8%	31.3%	56.3	16
2014	25.0%	38.9%	25.0%	25.0%	47.2%	36
2019	10.3%	39.6%	15.5%	17.2%	15.5%	58

Table III. Other resources mentioned by librarians as linking to Google Scholar

Year	LibGuide/Research Guide	Discovery Layer/Link Resolver	Other	n=
2007	0%	0%	100%	9
2014	66.6%	9.5%	23.8%	21
2019	70.0%	0%	20.0%	12

Table IV. Self-reported reasons that libraries did not link to Google Scholar from their websites

Year	It takes away from promoting other resources and/or GS is too flawed	I do not know why GS is not promoted	Our institution had not considered, or only beginning to consider promoting GS	Other reason	n=
2007	88.4%	3.8%	3.8%	0	26
2014	73.9%	4.3%	17.3%	4.3%	23
2019	81.2%	12.5%	0	6.2%	16

Table V. Does your library's website include instructions about setting up preferences so Library Links will show up in Google Scholar results?

Year	Yes	No	Don't know	n=
2007	20.5%	68.2%	11.4%	44
2014	26.2%	60.0%	13.8%	65
2019	25.5%	56.4%	18.2%	55

Table VI. Do instruction librarians at your library routinely mention Google Scholar in undergraduate instruction classes?

Year	Yes	No	Don't know	n=
2007	23.3%	58.1%	18.6%	43
2014	38.1%	34.9%	27.0%	63
2019	29.3%	25.9%	37.9%	54

Table VII. Reasons stated that instruction librarians do not routinely mention Google Scholar in undergraduate classes

Year	GS is viewed negatively and/or it takes away time that would be better devoted to other resources	The respondent or institution did not know enough about GS to teach it	The respondent did not know if others were utilizing GS	Question not applicable to the respondent's university or instruction sessions	Depends on particular class	n=
2007	71.4%	9.5%	4.7%	14.2%	0	21
2014	45.0%	0	13.0%	25.0%	15.0%	20
2019	53.8%	0	23.0%	7.6%	15.4%	13

Table VIII. Do instruction librarians at your library routinely mention Google Scholar in graduate instruction classes?

Year	Yes	No	Don't know	n=
2007	18.6%	62.8%	18.6%	43
2014	36.5%	41.3%	22.2%	63
2019	33.9%	10.7%	30.4%	32

Table IX. Reasons stated that instruction librarians do not routinely mention Google Scholar in graduate-level classes

Year	Focus on other information resources and/or GS is flawed and not worth the effort	The respondent did not know if others are utilizing GS	The question was not applicable to the respondent's university or instruction sessions	Other Reason	n=
2007	35.2%	0	58.8%	5.8%	17
2014	31.8%	4.5%	59%	4.5%	22
2019	16.8%	50%	16.8%	16.8%	6