淡江大學 101 學年度碩士班招生考試試題

系別:資訊與圖書館學系 科目:圖書館學與資訊科學

考試日期:2月26日(星期日) 第2節

本試題共 4 大題, 共 2 頁

申論題

- 1. 著錄電子資源時,有哪些 CMARC 欄位比較特別,請簡述之。(25 分)
- 2. 試述雲端運算對圖書館發展的影響。(25分)
- 3. 電子書時代來臨,圖書館之流通與管理須考慮那些因應之道?(25分)
- 4. 請摘要敘述下列短文。(25分)

Virtual references services: defining the criteria and indicators to evaluate them

BY María Pinto, Ramón A. Manso

According to <u>Pomerantz (2008)</u>, a virtual reference service can be evaluated from two perspectives: a library-focused or a user-focused perception. Both perspectives include a set of elements that can be assessed to establish whether users' information needs are satisfied, although the evaluation generally includes elements from the two perspectives. In this paper, we follow the user-focused perspective, with particular emphasis on the criteria essential to promote the use of this type of service and its features among its user community.

The study began with the analysis of published standards for the development of VRS, such as the Guidelines for Implementing and Maintaining Virtual Reference Services (<u>American Library Association and Reference and User Services Association</u>, 2003) and the Recommendations for Digital Reference Service (<u>IFLA</u>, 2004), in order to gather assessment criteria and parameters related to service policies and communication interface.

We reviewed <u>Shachaf and Horowit's (2008)</u> study, which analyses transactions made through the virtual reference services of 54 academic libraries in North America, to learn how closely they adhere to the above-mentioned guidelines and recommendations. The study shows the importance of using professional standards to evaluate VRS quality. We also explored VRS best practices by considering <u>McClure et al.'s (2002)</u> contributions on how to describe and develop procedures to evaluate aspects associated with virtual reference services, and the <u>Washington State Library (2004)</u>, study, which proposes a practical evaluation tool, from the user's perspective, based on chat applications.

Studies by <u>Pomerantz (2008)</u>, and <u>Pomerantz and Luo (2006)</u> provide various approaches for evaluating VRS and the efficacy of chat reference services to satisfy users' information needs. <u>Pomerantz et al. (2008)</u> outline the main issues that affect the successful evaluation of virtual reference services, particularly compiled data quality. They suggest solutions to strengthen the

淡江大學 101 學年度碩士班招生考試試題

系別:資訊與圖書館學系 科目:圖書館學與資訊科學

考試日期:2月26日(星期日) 第2節

本試題共 4 大題, 共 2 頁

evaluation design and the information retrieval method. Other interesting sources on VRS evaluation include <u>Janes (2001)</u> and <u>Luo (2008)</u>, who propose a set of parameters applied in North America, and measures to assess a chat-based virtual reference service, respectively. For his part, <u>Manso (2008)</u> analyses VRS policies established by organisations and professional associations, and contrasts essential related features like service organisation, the role of the librarian, privacy policies, and copyright laws. <u>Neuhaus (2003)</u>, examines aspects of confidentiality and privacy involved in VRS, together with the librarians' role and responsibilities in this area. The works of <u>Pinto et al. (2007, 2009)</u> and <u>Hungyune (2001)</u> were used as references to select a set of indicators to evaluate the service in university web portals, involving both institutional and library services, while the literature on Web 2.0 by <u>O'Reilly (2005)</u>, <u>Casey and Savastinuk (2006)</u>, and <u>Maness (2006)</u>, provided a general background on the key Web 2.0 indicators that today's information services should comply with.

We can say that most of the literature on the subject under investigation, is based on case studies of service design and administration. Regarding evaluation aspects of this type of service, research is limited essentially to assess the expectations of users in the process of interaction with the service, from the perspective of the accuracy of the responses, the preference of the communication channel and response time. Regardless, <u>Janes (2001)</u> and <u>Lankes (2003)</u> have noted the lack of systematic evaluations of virtual reference services, by their suppliers. However, says <u>Kuruppu (2007)</u>, that given the changing environment in which today surround this type of service, evaluation of it has to be an ongoing process in order to understand how to use the service as it is seen and accepted by users, or that the assessment should be an integral part of the service.

Finally, this section only wanted to mention those documents that were essential in setting up the instrument for the evaluation of virtual reference services, which in this research is proposed. In a following section, this review focused reverting to list those criteria used by these different authors, have been useful for the realisation.