

makes that expert-generated or librarian-generated metadata is not competent to describe all the resources. Instead, an alternative decentralised way for metadata generation is needed in the view of user-driven metadata approach. The user-driven metadata is generated through the process of social tagging¹¹. LibraryThing, a social network site for book lovers is allowing users to assign any tags to any books as per need where tags are found as a tag cloud with different font size and weight reflecting the popularity of each tag¹².

Despite many advantages, social tags still suffer from quality issues. Being generated from uncontrolled vocabulary social tags suffer from homonyms, synonyms, lack of controlled vocabularies and semantic ambiguities¹³⁻¹⁴. Besides social tags contain many personal tags ('read', 'to-read', 'unread', 'read in 2015' etc.) that neither define any subject nor help in information retrieval. Personal tags are mainly used for personal purposes rather than public benefit¹⁵. Having many issues regarding incorporation into library databases, still many researchers and information scientists opined that social tagging can enhance the library catalogue as well as library website by supplementing controlled vocabularies¹⁶.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Bogers & Petras¹⁷ conducted a comparative study to know whether social tags can replace or improve professionally assigned metadata used for books. The study compared a test collection of over 2 million book records with metadata elements from Amazon, the British Library, the Library of Congress and LibraryThing which concluded that social tags and controlled vocabulary complement each other.

Wu, D. *et al.*⁹ examined the relationship between social tagging and controlled vocabulary-based terms in information science domain. The study shows that more overlap between social tags and controlled vocabulary-based terms. The study also highlights that social tagging can enrich the controlled vocabulary.

Petek¹⁸ compared user generated metadata with librarian generated metadata on digital images collected from Flickr and Digital Library of Slovenia respectively. The study was conducted to identify whether any dissimilarity exist between those metadata. The result shows that tagging has perpetual quality can be used for enriching digital images but tagging is mostly done for personal benefit.

Lu, C. *et al.*⁵ conducted a study to know the connection between social tags and expert-assigned terms and the feasibility of implementing those social tags into libraries. The study shows that social tags can improve the accessibility of library collections.

Rolla¹⁹ made a comparison between user tags from LibraryThing and library-supplied subject headings for a group of books. The study mainly focuses that there is a difference between those metadata and for that reason user tags can not replace entirely controlled vocabularies such as Library of Congress Subject Headings.

3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- Do social tags and SLSH terms follow the same vocabulary?

- Do both social tags and SLSH terms are the same based on usage?
- Do social tags and SLSH terms use keywords from the title of books?
- Do social tags enhance the subject access like SLSH terms?
- Can social tags replace controlled vocabularies?

4. DATASET

The present study compares two types of metadata of which one is user-generated social tags and other one is librarian-generated subject terms used for libraries. Thousand book titles in field of History were randomly sampled under the study. The study uses LibraryThing (www.librarything.com) for collecting user-generated social tags whereas uses Sears List of Subject Headings (19th ed.) for librarian-generated subject headings. The study primarily collects 41313 user-generated social tags from LibraryThing database and 3227 SLSH terms from librarian-generated subject headings using Sears List of Subject Headings (19th ed.) for thousand book titles in History. After removing duplicates unique social tags and unique SLSH terms are 6123 (average 6.12 per book) and 387 (average 0.39 per book) respectively. The overall comparison was carried out based on those unique social tags and SLSH terms.

5. METHODOLOGY

The study measures the effectiveness of social tags in comparison with sears list of subject heading (SLSH) terms in the domain of History. There are many active social cataloguing sites like Goodreads (<https://www.goodreads.com>), Litsy (<https://www.litsy.com>), Anobii (<https://www.anobii.com>), Readgeek (<https://www.readgeek.com>) and LibraryThing (<https://www.librarything.com>) etc. on the web and these provide users different experiences of resource organisation. But the present study prefers the LibraryThing database (a social cataloguing site for book lovers) for collecting social tags²⁰. This is because LibraryThing provides a collection of social tags which are assigned by users under a given subject in alphabetical order. The collection of social tags is also called technically as 'Tag Cloud'. Tags in the 'Tag Cloud' are visualised by different font size which represents the popularity of tags under a given subject. Beside, LibraryThing database has a vast collection of books from LOC online catalogue, Amazon.com and 4967 other sources also¹¹. A thousand books written in the English language in the domain of history were sampled under the study. The data collection procedure was carried out from September to October 2019. Those books were selected which had been catalogued by at least ten users (≥ 10) and had been assigned at least three social tags (≥ 3) simultaneously in the LibraryThing database. Tags hold different tag frequency in the LibraryThing database. Tags contain more tag frequency means the tag is more popular to users. That means the number of users uses this tag to define that particular book. The present study selects those tags only which had at least twice tag frequency (≥ 2) or more than that in the LibraryThing database.

On the other side, subject headings for the entire set were prepared in consultation with sears list of subject headings