



JÖNKÖPING UNIVERSITY

## Course outline

Information Literacy and Scholarly Communication, 3 higher education credits

**Part I: Information literacy**

**Part II: Scholarly communication**

### Schedule

Date	Time	Room	Teacher
2018-10-30	09.00-12.00	C2032	Paola Johansson
2018-11-02	09.00-12.00	C2032	Paola Johansson
2018-11-06	09.00-11.00	C2032	Paola Johansson/Stefan Carlstein
2018-11-09	09.00-12.00	C3028	Stefan Carlstein
2018-11-13	09.00-12.00	C2032	Stefan Carlstein
2018-11-16	09.00-12.00	C2032	Stefan Carlstein
2018-11-30	<i>Examination reports for part I and part II should be sent in</i>		
2018-12-11	09.00-12.00	C2032	All: examination seminar
2018-12-12	09.00-12.00	C2032	All: examination seminar
2018-12-14	09.00-12.00	C2032	All: examination seminar

Tuesday 30 October, 09.00-12.00 (Part I)

Course introduction, literature reviews, the information gathering process, scientific publications.

### To read before lecture

*Articles for discussion (see discussions points below)*

Gbededo, Liyanage & Garza-Reyes (2018)

Krishnan & Ulrich (2001)

Ngai, Moon, Riggins & Yi (2008)

Sonego & Galvan (2018)

### *Generally for lecture*

Jesson, Matheson, & Lacey (2011), pp. 9-25 (will be distributed)

Rumsey (2008), chapter 1.

### Discussion points

Prepare for a discussion by reading Gbededo, Liyanage & Garza-Reyes (2018), Krishnan & Ulrich

(2001) Ngai, Moon, Riggins & Yi (2008) and Sonego & Galvan (2018). Note! It is only necessary to read the introduction or method section in each article, enough to answer the questions and be able to take part in a discussion on the different search methods.

- How is the search method described?
- What limitations have been set up before gathering the literature?
- How is the literature gathered?
- What criteria are used to eliminate irrelevant publications?

Friday 2 November, 09.00-12.00 (Part I)

### **Content**

Search strategies, searching bibliographic databases, search results evaluation, evaluation of resources, citation searching, library databases.

### **Homework assignment (prepare for discussion)**

Take a look on the database Scopus and Google Scholar and make a reflection with respect to:

- General usefulness: What important advantages and disadvantages do you see in each of them?
- Search functionality: How can a search be limited?

### **To read before lecture**

Rumsey (2008), chapter 6, 7 and 11.

Tuesday 6 November, 09.00-11.00 (Part I)

### **Content**

Setting up alerts, introduction to patent searching.

### **Homework assignment (prepare for discussion/demonstration)**

- Try to identify the alert services in the library's databases that would be of most use in your doctoral studies.
- Set up at least one alert and be prepared to present it.

Friday 9 November, 09.00-12.00 (Part II)

### **Content**

The history of scholarly communication, peer review, and open access.

### **To read before lecture**

*Articles for discussion (see below)*

Oppenheim (2008)

Ware (2008)

Background reading: Jönköping University Library (2011)

### **Discussion points**

Prepare for a discussion by reading Ware (2008) and Oppenheimer (2008).

- What do you think are the pros and cons of peer review? (Ware, 2008)
- What type of peer review (or other quality assessment) would you prefer concerning an article that you have written and want to publish? (Ware, 2008)
- How do you feel about being a reviewer yourself – on what grounds would you base your participation? (Ware, 2008)
- What possible advantages or disadvantages, for you as an author/researcher, would open access publishing give you? (Oppenheimer, 2008)
- What incentives would, for you, be most effective in order for you to parallel publish? (Oppenheimer, 2008)
- How would you reason about “gold” or “green” open access for your own publishing? (Oppenheimer, 2008)

Tuesday 13 November, 09.00-12.00 (Part II)

### **Content**

Bibliometrics

### **To read before lecture**

*Articles for discussion (see below)*

Hicks et al. (2015)

Pendlebury (2009)

Weingart (2005)

### **Discussion points**

Prepare for a discussion by reading Pendlebury (2009), Weingart (2005), and Hicks et al. (2015).

- Why should you be careful of viewing citations as a proof of quality? (Pendlebury, 2009)
- What effects may bibliometric indicators have on the publishing behaviors of researchers? (Weingart, 2005)
- Contrast the peer-review process with the use of quantitative bibliometric indicators in research evaluation (Weingart, 2005; Hicks et al., 2015)

Friday 16 November, 09.00-12.00 (Part II)

### **Content**

Publication strategy

### **To read before lecture**

*Articles for discussion (see below)*

Knight & Steinbach (2008)

### **Discussion points**

Prepare for a discussion by reading Knight and Steinbach (2008).

- Think of different ways of choosing one or several journals to submit your article to, how would you pick them and what would your motives be?
- Discuss with a senior researcher at your department about how he/she chooses journals to publish in.

Friday 30 November

Last day for sending in the examination reports for part I and part II.

Tuesday 11, Wednesday 12, Friday 14 November – Examination seminars

Each course member should prepare a review of another student's reports. Instructions for the review will be presented. At the seminar, all course members are expected to present the review orally. Each course member choose one of the sessions.

## Literature

### Part I: Information literacy

#### *Main book*

Rumsey, S. (2008) *How to find information: A guide for researchers*. (2. ed.) Maidenhead: Open University Press. Retrieved from [https://ju-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=46JUL\\_ALMA512333220003831&context=L&vid=ju&search\\_scope=ju\\_l\\_all&isFrbr=true&tab=default\\_tab&lang=sv\\_SE](https://ju-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=46JUL_ALMA512333220003831&context=L&vid=ju&search_scope=ju_l_all&isFrbr=true&tab=default_tab&lang=sv_SE)

#### *Additional literature (pp. 9-25, will be distributed)*

Jesson, J., Matheson, L., & Lacey, F. M. (2011). *Doing your literature review : traditional and systematic techniques*. Los Angeles, Calif. ; London: SAGE.

#### *As basis for discussion*

Gbededo, M. A., Liyanage, K., & Garza-Reyes, J. A., (2018). Towards a Life Cycle Sustainability Analysis: A systematic review of approaches to sustainable manufacturing. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 184, 1002-1015. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.02.310>

Krishnan, V., & Ulrich, K. T. (2001). Product development decisions: A review of the literature. *Management Science*, 47(1), 1-21. Retrieved from <http://proxy.library.ju.se/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/213176824?accountid=11754>

Ngai, E. W. T., Moon, K. K. L., Riggins, F. J., & Yi, C. Y. (2008). RFID research: An academic literature review (1995-2005) and future research directions. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 112(2), 510-520. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2007.05.004>

Sonego, E. & Galvan D. (2018). The role of modularity in sustainable design: A systematic review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 176, 196–209. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.106>

### Part II: Scholarly communication

Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., De Rijcke, S. & Rafols, I. (2015). Bibliometrics: The Leiden manifesto for research metrics. *Nature*, 520, 429-431. doi: [10.1038/520429a](https://doi.org/10.1038/520429a)

Jönköping University Library (2011). "Publishing and copyright". Retrieved from: <http://hj.se/bibl/en/research-teaching-support/open-access/publishing-and-copyright.html>

Knight, LV, & Steinbach, TA. (2008). Selecting an Appropriate Publication Outlet: A Comprehensive Model of Journal Selection Criteria for Researchers in a Broad Range of Academic Disciplines. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 3, 59-79. Retrieved from <http://www.ijds.org/Volume3/IJDSv3p059-079Knight84.pdf>

Oppenheim, Charles. (2008). Electronic scholarly publishing and open access. *Journal of Information Science*, 34(4), 577-590. Retrieved from <http://login.bibl.proxy.hj.se/login?url=http://jis.sagepub.com/content/34/4/577.abstract>

Pendlebury, David. (2009). The use and misuse of journal metrics and other citation indicators. *Archivum Immunologiae et Therapiae Experimentalis*, 57(1), 1-11. Retrieved from <http://login.bibl.proxy.hj.se/login?url=http://www.springerlink.com/content/66561772n6638841/>

Ware, M. (2008). *Peer review: benefits, perceptions and alternatives*. Retrieved from [http://ils.unc.edu/courses/2014\\_fall/inls690\\_109/Readings/Ware2008-PRCPeerReview.pdf](http://ils.unc.edu/courses/2014_fall/inls690_109/Readings/Ware2008-PRCPeerReview.pdf)

Weingart, Peter. (2005). Impact of bibliometrics upon the science system: Inadvertent consequences? *Scientometrics*, 62(1), 117-131. Retrieved from <http://login.bibl.proxy.hj.se/login?url=http://www.springerlink.com/content/n230368327140061/>

*(Further literature may be added.)*