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Literature Review

- Librarians - “Teaching” faculty - Students Collaboration
  - “Embedded librarian” (Dewey, 2004)
  - Integration of information literacy into curriculum (Lindstrom et al., 2004)
  - Incorporate technology into curricula with instructional technologists and students (Boisselle et al., 2004)
  - LIS school faculty and librarian collaborating in collection development (Maurer & Wicks, 2004)
  - Faculty-librarian collaboration: “New Professors’ Fund” for collection development (Horava, 2005)
  - Building bridges between students and practitioners: LIS education, student-faculty conference presentation (Jurkowski, 2005)
  - “Teaching” faculty – “library” faculty - students collaborate in research project (Callison et al., 2005)
Literature Review

• Issues:
  – Lack of literature in collaboration in authorship among librarians, LIS faculty and students
  – Benefits and challenges of collaboration
  – Technology for collaborative research
    • Web 2.0 technology (e.g., blogs, wikis, tagging, RSS)
    • Traditional vs. newer technology
    • Push vs. pull technology
LIS Book Project: An Introduction

• A volume in a book series
• Bibliographic description


- 西方人文和社会科学研究前沿丛书 - 图书馆信息学分卷。分卷主编：储荷婷，张茵。丛书主编：鲁曙明。人民大学出版社。2007年出版。
LIS Book Project: Geographic Distribution of Authors

- Novelty of this project
  - International collaboration

Authors in the U.S.:
- Connecticut: 3
- Pennsylvania: 3
- NY: 1
- Ohio: 1
- Illinois: 4
- Texas: 2
- Kansas: 2
- California: 1

Authors from Canada: 2
LIS Book Project: Author Affiliation

- Collaboration among students, faculty and librarians

- 5 PhD students (4 from LIS, 1 from CS);
- 8 faculty members from LIS, 1 faculty member from Information Systems in Business School;
- 5 librarians.

![Co-authors Profile]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS Faculty</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-LIS Faculty</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS Students</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-LIS Students</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. 各种形式的信息 (Information in Various Forms)
2. 变化中的图书馆 (Libraries in Transition)
3. 信息表述 (Information Representation)
4. 信息检索 (Information Retrieval)
5. 用户服务 (User Services)
6. 信息系统 (Information Systems)
7. 用户研究 (User Studies)
8. 信息伦理和信息政策 (Information Ethics and Information Policy)
9. 图书馆信息学的研究方法 (Research Methods in Library and Information Science)
10. 信息技术 (Information Technology in the Field)
11. 信息计量学与网络计量学 (Informetrics & Webometrics)
Collaboration Stages (2-1)

• **Call for collaboration; Chapter proposal and discussion** (11/2005 - 12/2005)
  - Use of a list CALISE: A LIS volume in a book series?
    • Chu Heting (volume editor) emailed the list
    • Lu Shuming (series editor)
  - After participants identified, chapter proposal and discussion

• **Chapter outline construction** (12/2005 - 2/2006)
  - A mailing list for the book project was established at
    • cwp-palmerchu@lists.liu.edu
  - Zhang Qiping, the co-editor, created a blog at
    • http://lisbook.blogspot.com
  - Writing samples in both Chinese and English were requested
  - Editors’ comments and peer comments on the chapter outline, …
    book outline finalized
  - Chapter template provided
Collaboration Stages (2-2)

• Bibliography Selection (1/2006-)
  – Cover literature published since 1990

• Draft Preparation (2/2006-)

• Review, Revision and Editing (5/2006-1/31/2007)
  – Reference checking; editors’ feedback and revision
  – New Publisher: Renmin University Press
  – New co-editor: Zhang Yin (replacing Zhang Qiping)
  – 1/31/2007 LIS Volume completed
The LIS Book Project Survey: Q1- Participant Profile

Issues:
Participants’ different levels of knowledge and experience...

Response rate: 63%
Survey site: http://www.surveymonkey.com
The LIS Book Project Survey

Q2. A collaboration project among librarians, PhD students and LIS faculty is appropriate and efficient.

Remarks: Positive response!
The LIS Book Project Survey

• Q3. The list we have for communication among ourselves is very helpful in this project.

Remarks: Very positive response for the emailing list.
The LIS Book Project Survey

- Q4. The whole process, including outline preparation, bibliography selection, draft writing, peer review and revision is coherent and efficient.

Remarks: Positive response for the collaboration process.
Q5. I have encountered some difficulty in writing a literature review for the research topic(s) in this project.

Issues: Participants’ different levels of knowledge and experience;
Opportunities for students and young professionals;
The pros and cons of collaboration…
Q6. How did you communicate with your co-author(s)? (Check all that apply)

Issues:
“Push” technology (such as email) is still preferred;
Traditional vs. New vs. newer technology…
The LIS Book Project Survey

- Q7. How many times did you communicate with your co-author(s)?
Q8. In which stage(s) did you communicate a lot? (Check all that apply)

Remarks: Drafting and revision are rated the highest, the next is outline, and the least is bibliography selection.
Q9. I am satisfied with the result of this collaborated project, and I will participate in this type of collaboration in the future.

Remarks: Positive response.
• Q10. Please put any comments and thoughts you may have about the LIS book project below:

– The lack of accurate information about the **target audience** was the biggest issue. Collaboration among co-authors were pleasant and effective.

– In my case, my communication with co-author(s) didn’t involve much the content of the chapter. We each took care of different topics which did not overlap much. Most communications were for **logistic issues**, such as reminders of the deadline. Most communications with editors, likewise, involved deadlines, bios, citation formats, etc. Only at the **final stage of revision process**, our communications were focused on the **content**. We (authors) made revisions and additions following editors’ feedback.

– For Q9, I am satisfied, but I will probably not participate again in the near future, because **it took so much time**.

– This is quite an experience for me as an **editor**. However, I am not sure if I will ever do it again this way.

– It’s a tremendous effort for the coordinator and editor(s) to bring together so many participants and organize such a big project! Would like to see more cooperation opportunities in the CALA community in the future!
Concluding Remarks

• Collaboration in authorship among librarians, LIS faculty and students is considered as appropriate.

• Benefits of collaboration:
  – It could cover a variety of topics which is almost impossible as for a single author;
    • Ensure that important topics won’t be missed;
    • Rates of co-authorship: Growing importance of teamwork and the increasing division of labor (Cronin et al., 2003, 2004).
  – Required by the rapid growth of knowledge and new research fronts;
  – Training opportunities for students and new library professionals.
Concluding Remarks

• Challenges of collaboration:
  – Needs great **coordination** effort;
  – **Time consuming** for most of the participants;
  – **Different levels of knowledge** and experience can affect the coherence of chapters and the whole book.

• “Push” technology such as email is more frequently used and more effective in terms of communication channels than “pull” technology such as blog.
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