

Journal of Information Literacy

ISSN 1750-5968

Volume 15 Issue 3

December 2021

Editorial

Hicks, A. 2021. Pushing the boundaries of information literacy publishing: An open and developmental peer review experiment. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 15(3), pp.1-3.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11645/15.3.3132>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Copyright for the article content resides with the authors, and copyright for the publication layout resides with the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, Information Literacy Group. These Copyright holders have agreed that this article should be available on Open Access and licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike licence.

"By 'open access' to this literature, we mean its free availability on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. The only constraint on reproduction and distribution, and the only role for copyright in this domain, should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited."

Chan, L. et al. 2002. Budapest Open Access Initiative. New York: Open Society Institute. Available at: <http://www.soros.org/openaccess/read.shtml> [Accessed: 18 November 2015]

Pushing the boundaries of information literacy publishing: An open and developmental peer review experiment

JIL's mission has always been to push the boundaries of information literacy (IL) thinking in theory, practice, and method. I'm happy to say that we have jostled a fourth boundary in this issue with the publication of our first open peer-reviewed project report, "Step Up to Masters: Supporting the academic skills transition for taught postgraduate students." In this model, authors and reviewers worked together through a shared document and an online session to openly comment on, suggest edits to and engage in dialogue about the project report under review. Peer reviewers and authors consequently knew each other's identity and comments were immediately attributed to the reviewer in question. At the same time, the shared review process meant that authors were also able to pose questions to reviewers as well as to ask for clarification, while reviewers were challenged to support authors in developing and presenting their ideas in article form.

JIL has always had very good relationships with reviewers, who frequently provide pages of thoughtful and constructive feedback. However, this initiative aims to challenge the traditional anonymous review process that is used within scholarly publishing to explore whether we could create a more transparent and collaborative evaluation system, while also building an even more supportive writing experience for newer authors. We were also keen to openly acknowledge what Maron and Kennison in a recent ACRL report (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2019, p. 12) refer to as the "un(der)rewarded and un(der) compensated labor" that goes into the production of just one contribution to JIL. These are key goals of JIL's commitment to supporting open and inclusive scholarly publishing and our operational plan, some of which is outlined on a recent ILG blogpost (Hicks, 2021).

From my perspective, the trial was a huge success, and both the shared document and the online session were zinging with great ideas, respect for each other's thoughts and opinions and, importantly, rich conversations about the project, the literature it cites, its writing style, and its takeaways for library and information professionals. The proof of this experiment, however, is in the pudding, and I am pleased that you can finally read what must be one of our most scrutinised project reports in JIL history below. Huge thanks to authors, Jiani Liu and Dan Pullinger, who bravely agreed to submit their work to this experimental process; to open peer reviewers, Laura Ferguson and Lucy Royle, who equally courageously agreed to support this new reviewing paradigm; and to Kirsten McCormick, who copy-edited the final excellent piece of work. Thanks also go to *College and Research Libraries*, whose work on developmental review process helped to inspire and guide this project (Hare & Evanson, 2018).

It might be hard to imagine that the rest of this issue can meet the high standards set by this project report, but I am pleased to convey that there is plenty of jostling of IL research and practice going on within our peer reviewed articles and other project reports, too; we also note the return (hurrah!) of conference reports after a long pandemic-enforced hiatus. A huge thank you to the production team for all their work getting this issue into press, including new copyeditor, Sae Matsuno, and all of the usual team (Meg, Harriet, Helen, Kirsten, Tom, Rebecca) as well as Book Reviews Editor, Ian, and Digital Communications Officer, Heather. Everyone at JIL is a volunteer and I deeply appreciate the labour that underlies this open access work.

First up in this envelope-pushing issue is an article from Hilde Moore and Irene Trysnes whose exploration of a digital reading project within a kindergarten (age 4-6) reading project definitely pushes at our understanding of how young people enact IL in everyday settings. Employing

ethnographic and arts-based methodologies, including the use of film, drawing, audio recording and photography, the article also draws attention to how this project engaged these young people with basic principles of ethics and copyright as well as appropriate internet behaviour.

Our second article comes from Simon Cloudesley, who employs interviews to examine another underexplored topic – the role that IL plays within everyday citizenship practices. While much literature makes the connection between information and democracy, there has been little empirical work in this area – and Simon’s research demonstrates that the connection between the two is, perhaps, not as straightforward as it seems. The article is also one of the first to examine IL during the UK’s Brexit negotiations, which further adds to its resonance.

Our third paper, written by Danielle Dennie and Susie Breier, takes a completely different tack, employing love/breakup letter user experience techniques to examine undergraduate student perceptions of an online IL tutorial. Producing feedback that is often unintentionally hilarious, this approach enabled the authors to build a more complete picture of how their self-directed learning objects were used – including feedback that often seemed to contrast with pre-launch user testing.

Paper number four picks up on the political theme in an extended examination of how critical IL education can support the exercising of democratic citizenship. Written by a political scientist and a librarian, Pascal Lupien and Lorna Rourke, the article delves into and explains the connections that political theory makes between information and power to produce a nuanced exploration of the intersections of two fields of literature.

An article by Diane Bell rounds off our research article section. Emerging from Diane’s MA in Academic Practice, this paper draws upon surveys and interviews to examine digital literacy and doctoral education. Noting that a very low number of students felt adequately supported in their use of digital technologies, Diane also draws attention to the issues that doctoral students face in carrying out interdisciplinary research before outlining strategies that her university has employed to address these concerns.

The project reports in this issue pick up on many of the themes raised in the research article section. Two project reports, including the one by Jiani Liu and Dan Pullinger and another by Matthew Carl and Louise Worsfold, explore their respective libraries’ online training programmes, *Step Up to Masters* and *Digital Academy*. Of particular interest as libraries continue to explore their post-COVID educational offerings, these project reports dive honestly and in detail into what worked in their digital provision as well as what was not quite so successful. A similar approach was noted in the project report from Navroop Gill and Elena Springall, who write about the IL instruction scan that they carried out in their library system. Drawing on data from 64 interviews (!), Navroop and Elena analyse the state of IL instruction in a large, distributed library setting as well as offering recommendations for anyone looking to replicate their work. Finally, Clare Trowell presents one of the most colourful and visually appealing project reports that we have ever published in her examination of how comics and cartoons can be used to support scholarly communications teaching and research. Neatly drawing attention to how images form a powerful medium for learning, Clare also presents a handful of detailed case studies related to how her amazing artwork has been employed within the library – example images included!

Last but not least, the conference reports are back! Something that has been sadly missing since the pandemic forced the cancellation of several 2020 IL conferences, these reports provide FOMO-inducing insight into both FestivIL, the 2021 LILAC replacement, and ECIL 2021, originally planned for 2020 in Bamberg, Germany. Reviewing FestivIL, Heena Karavadra writes powerfully about themes of silence and accessibility, Amy Wong captures so much of the energy of the online event and Charlotte Dormer packs a great deal of detail into a short space. Reviewing ECIL, Jane Hammons connects an overview of sessions to useful takeaways for

librarians, while Marco Schirone draws several useful themes and links across programme tracks.

References

Association of College and Research Libraries (2019). [Open and Equitable Scholarly Communications: Creating a More Inclusive Future](#). Prepared by Nancy Maron and Rebecca Kennison with Paul Bracke, Nathan Hall, Isaac Gilman, Kara Malenfant, Charlotte Roh, and Yasmeen Shorish. Association of College and Research Libraries.

Hare, S. & Evanson, C. (2018). [Considering developmental peer review](#). *College and Research Libraries* 79(6).

Hicks, A. (2021). [Going beyond open access: Open and inclusive publishing at JIL](#). *ILG Blog*.