
International Federation of
Library Associations and Institutions
Fédération Internationale des Associations de
Bibliothécaires et des Bibliothèques
Internationaler Verband der bibliothekarischen Vereine
und Institutionen
Federación Internacional de Asociaciones de
Bibliotecarios y Bibliotecas
Международная федерация библиотечных
ассоциаций и учреждений



Newsletter No 2 (26), vol. 20

November 2004

NEWSLETTER Section of Library and Information Science Journals

CONTENT

1. Introductory remarks	1
2. LISJ Section meetings at IFLA-2004 in Buenos Aires	1
2.1 Minutes of the LISJ Section Interim Standing Committee	1
2.1.1 Chair's and Secretary's LIS Journals Section Report, August 2003-August 2004	3
2.1.2 Information co-ordinator's report	3
2.1.3 LIS Journals Section Strategic Plan, 2004-2005 (as updated by the SC in August 2004)	4
2.1.4 LISJ Project proposal Development of a "toolkit" for LIS journal editors.....	6
2.2 LISJ Section Open meeting on the theme «LIS Journal for continuing professional education»	7
3. Review of IFLA Sections by the Professional Committee in 2007	8
4. IFLA Election Process: SC Members, -officers, Co-ordinating Boards, Professional Committee (Governing Board Document GB 04-123)	8
5. IFLA-2005 Call for papers for the LISJ Section Programme at the World Library and Information Congress – the IFLA 71 th General Conference (Oslo, August 14–18, 2005) on the theme «LIS journals: a voyage of discovery beyond Anglo-American shores».....	11
6. LIS Journals as a Source of Evidence for Evidence-based Practice: The Case of <i>School Libraries World</i> by L. Clyde and D. Oberg.....	11

The Newsletter of the IFLA LISJ Section is published twice a year in the first half and at the end of the year. Materials to be considered for inclusion in the Newsletter should be sent to:

**Ms. Ludmila Kozlova, LISJ Section Interim Secretary & Newsletter Editor,
Chief of the Department of Foreign LIS and International Library Relations,
Russian State Library, 3/5 Vozdvizhenka str.,
119992 Moscow, Russia,
Fax: (7) (095) 913-6933; 290-6062
E-mail: mbs@rsl.ru and ludmilakozlova@rsl.ru
*Your information, any remarks and other input are really welcome!***

1. Introductory remarks

Dear LISJ Section members and other interested specialists you have now the second Newsletter's issue in this year, the 26th year of our unit existence.

Our previous 25th number paid tribute to the honourable Evaluation of LISJ Section Newsletter No 23 June 2003 made by outgoing of IFLA Professional Committee Chair Winston Tabb.

It might be agreeable to mention that this year in Buenos Aires our 25th Newsletter issue was noted as one of the five finalists in the annual evaluation of IFLA newsletters.

Open meeting on the theme «LIS Journal for continuing professional education» (August 26, 2004) in Buenos Aires gathered a good very interested audience of 75 registered participants and plus some unregistered.

Please note that we had a very good response to our last year Call for papers – more than 30 proposals were received of which five papers were selected for the Open meeting. Four papers were presented.

We draw your attention to the document of IFLA Governing Board on the IFLA election process (see below Point 4).

At the 2004 WLIC in Buenos Aires we held our first meetings as a fully fledged section of IFLA. In this regard, comments made by Ms Ia C. McIlwaine, IFLA Professional Committee Chair, in IFLA Express 8, September 2004 are most appropriate: «It was the first conference where many of the newly formed Sections, previously Round Tables, had the opportunity to hold sessions and committee meetings and to prepare their programmes for the future in an election year when they will achieve parity with all the other sections, with duly elected Chairs and Secretaries and full committees.»

As concerns LISJ Section membership we have now 19 registered members according to the IFLA Secretariat «Overview of Membership per Section», 14 September 2004. However, if the Section is to survive, we will need to increase our membership dramatically. It has been suggested that the minimum number of members required for a viable section is about 75. If the Section is to survive the planned evaluation of all IFLA Sections, we will have to make serious efforts to increase our membership over the next few years. Judging by the excellent and enthusiastic turnout that we have at our open meetings, the Section meets a real need and it would be a pity if we had to be closed down for lack of members. If each of the existing members could recruit just one or two more, we would be a long way towards meeting the membership target. Please make an effort to recruit members, and if you have any suggestions for growing our membership, please contact the Interim Chair, Peter Lor, at peter.lor@up.ac.za.

We would like to draw your attention to the deliberations of the Standing Committee at the 2004 WLIC, in Buenos Aires SC and the open meetings, and especially to our Call for Papers for the 2005 WLIC in Oslo. (See point 5.)

2. LISJ Section meetings at IFLA-2004 in Buenos Aires

2.1 Minutes of the LISJ Section Interim Standing Committee

(22nd and 28th August 2004)

The Meeting was opened by Peter Lor, who welcomed the non-numerous participants.

All the speakers had been invited, but couldn't attend due to different reasons.

Attended: Peter Lor (Chair), Ludmila Kozloza (Secretary), Linda Ashcroft.

Apologies: Eileen Breen (Information Coordinator), David Bawden, Philip Calvert, Johan Koren, Marzena Marcinek, Denis Nicholson, Nadia Pavlova and Mike McGrath, who stepped down as LISJ Section Chair in January 2005.

Absent without apology: Russell Bowden, Gary Gorman, Hans-Christoph Hobohm.

The Agenda was approved as published in LISJ Newsletter No 25 (2004).

The SC minutes in Berlin were approved as published in LISJ Newsletter No 24 (2003).

Interim Chair's and Secretary's Report by Peter Lor and Ludmila Kozlova (see below 2.1.1) was introduced and approved. Peter Lor thanked Ludmila Kozlova for shouldering most of the burden while he was still learning the ropes.

Generally speaking the proposed agenda was fulfilled.

Preparations for the Open programme with five papers presenters were discussed and the absence of the first speaker was noted.

The criteria for selection of papers, as proposed by Peter Lor and agreed with Ludmila Kozlova and Eileen Breen were noted: significance or value of the topic; timeliness; relevance to the Section's field of interest; relevance to the session theme; relevance to the WLIC theme for 2004; originality; logical structure; clarity of exposition; and compliance with formal requirements of IFLA (e.g. abstract, completed forms).

Peter Lor undertook to do duty at the IFLA booth to represent the Section.

Review of the Section's strategic plan

The SC reviewed the strategic plan and updated it. Some activities had been completed (actions 1.1 to 1,3); while others are on-going (1.4, 2.1, 4.1). We decided to scrap 3.1 (development of a lexicon of terms used in journal publishing) and instead expand the scope of 2.2 (development of a toolkit) as a new project proposal, *Development of a "toolkit" for LIS journal editors, for launch at a Pre-conference Workshop on Improving the Quality of LIS Journals, Durban, South Africa, 2007*. (See point 2.1.3).

Planning for Oslo, 2005

In view of the important issues raised at the Buenos Aires open session and the lively discussion they generated, the SC decided on an open session with the theme "**LIS journals: a voyage of discovery beyond Anglo-American shores**". We intend to focus on LIS journals published outside the English-speaking sphere, in languages other than English and will be seeking papers dealing with strategies to optimise the international impact of the research and professional expertise of countries with national languages spoken by relatively small numbers, such as the Nordic countries. A call for papers will be issued.

Planning for Seoul, 2006

The SC decided on the theme "**LIS journals: electronic journals, open access – and print as well?**" It is intended to explore the impact of current developments in journal publishing on LIS journals. We will approach the Section of Serials and Other Continuing Resources to co-present this session, during which we also want to present the first draft version of the "toolkit" (see point 2.1.3 below) for discussion.

At the SC Meeting two papers were selected and recommended for publication in IFLA Journal:

«Informacion, cultura y sociedad: una contribucion al alfabetismo profesional en la Argentina»
(Informacion, cultura y sociedad: a contribution to the professional literacy in Argentina) by
Susana Romanos de Tiratel, Alejandro E. Parada, Pedro Falcato, Graciela M. Giunti;

and, as alternative:

«Citations and links as a measure of effectiveness of online LIS journals» by Alastair G. Smith.

The question of LISJ Section membership and its recruitment was discussed. L. Kozlova reported that she had not received any replies to her letters of invitation to join the LISJ Section.

Financial report

Noted that there is no report as the Section has no funds.

Standing Committee

It appears that, as a result of the conversion of round tables to sections, we have only five SC members left. The chair was provided with a list of seven addresses by IFLA Headquarters, but this list proved to be out of date as some members are now on other SCs. IFLA Headquarters provided a further seven names for which no addresses were available as they had not yet been added to the address database. These may be corresponding members. This has to be clarified.

2.1.1 Report of the Chair and Secretary of the LIS Journals Section, August 2003-August 2004

Call for papers for IFLA 2004

The theme of the Open Meeting of the LISJ Section at IFLA-2004 was formulated within the main Buenos Aires World Library and Information Congress – IFLA General Conference (August 21–29, 2004) theme «**Libraries: Tools for Education and Development**», as «**LIS Journals: for continuing professional Education**».

The text of the Call for papers for the Open Meeting at the 70th IFLA General Conference in Buenos Aires was included in November 2003 issue Section Newsletter.

LISJ Section Newsletter

Two Newsletters of the LISJ Section were prepared, published and put on IFLANET:

No 2(24), vol. 19, November 2003

No 1 (25), vol. 20, June 2004

The printed copies of the 25th issue of LISJ Newsletter were sent to all **144** IFLA National Library Associations members on August 3, 2004. In covering letters they were invited to become LISJ Section members. (The late dispatch was due to the fact that we received the list of NLA members from IFLA HQ only on August 2, 2004. The IFLA Directory 2004-2005 has still not been received).

Paper Evaluation

In reply of the LISJ Section Call for papers 32 papers abstracts were received.

Abstracts were resent by Mike McGrath to L. Kozlova in December 2003 – January 2004 due to his resignation from the position of LISJ Sections Chair.

First evaluation was done by L. Kozlova and her colleague O. Diakonova. Then all the evaluations with proposals to present a paper or refusal to accept it were sent to Information Coordinator Eileen Breen, Linda Ashcroft, Gary Gorman, Philip Calvert, Nicolas Joint. In total, 30 evaluations were sent.

On receipt of the abstract from Peter Lor (in January, 19 2004) the proposal was made to him to take over the LISJ Section Chair position. Peter Lor expressed his willingness to work.

New Interim LISJ Section Chair

This proposal to Peter Lor met very positive reply from all involved in LISJ Section activities. He was nominated by acclamation and elected as Interim LISJ Section Chair. His name was approved by IFLA authorities. He started actively to work with Interim Secretary and Information Coordinator. The papers received were evaluated jointly by Peter Lor, Ludmila Kozlova, Eileen Breen and Olga Diakonova. Five papers were selected for the Open Meeting.

It is the time to thank our Information Coordinator, Eileen Breen, for her active work. Her input is greatly appreciated. Unfortunately she could not participate in the meetings held this year in Buenos Aires.

25 LISJ Section Anniversary.

You will remember that in LISJ RT/Section Strategic Plan, 2002-2003 one of the actions was to: «Prepare an article for IFLA Journal in order to celebrate 25th anniversary of the establishment of the RT». As a result the report «Strengthening Links between Library Associations and their

Members: the 25th anniversary of IFLA Section of Library and Information Science Journals» by Donald Davis Jr., Olga Diakonova and Ludmila Kozlova was prepared and thanks to the kindness of IFLA Journal Editor Stephen Parker, was distributed as a preprint in Berlin. Officially this Report was published in *IFLA Journal*, vol. 29 (2003), No 3.

The theme of the Open Meeting of the LISJ Section at IFLA-2005 is to be formulated within the main theme Oslo World Library and Information Congress – IFLA General Conference (August 14–18, 2005) «**Libraries: a voyage of discovery**».

2.1.2 Information co-ordinator's report, August 2003-August 2004 Section on LIS Journals, SC I meeting

1. Preparation for 70th IFLA General conference

A5-sized call for papers flyer prepared and circulated to:

- Subscribers of the Emerald journals *Journal of Documentation*, *Library Management* and *New Library World* in November/December 2003
- Delegates to the American Library Association Midwinter meeting, San Diego USA in January 2004 via the exhibition booth of Emerald Group Publishing Limited

Call for papers text published electronically at:

- LISJ Section web page on IFLANET
- Emerald Group Publishing Limited *Library Link* and *Literati Club* web pages.
- The web page of each of the 19 journals published by Emerald Group Publishing Limited

Call for papers circulated electronically through:

- IFLA-L listserv
- Emerald Group Publishing Limited *Library Link* newsletter
- e-mail to relevant Emerald Group mailings lists

2. LIS Journals Section web pages at IFLA-NET

The following information was supplied to the webmaster for upload:

- Buenos Aries conference call for papers (since removed)
- New Interim Chair contact details
- Results of the study of LIS Journals Quality commissioned by the LISJ Section
- Buenos Aries conference program
- Minutes of the Berlin SC meetings separately from the Newsletter

3. Membership recruitment

Membership leaflet supplied to Interim Chair for distribution at the May 2004, 2nd international conference on repository libraries, Kuopio, Finland

4. Promotion of Buenos Aries session to prospective and pre-registered delegates

ELECTRONIC

Details of the presentations and speakers have been posted at:

- LISJ Section web page on IFLANET
- Emerald Group Publishing Limited *Library Link* and *Literati Club* web pages.
- The web page of each of the 19 journals published by Emerald Group Publishing Limited

They have also been mailed electronically to:

- IFLA-L listserv
- Emerald Group Publishing Limited Library Link members in the club newsletter
- relevant Emerald Group E-mailing lists
- Preregistered delegates

PAPER

A5-sized leaflet produced. (100 copies). A stock can be collected from the Emerald booth no. 96 for distribution at the conference.

Eileen Breen
Information Co-ordinator
August 2004

2.1.3 LIS Journals Section Strategic Plan, 2004-2005 (as approved by PC and updated by the SC in August 2004)

Mission

RT LISJ serves as a means of bringing together library and international science journals, their editors, publishers, authors, users and LIS departments and provides an international forum for the discussion of ideas, sharing of experiences and development of projects.

Its main aim is to promote high standards for professional LIS journals based on all IFLA professional priorities.

Goals

1. Share information on new developments in LIS journals, especially ones in electronic form, and study the impact of technological development on LIS journals

(Professional priorities: (d) Providing Unrestricted Access to Information; (e) Balancing the Intellectual Property Rights of Authors with the Needs of Users; (g) Preserving Our Intellectual Heritage; (k) Representing Libraries in the Technological Marketplace)

Actions

1.1 Publish two issues of LISJ Section Newsletter each year and put them on IFLANET.

1.2 Prepare and distribute new version of LISJ Section brochure in English and Russian.

*1.3 Organise an Open meeting at Buenos Aires General conference on the theme «**LIS Journal for Continuing professional education**».*

1.4 Publicise the activities of RT LISJ during the period of transition to Section status with the aim of increasing membership.

2. Identify the most commonly accepted criteria for evaluating LIS journals, enhance the quality of LIS Journals

(Professional priorities: (a) Supporting the Role of Libraries in Society; (b) Defending the Principle of Freedom of Information; (h) Developing Library Professionals; (i) Promoting Standards, Guidelines, and Best Practices)

Actions

2.1 Following the discussions at Berlin LISJ Workshop: «Achieving Quality in LIS Journals: a Workshop for Editors and Authors» continue to maintain interest to the problem «Quality Criteria for LIS Journals» and establish a set of quality criteria for LIS Journals.

2.2. Develop a toolkit for editors of LIS journals, with particular emphasis on providing assistance to editors based in developing countries. It will consist of advice, guidelines, check-lists, form letters etc. for both printed and on-line journals. The first draft of the toolkit will be presented at a meeting of the Section in Seoul in 2006, and the final version will be launched at a pre-conference in Durban, South Africa, in 2007.

3. Monitor new LIS journals and provide assistance to their editors and to library Associations, especially from those in less developed countries

(Professional priorities: (f) Promoting resource sharing; (j) Supporting the infrastructure of library associations)

Actions

3.1 Organise a programme of LIS J Section within the Oslo Conference theme «Libraries: a voyage of discovery», with the specific theme «LIS journals: a voyage of discovery beyond Anglo-American shores».

4. Encourage high quality conference paper through a refereeing process.

(Professional priorities: (i) Promoting Standards, Guidelines, and Best Practices

Actions:

4.1 Organize referee team from leading LIS J editors in order to involve them in the Section's activities.

2.1.4 LISJ Project Proposal

Submitted to: Coordinating Board of Division VII

From: Standing Committee, Section of Library and Information Science Journals

Date: 2004-09-27

Title: Development of a “toolkit” for LIS journal editors, for launch at a Pre-conference Workshop on Improving the Quality of LIS Journals, Durban, South Africa, 2007

The Section intends to develop a “toolkit” for editors of LIS journals, with particular emphasis on providing assistance to editors based in developing countries. The toolkit will be on the model of the well-known “SPEC kits” published by the Association of College and Research Libraries in the United States. It will consist of advice, guidelines, check-lists, form letters, sample correspondence, pricing calculations etc. for both printed and on-line journals, following both conventional and open access financing models. Typical examples of material to be included would be:

- Job description of journal editor
- Job description and guidelines for members of editorial board
- Calls for papers
- Instructions for authors
- Criteria for selection of articles
- Guidelines for referees
- Correspondence with authors and referees
- Proofreading procedure and symbols
- Correspondence and contracts with printers and publishers
- Costing and pricing models
- Subscription procedures and form letters
- Financial procedures
- Promotional methods and correspondence
- Etc.

These materials will be selected to reflect best practice, chosen so as to be applicable to journals published in developing countries.

The project will be undertaken in three phases:

1. January to August 2005: Collection of material by SC members for presentation and discussion at the SC meeting at the WLIC in Oslo
2. September 2005 to August 2006: Development of a draft toolkit for presentation to an open meeting of the Section at the WLIC in Seoul. We anticipate that the initial set of selected materials will be disseminated electronically. Prior permission to do this will be obtained from the originating parties.

3. September 2006 to August 2007: Further refinement of the toolkit, including narrowing down the material for the final version. We will need to obtain permissions for reproduction of the material, which will be duplicated, electronically disseminated and launched at a Pre-conference of the 2007 WLIC in Durban. We intend inviting the Africa Section to co-present the Pre-Conference with us.

At this stage the Section is not applying for funds. An application for funding is envisaged for the third phase, in which funds will be required for the dissemination of the toolkit. This application will be submitted in August 2005.

It is intended that all the members of the Standing Committee will be involved in the Project. The project leader will be Peter Lor, Department of Information Science, University of Pretoria, Pretoria 0002, South Africa (e-mail: peter.lor@up.ac.za).

The proposed project is in line with the Section's Strategic Plan for 2004-2005 and represents an expansion of Action 2.2, "Develop a toolkit which will include literature research, some material purchase and mount on IFLANET". It is also in line with Goal 3, "Monitor new LIS journals and provide assistance to their editors and to library associations, especially those in developing countries" and represents an expansion of the planned action 3.1 "Prepare the first version of a vocabulary/lexicon of terms used in preparation and publishing of LIS journals in printed and digital form". It is also relevant to Goal 1, "Share information on new developments in LIS journals, especially ones in electronic form, and study the impact of technological developments on LIS journals", and Goal 2, "Identify the most commonly accepted criteria for evaluating LIS journals, enhance the quality of LIS journals". The Standing Committee sees the project as a practical expression of several of IFLA's professional priorities, namely:

- (f) Promoting resource sharing
- (h) Developing library professionals
- (i) Promoting standards, guidelines and best practices
- (j) Supporting the infrastructure of library associations

2.2 LISJ Section Open meeting on the theme «LIS Journal for continuing professional education» (August 26, 2004)

The audience of the open meeting counted 75 participants from 25 countries who registered in the attendance list: Jamaica, Chile, Estonia, USA, Argentina, Lebanon, France, Brazil, Belgium, Uruguay, Slovenia, Kuwait, UK, Egypt, Iran, Malaysia, Iceland, Canada, Spain, Portugal, Australia, Russia, South Africa. Some additional persons who did not register were also present.

We had scheduled 6 speakers in our session on the theme, "LIS journals for continuing professional education", anticipating that one or two might not make it to Buenos Aires. In the event one speaker did not arrive: Ruben Urbizagastegui Alvarado, who had prepared a very interesting survey on Latin American Journals. (His useful list of Latin American LIS Journals was published in the previous LISJ Newsletter, No 25.) As it happened, we had a good range of papers, some dealing with the production and usage of individual journals, others more generally with the impact and usage of LIS journal in CPE. The slot left open by the missing speaker was put to good use when a lively discussion arose following the paper on the Argentinian journal *Información, cultura y sociedad*, in which important issues of language barriers and barriers to South-North information flow were raised. We intend to follow up this theme in Oslo next year.

Four other papers were successfully presented:

1. LIS Journals as a source of evidence for evidence-based practice: the case of School Libraries Worldwide (L. Anne Clyde and Dianne Oberg) was introduced by D. Oberg
2. Información, cultura y sociedad: una contribución al alfabetismo profesional en la Argentina, por Susana Romanos de Tiratel, Alejandro E. Parada, Pedro Falcato y Graciela M. Giunti was introduced and commented by Alejandro E. Parada and Pedro Falcato.
3. Citations and links as a measure of effectiveness of online LIS journals by Alastair G. Smith. The paper of A. Smith has been stimulated many questions.
4. LIS Journal usage in masters' dissertations: experiences at the University of Wales Aberystwyth, by Lucy A. Tedd.

All the papers have been warmly received, and a lovely discussion took place.

We noted that well over 80 delegates attended the open session, which suggests that the Section's work is of interest to the IFLA community even though relatively few IFLA members choose to join it. It may be that LIS journals are of greater interest to individual delegates than to their institutions.

3. Review of IFLA Sections by the Professional Committee in 2007

(from Letter of 9 May 2003 by the then Secretary general Ross Shimmon)

We are publishing below again the text of IFLA Secretary General in order not to forget that we are responsible to continue the activities of our LISJ Section. It is especially important to maintain and develop the very important goals of our unit in transitional period.

The Professional Committee has decided that it would carry out a thorough review of IFLA Sections in 2007. It agreed to do this in the light of the recent increase in the number of Sections, arising from the decision to translate a number of former Discussion Groups into Sections, and the later decision to translate most of the former Round Tables into Sections. The context of the review is the successful introduction of the new Statutes and Rules of Procedure, together with the adoption of a set of Core Values and the Professional Priorities agreed by the Committee. These changes, combined with improvements to the Annual Conference, are helping to revitalise the Federation. The Committee wishes to maintain this momentum by inviting Standing Committee to review their objectives and means available to achieve them. It believes that, by setting the date for the review at 2007, it is providing a good opportunity for both well-established Sections and the newer ones to conduct their own reviews within a realistic time frame...

- Are there too many Sections competing for scarce resources, and conference slots?
- Are there gaps in the coverage of Sections (e.g. in the corporate sector) which should be catered for by new Sections, especially in the light of the demise of FID?
- Are there undesirable overlaps between Sections with similar interests?
- Should there be a realignment of Sections within Divisions?
- Should there be easier ways in which Sections can collaborate on projects and conference programmes?
- Are there ways in which we can release more resources for professional programmes?

4. IFLA Election Process: SC Members, Officers, Co-ordinating Boards, Professional Committee (Governing Board Document GB 04-123)

During the Buenos Aires conference (25 August 2004) two sessions were held for briefing IFLA Officers. The main issue discussed was the election process within the Sections and Divisions. Below is a summary of what was discussed.

1. In the course of October 2004 IFLA/HQ will distribute Calls for Nomination for Standing Committee members 2005-2009 of all Sections. These Calls will be sent to all members of all sections and contain the deadline for submission in early February 2005.

2. Results of Standing Committee elections will be announced in Spring (March/April 2005). IFLA/HQ will send results to current officers listing the “new” committees, i.e., those who will serve 2005-2007.
3. The electorate for officers to serve in 2005-2007 consists of this new committee (i.e. does not include those whose membership ceases in 2005).
4. Candidates eligible to stand as officers must be members of that Standing Committee, i.e. fully elected committee members for either the period 2003-2007 or 2005-2009.
5. Each committee should elect a Chair and a Secretary from its membership. By preference, one of them also fulfils the role of Treasurer
6. All officers are elected for a 2 year period. A person may only be re-elected to the same office once, serving in that office for a total of 4 years.
7. It is the responsibility of the outgoing officers, normally the Chair, to organize the election.
8. The Chair (or Secretary) should, in June, circulate committee members and ask for nominations. At the same time s/he should indicate whether the current office holders wish to stand for a second term, **provided they are eligible** (i.e. have been properly re-elected to the committee or have 2 further years to serve, and have only held the office in question for 2 years).
9. Nominations should be circulated to all voting members in July. This is to enable the people concerned to clarify with their employer conditions for attendance at and funding for the next 2 IFLA conferences. This is particularly important given that Korea and South Africa will involve both considerable cost and absence from the workplace for many people.
10. It should be noted that the Chairs and Secretaries of committees will form the new Division Co-ordinating Board.
11. All Co-ordinating Boards likewise need to elect a Chair and a Secretary from their number.
12. The Representatives of the new Co-ordinating Boards will (together with the President-Elect, 2 members of the Governing Board, elected from their number and the PC Chair, elected from the outgoing Professional Committee members) form the new Professional Committee.
13. The Professional Committee has several commitments:
 - a. Its members form part of the Governing Board and members are expected to attend Governing Board meetings which take place on **the day after the SC II meetings at the end of the conference**, in December and March in The Hague;
 - b. It meets in committee twice a year outside the conference, in December and March in The Hague (timed to coincide with Governing Board meetings), and normally once at the beginning of the conference;
 - c. These commitments mean that members must be prepared to spend approximately two weeks at meetings, in addition to extra time at the end of the conference. This is not funded by IFLA so both funding and absence need to be clarified with employers.
14. The time frame for all these elections is extremely short and it is therefore imperative that nominations are sought in good time and circulated to the electorate. It is the responsibility of the outgoing Chair, if necessary checking with IFLA/HQ, to ensure that all candidates nominated to hold office are eligible to do so.
15. Those who have been nominated should understand what they are committing to, in terms of time and cost, before expressing willingness to stand for election. It would be helpful if they could also indicate to the Chair of the relevant CB their willingness or otherwise to stand as chair of that

Board. All members should realize what is involved and if they wish to stand, should arrange to remain in Oslo for one extra day [Saturday 20 August 2005].

16. During the Oslo conference, the time table will be as follows:
 - a. 1st Saturday (13 August 2005) – Committees elect office holders
 - b. In the course of the week – New CBs meet to elect Chair and Secretary
 - c. Outgoing PC members take the new members immediately, to a brief meeting to elect the new Chair of the PC (from outgoing PC members)
 - d. 2nd Saturday (20 August 2005) – New PC joins the elected GB members for the first meeting of the new GB.

IFLA/HQ, 20 September 2004

5. IFLA 2005 Call for papers
For the Library and Information Science Journals Section
Programme at the World Library and Information Congress –
the IFLA 71th General Conference (Oslo, August 14–18, 2005)

Session theme:

LIS journals: a voyage of discovery beyond Anglo-American shores

In keeping with the 2005 World Library and Information Congress theme, “Libraries: a Voyage of Discovery”, the Interim Standing Committee of the IFLA Section for Library and Information Science Journals proposes to focus on LIS journals published outside the English-speaking sphere, in languages other than English. Our theme is **LIS journals: a voyage of discovery beyond Anglo-American shores**. We invite LIS journal readers, authors, editors, LIS educators and publishers to submit proposals for papers that pose and attempt to answer questions such as:

- How do LIS journals in languages other than English, particularly those in languages spoken by smaller language communities, survive and thrive?
- How do national policies (in areas such as higher education and research) impact on them?
- What do the LIS journals contribute to the world literature of LIS? What is their impact?
- What barriers are there to the world-wide diffusion of their contributions?
- To what extent are they covered in the international indexing and abstracting databases?
- What can be done to bring their contributions to the attention of the English-speaking world?
- What role do they play in bringing contributions from the Anglo-American LIS journals to the attention of their readers?

Since WLIC 2005 will be held in Oslo, we would hope to receive proposals from the Nordic countries, but proposals from all parts of the world, including English-speaking countries, will be welcome.

Important dates

Please e-mail **abstracts** (maximum 500 words) by **10 January 2005** to the Interim SC Secretary Ludmila Kozlova (lkozlova@rsl.ru) accompanied by the following information:

- Names of presenter(s)
- Position or title of presenter(s)
- Employer or affiliated institution

- Mailing address
- Telephone/fax numbers
- E-mail address
- Short biographical statement and résumé

Notifications of acceptance of abstracts will be issued by **10 February 2005**.

The deadline for submission of full papers is **15 March 2005**.

Papers with abstracts should not exceed 10-12 pages, including references.

Notifications of acceptance of papers will be sent by **10 April 2005**.

Submission of full papers (camera ready copies): **1 May 2005**.

Papers not accepted for delivery at the Open meeting may be selected for publication in the Section's newsletter in June 2005.

No financial support can be provided, but a special invitation might be sent to authors of accepted papers.

Papers must be submitted in one of the official IFLA languages (English, French, German, Russian, Spanish).

The translated abstracts in other of official languages than papers text are welcome. You may submit an abstract translated into an official IFLA language other than the language of the text you are submitting.

Abstracts of proposed papers for Oslo to be sent to:

Ms. **Ludmila Kozlova**

LISJ Section Interim Secretary & Newsletter Editor
Chief, Dept. of Foreign LIS & International Library
Relations

Russian State Library,
3/5 Vozdvizhenka str.

119992 Moscow, **Russia**

Phone: (7) (095) 202-3565

Fax: (7) (095) 913-6933; 290-6062

mbs@rsl.ru and ludmilakozlova@rsl.ru

6. LIS Journals as a Source of Evidence for Evidence-based Practice: The Case of *School Libraries Worldwide*

Laurel A. Clyde, The University of Iceland

Dianne Oberg, University of Alberta

Two of the speakers who presented a paper in Buenos Aires, Diane Oberg and Anne Clyde, asked us to publish their paper published in our LISJ Newsletter. We are pleased to present its full text to our readers, whom we ask to please let us know whether they would like to see more conference papers printed in full in the Newsletter in future.

Abstract: Journals in the field of school librarianship support evidence-based practice in school libraries through the publication of research articles and articles that describe "best practices". In this paper, the authors analyze and compare research articles and "best practices" articles in the international journal *School Libraries Worldwide* to develop a better picture of the journal as a source of evidence for evidence-based practice.

LIS journals provide a vital source of the information that LIS professionals need to ensure that their work exemplifies the best practices of the LIS field. The development of a new international LIS journal in the area of school librarianship, *School Libraries Worldwide*, is examined in this paper in terms of its role in supporting best practices through the publication of two kind of articles: those that reflect current "best practices" and those that report research in the field of school librarianship. Professionals look to their journals for evidence to inform and improve their practice. LIS journals support "evidence-based practice librarianship," an approach to professional practice that "seeks to improve library practice by utilizing the best-available evidence combined with a pragmatic perspective developed from working experiences in librarianship" (Eldridge, 2000). That is, evidence-based practice depends on LIS professionals using "good evidence" including evidence from research and evidence from practice (Clyde, 2003, p. 26).

THE JOURNAL

School Libraries Worldwide, published twice yearly by the International Association of School Librarianship (IASL), publishes literature reviews and papers of commentary and opinion in addition to research and best practices articles. It is a refereed journal, with an Editorial Board drawn from 14 countries on five continents. It has been edited by Dianne Oberg since its establishment in 1995. The journal is sent to all members of IASL as part of their benefits of membership. Libraries of universities and colleges (with school librarianship programmes) subscribe, as do school library service centres. Articles are indexed in a number of indexing and abstracting services (including Bibliothek Forschung und Praxis, Children's Literature Abstracts, Contents Pages in Education, ERIC, Library Literature, and Library and Information Science Abstracts—LISA), and the articles are available full text online for a fee through ProQuest (which increases access to the articles). In addition, the IASL web site School Libraries Online supports access to the articles through two main strategies: a Table of Contents listing for each issue of the journal; and the provision of abstracts for the research articles through "IASL's Research Abstracts" on the web site (with access by keyword, topic of the research, author, and country about which the research was done).

THE ANALYSES

To study *School Libraries Worldwide* in terms of its role in supporting evidence-based practice in school librarianship, content analysis was used as a methodology to investigate two kinds of articles published in the journal from 1995 to 2003 inclusive: those that reflect current best practices and those that report research in the field of school librarianship. The two types of articles were first analyzed separately, as described below. Then the analyses of the two groups of articles were compared to identify any patterns such as the possible dominance in the articles of the representation of the experiences of particular areas of the world or particular topics, and any gaps in the representation of the experiences of particular groups of people or particular regions, or gaps in the presentation of topics or professional practices. Finally, the paper presents some general conclusions about the articles in the journal and relates them to evidence-based practice in school librarianship.

The research articles were separated from the professional or best practices articles using criteria for identifying research articles in LIS (Clyde, 2001, p.68). These criteria were developed through a study of LIS research in and about Iceland (Pálsdóttir, *et al.*, 1997), and subsequently used in other projects (see, for example, Clyde, 2002). The criteria are:

- Evidence that the work reported in the article was intended as research
- Statement of aims or hypotheses or research questions
- Information about the research methodology used
- Discussion of the research results
- The work placed in the context of other related research and literature
 - Discussion of the implications of the work
 - Includes a reference list or bibliography
 - The report is of more than two pages

To be considered a "research article," an article had to meet all eight criteria. It should be noted that these criteria are not evaluative; they serve simply to separate research articles from the other articles published in a journal.

The other non-research articles were then examined to ensure that they fell into the category of professional or best practices literature, using the categories developed by Boyd Rayward (1990) in his analysis of LIS journals. Rayward developed four categories for determining the nature of LIS journal articles. In addition to "research articles" which he termed "scholarly literature," Rayward categorized other LIS articles as "practical literature" (focusing on details of systems, procedure, organization, or application), "reportage" (focusing on news, description, or discussion), and "hortatory literature" (focusing on self-congratulation or self-recrimination and filled with 'should's, 'must's, and 'ought's). The other or non-research articles of *School Libraries Worldwide* primarily fall into Rayward's category of practical literature. The exceptions include 12 reportage articles and one hortatory article, and these have been excluded from the analyses.

The best practices articles analyzed for this paper all fit into Rayward's category of practical literature, and meet the following criteria:

- Evidence that the practical information in the article was intended to support or encourage "best practices"
- Detailed rich description of the context from which the practical information was derived
- Clear description of the "best practice(s)" which would allow application in another location or context
- Discussion of how the "best practice(s)" might be implemented
- The work placed in the context of other related research and literature
- Discussion of the implications for practice of the work
- Includes a reference list or bibliography
- The report is of more than two pages

Table 1: Research and Other Articles in *School Libraries Worldwide*

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Research Articles</i>	<i>Other Articles</i>	<i>Total Articles</i>
1(1) Jan 1995	7	-	7
1(2) Jul 1995	1	3	4
2(1) Jan 1996	2	7	9
2(2) Jul 1996	3	1	4
3(1) Jan 1997	2	5	7
3(2) Jul 1997	4	3	7
4(1) Jan 1998	4	2	6
4(2) Jul 1998	2	8	10
5(1) Jan 1999	7	-	7
5(2) Jul 1999	7	1	8
6(1) Jan 2000	2	11	13
6(2) Jul 2000	7	1	8
7(1) Jan 2001	5	2	7
7(2) Jul 2001	2	5	7
8(1) Jan 2002	4	3	7
8(2) Jul 2002	2	5	7
9(1) Jan 2003	2	5	7
9(2) Jul 2003	4	2	6
Totals	67 (51.2%)	64 (48.8%)	131 (100%)

Note 1: Editorials are not included in the counts

Note 2: The July 1995 issue includes one reportage article and one hortatory article.

Note 3: The January 2000 issue was devoted primarily to "A Day in the Life...", descriptive stories from school library personnel around the world. There were only four regular articles in the issue, of which two were research articles. It was thus not a typical issue of the journal.

RESEARCH ARTICLES

Research in the field of LIS has been studied in many different ways over the years. However, in 1990 the Finnish researchers Kalervo Järvelin and Pertti Vakkari developed techniques for studying published research output in LIS, in such a way that the research output can be compared over time and across national boundaries. They used their own methodology to study international research in LIS generally through articles in 37 core journals (Järvelin and Vakkari, 1990). They subsequently updated this work through a longitudinal comparative study (Järvelin and Vakkari, 1993). Other researchers who have used their methodology include Cano and Rey (1993) for a study of the Spanish LIS research literature, Guðrún Pálsdóttir *et al.* (1997) for a study of published LIS research in and about Iceland, Yontar (1995) for a study of LIS research theses in Turkey, and Ragnhildur Blöndal (1997) for a comparative analysis of published and unpublished LIS research in Iceland. Most relevant to this present study, Patricia Layzell Ward (1997) used the methodology to compare research articles and professional articles in nine British LIS journals over a thirty-year period 1965 to 1995. Maxine Rochester and Pertti Vakkari (1998) later compared a number of country studies that used the Järvelin and Vakkari methodology, looking at national differences and trends. By 2000, Turkish researchers Yontar and Yalvaç could describe this methodology as "widely accepted" (Yontar and Yalvaç, 2000, p.41) internationally.

Has the amount of research reporting in SLW increased or decreased over the years?

Over the whole period studied, the research articles in *School Libraries Worldwide* accounted for 51.2 per cent of all articles (see Table 1). However, there was sometimes a great variation from year to year: for example, in 1998 just 37.5 per cent of articles were research articles, while in the next year, 93 per cent of articles were research articles. Such things as a special issue of the journal devoted primarily to short "Day in the Life..." stories, made a great deal of difference to the counts. However, in 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003, the percentage of research articles published in *School Libraries Worldwide* has remained fairly constant at around 50 per cent and very close to the average for the whole period. The impact of a 2002 decision by the journal's Editorial Board, to have theme sections in the second half of each issue of the journal, appeared to result in an immediate slight decline in the proportion of research articles, but this trend has reversed with the July 2003 issue. Though observable in a situation where the total number of articles under consideration is relatively small, neither trend was statistically significant.

Who writes about research for SLW?

The brief "author affiliation" information provided at the beginning of each article was used to categorize the authors of the research articles in *School Libraries Worldwide* (see Table 2). Approximately four fifths of the articles were written by university faculty members and/or doctoral students in universities; the proportion is higher if one takes into account the fact that five other articles had at least one university faculty member as co-author (taking the total percentage to 88.1%).

Table 2: Who writes about research? n=67

Categories	Number of Articles (%)
University Faculty, PhD Students	54 (80.6%)
Officers with Library Authorities	2 (2.3%)
School Librarians	2 (2.3%)
Employed in University Library	2 (2.3%)
Private Consultants	2 (2.3%)
School Library Service Centre Personnel	-
Officers with Education Authorities	-
Mixed Groups*	5 (7.5%)
Total	67 (100%)

* In each case, the “mixed group” consisted of at least one academic and at least one school librarian.

Which countries are represented in the reporting of research?

Table 3 gives an indication of the countries about which research articles have been published in *School Libraries Worldwide*. Perhaps not surprisingly, the United States of America accounted for around 30 per cent of the research articles. However, this was less than the 41.5 per cent found in a study of all the English-language research articles and papers in school librarianship (Clyde, 2002, p.61), suggesting that *School Libraries Worldwide* has a broader international base than might be expected. The articles listed in Table 3 as “international” were of two main types: those where data were collected by the researcher/s in two or more countries; and those the aim of which was to study an international phenomenon (such as an international professional association). Canada (the country where *School Libraries Worldwide* is edited) and Australia were the countries that ranked second and third. Twelve countries together accounted for 19 research articles—more than a quarter (28.3%) of the total; 16 individual countries (excluding those represented in “international” reports) are represented in the research articles.

Table 3: Research Articles by Country Studied n=67

Country	Number of Articles (%)
USA	20 (29.9%)
International	10 (14.9%)
Canada	8 (11.9%)
Australia	6 (9.0%)
United Kingdom	4 (6.0%)
Botswana	3 (4.5%)
Sweden	3 (4.5%)
Fiji	2 (3.4%)
Israel	2 (3.0%)
South Africa	2 (3.0%)
Ghana	1 (1.5%)
Iceland	1 (1.5%)
Jamaica	1 (1.5%)
Japan	1 (1.5%)
Latvia	1 (1.5%)
Lithuania	1 (1.5%)
The Netherlands	1 (1.5%)
Total	67 (100%)

What topics are reported in research articles?

The research topics classification of Järvelin and Vakkari is based on an hierarchical structure of categories and subcategories that cover the broad field of LIS. Table 4 presents the results of the analysis of research articles in *School Libraries Worldwide* by main topics (for brevity of reporting; interested readers will find the full classification in Järvelin and Vakkari, 1990). As was the case when used in Anne Clyde’s (2002) study of research articles and papers in the field of school librarianship internationally, the Järvelin and Vakkari topic classification required expansion to accommodate the research concerns of school librarianship as represented in the articles in *School Libraries Worldwide*. In fact, this was anticipated by Pertti Vakkari (2004). As was the case in the international study (Clyde, 2002, p. 66), one of the most popular areas of research reported in *School Libraries Worldwide* was information literacy and information skills (19.4% of articles). Järvelin and Vakkari include “User Education” in the category of “Library and Information Service Activities” but the information literacy / information skills research that is being undertaken in the field of school librarianship (and reported in *School Libraries Worldwide*) goes well beyond library user education. It also goes beyond the “Information Seeking Behaviour” that is part of the “Information Seeking” category. The category “Library and Information Service Activities” (20.9% of the articles) includes articles on library collections and facilities. The added category of “National Surveys” covers research studies with a wide-ranging approach, carried out to describe the “state of the art” of school libraries in a country, usually as the basis for forward planning. Under “Other Aspects of LIS”, eight of the ten articles were related to the evaluation of the *Library Power* initiative in the United States.

Table 4: Research Topics (Järvelin and Vakkari Classification) n=67

<i>Research Topic</i>	<i>Number of Articles (%)</i>
The Profession	5 (7.5%)
Library History	2 (3.0%)
Publishing	-
Education in LIS	4 (6.0%)
Methodology	-
Analysis of LIS	-
Library & Information Service Activities	14 (20.9%)
Information Storage & Retrieval	-
Information Seeking	1 (1.5%)
Scientific & Professional Communication	-
Other Aspects of LIS	10 (14.9%)
Other Studies	1 (1.5%)
Added: National Survey	9 (13.4%)
Added: Information Skills/Literacy	13 (19.4%)
Added: Principal Support	2 (3.0%)
Added: Information Technology	2 (3.0%)
Added: Censorship	2 (3.0%)
Added: Reading & Reading Promotion	1 (1.5%)
Total	67 (100%)

What research methodologies are used?

Table 5 shows the most common primary (or main) research method reported in research articles in *School Libraries Worldwide* was the survey (40.3%), reflecting the findings of Clyde's 2002 analysis of research articles and papers in school librarianship internationally (where the survey was found to account for 39.1% over the decade 1991 to 2000). Qualitative methods accounted for 29.9 per cent of primary methods used in research reported in *School Libraries Worldwide* (19.6% in the international study; Clyde, 2002). Other methods used as the primary method include case studies (often employing multiple data collection methods), action research, content analysis, and historical methods. On the other hand, half the methods listed in the Järvelin and Vakkari classification were not reported at all (as a primary method) in research articles in *School Libraries Worldwide*.

What indicators are there of the quality of the research?

All articles submitted for consideration for *School Libraries Worldwide* go through a process of double blind peer review. The reviewers are members of the Editorial Board of *School Libraries Worldwide* who bring an extensive expertise in both professional practice and in research. The majority hold or have held faculty positions in universities; this suggests at least a minimum competence in assessing research. The review process should ensure basic quality control; certainly it means that research articles with obvious methodological or other problems are not published. However, the peer review process is not without its critics as a method of controlling research quality (see, for example, White, 2003; Henderson, 2003); other methods also have their problems (see Clyde, 2004, in press). Katzner, Cook and Crouch (1998, p.7) outline a strategy that readers can use to evaluate published research articles; however, a 2003 study by Anne Clyde shows that even experienced evaluators will disagree in their evaluation of research articles as a basis for evidence-based practice. This research related to assessing the quality of research articles is continuing.

Table 5: Primary Research Methods Used

(Järvelin and Vakkari Classification) n=63

<i>Primary Research Method</i>	<i>Number of Articles (%)</i>
Empirical Research Strategy	63 (94%)
- Historical method	4 (6.0%)
- Survey method	27 (40.3%)
- Qualitative method	20 (29.9%)
- Evaluation method	1 (1.5%)
- Case / Action research	12 (17.9%)
- Content or protocol analysis	3 (4.5%)
- Citation analysis	-
- Other bibliographic method	-
- Secondary analysis	2(3.0%)-
- Experiment	1 (1.5%)
- Other empirical method	1 (1.5%)
Conceptual Research Strategy	
- Verbal argumentation, criticism	-
- Concept analysis	-

Mathematical or Logical Method	-
System / Software Analysis / Design	-
Literature Review	1 (1.5%)
Discussion Paper	-
Bibliographic Method	-
Other Method*	3 (4.5%)
Not Applicable, No Method	-
Total	67 (100%)

*Includes one mixed methods article

PROFESSIONAL ARTICLES

Has the amount of reporting of best practices in SLW increased or decreased over the years?

Over the whole period studied, the non-research articles accounted for 48.8 per cent of all articles (see Table 1). However, if the non-research articles are divided into sub-groups according to Rayward's categories, professional or best practices articles only account for 38.9 per cent (51 out of 131) of all articles. There was sometimes a great variation from year to year in the proportion of best practices articles published; the range from year to year varied from a high of 62.5 per cent in 1998 to a low of five per cent in 2000. The amount of variation from year to year was similar to that for research articles.

Who writes about best practices for SLW?

The brief "author affiliation" information provided at the beginning of each article was used to categorize the authors of the best practices articles in *School Libraries Worldwide* (see Table 6), as it had been for the research articles. Approximately half of the best practices articles were written by university faculty members and/or doctoral students in universities; when one takes into account the fact that three other articles had at least one university faculty member as co-author the total percentage rises to 62.7 per cent.

Table 6: Who writes about best practices? n=51

<i>Categories</i>	<i>Number of Articles (%)</i>
University Faculty, PhD Students	29 (56.9%)
Officers with Library Authorities	2 (3.9%)
School Librarians	8 (15.9%)
Employed in University Library	3 (5.9%)
Private Consultants	3 (5.9%)
School Library Service Centre Personnel	-
Officers with Education Authorities	2 (3.9%)
Mixed Groups*	4 (7.8%)
Total	51 (100%)

* The "mixed groups" included: an academic and a school librarian (two articles); an academic and an officer with an education authority; and a school librarian and an officer with a library authority.

Which countries are represented in the reporting of best practices?

Table 7 gives an indication of the countries in which professional articles published in *School Libraries Worldwide* have been set. Australia, the United States and Canada together accounted for over half of the best practices articles. The articles listed in Table 7 as "international" were of three types: those reporting practice in two or more countries; those reporting practice in international schools; and those commenting on the international relevance of a particular best practice. *School Libraries Worldwide* has a broad international base in terms of professional articles; 17 individual countries (excluding those represented in "international" reports) are represented in the reporting of best practices.

Table 7: Professional Articles by Country Reported n=51

<i>Country</i>	<i>Number of Articles (%)</i>
Australia	11 (21.6%)
USA	11 (21.6%)
Canada	7 (13.7%)
International*	6 (11.8%)
Botswana	3 (5.9%)
Bangladesh	1 (2%)
Fiji	1 (2%)

Ghana	1 (2%)
Greece	1 (2%)
Hong Kong (PRC)	1 (2%)
Iceland	1 (2%)
Latvia	1 (2%)
Malaysia	1 (2%)
Namibia	1 (2%)
New Zealand	1 (2%)
Sri Lanka	1 (2%)
The Netherlands	1 (2%)
United Kingdom	1 (2%)
Total	51 (100%)

* Includes international schools

What topics are reported in best practices articles?

The most popular best practice topics published in *School Libraries Worldwide* were “Reading and Reading Promotion” (23.5% of the practice articles) and national surveys (another 23.5% of the practice articles). The next most popular topics were “Library and Information Service Activities” (13.7%) and “Information Technology” (11.8%). However, all of these topics are related to themes of particular issues of the journal so this finding is not as significant as it would be if the journal did not use a thematic approach to soliciting articles.

Table 8: Best Practices Topics (Järvelin and Vakkari Classification) n=51

<i>Best Practices Topic</i>	<i>Number of Articles (%)</i>
The Profession	1 (2.0%)
Library History	-
Publishing	-
Education in LIS	2 (3.9%)
Methodology	2 (3.9%)
Analysis of LIS	-
Library & Information Service Activities	2 (3.9%)
Information Storage & Retrieval	-
Information Seeking	-
Scientific & Professional Communication	-
Other Aspects of LIS	2 (3.9%)
Other Studies	1 (2.0%)
Added: National Survey	12 (23.5%)
Added: Information Skills/Literacy	7 (13.7%)
Added: Principal Support	3 (5.9%)
Added: Information Technology	6 (11.8%)
Added: Censorship	1 (2.0%)
Added: Reading & Reading Promotion	12 (23.5%)
Total	51 (100%)

What bases for evidence are used in best practice articles?

The main sources of evidence for the best practices articles were: empirical research reports; theory based on research; application of research and/or theory to practice; descriptions of best practice; and argumentation. In terms of sources of evidence, the best practice article were evenly divided between those drawing primarily from personal experience, such as the implementation of a programme of service or instruction or the development of a document to guide and/or evaluate practice, and those drawing primarily from a reading and analysis of the literature of research and theory.

What indicators are there of the quality of the best practices?

Like the research articles, the best practices articles submitted for consideration for *School Libraries Worldwide* go through a process of double blind peer review. All of the members of Editorial Board have histories of providing leadership in the field of school librarianship (often as a result of the professional positions that they hold); this ensures at least a minimum competence in assessing best practices. Although the majority work in first world countries where school libraries are relatively well-developed, there is a significant number on the Board who work or have worked in the developing world and who have the capacity to assess best practices in the context of their applicability or utility in countries in the developing world. Whether first world or developing world, there are considerable differences in professional practice from country to country and sometimes within countries, as a result of social, cultural, economic, and political factors and educational traditions. While Editorial Board members come from 14 countries, providing for representation of five continents, nevertheless it is necessary that Board members and guest editors are aware of the need to consider best practices within a wide range of contexts.

COMPARISONS

In this section of the paper, the analyses (above) of the research articles and the best practices articles will be compared, using similar questions or headings to those used in the discussions of the research and best practices articles. The aims are to identify trends in *School Libraries Worldwide* as a whole, and to develop a better picture of the journal as a whole as a source of evidence for evidence-based practice in school librarianship.

Has the amount of research and best practice reporting in SLW increased or decreased over the years?

Table 1 shows that although the proportion of research articles to other articles may vary a great deal from issue to issue and even sometimes from year to year, over the whole period approximately half the articles fall into each of these main categories. Table 9 (below), which compares the first and second halves of the publishing history of *School Libraries Worldwide*, indicates that the proportion of research and best practices articles has remained about the same across the decade. However, a slight shift to a heavier emphasis on research articles seems to be occurring now; this is consistent with one of the current goals of the journal's Editorial Board, to develop *School Libraries Worldwide* into a significant research journal (Minutes of *School Libraries Worldwide* Editorial Board meeting, July 10, 2001).

Table 9: Research and Best Practices Articles in *School Libraries Worldwide*

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Research Articles</i>	<i>Best Practices Articles</i>	<i>Total Research and Best Practices Articles</i>
First half of publication period (Jan 1995 to Jan 1999)	32 (54.2%)	27 (45.8%)	59 (100%)
Second half of publication period (Jul 1999 to Jul 2003)	35 (59.3%)	24 (40.7%)	59 (100%)

Who writes about research and best practices for *SLW*?

Table 2 and Table 6 together help to answer this question. As was the case with the research articles, the group most likely to write best practices articles comprises university faculty and doctoral students, though school librarians are more heavily represented as authors or co-authors of the best practices articles than of the research articles. For approximately one fifth of the best practices articles (21.6%), school librarians were authors or co-authors; for the research articles, the proportion was about one tenth (9%). Thus school librarians were more likely to have been authors or co-authors of best practices articles than of research articles, even though they were still associated with a minority of the articles.

Which countries are represented in the research articles and the best practices articles?

Table 3 and Table 7 show the countries about which research articles and best practices articles have been written. Although the journal has a fairly broad international base (with authors from more than 20 countries, as indicated by the "author affiliation" information on the articles), over half of both the research articles and the best practices articles focus on just three predominantly English-speaking countries: the United States, Australia and Canada. While there were articles from countries such as Sweden (3), Iceland (2), and Israel (2) where English is not the national language, and articles from countries like Botswana (6) and South Africa (2) where English is just one of the national languages, nevertheless coverage of the non-English-speaking world is not strong in comparison with coverage of the main English-speaking countries.

What topics are discussed in research and best practices articles?

Table 4, Table 8, and Table 10 together help to answer this question. The broad topics most frequently represented in both the research and the best practices articles are topics with close relevance to the everyday work of the school librarian: information skills/literacy; library service activities (including collections and facilities); evaluation of library programmes and services; reading and reading promotion; and information technology. However, the research and professional articles tended to address different kinds of topics (see Table 10).

Table 10: Topics Most Frequently Addressed, by Number, % and Ranking

	<i>Research Articles</i> <i>n=67</i>			<i>Best Practices Articles</i> <i>n=51</i>			<i>Total Research and Best Practices Articles</i> <i>N=118</i>		
Library & Information Service Activities	14	20.9%	1 tie				16	13.6%	3
Information Skills/Literacy	14	20.9%	1 tie	7	13.7%	3	21	17.8%	1 tie
Other Aspects of LIS (evaluation)	10	14.9%	3				12	10.2	5
National Survey	9	13.4%	4	12	23.5%	1 tie	21	17.8%	1 tie
Reading & Reading Promotion				12	23.5%	1 tie	13	11.0%	4
Information Technology				6	11.8%	4			

In Table 10, those topics discussed in more than one tenth of each group of articles are shown (that is, 6 or more research articles, 5 or more best practices articles, 11 or more of the combined total of research and best practices articles). While topics related to library and information services activities and information skills/literacy were most commonly addressed in the research articles, national surveys and topics related to reading and reading promotion were most commonly addressed in the best practices articles. The frequency of national survey articles in both the research and best practices categories (where they usually took the form of national overviews) likely reflects the wider policy concerns of school librarians as collectives, in school library and/or library associations, for example, and as officers in education and/or library authorities. In addition, the frequency of the national overviews among the best practices articles is partly a result of a special issue of the journal (July 1998) that published “state-of-the-art” overviews of school librarianship in 10 different countries.

What research methodologies or types of evidence are used in articles in *SLW*?

The primary research methodologies used in the studies described in the research articles published in *School Libraries Worldwide* are shown in Table 5, according to an internationally-recognized classification. There is no equivalent classification for the strategies used to collect the evidence on which best practices articles in the field of library and information science are based. The research studies were based on only half of the research methods listed in the Järvelin and Vakkari classification, though there was a reasonable balance between quantitative and qualitative studies, with the latter being better represented in *School Libraries Worldwide* articles than in research in school librarianship internationally. As noted earlier, the main sources of evidence for the best practices articles were: empirical research reports; theory based on research; application of research and/or theory to practice; descriptions of best practice; and argumentation. Two patterns of evidence predominated: (1) review of research and/or theory, followed by application or argumentation related to practice and (2) description, followed by discussion and/or analysis of best practice. Within the first pattern, there were about twice as many articles using argumentation compared to those using application. Several reasons might be advanced for this finding: perhaps this indicates that there are many school library practices that are contested, or perhaps those school library practices that are accepted as best practices arouse less attention from those in the field. An in-depth analysis of the articles would be needed to address this question.

What indications are there of quality in the research and best practices articles in *SLW*?

Issues related to the quality control of research articles and best practices articles in *School Libraries Worldwide* have been discussed above. The members of the Editorial Board of the journal, with the Editor and Associate Editors, currently have the responsibility for managing quality through the peer review process. In addition, guest editors with specialist knowledge and experience of the topic solicit articles for the theme section of each issue of the journal and have an important role in evaluating the submissions. Many other professional and research journals operate in a similar way. While the rejection rate for all articles (in both categories) submitted to *School Libraries Worldwide* is low (see Lee, et al., 2002 for a discussion of article rejection rates as an indicator of journal quality), the editors and guest editors work with authors of marginal articles (using comments from reviewers) to improve the quality of submissions. In a relatively new and small research and professional field like school librarianship, this kind of activity is seen as necessary to build up the literature of the field.

CONCLUSIONS

How and to what extent does *School Libraries Worldwide* function as a source of evidence for evidence-based practice in school librarianship? *School Libraries Worldwide* has a strong overall record of dissemination of research and best practices articles, but even though more than 20 countries are represented altogether, these articles draw heavily on the research and practice of first world English-speaking nations where school libraries are particularly well-developed. School librarians from other areas of the world will find fewer articles that resonate with their contexts and their challenges. The Editor and the Editorial Board will be considering strategies for addressing this problem, and in particular for encouraging the submission of articles from more countries with different traditions of education and school librarianship. One such strategy, implemented on a trial basis in 2004, is to seek out quality articles published in other languages, for translation into English for publication in *School Libraries Worldwide*.

The authors whose work is published in *School Libraries Worldwide* are likely to continue to be mostly university faculty and doctoral students, but the Editor and the Editorial Board need to work to ensure that the voices of the professionals working in the school library field continue to be represented in the journal. Two types of articles that have previously offered opportunities for this were the “Day in the Life” articles and the “State of the Art” articles. These two types of articles made up about one-half of the best practices articles in the journal, and these two types of articles originated from more than one-half of the 20 countries represented in the journal. Unfortunately, these kinds of articles are less likely to be of the sort that fit within the research mandate of the journal.

The analyses undertaken for this paper have opened up questions for further research. A possible follow-up to the analyses presented in this paper would be an in-depth examination of the particular best practices recommended in the professional articles published in *School Libraries Worldwide*; this would allow an assessment of these practices in terms of the research published in *School Libraries Worldwide* and elsewhere. Another follow-up would be an analysis of the sources of evidence presented in articles, in best practices articles as well as research articles, to determine what types of research methods are being used to address various types of topics or practices.

Evidence-based practice involves using evidence as a basis for improvement of professional practice. The quality of the evidence is one of several factors that will have an impact on the actual improvement that can be accomplished. The quality of the evidence found in the research and best practices articles published in *School Libraries Worldwide* is accounted for primarily through the peer review process. Within the limitations pointed out earlier, peer review is an acceptable way of assuring basic quality control for research articles. Although it is used widely for the assessment of professional articles, particularly in the absence of other generally accepted strategies in the field of school librarianship, peer review may or may not be as useful for professional articles as it is for research articles. This matter needs further investigation, since it is an important consideration for evidence-based practice in school librarianship.

REFERENCES

- Blöndal, Ragnhildur (1997), Icelandic research in library and information science from 1964 to 1994, Unpublished BA Project, Library and Information Science Department, The University of Iceland.
- Cano, V. and Rey, C. (1993), Ten years of Spanish library and information science research: A bibliometric study. Paper presented at the 59th IFLA Conference, Barcelona, Spain, August 1993, 197-THEOR-E.
- Clyde, Laurel A. (2001), Behind the inspiring connections: Research and researchers in school librarianship. In P. Hughes and L. Selby (Eds), *Inspiring Connections: Learning, Libraries and Literacy, Proceedings of the Fifth International Forum on Research in School Librarianship and the 30th Annual Conference of the International Association of School Librarianship, Auckland, New Zealand, 9-12 July 2003*. Seattle, WA: International Association of School Librarianship, pp.65-77.
- Clyde, Laurel A. (2002), Developing the knowledge base of the profession: Research in school librarianship. In Diljit Singh, Anrizah Abdullah, Suscelah Foneska, and Brian de Rozario (Eds), *School Libraries for a Knowledge Society: Proceedings of the 31st Annual Conference of the International Association of School Librarianship and the Sixth International Forum on Research in School Librarianship, Petaling Jaya, Malaysia, 5-9 August 2002*, Seattle, WA: IASL, pp.55-75.
- Clyde, Laurel A. (2003), Evidence-based practice in school librarianship: Evaluating the research evidence, *Access*, 17(4): November, pp.26-29.
- Clyde, Laurel A. (2004), Evaluating the quality of research publications: A pilot study of school librarianship, *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, in press.
- Eldridge, J.D. (2000), Evidence-based librarianship: Searching for the needed EBL evidence, *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*, 19(3): Fall, pp.1-18.
- Henderson, Mark (2003), Scientists to investigate 'misleading' research, *The Times*, 12 August, p.10.
- Järvelin, Kalervo and Vakkari, Pertti (1990), Content analysis of research articles in library and information science, *Library and Information Science Research*, 12(4): pp.395-421.
- Järvelin, Kalervo and Vakkari, Pertti (1993), The evolution of library and information science 1965-1985: A content analysis of journal articles, *Information Processing and Management*, 29(1): pp.129-144.
- Katzer, Jeffrey, Cook, Kenneth H., and Crouch, Wayne W. (1998), *Evaluating Information: A Guide for Users of Social Science Research*, 4th edn, Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Layzell Ward, Patricia (1997), The nature of UK research literature: Some thoughts arising from a bibliometric study, Paper presented at the 63rd IFLA General Conference, August 31 – September 5, 1997. Available at <http://www.ifla.org/TV/ifla63/63layp.htm> (accessed 2 February 2004).
- Lee, K.P., Schotland, M., Bacchetti, P., and Bero, L.A. (2002), Association of journal quality indicators with methodological quality of clinical research articles, *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 287(21): pp.2805-2808.
- Pálsdóttir, Guðrún, Árnadóttir, Ingibjörg, Sverrisdóttir, Ingibjörg, Blöndal, Ragnhildur, and Clyde, Laurel A. (1997), Published research about library and information science in or related to Iceland, *Nordic Yearbook of Library, Information and Documentation Research*, Oslo: Novus forlag, pp.85-108.
- Rayward, W. Boyd (1990), Scholarly publishing in journals of library and information science, *Australian Library Journal*, 39(2): pp.127-133.
- Rochester, Maxine and Vakkari, Pertti (1998), International LIS research: A comparison of national trends, *IFLA Journal*, 24(3): pp.166-175.
- White, Caroline (2003), Little evidence for effectiveness of scientific peer review, *British Medical Journal*, 326, 1 February, p.241. Available at <http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/326/7383/241/a> (accessed 30 April 2003).
- Yontar, A. (1995), Main research trends being investigated in Turkey as revealed in graduate theses. Booklet 7, Division of Education and Research, 61st IFLA General Conference, Istanbul, Turkey, 20-26 August 1995, 137-LTR-3-E.
- Yontar, A. and Yalvaç, M. (2000), *Problems of library and information science research in Turkey: A content analysis of journal articles 1952-1994*, IFLA Journal, 26(1): pp.39-51.

* * *

LISJ Section Newsletter will be pleased to have any remarks to be sent:

Prof Peter Johan Lor

IFLA LISJ Section Interim Chair

Department of Information Science

University of Pretoria

Lynnwood Road

Pretoria 0002

South Africa

Phone: +27 (0) 12 4204232

Fax: +27 (0) 12 362 5181

peter.lor@up.ac.za

Ms. Ludmila Kozlova

LISJ Section Interim Secretary & Newsletter
Editor

Chief, Dept. of Foreign LIS & International
Library Relations

Russian State Library,

3/5 Vozdvizhenka str.

119992 Moscow, **Russia**

Phone: (7) (095) 202-3565

Fax: (7) (095) 913-6933; 290-6062

mbs@rsl.ru and ludmilakozlova@rsl.ru

Ms. Eileen Breen

IFLA LISJ Section Information Coordinator

United Kingdom

E-mail: Ebreen@emeraldinsight.com

To visit IFLA Website: www.ifla.org

To contact IFLA HQ: *Ms Karin Passchier, Administrative Assistant*

e-mail: Karin.Passchier@ifla.nl