

Research on the Development of Academic Publishing Literacy Education Curriculum in Foreign Academic Libraries (Postprint)

Authors: Wang Junyu, Li Ling, Chen Lintao

Date: 2023-07-26T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] As the publishing environment becomes increasingly complex, academic publishing literacy education has gradually emerged as a new growth area for information literacy education in university libraries. This paper conducts an in-depth investigation and analysis of the current status and characteristics of academic publishing literacy courses offered by foreign university libraries, aiming to provide references for the development of such courses in Chinese libraries.

[Method/Process] Employing web-based and literature research methods, this study selected 16 representative foreign university libraries that have established academic publishing literacy courses. The investigation examined these courses from five dimensions: teaching content, teaching format, teaching methods, teaching team, and teaching evaluation, to analyze their practical implementation and distinctive features.

[Results/Conclusion] Foreign university libraries have actively engaged in delivering academic publishing literacy education. The cases investigated reveal characteristics of comprehensive teaching content, diverse teaching formats, dynamic teaching atmosphere, open collaboration among teaching teams, and sustainable teaching evaluation. Libraries in China should fully leverage the practical experience of foreign academic publishing literacy courses and promptly implement academic publishing literacy education.

Full Text

Preamble

Vol. 63 No. 19, October 2019

Research on the Progress of Scholarly Publishing Literacy Education Courses in Foreign University Libraries

Wang Junyu^{1, 2}, Li Ling^{1, 2}, Chen Lintao^{1, 2}

¹ National Science Library, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190

² Department of Library, Information and Archives Management, School of Economics and Management, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] With the increasing complexity of the publishing environment, scholarly publishing literacy education has gradually become a new growth point for information literacy education in university libraries. This paper investigates and analyzes the current status and characteristics of scholarly publishing literacy courses in foreign university libraries, aiming to provide references for the construction of such courses in Chinese libraries. **[Method/Process]** Using network and literature survey methods, this study selected 16 representative foreign university libraries that have offered scholarly publishing literacy courses, and analyzed their practical progress and characteristics from five perspectives: teaching content, teaching form, teaching method, teaching team, and teaching evaluation. **[Result/Conclusion]** Foreign university libraries have actively participated in scholarly publishing literacy course instruction, demonstrating characteristics of rich teaching content, diverse teaching forms, active teaching atmosphere, open cooperative teaching teams, and sustainable teaching evaluation. Chinese libraries should fully learn from foreign practical experience and timely develop scholarly publishing literacy education.

Classification Number: G258.6

Keywords: university library, scholarly publishing literacy, information literacy, curriculum construction

In recent years, the emergence of open access, academic social media, and other new developments has brought tremendous changes to the production, acquisition, organization, dissemination, and evaluation of scholarly outputs, making it more necessary for researchers to enhance their literacy to cope with the complex and changing scholarly publishing environment. Scholarly Publishing Literacy is an important component of information literacy, typically referring to the comprehensive ability of researchers to publish and disseminate academic achievements.

In recent years, theoretical research on scholarly publishing literacy education is becoming a new research direction in the field of library information literacy education both domestically and internationally. Scholarly publishing literacy research began in 1996 when American scholar J.J. Shapiro proposed the concept of “Publishing Literacy,” considering it as “the ability to publish research results and ideas in electronic form, one of the seven literacies that information

literacy should cover” [1]. In 2012, J. Beall first proposed the concept of “Scholarly Publishing Literacy” at the American Educational Research Association meeting, defining it as “the ability to identify and avoid predatory journals, and to distinguish between fake and legitimate journals” [2]. In 2013, J. Beall further argued that to become an effective researcher, scholarly publishing literacy would be an essential skill to master [3]. In 2014, L.L. Zhao from Deakin University in Australia further refined the content of scholarly publishing literacy [4]. In 2015, Xu Su from Peking University published relevant papers [5], and domestic libraries began to pay attention to this field. In 2017, S. McClellan from the University of Louisville introduced practical experience in scholarly publishing literacy education [6].

In terms of practice, some foreign university libraries have begun to carry out relevant educational activities and offer scholarly publishing literacy courses. In China, university libraries have also made attempts, such as Peking University [7] and Tsinghua University [8] offering related lectures, generally lasting 1-2 hours with librarians as the main instructors, teaching students knowledge about journal submission. Southeast University Library provides help and guidance on academic submission for faculty and students [9]. However, overall, domestic scholarly publishing literacy education is still in its infancy and has not yet become mainstream; it mostly involves sporadic lectures on academic journals and paper writing, without systematically constructing scholarly publishing literacy education content.

Scholarly publishing literacy education services are closely connected with library publishing services, digital scholarship, information literacy education, and subject services. It is an area that urgently needs in-depth exploration in Chinese university libraries. In terms of deepening services and expanding education, Chinese universities need to reference and learn from foreign best practices and excellent models. Therefore, based on extensive case investigations, this paper deeply analyzes the current status of scholarly publishing literacy courses offered by foreign university libraries, aiming to provide references for Chinese university libraries to develop such teaching.

2 Research Design

2.1 Research Object Selection

On the one hand, considering the authority of the research objects, this study used the 2018 US News World University Rankings [10] as the basis (the following university abbreviations are also based on US News), selected TOP 20 universities, and through investigating these university library websites, selected 6 universities where libraries are the main body offering scholarly publishing literacy courses, including Stanford University (Stanford), University of Washington (UW), University of Michigan (UMich) from the United States, Cambridge University (Cambridge), Imperial College London (IC) from the United Kingdom, and University of Toronto (UT) from Canada. Other TOP 20 universities also

have scholarly publishing courses, but not with libraries as the main body. For example, Harvard University enhances students' academic writing and publishing skills through its academic writing center, which is not within the scope of this investigation.

On the other hand, considering the comprehensiveness of the research objects, this paper also used “publishing literacy,” “publishing instruction,” “publishing education,” and “publishing course” as search terms in Web of Science, Elsevier Science Direct, ProQuest Digital Dissertations & Theses, EBSCO and other academic databases to find relevant literature on foreign scholarly publishing literacy education, and used Google Scholar and other academic search engines to further supplement relevant literature. Meanwhile, using “scholarly publishing literacy” or “information literacy and publishing” as search terms in CNKI to retrieve Chinese literature, and using Baidu Scholar to further supplement relevant literature. Then, by reading and excluding irrelevant literature in the publishing and media professional fields, 33 relevant papers were obtained. After carefully reading these 33 relevant papers, 10 typical cases were selected based on the completeness of course process design, novelty of form and method, and richness of content described in the papers. These include Georgia Institute of Technology (GT), Purdue University (PU), Texas A&M University (TAMU), Indiana University (IU), Utah State University (USU), University of Louisville (UofL), Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU), and University of Vermont (UVM) from the United States, University of York (York) from the United Kingdom, and University of Auckland (UOA) from New Zealand. These universities also have considerable reputation and influence globally.

[Figure 1: see original paper] National Distribution of Research Objects

To ensure that relevant educational content on scholarly publishing literacy is not omitted and to facilitate classification, this paper referenced the “Publishing Cycle” model proposed by the University of Winnipeg Library [11]. This model covers the entire scholarly publishing process (see [Figure 2: see original paper]), including five stages: creation, evaluation, publication, dissemination, preservation, and utilization.

The creation stage includes using literature retrieval to assist in topic selection, project/funding applications, and academic writing. The evaluation stage includes selecting publications and peer review. The publication stage includes submission, editing and revision, publishing, and academic integrity. The dissemination stage includes promotion of scholarly publications and impact metrics. The preservation stage includes storing and managing scholarly publications. The utilization stage includes the fair use of scholarly publications. This model is based on the definition of scholarly communication by the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) [12] and has been adopted by the library community. This paper further subdivides the content of scholarly publishing literacy courses based on this model (see), dividing it into 6 parts and 26 items. The creation stage is subdivided into 3 items, evaluation into 2 items, publication into 10 items, dissemination into 5 items, preservation into 3 items,

and utilization into 3 items.

[Figure 2: see original paper] Scholarly Publishing Lifecycle Model

3 Investigation and Analysis of Foreign Scholarly Publishing Literacy Courses

In summary, this paper selected scholarly publishing literacy courses offered by 16 university libraries as research objects. From the perspective of national distribution (see [Figure 1: see original paper]), they are concentrated in developed countries such as the United States, United Kingdom, Singapore, and Canada, with the United States accounting for the highest proportion at 69%.

3.1 Rich Teaching Content

Through investigating and sorting out the syllabi of foreign university library scholarly publishing literacy courses, the courses are divided into two types: single-topic and multi-topic.

3.1.1 Multi-topic Course Content Multi-topic courses refer to courses that cover various stages of the scholarly publishing lifecycle and are organized according to a certain logical sequence. Among the research objects, 13 adopted multi-topic courses. Although different courses have specific differences in content arrangement, they all generally revolve around the scholarly publishing lifecycle (see). For example, Utah State University's (USU) course includes 12 sessions, sequentially covering scholarly publishing overview → paper writing → co-author attribution → selecting publications → author submission → peer review and manuscript revision → journal impact → scholarly publishing integrity → copyright, helping graduate students grasp the overall picture of scholarly publishing.

Multi-topic Course Content

3.1.2 Single-topic Course Content Single-topic courses refer to courses that focus on a specific stage of the scholarly publishing lifecycle. The most commonly offered are academic integrity and copyright education courses (see). For example, Imperial College London (IC) Library offers a 1-credit online required course "Plagiarism Awareness" [15-16] and a 1-credit online elective course "Copyright" [17] for master's and doctoral students, aiming to strengthen graduate students' copyright awareness and warn them of the serious consequences of plagiarism and copyright infringement.

Single-topic Course Content

3.1.3 Analysis of Teaching Content Focus

- (1) Teaching content emphasizes the publication stage. Statistics on the content distribution of the 16 research objects (see [Figure 3: see original paper]) show that scholarly publishing literacy course content is mainly concentrated in the publication stage (accounting for 42%). The least covered stages are creation (9%) and preservation (9%). In fact, the creation and preservation stages are not unimportant, but are covered by other specialized courses. For example, “literature retrieval” in the creation stage and “reference management software” in the preservation stage are main content of regular information literacy education in university libraries. “Academic writing” in the creation stage is provided by university writing centers through free writing guidance. To avoid redundancy, these contents are generally reduced in scholarly publishing literacy courses.

[Figure 3: see original paper] Course Content Distribution

- (2) Teaching content focuses on new publishing models. In the publication stage, open access content is the most common (9 institutions). This is due to the vigorous development of the global open access movement, which has reshaped the scholarly publishing model, promoted diversification of the scholarly publishing market, and provided researchers with more choices for publishing research results [5]. However, some open access publishers, to compete with traditional journal publishing, promise faster speed and more relaxed quality review, which has contributed to the proliferation of predatory journals and put researchers in a publishing dilemma. This urgently requires professional scholarly publishing literacy education to understand and master new publishing models such as open access.
- (3) Teaching content emphasizes academic integrity. Eight universities involve academic integrity content, including 7 multi-topic universities and 1 single-topic university. Universities conduct academic integrity education to cultivate students’ integrity awareness from the source, which is a fundamental measure to prevent academic misconduct, conducive to enhancing university research innovation capabilities and supporting the cultivation of high-quality innovative talents. Foreign university scholarly publishing literacy courses generally treat academic integrity education as a key content of the publication stage.
- (4) Teaching content involves multiple publication types. From the perspective of publication types covered in courses (see [Figure 4: see original paper]), journal and conference papers are the most involved (7 institutions). For researchers, journal and conference papers are the most common and recognized forms of academic output. Data publishing is a new concept jointly proposed and actively explored by the publishing and data sharing communities in recent years. It is expected to fundamentally change the current problems facing data sharing [18]. Currently, Stanford University’s (Stanford) course [19] has already involved this new type of publication. The courses also cover specific publication types such as dis-

sertations (4 institutions), academic posters (3 institutions), and academic monograph publishing (1 institution), showing diverse characteristics.

[Figure 4: see original paper] Distribution of Publication Type Teaching Content

- (5) TOP 20 universities have more forward-looking and diversified teaching content. The research objects are divided into TOP 20 universities and non-TOP 20 universities. Due to the difference in numbers between the two types of schools, mean values were used in the statistical analysis of course content to create the radar chart shown in [Figure 5: see original paper]. It can be seen that TOP 20 university libraries have more forward-looking and diversified teaching content design, such as data publishing, data management, academic social media, ORCID, scholar profiles, dissertation publishing, monograph publishing, and software and image copyright and fair use.

[Figure 5: see original paper] Comparison of Course Content Between TOP 20 and Non-TOP 20 Universities

3.2 Diverse Teaching Forms

Foreign university library scholarly publishing literacy courses include four teaching forms: online teaching, offline teaching, blended teaching, and flipped classroom (see).

- (1) Offline teaching. Offline teaching can be divided into three types according to content: multi-topic, single-topic, and special lectures. Multi-topic courses are the mainstream form, represented by Georgia Institute of Technology (GT) [20] and University of Louisville (UofL) [6]. Single-topic courses generally use a semester to focus on an important topic, such as Texas A&M University (TAMU) offering a one-semester credit course on copyright education, which helps students systematically master scholarly publishing knowledge and form a knowledge system, but requires students to spend substantial time for credit. Special lectures can more timely meet user needs but cannot provide students with a complete knowledge system. For example, University of York (York) Library [21] offers special lectures on open access, peer review, data management, etc., to provide training and help for graduate students. University of Toronto (UT) Library [22] provides multiple 1-credit courses on various topics as an important component of graduate professional skills programs. University of Michigan (UMich) Library invites copyright experts to give special lectures on copyright knowledge [23].
- (2) Online teaching. Online teaching offers flexibility and autonomy. In the University of Auckland (UOA) course [24], students can choose to attend class and then complete tests, or skip class and complete tests directly. By discovering their weaknesses through tests, they can engage in targeted learning. This transformation from passive to active learning is more effi-

cient. However, since online teaching often lacks teacher supervision, it is more suitable for students with strong self-control. Imperial College London (IC) only offers online courses for master's and doctoral students. Online courses generally require high initial investment, but these resources can be reused later and can also be developed into MOOCs for off-campus learners. To date, more than 17,000 students have completed the University of Auckland (UOA) Academic Integrity MOOC course [25].

- (3) Blended teaching and flipped classroom teaching. Blended teaching fully leverages the advantages of “online” and “offline” teaching. Online teaching can mobilize students' learning initiative, while offline exchanges can fully play the guiding and inspiring role of teachers. Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU) Library collaborated with Taylor & Francis to hold a series of seminars [26], including six online courses and one offline course. The offline course not only summarizes and reviews the online seminars but also provides opportunities for faculty and students to further discuss scholarly publishing and exchange ideas.

Flipped classroom is a teaching method where teachers provide teaching materials for students to self-study before class, and class time is mainly used for teacher-student interactive activities [27]. Texas A&M University (TAMU) Library course [28] achieved a “flip” when teaching the “fair use” lesson: before class, students were required to read designated materials, self-study to understand the four factors of fair use, and then watch videos to use the fair use four-factor checklist to determine whether behaviors in the videos infringed copyright. In class, students expressed their views on the four factors of fair use and debated them, and reflected on why different people made different judgments on fair use behaviors in the video cases. University of Vermont Library (UVM) created a website for the scholarly publishing seminar series, integrating course PPTs, relevant learning websites, databases, tutorials, and course teaching videos, providing abundant materials for implementing flipped classrooms [29].

Course Teaching Forms

3.3 Active Teaching Atmosphere

Common teaching methods used in foreign university scholarly publishing literacy courses include classroom discussion, case teaching, role-playing, and values clarification. These methods play an important role in stimulating student initiative and enlivening classroom atmosphere.

- (1) Classroom discussion method. Classroom discussion includes free discussion and group discussion. Discussion topics include issues that need further clarification, such as Utah State University (USU) publishing course using classroom discussion to help students form their own value judgments on issues prone to research ethics dilemmas when teaching about co-author contribution definition and authorship order. They also include

open-ended questions. After teaching copyright knowledge, University of Vermont (UVM) Library guides students to further expand their knowledge based on what they have learned, discussing the sources of medical images and related copyright issues.

- (2) Case teaching method. Case teaching solves the problem of students lacking actual publishing experience. It provides cases such as how teachers revise papers based on reviewer comments and successfully publish them, helping students understand the requirements of reviewers and journal editors in real situations. It also shares existing publishing contract cases to help inexperienced learners strengthen their awareness of authors' rights. On the one hand, case teaching can concretize and contextualize abstract content such as academic norms and research ethics. For example, University of Auckland (UOA) Library uses numerous cases when teaching the concept of academic integrity to facilitate understanding by students from different disciplinary backgrounds [30].
- (3) Role-playing method. Role-playing is a characteristic teaching method in foreign scholarly publishing literacy courses. By creating actual publishing environments, it allows students to simulate authoritative roles in the academic publishing process, achieving a transformation from author to reviewer, thereby better understanding the academic publishing process and effectively avoiding common problems in academic writing and submission. For example, Utah State University (USU) uses role-playing, requiring students to study core journal reviewer guidelines, learn how to become qualified reviewers, and then have students review articles currently in the peer review process as journal reviewers. Purdue University (PU) [31] scholarly publishing course has students act as publishing editors, participating in manuscript editing and revision.
- (4) Values clarification method. Values clarification method originated in the United States in the 1960s and is a methodological system applied in moral education. Through a series of value clarification strategies, it enables students to understand, evaluate moral values, and autonomously choose their own values and put them into action to effectively solve value conflict problems [32]. For example, plagiarism and copyright content contain many gray areas. Texas A&M University (TAMU) requires students to engage in intense discussion and debate on some scenarios in scholarly publishing classes, and use critical thinking to evaluate the multiple possibilities of whether materials comply with copyright law fair use, thereby forming a stable moral mindset to regulate their own behavior.

3.4 Open Cooperative Teaching Team

From the perspective of teaching team composition, a pattern has formed with the library as the center, involving participation from campus institutions, publishers, and scholarly societies. University libraries have always been centers

of academic research and exchange, with rich experience in information literacy education and familiarity with the scholarly publishing field. Therefore, university libraries serve as the main participants and organizers of scholarly publishing literacy courses. However, limited by insufficient discipline and actual publishing experience, faculty from various university departments with disciplinary backgrounds also participate in scholarly publishing literacy teaching. Departmental faculty can provide first-hand publishing knowledge that librarians cannot provide, knowledge directly related to practical issues that students care about. For example, University of Michigan (UMich) courses [33] invite junior faculty in molecular biology and psychology to share their experiences as authors, and senior professors in humanities to share their suggestions as peer review experts. Meanwhile, other campus institutions also widely participate in scholarly publishing literacy education, such as writing centers teaching academic writing knowledge, copyright offices teaching copyright knowledge, institutional repositories teaching digital resource preservation knowledge, and scholarly communication offices teaching scholarly communication knowledge.

University libraries also actively seek opportunities to collaborate with publishers and scholarly societies in course development. Publishers and scholarly societies have very rich practical experience in the scholarly publishing field and can provide authoritative advice. At the same time, scholarly publishing teaching provides an opportunity to strengthen connections between publishing professionals and librarians. For example, Purdue University (PU) Press plays a key role in scholarly publishing literacy courses, and Stanford University (Stanford) actively invites publishers such as IEEE and Elsevier to communicate face-to-face with faculty and students, providing professional answers to questions.

3.5 Sustainable Teaching Evaluation

Foreign scholarly publishing literacy courses attach great importance to the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, using students' most intuitive feelings as the main basis. Evaluation includes four types: process evaluation, summative evaluation, real-time evaluation, and diagnostic evaluation, forming a "teaching-evaluation-optimization" cyclic teaching ecosystem that achieves continuous improvement and healthy development of courses.

As shown in , "pre-test and post-test" is the most common evaluation method in scholarly publishing literacy courses. Cambridge University (Cambridge) [34] and Indiana University (IU) 1-credit scholarly publishing courses [35] use Likert scales to assess students' scholarly publishing knowledge level before the course begins. After course completion, learners need to complete the same assessment scale. This method clarifies the knowledge gap between learning objectives and learning effects, intuitively showing student growth from a quantitative perspective.

Teaching evaluation also uses student growth portfolios to measure teaching effectiveness. Student growth portfolios refer to collecting materials mainly

consisting of student works to evaluate students' efforts, progress, and achievements in learning in specific fields [36]. Texas A&M University (TAMU) uses students' learning outcomes after course completion, including ten individual assignments, nine classroom activities, and one group assignment, for evaluation. Results show that students have improved in both publishing skills and publishing confidence.

In addition, summative evaluation is also a commonly used assessment method. Purdue University (PU) uses questionnaires to understand student satisfaction with courses as a basis for further course improvement. Indiana University (IU) scholarly publishing course teaching teams use informal group interviews to understand student opinions on courses face-to-face, and also use one-minute questionnaires to understand students' mastery of courses and opinions in real-time, enabling immediate evaluation and immediate feedback.

Course Teaching Evaluation Methods

4 Implications for Chinese Libraries in Developing Scholarly Publishing Literacy Courses

Based on the above analysis, it can be seen that foreign university libraries are increasingly paying attention to scholarly publishing services and have actively participated in scholarly publishing literacy course teaching, making it a new frontier for information literacy education. Existing course practice cases have already demonstrated rich teaching content, diverse teaching forms, active teaching atmosphere, open cooperative teaching teams, and sustainable teaching evaluation, accumulating rich practical experience.

The author believes that Chinese libraries should focus on the following aspects in the construction of scholarly publishing literacy courses:

- (1) Establish a scientific and reasonable curriculum system. Scholarly publishing literacy courses will gradually establish a complete knowledge system that conforms to students' cognitive levels and runs through the entire scholarly publishing lifecycle. Libraries should always stand at the forefront of the scholarly publishing field, grasp new trends in scholarly publishing, and adhere to the combination of basic and novel content, and the combination of universal and disciplinary characteristics in content selection.
- (2) Adopt flexible and diverse teaching forms. Future scholarly publishing literacy teaching will be more user-centered, breaking away from traditional teacher-centered cramming teaching. Fully utilize new methods such as MOOCs, flipped classrooms, and blended teaching, focusing on cultivating students' active learning habits. Draw on teaching methods from different disciplinary fields, give full play to students' sense of ownership as the main body of the classroom, and create a more active classroom atmosphere.

- (3) Build an open and win-win teaching team. In today's era of win-win cooperation, university libraries will cooperate with internal and external institutions with a more open mindset. Team teaching can be adopted to fully absorb excellent human resources from internal and external institutions, making scholarly publishing literacy education more professional.
- (4) Emphasize sustainable teaching evaluation. Course teaching is not a one-time process. In the future, more attention should be paid to the establishment of evaluation mechanisms in the construction of scholarly publishing literacy courses, using evaluation results to continuously improve and iterate course content, forming a sustainable development ecological chain of "teaching-evaluation-optimization" for scholarly publishing literacy education.

In conclusion, driven by the rapidly changing publishing environment and researchers' increasing publishing pressure, scholarly publishing literacy education will become a new growth point for information literacy services in university libraries. Chinese university libraries should also seize the opportunity, learn from the best practices of foreign university libraries, and timely develop scholarly publishing literacy education.

References

- [1] SHAPIRO J J, HUGHES S K. Information literacy as a liberal art [J]. *Educom review*, 1996, 31(2): 31-35.
- [2] BEALL J. Predatory publishers and opportunities for scholarly societies [C]//The American educational research association meeting. Washington, DC: APARC, 2012.
- [3] BEALL J. Predatory publishing is just one of the consequences of gold open access [J]. *Learned publishing*, 2013, 26(2): 79-84.
- [4] ZHAO L L. Riding the wave of open access: providing library research support for scholarly publishing literacy [J]. *Australian academic & research libraries*, 2014, 45(1): 3-18.
- [5] Xu Su, Zhang Xinhe. Discussion on library scholarly publishing literacy education in OA environment [J]. *Library and Information*, 2015(2): 118-122.
- [6] MCCLELLAN S, DETMERING R, MARTINEZ G, et al. Raising the library's impact factor: a case study in scholarly publishing literacy for graduate students [J]. *Portal libraries & the academy*, 2017, 17(3): 543-568.
- [7] Peking University. One-hour Lecture [EB/OL]. [2018-11-13]. http://www.lib.pku.edu.cn/portal/cn/xxzc/yixue/content_{{page}}{{onehour}}=0#qt-content{{page}}{{onehour}}.
- [8] Tsinghua University. 2018-2019 Autumn Semester Tsinghua University Library Themed Training Lectures [EB/OL]. [2018-11-13]. <http://lib.tsinghua.edu.cn/service/workshop.html>.
- [9] Lu Mei, Gu Yang, Shi Minglan. Practical exploration of university library research support services: A case study of "Customized Scholar Submission Guide" of Southeast University Library [J]. *University Library Work*, 2014, 34(5): 3-6.
- [10] Best global universities rankings [EB/OL]. [2018-12-20]. <https://www.usnews.com/education/best->

global-universities/rankings.

[11] University of Winnipeg [EB/OL]. [2018-12-20]. <https://library.uwinnipeg.ca/scholarly-communication/index.html>.

[12] ACRL. Scholarly communication [EB/OL]. [2018-12-20]. <https://www.arl.org/focus-areas/scholarly-communication#.XEfz8FwzblV>.

[13] ROMESBURG H C. A course that prepares science graduate students to publish [J]. *Journal of college science teaching*, 2013, 42(5): 50-53.

[14] University of Cambridge. PhD training sessions [EB/OL]. [2019-01-13]. <https://osc.cam.ac.uk/current-events>.

[15] Imperial College London. Ensuring integrity I: plagiarism awareness (master's students) [EB/OL]. [2018-12-20]. <http://www.imperial.ac.uk/study/pg/graduate-school/students/masters/professional-development/plagiarism-online/>.

[16] Imperial College London. Ensuring integrity: plagiarism awareness (mandatory online course) [EB/OL]. [2018-12-20]. <http://www.imperial.ac.uk/study/pg/graduate-school/students/doctoral/professional-development/digital-literacies/>.

[17] Imperial College London. Ensuring integrity: copyright (online course) [EB/OL]. [2018-12-20]. <http://www.imperial.ac.uk/study/pg/graduate-school/students/doctoral/professional-development/digital-literacies/>.

[18] Wu Zongli, Wang Liangxu, Nan Zhuotong. Current status and framework of scientific data publishing [J]. *Remote Sensing and Technology Application*, 2013(6): 383-389.

[19] Stanford libraries. What's on at the libraries: workshops [EB/OL]. [2019-01-01]. <http://library.stanford.edu/workshops>.

[20] CRITZ L, AXFORD M, BAER W M, et al. Development of the graduate library user education series [J]. *Reference services review*, 2012, 40(4): 530-542.

[21] Zhao Huifang. Foreign university library scholarly publishing literacy education and its implications [J]. *Journal of Academic Libraries*, 2015, 33(5): 58-63, 43.

[22] University of Toronto. Research-related skills offerings [EB/OL]. [2019-01-01]. <http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Research-Related-Skills-Offerings.aspx>.

[23] University of Michigan. Copyright workshops [EB/OL]. [2019-01-09]. <https://www.lib.umich.edu/copyright/presentations>.

[24] University of Auckland. Academic integrity course [EB/OL]. [2019-01-09]. <https://www.auckland.ac.nz/en/students/forms-policies-and-guidelines/student-policies-and-guidelines/academic-integrity-copyright/academic-integrity-course.html>.

[25] Academic integrity: values, skills, action [EB/OL]. [2019-01-09]. <https://www.futurelearn.com/courses/academic-integrity#section-requirements8>.

[26] DONLAN R, STANISLAW S, FERNANDEZ M. The future of information literacy in the library: an example of librarian/publisher collaboration [J]. *Serials librarian*, 2017, 72(1): 1-4.

[27] Huang Qinling, Gao Xie, Chen Zhiling, et al. Exploration and reflection on embedded teaching practice in university libraries based on flipped classroom: A case study of mechanical power discipline service of Shanghai Jiao Tong

- University Library [J]. Library and Information Service, 2018, 62(7): 30-37.*
- [28] CLEMENT G, BRENNENSON S. *The theft of the mind? an innovative approach to plagiarism and copyright education [J]. Mathematical models & methods in applied sciences, 2013, 14(9): 1261-1296.*
- [29] O'MALLEY D, DELWICHE F A. *Aligning library instruction with the needs of basic science graduate students: a case study [J]. Journal of the medical library association, 2012, 100(4): 284-289.*
- [30] Han Li, Liao Ying. *Research on academic integrity courses of University of Auckland Library [J]. Library Forum, 2017, 37(2): 126-131, 125.*
- [31] RIEHLE C F. *Collaborators in course design: a librarian and publisher at the intersection of information literacy and scholarly communication [J]. Journal of librarianship and scholarly communication, 2014, 2(3): 1-10.*
- [32] Qi Wanxue. *Conflict and Integration: Western Moral Education Theory in the 20th Century [M]. Jinan: Shandong Education Press, 1995: 275-276.*
- [33] BONNET J, ALVAREZ B, KAHN M. *Publish, not perish: supporting graduate students as aspiring authors [J]. Journal of library innovation, 2012, 3(2): 21-26.*
- [34] SEWELL C, KINGSLEY D. *Developing the 21st century academic librarian: The research support ambassador programme [J]. New review of academic librarianship, 2017(3): 148-158.*
- [35] HARE S. *Publishing literacy in the for-credit classroom: assessing IU JUR student editors [EB/OL]. [2019-01-16]. <https://library.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1125&context=...>*
- [36] Zhao Decheng. *Review and reflection on the application of growth portfolios [J]. Curriculum, Teaching Material and Method, 2012, 32(5): 21-26.*

Author Contribution Statement:

Wang Junyu: Conducted investigation and wrote the paper;

Li Ling: Determined the research topic, proposed research ideas and revision suggestions, and finalized the paper;

Chen Lintao: Participated in discussion and provided revision suggestions.

Abstract: [Purpose/significance] With the increasing complexity of the publishing environment, scholarly publishing literacy has gradually become a new growth point for information literacy education in university libraries. This paper investigates and analyzes the current status and characteristics of scholarly publishing literacy courses in foreign university libraries, aiming to provide references for the construction of such courses in Chinese libraries. [Method/process] By means of network survey and literature survey, this paper selected 16 representative scholarly publishing literacy courses offered by foreign university libraries. It then analyzed practical progress and characteristics from five aspects: teaching content, teaching form, teaching atmosphere, teaching team, and evaluation. [Result/conclusion] Foreign university libraries have actively participated in scholarly publishing literacy courses. The research cases show rich teaching content, diverse teaching forms, active teaching atmosphere, cooperative teaching teams, and sustainable teaching evaluation. Chinese libraries should fully learn from foreign experience and timely develop scholarly publishing literacy education.

Keywords: university library; scholarly publishing literacy; information literacy; curriculum construction

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.