Bhinneka: Jurnal Bintang Pendidikan dan Bahasa
Vol.1, No.2 April 2023
e-ISSN : 2963-6167,p-ISSN: 2963-6183 Hal 97-109
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59024/bhinneka.v1i2.285

Getting Ready To Conduct Scientific Writing: Academic Search Engine As Personal Learning Environment (PLE) Assistance

A'thi Fauzani Wisudawati [1], Dian Palupi [2], Jannatul Laily Noviabahari[3]
[1,2,3] Politeknik Negeri Madiun

Jl. Ring Road Barat, Winongo, Kec. Manguharjo, Kota Madiun, Jawa Timur 63162
Korespondensi Penulis : athifauzani@pnm.ac.id

Abstract: *At the point when the students are assessed, they are demanded to work to publish scientific writing. This study investigates the process of constructing scientific writing as well as the academic search engine that is frequently used by graduate students in building their papers. Later on, this study also discloses the factor of using repeated platforms. A personal learning environment helps the students to connect both inside and outside the classroom learning by employing digital tools. This paper presents a case study exploring the steps of conducting scientific writing, the academic search engine mostly used by students, and the factors in deciding the platform. Eighteen graduate students majoring in the English education department were the participants of this study. The data was collected through class observation, questionnaires, and semi-structured interviews. The result shows several steps to construct scientific writing including readiness, composing the article, getting ready for publication, distribution, and development. While Google Scholar (100%), Web of Science (94.7%), and online library (63.2%) are the top three online platforms as the academic search engine they used to search for references to build arguments for their scientific writing. Some factors why those platforms become highly beneficial are exposed by the participants such as their pertinence, reference quality, and publication impact. This study is expected to provide certain considerations for students or scholars about utilizing several online platforms and some reasons behind which is beneficial to build scientific writing publications.*

Keywords: *Academic Search Engine, Personal Learning Environment, Scientific Writing.*

Abstrak: Pada saat mahasiswa dinilai, mereka dituntut untuk bekerja menerbitkan karya ilmiah. Studi ini menyelidiki proses pembuatan karya tulis ilmiah serta mesin pencari akademik yang sering digunakan oleh mahasiswa pascasarjana dalam menyusun makalah mereka. Belakangan, penelitian ini juga mengungkap faktor penggunaan platform berulang. Lingkungan belajar pribadi membantu siswa untuk terhubung baik di dalam maupun di luar pembelajaran kelas dengan menggunakan alat digital. Makalah ini menyajikan studi kasus yang mengeksplorasi langkah-langkah melakukan penulisan ilmiah, mesin pencari akademik yang paling banyak digunakan oleh mahasiswa, dan faktor-faktor dalam menentukan platform. Delapan belas mahasiswa pascasarjana jurusan pendidikan bahasa Inggris adalah peserta penelitian ini. Pengumpulan data dilakukan melalui observasi kelas, angket, dan wawancara semi terstruktur. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan beberapa tahapan dalam menyusun karya tulis ilmiah meliputi kesiapan, penyusunan artikel, penyiapan publikasi, distribusi, dan pengembangan. Sedangkan Google Scholar (100%), Web of Science (94,7%), dan online library (63,2%) merupakan tiga besar platform online sebagai mesin pencari akademik yang mereka gunakan untuk mencari referensi guna membangun argumentasi tulisan ilmiah mereka. Beberapa faktor mengapa platform tersebut menjadi sangat bermanfaat diungkapkan oleh para peserta seperti kepedulian mereka, kualitas referensi, dan dampak publikasi. Kajian ini diharapkan dapat memberikan pertimbangan tertentu bagi mahasiswa atau sarjana tentang pemanfaatan beberapa platform online dan beberapa alasan dibaliknya yang bermanfaat untuk membangun publikasi karya ilmiah.

Kata kunci: Mesin Pencari Akademik, Personal Learning Environment, Karya Tulis Ilmiah.

INTRODUCTION

The researcher ought to have an enthusiasm for guaranteeing that their articles are listed by scholarly web indexes which incredibly improves their capacity to make their articles accessible to the scientific network. In addition to the fact that writers should look into seeing that their articles are recorded, they likewise ought to be enthusiastic about where

Received Februari 30, 2023; Revised Maret 02, 2023; Accepted April 30, 2023
** A'thi Fauzani Wisudawati, athifauzani@pnm.ac.id*

the articles are shown in the outcomes list. Like some other kinds of articles, articles shown in top positions are bound to be perused.

This article displays the idea of scientific website streamlining to advance insightful writing for scholarly web indexes. The initial segment of the article covers related work that has been done for the most part in the field of general learning improvement. The second part characterizes academic search engines. The third part gives an outline of positioning calculations of scholastic web crawlers, all in all, trailed by a review of Google Scholar's positioning calculation. At long last, rules are given on how writers can advance their articles for scientific web indexes. This article covers the rules depend on three investigations we have as of late conducted and on our involvement in building up the scholarly internet searcher.

Reference investigation, alongside friend judgment and evaluations of production checks and settings, is a standout amongst the most generally utilized techniques in assessing the examination execution of researchers (Lewison, 2001 & Thomas, 1998). Scientists at numerous scientific institution overall utilize reference information for enlisting, advancement, and citation investigation, alongside companion judgment and appraisals of production checks and settings, which is a standout amongst the most generally utilized techniques in assessing the examination execution of researchers (Lewison, 2001 & Thomas, 1998). Scientists at numerous scientific organizations overall utilize reference information for contracting, advancement, and coordinated effort.

The purpose of the article is to report the steps as well as the process to learn scientific writing just as the academic search engine that is generally utilized by the students. The elements of choosing the platforms likewise uncovered to fortify the value of that stage. This study aimed to show the academic search engine that is frequently used by scholars, and also the reason why those engines are beneficial for the process of learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

What is PLE?

The abbreviation PLE showed up in November 2004 in the title of one of the sessions of the 2004 JISC/CETIS Conference (Schaffert & Hilzensauer, 2008). Dark colored (2010) distinguishes the beginning of the PLE approach in the year 2001 when NIMLE (Northern Ireland Integrated Managed Learning Environment) was set up (Srinivasan, et al, 2002 & Oliver, 1980)

We can consider a PLE as an in-design idea when a few exceptional issues about it were propelled from surely understood distributions in 2008: eLearning Papers (Ehlers & Carneiro, 2008) or Interactive Learning Environments (Lewison, 2001). Be that as it may, the idea, and the words, Personal Learning Environment, have a more extended history.

Indeed, even in the prior year, in 1968, the Association for Student Teaching likewise referred to the articulation PLE which can be set up by an expert partner who shares encounters in an individual learning condition. In this way, we would thus be able to accept, that the possibility of a customized situation for taking in originates from the thoughts regarding the individualization and personalization of instructing toward the finish of the sixties. Be that as it may, the innovative methodology starts with the 21st century. On the off chance that we think that the Web existed right then and there for over 10 years, and PCs and different innovations for more than 20, why have PLEs not shown up previously?

Liber & Johnson (2008) think about that, to put it we had such a large number of students for so couple of instructors, and the innovation received by the instructive frameworks of the twentieth century was altered to turn out to be increasingly effective. Along these lines, it took on conventional showing models, precluding the educational chances of new advancements.

Along these lines, a PLE is more an academic change in the utilization of advancements than an innovative change in instructive frameworks. The apparatuses included are not altogether different from the ones of an LMS: websites, wikis, and offices on the web, during the twentieth century, ICTs were utilized to replicate the old model. From the earliest starting point of the 21st century, instructors have started to find alternatives to ICT to react to old educational issues, for example, individualization.

Our work depends on this suspicion: how we alternately use ICT to react to learning personalization requests. The examination incorporated into this work is just a piece of this exploration line, where we consider the mechanical components that clients select for their PLEs.

PLE is more like a system that enables students to deal with their learning surroundings, and the accumulation of substance and apparatuses are optional in their dialog (Shankar et. al, 2003). PLE comprises online networking devices that enable understudies to pick up fitness information (Dabbagh & Kitsantas, 2012). This thought of the importance of online life shows up in a few creators. PLE definitions for the most part stress a functioning and self-coordinated job of students in their learning procedure (Attwell, 2007 & Ponsford &VanDuinkerken, 2007).

Academic Search Engine

Academic search engine means a network system that is beneficial for scholar to find references for building a scientific paper or article. However, at the point when Academic Search Engine started, many communicated their worries that it would advance spam and tweaking, and, for sure, web index spam is a major issue. Today, in any case, a search engine is a typical and generally acknowledged strategy and by and large, web indexes figure out how to distinguish spam greatly. Most likely the most grounded contention for Academic Search Engine is simply the way that web crawlers distribute rules on the best way to upgrade Web locales for web search tools. Be that as it may, comparative data on improving insightful writing for scholastic web crawlers do not exist, as far as anyone is concerned.

METHOD

As many as eighteen students from a master's program in English Education major are involved in this study. They had been observed in academic writing class for around four months. In academic writing class, they had an obligation to submit their scientific article to an indexed journal. Looking back to their previous experience in their college, this assignment was considered something new yet challenging for them. Hence, because they've already mature enough, are believed to have high PLE power, and independently learn, the lecturer briefly guided them to construct their article.

They will openly fabricate their very own surroundings utilizing the web scientific web index stages. The examination questions are created by the writing surveyed and portrayed beneath. We could likewise consider this as an exploratory examination with qualities of a pilot stage for a more extensive expressive work.

The data was gathered through class observation, questionnaires, and in-depth interviews. Along with the procedure of observation, the specialist endeavoured to look further at what sort of action and apparatus assistance the students learn. In the study hall, the scientist head over to check what online stage they open on their cell phone. 10 inquiries in the poll are organized to ask, for example, how the teacher trains them about logical composition taken from the students' point of view, what apparatuses they generally utilized, and what is the capacity and the shortcoming. while to know the detail, the semi-structured meet was led to investigate the particular reason for utilizing some valuable stage for them.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The steps to conducting scientific writing

1. Readiness

In the first place, it is important to consider the most vital words that apply to the article. It is beyond the realm of imagination to expect to upgrade one report for many watchwords, so it is smarter to pick a couple. Some apparatuses assist in choosing the correct catchphrases, for example, Google Trends, Google Insights, Google Adwords watchword device, Google Search–based watchword device, and Spacky. It may be savvy not to choose those catchphrases that are generally famous. It is normally a smart thought to inquire about the regular scholarly web indexes utilizing each proposed watchword; if the pursuit as of now returns several archives, it might be smarter to pick another catchphrase with less competition.

2. Composing the Article

When the watchwords are picked, they should be referenced in the correct spots: in the title, and as regularly as conceivable in theory and the body of the content (in any case, obviously, not all that frequently as to pester perusers). Even though as a rule titles ought to be genuinely short, we recommend picking a more extended title if there are numerous important catchphrases. Equivalent words of critical catchphrases ought to likewise be referenced a couple of times in the body of the content, so the article might be found by somebody who does not realize the most widely recognized phrasing utilized in the examination field. In the event, that conceivable, equivalent words ought to likewise be referenced in theory, especially because some scholarly web crawlers don't list the report's full content.

Be predictable in spelling individuals' names, taking exceptional consideration with names that contain uncommon characters. On the off chance that names are utilized conflictingly, web crawlers will be unable to distinguish articles or references effectively; as a result, references might be doled out inaccurately, and articles won't be as exceptionally positioned as they could be. For example, Jo¨ran, Joeran, and Joran is for the most part right spellings of similar name (given diverse translation rules), however, Google Scholar considers them to be three distinct names.

The article should utilize a typical logical design and structure, including standard segments: presentation, related work, results, etc. A typical logical format and structure will help Web-based scholarly web search tools recognize an article as logical. Scholastic web indexes, and particularly Google Scholar, dole out a huge load to reference tallies. References

impact whether articles are ordered by any stretch of the imagination, and they likewise impact the positioning of articles. We would prefer not to urge perusers to assemble 'reference hovers,' or to make some other deceptive move. Yet, any distributed articles you have perused that identify with your ebb and flow inquiry about the paper ought to be referred to. While referencing your own distributed work, it is imperative to incorporate a connection where that work can be downloaded. This causes perusers to discover your article and encourages scholarly web crawlers to record the referenced article's full content, this should likewise be possible for different articles that have surely understood (i.e., stable and perhaps sanctioned) download areas.

3. Publication

As a major aspect of the advancement procedure, creators ought to think about the diary's or distributer's strategies. Open-get to articles for the most part get a larger number of references than articles open just by buy or membership, and just articles that are accessible on the Web can be filed by Web-based scholastic web crawlers. As needs are, while choosing a diary or distributer for accommodation, writers should support those that collaborate with Google Scholar and other scholastic web search tools, since the article will conceivably get more perusers and get more citations. If an article does not distribute on the web, writers should support distributors who in any event enable writers to put their articles on their or their foundations' home pages.

4. Development

There are three different ways to enhance articles for scholastic web indexes after production. The first is to distribute the article on the writer's landing page, so Web-based scholarly web search tools can discover and record it regardless of whether the diary or distributor does not distribute the article on the web. A writer who does not have a Web page may post articles on an institutional Web page or transfer them to a website, for example, Sciplore.org, which offers analysts an individual distribution landing page that is normally slithered by Google Scholar. In any case, verify that posting or transferring the article does not comprise an infringement of the writer's concurrence with the distributor.

Second, an article that incorporates obsolete words may be supplanted by either refreshing the current article or distributing another form on the writer's landing page. Google Scholar, in any event, considers all forms of an article accessible on the Web. We think about this as a decent method for making more established articles simpler to discover. Be that as it may, this training may likewise damage your distributer's copyright arrangement, and it

might likewise be viewed as rowdiness by different scientists. It could likewise be an unsafe methodology: sooner or later, web crawlers may come to group this training as spamming. Regardless, refreshed articles ought to be unmistakably named accordingly, so perusers know that they are perusing an adjusted adaptation.

Third, it is essential to make important parent Web pages for PDF documents. This implies Web pages that connect to the PDF document should refer to the most vital catchphrases and the PDFs metadata (title, creator, and conceptual). We don't know whether any scholarly web search tools are thinking about this information yet, however, typical web indexes do think about them, and it appears to be just a short time before scholastic web crawlers do, as well.

Google Scholar, the top Academic Search Engine for Conduct Scientific Writing

Eighteen graduate students show their interest in making use of several tools to support their learning. The result of the questionnaire shows that the respective academic search engine they commonly used are google scholar (100%), web of science (94.7%), online library (63.2%), online dictionary (21.1%), chat or forum (21.1%), Wikipedia (15.8%), and blog (10.5%).

Google Scholar is an online web search tool that utilizes Google's one-of-a-kind calculation to discover insightful assets web-based, including books, articles, modified works, and meeting procedures. Google Scholar's extension is never expressed, and as opposed to listing the particular databases or diaries incorporated into the indexed lists, Google (2010) enigmatically expresses that they draw from "scholastic distributors, proficient social orders, online vaults, colleges, and other sites." Since Google Scholar's presentation, data experts have distributed numerous articles investigating the advantages and disadvantages of Google Scholar, however, the client experience is to a great extent overlooked. Dabbagh & Kitsantas (2012) investigating Google Scholar as an instrument for data proficiency, examine a few usually wailed over shortages of Google Scholar, including its absence of controlled vocabulary and fragmented ordering.

Additionally, several articles point to the way that Google Scholar does not list the particular assets it covers (Hartman & Mullen, 2008) (Kesselman & Watstein, 2005) (Thomas & Watkins, 1998). Be that as it may, different writers notice Google Scholar's capacity to recover interdisciplinary outcomes, discover articles from open-access diaries and storehouses, and straightforwardly interface full-content articles to library databases (Hartman & Mullen, 2008) (Neuhaus, et.al, 2008) (Neuhaus, et.al, 2006). These advantages have incited numerous libraries to advance Google Scholar as an enhancement to the library's

membership databases, or as one device among numerous potential data assets (Callicot & Vaughn, 2005) (Oliver & Liber, 2001) (Walters, 2009).

During the discussion about the effect of Google Scholar, data experts regularly estimated the reaction of understudies. Such cases incorporate, "it will be wildly popular with understudies" (Taraghi, et.al, 2009) and destroy them back to the library (Vilelle, 2008). Furthermore, the writing presents a developing worry that Google Scholar will be negative to understudies' data education abilities, and draw clients from the library, bookkeepers, and library databases (Cathcart & Roberts, 2005) (Giglierano, 2008).

Every one of these hypotheses leads one to address whether understudies truly use Google Scholar, and assuming this is the case, how their utilization of Google Scholar looks at to the utilization of library-gave databases and metasearch items. One ease-of-use examination contrasting the experience of understudies utilizing Google Scholar and the Metalib metasearch item discovered that understudies seeking Google Scholar found a more prominent number of and higher nature of articles (Haya, et.al, 2007).

The factor in deciding the academic search engine

1. Pertinence

Google Scholar centers emphatically around report titles (Dabbagh & Kitsantas, 2012). Reports containing the pursuit term in the title are probably going to be situated close to the highest point of the outcomes list. Google Scholar likewise appears to think about the length of a title: In a look for the term 'Web optimization,' an archive titled 'Website design enhancement: An Overview' would be positioned higher than one titled 'Site design improvement (SEO): A Literature Survey of the Current State of the Art.' Although Google Scholar lists whole reports, the complete search term included in the record has next to zero effect. In a look for 'recommender frameworks,' an archive containing fifty examples of this term would not be positioned higher than a record containing just ten cases. Like other web search tools, Google Scholar does not record a message in figures and tables embedded as raster/bitmap illustrations, yet it indexes messages in vector designs. It is additionally realized that neither equivalent words nor PDF metadata are considered.

2. Reference

Reference includes assuming a noteworthy job in Google Scholar's positioning calculation. It is certain that, by and large, articles in the top positions have essentially a larger number of references than articles in the most minimal positions. This implies to

accomplish a decent positioning in Google Scholar, numerous references are fundamental. Google Scholar appears not to separate between self-references and references by outsiders.

3. Publication Name

If the pursuit question incorporates a creator or production name, an archive in which either shows up is probably going to be positioned high. For example, seventy-four of the main 100 aftereffects of a look for 'arteriosclerosis and thrombosis fix' were articles about different (restorative) points from the diary Arteriosclerosis, Thrombosis, and Vascular Biology, a considerable lot of which did exclude the inquiry term either in the title or in the full text.18

4. Different Factors

Google Scholar's standard hunt does not consider article production dates. Be that as it may, Google Scholar offers a unique scan work for 'ongoing articles,' which limits results to articles distributed within the previous five years. Moreover, Google Scholar professes to consider both production and creator reputation.19 However, we couldn't inquire about the impact of these elements due to an absence of information, and in this manner, we don't consider them here.

Bert van Heerde, an expert in the field of SEO, utilizes the term 'welcome-based web search tool' to portray Google Scholar: Only articles from confided-in sources and articles that are 'welcomed' (referred to) by articles previously filed are incorporated into the database.20 'Confided in sources,' for this situation, are distributors that collaborate straightforwardly with Google Scholar, just as distributors and Webmasters who have mentioned that Google Scholar creep their databases and Web sites.21

When an article is incorporated into Google Scholar's database, Google Scholar scans the Web for related PDF records, regardless of whether a believed distributor has just given the full text.22 It has no effect on which webpage the PDF is distributed; for example, Google Scholar has listed PDF documents of our articles from the distributer's website, our college's website, our private home pages, and SciPlore.org.23 PDFs found on the Web are connected straightforwardly on Google Scholar's outcomes pages, notwithstanding the connection to the distributer's full content. On the off chance that diverse PDF documents of an article exist, Google Scholar bunches them to improve the article's ranking. For example, if a preprint adaptation of an article is accessible on the writer's Web page and the last form is accessible on the distributer's website, Google records both as one rendition. If the two renditions contain diverse words, Google Scholar connects every contained word with the article.

Google, the famous Internet seek administration, as of late discharged a beta variant of another database called Google Scholar. Google Scholar, referred to in certain circles as "Schoogle," is an Internet web crawler that, as per Google's webpage, "empowers you to look explicitly for academic writing, including peer-evaluated papers, theories, books, preprints, modified works and specialized reports from every expansive region of research." The technique by which Google indexers figure out what material is "insightful writing" has not been made open as of now. A basic inquiry brings up what seems to be exemplary companion-inspected diary articles. This is what Google Scholar is– a gathering of Web documents that resemble academic diary articles with a sprinkling of insightful help, for example, meetings and specialized reports, propositions, and such. Utilizing uncommon, mystery calculations, Google separates things from their general database that fit the form of an academic article. These pages are then dumped into another, progressively specific database– Google Scholar.

6. Satisfaction

All in all terms, fulfillment is characterized as a positive full of feeling reaction from a client, in light of his or her involvement with a framework (Nielsen, 2005). Fulfillment is a connection between the client's desire before the experience, and whether the genuine encounter meets or surpasses that desire (Nielsen, 2005). With each new communication, more data and encounters are added to the client's viewpoint, thus the sentiment of fulfillment can be re-evaluated at some random minute (Flavian, et.al, 2006). Studies have demonstrated that fulfillment, based on related knowledge, is identified with future use expectations (Bloemer & Kasper, 1995) Heinrichs, Lim, Lim, and Spangenberg, 2007; Oliver, 1980). As it were, if the client had positive encounters or results with a site before, almost certainly, the person will keep utilizing that site later on.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This investigation gives immediate and important ramifications to students who need help with assembling their scientific writing (e.g., for developing an article, paper, or book). The investigation advises the means to direct logical composition, the helpful scholarly internet searcher, and the elements behind choosing those devices. This examination demonstrated that commonsense strategies and sources such as Google Scholar can help distinguish an impressive number of references in report types and may help with giving an

increasingly far-reaching image of the degree of universal and interdisciplinary nature of insightful correspondence of and among specialists.

REFERENCES

Adlington, J., & Benda, C. (2005). Checking under the hood: Evaluating Google Scholar for reference use. In W. Miller & R. Pellen (Eds.), Libraries and Google (pp.135–148). Binghamton, NY: Hawthorn Press.

Association for Student Teaching. (1968). *Yearbook,* vol. 47. Association for Student Teaching, Washington.

Attwell, G. (2007). 'Personal learning environment – the future of learning?' *eLearning Papers*, vol.2.

Beel, J., Gipp, B., & Wilde, E. (2010). Academic Search Engine Optimization (aseo) optimizing scholarly literature for google scholar & co. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, January 2010

Bloemer, J., & Kasper, H. (1995). The complex relationship between consumer satisfaction and brand loyalty. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 16, 311– 329.

Brown, S. (2010). 'From VLEs to learning webs: the implications of Web 2.0 for learning and teaching', *Interactive Learning Environments*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1-10.

Callicott, B., & Vaughn, D. (2005). Google Scholar vs. library scholar: Testing the performance of Schoogle. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 10(3/4), 71–88.

Cathcart, R., & Roberts, A. (2005). Evaluating Google Scholar as a tool for information literacy. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 10(3/4), 167– 176.

Cooke, R., & Donlan, R. (2008). Thinking inside the box: Comparing federated search results from Google Scholar, Live Academic Search and Central Search. *Journal of Library Administration*, 46(3), 31–42.

Cothran, T. (2011). Google Scholar acceptance and use among graduate students: A quantitative study. *Library & Information Science Research* 33, 293-301

Dabbagh, N & Kitsantas, A. (2012). Personal Learning Environments, social media, and self regulated learning: A natural formula for connecting formal and informal learning', *The Internet and Higher Education*, 15(1) 3-8.

Ehlers, U & Carneiro, R. (2008). Personal learning environments', *eLearning Papers*, vol. 9.

Flavián, C., Guinalíu, M., & Gurrea, R. (2006). The role played by perceived usability, satisfaction and consumer trust on website loyalty. *Information Management*, 43(1), 1–14.

Giglierano, J. (2008). Attitude of OhioLINK librarians toward Google Scholar. *Journal of Library Administration*, 47(1/2), 101–113.

Haya, G., Nygren, E., & Widmark, W. (2007). Metalib and Google Scholar: A user study. *Online Information Review*, 31, 365–375.

Hartman, K., & Mullen, L. (2008). Google Scholar and academic libraries: An update. *New Library World*, 109(5/6), 211–222.

Howland, J. L., Wright, T. C., Boughan, R. A., & Roberts, B. C. (2009). How scholarly is Google Scholar? A comparison to library databases. *College and Research Libraries*, 70, 227–234.

Helms-Park, R., Radia, P., & Stapleton, P. (2007). A preliminary assessment of Google Scholar as a source of EAP students' research materials. *Internet and Higher Education*, 10(1), 65–76.

Kesselman, M., & Watstein, S. B. (2005). Google Scholar and libraries: Point/counterpoint. *Reference Services Revie*w, 33, 380–387.

Lewison, G. (2001). Evaluation of books as research outputs in history of medicine. Research Evaluation, 10(2), 89-95.

Liber, O & Johnson, M. (2008). Personal Learning Environments', *Interactive Learning Environments*, vol. 16, no. 1.

Milligan, C, Beauvoir, PH, Johnson, M, Sharples, P, Wilson, S & Liber, O 2006, 'Developing a Reference Model to Describe the Personal Learning Environment' in W Nejdl and K Tochtermann,(eds.), *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 4227, pp 506-511, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Mullen, L., & Hartman, K. (2006). Google Scholar and the library web site: The early response by ARL libraries. College and Research Libraries, 67, 106–122.

Neuhaus, C., Neuhaus, E., & Asher, A. (2008). Google Scholar goes to school: The presence of Google Scholar on college and university web sites. *Journal of Academic of Librarianship*, 34(1), 39–51.

Neuhaus, C., Neuhaus, E., Asher, A., & Wrede, C. (2006). The depth and breadth of Google Scholar: An empirical study. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 6(2), 127–141.

Nielsen, J. (2005). Usability 101: Introduction to usability.

Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decision. Jour*nal of Marketing Research*, 17, 460–469.

Olivier, B & Liber, O. (2001). Lifelong learning: The need for portable Personal Learning Environments and supporting interoperability standards', *The JISC Centre for Educational Technology Interoperability Standards*, Bolton Institute, Bolton, UK.

Ponsford, B. C., & vanDuinkerken, W. (2007). User expectations in the time of Google: Usability testing of federated searching. *Reference Services Quarterly*, 12(1/2), 159-178.

Schaffert, S & Hilzensauer, W. (2008). On the way towards Personal Learning Environments: Seven crucial aspects', *eLearning Papers*, vol. 9 .

Severance, C, Hardin, J & Whyte, A 2008, 'The coming functionality mash-up in Personal Learning Environments', *Interactive Learning Environments*, 16(1), 47-62.

Shankar, V., Smith, A. K., & Rangaswamy, A. (2003). Customer satisfaction and loyalty in online and offline environments. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 20, 153–175.

Srinivasan, S. S., Anderson, R., & Ponnavolu, K. (2002). Customer loyalty in e- commerce: Anexploration of its antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Retailing*, 78, 41–50.

Taraghi, B, Ebner, M, Schaffert, S 2009, 'Personal Learning Environments for Higher Education: A Mashup Based Widget Concept', *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Mash-Up Personal Learning Environments MUPPLE'09*, Nice, France.

Tenopir, C. (2005). Google in the academic library. *Library Journal*, 130(2), 32.

Thomas, P.R., & Watkins, D.S. (1998). Institutional research rankings via bibliometric analysis and direct peer review: A comparative case study with policy implications. Scientometrics 41(3), 335-355.

Ullrich, C, Borau, K, Luo, H, Tan, X, Shen, L & Shen R. (2008). Why Web 2.0 is Good for Learning and for Research: Principles and Prototypes', *17th International World Wide Web Conference*, Beijing, China.

Walters, W. H. (2009). Google Scholar search performance: Comparative recall and precision. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 9(1), 5–24.

Wixom, B. H., & Todd, P. A. (2005). A theoretical integration of user satisfaction and technology acceptance. *Information Systems Research*, 16, 85–102.

York, M. (2005). Calling the scholars home: Google Scholar as a tool for rediscovering the academic library. In W. Miller & R. Pellen (Eds.), *Libraries and Google*, 117–133. Binghamton, NY: Hawthorn Press.