Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication

Volume 1 | Issue 4 eP1075

How to Scuttle a Scholarly Communication Initiative

Dorothea Salo

Salo, D. (2013). How to Scuttle a Scholarly Communication Initiative. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 1(4):eP1075. http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1075

© 2013 by the author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution License, which allows unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, providing the original author and source are credited.

JLSC is a quarterly journal sponsored and published by Pacific University Library | ISSN 2162-3309 | http://jlsc-pub.org

Rights

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License.

Erratum

Reference for (Harnad, 2001) citation: Harnad, S. (2001). The self-archiving initiative: Freeing the refereed research literature online. *Nature*, *410*, 1024-1025. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/35074210 [Also available: http://users.ecs.soton.ac.uk/harnad/Tp/nature4.htm]

Authors

Dorothea Salo

ISSN 2162-3309 JLSC

COMMENTARY

How to Scuttle a Scholarly Communication Initiative

Dorothea Salo *Faculty Associate, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison*

Since Clifford Lynch's infamous call to arms (2003), academic libraries have been wasting their time trying to change the scholarly communication system on the feeblest of rationalizations. Proper librarians know that the current system is obviously the most sustainable, since it's lasted this long and provided so much benefit to libraries (Rogers, 2012a) and profit to organizations as diverse as Elsevier, Nature Publishing Group, and the American Chemical Society, as well as their CEOs (Berrett, 2012). Moreover, faculty have proclaimed loudly and clearly that they believe libraries' central role is to be the campus's collective knowledge wallet (Schonfeld & Housewright, 2010; Lucky, 2012), so who are librarians to argue?

Open access cannot possibly succeed in any case, given that "faculty will never just give their work away" (librarian, name withheld, personal communication). Even mere open-access advocacy invites stiff opposition from many faculty, campus administrators, and publishers (including local university-press directors), inviting significant reputational and relationship risk for no corresponding benefit. Actual failure, of course, is such an unacceptable option for beleaguered libraries that failure-prone scholarly communication initiatives cannot be embarked upon until they are sure winners, which in practice means "never."

Scholarly communication initiatives such as institutional repositories (IRs), library-sponsored publishing initiatives, open-access author-fee funds, copyright training and consulting, faculty-publication registries, and open-access publisher memberships must therefore be rapidly and effectively squelched, lest the system change in a fashion that disintermediates the existing pattern of library work. If these initiatives flourish, libraries will find themselves in the shoes of abbot Johannes Trithemius, whose *De laude scriptorum* (1494) presciently railed against the damage that Gutenberg's printing press would do to monasteries' lucrative scriptoria. Protecting the contours of librarian employment is of paramount concern, especially given the manifest impossibility of retraining existing staff to cope with the complexities of copyright (Hirtle, Hudson, & Kenyon, 2009), outreach to faculty (Malenfant, 2010), and digital preservation (Digital Preservation Coalition & University of London Computer Centre, n.d.).

Fortunately, scholarly communication initiatives are straightforward to scuttle, even when foisted upon an otherwise-responsible library by the provost's office or the faculty senate. Given the natural hierarchy of most reputable academic libraries (Maloney, Antelman, Arlitsch, & Butler, 2010), it is of course easiest to put a stop to these misguided efforts from a leadership position, but in truth, any academic librarian can stop them in their tracks. Tried and true, proven-effective techniques follow.

PLANNING

Many libraries successfully scuttle new scholarly communication initiatives before they even begin via planning practices that set these initiatives up to fail. Vague planning scope, plentiful undefined buzzwords (like "institutional repository," itself a phrase with no clear service outline as referent), and dilatory red tape can murder an initiative in its cradle. Phraseology in the planning committee's charge or deliverables that

© 2013 Salo. This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License, which allows unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

threatens other campus stakeholders such as campus IT, local research centers, or the university press guarantees that the new initiative will have enemies even before its birth. The best, most destructive planning attitude, of course, is that a scholarly communication initiative is a thing (such as an IR or a publication database) that a library sets up (because other libraries do, not for any internally-coherent reason) and then leaves strictly alone, rather than a conscious long-term investment in change to a set of entrenched and difficult-to-modify social, economic, and technological systems.

Careful stacking of the planning committee also vitiates the initiative. Excluding librarians known to be influential among either faculty or their fellow librarians creates organic opposition to the initiative among rank-and-file library staff, as does keeping the committee selection process as secret as possible. The most usefully harmful librarians and outside participants to include on the planning committee are:

- ignorant of copyright law and licensing, digital preservation and related technologies, multimedia creation and publication, and scholarship-dissemination practices in disciplines other than their own;
- technologically naïve and/or contemptuous of digital technologies (print preservationists may fit here);
- professionally, financially, and/or emotionally invested in toll-access publishing (the university-press director can be an especially savvy choice here, as are many different sorts of librarians, from collection developers to acquisitions specialists);
- incurious and resistant to self-education;
- resistant to change or incapable of effecting change; and
- poor planners, managers, or communicators, ideally all three.

Planning-committee members should not read any publications or reports about scholarly communication published more recently than 2003, and should especially be steered away from the published experience of practitioners (e.g. Hixson, 2006; Buehler & Trauernicht, 2007; Hixson & Cracknell, 2007; Salo, 2008a; Troll Covey, 2009; Wrenn, Mueller, & Shellhase, 2009; Connell & Cetwinski, 2010; Connell, 2011). Mounting evidence that common library approaches to scholarly communication initiatives are ineffectual (e.g. Hixson, 2006; Davis & Connolly, 2007; McDowell, 2007; Salo, 2008a; Troll-Covey 2009; Madsen & Oleen, 2013) should of course be minimized, so that the savvy planner can embed those approaches into the initiative outline in order to weaken it. Above all, if it is likely that the initiative will be run by a new hire, the hiring process must be delayed until planning has run its course, so that the planning committee will not be contaminated with relevant expertise, knowledge, or experience, and the new hire will be forced to inhabit a world he or she never made.

Omitting parts of the planning process crucial to success should also damage the results. Planners should avoid performing market research lest they correctly gauge acceptance potential, much less find early willing partners for the new initiative; they should also avoid reading market research and implementation outcomes from other institutions (e.g. Ferreira, Rodrigues, Baptista, & Saraiva, 2008; Foster & Gibbons, 2008). Planners should be forbidden outright from mentioning the potential initiative to any prospective stakeholders, collaborators, or funders (particularly dean-level or above), lest they decide to support it, or receive the false impression that the library is seriously committed to it. Informing those in positions of power who are likely to oppose the initiative for any reason (including spurious or uninformed reasons) is, of course, a wise move. Pilot projects should be avoided, lest they succeed, generate good word-of-mouth for the new initiative, or ground the initiative plan in local realities.

The new initiative's expressed mission and vision should be vague, grandiose, and impossible to accomplish in any meaningful or measurable way, such as "the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community members" (Lynch, 2003) or "serv[ing] as tangible indicators of an institution's quality, thus increasing its visibility, prestige, and public value" (Crow, 2002). Mission and vision must not be broken down into concrete achievable milestones, much less have a timeline drawn up. No plans should be made to assess progress toward milestones, and it should be assumed that all decisions made during the original planning process, including decisions about software, resources, and staffing, will never need to be revisited or altered in any way. Reality and its infinite frustrating

curveballs should then do a marvelous job of destroying the new initiative; should they not suffice, the very unmeasurability of the initiative's mission and vision allows the library to discipline the initiative's staff for not meeting them.

Should these measures prove insufficient to kill the new initiative, starving the planning process in other ways may fatally wound it. The expectation that the new initiative must run with the absolute minimum of staff involvement, budget, and technology infrastructure should be clearly made and reiterated as necessary. For example, since it has been perfectly clear for over a decade (*contra* Swan, 2005) that neither faculty nor librarians willingly self-archive in IRs at scale (Harnad, 2001; Foster & Gibbons, 2005; Hixson, 2006; Joint, 2006; Davis & Connolly, 2007; McDowell, 2007; Bankier & Perciali, 2008; Ferreira, Rodrigues, Baptista, & Saraiva, 2008; Gaffney, 2008; Salo, 2008a; Shreeves & Cragin, 2008; Burris, 2009; Palmer, Dill, & Christie, 2009; Troll Covey, 2009; Koopman & Kipnis, 2009; Bankier & Perciali, 2010; Malenfant, 2010; Connell, 2011; Mercer, 2011; Mischo & Schlembach, 2011; Wilson & Jantz, 2011; Rodrigues & Rodrigues 2012; Singeh, Abrizah, & Karim 2012), staffing a repository such that self-archiving is the only feasible road into it dooms it to irrelevance and failure. Similarly, publishing initiatives that offer neither editing nor typesetting/reformatting services will rightly be viewed as singularly useless. Discouraging involvement by subject specialists and reference librarians in participant recruitment and general advocacy (Jenkins, Breakstone, & Hixson, 2005; Malenfant, 2010; Leary, Lundstrom, & Martin, 2012) will hobble the new initiative admirably, as will setting extremely narrow parameters for what the initiative is allowed to do, say, collect, or pay for. Insisting that an IR only harbor trustworthy, authoritative, peer-reviewed, born-digital (not digitized) materials, that an author-fee fund only pay for articles in journals with sky-high impact factors, or that open-access advocacy only take place when it does not challenge the views of campus faculty or administrators, are classic impossible-dream tactics.

Electronic thesis and dissertation (ETD) initiatives present a special problem for the library desirous of scuttling scholarly communication initiatives: they tend to be popular among many campus stakeholder groups, and are relatively simple to implement because of the political ease of ordering graduate students around. Still, careful management can ruin even these. Insisting that all theses and dissertations be made open access immediately will alienate patent-seekers and humanists alike, even when they might be content with an ETD initiative allowing embargoes. Creative-writing and fine-arts programs should be the first to hear about mandatory open-access ETDs, as they will immediately explode with fury sufficient to ensure the defeat of an ETD initiative (Foster 2008a, Foster 2008b). Should ETDs prove too popular to avoid, excluding undergraduate research may still be possible (Davis-Kahl, Hensley, & Shreeves, 2011).

SOFTWARE CHOICE AND MANAGEMENT

The sooner a software package is chosen during the planning process, the more likely it is to be wholly inadequate. It is particularly important to fixate on a software package before the initiative's mission, milestones, and workflows have been decided to maximize the discrepancies between necessary work and the software's capabilities, as well as to constrain service models to what the software permits. For best results, choose software based on one technologically-naïve librarian's brief conversation with a vendor on a conference exhibit floor; the less the librarian knows about local needs and workflows, the better.

One exception to the preceding rule involves insisting upon a mission or service model for which the software likely to be chosen is known to be hopelessly inadequate. A common example is insisting that IRs handle records management, despite the utter lack of scheduling, arrangement, true dark archiving (including of metadata), bulk automated ingest, and disposal capacities in most IR software packages and services. Research universities can also scuttle an IR by insisting that it solve the entirety of the campus's research-data management and storage problems over the entire data lifecycle, though IR software and services have clearly been designed for only the very end of content-production lifecycles.

Usability testing or piloting of any software that will become part of the initiative's infrastructure should be avoided lest the software chosen fulfill local requirements. Likewise, reading software comparisons (e.g. Fay, 2010; Samuels & Griffy, 2012) or asking librarians at other institutions about their experiences risks injecting dangerous amounts of intelligence into the software-selection process. If questioning experienced librarians cannot be avoided, it should happen where the librarians

are clearly speaking on the public record so that they feel they cannot discuss negative experiences. Substituting in-person or webinar-based vendor pitches or "training," biased and incomplete as they invariably are, often bestows a useful illusion of informed choice. Finally, it is wise to choose software whose developers are heavily focused on the minutiae of digital preservation or standards compliance, since they are likely to give short shrift to librarian and end-user usability. The more hostile toward, dismissive of, or defensive about usability these developers are, the more likely their software is to damage a scholarly communication initiative.

Specific features to look for in order to secure the least-usable, least-useful software available include:

- a login system that cannot be tied into the institution's existing authentication and authorization mechanisms;
- Byzantine privilege-assignment systems; the more difficult, time-consuming, and confusing it is to add, change, and subtract user privileges, the better (Salo, 2008b);
- lengthy, inflexible, poorly-labeled metadata-entry screens, without helpful autocompletes or default values;
- inexplicable, unrecoverable errors and error messages (Salo, 2008b);
- jargon and verbosity in the interface's language;
- ugly, outdated, difficult-to-change visual design, or design not adapted well to mobile use;
- as many unnecessary clicks, dropdown menus, and other obtrusive interface excrescences as possible;
- inability to batch-edit existing metadata, ensuring widespread authority-control problems (Salo, 2009) and useless subject keywording, both of which make the initiative look inept to end-users;
- for web-facing software, hostility to (or fragility faced with) search-engine crawlers; at minimum, inability to create search-engine-friendly sitemaps ("sitemaps.org – Home," 2008); and
- no usable APIs or plugin/mod architectures; ideally, third-party systems should be prevented from interacting with the software at all, but if that cannot be managed, APIs should be as limited, obfuscated, undocumented, library-specific, and web-developer–unfriendly as possible.

For IRs specifically, the following criteria should be considered as well:

- poor handling of third-party/mediated deposit, e.g. assuming that the person performing the deposit possesses sufficient intellectual-property rights in the deposited content to grant the IR a license to it;
- a requirement that interested depositors be explicitly given deposit privileges by a system administrator, thereby eliminating immediate gratification and point-of-need deposit demonstrations;
- unintuitive, inexplicable collection structures and internal naming/reference practices, ideally leading to fragile, impenetrable URLs for deposited materials;
- inability to limit end-user access to deposits and their metadata, or failing that, an inexplicable, inflexible access-limitation system with poor usability that must be directly enabled and tweaked by system administrators to be used at all;
- unnecessary and ideally meaningless filename changes to deposited files;
- inability to version or change deposited files or metadata, or failing that, requiring that system administrators perform all such changes, ideally through the most error-prone, technically-convoluted process possible (Salo, 2008c);
- inability to perform batch deposits, or failing that, batch deposit only available to system administrators or those with server access; and
- no feedback to depositors and initiative staff about pageviews and download numbers for deposited items, or if this cannot be avoided, no API access to this information.

Once a software package has been chosen, initiative staff should be walled away from its internal workings as much as possible, especially when those staff are technically-inclined enough to do useful work. Ideally, entire suites of desirable features should be unavailable for use, either because initiative staff cannot activate or configure them due to lack of access to configuration files on the server,

or because they must rely on intransigent vendors for assistance. Depriving initiative staff of access to web designers, programmers, and system administrators obviously causes damage as well; custom design and development in particular must not be allowed, to let bugs and other software warts cause the most damage possible.

STAFFING

Several staffing anti-patterns serve equally well to hobble a scholarly communication initiative. Which, or which combination, is most suitable for a given library depends on its existing situation, particularly with respect to current staffing levels and available open positions. All initiative staff, however, whether dedicated wholly or in part to the initiative, should be encouraged to act as gatekeepers, discouraging participation from other librarians and from faculty. Granting them administrator privileges in software (as for an IR) often suffices; drunk with power, they may refuse to grant privileges to anyone else, reducing spontaneous participation (lackluster as that is likely to be in any case) to zero.

Committees

The more dysfunctional and ineffectual committee culture is in a given library, the stronger the case for assigning oversight of the scholarly communication initiative to a committee. The guidelines given above for stacking a planning committee apply equally to an oversight committee. Moreover, if those most directly responsible for (or most supportive of) the initiative are new or junior staff, stacking the committee with supervisors and administrators will ensure that the initiative's staff are suppressed like Lewis Carroll's dormouse, their ideas and concerns unaired and unheeded. A strong supervisor/administrator presence also ensures that few on the committee will be willing to do necessary low-level grunt work.

The committee should ideally not have a charge at all, but if a charge must be drafted, it should be (like the initiative's own vision and mission) as vague, grandiose, and unmeasurable as possible. No budget should be allocated to the committee, nor should it be empowered to require work from any staff member not on the committee. Clear success has been achieved when the committee will not so much as participate in an international event such as Open Access Week (Higginbotham, n.d.).

Deadwood

Shuffling an ineffectual librarian on the existing staff into a dedicated scholarly communication position accomplishes two goals at once: destroying scholarly communication initiatives and placing bad librarians (especially those who are unfirable because of tenure or local hiring culture) someplace they cannot hinder the real work of libraries. These positions may also permit politically-useful, nepotistic, or other insider-baseball hires to be placed where their incompetence will provide a net benefit to the library. An organic benefit of this approach to staffing is that all other library staff will refuse to take the new initiative seriously because of the individual running it.

Existing staff

Adding scholarly communication responsibilities to existing staff's workloads without consulting them, much less shifting any other responsibilities away from them, ensures that staff will devote exactly zero time to scholarly communication work. It also forges an entirely new base of resentful opposition to the initiative. Neither training nor additional budget should be available to staff. Their position descriptions should not explicitly mention scholarly communication, nor should their employee reviews take activity related to it into account, to give them cover in ignoring it (Malenfant, 2010). Similarly, the less clear to them and their supervisors their intended contributions and outcomes are, the better.

Under no circumstances should on-staff librarians who are foolishly interested in scholarly communication—much less actual open-access advocates or those interested enough in scholarly communication to have spontaneously sought professional development in it—be allowed to participate in scholarly communication initiatives, particularly when they are likely to be more effective than existing scholarly communication staff. Librarians suspected of interest in scholarly communication should be walloped with other work to prevent them from pursuing their interest. Should this not suffice, they should be blocked from joining library or campus scholarly communication committees, training other staff, working with dedicated scholarly

communication staff (if any), and incorporating scholarly communication issues into existing library events or initiatives. Forbidding them from pursuing their interests will damage their morale and cause them to envy or despise dedicated scholarly communication staff (new hires and the incompetent especially); sheer frustration may transform interested staff into surly backstabbers. They may even leave, removing from the library another source of unwanted interest in scholarly communication.

New hires

Stealing a hiring line from another library department for a scholarly communication initiative creates organic opposition to the new hire and the initiative, while a temporary or visiting hire signals that the library will shut down the new initiative immediately after the hiree shuffles off the payroll. In addition, hiring scholarly communication staff from outside the institution ensures that they will labor under a heavy political-capital deficit from the outset of their employment. The more contested, acrimonious, and obtuse the planning process is, the worse the new hire's deficit will be as resentment of the planning process and its result naturally accrues to the new hire. A new library-school graduate will suffer from the greatest capital deficit, and is least likely to have the interpersonal skills and experience with library politics to recover from it. In contrast, not insisting that the new hire have an ALA-accredited degree ensures that librarians will both despise and feel threatened by the new hire; the new hire is likely also to know considerably less about how libraries work. The best new hire, then, is a paraprofessional or new MLS graduate wholly new to the institution who has been hired into a visiting position stolen from another library department.

A carefully-written job ad may scuttle the initiative altogether by being unfillable; even should it fall short of that enviable ideal, it may enforce a poor hire. The best way to develop a thoroughly unworkable position description that still looks sufficiently realistic to be unassailable is to crib indiscriminately from other institutions' position descriptions, or from the ubiquitous skills-and-requirements roundups in the LIS literature and elsewhere (e.g. Kinkus, 2007; Rosenblum, 2008; Iandoli, 2009). This strategy works because the outcomes of the searches represented by these descriptions (measured by search success, candidate-pool quality, or any subsequent assessment of actual employee or initiative success) are never evaluated, such that many position descriptions are flights of fancy. A little cleverness, then, suffices to piece together a laundry list of required skills that not even a demigod could encompass, or a list of position responsibilities that no three people could actually achieve. Only naïve new MLS graduates and desperate unemployed librarians will apply, throwing the initiative into immediate jeopardy; resulting hiring difficulties can be blamed on library schools.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TECHNIQUES

Previous sections of this paper address direct strikes at a scholarly communication initiative's processes, infrastructure, and staffing. While effective, these interventions may not suffice to stamp out the initiative altogether without an allied barrage against the morale and efficacy of staff associated with the initiative. This section addresses that challenge.

Hypocrisy

Library policy and librarian behavior should clearly signal to the institution that the scholarly communication initiative should not exist, to undercut its staff as they promote the initiative and its associated ideals (e.g. open access, open data, digital preservation). Common hypocrisies to foster surrounding scholarly communication include:

- never self-archiving, especially not in the local IR;
- never publishing in open-access journals;
- never asking journal publishers about rights retention;
- donating authorship, review, and editorial labor to those that regularly lobby against open access, preferably toll-access LIS journals belonging to toll-access-funded publishing corporations;
- establishing publication requirements for tenure, retention, or promotion that disadvantage open-access journals (insisting on "established journals" often suffices, since open-access journals are usually newer), do not require or even mention self-archiving, and encourage staff to donate review and editorial labor to toll-access LIS journals owned by anti-open-access publishing corporations;

- placing unnecessary legal or quasi-legal restrictions on reuse of digitized and born-digital library collections (Eschenfelder, 2009) to signal broad-based library opposition to openness and reuse; and
- expressing confidence in the library's continued or even increased ability to serve patron needs under toll-access scholarly communication systems.

The above stances naturally do additional useful damage to scholarly communication initiatives when adopted by library administrators to whom library staff and campus faculty and administrators look for example.

It is especially vital to quash all discussion of a library open-access mandate, particularly when a campus open-access mandate is in play. Implementing such a "patchwork" mandate (Sale, 2007), as Oregon State University Library's experience demonstrates (Brown, 2009), intrigues faculty and gives library-based scholarly communication initiatives credibility on the broader campus that they must not be permitted to earn.

The fundamental attribution error

The *fundamental attribution error* is the name assigned by psychologists to the human tendency to personalize error and failure by blaming them on an individual and his/her distinctive traits rather than the system in which the individual is embedded. Encouraging the fundamental attribution error in everyone who interacts with the new initiative both savages the initiative and absolves everyone but the initiative's staff members of responsibility for any difficulties associated with it.

Libraries can even cause their own scholarly communication staff to subscribe to the fundamental attribution error, losing their grip on reality enough to blame themselves for every difficulty they encounter. Such staff must merely be convinced that their colleagues are helpful, their tasks are achievable, and their environment is hospitable to their work, despite the effort the library has specifically expended to ensure that none of this is true. An additional fallacy useful to instill is the notion that no one in their position anywhere else is experiencing any difficulty, ergo something must be wrong with them or their approach; emailing them "how we done it good" articles from the literature, especially when the articles describe tools or services that local staff have neither resources nor authority to implement, works well. These tactics are quite likely to cause the initiative's staff members to burn out and depart. Especially adept brainwashing may even convince them to leave the library profession altogether, doing a service to all of academic librarianship by reducing the chance that scholarly communication initiatives will arise (much less succeed) elsewhere. Moreover, any library service is most politically vulnerable when unstaffed; all opportunities to kill a scholarly communication initiative outright while it has no voice among library staff should be seized upon.

All-staff meetings and conferences offer unique opportunities for every librarian to reinforce the fundamental attribution error. Onstage or off-, widespread expression of skepticism toward scholarly communication initiatives will affirm opposition to them, demoralize those involved in them, and convince the undecided that opposing them is the smart career move. Individuals need not even be explicitly targeted; the fundamental attribution error ensures that the default assumption will be that those with documented responsibility for scholarly communication initiatives must be solely and uniquely responsible for any challenges or failures such initiatives encounter.

Microaggressions

Chester M. Pierce (1974) famously coined the term *microaggression* to mean "brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults toward people of other races." The concept has since had its scope expanded beyond racism to include many other situations of repeated small-scale barbs that erode targets' morale over time. Given the scant staffing and minimal political capital of scholarly communication initiatives, microaggressions are an easy, safe, devastating weapon against them. Those who employ this tactic must be sure to keep the pressure on; repetition is the key to microaggressions' success.

The hypocrisies mentioned above often serve as microaggressions. Other useful microaggressions may either disparage scholarly communication reform in general, or be specific to local scholarly communication initiatives and their staff. Generally-aimed microaggressions that discredit open access, scholarly communication reform, and library support for such reform include:

- calling scholarly communication initiatives a fad, accusing them of stealing resources from more fundamental library services, or calling them "the future" with the implication that they are presently ignorable;
- characterizing scholarly communication work as unimportant or "not library work";
- attacking or dismissing pro-open-access reports, news articles, and blog posts (ideally within earshot of scholarly communication staff);
- forwarding anti-open-access reports, news articles, and blog posts to the most comprehensive available library-staff mailing list;
- forwarding reports, news articles, and blog posts critical of libraries' contribution to open access to the most comprehensive available library-staff mailing list;
- writing and publishing such reports, articles, and blog posts;
- expressing open, public distrust in digital publishing, open-access publishing, repositories (of any sort, disciplinary as well as institutional), and bibliometric measures aside from the journal impact factor;
- expressing open, public distrust in open-access publishing because of scam open-access journals, while suppressing discussion of the many quality problems in toll-access journals (Guterman, 2008; Fang, Steen, & Casadevall, 2012); and
- expressing incredulity that change in scholarly communication systems (or in allied efforts, such as digital preservation) is in any way feasible, much less necessary and sustainable.

Microaggressions specifically trained on local initiatives and staff include:

- drawing lines in the sand around the library and its services (e.g. in library mission and vision statements, library strategic plans, or librarian publications) that do not include scholarly communication or any area with which it overlaps (e.g. digital preservation);
- implying that scholarly communication staff chose their jobs because the topic is "hot" and they are venal, not because they enjoy or believe in their work;
- asking scholarly communication staff "What exactly do you *do* all day?";
- scoffing at scholarly communication staff with significant technical skill, e.g. by implying that they could secure far more important and better-remunerated jobs than the one they have;
- hiding or discarding scholarly communication outreach materials (see Figure 1);
- insisting that patrons use only "trusted, quality" materials, defining that set as "materials the library has bought" and excluding open-access materials from it (Dorner, 2012); and
- for libraries with digital collections separate from the IR, cherrypicking projects away from the IR and its staff without crediting or involving them, regardless of how much work they did.

Figure 1. Properly-placed scholarly communication outreach materials: an untidy pile on an unused desk concealed behind boxes of other unwanted detritus

Photo: Dorothea Salo, CC-BY 2013

For best results, microaggressions should be employed where the target is isolated among a group of hostile colleagues (ideally including several higher in seniority and authority than the target), or otherwise prevented from responding. Microaggressions should also be

employed within earshot of librarians sympathetic to scholarly communication initiatives, to isolate scholarly communication staff further from the rest of the library and to intimidate potential allies into remaining silent and refusing help. Any attempt by targets to respond to microaggressions, or evinced frustration in the face of microaggressions, should be reported to the targets' management chain as a failure of collegiality.

TIPS FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF LIBRARIANS

Library administrators

Library administrators are naturally in the best position to ruin scholarly communication planning processes, not least because they control the planning committee's membership and charge. Even when planning ends, they can easily starve scholarly communication initiatives and staff of infrastructure, budget resources, and authority to plan and execute events and services. Administrators can also raise false hopes in scholarly communication staff by loudly and publicly touting their commitment to scholarly communication initiatives (e.g. in strategic plans), then dash those hopes by starving the initiatives of resources. For the greatest impact, these initiatives should be defunded without discussing the defunding with initiative staff, or even warning them of potential trouble. If the scholarly communication initiative is dependent on open-source software, administrators can refuse to assign in-kind or budgetary-support resources to further development of that software; should it die, the library will have an excellent excuse to discontinue the initiative reliant on it.

Beyond that, administrators should dissociate themselves from scholarly communication initiatives as much as possible, never mentioning them to other library staff or to campus stakeholders, certainly never lending them any of administrators' own political capital. Administrators should not offer scholarly communication staff any help whatever with policy, strategy, or tactics; this does extra damage when that staff consists mostly or entirely of a new librarian who still needs to develop political capital and planning skills. Should staff explicitly approach administrators for advice, administrators should speak in as confusingly self-contradictory a fashion as possible, e.g. calling staff "change agents" while insisting that they "not rock the boat." Especially wily administrators will insist that staff open discussions with, or even defer to, powerful campus stakeholders known to be most skeptical and intransigent about change in scholarly communication. Administrators bent on microaggression should consider inviting representatives of anti-open-access publishers to speak to library staff, making clear that scholarly communication staff members will have no chance to debate or even respond, and indeed are required to remain silent on pain of disciplinary action for failure of collegiality. Finally, administrators should prevent scholarly communication staff from offering useful services allied to the useless ones they have been directed to offer; staff associated with an IR, for example, should be prevented from offering ETDs, digitization services, or copyright advising, all of which faculty or students often appreciate. An effective "kill it with kindness" approach is to express fear that the service will be so successful that the library and its staff will be unable to absorb the new workload. This traps the service coming and going, leaving it no way to be "just successful enough."

Library administrators should also criticize whatever policy, strategy, and tactics the initiative staff adopt as publicly as the library's culture allows; other librarians should be tacitly encouraged to do so as well. For example, during verbal progress reports on the initiative, especially when other campus stakeholders are auditors, administrators should visibly demonstrate their disappointment in the initiative's progress and its staff's efforts; one heavy sigh or shake of the head is worth a thousand words, and vastly less accountable to boot. Ordinary staff-demoralization tactics such as ignoring honors received by scholarly communication staff, forgetting their names and titles, bypassing their publications, disregarding their suggestions and requests, calling on external sources of relevant expertise rather than theirs, and leaving them off relevant library and institutional committees can also be expected to have their accustomed impacts.

Employee review processes offer special opportunity to confuse and dismay scholarly communication staff. Supervisors should lean heavily on the fundamental attribution error, making clear that scholarly communication staff themselves are solely responsible for any difficulties they encounter. When these staff express concern about their work environment, they should be ordered to be more collegial and their concerns should be ignored; if they express actual frustration, it should be treated as an occasion for discipline. Administrators

can also monitor the social-media presences of scholarly communication staff for actionable signs of frustration, especially those staff members too savvy to provide more obvious excuses deserving of discipline. The truth value of the offending staff members' assertions or frustrations should be irrelevant to disciplinary measures taken, though it must be noted that shoot-the-messenger disciplinary measures are most feasible where librarians are not faculty and do not have academic freedom of expression.

Finally, staff purges provide a main chance to destroy scholarly communication initiatives by eliminating their staff first, sending a clear message to the rest of the library about how expendable these initiatives are and how their staff should be treated (McMaster University Faculty Association, 2009).

Liaisons, catalogers, and other normal librarians

As discussed above, any librarian at any level in the library's organizational hierarchy can engage in brainwashing of and microaggressions toward scholarly communication staff. Beyond that, foot-dragging and complaining often work well (Palmer, Dill, & Christie 2009; Malenfant, 2010). When offered training in scholarly communication or research-data management, library staff should refuse it; pleading time poverty and lack of understanding are such common excuses as to be unassailable. When asked to participate in scholarly communication initiatives, staff should again refuse, insisting on prior training (which, of course, should be refused when offered).

Since normal librarians heavily outnumber scholarly communication staff, they should use their dead weight to advantage. For example, normal librarians can easily band together on committees to vote down scholarly communication initiatives. They should also defeat scholarly communication issues in consensus-based environments simply by holding firm against any consensus decision that might benefit a scholarly communication initiative. Their numbers also allow them to filibuster scholarly communication agenda items by holding the floor long enough to ensure that the meeting ends before those agenda items can be reached. Committee chairs should assist this process by ensuring that scholarly communication is at the bottom of any agenda where it appears.

Liaison librarians should insist on acting as gatekeepers to their designated departments and their faculty however possible, as this adds significant communication overhead to a scholarly communication initiative while hindering campus communication about open access and related inanities. Liaisons should insist that all communication with faculty—from casual hallway conversations all the way up to formal presentations at faculty meetings—by scholarly communication staff go through them. Liaisons should immediately complain up the scholarly communication staff's chain of command about any conversation between scholarly communication staff and faculty that they hear about directly from faculty. Naturally, liaisons should offer exactly no assistance to scholarly communication staff in return for these burdensome notice requirements. Moreover, liaisons should never introduce scholarly communication staff to their faculty, nor speak to faculty themselves about scholarly communication issues except to spread misinformation, fear, uncertainty, and doubt.

Liaisons and other collection-development librarians should resist any effort to apply acquisitions resources to scholarly communication reform. Author-side fee funds, open-access publisher memberships, local publishing initiatives, and open educational resource projects should all be forced to seek funding elsewhere. Similarly, collection-development librarians should double down on Big Deal serials support, loudly decrying any suggestion that serials, even core serials, are in fact too expensive to afford and may need to be canceled (Rogers, 2012b).

Technical-services librarians should refuse to assist institutional-repository and faculty-publication-database initiatives with name-authority management and bibliographic searches. They are also in a unique position to employ the fundamental attribution error by blaming scholarly communication staff for the poor-quality and incomplete metadata often found in IRs and library-sponsored publishing initiatives and publication databases, which of course they should not offer to help correct and augment. At all times, technical-services librarians should make clear that redundant cataloging of commodity materials is vastly more important than original-metadata capture and augmentation for the materials found in an IR.

Systems librarians and library developers should unequivocally bar scholarly communication staff, regardless of their level of technology skill, from

back-end access to software. They should also deny scholarly communication initiatives their time and expertise; library administrators, who always have higher-priority information technology projects than scholarly communication initiatives, are often natural allies in this endeavor. Systems staff should not help less-technical scholarly communication staff frame bug reports or requests for improvement; if they must, they may request bugfixes and improvements that help them alone, but they should never request usability or feature improvements. Under no circumstances should library developers volunteer time to scholarly communication-related open-source software projects, nor should they offer support for these projects on mailing lists even when they understand the software well. Alternately, confusing and insulting help-seekers on these mailing lists is an advanced microaggression tactic available to developers.

CONCLUSIONS

Many of the techniques suggested in this paper do not apply solely to scholarly communication initiatives. Properly deployed, they can scuttle almost any sort of risky, faddish new initiative in academic libraries:

- information-literacy instruction (Weiner, 2010);
- digitization, on any scale (Daigle, 2012);
- embedded librarianship (Kesselman & Watstein, 2009);
- assessment (Hufford, 2013);
- librarywide project-portfolio management (Vinopal, 2012);
- research-data stewardship (Salo, 2010); and
- digital-humanities initiatives (Posner, 2013).

After all, the academic library as formalized in the 1970s and 1980s has clearly reached its Platonic paradigmatic ideal, from which any change can only mean devolution (Mason, 1972).

AUTHOR'S NOTE

The tone of this piece was indirectly inspired by the immortal Machiavelli and Swift, and directly inspired by the unsurpassed tongue-in-cheek closing keynote "Extensible stability, open standards, and other cameleopards" by C.M. Sperberg McQueen at the Markup Technologies '99 conference. Its content largely derives from many, many sad and infuriating stories told me by treasured professional colleagues and former students, whose honesty, perseverance, and courage I gratefully acknowledge, and hope to requite by telling their stories openly when they themselves dare not.

While nothing in this paper was invented from whole cloth, and I have done my best to cite publicly-documented evidence where it exists, such public evidence does not exist for many of the behaviors I recount, not even in the form of anecdote. This constitutes an obvious and substantial weakness in the paper. Rigorous qualitative and quantitative research aimed at establishing the prevalence of these behaviors and quantifying the damage they do would be most welcome, provided that research subjects still employed in scholarly communication can be protected from workplace retaliation. (I am far from the only former scholarly communication librarian; qualitative investigations of professionals like me would naturally incur less risk to subjects.)

I should note that authors other than myself cited in this paper were not in on the joke. I intentionally sprinkled "stunt citations" throughout (especially in the Introduction and Conclusion) that flatly contradict the text associated with them. I apologize to authors whose work I have thus traduced, and I exhort readers not to assume that what my text implies about any citation is true. Bibliometricians: have fun untangling what citations mean in this one!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Lisa Schiff for suggesting that I write this, as well as to Marisa Ramírez and the rest of the JLSC editorial team for encouragement and many refinements, and to Joe Kraus and several other librarians who do not wish to be named for topic suggestions, horror stories to write about, beta-reading, and bibliographic assistance.

REFERENCES

Berrett, D. (2012, April 1). Scholarly groups' choices yield diverging fortunes. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Scholarly-Groups-Choices/131396/

Brown, A. (2009, April 9). "Open Access" repository to house works of OSU faculty publishers. *The Daily Barometer*. Corvallis, OR. Retrieved from http://www.dailybarometer.com/news/open-access-repository-to-house-works-of-osu-faculty-publishers-1.2380645

Buehler, M. A., & Trauernicht, M. S. (2007). From digital library to institutional repository: a brief look at one library's path. *OCLC Systems & Services*, *23*(4), 382–394. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10650750710831529

Burris, B. (2009). Institutional repositories and faculty participation: encouraging deposits by advancing personal goals. *Public Services Quarterly*, *5*(1), 69–79. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15228950802634212

Connell, T. H. (2011). The use of institutional repositories: the Ohio State University experience. *College & Research Libraries*, *72*(3), 253–274.

Connell, T. H., & Cetwinski, T. (2010). The impact of institutional repositories on technical services. *Technical Services Quarterly*, *27*(4), 331–346. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07317131003765993

Crow, R. (2002). The Case for Institutional Repositories: a SPARC Position Paper. Washington D.C.: Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition. Retrieved from http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/ir_final_release_102.pdf

Daigle, B. J. (2012). The digital transformation of special collections. *Journal of Library Administration*, *52*(3/4), 244–264. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2012.684504

Davis, P. M., & Connolly, M. J. L. (2007). Institutional repositories: evaluating the reasons for non-use of Cornell University's installation of DSpace. *D-Lib Magazine*, *13*(3/4). Retrieved from http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march07/davis/03davis.html

Davis-Kahl, S., Hensley, M. K., & Shreeves, S. L. (2011, March 31). Completing the research cycle: The role of libraries in the publication and dissemination of undergraduate student research. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2142/27744

Digital Preservation Coalition, & University of London Computer Centre. (n.d.). DPTP: The Digital Preservation Training Programme. DPTP. Retrieved April 3, 2013, from http://www.dptp.org/

Dorner, D. G., & Revell, J. (2012). Subject librarians' perceptions of institutional repositories as an information resource. *Online Information Review*, *36*(2), 261–277. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14684521211229066

Eschenfelder, K. R. (2009). Controlling Access to and Use of Online Cultural Collections: A Survey of U.S. Archives, Libraries and Museums for IMLS. (Report). Retrieved from http://dlist.sir.arizona.edu/2572/

Fang, F. C., Steen, R. G., & Casadevall, A. (2012). Misconduct accounts for the majority of retracted scientific publications. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *109*(42), 17028–17033. http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1212247109

Fay, E. (2010). Repository software comparison: building digital library infrastructure at LSE. *Ariadne*, (64), 17–17.

Ferreira, M., Rodrigues, E., Baptista, A. A., & Saraiva, R. (2008). Carrots and sticks: some ideas on how to create a successful institutional repository. *D-Lib Magazine*, *14*(1/2). http://dx.doi.org/10.1045/january2008-ferreira

Foster, A. L. (2008a, March 13). U. of Iowa writing students revolt against a plan they say would give away their work on the web. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/U-of-Iowa-Writing-Students/590

Foster, A. L. (2008b, March 18). U. of Iowa reverses new policy that would have made nearly all theses freely available online. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Students-Protect-Their-Novels/601

Foster, N. F., & Gibbons, S. (2005). Understanding faculty to improve content recruitment for institutional repositories. *D-Lib Magazine*, *11*(01). http://dx.doi.org/10.1045/january2005-foster

Gaffney, M. (2008). Involving the library and campus community in institutional repository projects. *Serials Librarian*, *55*(4), 568–576. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03615260802380411

Guterman, L. (2008, April 16). Scientists may be putting their own names on papers written by companies. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://chronicle.com/article/Scientists-May-Be-Putting/695

Higginbotham, A. (n.d.). Open Access Week. Retrieved April 10, 2013, from http://www.openaccessweek.org/

Hirtle, P. B., Hudson, E., & Kenyon, A. T. (2009). Copyright and Cultural Institutions: Guidelines for U.S. Libraries, Archives, and Museums. Cornell University Library. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1813/14142

Hixson, C. (2006). If we build it, will they come (eventually)? Scholarly communication and institutional repositories. *Serials Librarian*, *50*(1/2), 197–209. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J123v50n01_18

Hixson, C., & Cracknell, L. (2007). How to implement an institutional repository. *Serials Librarian*, *52*(1/2), 37–54. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J123v52n01_05

Hufford, J. R. (2013). A review of the literature on assessment in academic and research libraries, 2005 to August 2011. *portal: Libraries & the Academy*, *13*(1), 5–35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2013.0005

Iandoli, L. (2009, May 5). Association of Research Libraries: Position Descriptions Collection. Retrieved April 10, 2013, from http://www.arl.org/sc/institute/fair/position-descriptions.shtml

Jenkins, B., Breakstone, E., & Hixson, C. (2005). Content in, content out: the dual roles of the reference librarian in institutional repositories. *Reference Services Review*, *33*(3), 312–324. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00907320510611348

Joint, N. (2006). Institutional repositories, self-archiving and the role of the library. *Library Review*, *55*(2), 81–84. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00242530610649576

Kesselman, M. A., & Watstein, S. B. (2009). Creating opportunities: embedded librarians. *Journal of Library Administration*, *49*(4), 383–400. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01930820902832538

Kinkus, J. (2007). Project management skills: a literature review and content analysis of librarian position announcements. *College & Research Libraries*, *68*(4), 352–363.

Koopman, A., & Kipnis, D. (2009). Feeding the fledgling repository: starting an institutional repository at an academic health sciences library. *Medical Reference Services Quarterly*, *28*(2), 111–122. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02763860902816628

Leary, H., Lundstrom, K., & Martin, P. (2012). Copyright solutions for institutional repositories: A collaboration with subject librarians. *Journal of Library Innovation*, *3*(1), 101–110.

Lucky, J. T. (2012, October 18). Faculty question future of libraries. The Harvard Crimson. Cambridge, MA. Retrieved from http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2012/10/18/faculty-question-library-future/

Lynch, C. (2003). Institutional Repositories: Essential Infrastructure for Scholarship in the Digital Age (No. 226). Association of Research Libraries. Retrieved from http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/br/br226/br226ir.shtml

Madsen, D., & Oleen, J. (2013). Staffing and workflow of a maturing institutional repository. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, *1*(3). http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1063

Malenfant, K. (2010). Leading change in the system of scholarly communication: a case study of engaging liaison librarians for outreach to faculty. *College and Research Libraries*, *71*(1), 63–76.

Maloney, K., Antelman, K., Arlitsch, K., & Butler, J. (2010). Future leaders' views on organizational culture. *College & Research Libraries*, *71*(4), 322–347.

Mason, E. (1972). Automation, or Russian roulette? In F. W. Lancaster (Ed.), Applications of on-line computers to library problems (pp. 138–156). Presented at the 1972 Clinic on Library Applications of Data Processing, Urbana, IL: Graduate School of Library Science. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2142/872

McDowell, C. S. (2007). Evaluating institutional repository deployment in American academe since early 2005: Repositories by the numbers, Part 2. *D-Lib Magazine*, *13*(9/10). http://dx.doi.org/10.1045/september2007-mcdowell

McMaster University Faculty Association. (2009, April 27). Statement of the MUFA Librarians regarding the firing of Donna Millard and Barbara McDonald. Retrieved from http://www.mcmaster.ca/mufa/LibrarianDismissal2009.pdf

Mercer, H. (2011). Almost halfway there: an analysis of the open access behaviors of academic librarians. *College & Research Libraries*, *72*(5), 443–453.

Palmer, K. L., Dill, E., & Christie, C. (2009). Where there's a will there's a way?: Survey of academic librarian attitudes about open access. *College & Research Libraries*, *70*(4), 315–335.

Pierce, C. (1974). Psychiatric problems of the Black minority. In S. Arieti (Ed.), *American handbook of psychiatry* (2nd ed., pp. 512–523). New York: Basic Books.

Posner, M. (2013). No half measures: overcoming common challenges to doing digital humanities in the library. J*ournal of Library Administration*, *53*(1), 43–52. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2013.756694

Rogers, J. (2012a, October 12). Walking away from the American Chemical Society. Attempting Elegance. Retrieved April 3, 2013, from http://www.attemptingelegance.com/?p=1765

Rogers, J. (2012b, September 27). we are not the ones who failed. Attempting Elegance. Retrieved April 10, 2013, from http://www.attemptingelegance.com/?p=1785

Rosenblum, B. (2008). Developing new skills and expertise to support digital scholarship and scholarly communication. *IFLA Conference Proceedings*, 1–7.

Sale, A. (2007). The patchwork mandate. *D-Lib Magazine*, *13*(1/2). http://dx.doi.org/10.1045/january2007-sale

Salo, D. (2008a). Innkeeper at the roach motel. *Library Trends*, *57*(2).

Salo, D. (2008b, May 6). Courtesy. Caveat Lector. Retrieved April 3, 2013, from http://cavlec.yarinareth.net/2008/05/courtesy-2/

Salo, D. (2008c, October 31). Miniature disasters and minor catastrophes. Caveat Lector. Retrieved April 3, 2013, from http://cavlec.yarinareth.net/2008/10/miniature-disasters-and-minor-catastrophes/

Salo, D. (2009). Name authority control in institutional repositories. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, *47*(3/4). Retrieved from http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1793/31735 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01639370902737232

Salo, D. (2010). Retooling libraries for the data challenge. *Ariadne*, (64). Retrieved from http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue64/salo

Samuels, R. G., & Griffy, H. (2012). Evaluating open source software for use in library initiatives: a case study involving electronic publishing. p*ortal: Libraries & the Academy*, *12*(1), 41–62. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2012.0007

Schonfeld, R. C., & Housewright, R. (2010). US Faculty Survey 2009. Ithaka S+R. Retrieved from http://www.sr.ithaka.org/research-publications/us-faculty-survey-2009

Shreeves, S. L., & Cragin, M. H. (2008). Introduction: institutional repositories: current state and future. *Library Trends*, *57*(2), 89–97. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/lib.0.0037

sitemaps.org - Home. (2008, February 27). Retrieved April 8, 2013, from http://www.sitemaps.org/

Swan, A. (2005). *Open access self-archiving: an author study*. Truro: Key Perspectives.

Trithemius, J. (1494). *De laude scriptorum*. Mainz: Petrus Friedberg.

Troll Covey, D. (2009). Self-archiving journal articles: a case study of faculty practice and missed opportunity. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *9*(2), 223–251. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.0.0042

Vinopal, J. (2012). Project portfolio management for academic libraries: A gentle introduction. *College & Research Libraries*, *73*(4), 379–389.

Weiner, S. A. (2010). Information literacy: a neglected core competency. EDUCAUSE Quarterly. Retrieved from http://www.educause.edu/ero/article/information-literacy-neglected-core-competency

Wilson, M. C., & Jantz, R. C. (2011). Building value-added services for institutional repositories (IRs): modeling the Rutgers experience. Presented at the Social Science Libraries: A Bridge to Knowledge for Sustainable Development, Havana, Cuba: International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. Retrieved from http://mss3.libraries.rutgers.edu/dlr/showfed.php?pid=rutgers-lib:36023

Wrenn, G., Mueller, C. J., & Shellhase, J. (2009). Institutional repository on a shoestring. *D-Lib Magazine*, *15*(1/2). http://dx.doi.org/10.1045/january2009-wrenn

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Dorothea Salo
Faculty Associate

School of Library & Information Studies
University of Wisconsin-Madison
84261 Helen C White Hall
600 N Park St
Madison, WI 53706

salo@wisc.edu