CAS Information Services
Newsletter (May 2016)

1. Predatory Publishers: An Interview with Jeffrey Beall, Pt. 1

A librarian and associate professor at the University of Colorado, Denver, Jeffrey Beall is known as the “go-to guy” when it comes to checking out the validity, authenticity, or value of those incessant email invitations to publish in a scholarly journal or serve on their editorial boards. CAS library has been increasingly interested in his work after the publication of his article on Bentham Open, a publisher that contacted CAS faculty back in 2008. To illustrate the need for an authoritative resource, we recently asked a group of researchers at the Center of Alcohol Studies not to delete these invitations as they would normally do, but instead to forward them along to us. In a short, three-month period, over 400 emails were collected by CAS faculty, who were willing to play along. All met the criteria of “predatory publisher,” a term Beall coined to describe questionable scholarly Open Access publishers.

Jeffrey Beall has been running a blog for several years now called Scholarly Open Access. His page features a list of “Potential, possible, or probable predatory scholarly Open-Access publishers,” also known as “Beall’s list” of predatory publishers. Additionally, he runs a list of standalone journals.

His list of criteria for determining predatory Open Access publishers, intended to provide a framework for evaluating and determining predatory journals, recommends assessing editors and staff; business management, including transparency; integrity; journal standards; and publishing practices, many of which can be clearly noticeable in the very first contact email, such as the ones collected by CAS faculty. Beall was recently profiled alongside two others doing similar work in a piece entitled “Cleaning Up Bad Science” for a news program broadcasted by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Beall’s list is frequently updated, growing from 18 publishers in 2011 to 923 in 2016 (Fig. 1) with the hope “that tenure and promotion committees can also decide for themselves how importantly or
not to rate articles published in these journals in the context of their own institutional standards and/or geo-cultural locus.”

Beall was one of the invited speakers at the joint conference of the Substance Abuse Librarians & Information Specialists and Association of Mental Health Librarians in Denver, May 4-7, 2016. We interviewed him at the Auraria Library, where he works as the Scholarly Communications Librarian.

What follows is a brief segment of a far longer conversation, Part 2 of which will be published in the next issue of SALIS News, freely available for a brief time after publication, but following that available only to SALIS members or SALIS News subscribers ($25 per year for non-SALIS members).

CAS: How did you get interested in the topic of predatory publishers?

Beall: In 2008 and 2009, I was on tenure track as an assistant professor, and I started to receive spam emails from library science journals. At that time, I was very interested in looking for new places to publish. I noticed that the journals’ spam emails had grammatical errors. They said “call for paper” instead of “call for papers.” They were new journals, often soliciting manuscript submissions for volume 1, issue 1. They were broad in scope, like International Journal of Library Science. They matched the scope of existing journals, so there wasn’t really a need for a new journal, as the coverage was exactly the same as existing journals. I started to notice them, and at that time I would print the spam emails out, and I had the printouts in a folder. I had an old blog, and eventually I compiled them all and made a list out of them on the blog. I think it was in 2009 or 2010, and there were 18 on it. Nobody paid any attention to it.

A year later, I created a new edition of the list. In December 2011, it was the third edition of the list. I updated it once a year. That’s when it started to go viral, in December 2011 with nurses and nursing researchers. Somebody sent it to a nursing listerv, and then it just hit a whole bunch of other lists, and it went crazy from there. I really had no idea that any of this would happen. I was just a quiet cataloger, working here in the back, just cataloging. I never imagined that any of this would happen.

CAS: Why did a librarian pick up on this trend?

Beall: I was a cataloger for most of my career. My lists are almost like a catalog, an index. Also, academic librarians are constantly reinventing themselves. We don’t have very many physical collections any more. As we reinvent ourselves, one of the ways we’re doing that is by providing services to researchers on campus at the university, and I’m following that. I’m helping researchers here and hopefully elsewhere avoid bad journals.

CAS: Do they appreciate what you are doing locally?

Beall: Some of the researchers here that know about my work are very happy. They email me and ask for advice on particular journal publishers. It’s a challenge for the university, because a lot of the publishers attack back. One of the ways they do that is by using something called the “heckler’s veto.” If a publisher is angry at me, its representatives will send emails to the provost, the chancellor. They go to the website and they grab emails from the administration page and send emails to all the librarians: “Jeffrey Beall is a crook!” They annoy them and they try to manipulate them into telling me to shut up. So,
it’s the heckler’s veto. The university knows about this, fortunately. But it’s a hassle, it’s annoying.

CAS: What does the university say about potential lawsuits, or any kind of liability issues?

Beall: Well, there have been no lawsuits. There have been a few threats of lawsuits. I’m on a first name basis with the university’s lawyer. I meet in his office with him sometimes. I’m supposed to go next week, to talk about publishers. But because I’m a faculty member, this is my research interest. And research is protected by academic freedom. I am very grateful for that.

CAS: It is interesting that it originated from a library journal. Most of the journals that we’re seeing nowadays are in science and medicine.

Beall: Correct, where the grants are.

CAS: Right. That’s why we think addiction is another field just coming up. It’s an applied science used by clinicians. Do you find any specific applications of predatory publishing to addiction science? Or applied sciences in general?

Beall: I’ve seen it happening with drugs. New drugs. People invent a drug, and they want to make it look good, so they write articles about the drug. And it’s not a real drug, so it won’t pass peer review. So they write up articles and send them to predatory journals, then they try to sell the drug to investors or patients, by pointing to these articles in predatory journals. The investors or the patients don’t know about predatory journals. They think they’re real journals; they appear authentic at first.

That’s happened with a drug called GcMAF. So that’s a specific example. Medical research is the most important and most crucial research of all that’s done, because it deals with the health and welfare of human beings. The potential exists for research done in predatory journals to be translated into clinical practice. It could be bogus research, or research that is not properly peer reviewed, and that can be potentially dangerous.

CAS: Which groups of researchers do you consider the most vulnerable?

Beall: Any researcher with grant money. Predatory publishers know that researchers have grants, and that grants can be used to pay for article processing charges. So that’s why there are so many predatory medical journals. It is probably the same with addiction science. Society has a big interest in reducing the number of people who are addicted, so it invests money into finding solutions for that. Predatory publishers obviously know that. They have done their marketing research.

CAS: What about younger researchers? Early career researchers, or entry-level people?

Beall: They’re the most vulnerable, because they’re often unfamiliar with the scholarly publishing system. The predatory publishers use tricks in their spam email. They’ll send you a personalized spam email. They’ll praise your first paper, your most recent paper and, when you’re a young researcher, or you’re a PhD student, or a post-doc, or if you’re on tenure track, you exclaim, “Wow, this is great!” So they exploit them, they pander to them, and invite a new paper. Unfortunately, it often is successful. The key is to educate people as much as possible about predatory publishers and how they operate. That’s what I try to do.

CAS: What about non-native speakers of English? They seem to be a very vulnerable group. Their written English proficiency is fine, but they may not always read the fine print.

Beall: What I say in my talks is if English is not your native language, it’s harder to judge the authenticity of a publisher’s website (assuming the publisher’s website is in English). I learned that from emails I’ve gotten from all over the world. It’s really hard. I speak Spanish, so if a publisher’s website was in Spanish, it would be hard for me to tell if it was authentic or not. You have to have almost native fluency in the language.
CAS: That leads to a question about your process, which is more of an art than a science. As you read through the text and say to yourself, “that doesn’t sound quite right.” For the rest of us, you list your criteria on your website. Can you explain how you came to develop these?

Beall: Basically, if you look at those things, there is lack of transparency, use of deceit, and a failure to follow standards. Most of the judgments I make are really easy, because the publishers so clearly are predatory and meet the criteria. I prefer to make the judgments at the publisher level whenever possible. I don’t have time to look at every individual journal.

CAS: Unless they are standalone journals, sometimes.

Beall: Right, right. Then there’s no choice. And that’s what my second list includes. I often find that they just threw a journal together really quickly. Also, the titles are often broad in scope. The journals duplicate the coverage of one or more existing journals. Many academic fields are already saturated with journals, and they don’t need new ones.

CAS: Can the name of the journal be telling, even if you’re not familiar with a particular field? Too broad or too similar to an existing one?

Beall: Unfortunately, you can’t copyright a journal title. You can trademark it, but most publishers don’t trademark their titles. So there’s almost nothing you can do about hijacking a journal.

CAS: There’s the answer. That’s why a librarian. Because you know how to do all this. You know the resources, you know the tools.

Beall: Sometimes when people complain about what I’m doing, I’ll say that researchers write book reviews. And my work is essentially a review of serials. And who better to write such reviews than a librarian? So it’s just like, my lists are essentially collective reviews of serials. The titles look like good titles when viewed on a CV.

CAS: In your expert opinion, do you think people are fooled into publishing in these journals, or are they just trying to find a shortcut?

Beall: It’s both.

CAS: Some are just playing along to get the extra CV line, I guess?

Beall: Yes. For tenure, promotion, annual evaluation, they use it for jobs, for the CV.

CAS: Just padding the list, making it longer. Is it the same thing with editorial boards?

Beall: Well, editorial boards are different. Some of the journals add researcher’s names without their permission. But, yes, people often become editorial board members of predatory journals just to get the easy credit — another line for the CV.

CAS: In terms of solutions, where do you find the role of peer review? Do you think there should be any kind of protocols or accreditation or anything like that?

Beall: That’s a good question, actually. The scholarly publishing industry is not policing itself well. Other fields, other industries, have accreditation agencies or companies, but scholarly publishing hasn’t really done that. And it really needs to. It’s letting the whole system go into chaos. But, at the same time, Open Access advocates have a lot of power and a lot of influence. They keep continuing to push author-pays Open Access even when there’s a lot of evidence that it’s a very problematic publishing model.

CAS: Do you see a solution? A way we could separate them? Such as a badge of honor or logo, an accreditation process?

Beall: The predatory publishers would copy that in a second. If you look at many of their journal websites now, they all have impact factors.

CAS: Right. The fake impact factor.
Beall: So they’re copying. They’ll put the logo for COPE on their websites. They’ll emblazon the logo for EBSCO on their websites. They have like a hundred logos on their websites, yet they don’t have any authentic connection to any of those companies. So no, I don’t think that the badge would work. The only thing I know to do is education. And the other thing, and people tell me not to say this, but—the subscription model has a built in validation feature. If the journal publishes junk, we cancel the subscription. With Open Access journals, there’s no subscription to cancel. The authors are the customers. That’s the problem. It’s a flawed model. So, do we go back to the subscription model?

CAS: It is not just journal publishing any more, but books and conferences. “We want you to be a guest lecturer,” etc. Have you found that it expands beyond just journals, and do you keep track of those? I suppose you could call some of these “predatory conferences.”

Beall: No, I limit my work to scholarly Open Access journals. I do blog about the conferences, because I think it is important to warn people about them, but I just don’t have the time to draw up a list. They’re ephemeral; they appear and disappear really fast. Dana Roth at Cal Tech has a small list of some of the worst ones. But conferences are expanding like crazy, especially in East Asia, and the spamming for them is growing like crazy. I just don’t have time to develop another list.

CAS: Which, I guess leads me to my next question. Why is it only you that we hear about when we talk about predatory publishers? Why don’t we ever hear anyone else?

Beall: I would welcome competition, because I can’t do this forever. I might burn out, although I’ve been threatening that for years. I don’t know why it is. I wish more people would do it. I wish someone would find a better way to do what I’m doing or compete with me in some way. Most academic librarians are pro-Open Access and very idealistic in that they don’t want to admit that there are any problems with the Gold Open Access model — strong problems. It also takes a lot of time to do this.

So, I wish somebody else would take this on. There’s also this thing called Think Check Submit, which is an attempt to compete with me, but it hasn’t really taken off very much. I think it’s kind of ineffectual. Unfortunately it hasn’t been very helpful. It’s a mere slogan.

--Judit Ward and William Bejarano

See Jeffrey Beall’s blog:

For more, see the following LibGuides

Open Access / Predatory Publishers by Dana Roth, Caltech
http://libguides.caltech.edu/content.php?pid=80242

Author Beware from Research Impact and Evaluation (Washington University in St. Louis)

Avoid predatory publishing (part of a Guide to Academic Publishing, from Royal Roads University, UK)

Predatory Publishers (part of a Guide to Scholarly Communications, from University of Witwatersrand, South Africa)

Evaluating Health Literature from the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (Toronto)
2. Tweeting for non-birders: Twitter usage in academia

A previous and emphatic reluctance to engage in social media, particularly Twitter, is related to my profound distaste for commercials and inanity. It’s an attitude that my millennial children and friends describe as curmudgeonly. I resisted the curmudgeon label with the “everyone is too busy to check everything” defense, although, I know that part of the reluctance is based in crankiness.

The contemporary climate of more/faster engagement means I can get the news from the New York Times app just as well as Twitter, without as much of the advertising noise. Instagram is replete with all the cute-pet-of-the-day images anyone could possibly ever need. Everybody knows Google is reading our minds and taking over the world. Possibly, that’s enough? Maybe not. On May 15, I got to hear President Obama speak at the Rutgers’ 250th Commencement. During the speech, I thought lots of things:

“This is so cool.”

“That’s the actual President!”

“Somebody did their research on Rutgers’ student life, for sure.”

“This is speech is so full of sound bites.”

A friend told me they followed the speech via Twitter, which I looked up later. In retrospect, the speech and the medium seemed to suit each other quite well.

With its 140 character limit, Twitter mandates brevity. I am sure someone cleverer than me has already established the Twitter-verse as the natural habitat of sound bites. The news cycle includes daily references to media-savvy politicians and their manufactured social media battles. Whether we communicate in this milieu or not, it is definitely an option on the social media meal plan.

Curiosity about science and health topics led me to the Twitter streams of a number of government organizations: CDC, HHS, NIAAA, NIH, and NLM. In exploring the accounts, I learned two new things. First, there was a lot of content to pique the interest, particularly related to current conversation on addiction. Second, that an ordinary user can see who a given organization is following. For example, NIAAA uses the twitter handle “@NIAAAnews,” and is followed by almost 15,000 users. The person(s) responsible for the @NIAAAnews stream follows about 300 other people or organizations. What is that activity like? Here are some tweets from the last month:

- @NIAAAnews announced the winner of its “wearable alcohol biosensor” challenge, a contest to reward the design of a devise to monitor blood alcohol levels in real-time

![Image of NIAAA news announcement](image-url)
• The reactions to the Addiction 2016 conference hosted at New York Academy of Sciences (@NYASciences).

• Scholarly and professional journals and societies share links to content.

• Advocacy groups and research organizations promote their ideas.

There is no dearth of interesting reading material and the ATD addiction-related field is definitely represented.

There is A LOT of promotion going on for sure. But setting that aside, what I found really fascinating is the question of who follows who. If you subscribe to the idea that Twitter is a form of conversation, then choosing to follow someone might suggest that their point of view is compelling, that there is an intrinsic value in their posts and the information they publicize.

As an example, the NYAS follows the Twitter accounts of Scripps Research Institute, Weill Cornell Medicine, Cal Tech, UC San Diego.

A tweet by SSA about the Jellinek articles in JSAD.
Neurosciences Department, the Rutgers SEBS, and more than forty (40) other colleges and universities. It also follows individual researchers like Dr. Staci Gruber (Harvard), Mike Thompson, MD, PhD (Vince Lombardi Cancer Clinic), and Christopher Mason (Weill Cornell Medicine).

The potential gains of tweeting about research is itself a focus of research. For their 2010 paper, “How and why scholars cite on Twitter,” Priem and Costello interviewed twenty-eight (28) academics from the sciences, social sciences and humanities and evaluated the contents of their tweets. Priem and Costello found that the “scholars sampled used Twitter to cite articles in a different way from traditional citations,” with about 50% of Twitter citations including direct links to sources and others linking to “an intermediary that links to a source or describes it.” Twitter citations had a discursive quality about them. One scholar likens citation tweeting to, “...bringing it up in a seminar or classroom situation. It’s about pointing people in the direction of things they would find interesting, rather than using it as evidence for something” (Priem and Costello, 2010).

Things happen quickly in the Twitter-verse. Priem and Costello (2010) found that about “40% of Twitter citations occurred within a week of the citation resources’ publication.” In studying chemistry blogs, Groth and Gurnsey (2010) noted a similar quality; they observed that “scientific discourse on the Web is more immediate, contextually relevant and has a larger non-technical focus than the academic literature.” In spite of the difference between traditional citation and Twitter, the scholars surveyed by Priem and Costello (2010) felt that tweets “represent and transmit scholarly impact.” Jeffery R. Young (2009) wrote “Twitter is quickly becoming a global faculty lounge,” offering “mundane details,” yes, but also the opportunity to “track down colleagues to collaborate with or get advice on how to improve your teaching and research.” It’s an opinion that Michael Wesch of Kansas State University seemed to share:

“I don’t use it for broadcasting my daily life, but for sharing interesting links, knowledge and ideas. It is also useful for more traditional research if you can form or tap into a good network” (Young, 2009).

A 2015 Pew research report found “65% of adults now use social networking sites,” almost ten times as many more from 2005 to 2015 (Perrin, 2015). Whether Pew-surveyed groups are actively tweeting or just following was not specified, neither was the level of interest in academic research gauged. I expect that a summary of the characterization of research-focused tweets is in the works somewhere. Hopefully, someone will tweet it at me.

References


--Maria Ortiz-Myers
3. Reading for Recovery: R4R on Social Media

The CAS Library is in the second year of the two-year ALA-funded Carnegie-Whitney project called R4R, Reading for Recovery. The project aims to create a tool to connect those with substance use disorders with appropriate reading materials and to promote bibliotherapy as a complementary treatment modality. The project is currently in the phase of collecting and evaluating materials based on the selection criteria already established in the previous phases. Also in focus now is how and where to share the wealth of information and how to provide the best discoverability of titles hidden on the shelves of public libraries for potential readers.

One of our primary concerns as we began working on the R4R project was how to ensure the information we compiled reached as broad an audience as possible. Simply identifying books of potential use in bibliotherapy would not be enough; we had to be sure that our recommendations reached the people who could actually make use of them. Ultimately, the high priority we placed on user accessibility led us to develop the R4R project across three different platforms: LibGuides, LibraryThing, and Goodreads.

The main hub of the project is the R4R LibGuide. LibGuides is a content management system used by thousands of libraries around the world. Customizable and easy to use, it offers librarians a way to link to outside resources, embed multimedia, and make their content available on social media. The platform has quickly become one of the most popular ways for libraries to create resources dedicated to specific topics of interest to patrons, and we felt it was a natural choice for promoting the R4R project.

We designed the R4R LibGuide around meeting the needs of three distinct user groups: librarians, counselors, and self-directed readers. For librarians looking to offer bibliotherapy collections and discussion groups, the guide offers suggestions on how to select materials and structure book club meetings. For counselors working with bibliotherapy patients, the guide offers advice on incorporating reading into a wider plan of treatment. For readers pursuing self-directed treatment, the guide offers recommendations on effective reading techniques. For all users, the LibGuide offers suggestions for reading materials, including direct links to holdings in the Rutgers University Libraries catalog.

Additionally, the LibGuide provides background information on the Carnegie-Whitney Grant, which funds the R4R project and was awarded to the CAS Library by the American Library Association. The guide also contains a section that defines bibliotherapy, outlining its underlying philosophy and methodology. Finally, we have compiled bibliographies of both popular and scholarly writings on bibliotherapy's use and effectiveness, with annotations of selected resources.

As a hub of information, the R4R LibGuide not only brings materials together but also links to outside resources. Two of those resources are the AlcoholLibrary LibraryThing account and the AlcoholLibrary Goodreads account, the other online components of the R4R project.
Turning to reader-focused social media platforms seemed a good no-cost first step towards promoting this project. LibraryThing (LT) and Goodreads (GR) are the two best known in this realm, and if their promotions are to be believed, they are visited by between 2 million and 40 million users, respectively. Both sites allow visitors to create free personal and/or organizational accounts, and are popular among academic and public libraries alike. LT charges a modest hosting fee after the addition of 200 items to a single account. GR does not charge hosting fees, instead including advertisements from authors and publishers.

Finding a book is terrifically easy. Both websites lead consumers to browse by title, author, genre or themes, and to locate them at nearby libraries or booksellers. User-generated ratings and tags facilitate discovery as well. It is just as simple to find or create a book group based on a theme or genre, and to write a book review.

The explicitly-stated pitch for both LT and GR is the opportunity to peruse friends’ bookshelves; users’ get recommendations from people with common interests. Alternatively, someone can investigate books anonymously, a particularly salient quality for readers wanting to address addiction concerns for themselves or others discreetly.

The CAS Library account in LT provides several lists, including one called R4R. This compilation highlights titles available from the CAS Library, as well as the larger RUL collection, and is modeled in part on the Recreational Reads (RecReads) collection created at the Kilmer Library. To enhance findability for other librarians, we added references to Library of Congress Subject Headings relevant to each book on the R4R list.

Among other groups, young adults aged 18-25 struggle with alcohol and drug addiction. To create a R4R list with applicability to our own Rutgers student community, we recruited two of the CASL undergraduate work-study students to contribute to the project by choosing a book from among our R4R candidate titles. Each then read, reviewed and tagged the selected book in whatever way was meaningful to them. Beyond a true expression of the social media ethos, this was a way of engaging our native Rutgers’ population. Their participation, we hope, will enhance the process of identifying stories that variety of potential users will find compelling and relevant to themselves or their loved ones. While the overall success of R4R is yet to be fully realized, our undergrad project assistants have received some well-deserved compliments for their work.

-William Haggis and Maria Ortiz-Myers

CAS Library Undergraduate Assistants Amber Yang and Aylin Guillen won the award for Best Process-Focused Poster at the 3rd Annual CAS Poster Session.
Addiction is, among many other things, bewildering and isolating. It’s an enormous and complex phenomenon that can take over every facet of a life, simultaneously outside the sufferer’s control and controlling him or her from within. It undermines the freedom of will and the autonomy of thought, both as concepts and in practice; and it turns relationships with other people into reflections or components of the addictive process (as the saying goes, addicts don’t have relationships, they take hostages). Part of what makes addiction so difficult to process, in short, is that it actively interferes with the relationships and faculties of mind that we rely on to process experience in the first place.

The Reading for Recovery (R4R) project offers an elegantly simple solution. We believe that reading and reflecting on written work about addiction, both fiction and nonfiction, can help people in recovery to come to terms with their experience, to better understand what can seem like an inscrutable compulsion. Further, narrative can help rebuild social connections: connections with the characters in a story and connections with fellow participants in the reading group. We’re particularly excited about this latter twist, which shifts European-style one-on-one bibliotherapy towards the “book club” model familiar to public libraries. This innovation makes bibilotherapy available to more people and – just as important – makes them available to one another to share experiences, insights, and support.

Generally speaking, when selecting reading material we’ve erred on the side of inclusion. Memoirs significantly dealing with addiction are a sizeable sub-genre unto themselves, and provide a rich resource for the project. Modern classics like Mary Karr’s Lit and Caroline Knapp’s Drinking: A Love Story are on the list, but we also include older works like Jack London’s John Barleycorn and Thomas de Quincey’s Confessions of an English Opium Eater. (The jury is out on how to classify James Frey’s notorious A Million Little Pieces; we’d hate to get on Oprah’s bad side!) We also bring in works of fiction that reflect significantly on addiction.

For instance, Malcolm Lowry’s modernist opus Under the Volcano traces the last days of a British consul in Mexico under the lucid despair of mezcal, and Leslie Marmon Silko’s Ceremony explores alcoholism and spirituality on a Native reservation. Finally, we’ve gone out on a limb and included open-ended works that could be read as allegories of addiction: for example, Robert Louis Stevenson’s Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde offers a powerful figure for the ‘double life’ many addicts lead and the loss of control they feel
over the person they become under the influence. Some stories end in recovery and redemption, and some don’t: the cathartic power of tragedy has been recognized since Aristotle, and an honest, bleak reflection of the hopelessness embedded in the logic of addiction can paradoxically be just what someone in recovery needs in order to keep going. Our role is to collect and curate stories that might ring true for survivors of addiction, that can help them explore through a text and recognize in themselves the powerful feelings and complex damage that it leaves behind.

The ultimate interpretation of texts is left up to participants, and we believe that this is key to the program’s strength. We provide sample questions as tools for facilitators to get the conversation started: groups can speculate on why characters act the way they do, what’s at stake in pivotal moments, and why writers choose to describe and narrate in particular styles. The answers are up for discussion, and the discussion itself is the site of healing: puzzling over a book together allows connections with other people, both in the text and around the table, that can help participants recognize and make sense of their own experiences. In R4R, literary reflections of addiction become occasions to reflect on addiction. That’s the central gambit of the program, and we’re excited and grateful for the opportunity to put it into practice.

--Nicholas Allred

The Rutgers English Department awarded Nicholas Allred the Marius Bewley Prize for his essay on “Haywood’s Present,” the abridged version of which appeared in the previous issue of the CAS IS Newsletter.
5. Conference Globetrotting 2016

A. Bibliotherapy and the rest

Conference season is once again upon us, and CAS library has been well-represented in various capacities at state, national, and international conferences over the course of the past month.

Conference season is once again upon us, and CAS library has been well-represented in various capacities at state, national, and international conferences over the course of the past month.

From May 4 through May 7, Judit Ward and William Bejarano participated in the 38th annual conference of the Substance Abuse Librarians and Information Specialists (SALIS) in Denver, CO, as past-chair and member-at-large of SALIS, respectively. This year’s conference was a joint venture alongside the Association of Mental Health Librarians (AMHL). With this, we finalized our service commitments to the SALIS Executive Board (Judit concluding her five-year board membership, and William concluding his two-year membership). In addition to board activities, we presented material each day of the conference, and also set up an exhibit table promoting CAS, JSAD, and E&T, which saw quite a lot of activity over the course of the four days. Our only regret was not taking an “after” photo to show how little material remained on the table by the conclusion of the week.

We learned quite a bit from our SALIS and AMHL colleagues, including case studies supporting our suggestion for IS to be more involved in research, potentially with a formalized system of conducting literature reviews prior to grant applications or potential projects. In a few similar North American addiction and mental health institutions, protocols dictate that librarians be involved in all research projects, and even serve as co-authors to articles generated in part from their work.

A second theme of the week dealt with alternative means of scientific dissemination, utilizing social media, multimedia, and other technologies. As an example, articles published in Elsevier journals are available for immediate sharing in several ways, including a link to 50 days of free access. Our colleagues also shared our commitment to translating science, advocating working with researchers to provide fact sheets, lay versions of scholarly publications, and precision medicine-style patient-level literature. A
The Six Frames of Information Literacy (Framework for Information Literacy…, 2015):

1. Authority Is Constructed and Contextual
2. Information Creation as a Process
3. Information Has Value
4. Research as Inquiry
5. Scholarship as Conversation
6. Searching as Strategic Exploration

The final theme of the week was about many of the information needs and potential solutions that arose with the legalization of marijuana in Colorado. Should marijuana be legalized in New Jersey, CAS could similarly spearhead the information and education campaign related to the potential changes.

CAS was an active participant each day of the conference, beginning with a presentation about the efforts of CAS Information Services toward developing a critical framework of information literacy in the addiction sciences. We dubbed this initiative CICAS, which stands for Critical Information Competencies in Addiction Science. The presentation was designed to review the six “frames” of information literacy that were developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries in 2015, and apply those frames to the unique needs of addiction professionals, including researchers, counselors, educators, and, of course, librarians.

We explained each frame generally, showed some examples of how we have been applying them at CAS, and provided some areas in which information professionals in the addictions can develop each of these areas further. We met our goal of generating a fruitful discussion, and aim to continue to more formally document how this framework can be used, adapted, and customized to our specific transdisciplinary field.

Our second presentation was the ignite session explaining the eight-poster Reading for Recovery Poster Series, focused on the potential of bibliotherapy as a complementary treatment modality. Because this project has many interconnected parts, we thought the best way to transmit the information would be through individual posters dedicated to each of its specific elements.

As depicted by the list of poster titles below, we began with an overview of the various definitions of bibliotherapy, followed by the scope of included genres, then explained the potential applications and methods of distribution (both online and in person), concluding with a description of training opportunities, with concrete examples provided by our Hungarian colleagues. For more information about a few of these elements, please see the brief reports by William Haggis, Maria Ortiz-Myers, and Nicholas Allred in this issue of the newsletter.
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1) Authority Is Constructed and Contextual

“An expert is somebody who is more than 50 miles from home, has no responsibility for implementing the advice he gives, and shows slides.”

-Edwin Meese

A slide depicting constructed and contextual authority, from the CICAS presentation

We explained each frame generally, showed some examples of how we have been applying them at CAS, and provided some areas in which information professionals in the addictions can develop each of these areas further. We met our goal of generating a fruitful discussion, and aim to continue to more formally document how this framework can be used, adapted, and customized to our specific transdisciplinary field.

Our second presentation was the ignite session explaining the eight-poster Reading for Recovery Poster Series, focused on the potential of bibliotherapy as a complementary treatment modality. Because this project has many interconnected parts, we thought the best way to transmit the information would be through individual posters dedicated to each of its specific elements.

As depicted by the list of poster titles below, we began with an overview of the various definitions of bibliotherapy, followed by the scope of included genres, then explained the potential applications and methods of distribution (both online and in person), concluding with a description of training opportunities, with concrete examples provided by our Hungarian colleagues. For more information about a few of these elements, please see the brief reports by William Haggis, Maria Ortiz-Myers, and Nicholas Allred in this issue of the newsletter.
Our final presentation was also related to the R4R project—namely, a mock bibliotherapy workshop. Working in close collaboration with our secret weapon, English PhD student Nicholas Allred, we selected and edited a text by F. Scott Fitzgerald entitled “Sleeping and Waking” down to a readable five-minute piece. After a few slides which provided an evidence base of bibliotherapy’s usefulness, William read the abridged piece aloud to the conference attendees, a first-person account of the author’s relationship with sleep, and followed that with a series of pointed questions designed to generate discussion from the group. The focus of conversation ranged from specifics about the author’s description of insomnia and its potential applications to addiction, to more general applications of book clubs as peer-support mechanisms for those in recovery.

**Medical Library Association**

From May 15—17, Judit and William attended the annual conference of the Medical Library Association (MLA) in Toronto, ON. We were invited to present our poster entitled *Reading for Recovery: Exploring partnerships between professionals in Addiction and Information Science*. In what has become standard when we present on this project, the topic garnered much interest and discussion from conference attendees. While no surprise that a poster on reading would be met with such enthusiasm from a conference of librarians, what was unexpected was the range of interest and discussion points that were brought up. Many inquired about how they could apply such a design in their hospitals or places of business. Some talked about how they had been informally suggesting and using material with their patients or clients. Others had title suggestions. And we even received some personal accounts from friends and family of those suffering from addiction or other mental disorders who might benefit from such an endeavor. After the highly specialized discussions at the SALIS/AMHL conference, hearing from the broader medical library community made it worth the short trip over the northern border.
Among the posters and exhibitors, which included all of the major medical and science publishers, we were pleased to see a large representation from the Rutgers community, specifically from the Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS). One theme we picked up on from our short time at the conference was the various attempts to formalize a systematic search method for different medical and health institutions. We lost count of the number of posters and exhibitors who focused on some variant of this topic, but it confirmed our belief in the importance of staying current on best practices in research methods and helping those who might benefit from training in this area.

Finally, though our trip consisted of only one day of travel, one day of conference attendance, and one day to head back, we were able to schedule an interview with Harold Kalant, a giant in the field of addiction science, and someone who worked alongside E. M. Jellinek directly! We spoke for about 90 minutes on a range of topics, and our conversation will soon be written up in a formal article, with the venue to be determined.

Reference

http://www.alan.org/acrl/standards/ilframework
(Accessed June 6, 2016)

--William Bejarano

William Bejarano was one of three selected for Outstanding Academic Performance upon graduation from the School of Communication & Information MLIS program.
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B. CAS @ NJLA

While Judit and William were attending the MLA conference on May 17th, former CAS graduate assistant and public librarian Molly Stewart represented CAS Library along with Maria Ortiz-Myers at the 2016 New Jersey Library Association (NJLA) Conference in Atlantic City, NJ where they presented a poster designed by the entire CAS team, which also included William Haggis and Nicholas Allred.

The poster, entitled Reading for Recovery: A Project Update, was the follow-up to a poster presented at last year’s conference. Expanding on last year’s poster, Reading for Recovery: Self-Help Books On Our Shelves, this year’s presentation highlighted the development and growth of the Carnegie-Whitney grant-funded project R4R. The main focus of the poster was discussing how academic and public librarians are working together to fill a gap between the books available in public libraries and the users who need them the most.

The poster was enthusiastically received by other librarians in the state. In particular, several public librarians stressed the importance of this project and how useful this tool could be in reaching and helping patrons.

Molly Stewart and Maria Ortiz-Myers presenting the CAS poster at the 2016 New Jersey Library Association (NJLA) Conference in Atlantic City, NJ

--Molly Stewart (Franklin Township Public Library)
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C. International Conferences

CAS has a long tradition of collaborating with scholars all over the world. The CAS Library follows this trend with many of its projects. The spring of 2016 was another time to venture to international territories.

Based on her previous publications on the topics of bibliometrics and scholarly social media, Judit Ward was invited to present at the Eötvös Loránd University, School of Education and Psychology, Hungary on April 6, 2016. Her two talks in Hungarian are available for the public: “Publicare neceese est: Red speakers, h-index, and predators of science” and “Profile maintenance: Scholarly portraits on the World Wide Web.” The translation doesn’t do justice to the titles, heavily embedded in the Hungarian cultural history, recent and past. A review in Hungarian highlighted the presentations.

R4R International: Hungary

Our ALA-funded Carnegie-Whitney project, called Reading for Recovery, has benefited from our international collaboration from its inception. Since Hungarian psychologists, librarians, and other professionals demonstrate not only interest, but also a long commitment to bibliotherapy (see posters # 7 & 8 at SALIS), the first station of the international promotion was Budapest, Hungary.

Bibliotherapy in the United States has a strong focus on the “therapy” portion, referring to the use of any reading material that addiction counselors can use to complement the in-person intervention and/or treatment. Most European followers of bibliotherapy, however, may limit texts to traditional literary works, such as fiction, poetry, and drama (see poster #1 at SALIS). Hungary offers programs and various structured bibliotherapist training, based on the second approach, or on a combination of the two.

Interested in the selection criteria and the developmental phase of our project, the Hungarian Medical Library Association invited our R4R project to be part of a panel focusing on the various aspects of bibliotherapy at their annual conference in Budapest on April 7, 2016. Representing CAS, Judit Ward highlighted the milestones of the two-year project, emphasizing the importance bibliotherapy in Hungary and collaboration with Hungarian partners.

The next day, April 8, 2016, Judit Ward was invited to present at the Bibliotherapists Program’s Workshop hosted by the Department of Culture, Library and Information Science of the University of Pécs, Hungary. Participants from all over Hungary gathered in the National Library and Museum of Education in Budapest to gain experience in database development from our R4R project. The co-authors of the workshop were Nicholas Allred, William Bejarano, William Haggis, and Maria Ortiz-Myers from CAS.
R4R International: Canada

Back to North America with the R4R road show, the next station was Toronto. The Medical Library Association held its annual conference in Canada this year. Over 2,400 librarians gathered in the impressive Metro Toronto Convention Center for almost a week-long program of presentations, posters, vendor demos, and continuing education. The CAS poster, presented by William Bejarano and Judit Ward was entitled “Reading for Recovery: Exploring partnerships between professionals in addiction and information science.” See more in William Bejarano’s article above.

A memorable afternoon with Dr. Harold Kalant

On the agenda of this trip, as mentioned before, was also an interview scheduled with the renowned Dr. Harold Kalant, the president of the Jellinek Memorial Awards, in his office at the University of Toronto. Generous with his time, Dr. Kalant, a forward-looking and visionary leader and scientist reflected on the most pressing issues of addiction science and some related public health topics, in addition to sharing his memories about E. M. Jellinek. Unfortunately the building where their offices resided no longer exists.

Dr. Kalant spoke very highly and affectionately of the “grandfatherly” Jellinek, even if he, as admitted, never called him “Bunky.” For more about the subject, stay tuned.

---

On our way to Dr. Kalant’s office: old and new meeting in the hallway at the U of Toronto.

Dr. Harold Kalant in his office

CAS Library and JSAD were recently profiled in a piece written by Library and Information Science Student Association (LISSA) Vice President Carla Harwood after her visit here in late March.

--Judit H. Ward