



# A Case for Open Peer Review Podcasting in Academic Librarianship

---

Amber Sewell

**abstract:** Models of open peer review are being explored in multiple disciplines as academia seeks a more feminist, care-based approach to scholarship. One model of open peer review that aligns well with the work of information professionals, particularly those with information literacy instruction duties, is an open peer review podcast. This type of podcast, recorded before a manuscript is submitted for publication, brings an informal peer review process into the open as a host facilitates critical discussion of a research output between the researcher and a reviewer. This approach fosters a supportive community with shared values while utilizing the affordances of podcasting to make invisible labor visible and bring whole personhood into scholarship and scholarly communication. The author provides a case study of implementing this model with the creation of *The LibParlor Podcast*.

## Introduction

Information professionals occupy a unique space in the world of scholarly communication. Some academic librarians hold tenured faculty positions that come with an expectation of scholarship; others are staff who may wish to participate in research and scholarship for a variety of reasons. Those who work in special libraries, school libraries, public libraries, and other institutions may also want to take part in scholarly communication to share their ideas, build community, and engage in professional development.

Just as the types of information professionals vary, so, too, do the types of scholarly communication with which they engage. Publishing a manuscript or peer-reviewed article is often seen as the highest achievement, but doing so requires time, effort, and support that some positions may not provide. Other library practitioners are interested in less formal, more accessible forms of scholarship, such as creating blogs, writing

*portal: Libraries and the Academy*, Vol. 23, No. 4 (2023), pp. 799–818.

Copyright © 2023 by Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD 21218.

articles for websites, or even producing podcasts that talk about their work. These types of public scholarship, as well as pursuits of open access, often align with feminist approaches to information literacy work. Maria Accardi describes such methods as incorporating elements of narrative, intuition, and experiential knowledge that make research more accessible to communities outside the profession by removing paywalls and making content more approachable.<sup>1</sup> Some positions consider these pursuits part of a librarian's job responsibilities; others require that this work be done outside working time, adding yet another barrier for information professionals wishing to engage with the larger profession and share their ideas.

Authoring a traditionally peer-reviewed article is often an important accomplishment, particularly for tenure-track librarians. The peer-review process, however, is not exempt from scrutiny. As information professionals engage more with open access and feminist practices, some seek methods of scholarly communication that involve less gatekeeping and that facilitate the dissemination of information to communities who can use it or who are engaged in the creation process. These approaches can "make invisible labor visible," a phrase built on Arlene Daniels's concept of invisible work, initially used to describe the undervalued tasks women traditionally perform, such as child-rearing and housekeeping.<sup>2</sup> Open access and feminist practices foster communities that value

---

**Open access and feminist practices foster communities that value compassion, equity, and inclusion, and that honor different ways of knowledge creation.**

---

compassion, equity, and inclusion, and that honor different ways of knowledge creation.<sup>3</sup> Open access publishing, as Samuel Moore puts it, can be seen as a form of care with "the potential for developing publishing practices that enrich not just the careers of individual scholars but also scholarly communities."<sup>4</sup> Tony Ross-Hellauer defines open peer review as "an umbrella term for a number of overlapping ways that peer review models can be adapted in line with the ethos of Open Science, including making reviewer and author identities open, publishing review reports and enabling greater participation in

the peer review process."<sup>5</sup> Such practices seek to incorporate open access principles into peer review in an attempt to make the process more equitable and effective.

Scholarly podcasting, a form of audio communication described by Mack Hagood, is another. While Hagood acknowledges that audio work has "yet to emerge as a polished mode of primary scholarship," he explains that "doing sonic scholarship opens up a different set of performative, affective, argumentative, and evidentiary possibilities, contributing to a greater breadth and variety of research (and ways to communicate that research)."<sup>6</sup> Hannah McGregor views scholarly podcasting not as a change in modality but as a shift in the system that allows academia to rethink what is valuable about the work scholars do and how it is communicated to others. As she and Chris Friend discuss, scholarly podcasting can allow scholars to ask, "What do I actually want my work to do?"<sup>7</sup>

One way to implement a more inclusive system of peer review based on an ethics of care is to do an open peer review podcast. This article describes a podcast for information professionals, based on a model created by Lori Beckstead,<sup>8</sup> recorded before an article was submitted for publication. The participants were a host to facilitate the conversation,



a researcher who provided their research output to be reviewed, and a reviewer who, rather than—or in addition to—making written comments, engages in a conversation with the researcher. In this way, the podcast resembles the informal peer review that many scholars implement with their work, sending a draft article to their peers, who then offer comments and suggestions before the scholar submits the article to a publisher for a more traditional peer review. This podcast model shifts the conversation from back-and-forth comments exchanged on a document to a facilitated discussion for others to listen to and engage with. An open peer review podcast model has been implemented in media and sound studies, and it blends the benefits of the peer-review system with the affordances of podcasting to create a new way of engaging in scholarly communication. As Beckstead explains in her first episode of the *Open Peer Review Podcast*, “The idea is that the peer reviewer and the researcher get to kind of chew up the research a little bit, ask questions, go down paths that maybe hadn’t been considered before, look for any issues with the research, maybe find new meaning for what the research means.”<sup>9</sup> This model does not create podcasts as scholarly output, unlike the work done with the Amplify Podcast Network and their first-ever peer-reviewed podcast the *Secret Feminist Agenda*. But it could pave the way to acknowledging the scholarly value of research outputs in information sciences outside the traditionally accepted manuscript and peer-reviewed article.

This article will present a case study of the author’s experience creating the pilot episode of *The LibParlor Podcast*, the first podcast to implement the proposed style of open peer review for information professionals. It will detail the challenges and barriers addressed, discuss how this process differed from a written peer review, and provide guidance for others interested in implementing this model.

### Literature Review

An ethics of care, which focuses on relationships rather than individuals, “arose out of feminists’ appreciation of the importance of care and caring labor.” It looks at structures of power to dismantle violence, domination, and other forms of oppression. Instead, it focuses on the values and practices of care to form relationships and communities that “share an interest in their mutual well-being.”<sup>10</sup> A feminist ethics of care regards lived experience as essential to forming and maintaining supportive relationships. The social activist bell hooks brought an ethics of care into the classroom by merging it with critical pedagogy, arguing that a feminist and engaged classroom is one of community. Feminist classrooms were the only space where hooks experienced instructors “willing to acknowledge a connection between ideas learned in university settings and those learned in life practices.” In such classrooms, she “witnessed professors striving to create participatory spaces for the sharing of knowledge.”<sup>11</sup>

In information literacy instruction, instructors who incorporate feminist practices seek to use an ethics of care to build community, whether at the reference desk,<sup>12</sup> in one-shot library instruction sessions,<sup>13</sup> or in semester-long courses. These instructors make a conscious effort to restructure the traditional power hierarchies of a teacher and a learner. Instead, they view participants as experts in their own right. Information professionals have specialized knowledge about seeking and evaluating information, among other

skills, and students are experts in their own lived experiences. This approach “requires that the teacher respond to a student’s expressed need,” which “gives students’ needs power and weight within the relationship, thus working to shrink the hierarchical space between them.”<sup>14</sup>

Another area where an ethics of care is evident is in open peer review. Such reviews seek to improve the traditional peer-review process by, among other things, shortening the time between submission and publication, producing better quality reviews and articles, holding reviewers accountable for conducting themselves professionally, increasing transparency in the process, and making invisible labor visible.<sup>15</sup> Open peer

---

**Open peer review can include open identities, open reports, open participation, open pre-review manuscripts, open final-version commenting, open interaction, and open platforms.**

---

review can include open identities, open reports, open participation, open pre-review manuscripts, open final-version commenting, open interaction, and open platforms.<sup>16</sup> Emily Ford notes that, while there are multiple definitions and phases of open peer review, none has been widely used or accepted in library and information sciences.<sup>17</sup> While double-anonymous peer review is designed to protect authors from gender and race-based bias, it makes embodied, personal, and autobiographical scholarship nearly impossible.<sup>18</sup> As McGregor explains, “Open and public scholarship gives us an opportunity not to throw out these institutionalized norms, but to fundamentally reconsider the work they’re doing,”

encouraging scholars to consider “who is the peer in peer review?”<sup>19</sup> Liz Jackson and her coauthors see peer review as a way to serve one’s community, proposing that “to find the wisdom of humility in peer reviewing as pedagogical work requires an ethos of care and trust, which places peer review in its rightful place in the core knowledge-building educational business of academic research.”<sup>20</sup> Ford additionally argues that “open peer review helps achieve social justice in scholarly publishing.”<sup>21</sup>

One method implemented in media studies and other disciplines is an open peer review podcast. Though this format may not be the obvious method for conducting open peer review, Dario Llinares, Neil Fox, and Richard Berry argue that “podcasting is a significant part of the growing open-source ethos that challenges the structures of traditional academic publishing.”<sup>22</sup> Open peer review podcasts are part of what Mack Hagood calls “audio academia,” which he describes as “a diverse collection of initiatives aimed at producing and communicating scholarship through electronic audio in the form of podcasts, audiobooks, online lectures, and other genres.”<sup>23</sup> Academic podcasting, then, can be defined as “the communication of scholarly knowledge through the digital medium of podcasting,” which “can be a radical, open, and subversive way of creating publicly accessible and community engaged scholarship.”<sup>24</sup> Podcasting can pose challenges for scholars who are pressed for time and may need to develop a new set of skills to pursue such a production. For those interested in incorporating feminist practices in their scholarship, however, “It can also bring a re-orientation, sense of exploration, and renewed community building to the research experience.”<sup>25</sup> Academic podcasts can reinforce “the connection between the university and society at large,” making research “accessible to a far greater audience than written materials could ever reach.”<sup>26</sup>



An informal review of podcasting in academic librarianship reveals a variety of types. Some are produced by publishers such as Choice and Ex Libris, including *Patron Driven*, *Citing the Obvious*, and *The Authority File*. These podcasts have high production quality and are generally larger-scale takes on librarianship. *Circulating Ideas* offers interviews that touch on aspects of work in libraries, including authors, officers of the American Library Association, and librarians from different types of institutions. A handful of podcasts focus less on production values and more on informal conversations between guests.<sup>27</sup> Among these are *LibVoices*, which highlights the experiences of librarians of color, and *The Librarian's Guide to Teaching Podcast*, which discusses information literacy instruction. The scope of library podcasts to date, however, does not yet venture into the realm of scholarship.

### Reasons for an Open Peer Review Podcast

Although not all information professionals claim teaching as one of their job duties, instruction often seeps into the work, particularly for academic librarians. They frequently must collaborate with a faculty member on how to create a more meaningful assignment, work with a patron to find an appropriate resource, or help a colleague from another department deepen their understanding of a subject. For many, whether it is a one-shot, a reference interaction, or a full-semester course, teaching plays an important role in communicating the value of libraries and the importance of developing information literacy.

When considering podcasting as a form of scholarly communication for academic librarians, the similarities between instructional aims and podcasting emerge naturally, especially given Jackson and her colleagues' point that "peer review is more like a form of pedagogy."<sup>28</sup> An obvious similarity is the goal of reducing jargon. A common challenge in information literacy instruction is that the patrons or students arrive with various levels of information literacy. They could have attended a high school where research projects were the norm, are thus familiar with terms like "peer review," and have skills in determining the authority of a source. Or, they may have searching abilities developed from personal information seeking but have yet to translate those into the academic setting. One way to address this challenge is to reduce jargon as an effort to remove barriers to understanding. Librarian instructors strive to break down opaque concepts and processes. Rather than mention the "information life cycle" and assume students understand the phrase, for instance, information professionals translate it into more relatable terms with which students are already familiar.

This goal of reducing jargon to increase understanding and remove barriers to engagement and learning is also found in podcasting. Many podcasts, especially those with an educational bent, assume a broad listenership and create content with which the everyday individual can engage in a meaningful way, much as information professionals do in an instructional context. Podcasts such as *This Podcast Will Kill You* or *Why Aren't You a Doctor Yet?* may be written and produced by scholars in the sciences, but because the goal is to disseminate knowledge to a broad audience, they try to eliminate or explain disciplinary jargon. As a result, listeners with no background in the field can still engage with the content. By shifting an informal peer-review process to a podcast, participants can practice translating their work from formal, academic language to wording that anyone could understand.

---

**By shifting an informal peer-review process to a podcast, participants can practice translating their work from formal, academic language to wording that anyone could understand.**

---

Another common goal of information literacy instruction is to provide an example of being wrong. Research can be a frustrating process, and information professionals seek to normalize that frustration and focus on strategies to overcome challenges by thinking critically about the problem. A common way of demonstrating this concept is to take a student's research topic as the subject of a search demonstration. Without choosing search terms ahead of time, the librarian cannot be sure what results will come up, if any. Filters and additional search terms may be required. If so, the demonstration often closely replicates what students will experience when they do their own research. This can be a risky strategy for some librarians, especially those newer to the classroom.

By having informal peer review discussions recorded in live time, information professionals find themselves in an uncertain space, where getting a name wrong or stumbling over words may embarrass them. Having that happen on a podcast, where the conversation will be broadcast to an audience, may make them feel even more vulnerable to criticism than if it occurred in a classroom. But demonstrating being wrong is not just important for students learning how to navigate the research process—it is also vital for graduate students earning their MLIS or for early career professionals new to teaching and scholarship. Those audiences benefit from seeing experienced librarians admit to mistakes in a public forum.

---

**Podcasts are an excellent way to demonstrate knowledge creation as an iterative process.**

---

Knowledge creation as an iterative process is another concept librarians address in their teaching, from discussing how research questions may change based on students' findings to talking about how to transfer what they learn in one class to others. Podcasts are an excellent way to demonstrate knowledge creation as an iterative process. The didactic nature of podcasts means that as peer reviewers and the researcher engage in discussion, new ideas and perspectives emerge that would not have come to light if the feedback method were a static exchange of notes without accompanying dialogue. An open peer review podcast enables listeners to see how a research product is shaped by the process, including both the informal conversations held on the podcast and the formal peer review later.

An overarching goal of information literacy instruction is to demystify the research process. By reducing the use of jargon, demonstrating what to do if you make a mistake, and emphasizing that research is an iterative process, instruction librarians paint a revealing picture of what the research process looks like. Those who teach often seek to dismantle the anxiety students have that they are expected to already know how to do research. By participating in an open peer review podcast, information professionals can do the same thing within their own community. Walking through the research process and participating in peer review in the open makes the process clear to listeners in a



jargon-free, accessible manner. Such a demonstration is valuable to graduate students, early career information professionals, and those from other disciplines interested in the work librarians do. An open peer review podcast would reduce the anxiety some students and early career professionals feel when they perceive the same expectation of skill that undergraduate students face in the classroom.<sup>29</sup>

Another similarity podcasting shares with feminist information literacy instruction is honoring other ways of knowing. Information professionals working to incorporate feminist practices into their work may do this by explaining how students can question authority and inequitable power structures, bringing forth examples from scholarly publishing. They can encourage students to incorporate sources other than peer-reviewed journals to give voice to those historically excluded from scholarly conversation. The value placed on peer-reviewed journal articles or monographs is something information professionals must also contend with when they engage in research.

---

**The open peer-review process, which is situated in the open access movement, elevates the more informal ways of knowing and places value on accessibility of content and disseminating knowledge to a broader audience**

---

The open peer-review process, which is situated in the open access movement, elevates the more informal ways of knowing and places value on accessibility of content and disseminating knowledge to a broader audience,<sup>30</sup> particularly “a significant amount of people on platforms not usually associated with academia.”<sup>31</sup>

Finally, the interdisciplinary nature of librarianship lends itself well to podcasts. In a classroom or in a single shift at the reference desk, librarians can assist students and patrons in a variety of disciplines, from literature to biology to physics. Librarians are used to explaining things to different audiences and to adapting the explanation to fit the listener. This skill would translate easily into a podcasting format, where sharing research with a broader audience would allow information professionals to showcase that work to those outside librarianship. As Hagood pointed out, “While podcasting is used to translate and popularize academic research, it also has potential for inter- and intradisciplinary communication.”<sup>32</sup> An open peer review podcast would allow information professionals to invite reviewers from other disciplines to participate in their research process and forge connections in a new way.

### **Fostering a Feminist, Care-Based Community**

Just as information professionals are seldom taught how to teach, despite their many roles requiring some form of instruction, librarians are also seldom taught how to participate in the peer-review process. Submitting original research for peer review can be intimidating. Charlotte Roh declares that the critical and negative culture of peer review is a fundamental problem of the model.<sup>33</sup> As Jackson and her coauthors point out, in a double-anonymous peer-review process, “For anonymity to be preserved the writer should adopt the tone and style of the learned society, that is, middle class and

**Rather than dealing with the frustrations of vague comments or a reviewer who misinterprets the purpose of a passage, the reviewer and researcher can engage in a mutual effort to make the work better through asking thoughtful questions and working together.**

enable academic librarians and others doing research to provide a compassionate, care-based critique. Rather than dealing with the frustrations of vague comments or a reviewer who misinterprets the purpose of a passage, the reviewer and researcher can engage in a mutual effort to make the work better through asking thoughtful questions and working together.

A well-documented phenomenon in media and sound studies is the affordance of podcasting to build parasocial relationships, in which listeners imagine having a connection with someone they encounter on media but do not actually know.<sup>36</sup> A media encounter may generate such one-sided relationships due to a combination of “its authentic DIY-character, the focus on serial storytelling and audio narratives, the listeners’ focused attention, as well as the customizable experience.”<sup>37</sup> Listeners to a podcast feel a connection with hosts they have never met; they may go on walks, do chores, or take showers while the host speaks to them as if they were a friend. A sense of community is developed, and listeners often form online groups to extend the one-way conversation of the podcast. Often, too, podcast hosts incorporate listener feedback, reading reviews

**Engaging in an open peer review podcast within academic librarianship will allow information professionals to foster a new community of shared values and interests.**

or responding to criticism from their audiences. McGregor often speaks to the level of accountability she feels to her listeners and has described how her relationship with the audience shapes the work she creates.<sup>38</sup> Likewise, Roberta Kwok mentions how listener feedback about lack of ethnic diversity on the podcast *The Taproot* spurred the producers to be mindful about the range of guests they featured.<sup>39</sup> Engaging in an open peer review podcast within academic librarianship will allow information professionals to foster a new community of shared values and interests.

By sharing work in a more informal, accessible setting, information professionals participating in an open peer review podcast not only make their work easier to access but also demonstrate behaviors as potential mentors or collaborators. For early career librarians, finding others to work with or seeking mentors can be intimidating and challenging. Because the parasocial aspect of podcasts often results in listeners feeling a

masculinised.” Any “writing that is playful, personal, narrative, emotive or non-linear” is discouraged.<sup>34</sup> Someone invited to serve as a peer reviewer may get minimal guidance on how to provide meaningful feedback. By participating in an open peer review podcast model, information professionals can make that peer-review process transparent and give “young researchers a guide (to tone, length, the formulation of criticisms) to help them as they begin to do peer review themselves.”<sup>35</sup> Such podcasts

or responding to criticism from their audiences. McGregor often speaks to the level of accountability she feels to her listeners and has described how her relationship with the audience shapes the work she creates.<sup>38</sup> Likewise, Roberta Kwok mentions how listener feedback about lack of ethnic diversity on the podcast *The Taproot* spurred the producers to be mindful about the range of guests they featured.<sup>39</sup> Engaging in an open peer review

connection with the hosts or other participants, early career librarians or MLIS students may find it easier to reach out. In fact, Carla DeMarco has observed that “a podcast can help expand a person’s network to include colleagues they might not have had previous opportunities in which to engage.”<sup>40</sup> By developing a feeling of connection listening to reviewers and researchers discuss their work, those seeking networking opportunities may feel more comfortable approaching potential mentors or collaborators.

Traditional peer review can be intimidating for early career information professionals and MLIS students. By creating a community of professionals who engage in their work in an open, care-based manner that promotes thoughtful and compassionate curiosity, an open peer review podcast model can provide support for students and librarians. It can foster a community of shared values, make an opaque process more transparent, and create a space where being wrong and asking questions is encouraged.

---

**By creating a community of professionals who engage in their work in an open, care-based manner that promotes thoughtful and compassionate curiosity, an open peer review podcast model can provide support for students and librarians.**

---

### The Function of Peer Review

In an episode of *Teacher of the Ear*, McGregor and host Chris Friend discuss how an open peer review podcast allows scholars to critically engage with the process. What is the function of peer review? What is it trying to accomplish? Is its current form the best way to do so? If the function of peer review is to make work stronger, how can the process be improved?<sup>41</sup>

Those who have participated in the open peer review podcast model have spoken about the differences between this model and a more traditional, even if informal, peer review, where the researchers send their draft to peers for comments.<sup>42</sup> The discursive nature of podcasts has led to better suggestions about the overall shape of the research output. Because each party can ask questions, experts in their fields can bounce ideas off each other and come up with new perspectives or future avenues of research that they might not have considered if they only exchanged comments in writing. A well-structured podcast will still lead to suggestions about the shape of the paper, such as if a paragraph makes more sense in a different section, but it will also take advantage of the expertise of those involved to create new ideas.

Another effect of the discursive nature of podcasts is that reviewers can ask how to make the work better based on what the author is trying to do or convey, rather than what they assume is the meaning of the work.<sup>43</sup> Tone can be tricky in writing, and researchers often try to put into words ideas they have had for a long time. A comment from a reviewer indicating a paragraph is confusing, without clarifying what the confusion is about, can frustrate the researcher, who can only guess where the problem lies. In a podcast, the reviewer and researcher can have a dialogue rooted in curiosity and a desire to come to a mutual understanding. They can hash out where the problem is and how to make the researcher’s point clear to an audience. The ability to have conversa-

tions without the assumptions inherent in a traditional peer-review process will result in stronger work that accurately reflects the ideas of the researcher.

### Affordances of Podcasting as Open Peer Review

Open access is a feminist issue that has increasing support in libraries.<sup>44</sup> Adopting an open peer review podcast model allows academic librarians and other information

**In a podcast, the reviewer and researcher can have a dialogue rooted in curiosity and a desire to come to a mutual understanding.**

professionals to make knowledge available to communities who might not otherwise have access because of the expense of subscriptions or the difficulty of understanding jargon-heavy scholarly outputs. Open peer review podcasts might serve as a scholarly output themselves, as has been demonstrated by the Amplify Podcast Network, the journal *Kairos*, and scientific journals that publish a variety of research outputs other than typical articles.

Another affordance of a podcast as peer review is that researchers discussing their work must think about and articulate their efforts in a new way that may be beneficial for the writing process.<sup>45</sup> Writing can be a solitary endeavor, and verbally walking others through one's work can reveal areas where processes or relationships may not be clear to the audience. Speaking about one's work allows the author to communicate in a different way. A podcast provides feedback about areas that need clarification or further explanation, allowing the author to edit their written work prior to submitting it to a journal or other publishing venue for formal review.

In an open peer review podcast model, researchers can strengthen their article by receiving critique and engaging in dialogue about their research before submitting it for traditional peer review. As mentioned earlier, this process often generates questions about potential avenues of further investigation and makes connections that the researcher may not have identified. By incorporating this feedback before submitting to a publication, researchers can be confident that their work has already undergone a supportive critique that has addressed issues of validity and communication. One feature of podcasts that makes this process unique is that podcast listenership is broad. While a producer may have an audience in mind while producing podcast episodes (in this instance, information professionals), any individual, no matter their background, may find and subscribe to podcasts. To reach a broad audience, those making podcasts often avoid jargon or passing references to ideas that may be well-known in the field

**Podcast hosts and guests strive to communicate so that anyone, regardless of background, can understand the information being conveyed.**

but unfamiliar to others. Instead, podcast hosts and guests strive to communicate so that anyone, regardless of background, can understand the information being conveyed. For an open peer review podcast, researchers receive feedback that does not assume prior knowledge of whatever theory or work the reviewers may reference.<sup>46</sup> Because anyone might be listening, those references must be



provided with enough context that casual listeners can understand them and how they relate to the work being discussed.

One of the reasons peer review is such a mystifying process for graduate students or early career information professionals is that it takes place out of sight. The review process is often not visible to readers—only the finished product. McGregor posits that peer review can be improved by centering the practice as an act of community and by making unseen labor and hidden processes visible.<sup>47</sup> Podcasting not only offers a way to incorporate feminist values into the peer-review process but also, as Brenna Clarke Gray points out in an episode of *Amplified*, allows scholars to bring their whole selves to their research and scholarship.<sup>48</sup> By thinking in terms of peer engagement rather than peer review, argues Siobhan McMenemy, senior editor at Wilfrid Laurier University Press, scholars can challenge the hierarchical thinking inherent in the traditional peer-review process.<sup>49</sup> Manifestations of this hierarchy, including lack of accountability, risks of subversion, and bias, are cited as drawbacks to the current model of peer review. The wastefulness of invisible labor is another.<sup>50</sup> Open peer review seeks to reveal this hidden labor by publishing reviewers' comments and reports, and some scholars even include these reports in their ORCID accounts.<sup>51</sup> Adopting a podcast model would go a step further in making the peer-review process—and that of improving work by engaging in critical conversation around a research output—audible to those interested in learning how peer review can function. At the same time, a podcast can make the effort and knowledge that go into shaping a piece of scholarship visible to those outside the process. As Jackson and her coauthors state, "Reviewing provides a significant learning practice . . . assists in enhancing interaction and assessment, and offers constructive feedback that an academic is highly regarded and coactive in their sphere and furthers inner strength."<sup>52</sup> Making the review process accessible offers a valuable learning opportunity for the information professional community.

One of the many issues highlighted by the COVID-19 pandemic is the inaccessibility of conferences and other professional development events. Labor, finances, environmental costs, and the physical demands of traveling and attending these events serve as barriers to participation for some. At these gatherings, academic librarians and other information professionals make connections, discuss their work in informal settings, and learn about the projects of other researchers. These valuable engagements with one's community can be replicated in a podcast. By listening and engaging with the hosts, participants, and listeners, librarians can benefit from these contacts without the challenges of travel.

### Implementing Open Peer Review Podcasting

Though new to the field of information sciences, as demonstrated in this article, podcasting is not a new approach to peer review. Nor does this model necessarily demand much more work, only a shift in approach. This peer-review work, particularly at the informal model being proposed, already happens when researchers send their draft articles to their peers for comment before submitting them for formal peer review. Implementing an open peer review podcast model would simply move the conversation from an exchange of e-mails or comments on a document to a facilitated dialogue

where participants can voice their thoughts and questions about the research and the researcher can respond and clarify. This approach gives both researcher and reviewer an opportunity to vocalize their thoughts.

That said, who should provide this opportunity and facilitate these dialogues? Who should structure these conversations to take advantage of the affordances of podcasting? The do-it-yourself nature of podcasting means that any interested information professional, or team of information professionals, could create their own podcast, taking on the role of producer and facilitator. Many resources are available on the open Web about creating podcasts; there are even specific resources about creating scholarly podcasts available with a quick Google search. As demonstrated in the case study described in the next section, the author herself has created a podcast, *The LibParlor Podcast*, that implements this model. She recruited participants, provided guidelines for the peer-review process, and scheduled, produced, edited, and published the episodes. This process does require some labor from the author and reviewer, who must make themselves available for recording the conversation and come prepared with talking points. The result is a more polished draft that should make the formal peer-review process more efficient.

There are currently no guidelines for conducting this informal open peer review, particularly in a podcast format. Those looking for guidance for implementing open peer review podcasting can listen to episode 00 of *Open Peer Review Podcast*, where Beckstead walks listeners through her process and her decision-making.<sup>53</sup>

This model, focused on the informal peer-review process, does not involve publishers or editors, but some publishers and scholarly journal editors have begun to explore the use of podcasting for scholarship. The Amplify Podcast Network, particularly its stream Resonate, produces podcasts that are published under the imprint of Wilfrid Laurier University Press and undergo formal peer review. *Kairos* recently released a podcast that not only uses a series of short episodes as the final form of scholarship but also includes in the appendix a podcast of the reviewers' feedback and peer-review discussion.<sup>54</sup> The editors adapted their review process for this series of episodes so reviewers provided their feedback in an audio format via a synchronous review session. One of the first scholarly podcasts was published in the *McGill Journal of Education* in 2014 by Ted Riecken.<sup>55</sup> The issue also featured a written roundtable response by peer reviewers to Riecken's podcast.<sup>56</sup> While exploring podcasts as scholarly outputs in themselves is beyond the scope of this article, podcasting obviously fits into the peer-review ecosystem in several ways. This model would help strengthen a researcher's work prior to submission to a venue, and there is space and precedent for podcasts at various points of peer review and publication.

### Barriers

While the open peer review podcast model has many affordances and aligns well with the work of academic librarians, there are barriers to creating such a podcast for the library profession. Perhaps the most obvious is the technology challenge. Much work goes into creating, recording, producing, editing, and publishing a podcast, even with one or two people taking on that production role. Some researchers and reviewers may lack confidence in their technology skills to participate in the recording of an episode.



This barrier can be overcome in a variety of ways. Many libraries now have audio recording booths or rooms, which would be ideal for recording a podcast, and they often have faculty or staff who can guide participants through using the technology available. If that is not an option, most phones now have microphones that can record a participant's audio via a free application, then e-mail it to the producer. While recording in an audio booth may be preferable to recording with a phone, both are valid options.

Another obstacle to an open peer review podcast that information professionals may have to overcome is reluctance to make themselves open to criticism. It can be intimidating to talk about your research in person, without being able to prepare your response to a critique ahead of time. Beckstead described one of her first experiences having her work discussed on an episode of *Open Peer Review Podcast* as similar to defending her PhD thesis.<sup>57</sup> Ford similarly acknowledged that "authors may prefer to privately discuss mistakes or flaws of their writing and scholarship."<sup>58</sup> Much of this concern can be alleviated by creating a safe and trusting environment for participants. Allowing researchers to choose their own reviewers, providing a thorough recording guide so all parties know what to expect of the recording process and the flow of discussion, and allowing researchers to listen to the edited audio before its release will offset the vulnerability of having a live discussion of one's work recorded and made public. Also important will be making an example of a podcast available for those interested, so they will know what to expect if they choose to participate. To that end, the next section will detail the author's experience recording a pilot episode of an open peer review podcast for information professionals, to serve as an example for others who might want to take part.

Another barrier that should not be dismissed is that podcasts are not commonly accepted as scholarly output.<sup>59</sup> While Cheryl Brumley argues that podcasting is a "more human-centered method of research,"<sup>60</sup> podcasts such as *LibVoices* and *The Library Teaching Podcast* are made on the hosts' own time, not as part of their position as librarians. Participants may have difficulty convincing their supervisors or institutions of the validity of podcasting as public scholarship. Including participation in a podcast on one's curriculum vitae, for instance, may be less impactful due to a podcast's citation style. Often, the host is cited as the author, while the participants' names may be left out entirely. This difficulty can be addressed by including participants' names in the episode title, but individual participants must justify their contribution to institutions and peers who do not see podcasting as a valid form of scholarship.

---

**Participants may have difficulty convincing their supervisors or institutions of the validity of podcasting as public scholarship.**

---

### The LibParlor Podcast

The author wanted to bring an open peer review model like that used in *Open Peer Review Podcast* to the world of information professionals. She had the support of her supervisor and that of two peers, both cofounders of The Librarian Parlor, a website featuring a blog and other resources designed to build a community of practitioners of library research. The author's goals in creating this podcast, as set out in the rest of this article, aligned

well with The Librarian Parlor's objective of creating a space for researchers to openly discuss the challenges, successes, and sometimes opaque parts of the research process.

The author felt that recording a pilot episode with her own work undergoing the open peer review would be helpful for a number of reasons. First, it would give her a chance to test the model firsthand, working out the major kinks in the process before asking others to join. Second, as acknowledged in the "Barriers" section, asking library researchers to undergo the peer-review process as a recorded conversation could be intimidating, especially as there were no models to prepare them for what to expect. The author intended the pilot episode to serve as such a model, so others who considered taking part would have an example to consult.

The author already had an article ready to undergo an informal peer-review process before being submitted to a journal. She asked a former colleague, Charissa Powell, to serve as the reviewer for the pilot episode of the podcast. Powell accepted, and the author put together a task list of the steps required to create, produce, edit, and publish a podcast. The process included producing an episode recording guide, figuring out what software to use and how to use it, and consulting scholarly and nonscholarly sources for guidance.

Shortly after recruiting Powell to serve as reviewer, the author reached out to Lori Beckstead to inquire about a recording guide mentioned in an episode of *Open Peer Review Podcast*.<sup>61</sup> Beckstead offered to host the pilot episode, explaining that hosting and serving as the researcher being questioned about their work would be overwhelming for someone new to podcasting. Beckstead, Powell, and the author met virtually and recorded the pilot episode. Beckstead provided a sample recording guide she had used for a previous project, which the author used to create one for this pilot episode.

### Production

Consulting *A Guide to Academic Podcasting* by Stacey Copeland and Hannah McGregor,<sup>62</sup> the author created a comprehensive task list for the overall launch of the podcast, for recording a regular episode, and for recording a shorter episode that would focus on interviews or discussing specific elements of the research process.

The academic library where the author works has two audio production rooms. She consulted with the library's multimedia and design specialist to familiarize herself with the equipment and software. Using the example Beckstead provided, the author created an abbreviated recording guide. This guide followed the structure of the article, a case study in instructional design. Because the author and Powell had worked together on many projects, the author was confident that the guide did not need to cover the importance of using inclusive language or provide reflective questions to aid in the feedback and critique process. Beckstead, who has extensive experience hosting podcasts and teaching others to create their own, offered several helpful suggestions to make the guide more effective, including the recommendation that notes take the form of bullet points, not full-sentence text. This, she explained, would help the tone remain conversational rather than stilted and rehearsed.

A virtual meeting in Google Meets was recorded as backup audio. Each participant also recorded on an individual device.



## Recording

The author used Audition software to record and edit the podcast. Beckstead gave some helpful pointers for the recording session. Participants, for instance, needed to use headphones so the recording device did not catch any audio from the virtual meeting room. Beckstead also instructed everyone to hit “record” at the same time so the tracks would sync better.

The recording session demonstrated several points that the author had read about during preparation. The conversational nature of podcasting meant that some sections of the recording guide were never addressed. For the author, this meant that in the future, she should consult the researcher and reviewer ahead of time to note any points that either feels are necessary to address. The unplanned directions the conversation took were valuable, however, and the author did not believe anything was missed by omitting some sections of the recording guide. Beckstead was an attentive and observant facilitator of the conversation, drawing Powell into the dialogue with thoughtful questions and noting her visible reactions in the meeting space.

An hour and a half had been set aside to record, and the session lasted just over that. The final edited episode, with an introduction and a closing section, came to about an hour and 17 minutes.

## Editing

The author had consulted with the multimedia and design specialist at her library, David Ramos Candelas, about using Audition to record and edit the podcast. Powell and Beckstead sent the author their solo audio files, and the author added them to her own track. Ramos Candelas created a podcast template that applied some audio effects automatically. The author met with him to learn how to sync the tracks in Audition and adjust the volume so that all speakers sounded the same. Ramos Candelas also demonstrated how to clip audio and how to move segments around.

The editing was a time-consuming process of trial and error. Ramos Candelas had recommended cutting all periods of silence from each person’s track to produce a cleaner file. The author spent a great deal of time going through each track and listening to noises to ensure they were sounds appropriate to cut, rather than isolated laughs or expressions of agreement with something another participant had said, which the author wanted to preserve. After editing one speaker’s track, she realized that it would have been more efficient to listen to the entire unedited track to mark where to cut chunks of audio, such as interruptions or when someone misspoke, rather than doing it on an individual level. Observances like these will make future editing sessions more efficient.

This process also involved selecting theme music and recording the podcast introduction and conclusion. Recording the beginning and end for the episode was not difficult; the author taped several versions of each in one session and chose one that worked well. Selecting theme music took another couple of hours as the author first listened to multiple tracks, then made the final selection.

## Publishing

Publishing a podcast was another learning curve for the author. She consulted Copeland and McGregor's *A Guide to Academic Podcasting*<sup>63</sup> again to consider whether she wanted to use a hosting service or upload the RSS Web feed for the podcast to listening platforms, such as Apple Podcasts and Spotify, individually. After consulting colleagues who have experience with podcasting, the author chose to use Anchor.fm, Spotify's podcast hosting service, to publish *The LibParlor Podcast*. She created a logo for the podcast in consultation with the *LibParlor* editorial team and set up accounts with Anchor.fm, Apple Podcasts, Google Podcasts, Stitcher, and Amazon Music.

While waiting for publication, the author created a short announcement episode to air a week before the pilot episode. She created a transcript, a description of the episode, and show notes. The transcription process was done manually using the speech-to-text tool oTranscribe, which provided time stamps throughout.

Once accounts were set up with all listening platforms, which were added to the podcast's Anchor.fm account so they all would be updated at the same time, the publication process was simple. The author uploaded the MP3 of the episode, a file format for the compression and storage of digital audio data. She then added the description and show notes, and set the publication date. On the podcast's website, the episodes were embedded in individual pages, along with the show notes and transcripts. Also on the website are submission forms for researchers and reviewers, a form for suggesting ideas for episodes, and an application to become a cohost. The pilot episode, "Ep. 00: Building an Augmented Reality Game for Academic Libraries with Amber Sewell, Reviewer Charissa Powell, and Guest Host Lori Beckstead," was published on September 15, 2022.<sup>64</sup>

## Challenges and Lessons Learned

As with any new endeavor, creating *The LibParlor Podcast* had its share of challenges. Luckily, existing resources about making podcasts helped the author feel confident in her ability to create, produce, and publish her own. It was a time-consuming process, and if the author had lacked a supportive supervisor and an institution with appropriate resources to aid in creating a podcast, it may not have been a practical undertaking. While the technological side certainly had a learning curve, the author felt supported in working her way through the process.

The author intended to create a pilot of her own work to provide a model for future participation, and she felt comfortable discussing and being questioned about her article. She was pleased when Powell agreed to be a reviewer for the podcast. Beckstead, a professor who taught sound design and audio production and who had extensive experience with podcasting, signed on as a guest host for the pilot. While performing both the role of researcher and facilitator would have been a mistake, the author felt nervous about having a professional join her first foray into podcasting. This nervousness lasted only until the conversation about the piece began, when the participants easily fell into a natural dialogue.

Despite podcasting's tenuous status as scholarship, the author's supervisor supported the endeavor. All participants are advocates for podcasting as a valid form of publicly accessible scholarship.



## Next Steps

The author took notes during this process and will work them into documentation for future production. At the time of writing, *The LibParlor Podcast* seeks a cohost to share in the production and recording process. The author will review submissions for future episodes, and *The LibParlor Podcast* will have an official launch. The regular content will feature full-length open peer review episodes, as well as short installments focused on demystifying research and scholarship through question and answer sessions, interviews, and more.

## Conclusion

As information professionals seek more open and equitable ways to participate in scholarship, open peer review offers a way to shape traditional peer review into a critical conversation that strengthens the work of scholars, rather than a gatekeeping mechanism that reinforces the harmful hierarchies that abound in academia. An open peer review podcast mirrors the work information professionals do in providing information literacy instruction and builds a supportive community of shared values. In addition, it makes the often-invisible labor of peer review visible in a way that not only honors the work but also allows those new to the profession to learn how the process works.

Implementing the open peer review podcast model is not without its challenges. It will require willingness to make oneself vulnerable, overcoming technological barriers, and dedicating time and energy to a form of scholarship that is not commonly accepted as such in the profession. This model must utilize a rigorous and transparent production and recording process to ensure participants feel confident in sharing their work in a public format. It can build community by encouraging the audience to engage with the work in a variety of formats. An open peer review podcast can give voice to scholars' projects, make it accessible to new audiences, and strengthen the work information professionals do and the communities in which it is conducted.

## Acknowledgments

My sincerest thanks go to Lori Beckstead for her time and guidance as I put together the pilot episode. Thanks also to Charissa Powell, who served as my reviewer for the pilot and a sounding board for the idea of an open peer review podcast in general.

*Amber Sewell is an assistant professor and a teaching and learning librarian at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas; she may be reached by e-mail at: amber.sewell@unlv.edu.*

## Notes

1. Maria T. Accardi, *Feminist Pedagogy for Library Instruction* (Sacramento, CA: Library Juice, 2013).
2. Arlene Kaplan Daniels, "Invisible Work," *Social Problems* 34, 5 (1987): 403–15, <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.1987.34.5.03a00020>.
3. Emily Ford, "Opening Peer Review in LIS," *ACRL [Association of College and Research Libraries] Presents*, September 21, 2021, webinar, 58:09, <https://www.youtube.com/>



- watch?v=1uCHRjP2x1M; Hannah McGregor, "Bonus Episode: Podcasting, Public Scholarship, and Accountability," November 23, 2017, *Secret Feminist Agenda*, podcast, 34:44, <https://secretfeministagenda.com/2017/11/23/bonus-episode-podcasting-public-scholarship-and-accountability/>; Liz Jackson, Michael A. Peters, Leon Benade, Nesta Devine, Sonja Arndt, Daniella Forster, Andrew Gibbons, et al., "Is Peer Review in Academic Publishing Still Working?" *Open Review of Educational Research* 5, 1 (2018): 95–112, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2018.1479139>.
4. Samuel Moore, "Introduction," in Joe Deville, Samuel Moore, and Tahani Nadim, *The Commons and Care* (2018): 4–5, <https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:19817>.
  5. Tony Ross-Hellauer, "What Is Open Peer Review? A Systematic Review," *F1000Research* (2017): 588, <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.11369.2>.
  6. Mack Hagood, "The Scholarly Podcast: Form and Function in Audio Academia," in *Saving New Sounds: Podcast Preservation and Historiography*, Jeremy Wade Morris and Eric Hoyt, eds. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2021), 180–95, <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.11435021>.
  7. Chris Friend and Hannah McGregor, "Scholarly Communication," *Teacher of the Ear*, podcast, October 14, 2021, 40:14, <https://hybridpedagogy.org/scholarly-communication/>.
  8. Lori Beckstead, "EP 00: What Is the Open Peer Review Podcast All About?" *Open Peer Review Podcast*, August 14, 2020, 34:52, <https://oprpodcast.ca/2020/08/14/ep-00-what-is-the-open-peer-review-podcast-all-about/>.
  9. Beckstead, "EP 00: What Is the Open Peer Review Podcast All About?"
  10. Virginia Held, *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).
  11. bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (New York: Routledge, 1994).
  12. Symphony Bruce, "Teaching with Care: A Relational Approach to Individual Research Consultations," *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*, February 5, 2020, <http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2020/teaching-with-care/>.
  13. Leah Morin, "The First-Year Library Instruction One-Shot: A Place for Caring," *Communications in Information Literacy* 15, 1 (2021): 95–103, <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2021.15.1.5>.
  14. Bruce, "Teaching with Care."
  15. Emily Ford, "Defining and Characterizing Open Peer Review: A Review of the Literature," *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 44, 4 (2013): 311–26, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/jsp.44-4-001>.
  16. Ross-Hellauer, "What Is Open Peer Review?"
  17. Emily Ford, *Stories of Open: Opening Peer Review through Narrative Inquiry* (Chicago: ACRL, 2021).
  18. McGregor, "Bonus Episode: Podcasting, Public Scholarship, and Accountability."
  19. McGregor, "Bonus Episode: Podcasting, Public Scholarship, and Accountability."
  20. Jackson, Peters, Benade, Devine, Arndt, Forster, Gibbons, et al., "Is Peer Review in Academic Publishing Still Working?"
  21. Ford, "Defining and Characterizing Open Peer Review."
  22. Dario Linares, Neil Fox, and Richard Berry, eds., "Introduction: Podcasting and Podcasts—Parameters of a New Aural Culture," in *Podcasting: New Aural Cultures and Digital Media* (Cham, Switz.: Springer International, 2018), 1–13, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90056-8\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90056-8_1).
  23. Hagood, "The Scholarly Podcast."
  24. Stacey Copeland and Hannah McGregor, *A Guide to Academic Podcasting* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2021), <https://doi.org/10.51644/9781777948801>.
  25. Stacey Copeland and Jason Camlot, "Jason Camlot and the SpokenWeb," *Amplified* (blog), March 22, 2022, <https://amplifypodcastnetwork.ca/2022/03/22/amplified-jason-camlot-and-the-spokenweb/>.

26. Kimberly Adams, Ulrich Baer, Olivia Leigh Branscum, Saronik Bosu, Daniel Dissinger, Annie Galvin, Beth Kramer, et al., "It's Time for Academe to Take Podcasting Seriously," *Inside Higher Ed*, September 28, 2021, <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2021/09/28/how-harness-podcasting-teaching-and-scholarship-opinion>.
27. Hagood, "The Scholarly Podcast."
28. Jackson, Peters, Benade, Devine, Arndt, Forster, Gibbons, et al., "Is Peer Review in Academic Publishing Still Working?"
29. Beckstead, "EP 00: What is the Open Peer Review Podcast All About?"
30. Jackson, Peters, Benade, Devine, Arndt, Forster, Gibbons, et al., "Is Peer Review in Academic Publishing Still Working?"; Hannah McGregor, "Guest Post: Open Access Is a Feminist Issue," *Hook & Eye* (blog), November 6, 2019, <https://hookandeye.ca/2019/11/06/guest-post-open-access-is-a-feminist-issue/>.
31. Amy Mollett, Cheryl Brumley, Chris Gilson, and Sierra Williams, "Creating and Sharing Audio and Podcasts," chap. 5 in *Communicating Your Research with Social Media: A Practical Guide to Using Blogs, Podcasts, Data Visualisations and Video* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2017), 159–98.
32. Hagood, "The Scholarly Podcast."
33. Charlotte Roh, "Owning the Peer Review Process: If We Have to Do This Work, We Should Own It," *College & Research Libraries News* 83, 3 (2022), <https://crlnews.acrl.org/index.php/crlnews/article/view/25362/33246>.
34. Jackson, Peters, Benade, Devine, Arndt, Forster, Gibbons, et al., "Is Peer Review in Academic Publishing Still Working?"
35. Ross-Hellauer, "What Is Open Peer Review?"
36. Laith Zuraikat, "The Parasocial Nature of the Podcast," chap. 3 in *Radio's Second Century*, ed. John Allen Hendricks (Ithaca, NY: Rutgers University Press, 2020), 39–52, <https://doi.org/10.36019/9780813598505-005>; Daniela Schlütz and Imke Hedder, "Aural Parasocial Relations: Host-Listener Relationships in Podcasts," *Journal of Radio & Audio Media* (2021): 1–18, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19376529.2020.1870467>.
37. Schlütz and Hedder, "Aural Parasocial Relations: Host-Listener Relationships in Podcasts."
38. McGregor, "Bonus Episode: Podcasting, Public Scholarship, and Accountability."
39. Roberta Kwok, "How to Make Your Podcast Stand Out in a Crowded Market," *Nature* 565, 7739 (2019): 387–89, <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-00128-7>.
40. Carla DeMarco, "Hear Here! The Case for Podcasting in Research," *Journal of Research Administration* 53, 1 (2022), <https://www.srainternational.org/blogs/srai-jra1/2022/01/27/hear-here-the-case-for-podcasting-in-research>.
41. Friend and McGregor, "Scholarly Communication."
42. Beckstead, "EP 00: What Is the Open Peer Review Podcast All About?"; Dario Llinares and Lori Beckstead, "Peer Review Podcasting Part 2: Reflections," December 4, 2021, in *The Podcast Studies Podcast*, 1:01:47, <https://www.podpage.com/podcaststudiespodcast/peer-review-podcasting-part-2-reflections/>.
43. Llinares and Beckstead, "Peer Review Podcasting Part 2."
44. Charlotte Roh, "Owning the Peer Review Process"; Ford, "Opening Peer Review in LIS"; McGregor, "Guest Post: Open Access Is a Feminist Issue."
45. Beckstead, "EP 00: What Is the Open Peer Review Podcast All About?"; Llinares and Beckstead, "Peer Review Podcasting Part 2."
46. Llinares and Beckstead, "Peer Review Podcasting Part 2."
47. McGregor, "Bonus Episode: Podcasting, Public Scholarship, and Accountability."
48. Stacey Copeland, "Brenna Clarke Gray Says . . . You Got This!" *Amplified* (blog), February 21, 2022, <https://amplifypodcastnetwork.ca/News/2022/Amplified-Brenna-Clarke-Gray-says-You-Got-This>.
49. Elizabeth Parke and Siobhan McMenemy, "Moving beyond the Monograph: Podcasting as Scholarly Publishing," Centre for Research & Innovation Support, University of Toronto,



March 22, 2022, webinar, 1:13:37, <https://play.library.utoronto.ca/watch/51bce939c01fa9e9eb742217a678bbd6>.

50. Ford, "Defining and Characterizing Open Peer Review."
51. Jackson, Peters, Benade, Devine, Arndt, Forster, Gibbons, et al., "Is Peer Review in Academic Publishing Still Working?"
52. Jackson, Peters, Benade, Devine, Arndt, Forster, Gibbons, et al., "Is Peer Review in Academic Publishing Still Working?"
53. Beckstead, "EP 00: What Is the Open Peer Review Podcast All About?"
54. Hannah McGregor and Stacey Copeland, "Why Podcast? Podcasting as Publishing, Sound-Based Scholarship, and Making Podcasts Count," *Kairos* 27, 1 (2022), <https://kairos.technorhetoric.net/27.1/topoi/mcgregor-copeland/index.html>.
55. Ted Riecken, "Mapping the Fit between Research and Multimedia: A Podcast Exploration of the Place of Multimedia within/as Scholarship," *McGill Journal of Education* 49, 3 (2014), <https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/mje/2014-v49-n3-mje02117/1033545ar/>.
56. Carl Leggo, Anthony Paré, and Ted Riecken, "Peer-Reviewer Round Table Response to Ted Riecken's Scholarly Podcast, 'Mapping the Fit Between Research and Multimedia: A Podcast Exploration of the Place of Multimedia within/as Scholarship,'" *McGill Journal of Education* 49, 3 (2014), <https://www.erudit.org/fr/revues/mje/2014-v49-n3-mje02117/1033556ar/>.
57. Lori Beckstead, "In Conversation with Dr. Ian Cook: Publishing, Podcasting, and Bean Counting," August 14, 2020, in *Open Peer Review Podcast*, 55:26, <https://oprpodcast.ca/2020/08/14/in-conversation-with-dr-ian-cook-publishing-podcasting-and-bean-counting/>.
58. Ford, "Defining and Characterizing Open Peer Review."
59. Hannah McGregor, "Podcasting as Peer-Reviewed Scholarship," University of British Columbia Public Humanities Hub, webinar, August 21, 2020, 1:18:17, <https://youtu.be/U38VhmXK0PQ>; Hagood, "The Scholarly Podcast."
60. Amy Mollett, Cheryl Brumley, Chris Gilson, and Sierra Williams, "Creating and Sharing Audio and Podcasts," in *Communicating Your Research with Social Media*, 159–98.
61. Beckstead, "EP 00: What Is the Open Peer Review Podcast All About?"
62. Copeland and McGregor, *A Guide to Academic Podcasting*.
63. Copeland and McGregor, *A Guide to Academic Podcasting*.
64. Amber Sewell, "Ep.00: Building an Augmented Reality Game for Academic Libraries with Amber Sewell, Reviewer Charissa Powell, and Guest Host Lori Beckstead," September 16, 2022, *The LibParlor Podcast*, 1:16:22, <https://libparlor.com/2022/09/16/the-libparlor-podcast-ep-00/>.

This mss. is peer reviewed by the Center for Information Portal 23.4.