# Library publishing services:
# An investigation into open access publishing in academic libraries

**By Stuart Lawson**

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of MA Information Studies at the University of Brighton, School of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics, 2013.**

## Acknowledgments

I'd like to thank all of the participants and everyone at Anglia Ruskin University who helped me to do this research.

Thanks to my supervisor David Horner for guiding me through the process.

And special thanks to Jamie Redgate for proofreading it and supporting me the whole way through.

## Abstract

The aim of this research is to investigate whether it is feasible for a UK university to publish its research output itself through an open access library publishing service. It achieves this by undertaking a qualitative study at one institution, Anglia Ruskin University. It identifies the scholarly communication needs of the institution and its academics, and evaluates whether a library publishing service meets these needs. It also assesses the potential level of support for such a service within the university and recommends actions to take.

The literature review explores the idea of library publishing and places this research in a wider context. Given that the policy context in the UK is putting increasing pressure on researchers to publish open access, this dissertation examines whether creating a library publishing service is a good way for an institution to facilitate this.

This is a qualitative study consisting of five semi-structured interviews which were transcribed, coded and analysed. The results show mixed support for open access because although researchers support it in principle, they are unwilling to change their practices if they think that doing so might harm their reputation. One of the primary needs that they have from the scholarly communication process is to perform well in the REF. Other needs identified by this research include: being seen by one's peers; having access to an appropriate range and scope of publication outlets; a strong quality control process governed by peer review; and support with managing the publication and post-publication process. A library publishing service can meet these needs as long as it is designed with them in mind. Existing library publishing services can be used as a guide to best practice.

In answer to the aim of the research: creating a library publishing service at Anglia Ruskin University is feasible and could provide a valuable service to the university and its researchers. The question of whether there is sufficient support for such as service among academics at Anglia Ruskin University is still uncertain and requires further research to answer. The recommendations for Anglia Ruskin University are: to create a research support post in the library, to conduct a survey of academic staff to further investigate the level of support for library publishing, and to initiate a journal hosting service.

**Contents**

**Chapter 1 - Introduction**

This dissertation examines the idea of library publishing, specifically regarding open access publishing of UK universities' research output. The aim of this research is to investigate whether it is feasible for a university to begin gold open access publishing of its research output via a library-hosted open access publishing platform. The current chapter provides some background context to the research.

**1.1 Academic journal publishing**

Academic journals have long been vital to the dissemination of research and the exchange of ideas. In many disciplines, particularly the Sciences (Vincent 2013, pp. 108-109), journal articles are the primary form of research output. In the traditional academic publishing model, which has remained largely unchanged for several hundred years, academics and researchers undertake the intellectual work of a journal i.e. producing content, editing, and peer review. Publishers then perform functions such as copyediting and formatting to turn it into a print publication and distribute and sell it. In the transition to online digital publishing the details of how these roles are performed have changed drastically but the underlying function of a journal, which is "facilitating scholarly communication through the valuable filters of peer review and editing" (Morris et al. 2013, p. 2), remains the same.

When journals began publishing online as well as or instead of print, a complex set of problems faced by the library community led some to begin to question the efficacy of the traditional publishing model (Suber 2012, pp. 29-42). The largest purchasers of scholarly journals are academic libraries. In effect, this means that institutions are paying for research twice: once paying the researchers' salaries and the cost of their work, and again to have access to the published results. The cost of journals to libraries has also been rising well above inflation for several decades (Dingley 2005; Suber 2012, p. 30; Association of Research Libraries [no date]) leading to what became known as a 'serials crisis' as the ability of libraries to pay for journals was outstripped by their ever-increasing cost (BIS 2013, p. 8). A possible solution for these problems was proposed in the guise of a new model of publishing: open access.

**1.2 Open access**

Open access publishing is the publication of peer-reviewed scholarly research without restrictions on access (Suber et al. 2002). There are two main kinds of open access publishing, often referred to as green and gold (BIS 2013, p. 6). Green open access, also

known as self-archiving, is when published journal articles are deposited in an institutional or subject repository. Publishers often insist on an embargo period of 6-24 months before allowing this deposit to happen. It is also common for them to only allow pre-prints to be deposited rather than the final published version of an article. Gold open access is when research outputs are made open access immediately upon publication in a journal. The journal itself does not require a subscription to access. This model sometimes requires a fee known as an Article Processing Charge (APC) to be paid by either the article author(s) or someone else on their behalf, such as their home institution or a research funder (Solomon and Björk 2012, p. 1485).

Open access is seen by many librarians and researchers as a more effective model of scholarly communication than traditional publishing. However there are objections to it both from publishers who see it as a disruption to their businesses, and also from some academics who are concerned about losing the benefits that the current model provides. Most publishers are now experimenting with introducing some degree of open access. The 'hybrid' method of allowing authors to pay APCs to make individual articles open access within otherwise subscription-access publications has been introduced by all of the major publishers for at least some of their journals, but has yet to see significant uptake from authors (Shieber 2013, pp. 35-36).

The support of the academic community is vital for open access to be successful because an effective scholarly communication system has to be driven by user needs. This means that the concerns of academics must be addressed. Some of their concerns are based on misunderstandings about what open access entails, for example the false belief that it removes the validation function provided by peer review (Suber 2012, p. 20). There is particular concern among Humanities and Social Science (HSS) researchers that the open access movement has largely been driven by the needs of Science, Technology, Engineering and Medicine (STEM) disciplines with little regard to the differing needs of HSS researchers (Curry 2013, p. 56).

A further complication of switching to open access is the potential crisis for academic libraries as one of their primary functions, paying for and collecting academic output, is threatened by the possibility of universal online open access content (Eve 2012). Librarians have been among the most vocal advocates for open access because they can see the potential benefits for their users, but they need to carefully consider what their role might be in a post-open access environment. There is some consensus that libraries are well placed to provide services such as supporting researchers by providing advice on areas like

copyright, managing research data, and understanding open access (Harris 2012). If libraries have expertise on these areas and also manage the institutional repository, then it makes sense for them to consider initiating a publishing service themselves within the library as an extension of this role.

**1.3 Open access library publishing**

There have been numerous library publishing initiatives but they are not currently a significant element of the scholarly publishing environment. Most of the established library publishing projects are based in North America. In 2011, Jisc funded several library publishing projects in the UK: Huddersfield Open Access Publishing (HOAP) at the University of Huddersfield, SAS Open Journals at the University of London's School of Advanced Study, and UCL's EPICURE. The EPICURE project provided evidence for the feasibility of a repository-overlay service (Brown 2009) (see Chapter 2.3.4, *Overlay journals*).

There are a variety of open access publishing models which could be utilised for library publishing services. These include: library-press collaborations, if an institution has a university press; publishing only online, or offering printed works as well; and more lightweight digital publishing services that tie into existing repository infrastructure. A business model favoured by some open access publishers such as the Public Library of Science (PLOS) and Open Library of Humanities is that of the 'megajournal' with a single repository for all articles and 'overlay' journals on top (Open Library of Humanities 2013a). This research will consider which particular model might work best for library publishing.

Whichever model or platform is selected there are also decisions to be made as to the nature of the journals themselves. There could be a journal for each faculty or school; more narrowly defined subject-specific journals; a separate journal for postgraduate research; or perhaps a move beyond the traditional journal model altogether and instead fully integrate with the institutional repository. This could involve publishing at the article level right from the start, perhaps with additional overlay journals acting as a presentation layer (see Chapter 2.3.4, *Overlay journals*).

The fact that much of the software used in open access publishing is open source means that new publishers can work with existing no- or low-cost technical infrastructure rather than needing to create it themselves. Open Journal Systems (OJS) is an open source journal publishing platform that can be overlaid on common repository software such as DSpace,

and can also manage the editing and peer review workflows (Biondo and Weiss 2013, pp. 211-212) (see Chapter 2.3.3, *Software*).

A search in the Directory of Open Access Journals reveals 78 journals (as of 1 August 2013) listing a UK university as publisher, but it is difficult to gauge how many of these are part of a formal publishing program, and how many are just published ad hoc and run by particular academics or departments. No comprehensive research has been done on this topic. Services now exist at both the University of Edinburgh (University of Edinburgh 2013) and University of St Andrews (University of St Andrews 2013) on a similar scale and format to the UCL service mentioned above, including the use of OJS (see Appendix 1 for more examples). However these universities both stress that they are journal *hosting* services, rather than publishing services. There is a continuum between hosting services and publishing services depending on exactly which services are provided so it is important to define the extent of services at the outset of any new library publishing initiative, perhaps by using service level agreements (Deliyannides and Gabler 2013, p. 83).

The library appears to be a natural place within the institution to host this kind of publishing service since the role of the library is to facilitate the transfer of knowledge. It can be argued that one of the fundamental facets of librarianship, collection development, is currently undergoing a change from trying "to obtain the outputs of the world's scholars ... to collect[ing] the outputs of our own institutions' scholars and mak[ing] them freely available to the world" (Ball 2012, p. 122). This research will try to contribute to the body of knowledge surrounding this change by investigating whether library publishing might play a significant part in the future of scholarly communication.

## 1.4 Policy

Recent developments in scholarly publishing are reflected in the current research funder policy landscape. In 2011 the UK government established the Working Group on Expanding Access to Published Research Findings to "examine how most effectively to expand access to the quality-assured published outputs of research; and to propose a programme of action to that end" (Finch Group 2012, p. 122). This group contained academics, publishers and other interested parties. The final report, commonly referred to as the Finch report, made policy recommendations designed to encourage a transition to open access publishing, including favouring gold over green open access (Finch Group 2012).

The two biggest funders of UK research are the Higher Education Funding Councils, led by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), and the seven research councils for different subject areas, collectively known as Research Councils UK (RCUK). Following the publication of the Finch report both RCUK and HEFCE announced their support for open access by stating that they are introducing mandates in their policies. For RCUK this means that all research that they fund must be made available as open access (RCUK 2013). The RCUK policy came into effect on 1 April 2013. HEFCE's policy is still under development, but will probably require that for research to be eligible for submission to the post-2014 REF (Research Excellence Framework) it will have to be open access (Eve 2013, p. 73), at least for journal articles if not monographs. The REF takes place approximately every six years as a means of assessing the quality of universities' research and will be discussed further below.

The majority of public attention directed towards research funders' open access policies has been on RCUK and HEFCE but other major funders have implemented similar policies as well. The Wellcome Trust is a large private research funder that often aligns its policies with that of the UK's national research funders. In 2013 it introduced a mandate for all researchers that it funds to make their research outputs available as open access (Wellcome Trust 2013). This mandate, like all except for the RCUK policy, is for green open access rather than gold. RCUK is currently the only European funder to state a strong preference for gold open access. This is a somewhat controversial position which has caused such significant concern among researchers and other interested parties that the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills held a consultation in order to investigate whether the position should be modified (BIS 2013, pp. 6-7). The RCUK policy is due to be reviewed in 2014.

The European Commission is also a major funder of research in the EU through its multi-year Framework Programmes for Research and Technical Development. The Eighth Framework Programme, Horizon 2020, will support research for 2014-2020. Their report on improving access to scientific information (European Commission 2012, p. 9) contains an open access policy statement that is representative of current research funder thinking:

> In Horizon 2020, both the 'Green' and 'Gold' models are considered valid approaches to achieve open access. All projects will be requested to immediately deposit an electronic version of their publications (final version or peer-reviewed manuscript) into an archive in a machine-readable format. This can be done using the 'Gold' model (open access to published version is immediate), or the 'Green' model. In this

case, the Commission will allow an embargo period of a maximum of six months, except for the Social Sciences and Humanities where the maximum will be twelve months (due to publications' longer 'half-life').

The broad alignment of these various policy positions indicate that the UK is currently on course to have a majority of its research output published as open access by 2020. Individual research active institutions therefore need to take steps towards managing this transition. Additional funds have been allocated by RCUK to some universities as a means of enabling this process (RCUK [no date]), but most universities have not received significant amounts and money alone is not going to lead to a sustainable solution. As a way of exploring how the policy changes may affect universities and how academics are responding to them, this research will examine whether library publishing might play an important role in an open access scholarly publishing environment. In order to get a detailed view of the issues, this research has chosen one UK university to focus on: Anglia Ruskin University.

## 1.5 Anglia Ruskin University

Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) is a large post-1992 university that is attempting to develop a strong research culture. Discussions with some senior staff at ARU have revealed a desire for a wider debate within the institution about its approach to open access. One of the university's strategic priorities is to "disseminate our research to ensure its impact, economically, culturally, socially and on quality of life" (Anglia Ruskin University 2012, p. 7). Publishing all research outputs as open access may be one way to fulfil this. The third goal of ARU's Research and Scholarship Strategy 2012-2014 is "to lead nationally in knowledge transfer" (Anglia Ruskin University 2012, p. 5). This research investigates whether library publishing can help achieve these aims.

Library publishing has the potential to create a showcase for the institution's research far greater in scope than that achieved by the current institutional repository, Anglia Ruskin Research Online (ARRO). For example, open access research can be indexed very widely, including in the Directory of Open Access Journals, which is itself indexed in web scale discovery systems like Summon (Vaughan 2011, p. 23), Primo (Vaughan 2011, p. 40) and Google Scholar. There is some publishing activity already going on within the university. The Lord Ashcroft International Business School publishes the open access journal Interconnections (Anglia Ruskin [no date]), and the research institute Global Sustainability Institute publishes the magazine 'So what?' twice a year. These kinds of endeavours are not

part of any formal publishing service. There is also an MA Publishing course at the university which could perhaps be involved in the project and contribute their expertise.

ARU is in some ways representative of many other UK institutions: it is new (post-1992) university; it is not one of the Russell Group universities, which have substantial investment in research; it is trying to increase its research standing; and it has no existing university press. So although in its specifics this research is an investigation based on one university with unique characteristics, it is hoped that the findings are transferrable and can be applied to other institutional contexts as well.

## 1.6 Aim and objectives

*Aim:*

To investigate whether it is feasible for a UK university to publish its research output itself through an open access library publishing service.

*Objectives:*

- To identify academics' and institutional needs for scholarly communication at Anglia Ruskin University.
- To evaluate whether a library publishing service could meet these needs.
- To review existing library publishing services.
- To establish whether there is sufficient support within the university (faculty, research office, and library) to make a library publishing service successful at Anglia Ruskin University.
- To provide recommendations for Anglia Ruskin University.

## 1.7 Conclusion

The rest of this dissertation focuses on meeting the aim and objectives set out above. In Chapter 2 the relevant research literature is reviewed, to explore the idea of library publishing and ground it in a wider context. Chapter 3 describes the methods used to conduct this research, and gives reasons for their use. A qualitative approach was chosen using semi-structured interviews. In Chapter 4 the results of the data collection and analysis are described. These results are organised by the five themes that emerged from the data analysis: change; the institution and its culture; research(er) support; publishing and open access; and reputation. In Chapter 5 these results are discussed in relation to the objectives, and other issues arising from the results are explored in depth. Some suggestions for further

research are made. In Chapter 6 conclusions are drawn and the aim and objectives are re-visited to see how well this dissertation has been able to meet them. Finally, Chapter 7 provides recommendations for Anglia Ruskin University. The recommendations are: to create a research support post in the library, to conduct a survey of academic staff to further investigate the level of support for library publishing, and to initiate a journal hosting service.

## Chapter 2 - Literature review

Research into open access publishing has now produced a large body of knowledge (see Bailey 2010). Some of the broad areas of relevance for this project include academic publishing, open access business models, university presses, and institutional repositories. In order to focus on meeting the aim set out above, this literature review will mostly be limited to key articles and reports on publishing in academic libraries, and will discuss the other broader areas only as they apply to this subject. First, though, it is important to elaborate upon the background provided in the introduction by briefly discussing research into scholarly communication and open access. This will provide a broader context for what follows.

Library publishing services are not necessarily tied to open access means of production and distribution but this is the course that is usually chosen. Open access aligns well with both the non-profit nature of many institution-based publishers and the mission of libraries to share scholarly information. It also makes practical sense for a digital-first or digital-only service that is commonly run by the same scholarly communications department as the institutional repository. For these reasons, the literature review will assume that a library publishing service is open access unless stated otherwise.

### 2.1 Researcher needs for scholarly communication

The survey conducted by Housewright et al. (2013) about the current research behaviour of UK academics is a useful starting point for exploring academics' perceptions of scholarly communication channels. It highlights that the need to be discoverable by others working in the same subject area is of key importance. As a part of their study into open access books (see Chapter 2.2.2, *Scholarly monographs*), OAPEN-UK ([no date]), which is a part of the Open Access Publishing in European Networks (OAPEN) project, conducted a survey into Humanities and Social Science researchers' perceptions of their scholarly communication needs. This survey revealed that many services commonly provided by publishers are considered to be very important to researchers, particularly marketing, distribution and editorial functions. Marketing and distribution were also rated as the publisher services that authors are least keen on taking on themselves, so a library publishing service should ideally provide these.

There are differences in the scholarly communication practices of researchers within different subject disciplines. In Becher's study on academics' perceptions of the culture of their own disciplines, *Academic tribes and territories,* he claimed that "communication

patterns reflect the characteristics of the field of enquiry as well as those of the relevant research community" (1989, p. 77). One such disciplinary difference is the extent to which academics rely on journal articles as the primary means of dissemination. Some subjects such as Physics rely more heavily on informal communication methods such as conference papers and preprints, while in other subjects such as History, scholarly monographs are considered the most important means of communication (Becher 1989, pp. 81-83). There is wide variation even between related subdisciplines so absolute generalisations cannot be made, but Becher identified a broad tendency towards favouring monographs to journal articles in many Humanities subjects. This tendency is still the case today (Vincent 2013, pp. 108-109).

## 2.2 Open access

Open access has largely been driven by an attempt to solve some of the perceived problems with the scholarly communication system mentioned above (see Chapter 1.1, *Academic journal publishing).* The complexity and diversity of this system makes economic analysis of the whole system difficult. King and Tenopir (2011) have attempted this with a "system approach to studying the economics of scholarly journal publishing" (p. 350) which examined whether open access journal publishing results in lower costs for the various participants. While this is a useful approach for a high-level understanding of the overall situation and highlights the reduced average cost per article for open access (King and Tenopir 2011, p. 313), it doesn't elicit much practical insight in terms of how individual institutions or researchers should react to it in terms of allocating resources given the current economic context. For this it is necessary to examine some of the details of the current open access ecosystem.

### 2.2.1 Researcher perceptions of open access

The research literature on academics' perceptions of open access highlights a number of potential barriers to adoption of open access library publishing services in UK universities. These barriers include reluctance among senior academics to abandon scholarly communication practices that have served them well in the past, and the concern that open access research is not of a high quality (Park and Qin 2007). A library publishing service will only be successful if it gains academics' support by alleviating their concerns and satisfying their needs. In part this could be achieved by highlighting the fact that since researchers must now comply with research funder open access mandates, the library has the expertise to assist them with this and will not charge them APCs to publish with them.

Scepticism regarding open access is prevalent among some researchers. Xia's *A longitudinal study of scholars attitudes and behaviors toward open-access journal publishing* (2010) reviewed 18 years' worth of surveys (from 1991-2008) into researchers' attitudes towards open access. Over this time scale awareness of open access rose from around 50% to over 85% (Xia 2010, p. 620), and given the recent publicity around open access it is safe to assume that this trend has continued and the vast majority of researchers are now at least aware of the existence of open access. Despite this awareness, lack of peer review in open access journals was consistently raised as a concern (Xia 2010, p. 615), even though this is not based in fact. This shows that while researchers may be aware of open access many of them still do not fully understand what it is.

### 2.2.2 Scholarly monographs

Open access has primarily focused on the needs of scientific researchers so a lot of the focus has been on academic journals. For many subjects in the Humanities and to a lesser extent the Social Sciences, however, scholarly monographs are still the most important unit of scholarly communication (Vincent 2013, pp. 108-109). Open access can apply just as much to monographs as to journals but they are quite different in terms of production and costs so less progress has been made as to finding sustainable open access business models for publishers. There are, however, a number of open access book publishers such as Open Book Publishers who are producing small numbers of scholarly monographs. It is also an active area of research; the OAPEN study is an ongoing pan-European project designed to create an evidence base for the sustainability of open access monograph publication models (Adema and Schmidt 2010).

### 2.2.3 Article Processing Charges

An Article Processing Charge (APC) is a fee that is sometimes levied by publishers in order to cover the costs of publishing in an open access journal (Solomon and Björk 2012, p. 1485). The fees vary widely between different publishers. In the most comprehensive study of APCs to date, Solomon and Björk (2012) found an average price of $906 U.S. Dollars (USD) with a range of $8 to $3,900 USD (p. 1485). The high price charged by some journals is one of the points of concern for academics in switching over to open access publishing, so it is important to note that APCs are not synonymous with gold open access journals, and approximately 70% of open access journals do not charge APCs (Solomon and Björk 2012, pp. 1485-1486).

One of the business models in which APCs are commonly used is that of 'hybrid' journals, in which traditional publishers make some articles within a subscription journal open access for a fee. While hybrid journals are not the dominant form of open access journals, they were prominently supported by the Finch report. Since this report was for many people the starting point in debating open access as well as forming the basis of the RCUK open access policy, subsequent discussion has tended to conflate gold open access journals with APC-charging journals. This is likely to have had an effect on the willingness of researchers to consider publishing in open access journals.

### 2.2.4. Repositories

The two main types of repository are subject repositories and institutional repositories. Both of these types of repository usually satisfy the criteria for complying with research funder mandates which require green open access, unless the funder requires deposit in a specific repository (RCUK 2013, p. 8). Subject repositories have become very widely used in some disciplines, notably arXiv for pre-prints in subjects such as High Energy Physics. Institutional repositories now exist at over 1,900 institutions worldwide (OpenDOAR 2013), including the majority of UK universities (OpenDOAR 2013a). However, they have had a low uptake with academics and the majority of records in most of them are metadata-only rather than full text. The global figure for the availability of academic articles in repositories is estimated to be around 20%, albeit with large subject variations (Gargouri et al. 2012, pp. 286-289).

The fact that institutional repositories are nearing ubiquity in research institutions means that there is an existing infrastructure which can be co-opted as a platform on which to build other services. Rather than just hosting and re-publishing material already published elsewhere, repositories can be used to publish original material (Royster 2008, p. 27). Furlough (2009, p. 21) describes this potential function:

> Some institutional repository services and their infrastructure serve as the basis for publication activities. Campus-based publishing has become an increasingly visible (though still very experimental) service at many research libraries and smaller ones as well. They share core assumptions with broader IR [institutional repository] programs: Libraries, working with faculty and often with publishers such as university presses, can provide cost-effective technology to support the open distribution of research literature from within the university ... Given the experimental nature of these efforts, it appears that many institutions are limiting costs by first taking

advantage of their existing technology investments before investigating more specialized service offerings.

Using repositories as a platform for publishing like this was deemed to be common enough for Xia and Opperman to include it in their review of *Current trends in institutional repositories for institutions offering Master's and Baccalaureate degrees* (2010). They discuss three types of repository-based journal publishing: hosting digitised back runs of previously published journals; student journals; and open access peer-reviewed scholarly journals (Xia and Opperman 2010, p. 17).

## 2.3 Library publishing

While library publishing has a long history (see Maxim 1965), it is the electronic distribution of information via the Internet that has spurred a growing interest in the role of the academic library as a publisher of research outputs. The majority of experiments with web-based library publishing services have been in North America. From 2007-2011 a consortium of Canadian universities collaborated in the Synergies project which aimed to develop technical capacity for disseminating Canadian research (Devakos and Turko 2007, p. 16), and was notable for its use of open technical infrastructure and cross-institutional collaboration. The first two major reports to document the library publishing trend in detail were *University publishing in a digital age* (Brown et al. 2007) and *Research library publishing services: new options for university publishing* (Hahn 2008).

The study by Brown et al. was not specifically focused on library publishing but rather was "an assessment of university-based publishing and the future role of the university in the scholarly publishing system" (Brown et al. 2007, p. 6). It made some strong recommendations, such as: "Recognize that publishing is an integral part of the core mission and activities of universities, and take ownership of it" (Brown et al. 2007, p. 32). This implication that university publishing is essential to their mission was echoed by Hahn, who saw it as an emerging core function of academic libraries. Hahn's large survey of North American research libraries revealed that 65% of surveyed institutions were involved or planning to be involved in library publishing, and this was predominantly peer-reviewed journals but also conference proceedings and monographs (Hahn 2008, p. 5).

A number of articles followed over the next few years, indicating that there was a growing interest in the idea of library publishing (see Lawrence 2010; Park and Shim 2011; Perry et al. 2011; Walter 2012). But as Xia (2009, p. 371) cautioned, libraries had shown a similar

enthusiasm for institutional repositories, which have struggled to gain wide usage among academics. Since library publishing has still not become a significant part of scholarly communications this was an apt observation. Xia advocates for disciplinary rather than institutional based journals because this is the best way to meet academics' need to reach their target audience. He also looks at the system of 'university journals' common in China which provide some of the advantages of both subject journals and institutional repositories (Xia 2009, pp. 375-376). Overlay journals such as used in UCL's EPICURE project (Brown 2009) fulfil a similar function (see Chapter 2.3.4, *Overlay journals*).

Some articles have been written from the perspective of librarians who are directly involved in library publishing initiatives, such as Perry et al. (2011), which provides practical information for things to consider in setting up a service such as defining the scope of library involvement. The recently published open access eBook, *Library publishing toolkit* (Brown 2013), also reflects this practical focus. Most articles on library publishing seem to be grounded in descriptions of existing practices rather than exploring theoretical aspects, with notable exceptions such as Park and Shim (2011) and Eve (2012).

Harboe-Ree has claimed that "the emergence of university libraries as publishers has largely been in a complementary role to traditional academic presses, with libraries concentrating on electronic publishing, and traditional presses retaining print publishing" (2007 p. 21). University presses have since become more involved in digital publishing so this division may no longer be as clear-cut but it does show that the areas that libraries have strength in, such as digital infrastructure and open access, are becoming just as important as traditional publishing roles.

A research project to examine the state of library publishing services in the US was jointly undertaken by Purdue University, Georgia Institute of Technology, and the University of Utah (Mullins et al. 2012). Their final report, *Library publishing services: strategies for success*, acted as both a follow up to Hahn's earlier work by seeing what developments had been made in the intervening years, and also as guidance for universities considering launching similar services. Its identification of the lack of a central resource or meeting place for library publishing services was the inspiration for setting up the Library Publishing Coalition (Library Publishing Coalition 2013). As with earlier studies, Mullins et al. only consider the US situation so there may be some difficulty in directly translating their findings to a UK higher education context. This research hopes to go some way towards filling this gap in the knowledge.

### 2.3.1 Business models and sustainability

There are various business models for open access publishing that differ from traditional publishers, such as PLOS' megajournal approach (see Chapter 1.3, *Open access library publishing*). Wittenberg (2004) claims that librarians are more free than traditional publishers to think creatively of ways to serve users' needs. Thomas (2008) provides some examples of this in practice with case studies describing several innovative library-based projects including Project Euclid and arXiv. Wittenberg (2004) also highlights sustainability as a key challenge for library publishing; the economic costs of creating and maintaining services must be understood, and librarians may need to think entrepreneurially about their business models. Hahn claims that the set up costs for infrastructure and for new journals are the largest costs of any library publishing service, and these costs are usually met by institutional funding rather than needing to be reclaimed through revenue (2008, p. 19).

### 2.3.2 Library-press collaborations

Many library publishing services are collaborations with university presses (Hahn 2008). In Wittenberg's (2004) interviews with leading figures in library publishing at the time, many of them agreed that collaboration with a university press is very important. For institutions without an existing press there may therefore be more difficulty in starting a publishing service. Since only about a dozen UK universities have a press[1] this may prove to be a barrier to widespread adoption in the UK.

### 2.3.3 Software

There are a number of software packages which facilitate journal hosting, with the Public Knowledge Project's Open Journal Systems (OJS) the most widely used in library publishing services. More than half (57%) of respondents to Hahn's survey used OJS (2008, p. 14), with Digital Commons from bepress being another popular choice (25%) particularly for smaller institutions. More recent comparative figures do not seem to be available but at the end of 2012 OJS was being used for over 14,700 journals (Public Knowledge Project [no date]) and as of July 2013, Digital Commons is being used for around 600 (Digital Commons 2013). OJS is open source which means it is free to use and very flexible in terms of how it can be adapted to individual institutions, and it can manage each stage of the journal production process including peer review.

---

[1] It is difficult to find an exact figure for the number of university presses in the UK. There were 17 as of June 2004 (Hardy 2005, p. 98) but this cannot be relied upon as being still accurate.

John Willinsky, the founder of the Public Knowledge Project, has written an account of the early development of OJS (2005) which documents the reasons for creating it. Owen and Stranack (2012) wrote an updated account detailing some of its uses but their article is clearly biased towards promoting the software; in fact it is difficult to find critical comparisons between different open journal platforms. The wide user base of OJS means that there is a large community to support it and many problems that a user might face have already been encountered and documented. For example, a case study by Hunter (2011) was based on transitioning an existing journal onto the OJS platform and describes some of the issues which might arise.

One of the drawbacks of OJS is that the default set up is aesthetically very basic and has not been updated for many years, so it needs a lot of modification to make it look professional by contemporary web design standards. Open Library of Humanities is developing a "new presentation (view) layer for OJS that will facilitate the curation of overlay journals", which will be released under a free license (Open Library of Humanities 2013) so perhaps this can be used to overlay OJS on an institutional repository. The open access publisher Ubiquity Press has also done a lot of work modifying OJS to have a more contemporary feel. The level of customisation to the web interface that a new library publishing service would undertake will depend on both the resources available and the needs of the academics who are involved.

### 2.3.4 Overlay journals

The idea of an overlay journal brings together many of the factors already discussed above. An overlay journal is a presentation layer for content which has already been published or is hosted somewhere such as in a repository. This builds on the idea of the repository as a platform. For example, a journal could be produced using journal management software such as OJS with the content held in a repository. For institutions which have a repository but no existing university press this may be an attractive solution, especially in the UK since all of the Jisc-funded projects mentioned above utilised this approach to some degree.

Some of the details for overlay journals were explored by RIOJA (Repository Interface for Overlaid Journal Archives), another Jisc-funded project at UCL (Polydoratou and Moyle 2008). The first overlay journals were created with content originally published as preprints in the arXiv repository (Brown 2009), and the initial idea for the RIOJA project also originated from arXiv users (Polydoratou and Moyle 2008, p. 1). RIOJA's main outcomes were to develop technical tools to facilitate overlay journals (Polydoratou and Moyle 2008, p. 4) and

identify support for the idea within the physics and astronomy research community (Polydoratou and Moyle 2008, p. 8). This laid the groundwork for the EPICURE project (see Chapter 2.3.6, *UK*).

To return to the point stated above (Chapter 2.1, *Researcher needs for scholarly communication*) that a successful library publishing service must satisfy academics' scholarly communication needs, Schonfeld and Showers (2013), in a summary of Long and Schonfeld's study into the behaviour of chemists (2013), highlight a way in which this could be achieved through repository overlay journals:

> An interface to the repository that highlights the researchers and their research for an audience interested in the institution and its research is also important. In addition, there is a need to use the repository to power ... overlay journals for fields of institutional strength and other mechanisms for driving publications and for common standards for citing publications contained in an institutional repository, such as citation format and digital object identifiers.

> These ideas bring several benefits, including a strong support role for the library and wider institution, in helping researchers navigate the various mandates from funders, institutions and government and help researchers to focus on their research. It would also improve impact and dissemination for research outputs, enhancing institutional research and boosting reputation and give the potential to help researchers understand their audiences and impact through the use of analytics.

This idea incorporates a number of the functions of traditional publishing, such as marketing and audience engagement, within the remit of a repository-overlay publishing service. The fact that the suggestion arose from an analysis of researcher needs lends support to the idea of library publishing services. The study was limited to chemistry so it would be a mistake to assume its findings are necessarily transferable to other disciplines but it does seem to correlate with the findings of studies on Humanities and Social Science researchers such as OAPEN-UK ([no date]).

### 2.3.5 International context

This literature review has been limited to works available in English so does not cover much research from outside the English-speaking world. This is an important point because the policy context, at both national and institutional levels, determines whether infrastructure and

funding is available for initiating library publishing services. For example the vast majority of research in developing regions is government funded and there is often a problem with making it discoverable beyond the local region (Alperin et al. 2013, p. 2), which are prime conditions for making work available open access.

There are some regions which have a strong open access culture, for example Latin America (UNESCO 2011), where there may well be library publishing services which would be of interest. Several countries in East Asia have sizeable open access outputs and both China (Xia 2009) and Japan (Kamada 2007) have a tradition of institutional journal publishing. Other European nations are also experimenting with different open access models, such as Göttingen University Press which uses the university library's repository infrastructure to disseminate open access editions of books that it publishes (Adema and Schmidt 2010, pp. 34-35).

An Australian perspective is offered by Harboe-Ree, who acknowledges that in Australia they are building on the earlier work undertaken by US institutions and suggests some reasons for US prominence: the existence of the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC), US dominance in scholarly publishing, and funding to support projects (2007 p. 17). The UK is also a major world centre of academic publishing and given the investment now being made in open access publishing, it is an opportune time for UK institutions to consider library publishing.

### 2.3.6 UK

With the exception of a few print-focused university presses, there are currently no UK university-based publishing services on the scale of the larger of the North American services. In order to explore this gap, in 2011 Jisc funded several small library publishing projects: SAS Open Journals, Huddersfield Open Access Publishing (HOAP), and E-publishing Infrastructure Capitalising on UCL's Repositories (EPICURE) (Jisc [no date]).

SAS Open Journals is a publishing service linked to SAS-Space, the repository of the University of London's School of Advanced Study. So in this sense it functions like a library publishing service, but the repository is not actually run by the library. Perhaps this is an indicator that it is not the library that is the most important component in hosting a publishing service but rather it is the institutional repository. While repositories are usually tied to the library (Brown 2012, p. 149), SAS-Space demonstrates that this is not always the case.

The sister project of SAS Open Journals, HOAP, was based in a library. Rather than using OJS it published via EPrints, which is the repository software used by the University of Huddersfield (Stone 2012, pp. 8-9). HOAP used an overlay journal style by creating a presentation front end to act as the public face of the journal while hosting content in the repository (Stone et al. 2012, p. 3). In the final report one of the recommendations to the wider community was that they should "investigate the potential of OA [open access] journals as an alternative to traditional forms of publishing, particularly for niche subject areas and markets" (Stone et al. 2012, p. 17). The project also produced a toolkit for other universities to use (Stone 2011).

EPICURE was a 6-month project which created a repository-based publishing infrastructure (Moyle and Causer 2011, p. 3). It migrated an existing journal onto an Open Journal Systems instance which was overlaid on UCL's repository; see Chapter 2.3.4, *Overlay journals* for details of this model. The infrastructure created by this project has continued to be maintained and the service has since expanded to include a few other journals (UCL 2013).

## 2.4 Conclusion

This research aims to investigate whether the literature on scholarly communication, open access, and North American library publishing services can be combined with knowledge of the current open access policy context in the UK, in order to examine the feasibility of introducing library publishing services in the UK. Other than the projects mentioned above this idea has not been investigated, so as yet there has been no research regarding introducing a large-scale university-wide open access library publishing service in a UK university. In light of the current research funder policy context, in which open access mandates are being introduced by most major research funders, it is very timely to investigate these possibilities now. Anglia Ruskin University is having to adjust to this changing policy context and this research aims to provide it with some guidance regarding possible approaches it might take by setting out some recommendations.

# Chapter 3 - Methods

This research takes a qualitative approach and the main data collection instrument was semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews can be used to provide detailed qualitative data on the kind of complex topics under investigation (Denscombe 2010, pp. 173-175), and so they were chosen as the best way to obtain this data and meet the objectives set out above. Undertaking a survey by sending out a questionnaire to a large number of academic staff at ARU was considered, but it was decided that while this might give a greater sense of their general opinions on open access, it would not be able to explore the complexity of views to a sufficient degree. This is especially the case when it comes to the details of library publishing, which few people are familiar with. Therefore interviews would allow the researcher to exchange more information with participants in order to elicit considered opinions. One of the objectives, 'To review existing library publishing services', was investigated by the background research and literature review. The rest of the objectives were primarily investigated by the interviews, some of the questions of which were derived from information gained by undertaking the literature review.

## 3.1 Sampling

Purposive sampling was used to target key individuals within the research office, faculties, and library at ARU. Undertaking the research with the support of the host institution, and in particular the library's senior management team, meant that it was possible to approach staff members to participate in the research. It was intended that between 4-8 interviews would be carried out in order to have enough data to build up a rich picture and still be feasible in terms of time given the scope of this project. The final figure was at the lower end of this scale due to many academic staff being unavailable or on annual leave at the time of the research, a problem with undertaking research in universities at this time of year (July-August). Four interviews were carried out with ARU staff involved in research and research support. Each participant was asked who else in the university they thought would be useful to talk to, which provides useful information should ARU decide to pursue the idea of library publishing further.

One interview was also carried out with an academic from another institution, Martin Eve, a lecturer at the University of Lincoln. Martin is co-founder of the Open Library of Humanities which is a very different kind of open access publishing project. This additional interview was done to get an alternative view on the topics under investigation and check whether any of the results were idiosyncratic to ARU. When 'participants' are referred to below as a collective this usually means just those participants who are members of staff at ARU.

## 3.2 Data collection and analysis

Once the participants had agreed to take part in the research an interview schedule was produced. Using semi-structured interviews meant that although some direct questions were formulated, the role of the interviewer consisted more of choosing topics for discussion. Each interview investigated the same overall topics but they were tailored to reflect individuals' differing experience and roles within the institution. Appendix 4 provides an example of this for the first participant, in which an outline of topics to talk about in the interviews is interspersed with a handful of questions. This was used as the model for subsequent interviews and was heavily adapted for each one. For example, the question asked to the first participant about the library's strategic plan (see Appendix 4) was not asked to other participants.

With permission from the participants, the interviews were recorded in order to preserve a full copy of them for further analysis rather than relying on the interviewer's memory and notes (Denscombe 2010, p. 187). In order to undertake data analysis the audio recordings of the interviews were transcribed. The four ARU interviews were between 33 and 43 minutes in length (2 hours 33 minutes in total), and given the small sample size all of these interviews were transcribed in full verbatim, resulting in 27,012 words to analyse. It is hoped that using full verbatim transcripts for the analysis has helped to reduce bias by ensuring that all aspects of the conversations are examined, thus not allowing pre-conceived notions of which aspects are important to prevent new ideas from emerging. That said, transcription is an interpretive process and changing the medium inevitably results in a loss of certain kinds of information, such as speech intonation and emphasis (Gibbs 2007, pp. 10-11). Listening back to the recordings repeatedly and referring to notes taken during the interviews will have allowed a lot of this contextual information to remain in mind as the transcripts were analysed.

The data collection and analysis were not done in two discrete stages but were undertaken concurrently, with analysis beginning as soon as data collection was underway (Denscombe 2010, p. 272; Gibbs 2007, p. 3). The iterative nature of this process meant that findings from early interviews fed back into later ones so none of the different interviews had an identical set of questions.

After the interviews were transcribed, the transcripts were then coded following the technique of thematic coding (Robson 2011, p. 474) (see Appendix 5 for an example of a

coded transcript page). Gibbs (2007) defines coding as "the process of identifying passages (in the field notes or interviews) that exemplify certain thematic ideas and giving them a label - the code" (p. 31). This coding process added another layer of interpretation to the analysis by identifying and labelling concepts that arose in the interviews. A data-driven approach has been attempted in this research but prior knowledge of the topics will have influenced which codes were chosen, because it is not possible for a qualitative researcher to be completely objective in their interpretations (Gibbs 2007, p. 91). The codes from all four interviews were then compiled into a separate document. Inductive analysis was used to group these codes into clusters of related concepts which were then arranged hierarchically within these clusters. Thus the resultant themes were allowed to emerge from the data. Each theme was compared across all interviews to build up a rich picture of the areas of investigation set out in the objectives.

The final interview, with Martin Eve, was carried out in the same way as the others but was not analysed in the same way. It was instead used as a counterpoint to provide alternative ideas to those expressed by Anglia Ruskin staff. The interview occurred after the data analysis for the ARU interviews had been completed and written up. Martin's responses have therefore not been integrated into the main analysis of results and have instead been interspersed throughout the results and discussion chapters (Chapters 4 and 5) as a commentary on them.

### 3.3 Ethical considerations

All participants are adults working in higher education institutions. Informed consent was obtained from research participants in order to interview them and record the interviews. According to Robson (2011, p. 207), "Giving anonymity to participants when reporting on research is the norm. It is regarded as good practice by ethical research boards and committees and expected in legal frameworks such as the UK's Data Protection Act (1988)." Therefore participants were given the opportunity to use pseudonyms rather than real names. In the end all participants agreed to have their real names used in this dissertation.

All participants also agreed to allow transcripts of their interviews to be deposited online in an open access research repository alongside a copy of this dissertation. Participants were shown a copy of the transcript to their interview before agreeing to make it available online. Four participants were happy for the entire transcript to be made available and one asked for a few short passages to be redacted. This researcher believes that the most ethical stance to take with all aspects of research is to make it as open as possible, so long as there are no

competing ethical constraints. This accords with the principles of open science, which include "the complete and persistent access to the original data from which knowledge and conclusions have been extracted" (Lyon 2009, p. 12). If a scientific article presents its results and conclusions without making the underlying data on which they are based available for public scrutiny, then a reader has reason to doubt the validity of the work because they cannot check it for themselves. This principle can apply equally to qualitative Social Science research. Making the transcripts available means that readers do not have to rely solely on the interpretation of the researcher if they wish to view the raw data for themselves. Therefore the analysis and conclusions can be questioned more thoroughly.

## 3.4 Limitations

There are some limitations in this research design. While using a small selected sample gives a rich picture, it means that the results from the analysis cannot be generalised. However, it is believed that the results are transferrable to other similar contexts. As stated in Chapter 1.5, Anglia Ruskin University shares characteristics with a number of other institutions: it is new (post-1992) university; it is not one of the Russell Group universities, which have substantial investment in research; it is trying to increase its research standing; and it has no existing university press. It is therefore reasonable to expect that similar results would be found elsewhere. Another limitation is that it will be impossible to exactly replicate this research because the interviews cannot be conducted again to obtain the same results. It is hoped that the benefits gained from the detailed qualitative data outweigh these limitations.

The small sample size raises some problems. Participants were selected because of their specialist knowledge of certain areas so that informed responses could be obtained. However, many of the statements that the analysis is based on came from only one or two participants so it is difficult to tell how representative they are. This is an intrinsic facet of this kind of small-scale qualitative research. The literature review and discussion chapters relate the results of this research to the wider context of open access and higher education, which hopefully should bring to light any discrepancies between participants' perspectives and those of the wider community.

A problem with basing the analysis on participants' responses is that sometimes they have an incorrect or partially correct idea of what something is. For example, in a question involving Creative Commons licenses, which are open licenses that are often used for open access journal articles, the subsequent discussion revealed that the participant was not

aware that Creative Commons licenses are commonly used in this way. A similar situation also arose when discussing certain aspects of open access publishing with all participants at ARU, particularly in the finer details.

## 3.5 Reflection

The interviews were successful and a lot of useful data was gathered which helped to meet the objectives, but the nature of the interview process creates some difficulties for any qualitative researcher. It may be impossible to completely avoid interviewer effects, i.e. the fact that the interactions with and perceptions of the interviewer can affect participants' answers (Gilbert 2008, pp. 255-256), but having an awareness of these issues hopefully went some way towards minimizing them. Although the research was conducted by an avowed open access advocate the outcome of the research should not have been too greatly affected by this; the researcher is agnostic as to which means of achieving open access are most appropriate and so strove to answer the research aim and meet the objectives.

In each of the first two interviews, which were with library staff, there was a noticeable difference about halfway through when the topic of conversation changed to library publishing. Since this topic was less familiar to participants more explanation had to be given and this led to the interviewer taking a less passive role in the conversation. This may have influenced how the participants perceived the idea as the interviewer picked up on their potential enthusiasm for library publishing and may have given it a positive spin. The same phenomenon occurred in the second interview despite being aware of it happening in the first; perhaps this is an unavoidable feature of the researcher also being the research instrument.

This dynamic seemed to happen significantly less in the third and fourth interviews because the participants were less enthusiastic about the idea of library publishing initially and so there was greater discussion on both the positive and negative aspects of it. In the fourth interview in particular, with the head of the MA Publishing course, the participant had opinions on why some kinds of library publishing might not work.

The final interview, with Martin Eve, was undertaken for slightly different reasons and in different circumstances. This meant that the dynamics of the conversation were very different, particularly since both people knew that the other was an open access advocate.

Martin tried to keep his own views separate from how he thinks other researchers view things, much as this research has tried to do throughout.

**Chapter 4 - Results**

This chapter of the dissertation contains the results of the data analysis. It is organised by the five themes that emerged from this analysis: change; the institution and its culture; research(er) support; publishing and open access; and reputation. These themes are very closely interrelated. They arose from grouping together the codes that were assigned to the interview transcripts. Some of these codes were descriptive and some were analytic or conceptual, and this difference is also noticeable in the nature of the themes as well. Three of the themes - the institution and its culture, research(er) support, and publishing and open access - are descriptive, and correlate to the questions that were asked in the interviews. The other two themes - change and reputation - are analytic concepts. Reputation was not intended to be a major topic of investigation but it emerged from the interviews as an important theme.

The named participants who are members of staff at Anglia Ruskin University are as follows: Nicky Kershaw is the University Librarian; Pete Stokes is a Subject Librarian for the Health faculty and also has responsibility for research support; Tim Brooks is the REF Manager (a part of Research Development and Commercial Services (RDCS)); and Leah Tether is the Course Leader for the MA Publishing course. Martin Eve is a Lecturer specialising in 20th- and 21st- Century American Literature at the University of Lincoln, and also the co-founder of the Open Library of Humanities, an open access publishing initiative.

**4.1 Change**

As well as the constant process of change that universities and their libraries go through in order to stay up to date and on a par with their peers, all aspects of scholarly communication are currently in a state of flux accelerated by innovations in digital technology. This means that the role of the library within an institution, and the roles of what library staff do, are also changing to adapt to these developments. All participants had an understanding of the general direction of changing trends albeit with different levels of understanding of the details.

The results show that there is a conflict between a willingness to experiment with new services in order to find better ways of doing things and a reluctance to change from the way things have traditionally been done. This conflict is represented both in the differences in attitude among different people and groups, and also in individuals' responses to situations based on their own experience.

### 4.1.1 Willingness to experiment with new services

Both the members of library staff who were interviewed said that the library was willing to experiment with new services, perhaps more so than academics:

> We accept that things need to change probably more readily, I think from my experience anyway. And depending on what it is I think most of us just tend to get on with it or accept that we have to get on with it. - Pete Stokes

Nicky talked about the importance of comparing the library with other university library services, and said that the library at ARU compared favourably with others in terms of willingness to experiment:

> I think willingness to try; if you look at the things that we do through our website. We have this tendency to think 'ooh, not very innovative', and then you talk to a couple of other places, places you respect, and they go 'ooh, wow, you're doing that'. So we are trying things out. - Nicky Kershaw

Tim said that there was an appetite for change both in the university in general and also with academics wishing for change in academic publishing practices. He described how academics would welcome change but need it to be implemented in a way that works for them:

> I think there is an appetite for change, it's just that what that change might actually prove to be isn't yet clear. If somebody were to stand up, if the government were to stand up and say 'this is how we should do it' then I think academics would find it a lot easier to change the way in which they do things because they're being presented with a clear alternative, a clear way forward. - Tim Brooks

Martin echoed this sentiment: "I think it's easy to persuade people that it's a worthwhile thing to do but it still sounds utopian and it's difficult to show them pragmatic examples of it being done otherwise." For Leah, experimentation is an intrinsic part of the MA Publishing course that she runs. Students can submit work in alternative formats:

> … and it's to be encouraged if you ask me because they're going into an industry which is in a state of flux, which is moving to the digital age and they've just got to

learn that you're going to have to be adaptable and flexible and try new things out. - Leah Tether

## 4.1.2 Reluctance to change

This willingness to change is balanced by people being reluctant to change the practices that they are familiar with if they don't see an urgent need to change. With regards to academic publishing, this sentiment was expressed by both of the participants at ARU who are also publishing authors.

> From my point of view yeah I think they'd just like to carry on as normal. My experience is that most people don't like change anyway. So when the library changes something it's all 'oh, you've changed something'. So if the way you submit to the journals changes, 'oh, you've changed that now, in the past this all worked perfectly, why are you changing it now?' And so I think if the current way of doing things were to stay the same I think most academics would be very happy with that. - Pete Stokes

Leah said that one of the reasons for a reluctance to change that might be encountered at ARU is fatigue with too often being asked to try out new services that still have problems with them:

> I do feel that happens quite often, these experimental things are rolled out before the creases have been ironed out or they've been piloted elsewhere ... I can see the benefit in the long run but I think the system has to work before you start rolling it out. - Leah Tether

## 4.2 The institution and its culture

Participants, especially Nicky (the University Librarian), had a lot to say about the ways in which different departments of the university interact. This was partly in response to questions about the library's role within the institution and how services to support researchers could be best integrated. Acknowledgement of the university's institutional priorities, as governed by the Vice Chancellor and the corporate plan, is also regarded as important.

The University Librarian sees part of their role as bringing in ideas from the wider library community. In this way the library can initiate change, although there are limits to the

influence that the library can wield. So seeing an increasing role for research support being introduced at other university libraries has led to a consideration of creating a similar role at ARU, and this aligns with the institutional priorities set out by the Vice Chancellor. The process of introducing the institutional repository illustrates these points well:

> There wouldn't be an institutional repository if we hadn't insisted that that's what everybody else was doing and we really ought to do it and I think we drove it through, with the help of Caroline Strange [Assistant Director (Research Support), RDCS], but I wouldn't say that anybody else at the corporate table really understood the value of an institutional repository [initially]. So ... we were able to look ahead and tell them the way we ought to be going. - Nicky Kershaw

Nicky also talked about balancing institutional priorities with the wider library context, saying that "the corporate plan [is] important, it's a context, but equally the HE library context and the larger library information world context I would say is equally important." All participants who were asked about the library's role in research support referred in their answers to how other universities are tackling this issue. This has implications for considering introducing a library publishing service because now that they have been alerted to a growing trend towards library publishing, library staff may want to look very closely at how other universities are implementing these services.

Comparing ARU with other universities was also frequently mentioned as something that is done to ensure they don't fall behind emerging trends. The University of East London (UEL) in particular is often used to benchmark against, so the fact the UEL has more structured research support services is something that ARU is aware of and taking into consideration. Nicky described the purpose of creating a Research Support Librarian role as to "provide a signal that we're taking it seriously", to show that the library is working towards the institution's aim of increasing its research focus.

### 4.3 Research(er) support

The focus of the interviews was on scholarly communication practices and the needs of researchers that these practices stem from. The questions about these areas were then directed towards library support for researchers and whether the library can provide extra services, especially publishing services, to help meet their needs. While there were differences in the participants' responses there was a high degree of correlation on some points, which indicates potential areas for the library to develop. The interviews should have

revealed whether there are any researcher needs for scholarly communication that are specific to ARU but none were identified.

Leah has given consideration to the kind of skills researchers need to be developing in a digital environment. Open access and copyright are two related areas that she identified as important and not well enough understood:

> [T]his is something that should be incorporated as part of all the generic research methods sessions that students actually have to undertake as compulsory parts of doing a research degree ... I actually think training in this area is so crucial now because it is going to be a career skill for people who are already in academia – people who are going into academic jobs certainly need to be aware of all of the issues around open access, and distributing their work online, all of those kind of things. So I actually think it needs to become a part of those generic research methods sessions – I think it needs to be fed in either as an add-on or integrated throughout but one way or the other I think it needs to be addressed. - Leah Tether

At ARU, researcher training sessions are currently run by RDCS rather than the library. Tim acknowledged that RDCS do not offer much support with the end stage of research, such as copyright and open access publishing, so perhaps if the library has greater knowledge of these topics then this is a role best suited to them. Martin made the interesting point that researchers might not look to the university for support with copyright or publishing, but turn to publishers instead. As Leah suggested, Martin believes that the best time to get researchers to see the value of institutional support with these issues is during their training:

> Postgraduates doing their PhDs is a little bit different [to established researchers]. Some universities like Sussex have training programmes now where they mention that they have a copyright librarian. And with the rise of institutional repositories and the depositing of those theses, that becomes actually something they're flagging up earlier and earlier. And they're trying to get supervisors aware of as well. So I think when that generation go through they will be more savvy about the library's provision of copyright advice but for now existing staff seem to be just going to the publishers. - Martin Eve

**4.4 Publishing and open access**

The discussions about academic publishing and open access highlighted the pros and cons of both traditional publishing models and open access alternatives. All participants had heard of the idea of library publishing before but had not given it serious thought until now. When asked about how the library might adapt to a fully open access environment, Nicky was unsure. The knowledge and skills are not in place at the moment and there is too much uncertainty as to how the overall situation is developing. No other department (e.g. RDCS) has taken a lead in open access either, so the library can still create that role for itself.

A good summary of researchers' general feelings about open access was given by Tim, who described how it is now widely known about and supported in theory, but researchers don't feel like they have suitable options available to them yet:

> It's talked about. I think it is seen as a good thing, capital 'G' and a capital 'T'. The idea of being able to share findings of research as widely as possible is a good thing. And I think that anybody that thinks about it in the abstract will recognise it is and wish to go down that route. But the barriers in the way of doing that are perhaps seen as insurmountable. Or at least rather difficult to get round. Especially when you start considering the effort it takes to publish something in an open access way that isn't through a traditional journal, the impact on REF scores and so forth by not publishing in the expected outlets, despite what the REF rules say about that, and so on and so forth. I think that if you give them an easy way to do it then yes absolutely they'll jump on that route of doing things. But that's the thing, at the moment there isn't yet a sort of clear 'this is the best way to do it' model. There are various different conflicting models around as to how to proceed. - Tim Brooks

**4.4.1 Disciplinary differences**

Pete, speaking as a Health Librarian as well as having responsibility for research support, said that open access is not much discussed in that faculty (Health, Social Care and Education). He suggested that the Science and Technology faculty may be more aware of it. A similar sentiment was expressed by Leah about Arts and Humanities subjects, which she related to both cultural differences, including the need for research to be published as quickly as possible in the Sciences, and also funding differences:

> There is an awful lot more money in the science side of things as well which means that the idea of paying for publication – either on a green or gold access model,

whatever it is the journals they want to have are using – I think it's not quite so terrifying to them because writing that into a funding application or something like that, you know there's an awful lot more funding out there for them so that's not so difficult. Whereas in the arts it's much more of a lottery as to whether you get funding.
- Leah Tether

### 4.4.2 Library publishing

Each participant approached the idea of library publishing from the perspective of their role in the university, which led to some interesting differences of opinion. Nicky looked at if from a strategic viewpoint of improving the both the university's image and also the library's reputation within the university. Pete also talked about how library publishing might provide a useful service for researchers and in doing so improve their reputation and therefore the university's reputation as well. He emphasised the need for an appropriate range of journals at a level of specificity that suits researchers. When the idea of having journals for broad institution-defined areas such as faculties was floated, this was considered to be impractical and unlikely to see much take up from academics; it was thought that journals for narrow specialities would work far better.

Leah, who also has a background in publishing, found it important to highlight the benefits of services provided by traditional publishers and was concerned that a library publishing service would not be of a high quality if it did not also provide these services. The quality control process, especially peer review, was something she strongly emphasised. This was probably because of the common fallacy that open access publications are of a lesser quality than toll-access or subscription publications, which is not true but has long been the view of many academics (see Chapter 5.2, *Questions about open access*).

### 4.4.3 Postgraduate journals

The idea of postgraduate journals was well received by all participants at ARU with the exception of Leah. Pete spoke about how it would benefit the students, saying: "That's a good idea. I think it would help, gets you into the idea of how to subsequently publish stuff later on. I've published some stuff from my Masters as well so I know that as you go through [the publication process] it makes you aware of how the process works." Tim looked at it from an institutional perspective at how it could benefit not only the students but also the reputation of the university:

[The idea] makes an awful lot of sense. That's an awful lot better of a use for a library publishing service perhaps than a general research journal for a university. Because your niche is 'this is what our postgraduates do', and so it's maybe not even so much about the research itself, in terms of really why we're doing it although it has that tool, but it's a teaching tool, it's an experiential tool. It's also a marketing tool because you can say to potential postgraduates 'come here and see what our existing lot have done.' I could see how that might tie in very nicely with some of the research support training stuff the RDCS does to help postgrad students. There are various stages of training that are provided for all students, to do things like writing and publishing and giving presentations all that kind of stuff, of which obviously writing for a journal is quite important. So definitely. That kind of thing would be good. - Tim Brooks

However Tim also raised the point that "if they're actually producing groundbreaking research with their postgraduate studies, then ... actually is this the best place to put it?" This idea was elaborated on by Leah, who was concerned that postgraduate journals would not have a good enough reputation to provide outstanding research with the exposure it needs:

I'm not saying that's necessarily a bad thing but I'm not sure that top institutions would necessarily want to be hosting those journals and looking like they were the overarching body associated with it ... I would actually discourage a student of mine from publishing in a postgraduate journal. And as much as I do agree it's really useful for students to see the publishing process from the inside, I'm not necessarily sure that it's time well spent to kind of publish in those journals ... I don't want to discourage the idea because I like the idea but the reality of the times we live in ... as a principle, as a concept, I don't see a problem with it. I like the idea of students doing these kind of things, it's great. But in the world we live in as academics, it's not necessarily a practical use of time. - Leah Tether

Martin agreed with this, saying that getting editorial experience would be beneficial for postgraduate researchers but he would not recommend PhD students to publish in a postgraduate journal because it would do nothing to advance their career. The view expressed by Leah is not based on anything intrinsic to open access and/or postgraduate journals but rather it is concerned with the way that academics perceive the reputation of these outlets, and more importantly, how they perceive that other academics perceive the reputation of these outlets.

**4.5 Reputation**

Reputation was perhaps the strongest theme to emerge from the interviews. In the UK the measuring of reputation is highly entrenched in academic practice in part because of the Research Excellence Framework (REF). The REF is a survey of universities' research output which is conducted on behalf of the government in order to allocate future funding based on past performance. Tim, the REF manager at ARU, said that "the purpose ... is essentially to award us funding and for us to be benchmarked in reputational terms against our competitors." The rules of the REF officially disallow evaluating the quality of research outputs based on things like journal reputation or Impact Factors, but nobody seems to believe that this is actually adhered to. Although the REF is used to allocate some funding to universities, more important than that is the reputational advantage bestowed on an institution by having a good REF score. Because of this, universities base a lot of their actions, including hiring decisions, on increasing their REF performance. Leah Tether said that "the first thing any employing committee will do is look at your publications and say where have they published, how would this person do in the REF. That's the first thing they're looking at." This has important implications for library publishing, as highlighted by Leah:

> In the times of the REF, they are looking for particular kinds of publications in which to publish. Preferably A-rated journals, if not B-rated journals, and I think there's no problem with libraries providing these hosting services for journals, that's fine. But what benefit is it really serving if they're not high quality journals? Or journals which are perceived of as being high quality at the very least. Because that institution is then affiliating itself effectively with what's possibly considered poor research. - Leah Tether

Pete agreed that researchers feel this way, saying: "I could see that if the articles are going to published only in the university publishing journal, some ... researchers won't want that because they want to publish in a high Impact Factor journal so they wouldn't want to be restricted in that way." So maintaining a high standard for a library publishing service is very important, but given how long it can take to develop a good reputation, it may be a slow process. One way round this would be to transfer some existing academic journals that have already built up a reputation onto a library publishing platform.

### 4.5.1 Library reputation and library publishing

The participants' responses explored the reputation of a library within its institution. Nicky said that the image of the library held by academics has not kept pace with the changes that libraries have made:

> I know we do all the other stuff but I still think if you go out to an academic and say 'library' immediately the picture in their mind is that place where the books are on the shelves, and they haven't stepped beyond that. - Nicky

Pete suggested that perhaps the reputation of the institution itself could be enhanced by introducing a library publishing service, if well-regarded publications are published through it and therefore associated with the institution. Publishing postgraduate journals could also help attract future postgraduate students by acting as a showcase for ARU's postgraduate programme. This reputation might not be easily won, however, as Tim explained:

> [If] it's a Springer journal, or it's a Nature journal or something, then immediately it's got a kind of a cachet because of where it's come from. It's difficult; I think probably to be fair, if you started a University of Oxford library publishing service, you'd immediately have a cachet for that output that I'm afraid you're not going to get with Anglia Ruskin. And again that's not to pass comment on what Anglia Ruskin is doing, we're doing some absolutely excellent stuff, but it is about the reputation, how that stuff is perceived in the outside world. That I think is the problem that an institution like ours will have to overcome in order to make a library publishing service work. - Tim Brooks

Tim and Leah were in agreement that the idea that good research is only done at 'good' institutions is a fallacy, but these reputational issues are important to bear in mind. They both considered it important to think carefully about how a library publishing service might impact on the reputation of ARU.

**Chapter 5 - Discussion**

In this chapter the results and analysis that were presented in the previous chapter are discussed further. In Chapter 5.1 the results and analysis are related back to the literature review and the wider higher education and library context. Chapter 5.2 addresses concerns raised by participants about open access and draws on evidence from the literature to explain why some of these concerns are misplaced. In Chapter 5.3 the broader implications of this research are discussed and areas of further study suggested. Finally, Chapter 5.4 shows how the results and analysis relate to the objectives.

**5.1 Comparing results to the literature**

This research has been conducted within the UK higher education context, where there is little familiarity with library publishing or research published about it. By referring to the literature on library publishing in North America, it may be possible to use existing knowledge to see where this dissertation fits into a broader understanding of library publishing.

A review by Cowen (2013) of the first few years of a library publishing service at the University of Lethbridge, Canada, identified the following areas of expertise that librarians could bring to a service:


- Metadata standardisation
- Discoverability: indexing, cataloguing, aggregators, search engine optimisation, and social media
- Researching and recommending standards in publishing format and software
- Impact and bibliometrics
- Archiving standards, procedures, and space
- Intellectual property standards and recommendations

(Cowen 2013, p. 181)


When applied to ARU, these areas fall into two categories: those which the university library already has expertise in (metadata standardisation, discoverability, archiving standards, procedures and space), and those which are likely to be provided by someone filling a Research Support Librarian role (researching and recommending standards in publishing format and software, impact and bibliometrics, intellectual property standards and recommendations). Since the library is considering creating this role (see Chapter 4.2, *The*

*institution and its culture*) it is likely that these skills will be brought into the library, so perhaps a library publishing service could be led by the same member of staff as other research support services.

The services that participants suggested would be good for a library publishing service to provide were: open access journals for niche subject areas; postgraduate journals; publication of other outputs such as grey literature; consultancy and advice on copyright and other areas of publishing; and web publication services e.g. blogging and online marketing. These areas are similar to those commonly provided by existing library publishing services, with some combination of them usually being offered. For example, the University of Pittsburgh service publishes peer-reviewed journals and also collaborates with the university press to publish open access monographs (Deliyannides and Gabler 2013, p. 82). The Center for Digital Research and Scholarship at Columbia University provides support with additional interactive web tools such as blogs and wikis (Newton et al. 2013, p. 110).

In the UK, on the other hand, most library publishing services have so far focused on providing journal hosting for niche subject areas and postgraduate journals, with further support mostly restricted to the initial set-up phase when bringing new journals onto the platform. The Jisc-funded projects outlined in Chapter 2.3.6, *UK* are an example of this, with the final assessment of the HOAP project recommending niche subject journals as a priority (Stone et al. 2012, p. 17). Journal hosting may be the core of any library publishing service but this research indicates that support in the other areas would be necessary to create a significant presence and provide a valuable service to the university and its researchers. As the OAPEN-UK ([no date]) study discovered, marketing is one of the key facets of publishing that authors are least willing to do themselves, so those library publishing services which only provide basic journal hosting are forgoing a useful function by not providing this.

This research has focused primarily on journal articles. As mentioned above, there are many other important forms of scholarly research output and there is no reason other than resource constraints to limit a library publishing service to only journal articles. Institutional repositories are often used to provide access to book chapters, conference papers, grey literature and non-traditional formats (SPARC Europe 2013). This function of repositories could be integrated into a library publishing service, especially if an overlay service is used. In the literature review the idea of overlay journals was discussed in depth (see Chapter 2.3.4, *Overlay journals*) but the results of this research did not delve further into this idea; the topic of which publishing model a library publishing service should adopt did not arise in the interviews. This is perhaps unsurprising given the participants' lack of familiarity with the

details of this area. The idea of overlay journals linked to a repository may appear to be interesting only to librarians from a technical standpoint, even though such structural details do have further implications for how a service develops. As a result, this research has not contributed to an understanding of whether any particular model should be favoured.

The lack of an existing university press at ARU did not arise as being considered a problem. Martin suggested that the name 'university press' carries so much weight that it may be worth considering using it for a library publishing service. While the term 'university press' tends to imply a traditional print publisher, the lines are being blurred as those presses are now providing more comprehensive digital services (Harboe-Ree 2007 p. 21). The new open access publishing initiative launched at Amherst College in the US has approached this from the other direction and named its library publishing service Amherst College Press (Amherst College [no date]). Given the concern about whether a new publishing service at ARU would be seen as prestigious enough to attract high-quality work, it is worth considering whether a name such as *Anglia Ruskin University Press* would be better than, for example, *Anglia Ruskin Open Journals*.

## 5.2 Questions about open access

The literature review identified researchers' perceptions of open access to be important and a possible barrier to adoption if this perception is in part based on misunderstandings. The results of this research raised the exact same concerns that were found in the literature (see Chapter 2.2.1, *Researcher perceptions of open access*) and demonstrate how an imperfect understanding of open access leads to difficulties in introducing new ideas to people. There are two such misunderstandings in particular that were raised by participants: that open access publishing, especially the varieties of it that most closely resemble traditional academic publishing, requires authors to pay to publish; and that open access research tends to be of a lower quality. These points were touched upon above but will now be discussed further with a particular focus on their impact upon researchers' willingness to publish open access.

As stated above (see Chapter 2.2.3, *Article Processing Charges*), Article Processing Charges (APCs) are not synonymous with gold open access journals, because a majority of open access journals do not charge them (Solomon and Björk 2012, pp. 1485-1486). However, discussion around open access in the UK has, since publication of the Finch report, often conflated gold open access journals with the APC-charging business model. This is because the remit of the Finch report was to find ways to expand access to research

while maintaining the interests of the publishing industry (Verhagen 2013, p. 52), and it is in traditional publishers' interests to promote the APC model because significant financial gains may be derived from it, particularly hybrid journals (BIS 2013, p. 16).

In the statement quoted in Chapter 4.4.1, *Disciplinary differences*, Leah equated open access with a 'pay to publish' model such as APCs. While this model is common it is by no means the only or even predominant model of open access (Solomon and Björk 2012, pp. 1485-1486), so funding should not be a barrier to publishing research open access. However it does seem that many academics (and all participants of this research with the exception of Martin) equate open access with APCs. This fallacy is probably derived from the way the Finch report's framing of open access has dominated the public debate around it. So while this funding issue should not be a barrier to researchers considering open access publishing, the reality is that many academics perceive it to be a problem, so this needs to be taken into account when discussing open access with them.

If researchers believe that open access publishing is expensive for them then they are likely to be less willing to consider publishing in open access journals. This argument is supported by the participants' responses; Leah implied that the inability of Arts and Humanities scholars to find funding to pay for APCs was a major factor in many of them not being willing to consider publishing open access. All participants at ARU except for Nicky talked about APC costs as an issue. Given how widespread this view seems to be at ARU, a library publishing service would have to undertake advocacy to provide staff with a greater awareness of the realities of open access, and explain how they would face no fees to publish with an institution-based publisher. In fact, as mandates for open access begin to be enforced, having a publishing service within the university which does not charge APCs to its staff could be seen as a selling point for the service.

The other concern with open access that was widely displayed by participants is that of quality. While open access publishing does not necessitate any change in traditional quality control processes - most definitions of open access include the term 'peer-reviewed' (e.g. Suber 2002) - for many people it has long been equated with 'free to read online' and non-peer reviewed content (Park and Qin 2007; Xia 2010, p. 615). This fallacy has been hard to shake despite the growing awareness of open access. ARU has an institutional repository but beyond that it has not yet launched institutional initiatives such as open access mandates and has received none of the RCUK's open access grant (RCUK [no date]). This demonstrates that advocacy would have to be an important part of any institutional open access program.

## 5.3 Reputation, the REF, and library publishing

Academia operates in a reputation economy. While it is generally acknowledged that researchers should be evaluated based on the quality of their research, the difficulty of doing this for the sheer volume of research that is produced means that people resort to proxies for quality. The most common of these is to judge the quality of research on the perceived quality of the outlet through which it is published. In other words, journal articles are rated more highly if they are published in 'big name' journals, whether that is measured by the general reputation of the journal or quantitative metrics such as the Impact Factor.

There are differences of opinion as to the purpose of academic publishing (see Osborne 2013) but a common definition is that the scholarly communication process is primarily about disseminating ideas in order to contribute to the world's knowledge (Morris et al. 2013, p. 380). Working with this assumption, in theory the most important thing about scholarly communication for an individual researcher is to make sure that their work is seen by as many people as possible, especially peers working in the same area. In practice, however, the results of this research indicates that an equally important need for scholarly communication in the UK has become the need to be seen as good by REF and your institution rather than your peers.

Research in universities is undertaken in the context of academia, and the structures that are present in the academic environment help to determine the processes of scholarly communication. In other words, politics can distort the scholarly communication process from being about generating and transmitting knowledge to being about career-focused goals for the researcher. The results given above highlight how in the UK in particular the REF is partly responsible for guiding the choices that academics make. Martin said that the mentoring schemes in universities, whereby senior academics advise early career researchers, also entrench conventional practices as academics recommend that their junior colleagues follow the same practices that served themselves well in the past.

In principle many people think that open access is a good thing but the reality of the context that they are working in means that they are reluctant to change to it. This is why library publishing would have to remain opt-in for academics, so it is therefore not possible to recommend that the entire university's research output is published through a library publishing service. People's reluctance to change their practices until they see a firm need to also supports this point, something recognised by Nicky:

You can facilitate but if you try and force them to do something then you'll get that adverse reaction so you have to be quite careful about how you play it. So have your foot in the door, help them, and then be ready and waiting when they actually say yeah we really want you to do something.

So creating a library publishing service could fulfil this facilitating role that the library can play while remaining an additional service for academics to choose to make use of if they wish. An investigation into the effect that a library publishing service may have on a university's REF performance is beyond the scope of this research but would be an important area of consideration for the ARU library if they do create a service. The criteria for the next REF, due to take place sometime around 2020, are not yet decided. At the time of writing (September 2013) the current indication from HEFCE is that it will mandate that all submissions must be available via an institutional repository. This means that library support for the REF is going to increase at ARU so it is an apt time to consider other ways in which this could be achieved. If there is not a shift in academics' understanding of open access then many are likely to remain uninterested in publishing their work open access even with a REF mandate, so may prefer to just deposit items in the institutional repository, as a means of trying to fulfil the mandate while still publishing in the prestigious journal of their choice.

Investigating the assessment process of the REF by collecting data on how the panels reach their decisions would be an interesting area for further research. The assumption that outputs are judged on the basis of the outlets they are published in seems to be held by everyone but there is currently only anecdotal evidence to back this assumption up. Martin pointed out that even if the assumption is false, researchers and institutions still act as if it were true. If further research were to provide evidence one way or the other then this might provide a solid grounding for changing practices.

It is too early to say whether any existing UK library publishing services have had an affect on their institution's reputation. It seems likely that a well-run service with high quality standards would be beneficial in reputational terms but as yet there has been no research into this area. This could be an interesting topic for a future study, to gather evidence of the impact of library publishing services.

It would have been useful to undertake a thorough evaluation of existing library publishing services in order to evaluate their success but this was felt to be beyond the scope of the research. An evaluation of this kind could have looked at how much investment is typically made in terms of money, infrastructure, and staff time, and whether the published output is

increasing at a given institution. Further research which developed a set of criteria to undertake an evaluation like this could prove very useful to those considering launching a library publishing service.

## 5.4 Meeting the objectives

There were three objectives which the results and analysis of the interviews were designed to meet. The first of these is: *To identify academics' and institutional needs for scholarly communication at Anglia Ruskin University*. The results indicate (see Chapter 4.3, *Research(er) support*) that for the institution, these needs include promoting and enhancing the university's reputation as a research institution; and for researchers, they include greater support with managing the publication and post-publication process. Chapter 4.4.2, *Library publishing* adds that an appropriate range and scope of publication outlets is necessary, as is a strong quality control process governed by peer review.

The next objective is: *To evaluate whether a library publishing service could meet these needs*. The participants' responses (see Chapter 4.4.2, *Library publishing*) suggest that yes, a library publishing can meet the needs stated above, as long as it is tailored to meet the specific needs of the faculty. These needs appear to correlate strongly with what some existing library publishing services are already doing so those services can be used as a model. Given that this research is based on a small sample size it would be prudent to conduct further research at ARU to ensure that all faculty have a chance to contribute their views on the matter before a publishing service is launched.

The final objective to be met by Chapter 4 is: *To establish whether there is sufficient support within the university (faculty, research office, and library) to make a library publishing service successful at Anglia Ruskin University*. The results indicate (see Chapter 4.1, *Change*) that there would be sufficient support within the library and it would be receptive to creating a library publishing service, but support within the faculties is still uncertain and gaining the acceptance of a significant number of academics may be a challenge. Therefore this research has not been able to conclusively meet this objective. Perhaps it is not possible to do so before a service has been launched, or has at least been fully planned out following further engagement with ARU academics.

## Chapter 6 – Conclusions

This research set out to investigate library publishing in UK universities and provide a set of recommendations for Anglia Ruskin University to act upon. To conclude, the aim and objectives will each be stated again with a brief summary of the answers to them that this research has provided. All objectives have been sufficiently met to provide an answer to the aim of the research, although objective 4 has not been met to a fully satisfactory degree and would require further follow-up research at ARU to give a more complete perspective. A survey with a greater sample population may be appropriate for this, and would complement the in-depth analysis afforded by this qualitative research.

**Aim: To investigate whether it is feasible for a UK university to publish its research output itself through an open access library publishing service.**

It is feasible for Anglia Ruskin University to create a library publishing service and there is evidence that such a service could be valuable to the university and its researchers. However, ARU should not aim to publish *all* of its research output itself. That would be too big of a change and is not exactly what other library publishing services do; most of them do not just publish the research outputs of their institution, but rather they offer services such as journal hosting and other support services to facilitate the scholarly communication process. The technical infrastructure is not difficult to set up and manage but creating the right culture to make it successful will take more work. The precise services to be provided should be established after wider consultation with academic staff. Changing the practices of scholarly communication is going to be a slow process as long as the systems of evaluating quality and reputation, such as the REF, remain unchanged.

*Objective 1: To identify academics' and institutional needs for scholarly communication at Anglia Ruskin University.*

For the institution, research outputs generated by and for the university must promote and enhance the university's reputation as a research institution. Achieving a good REF score is a part of this. For academics, needs for scholarly communication include: being seen by one's peers; having access to an appropriate range and scope of publication outlets; a strong quality control process governed by peer review; support with managing the publication and post-publication process; and scoring highly in the REF. These needs for scholarly communication are the result of research with ARU staff but are not specific solely to this institution and are likely to be very similar to those found elsewhere.

***Objective 2: To evaluate whether a library publishing service could meet these needs.***

A library publishing service can meet the needs that were stated in answer to Objective 1 as long as it is focused appropriately and keeps academics' needs in mind. These needs correlate strongly with what some existing library publishing services are already doing so they can therefore be used as a model. The identified needs will now be addressed individually:

- *Promote and enhance the university's reputation as a research institution*: a library publishing service can generate higher visibility for ARU's research, and by maintaining a high quality it can demonstrate leadership and innovation in scholarly communication. This result is not guaranteed and would need investment of time and resources to bring to fruition.

- *Being seen by one's peers*: open access journals can be indexed widely, and a library publishing service can involve promotional activities e.g. the use of social media.

- *Having access to an appropriate range and scope of publication outlets*: journals published by the library can be designed to have an appropriate subject focus, and academics still have the choice to publish elsewhere.

- *A strong quality control process governed by peer review*: in open access journals the process of peer review remains the same as in traditional journals. A library publishing service may help academics to experiment with other types of publication, but these do not replace peer review.

- *Support with managing the publication and post-publication process*: there is a growing need for support in this area, e.g. open access and copyright. This type of support is commonly provided by library staff, such as the Research Support Librarian role which has been introduced at some other universities.  This involves providing guidance on open access, copyright, and research data management, and could perhaps be integrated with a publishing service.

- *Scoring highly in the REF*: in the short term this is probably the one area that a library publishing service will not help with, although further investigation of the REF evaluation process would be necessary for a fuller understanding. Academics should

be reminded that HEFCE are making open access a requirement of submissions to the post-2014 REF.

***Objective 3: To review existing library publishing services.***

This review was done in the introduction, literature review, and discussion sections. A comprehensive survey was not attempted but a reasonable overview was obtained. It was found that there are a large number of library publishing services in North America offering a variety of services, whereas in the UK they are few in number and most of them only provide journal hosting. The technical set-up of using Open Journal Systems to provide overlay journals linked to an institutional repository would be reasonably straightforward for ARU to implement. This knowledge gained from the background research and literature review informed the interview questions.

***Objective 4: To establish whether there is sufficient support within the university (faculty, research office, and library) to make a library publishing service successful at Anglia Ruskin University.***

This research has not been able to give a clear answer to this objective. There is support from within the library to set up a service, and there is likely to be support from the wider institution (e.g. RDCS). The view of academics is less clear so advocacy and further research are needed to more fully understand their position so that a publishing service can be tailored to their needs. The small size of the sample for this research is a limiting factor here.

This research has contributed to the body of knowledge in the area of library publishing by reviewing the existing literature and investigating how library publishing ideas apply to a UK higher education context. The results and conclusions of this research are transferrable to other similar institutions that share characteristics with ARU, such as other UK universities without a tradition of substantial investment in research which are now trying to increase the visibility of their research.

## Chapter 7 - Recommendations

The following are the recommendations for Anglia Ruskin University based on the outcome of this research.

**Create a new research support post in the library.**

There is a definite need in the institution for greater support for researchers in areas of emerging importance such as open access publishing and understanding copyright. Ideally there would be at least one full-time position for a Research Support Librarian and one for a Publishing Services Manager. If resource constraints do not allow this then having a Scholarly Communications Librarian who has responsibility for both research support and library publishing may be more useful than having a Research Support Librarian who has no publishing role. This reflects the vital importance that knowledge of publishing now has in research support.

**Undertake a wider consultation with academic staff at Anglia Ruskin University into the idea of library publishing.**

Any new service can and should be tailored to the needs of academic staff. This research has identified that key people to consult on this are the heads of research for the faculties and research institutes. Highlight the fact that a library publishing service would be compliant with HEFCE and RCUK open access mandates.

**Create a journal hosting service.**

The outcome of the consultation recommended above should decide exactly which direction this journal hosting service should take. Once this is set up and stable, strongly consider extending the service to investigate other formats/outputs such as conference papers and books if the resources are available, and also to provide support with social media presence e.g. blogging and Twitter.

**References**

Adema, J. and Schmidt, B. 2010. From service providers to content producers: new opportunities for libraries in collaborative open access book publishing. *New Review of Academic Librarianship* 16(Supplement 1), pp. 28-43. doi: 10.1080/13614533.2010.509542. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13614533.2010.509542 [Accessed: 21 March 2013].

Alperin, J.P., Babini, D. and Fischman, G. 2013. *Open access indicators: assessing growth and use of OA resources from developing regions - the cases of Latin America and Africa.* figshare [Online]. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.745395 [Accessed: 24 July 2013].

Amherst College. [no date]. *Amherst College Press* [Online]. Available at: https://www.amherst.edu/library/press [Accessed: 14 September 2013].

Anglia Ruskin. [no date]. *Interconnections: our research journal* [Online]. Anglia Ruskin University. Available at: http://www.anglia.ac.uk/ruskin/en/home/faculties/aibs/research/interconnections.html [Accessed: 28 June 2013].

Anglia Ruskin University. 2012. *Research and scholarship strategy 2012-2014.* Anglia Ruskin University.

Association of Research Libraries. [no date]. *Monograph and serial costs in ARL libraries, 1986-2011* [online]. Association of Research Libraries. Available at: http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/monograph-serial-costs.pdf [Accessed: 6 July 2013].

Bailey, C.W., 2010. *Transforming scholarly publishing through open access: a bibliography.* Houston: Digital Scholarship.

Ball, D. 2012. Managing suppliers for collection development: the UK higher education perspective. In: Fieldhouse, M. and Marshall, A. eds. *Collection development in the digital age.* London: Facet.

Biondo, M. and Weiss, A. 2013. The California Geographer and the OA movement: using the green OA institutional repository as a publishing platform. In: Brown, A.P. ed. *Library*

*publishing toolkit.* Geneseo, NY: IDS Project Press. Available at:
http://opensuny.org/omp/index.php/IDSProject/catalog/book/25 [Accessed: 29 August 2013].

BIS. 2013. *House of Commons Business, Innovation and Skills Committee. Open access: fifth report of session 2013–14.* Available at:
http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmselect/cmbis/99/99.pdf [Accessed: 10 September 2013].

Brown, A.P. 2013. *Library publishing toolkit.* Genesco, NY: IDS Project Press. Available at:
http://opensuny.org/omp/index.php/IDSProject/catalog/book/25 [Accessed: 29 August 2013].

Brown, J. 2009. *An introduction to overlay journals* [Online]. London: UCL. Available at:
http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/19081/1/19081.pdf [Accessed: 29 April 2013].

Brown, J.A. 2010. Overlay journals, repositories and the evolution of scholarly communication. In: *OR 2010: The 5th International Conference on Open Repositories.* Madrid, 6-9 July, 2010. Available at: http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/20428/ [Accessed: 29 April 2013].

Brown, L., Griffiths, R.J., Rascoff, M., and Guthrie, K. 2007. *University publishing in a digital age* [Online]. New York: Ithaka S+R. Available at: http://www.sr.ithaka.org/research-publications/university-publishing-digital-age/ [Accessed: 5 February 2013].

CILIP. 2004. *Ethical principles for library and information professionals* [Online]. London: CILIP. Available at: http://www.cilip.org.uk/get-involved/policy/ethics/pages/principles.aspx [Accessed: 27 May 2013].

Cowen, S. 2013. Open access journal incubator at University of Lethbridge library. In: Brown, A.P. ed. *Library publishing toolkit.* Geneseo, NY: IDS Project Press. Available at: http://opensuny.org/omp/index.php/IDSProject/catalog/book/25 [Accessed: 29 August 2013].

Curry, S. 2013. Political, cultural and technological dimensions of open access: an exploration. In: Vincent, N. and Wickham, C., eds. 2013. *Debating open access.* London: British Academy. Available at: http://www.britac.ac.uk/templates/asset-relay.cfm?frmAssetFileID=12660 [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Deliyannides, T.S. and Gabler, V.E. 2013. The university library system, University of Pittsburgh: how & why we publish. In: Brown, A.P. ed. *Library publishing toolkit.* Geneseo, NY: IDS Project Press. Available at: http://opensuny.org/omp/index.php/IDSProject/catalog/book/25 [Accessed: 29 August 2013].

Denscombe, M. 2010. *The good research guide: for small scale social research projects.* 4th ed. Maidenhead: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill.

Devakos, R. and Turko, K. 2007. Synergies: building national infrastructure for Canadian scholarly publishing. *ARL Bi-Monthly* 252/253, pp. 16-19. Available at: http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/arl-br-252-253-synergies.pdf [Accessed: 12 June 2013].

Digital Commons. 2013. *Online journals published with Digital Commons* [Online]. Available at: http://digitalcommons.bepress.com/online-journals/ [Accessed: 11 July 2013].

Dingley, B. 2005. *U.S. periodical prices* [Online]. Chicago: ALA. Available at: http://www.ala.org/alcts/sites/ala.org.alcts/files/content/resources/collect/serials/ppi/05usppi. pdf [Accessed: 27 May 2005].

European Commission. 2012. *Towards better access to scientific information: boosting the benefits of public investments in research.* Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/era-communication-towards-better-access-to-scientific-information_en.pdf [Accessed: 14 May 2013].

Eve, M. 2012. Tear it down, build it up: the Research Output Team, or the library-as-publisher. *Insights* [Online] 25(2), pp. 158-162. Available at: https://www.martineve.com/2012/07/09/publication-tear-it-down-build-it-up-the-research-output-team-or-the-library-as-publisher-insights-25-2-july-2012-pp-158-162/ [Accessed: 5 February 2013].

Eve, M. 2013. Before the law: open access quality control and the future of peer review. In: Vincent, N. and Wickham, C., eds. 2013. *Debating open access.* London: British Academy. Available at: http://www.britac.ac.uk/templates/asset-relay.cfm?frmAssetFileID=12661 [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Finch Group. 2012. *Accessibility, sustainability, excellence: how to expand access to research publications. Report of the Working Group on Expanding Access to Published*

*Research Findings* [Online]. Available at: http://www.researchinfonet.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Finch-Group-report-FINAL-VERSION.pdf [Accessed: 11 May 2013].

Furlough, M. 2009. What we talk about when we talk about repositories. *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 49(1), pp. 18-22. doi: 10.5860/rusq.49n1.18. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.5860/rusq.49n1.18 [Accessed: 22 April 2013].

Gargouri, Y., Lariviere, V., Gingras, Y., Carr, L. and Harnad, S. 2012. Green and gold open access percentages and growth, by discipline. In: *17th International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators (STI).* Montréal, 5-8 Sep, 2012, pp. 285-292. Available at: http://2012.sticonference.org/Proceedings/vol1/Gargouri_Green_285.pdf [Accessed: 19 July 2013].

Gibbs, G. 2007. *Analyzing qualitative data.* London: Sage.

Gilbert, N. 2008. *Researching social life.* 3rd ed. London: Sage.

Hahn, K. 2008. *Research library publishing services: new options for university Publishing* [Online]. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. Available at: http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/research-library-publishing-services-mar08.pdf [Accessed: 16 May 2013].

Harboe-Ree, C. 2007. Just advanced librarianship: the role of academic libraries as publishers. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 38(1), pp. 15-25. doi: 10.1080/00048623.2007.10721264. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00048623.2007.10721264 [Accessed: 22 April 2013].

Hardy, R.L. 2005. *The future of UK university presses in the electronic environment.* PhD thesis, Loughborough University. Available at: https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/2134/8276 [Accessed: 16 July 2013].

Harris, S. 2012. *Moving towards an open access future: the role of academic libraries.* SAGE. Available at: http://www.uk.sagepub.com/repository/binaries/pdf/Library-OAReport.pdf [Accessed: 5 February 2013].

HEFCE. 2013. *Open access and submissions to the REF post-2014* [Online]. London: HEFCE. Available at: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/hefce/content/news/news/2013/open_access_letter.pdf [Accessed: 11 March 2013].

Housewright, R., Schonfeld, R.C. and Wulfson, K. 2013. *UK survey of academics 2012* [Online]. Ithaka; Jisc; RLUK. Available at: http://repository.jisc.ac.uk/5209/1/UK_Survey_of_Academics_2012_FINAL.pdf [Accessed: 16 May 2013].

Hunter, B. 2011. Moving open access to open source: transitioning an open-access journal into the Open Journal Systems journal management system. *Technical Services Quarterly* 28(1), pp. 31-40. doi: 10.1080/07317131.2010.500972. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07317131.2010.500972 [Accessed 23 May 2013].

JISC. [no date]. *Scholarly communications.* Available at: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/inf11/inf11scholcomm.aspx [Accessed: 12 July 2013].

Kamada, H. 2007. Kiyo journals and scholarly communication in Japan. *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 7(3), pp. 375-383. doi: 10.1353/pla.2007.0032.

King, D.W. and Tenopir, C. 2011. Some economic aspects of the scholarly journal system. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* 45(1), pp. 295-366. doi: 10.1002/aris.2011.1440450114. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/aris.2011.1440450114/abstract [Accessed: 14 May 2013].

Lawrence, J.C. 2010. Libraries as journal publishers. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries* 7(3), pp. 235-240. doi: 10.1080/15424065.2010.505516. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15424065.2010.505516 [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Library Publishing Coalition. 2013. *Background* [Online]. Available at: http://www.librarypublishing.org/about-us/background [Accessed: 18 September 2013].

Long, Matthew P. and Schonfeld, Roger C. 2013. *Supporting the changing research practices of chemists.* Ithaka S+R. 12 February 2013. Available at: http://www.sr.ithaka.org/research-publications/supporting-changing-research-practices-chemists [Accessed: 15 May 2013].

Lyon, L. 2009. *Optimising participation and predictive potential: consultative report.* JISC. Available at: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/publications/research/2009/open-science-report-6nov09-final-sentojisc.pdf [Accessed: 9 September 2013].

Maxim, G.E. 1965. *A history of library publishing, 1600 to the present day.* Thesis approved for Fellowship of the Library Association.

Morris, S., Barnas, E., LaFrenier, D. and Reich, M. 2013. *The handbook of journal publishing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moyle, M. and Causer, T. 2011. *EPICURE: final report.* London: UCL. Available at: http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1333964/ [Accessed: 23 April 2013].

Mullins, J.L., Murray-Rust, C., Ogburn, J.L., Crow, R., Ivins, O., Mower, A., Nesdill, D., Newton, M.P., Speer, J., and Watkinson, C. 2012. *Library publishing services: strategies for success: final research report.* Washington, DC: SPARC. Available at: http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/purduepress_ebooks/24/ [Accessed: 5 February 2013].

Newton, M.P., Cunningham, E.T. and Morris, J.N. 2013. Emerging opportunities in library services: planning for the future of scholarly publishing In: Brown, A.P. ed. *Library publishing toolkit.* Geneseo, NY: IDS Project Press. Available at: http://opensuny.org/omp/index.php/IDSProject/catalog/book/25 [Accessed: 29 August 2013].

OAPEN-UK. [no date]. *OAPEN-UK HSS researcher survey results* [Online presentation]. Available at: http://oapen-uk.jiscebooks.org/research-findings/researchersurvey/ [Accessed: 8 July 2013].

OpenDOAR. 2013. *Open access repository types - worldwide* [online]. OpenDOAR. Available at: http://www.opendoar.org/onechart.php?cID=&ctID=&rtID=&clID=&lID=&potID=&rSoftWareName=&search=&groupby=rt.rtHeading&orderby=Tally%20DESC&charttype=pie&width=600&

height=300&caption=Open%20Access%20Repository%20Types%20-%20Worldwide [Accessed: 7 July 2013].

OpenDOAR. 2013a. *Open access countries and organisations - Europe* [Online]. OpenDOAR. Available at: http://www.opendoar.org/countrylist.php?cContinent=Europe#United Kingdom [Accessed: 7 July 2013].

Open Library of Humanities. 2013. *Roadmap for technical pilot* [Online]. Available at: https://www.openlibhums.org/2013/05/15/roadmap-for-technical-pilot/ [Accessed: 16 May 2013].

Open Library of Humanities. 2013a. *The OLH model* [Online]. Available at: https://www.openlibhums.org/about/the-olh-model/ [Accessed: 18 September 2013].

Osborne, R. 2013. Why open access makes no sense. In: Vincent, N. and Wickham, C., eds. 2013. *Debating open access.* London: British Academy. Available at: http://issuu.com/thebritishacademy/docs/debating_open_access-osborne-why_op [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Owen, G.W.B. and Stranack, K. 2012. The Public Knowledge Project and Open Journal Systems: open source options for small publishers. *Learned Publishing* 25(2), pp. 138-144. doi: 10.1087/20120208. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1087/20120208 [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Park, J.-H. and Qin, J. 2007. Exploring the willingness of scholars to accept open access: a grounded theory approach. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 38(2), pp. 88-94. doi: 10.3138/C972-1321-8720-314M. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/C972-1321-8720-314M [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Park, J.-H. and Shim, J. 2011. Exploring how library publishing services facilitate scholarly communication. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 43(1), pp.76-89. doi: 10.3138/jsp.43.1.76. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/jsp.43.1.76 [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Perry, A.M., Borchert, C.A., Deliyannides, T.S., Kosavic, A. and Kennison, R. 2011. Libraries as journal publishers. *Serials Review* 37(3), pp. 196-204. Available at:

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0098791311001018 [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Pickard, A. 2013. *Research methods in information.* 2nd ed. London: Facet.

Polydoratou, P. and Moyle, M. 2008. Scientific journals, overlays and repositories: a case of costs and sustainability issues. In: Buchanan, G., Masoodian, M. and Cunningham, S., eds. *Digital Libraries: Universal and Ubiquitous Access to Information. Proceeding of the 11th International Conference on Asian Digital Libraries.* Bali, 2-5 December 2008. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 5262, pp. 154-163. Berlin/ Heidelberg: Springer Verlag. Available at: http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/13992/1/13992.pdf [Accessed: 11 June 2013].

Public Knowledge Project. [no date]. *OJS user numbers* [online]. Available at: http://pkp.sfu.ca/ojs-user-numbers [Accessed: 11 July 2013].

RCUK. [no date]. *APC fund distribution* [Online]. RCUK. Available at: http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/documents/documents/RCUK_APCfundDistribution.pdf [Accessed: 27 August 2013].

RCUK. 2013. *RCUK policy on open access* [Online]. RCUK. Available at: http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/Pages/outputs.aspx [Accessed: 28 March 2013].

Robson, C. 2011. *Real world research.* 3rd ed. Chichester: Wiley.

Royster, P. 2008. Publishing original content in an institutional repository. *Serials Review* 34(1), pp. 27-30. doi: 10.1016/j.serrev.2007.12.002. Available at: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0098791307001499 [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Schonfeld, R. and Showers, B. 2013. Designing researcher-centric library services. *Research Information* [Online] 12 May 2013. Available at: http://www.researchinformation.info/news/news_story.php?news_id=1248 [Accessed: 15 May 2013].

Shieber, S.M. 2013. Ecumenical open access and the Finch Report principles. In: Vincent, N. and Wickham, C., eds. 2013. *Debating open access.* London: British Academy. Available

at: http://www.britac.ac.uk/templates/asset-relay.cfm?frmAssetFileID=12659 [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Solomon, D.J. and Björk, B.-C. 2012. A study of open access journals using article processing charges. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 63(8), pp. 1485-1495. doi: 10.1002/asi.22673. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/asi.22673/abstract [Accessed: 14 May 2013].

SPARC Europe. 2013. *Institutional repositories* [Online]. SPARC Europe. Available at: http://sparceurope.org/repositories/ [Accessed: 10 September 2013].

Stone, G. 2011. *Huddersfield Open Access Publishing toolkit* [Online]. Huddersfield: University of Huddersfield. Available at: http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/12239/ [Accessed: 5 February 2013].

Stone, G. 2012. Huddersfield Open Access Project. In: Baptista, A.A. et al. eds. *Social Shaping of Digital Publishing: Exploring the Interplay Between Culture and Technology - Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Electronic Publishing.* Guimaraes, 14-15 June, 2012. Amsterdam: IOS Press, p. 118. Available at: http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/13909/ [Accessed: 5 February 2013].

Stone, G., White, S., Robinson, D., Pitchford, I. and Edmunds, C. 2012. *Huddersfield Open Access Publishing final report* [Online]. Huddersfield: University of Huddersfield. Available at: http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/13278/ [Accessed: 5 February 2013].

Suber, P. et al. 2002. *Budapest open access initiative* [Online]. Available at: http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read [Accessed: 6 July 2013].

Suber, P. 2012. *Open access.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

UCL. 2013. *UCL open access journals* [Online]. Available at: http://ojs.lib.ucl.ac.uk/ [Accessed 19 July 2013].

UNESCO. 2011. *Overview of OA in Latin America and the Caribbean* [Online]. UNESCO. Available at: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/portals-and-platforms/goap/access-by-region/latin-america-and-the-caribbean/ [Accessed: 6 June 2013].

University of Edinburgh. 2013. *University of Edinburgh journal hosting service* [Online]. Available at: http://journals.ed.ac.uk/ [Accessed: 19 July 2013].

University of St Andrews. 2013. *University of St Andrews library journal hosting service* [Online]. Available at: http://ojs.st-andrews.ac.uk/ [Accessed: 19 July 2013].

Vaughan, J. 2011. Web scale discovery services. *Library Technology Reports* 47(1), pp. 5-11. doi: 10.5860/ltr.47n1. Available at: http://alatechsource.metapress.com/content/p2148444086n7r7t/ [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Verhagen, N. 2013. Hybrid OA - a way to go? *Insights* 26(1), pp. 51-54. doi: 10.1629/2048-7754.26.1.51. Available at: http://dare.uva.nl/document/482242 [Accessed: 26 August 2013].

Vincent, N. 2013. The monograph challenge. In: Vincent, N. and Wickham, C., eds. 2013. *Debating open access.* London: British Academy. Available at: http://www.britac.ac.uk/templates/asset-relay.cfm?frmAssetFileID=12664 [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Wellcome Trust. 2013. *Position statement in support of open and unrestricted access to published research* [Online]. Available at: http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Policy/Policy-and-position-statements/WTD002766.htm [Accessed: 15 May 2013].

Willinsky, J. 2005. Open Journal Systems: an example of open source software for journal management and publishing. *Library Hi Tech* 23(4), pp. 504-519. doi: 10.1108/07378830510636300. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/07378830510636300 [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Wittenberg, K. 2004. Librarians as publishers: a new role in scholarly communication. *Searcher* 12(10), pp. 50-53.

Xia, J. 2009. Library publishing as a new model of scholarly communication. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 40(4), pp. 370-383. doi: 10.3138/jsp.40.4.370. Available at: http://utpjournals.metapress.com/content/m18104664798570k/ [Accessed: 12 September 2013].

Xia, J. 2010. A longitudinal study of scholars attitudes and behaviors toward open-access journal publishing. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 61(3), pp. 615-624. doi: 10.1002/asi.21283. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/asi.21283/full [Accessed: 19 July 2013].

Xia, J. and Opperman, D.B. 2010. Current trends in institutional repositories for institutions offering Master's and Baccalaureate degrees. *Serials Review* 36(1) pp. 10-18. doi: 10.1016/j.serrev.2009.10.003. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.serrev.2009.10.003 [Accessed: 11 June 2013].

## Appendix 1 - Examples of UK library publishing services

| | |
|---|---|
| Loughborough University | http://ojs.lboro.ac.uk/ojs/ |
| Queen Margaret University | http://journals.qmu.ac.uk/ |
| University of Central Lancashire | http://pops.uclan.ac.uk/ |
| University of Cumbria | http://194.81.189.19/ojs/ |
| University of Edinburgh | http://journals.ed.ac.uk/ |
| University of Northampton | http://journals.northampton.ac.uk/ |
| University of St Andrews | http://ojs.st-andrews.ac.uk/ |

## Appendix 2 - Participant information sheet

The purpose of this study is to investigate the feasibility of launching an open access publishing service in order to publish Anglia Ruskin University's research output.

The study is being conducted by Stuart Lawson, a member of library staff at Anglia Ruskin University, as a part of a postgraduate dissertation to complete an MA Information Studies at the University of Brighton. It is taking a qualitative approach and the main data collection technique is a series of interviews with Anglia Ruskin University staff.

Participants have been selected to take part based on their role in the university. Participation consists of being interviewed for up to an hour on subjects related to the purpose of the study. These will include, but are not limited to:

- open access
- researchers' scholarly communication needs
- whether potential new services might fit in with Anglia Ruskin University's strategic aims

Interviews conducted for the study will be analysed in the final project report and also inform a set of recommendations made to Anglia Ruskin University. Further publications may result from this work.

No risks are anticipated to result from participating in the research. Anonymity and confidentiality can be provided if required. Pseudonyms for participants will be used in all publications. Interviews will be recorded and transcribed, and a transcript of their interview will be provided to participants to check before the report is completed.

All data will be stored in private password protected digital storage. It is intended that after the research is completed interview transcripts will be stored online in a research archive, but participants are free to opt out of this.

Participation is voluntary and consent may be withdrawn at any time.

## Appendix 3 - Consent form

I agree to partake in this research which is a study investigating the feasibility of launching an open access publishing service in order to publish Anglia Ruskin University's research output. The study is being conducted by Stuart Lawson, a member of library staff at Anglia Ruskin University, as a part of a postgraduate dissertation to complete an MA Information Studies at the University of Brighton.

The researcher has explained to my satisfaction the purpose, principles and procedures of the study and the possible risks involved.

I am aware that I will be required to answer questions about open access, researchers' scholarly communication needs, whether new services might fit in with Anglia Ruskin University's strategic aims, and other related topics.

I understand how the data collected will be used, and that any confidential information will normally be seen only by the researcher and will not be revealed to anyone else.

I understand that after the research is completed a copy of the interview transcript may be stored online in a research archive, but only after a copy has been provided to me for approval and I am free to withhold permission for this at any time.

I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason and without incurring consequences from doing so.

I agree that should I withdraw from the study, the data collected up to that point may be used by the researcher for the purposes described in the information sheet.


Name  …....................................................

Signed …....................................................

Date    …....................................................

**Appendix 4 - Interview schedule**

*This was the initial interview schedule for the first interview, which served as a guide to the questioning and was modified for subsequent interviews.*

Introduce self and the project, talk about consent form, ask permission to record.

'Feel free to interrupt and ask me questions as we go along.'

'Firstly can you tell me a little bit about your role in the library and how it sits within the university?'

'Can you tell me a bit about the library's role within the university?'

Keywords: strategic plan, policy

'Is it important to tie everything in the library's strategic planning to university aims, or can the library also influence the direction of some aspects of the university's goals?'

'What role do you see the library as playing in supporting researchers?'

'… and might its level of importance change?'

Keywords: researcher services, research skills, open access, REF (HEFCE post-2014 announcement), APCs, repository, research funding

Some of these things are not currently library responsibility; talk about the split in this responsibility for supporting researchers between the library and other departments of the university (RDCS).

Academic needs for scholarly communication. subject differences.

Budget issues: serials crisis, subscription costs.

'Hypothetically, if the library didn't need to spend so much on journal subscriptions, how do you think it might change?'

'I'm thinking about the possibility that either the library would have its funding cut significantly, or perhaps it would have more money freed up to invest in other services.'

'Do you find it useful to speculate like this?'


'At Anglia Ruskin, do you feel there is a culture of willingness to experiment with creating new services?'

'Is innovative thinking encouraged?'

'Is there money to support innovations?'


Library publishing. Discuss what it is.

'Do you think it could help further the aims of the library?'

'And the university?'


'Are there any other points you'd like to raise that haven't been covered?'


'Can you think of anyone in the university it might be useful for me to talk to?'


'Thank you for your time.'

## Appendix 5 - Sample of coded interview transcript

The following page is a sample page of a coded interview transcript.

168    P: - which is quite a significant amount of money – where does the money come from?

169    I: Mm.

170    P: Um, as far as I know this university doesn't have any funds coming in from the research council to
171    pay for that kind of –

172    I: Yeah.

173    P: - pay those fees, so somewhere some money has to be made available, essentially. Until that
174    happens, you're not going to find academics paying thousands of pounds out of their own wallets –

**Comment [S1]:** Research funding

175    I: Mm.

176    P: - at least not typically, um, until that funding is available they're not going to do anything that'll
177    cost them money so they'll just keep doing what they've always, always done.

**Comment [S2]:** APCs

178    I: Okay. So, okay so you kind of get a sense that although open access in theory, yes, ideally it's a
179    good thing –

180    P: Yes.

181    I: - but you think academics, um, are more or less satisfied to keep going as things are, unless…

182    P: I'm not sure they're satisfied, I mean –

**Comment [S3]:** Appetite for change in scholarly communication

183    I: Okay.

184    P: - if you look at things like the revolt against Springer –

185    I: Mm-hmm.

186    P: - I think it was Springer, a couple of years back, or maybe more recently than that, there was
187    something big going on with Springer, a backlash against the fees they were charging. I think there is
188    an appetite for change, it's just that, what that change might actually prove to be isn't yet clear. If
189    somebody were to stand up, if the government were to stand up and say 'this is how we should do
190    it' then I think academics would find it a lot easier to change the way in which they do things
191    because they're being presented with a clear alternative –

**Comment [S4]:** APCs

**Comment [S5]:** Appetite for change in scholarly communication

**Comment [S6]:** Uncertainty about future

**Comment [S7]:** Government policy

192    I: Okay.

193    P: - a clear way forward. Um, that might well be part of the REF's thinking in bringing in open access
194    requirements in 2020 –

**Comment [S8]:** Change

195    I: Mm.

196    P: - or whenever the next REF is.

**Comment [S9]:** REF

197    I: Yeah. Okay. Um, slightly, slightly different question. Um, at Anglia Ruskin do you think there's, um,
198    a culture of willingness to experiment with new services?

199    P: Um, good question, difficult to answer given how long I haven't been here. Um… I think generally
200    yes, there's an appetite for change for, doing things in a clever way, in a smart way. I think open
201    access is, um, part of that. At the same time I say it comes back to the same point again about
202    making it easier, making it something that they can, academics can, can adopt without effort. I don't
203    mean that to suggest that academics are lazy, what I mean by that is that they have things that they
204    need to get done, and adding more and more things to their workload, things will give. And I think
205    pursuing open access in a difficult environment is not a choice that they'll want, they'll easily make.
206    So find easy ways to help them…

**Comment [S10]:** Appetite for change

**Comment [S11]:** Organisational culture

**Comment [S12]:** Researchers' scholarly communication needs

**Comment [S13]:** Difficulty of publishing open access

207    I: Yeah.

208    I and P: [laughs]