University Libraries Publications   University Libraries

2009

An Accounting of the Percentage of Faculty Willing to Deposit into an Institutional Repository

Adam B. Steele
Kent State University - Kent Campus, absteele@kent.edu

Author: Adam B. Steele
Title: An Accounting of the Percentage of Faculty Willing to Deposit into an Institutional
Repository
Semester: Summer
Year: 2009
Adviser: Dr. Yin Zhang

ABSTRACT

This paper is an attempt to determine the willingness of the faculty at Kent State University to deposit papers such as journal articles, lecture notes, sylabi, and other academic material into an institutional repository run by the university which would make these documents available to anyone with access to the internet. The results gathered via an online survey point towards the fact that the faculty at this institution would not be willing to deposit material for a variety of reasons. The answers gathered tend to point towards copyright issues as the main reason why the faculty would not be willing to place documents into an institutional repository.

AN ACCOUNTING OF THE PERCENTAGE OF FACULTY
WILLING TO DEPOSIT INTO AN INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORY

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library
and Information Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library and Information Science

by

Adam Steele
August, 2009

Master's Research Paper by

Adam B. Steele

B.S., Kent State University, 2005

M.L.I.S., Kent State University, 2009

Approved by

Adviser _____ Date _____

Contents

Introduction

An institutional repository (IR) is an online depository of research, usually at a college or university, which is freely accessible to anyone through the Internet. These IRs usually contain, but are not limited to, academic research such as journal articles (either pre- or post-prints), thesis and dissertations, lecture notes and syllabi, administrative papers, and other "grey" materials that an academic institution may have. The survey conducted for this research asked faculty at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio a series of questions that helped ascertain how much this faculty knows about institutional repositories and what and whether any of them would be wiling to deposit in one. The survey asked about the willingness to deposit different types of materials that are created by faculty and what concerns these faculty may have with depositing in general.

The main objective of this study was to determine what percentage of the faculty population at the Kent State University, Kent Campus, would be willing to add research to an institutional repository. The sub-objectives of this study was three-fold: 1) to determine the difference, if any, in the willingness to deposit material based on faculty differences such as time spent teaching, or different departments; 2) to determine the percentage willing to deposit actual research such as journal articles, and the percentage likely to deposit other "grey" material such as syllabi and lecture notes; and 3) to determine how much, and what kind of, effort will need to be put forth in terms of education, and actual placement of the material, for the faculty.

This study attempted to answer the following research question: in a survey-based study of a 100 % sample of faculty, either tenured or tenure track, from every department at Kent State University, Kent Campus, what percentage of faculty would be willing to deposit research and academic material into an institutional repository? It was hypothesized that there would be a

majority of faculty willing to deposit into an institutional repository, though the overall percentage may have been skewed in the direction of one type of department, such as social sciences or education, etc. The survey attempted to address these complications with a series of questions aimed at determining whether there were different groups of faculty more or less willing to deposit into an institutional repository. As the reader shall see, while the second part of this hypothesis was correct; that there was a slight difference depending on what departments the respondents were in, the first part was proven to be very wrong and there were few respondents willing to deposit. The reasons for why this was will be discussed in the results section.

Literature Review

The literature is diverse when it comes to open access in the library realm. Being one of the most logical proponents of an open access agenda, libraries, specifically academic libraries, are constantly trying to form institutional repositories. Whether this is good or bad, and whether they are used or not, is much debated in the literature (Morris, 2007; Davis, 2007; Pinfield, 2007; & Watson, 2007). There are many complications and arguments for and against the open access debate.

Complications

There are many problems which arise from talk about open access. The four main complications discussed in the literature are the decline of the peer review process, having no editing, copyright issues, and the destruction of the subscription journal as it's now known.

a. *Peer review* – One of the main criteria beloved by both those who write journal articles and those who search for them is the peer review process. Faculty only want to submit to journals with a good peer review(Watson, 2007), and very early in undergraduate years college

students are taught to only trust those articles published in peer reviewed journals. Sometimes the departments will go so far as to publish a list of journals that are acceptable to use in their classes when writing papers.

The question to ask though is whether articles in open access and institutional repositories are in any real danger of not being peer reviewed. Most literature on this subject agree that they are not. Pinfield explains on page 169 one of the options being used as "'open peer review', where an article is put into the public domain and then readers are invited to provide peer-review-based commentaries." This was met with some success when *Nature* tried it, but can prove successful with large universities or consortiums that try it with their own faculty.

b. *Editing* – Though usually thought of as referring to simple grammar and punctuation fixes, editing goes much farther in the journal article world. Much of what an article editor does is to check the references and citations to make sure they are correct. Morris talks about a study on page 174 in which "42.7% of queries from editors were to do with the references being either wrong or incomplete, 13.6% were about data that was actually missing, and 5.5% led to alterations that really altered the sense of what the article said." That is 61.8% of references that were basically bad. This is what the editors try to catch. There would certainly need to be a process in place that would supplement this in the open access world.

c. *Copyright issues* – Copyright is always the first thing cried foul by the journal publishers when someone wants to open access publish. Why journals believe that they should be the ones to have exclusive rights to an article is never made clear in the literature. This may become more of an issue since Harvard and Stanford have both issued mandates about articles written by their faculty, basically making it compulsory to submit articles to their IRs while still

having an "opt-out" option (Albanese, 2008).

       d. *Destroying the subscription journal* – If copyright is the first problem publishers have a problem with, then cancellations are the second. Librarians are fairly unanimous when it comes to the conclusion that if a journals articles are "easily and freely available in repositories, cancellations will follow" (Morris, 172). This idea worries journals immensely. Pinfield found that this may not necessarily be so. When two publishers were asked if they though any subscriptions had been cancelled as a direct result of articles existing in a repository called arXiv, "[b]oth societies said they could not identify any losses of subscriptions for this reason" (164).

       Evidence for use and non-use

       A study was done by Davis and Connolly at their own institution of Cornell University to see why its IR was not being used (Davis, 2007). What they found can be summed up in the phrase "faculty are typically best at creating, not preserving, new knowledge" (p 2). They discovered that, possibly rightly so, even faculty who support the idea of disseminating knowledge to as many people as possible were still worried about their own advancement and tenure and would rather submit to the "big journals" if possible because it looks better. In Watson's survey, she found that while only 48 per cent of academic authors had ever made their work freely available via the web, 86 per cent of them said their preferred method of finding research was via their institutions electronic resources or Google Scholar. So, while many researchers expect to be able to find information from open access sources, they themselves don't contribute by half.

       Complying – Mandatory vs. Optional

       Most institutional repositories are completely optional to the faculty who work there. This, unfortunately, means that more often than not, the paper never reaches the IR in any form.

The main reasons for this are copyright issues with the journal publishers, even the journal out-right denying the possibility; not having enough time to deposit; or not knowing how. The first two institutions to institute a mandatory compliance for depositing were the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in the public sector, and Harvard University in the academic sector.

The NIH was the first to have a mandatory depositing mandate. The mandate was signed into law on December 26th, 2007 by President George W. Bush. There are no exceptions to the law. Any researcher who receives money from the NIH must deposit their final article no later than 12 months after publication. It is up to the researcher, and possibly their institutions lawyers, to make sure that any journal they publish in will either deposit it for them, or allow the researcher to retain copyright and deposit themselves (National, n.d.). This rule was received relatively well after the journals realized that they could still retain copyright from the author as long as they deposited the article nearly a year later. Journals realized it was easier to comply than try to fight the federal government or lose authorship all together.

Harvard University instituted their mandatory depositing on February 12th, 2008. The policy was not only the first in the United States, but also the first to be voted on unanimously by the faculty instead of being passes by the administration (Suber, 2008). The first college to agree to the terms was their College of Arts and Sciences. Later, other schools, such as the Law School, agreed to the terms. As of now, they have a mandatory depositing with an opt-out clause. This option was written in such a way that it is easy to get a waiver. Says Suber "'If the author requests a waiver, the dean will provide a waiver'" (p. 3). But it's not really that easy. "[T]he request and explanation must be in writing. [F]aculty members may not ask for one waiver to cover all their articles, …[and] must submit separate requests for separate articles" (p. 3). Making the process this simple, yet this time consuming, allows there to be a

reasonable opt-out option while still maintaining that most material will make it into the repository.

Grey vs. White

Over the last year, and even before, there has been a push to have more and more "grey" material added to IRs. Grey material is the "other" academic literature that is created by the people who work at an institution. This material most notably includes work such as lecture notes or slides, syllabi, and administrative records. Depending on the definition, it can also include thesis and dissertations. Thesis and dissertation make up the largest growing section of most IRs because their depositing has been made mandatory by many institutions, many going so far as to even make it part of the final review process to include a digital copy of everything to the school so it can be archived. The inclusion of grey material may seem like a silly idea (who wants to see the syllabus of a class from two years ago), but really, many students would find this an invaluable service when it comes to choosing classes. Having a faculty members submit syllabi and lecture notes all in one place can allow the student to choose more closely a section of a class that they will more enjoy. Many faculty members already may put up these materials, but usually on their own personal pages or in places such as an online class section that can only be accessed if the student is enrolled in the class.

News and Resources

For basic news and resources, the single most valuable place is The Scholarly Publishing and Resources Coalition (SPARC) hosted by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Their website can be found at http://www.arl.org/sparc/. Even though it is a subsidiary section of a larger website, it is its own autonomous group. They have their own newsletter anyone can sign up for, their own news and events, and their own set of publications. Their

publication are all copyrighted under the Creative Commons Attribution License which means while a person or group can order professionally printed copies of anything they have for reasonable prices, people are also free to download, print, copy, distribute and even "remix," though not alter, the materials as long as they are properly attributed to the people or group that created them (Scholarly).

Methodology

The answers from 79 faculty members were obtained using an email and online survey. The idea for the method and topic came from multiple library science classes in which the concepts of both open access journals and institutional repositories were discussed, from research for a literature review and open access and institutional repository studies conducted by others in the field.

Population

To achieve the maximum number of responses, a letter of introduction and link to the online survey was sent to the email of every faculty member at the Kent campus for Kent State University who was classified either as tenured or tenure track. Simply stated, a 100% sampling of the population was used. This final number came to 665 people. Of these 665 emails sent out, ten were bounced back in the system saying that the receivers were out of their offices at the time for sabbaticals, vacations, etc. It is not clear then whether these emails made it to the receivers in time for them to participate in the study. The faculty was then given approximately two and a half months to complete the survey. In this time, 81 responses were collected by the system. Of these 81 responses, two had to be thrown out: one for the reason of not taking the survey seriously, going so far as to use offensive language; and one because the survey was submitted without having any of the relevant questions answered. This second reason is

disconcerting because the survey system was setup in such a way as to not be submittable without having certain questions answered. This left a final total of 79 usable submissions out of a possible 665, or approximately 11.88%.

Data Collection Procedures

For the data collection, an email containing a letter of introduction and a link to a short online survey of 18 questions was sent to all faculty with either tenure or with tenure track status. The emails were sent using the blind copy function so no one would know to whom or how many people the survey was sent. The relative ease of an electronic survey and the relatively short amount of time it would take to complete should have compelled a relatively large number of responses.

At the beginning of the survey there was a short set of instructions and a consent statement. There was also a short list of technical definitions used in the survey. This list was not added to compel answers in one direction or another, but to simply clarify meaning being used in this instance since they can have more than one meaning. The words defined were: institutional repository, open access, grey literature or material, pre-prints and post-prints.

Data Collection Tools

The following data collection tools were created and used in this study:

1) Letter of introduction.

This letter was sent out as the bulk of the email to each faculty member to receive the survey. It would include information about who I am, what research I am conducting, and how I would like the faculty member to help me, ie. fill out and submit the survey in a timely manner. A sample of the letter can be found in Appendix (A)

2) Instructions for survey

The instructions were included at the beginning part of the survey and included when

the survey need to be completed by and a statement of consent. It also included a set of

definitions for anyone who may not know the terminology of open access. A sample of

the instructions can be found in Appendix (B)

4) The data collection survey.

This was the survey itself used to collect the statistics. The survey itself included

questions arranged in five different sections: questions about the respondent; questions

about frequency of writing and publishing; questions about institutional repositories;

questions about open access education, and questions about mandatory depositing. A

sample of this survey can be found in Appendix (C).

5) Post-data collection statistics manager.

The data was compiled in the computer programs SPSS and PSPP (an open source

alternative) for comparative evaluation. Another program called NVIVO was used to

generate a list of word frequency for the final open-ended question.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed in four separate ways for four separate answers to the same

question. All four conclusions point back to the initial question of if there is a willingness of

Kent Campus Kent State University faculty to deposit in an institutional repository and if not,

why. The results of each type to analysis are discussed later.

1)	SPSS, PSPP and crosstabs analysis

A crosstabs analysis was used between the questions about the respondent and

various other questions. The main question answered in this analysis was whether there

was a difference in willingness to deposit based on time spent teaching in the academic

setting or department type in which the faculty worked. The analysis compared the two

questions about how long a faculty member has been teaching and what department she is

in to the questions about willingness to deposit three different types of materials and her

thoughts on the three different levels of mandatory depositing. This culminated in 12

different sets of data from which to draw an analysis (Tables 1-12).

2)   Close-ended answers tallied

Some questions simply had their close-ended answers tallied to see an overall result.

These were questions seven, nine and eleven. The possible answers were the same for all

three questions, but their answers only related back to the most previous question, only if

the answer to the previous question was no, and didn't necessarily have to be answered.

This led to a relatively low, though consistent, amount of responses.

3)   Other reasons not to deposit

Also in questions seven, nine and eleven, there was an open-ended answer option.

This option was little used, but those time it was used did help to make clear some of the

other reasons as to why faculty would be reluctant to use an institutional repository

4)   Final open-ended question

The one major open-ended question about the overall idea of institutional

repositories was run through a word frequency count in NVIVO to determine what issues

the respondents had with the survey and the idea. Looking at the top 30 used words of

more than four letters helped establish what ideas the respondents were thinking about,

both positive and negative. This list of word can be found in Appendix (D)

Results

An analysis of the four directions the research goes in shows them all pointing back

to one majority opinion: that of an unwillingness to deposit into an institutional repository because of copyright issues. Even though a low number of faculty responded to the survey, only 11.88%, the sample was the whole population and the answers received were very clustered around this central theme of copyright problems. This, along with the fact that the answers were spread amongst the population in both years teaching and different departments, it is therefore reasonable to assume that the answers received are a fairly good indication of the population as a whole. This being the case, it seems as though the results point to a sort of cognitive dissonance among the faculty when it comes to intellectual property and copyright.

A majority of respondents were leery about putting materials into a repository because of concerns surrounding "theft" or unauthorized use of their intellectual property without permission or citation of a creator. This can be seen in many of the open-ended responses to the questions about willingness to deposit materials, specifically questions seven, nine and eleven of the survey. Such answers included:

- "For protection against plagiarism"

- "I would rather facilitate access so I know who's getting them and why"

- "I want to be able to control access to these"

- "I work too hard on these to give them away"

- "Don't want it plagiarized"

and simply "academic freedom"

In this respect, the responses were mostly when it came to "grey material" such as syllabi, lecture notes, powerpoints, etc. Material actually used in the classroom. The responses show an almost vehement attitude that the material was created by the faculty member, so no one else can have it.

On the other hand, when it comes to the questions of why they would be unwilling to deposit pre- or even post-prints of journal articles they've written, the responses are very different:

- "before I get tenure I will do what the journals want"

- "I would be willing if I received copyright permission and receiving this permission wasn't too much of a hassle"

- "It would depend on the publisher's contract"

- "If it does not violate copyright"

- and "I do not own copyright to many of my works"

- "I do not own copyright to many of my works."

The question to ask here is, why? Why is it that faculty who are so worried about intellectual property theft of their lecture notes, to the point of not even being willing to give them to their students; then turn around and sign away all their intellectual property rights to journal articles that they may have worked on for years?

The research shows that the issue of copyright is also present in the tabulation analysis of questions seven and nine and the open-ended question 18. Of the 79 respondents, 29 were concerned about copyright issues with pre-prints and 28 were concerned about copyright issues with post-prints. In the word frequency count for question 18, "If depositing into an institutional repository were to be made mandatory; what policies, education, and/or assistance would you like to see to make the transition easier;" the word "copyright" came up forth, just after "mandatory" and "faculty," having been used 13 times in the 53 answers given to the questions. The word "copyright" is used is sentences such as:

- "Funding that would pay for all of the costs of obtaining copyright agreements, which are

extremely expensive at the present time."

- "Most journals won't print a paper unless you assign them copyright."

- "Mandatory policies would prevent me from publishing in some venues that maintain VERY rigorous copyright policies "

- "I don't see how this can be mandatory for post prints because journals hold the copyright - it's not our right to make them publicly available when they require library subscriptions for access."

- "Getting the copyrights for the illustrations I use in my journal articles (which with one exception were my out-of-pocket expenses), is the one thing that really keeps me from being more enthusiastic."

- "retaining own copyright"

- "Potential use of any deposited material must rest with the researcher, who would maintain copyright"

Again, it seems like the two categories these answers seem to fall into are either A) I better be able to keep my copyright or B) I've already given away all copyright.

The main second issue, beyond copyright and intellectual property rights, is that the faculty at the institution simply didn't know what a repository was since there wasn't one in place already for them to have learned about. It is the inevitable catch-22. If an institution doesn't already have a depository, then the faculty won't understand what it is used for and how the copyright can easily be obtained in most cases. If an institution wants to try to have an IR though, it has to go through the process of convincing faculty and administration what it can do and how it can be done. Without an IR already in place, these things all have to be explained abstractly.

What many institutions have had to do is create a basic IR, and then convince people to use it. This is not necessarily costly, but can take time, money and people away from other projects that may seem more important in the present. Even then, the IR may fail or not be used. This in fact happens at the surveyed institution and most faculty and students probably don't even realize it. The institution itself does not have an IR, but it is in the state of Ohio, which does have, through their state wide consortium called OhioLINK, a depository for all bachelor, masters and doctoral thesis and dissertations. This repository is severely under utilized by not only Kent State University, but by every institution in Ohio associated with it.

Conclusions and Further Research

Two conclusions can be reached from the results gathered from this research. One, the development of an Institution Repository at Kent State University, at this time, would be a wasted effort. Two, there is a strange cognitive dissonance in the minds of faculty at Kent State University (and so probably most academic institutions) when it comes to copyright control and the rights of authors in this country. The first conclusion was the reason for conducting this research and writing this paper, but the second conclusion is much more disturbing. The unwillingness of faculty to deposit anything into an online repository is directly correlated to their fears of copyright violation. There were a number of similarities between the responces gathered in the survey and general responces and complications from the existing literature. One topic that was specifically asked about in the survey, and one that was brought up again and again, was that of problems with copyrights. Even when it was specifically mentioned in the survey that there were universities which made it mandatory to submit articles, albeit with an "opt-out" option (Albanese, 2008), faculty was still very hesitant to allow such a thing to happen at their own university. The policy of mandatory depositing at Harvard Univeristy was voted on

by individual colleges and schools and by early 2008 the entire university voted unanimously on the issue (Suber, 2008). If every member of the faculty was able to see that the depositing was not a bad thing at their own school, it's interesting to note that the Kent State faculty are adimently against a mandatory policy by nearly 94%. The overwellming majority of faculty from the survey believe that there will be too many copyright and legal issues to contend with when it comes to the publishing of academic journal writing. All of these copyright problems stem from the fact that faculty are giving away their copyrights to the publishers in the fist place.

When it comes to grey material, the faculty was just as adament about retaining their copyrights and not having their work stolen as they were adament that it was absolutely necessary to give away their copyright to publishers of journal articles. This was also a trend seen in the literature. Davis and Connolly, in the paper "Evaluating the reasons for non-use of Cornell University's installation of DSpace," gathered responces from their own faculty as to why no one was depositing grey material, or scholarly work, into the repository. While the depositing was not mandetory, the practice was encouraged by the librarians who ran the repository and the administration of the school. When asked why no one was depositing, the faculty replied that there was already enough access to their research, that they had concerns about copyright, and that they had fears of plagarism; all concerns also raised by the faculty at Kent State University. Watson, in "Authors' attitudes to, and awareness and use of, a university institutional repository," states that, in her research, "authors expressed more concern about protecting the copyright of the publishers that about their personal copyright [when it came to academic research]. This was another similarity between her research and mine. The faculty responding to the survey were usually very worried about how the publishers would react to printing something that was already online or being asked to retain enough copyright to later re-

published something in an institutional repository.

  While more research into the area of repositories and how they are helping or hindering academics will still need to be a topic of discussion, the seemingly side topic of faculty not understanding their rights when it comes to material they have created could also be a line of interest. Far from it being the time for Kent State University to create an institutional repository, it is more the time for the faculty at Kent to learn what rights they have when it comes to publishing their work. The faculty will need to learn these rights and how to implement them long before they will feel comfortable with the idea of an institutional repository.

Appendix (A)

Letter of Introduction

Dear KSU Faculty member,

My name is Adam Steele, and I am a graduate student in Library and Information Science here at Kent State University. I am conducting a study entitled "An Accounting of the Percentage of Faculty Willing to Deposit into an Institutional Repository." This study will look at the willingness of the faculty at Kent to deposit their research into a hypothetically newly created institutional repository for the university. The data collected in this study will be compiled and presented to the administration of the Kent State University library for their consideration in possibly creating our own institutional repository.

There was a small problem with the email system initially, and I apologize if this was sent to you a second time by accident. If you choose to participate, please complete the survey located at the URL listed below no later than April 30th, 2009. Participation in this study is, of course, completely voluntary, and any participant can decide to leave the study at any time. There will be nothing on the survey that indicates who you are in any way other than what department you teach in, and how long you have been teaching. Every email has been sent out blinded; so no one else will know whether it was sent to you or not. This study has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. By filling out and submitting the survey, you are consenting to participate in this study.

If you have any questions about the study or need any clarification of the questions in the survey, please contact me at 330-672-1672 or by email at absteele@kent.edu. Please also feel free to contact me if you would like to know the results obtained from this survey. My faculty advisor is Dr. Yin Zhang and can be contacted at 314 Library, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio or by calling 330-672-0010. Information about Kent State university's rules for research can be obtained from Dr. John West, Vice President and Dean, Division of Research and Graduate Studies (330-672-2851).

Thank you for your participation.
Link to Survey: http://www.screator.net/showform.php?f=2058552207

Sincerely,
Adam Steele
Graduate Student
School of Library and Information Science
Kent State University

Appendix (B)

Instructions for Survey

Please fill out all information to the best of your ability and submit the survey by April 30th, 2009.

By filling out and submitting this survey, you are consenting to participate in this study.

The following is a list of definitions that may be helpful to you while filling out the survey.

Institutional repository refers to an online location that collects, organizes, archives, and posts, for free, the academic material created by an institution, usually a college or university.

Open access refers to free, immediately accessible, and full-text access to scientific and academic materials. The material necessarily has little copyright or licensing restriction and can be downloaded, read, copied, used and linked to without consequences as long as nothing is changed in the material and proper citation is given.

Grey literature or *grey material* refers to semi-academic papers such as course notes, lectures, syllabi, etc.

Pre-prints refer to academic journal articles that are archived before they are sent for final publication to a journal.

Post-prints refer to academic journal articles that have already been accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, or that have already appeared in a peer-reviewed journal.

Appendix (C)

Survey
(As of 8/4/2009, the survey could also still be found online at
http://www.screator.net/showform.php?f=2058552207)

Creating an Institutional Repository at Kent State University
Reactions of the Faculty

Instructions for survey

Please fill out all information to the best of your ability and submit the survey by April 30th, 2009.

By filling out and submitting this survey, you are consenting to participate in this study.

The following is a list of definitions that may be helpful to you while filling out the survey.

Institutional repository refers to an online location that collects, organizes, archives, and posts, for free, the academic material created by an institution, usually a college or university.

Open access refers to free, immediately accessible, and full-text access to scientific and academic materials. The material necessarily has little copyright or licensing restriction and can be downloaded, read, copied, used and linked to without consequences as long as nothing is changed in the material and proper citation is given.

Grey literature or *grey material* refers to semi-academic papers such as course notes, lectures, syllabi, etc.

Pre-prints refer to academic journal articles that are archived before they are sent for final publication to a journal.

Post-prints refer to academic journal articles that have already been accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, or that have already appeared in a peer-reviewed journal.

1/18

Questions about yourself
1. How many years have you taught in higher education?

1. ○ 0-5 years
2. ○ 6-15 years
3. ○ 16-30 years

4. ○ 31 or more years

2. For which department do you work?

1. _____

Questions about frequency of writing and publishing.
3. Have you ever had any research articles published?

1. ○ Yes - Please answer the next two quesstions
2. ○ No - Please skip to question 6

4. On average, how many journal articles would you say you write on a yearly basis?

1. ○ 0-1
2. ○ 2-5
3. ○ 6-10
4. ○ 10 or more

5. Were any of the research articles published in an open access journal?

1. ○ Yes
2. ○ No

Questions about Institutional Repositories
6. If Kent State University had an institutional repository (IR), would you be willing to deposit *pre-prints*?

1. ○ Yes

2. ○ No

7. If no, why not?

1. ☐ Copyright issues
2. ☐ Too Complicated
3. ☐ Not enough time
4. ☐
   [   ]

8. If Kent State University had an institutional repository (IR), would you be willing to deposit *post-prints*?

1. ○ Yes
2. ○ No

9. If no, why not?

1. ☐ Copyright issues
2. ☐ Too complicated
3. ☐ Not enough time
4. ☐
   [   ]

10. If Kent State University had an institutional repository (IR), would you be willing to deposit *grey material*(syllabi, lecture notes, power point presentations, etc.)?

1. ○ Yes
2. ○ No

11. If no, why not?

1. ☐ Copyright issues
2. ☐ Too complicated

3. ☐ Not enough time
4. ☐
   [   ]

Questions about open access education
12. If there were to be short seminars about copyright issues surrounding open access publishing, would you be willing to attend?

1. ○ Yes
2. ○ No
3. ○ Maybe

13. Would such education make you more likely to deposit material in an Institutional Repository (IR)?

1. ○ Yes
2. ○ No
3. ○ Maybe

14. If there were to be a service to deposit yor research electronically, leaving your with only the task of sending the product, would you be more likely to deposit?

1. ○ Yes
2. ○ No
3. ○ Maybe

Questions about mandatory depositing - There have been some institutions in this country and around the world that have made it mandatory for certain departments, colleges, or even whole universities to deposit any academic material created while working.
15. If there were to be a vote to make depositing mandatory for your department, how would you vote?

1. ○ For
2. ○ Against

16. If there were to be a vote to make depositing mandatory for your college, how would you vote?

1. ○ For
2. ○ Against

17. If there were to be a vote to make depositing mandatory for the entire university, how would you vote?

1. ○ For
2. ○ Against

18. If depositing into an institutional repository were to be made mandatory; what policies, education, and/or assistance would you like to see to make the transition easier?

Table 1. Willingness to deposit pre-prints, by number of years teaching

	Yes	No
0-5 Years	4	7
6-15 Year	14	14
16-30 Years	16	11
31 or more years	6	7
Total	40	39

Table 2. Willingness to deposit post-prints, by number of years teaching

	Yes	No
0-5 Years	5	6
6-15 Year	17	11
16-30 Years	18	9
31 or more years	10	3
Total	50	29

Table 3. Willingness to deposit grey material, by number of years teaching

	Yes	No
0-5 Years	5	6
6-15 Year	11	17
16-30 Years	12	15
31 or more years	6	7
Total	34	45

Table 4. Making depositing mandatory at the departmental level, by number of years teaching

	For	Against
0-5 Years	0	11
6-15 Year	4	24
16-30 Years	1	26
31 or more years	0	13
Total	5	74

Table 5. Making depositing mandatory at the College/School level, by number of years teaching

	Yes	No
0-5 Years	0	11
6-15 Year	4	24
16-30 Years	1	26
31 or more years	1	12
Total	6	73

Table 6. Making depositing mandatory at the University level, by number of years teaching

	Yes	No
0-5 Years	0	11
6-15 Year	4	24
16-30 Years	1	26
31 or more years	0	13
Total	5	74

Table 7. Willingness to deposit pre-prints, by department

	Yes	No
Architecture and Environmental Design	0	1
Arts	3	1
Business	5	6
Communication and Information	5	1
Education	6	9
Hard Sciences	3	4
Nursing	2	3
Social Sciences	15	12
University Libraries	1	2
Total	40	39

Table 8. Willingness to deposit post-prints, by department

	Yes	No
Architecture and Environmental Design	1	0
Arts	3	1
Business	6	5
Communication and Information	5	1
Education	6	9
Hard Sciences	3	4
Nursing	4	1
Social Sciences	20	7
University Libraries	2	1
Total	50	29

Table 9. Willingness to deposit grey material, by department

	Yes	No
Architecture and Environmental Design	0	1
Arts	1	3
Business	5	6
Communication and Information	4	2
Education	6	9
Hard Sciences	2	5
Nursing	0	5
Social Sciences	13	14
University Libraries	3	0
Total	34	45

Table 10. Making depositing mandatory at the departmental level, by department

	For	Against
Architecture and Environmental Design	0	1
Arts	0	4
Business	1	10
Communication and Information	2	4
Education	0	15
Hard Sciences	0	7
Nursing	0	5
Social Sciences	2	25
University Libraries	0	3
Total	5	74

Table 11. Making depositing mandatory at the College/School level, by department

	For	Against
Architecture and Environmental Design	0	1
Arts	0	4
Business	2	9
Communication and Information	2	4
Education	0	15
Hard Sciences	0	7
Nursing	0	5
Social Sciences	2	25
University Libraries	0	3
Total	6	73

Table 12. Making depositing mandatory at the University level, by department

	For	Against
Architecture and Environmental Design	0	1
Arts	0	4
Business	1	10
Communication and Information	2	4
Education	0	15
Hard Sciences	0	7
Nursing	0	5
Social Sciences	2	25
University Libraries	0	3
Total	5	74

References

Albanese, A. (2008). Harvard mandates open access. *Library Journal*, *133*(5), 16-17.

Bobay, J. (2008). Institutional repositories: Why go there? *Indiana Libraries*, *27*(1), 7-9.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The. (2007). *Institutions: Kent State University – Main campus*. Retrieved August 11, 2008, from
<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/
classifications/sub.asp?key=748&subkey=15705&start=782>.

Davis, P., & Connolly, M. (2007, March). Evaluating the reasons for non-use of Cornell University's installation of DSpace. *D-Lib Magazine, 13*(3/4). Retrieved July 25, 2008, from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march07/davis/03davis.html>.

Herb, U., & Müller, M. (2008). The long and winding road: Institutional and disciplinary repository at Saarland University and State Library. *Grey Journal (TGJ)*, *4*(2), 67-72.

Kent State University website. (June 11, 2008). *Academics section*. Retrieved August 3, 2008, from <http://www.kent.edu/Academics/>.

MacDonald, S., & Uribe, L. (2008). Libraries in the converging worlds of Open Data, E-Research, and Web 2.0. *Online*, *32*(2), 36-40.

Morris, S. (2007). Will the parasite kill the host? Are institutional repositories a fact of life -- and does it matter?. *Serials*, *20*(3), 172-179.

National Institutes of Health Public Access. (n.d.). *Public Access Homepage.* Retrieved August 11, 2008, from <http://publicaccess.nih.gov/index.htm>.

Open Society Institute. (n.d.). *Budapest Open Access Initiative*. Retrieved July 25, 2008, from <http://www.soros.org/openaccess/index.shtml>.

Pinfield, S. (2007). Can open access repositories and peer-reviewed journals coexist?. *Serials*,

20(3), 163-171.

Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition, The. (2007-2008). *SPARC*. Retrieved
July 25, 2008, from <http://www.arl.org/sparc/>.

Suber, P. (2008, March 2). The open access mandate at Harvard. *SOAN*. Retrieved August 11,
2008, from <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/03-02-08.htm>.

Watson, S. (2007). Authors' attitudes to, and awareness and use of, a university institutional
repository. *Serials*, *20*(3), 225-230.