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Abstract
The purpose of the study was to capture a brief snapshot of current academic librarian engagement with Open Access in UK higher education institutions. The study utilised a mixed method approach. An online questionnaire was used to capture quantitative data, and email interviews were used to collect qualitative data. A volunteer sample of 83 UK-based academic librarians responded to the questionnaire, and two further responses were received to the email interviews. Quantitative data was presented visually, and qualitative data was analysed using Braun & Clarke’s staged thematic analysis (2006).

The study found that the main forms of Open Access activities academic librarians engage in are promotion, education and communication. These Open Access activities elide with the pre-existing responsibilities academic librarians have for promoting library services, communicating with library users, and educating students and researchers. Academic librarians largely provide Open Access support to academic staff and students.

Academic librarians have limited knowledge of the specific mandates and policies relevant to Open Access, and do not engage with Open Access on a regular basis. They largely feel neutral or satisfied with their current level of Open Access engagement, and do not want to significantly change how they engage with Open Access in the future, although they would like to increase their teaching responsibilities.

The low Open Access engagement of academic librarians may be shaped by their limited Open Access remit, with responsibility for Open Access engagement located elsewhere in the university or library staffing structure. Due to the small scale of the study and the use of non-probability sampling, further study would be needed to affirm the study’s findings and to investigate the nature of academic librarian job remit and Open Access staffing within universities in greater depth.
Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................... 4

RESEARCH QUESTION, AIM & OBJECTIVES ........................................................... 4
  RESEARCH QUESTION ............................................................................................ 4
  AIM .......................................................................................................................... 4
  OBJECTIVES ......................................................................................................... 5
  SCOPE AND DEFINITIONS ...................................................................................... 5

LITERATURE REVIEW ............................................................................................... 5
  INTRODUCTION ....................................................................................................... 5
  OVERVIEW OF OPEN ACCESS .............................................................................. 6
  UNIVERSITIES AND OPEN ACCESS ................................................................... 9
  ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS ...................................................................................... 13
  ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS AND OPEN ACCESS ................................................... 15
  CONCLUSION ......................................................................................................... 16

METHODOLOGY ....................................................................................................... 17
  RESEARCH PARADIGM & METHODOLOGY ......................................................... 17
  DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT: ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE ....................... 17
  DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT: INTERVIEW .................................................. 20
  ETHICS AND CONFIDENTIALITY ......................................................................... 23
  LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY ............................................................................. 24

RESULTS .................................................................................................................. 25
  QUESTIONNAIRE .................................................................................................... 25
  INTERVIEWS ........................................................................................................... 32

DISCUSSION ............................................................................................................. 37
  OBJECTIVE 1: TO GAIN AN OVERVIEW OF THE OPEN ACCESS ACTIVITIES ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS ARE CURRENTLY ENGAGED IN ........................................... 37
  OBJECTIVE 2: TO MEASURE THE SELF-ASSESSED LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS HAVE OF OPEN ACCESS ........................................ 38
  OBJECTIVE 3: TO GAIN INSIGHT INTO WHETHER ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS FEEL GENERALLY POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE ABOUT THEIR CURRENT ENGAGEMENT WITH OPEN ACCESS ................................................................................................................................. 38
  OBJECTIVE 4: TO SUGGEST WAYS ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS COULD POTENTIALLY ENGAGE WITH OPEN ACCESS IN THE FUTURE ........................................ 38

CONCLUSION ......................................................................................................... 39

REFERENCES ........................................................................................................... 41

APPENDIX ............................................................................................................... 46

Table of Figures
  FIGURE 1 OPEN ACCESS ACTIVITIES OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS ......................... 26
  FIGURE 2 OPEN ACCESS ACTIVITIES OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS BY ACTIVITY TYPE .................................................................................................................. 27
  FIGURE 3 GROUPS SUPPORTED BY ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS WITH OPEN ACCESS ENGAGEMENT ............................................................................................................. 28
  FIGURE 4 LEVELS OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIAN CONFIDENCE IN TYPES OF OPEN ACCESS KNOWLEDGE .................................................................................. 29
  FIGURE 5 FREQUENCY OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIAN ENGAGEMENT WITH OPEN ACCESS ................................................................................................................. 30
  FIGURE 6 LEVELS OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIAN SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT OPEN ACCESS ENGAGEMENT ........................................................................ 31
  FIGURE 7 FUTURE ACADEMIC LIBRARIAN ENGAGEMENT WITH OPEN ACCESS ................................................................................................................................. 32
  FIGURE 8 DRAFT THEMATIC MAP .......................................................................... 33
  FIGURE 9 FINAL THEMATIC MAP ............................................................................ 34
  FIGURE 10 CURRENT ACADEMIC LIBRARIAN ENGAGEMENT WITH OPEN ACCESS FOR COMPARISON ................................................................. 38
  FIGURE 11 FUTURE ACADEMIC LIBRARIAN ENGAGEMENT WITH OPEN ACCESS FOR COMPARISON ................................................................. 39
Introduction

This small-scale research project focuses on the question of how academic librarians engage with Open Access in the United Kingdom.

Open Access is the act of publishing academic content in a form ‘freely accessible to all’ (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2017a), and engaging with it has become crucial to UK higher education institutions due to the necessity of publishing Open Access for compliance with complex, evolving funder mandates (Research Councils, 2017; Wellcome Trust, 2016) and for eligibility for the Research Excellence Framework (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2017b).

The academic librarian plays an important liaison role between the library and academic departments (Hardy & Corrall, 2007; Pinfield, 2001), but the exact responsibilities and duties of the academic librarian have altered significantly in recent years in order to meet the changing needs of universities (Austin & Bhandol, 2013; Pinfield, 2001). Due to the increasing importance of Open Access engagement, support for Open Access publishing is a university need that academic librarians potentially address. Therefore, the question of how academic librarians engage with Open Access – if they in fact do so at all – is one worth investigating.

The study utilises a mixed methods approach, positioned within the post positivist paradigm. Data was collected using an online questionnaire and email interviews. The data has been analysed in two ways: through presentation via graphs and percentages in the case of the quantitative data, and in the form of a report and map based on thematic analysis for the qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Research Question, Aim & Objectives

Research Question
How do academic librarians in the United Kingdom engage with Open Access?

Aim
To capture a snapshot of current academic librarian engagement with Open Access at UK higher education institutions.

Objectives

Objective 1: To gain an overview of the Open Access activities academic librarians are currently engaged in.

Objective 2: To measure the self-assessed level of knowledge academic librarians have of Open Access.
Objective 3: To gain insight into whether academic librarians feel generally positive or negative about their current engagement with Open Access.

Objective 4: To suggest ways academic librarians could potentially engage with Open Access in the future

Scope and Definitions
The scope and definitions outlined below are largely drawn from the initial research proposal, with some alterations. The original research proposal is available in Appendix B.

The study will have a limited geographical scope, and will focus specifically on the UK, and further narrow its focus to higher education institutions only. The only participants will be academic librarians within said institutions.

Academic Librarian: The academic role has shifted in nature significantly in recent years (Austin & Bhandol, 2013), and staff who perhaps would have been traditionally referred to as academic librarians now have a range of alternative job titles, from information adviser to liaison to subject specialist (Hardy & Corrall, 2007; CILIP, 2014). Therefore, within this study, an academic librarian is defined as a member of library staff whose job is specifically concerned with collaboration with academic communities, collection development, liaison and information literacy skills teaching (Eldridge et al., 2016). Due to the range of titles and responsibilities a librarian may have, participants in this study will be partly self-defined: as long as they identify as an academic, subject or liaison librarian in a higher education institution, the individual will qualify.

Open Access: Open Access is defined as the act of ‘making the products of research freely accessible to all’ (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2017c). There are two forms of recognised Open Access: Green, where peer-reviewed research is deposited in a subject or institutional repository, and Gold, where research is made freely available electronically by the publisher (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2017c). Both these forms of open access are relevant to this study.

Engagement: A broad approach will be taken to this term. ‘Engagement’ will not just cover instances of academic librarians directly publishing and archiving in repositories or supporting academics to do so, but will cover the range of potential Open Access activities outlined in the literature review, including promotion, advocacy, communication and upskilling.

Literature Review
Introduction
In order to look at academic librarian engagement with Open Access, it is necessary to consider a number of factors, including the contemporary Open Access environment and
the nature of modern academic librarianship. This literature review will therefore begin with the history of Open Access in the UK, before it will move on to the contemporary Open Access policy environment. The literature review will then discuss the current relationship between Open Access and UK universities, before defining academic librarianship, the main activities of academic librarians, and what is currently known about academic librarian engagement with Open Access.

Overview of Open Access
Definition of Open Access
Open Access is defined as the act of publishing research output in a manner that ensures it is ‘freely accessible to all’ (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2017a). The Internet has been key to the rise and establishment of Open Access (Laakso et al., 2011), as it allows for the instant, widespread and largely egalitarian dissemination of information.

There are two forms of Open Access. The first is the Gold Open Access route, where researchers or their institutions pay an article processing charge (APC) to ensure that research is available in its final form immediately via the publisher without the barrier of the need to pay a subscription. The second is the Green Open Access route, where research is archived in an institutional or subject repository at no initial cost and made available in its peer-reviewed but not final publisher branded form openly, subject to publisher embargo (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2017a).

History of Open Access in the United Kingdom
Origins of Open Access
Suber traces the original roots of Open Access back to the late 1960s (2009), whereas Laakso et al suggest the Open Access movement as it stands today began in the late 1990s (2011), most likely as a result of the dissemination opportunities allowed by the Internet. Laakso et al describe three phases in the development of Open Access: an initial phase of volunteer-built and run Open Access sites in the 1990s, a second phase in the early 2000s wherein volunteer-led projects were replace by a more long-term workable Open Access business model, and a third phase between 2005-2009 when better infrastructure and new licencing cemented the presence and significance of Open Access publishing (2011).

Both Suber and Laakso et al only cover the development of Open Access until 2009 (Laakso et al., 2011; Suber, 2009), and it is the next phase of post-2009 Open Access that is most relevant to the research questions at hand. More specifically, the phase of Open Access of greatest relevance is the period post-2012 to the present, a phase wherein research funder, publisher and institutional policy has been directly shaped by the findings of the Finch Report (Finch, 2012).

The Finch Report
The Finch Report was produced by the Working Group on Expanding Access to Published Research Findings who, as their name suggests, aimed to create a report which would provide guidance on sustainable, future-proof expansion of access to research outputs. The report suggested the most sustainable model of Open Access would be the Gold model, wherein research is published in hybrid and fully Open Access journals, funded via a one-
time payment of an article processing charge (henceforth known as an ‘APC’). This, the report suggests, would have the benefit of providing the public immediate, unrestricted access to research at no cost, whereas both the traditional subscription model and the Green model of self-archiving would be subject to greater restrictions – be they of copyright, or of embargo (Finch, 2012).

The Finch Report’s focus on Gold Open Access (2012) was not universally welcomed. In 2012, Harnad suggested the Finch Report was wrong to suggest Gold Open Access is more sustainable than Green Open Access, as APCs are a direct and significant drain on the public purse, whereas Green self-archiving can be sustainably carried out by higher education institutions on a low cost and therefore sustainable long-term basis (2012). Nonetheless, the government responded positively to the Finch Report (Department for Business, 2012), and Research Councils UK (henceforth RCUK) also expressed a preference for Gold Open Access over Green (Research Councils, 2017). As a result, Gold Open Access continues to be the UK government and funder preferred Open Access publishing route.

Contemporary Open Access in the United Kingdom

**Funder Open Access Policies**

On the basis of the Finch Report (2012) and government response (Department for Business, 2012), RCUK now provide a block grant for the payment of APCS and places limitations on the length of allowable embargo periods for self-archived Green research outputs (Research Councils, 2017). Charity funders, much like RCUK, also provide funding for APCs, through the Charity Open Access Fund (COAF) (Wellcome Trust, 2016).

Both RCUK and COAF require funded research to be published Open Access with adherence to certain restrictions on embargo lengths, location and licencing. For example, both forms of funding require Gold and Green outputs to be published with a CC-BY creative commons licence, ensuring research is as open and accessible as possible (Wellcome Trust, 2016; Research Councils, 2017).

These restrictions, along with the government’s stance on Open Access, have no doubt shaped researcher and institutional engagement with Open Access. But of even greater significance to the face of contemporary Open Access in the UK is the Higher Education Funding Council’s (henceforth HEFCE) Open Access Policy for the Research Excellence Framework (henceforth REF) 2021.

**HEFCE’s Open Access Policy for the Research Excellence Framework 2021**

In order for research outputs – specifically conference papers and journal articles - to be eligible for the Research Excellence Framework 2021, from 1 April 2016 onwards published research has been required to meet specific parameters. In order to be eligible, the peer reviewed version of the research output must have been deposited in an institutional or recognised subject repository within three months of acceptance for publication. HEFCE require higher education institutions to not only ensure compliance, but to provide evidence of said compliance – a clearly complex, time consuming task (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2016).
The Research Excellence Framework is intended to evaluate the quality of research output from higher education institutions, and research funding is allocated on the basis of the assessed quality of those institutions (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2017b). Therefore, it is crucial for universities to ensure their best output is eligible for assessment.

As HEFCE policy requires Green self-archiving, and RCUK and COAF policy emphasises Gold immediate Open Access, researchers and their institutions are faced with layers of compliance requirements. This rapid shift in policy and the vital need for researchers and their institutions to adhere to it has not only had an impact on the need for universities to alter their methods of publishing, archiving and recording compliance: it has also had an impact on the policies of publishers, and their requirements for potential contributors.

**Publisher Policies**

The swift, extensive changes in Open Access policy in recent years have resulted in equally swift alterations in publisher policies concerning Green and Gold Open Access. Publishers require specific APCs for Gold Open Access, and set embargos of different lengths on Green Open Access self-archiving. The consistent preoccupation of publishers with income – the protection of pre-existing revenue and the creation of a Gold Open Access revenue producing business model – means their own policies seek to meld funder policy adherence with revenue protection, and their own policies change as funder policy and the business climate also change (Gardner & Green, 2014; Covey, 2013; Marks & Bulock, 2016). The result is a range of disparate, complex policies in a state of flux.

Covey analysed data from April 2004 to June 2013, and found that for-profit publishers had unstable Open Access policies, prone to regular change, and lower support for self-archiving than similar non-profit publishers (Covey, 2013). Although support for self-archiving is now at 80% (SHERPA/RoMEO, 2017), likely in response to the pressure of funder policy and the REF, publisher Open Access policies remain complicated and arguably difficult to interpret. Publishers have their own individual policies regarding APC costs and embargo lengths. SHERPA/RoMEO, a searchable database of publisher policies, has the default Open Access policies of 2438 publishers in its database – hardly an insignificant number (SHERPA/RoMEO, 2017). By necessity, a service also exists specifically to help researchers determine if a journal is in fact compliant with their funder’s Open Access policy at all: the SHERPA/FACT database (SHERPA/FACT, 2013).

Whatever the reasons for the diversity of Open Access publisher policies, they create another layer of complexity for researchers and institutions, who must of course balance the requirements of funders, government and publisher policy in order to produce compliant Open Access research.

**Future of Open Access in the United Kingdom**

As has been established, Open Access in the UK has changed significantly even in the brief period between the publication of the Finch Report (Finch, 2012) and the present day. In order to consider the question of how academic librarians may engage with Open Access in the future, it is necessary to briefly determine some of the potential ways Open Access may change in the years to come.
**Brexit**

Brexit will have consequences that are largely unknowable at this point, due to the lack of clarity around the process itself. Ayris bravely suggests there may be opportunities in Brexit due to the UK’s pre-existing Open Access innovation and infrastructure, but cannot help but focus largely on the undeniable potentially destructive impact of Brexit on UK access to EU research funding, engagement with open science, and collaboration on EU copyright reform that may allow for greater text and data mining (Ayris, 2017).

**Scholarly Communications Licence**

Banks proposes the Scholarly Communications Licence, wherein researchers provide their home institution a non-exclusive licence to their scholarly output, potentially simplifying the compliance process for researchers (Banks, 2016). This model would be another radical change to the face of Open Access publishing in the UK, but is not without its critics. The Publisher’s Association have expressed concern about the proposed licence, suggesting it would limit researchers in their choice of publication location, would increase administration of researchers and institutions, and would negatively impact publisher income (Publisher’s Association, 2017); what impact the concerns of publishers will have on the implementation of the licence remains to be seen.

**Universities and Open Access**

**Library-Centric Open Access Services**

The majority of the literature focuses on the library as the location of Open Access services at universities (Pinfield, Salter & Bath, 2016; Awre, Stainthorp & Stone, 2016; Walters, Ritchie & Kilb, 2016). According to the literature, university libraries are at the forefront of Open Access provision, providing universities as a whole with the practical support to comply with the complex range of UK Open Access policies previously discussed (Awre, Stainthorp & Stone, 2016). Libraries have the negotiating experience, from purchasing large-scale journal packages from publishers, to engage with publishers regarding costs (Pinfield, Salter & Bath, 2016). Walters et al suggest the library is the correct locus for Open Access support in a university, due to its experience supporting researchers and providing ‘information services’ for the university as a whole (2016 p. 231).

**Open Access Activities of UK Libraries**

A significant element of the literature around UK Open Access provision focuses on JISC Pathfinder Projects (DeGroff, 2016; Ashworth, Mccutcheon & Roy, 2014; Sharp, 2014; Awre, Stainthorp & Stone, 2016). These projects were intended to create ‘shareable models of good practice’ in five areas of Open Access support: ‘cost management; workflows; policy and strategy; systems and metadata, and advocacy/communications to researchers’ (Fahmy, 2015).

The literature based on the pathfinder projects, with its focus on crucial Open Access activities, provides a solid framework for discussing the Open Access activities libraries support and engage in. The areas under discussion have been condensed down to the following: cost management, compliance and advocacy. Workflows, policy and systems are covered in relation to these three main strands.
Cost Management
Cost management is an initial area of considerable concern to universities. There are many costs associated with Open Access support, including the payment of APCs, the maintenance of a repository, and staffing costs (DeGroff, 2016). Block grant funding from RCUK, charity funders and the government have assisted significantly in ensuring that services are funded and that long-term support systems for policy compliance can be established (Aucock, 2014).

Ashworth, Mccutcheon & Roy note that of all the incoming and outgoing costs libraries must contend with, paying APCs can be uniquely challenging, as university financial workflows are not geared towards the kind of swift payments publishers insist on. Publishers also have heterogeneous workflows for APC payments, which makes establishing a streamlined internal library workflow for payments difficult to accomplish (2014).

A number of publishers have prepayment schemes. Sharp notes that adopting the prepayment schemes allowed UCL to avoid the complications of granular payments and follow a more straightforward deposit payment system (Sharp, 2014). By negotiating prepayment schemes with publishers much in the manner university libraries typically negotiate subscriptions to digital journal packages (Pinfield, Salter & Bath, 2016), libraries are potentially able to achieve discounts on advertised APC costs, and have in fact done so (Aucock, 2014; Sharp, 2014).

There are unavoidable negative aspects to engaging in prepayment schemes. Due to the fact that prepayment schemes are negotiated by individual institutions, the amount paid from one university to another may differ drastically. Universities do not share their negotiated deals – for prepayment or for subscriptions – therefore these deals lack transparency (Pinfield, Salter & Bath, 2016). An opaque payment process seems, on the face of it, diametrically opposed to the values that underpin Open Access.

Craig and Webb also suggest that their institution, the University of Sussex, is keenly aware that they risk ‘paying twice for content’ (Craig & Webb, 2017 p. 33). If a library pay APCs for content in a journal, and also pay subscription costs to access the journal’s non-Open Access content, they risk paying far more for the journal than they would have before Open Access mandates came in to force (Craig & Webb, 2017). Offsetting is a model where publishers ‘offset the cost of the university’s APCs against their subscription fees’ (Earney, 2015), and should ameliorate this problem. Awre, Stainthorp & Stone state that in the current Open Access climate, agreeing offsetting terms must be an intrinsic part of co-mingled subscription and Open Access prepayment library negotiations, in order to ensure value for money for an institutions (2016).

Compliance
In the first year of compliance with RCUK Open Access policy, UCL recorded data relating to Green and Gold Open Access on spreadsheets, before the sheer volume and complexity of the work required them to migrate to a proper database (Sharp, 2014). It is clear that, due to the size of the task of compliance, robust systems are essential.
The most essential system, according to Walters, Ritchie & Kilb is a Current Research Information System (CRIS), which they state is a mandatory system for Open Access support services, as it is brings together all the Open Access-related data necessary for compliance (2016). In particular, it allows for the linkage of specific grant information with a particular publication, ensuring the correct funding policy is adhered to, and also providing evidence of said adherence (Aucock, 2014).

A CRIS must also be interoperable with other systems; in particular Aucock notes the importance of interoperability with ResearchFish (2014). The Research Councils rely on ResearchFish for data about research output in the UK – it is, therefore, an essential related system (McArdle et al., 2016). Key to system interoperability is a ‘common metadata profile’ (DeGroff, 2016 p. 106).

Two metadata elements of note that allows for this interoperability are the digital object identifier (DOI) (Paskin, 2010) and the ORCID ID (McArdle et al., 2016). An ORCID ID is an identifier that is unique to a particular researcher (McArdle et al., 2016), whereas a DOI is an identifier unique to a particular research output (Paskin, 2010). McArdle et al specifically point out that ORCID feeds information about a particular researcher’s grants and research outputs directly from a CRIS into ResearchFish, demonstrating the value of unique, identifying, interoperable metadata in Open Access services (2016). These elements of the ‘common metadata profile’ (DeGroff, 2016 p. 106), due to clear necessity, have become a significant elements of modern published academic output.

Where prepayment of APCs is a rather opaque process, the workflows necessary to administrate Open Access services and ensure compliance are more open, and based on crowdsourced best practice (DeGroff, 2016; Awre, Stainthorp & Stone, 2016). The systems used as part of these workflows, such as the CRIS, are also relatively transparent due to their functional interoperability, and are therefore tools more in keeping with Open Access values.

Advocacy

In the model outlined as the basis of the JISC Pathfinder Projects, advocacy is an integral aspect of Open Access support services (Fahmy, 2015). Although compliance and cost management are time-consuming and produce a heavy practical workload, it is important to ensure Open Access staff are able to dedicate time to communicating with academics and other institutional stakeholders (Walters, Ritchie & Kilb, 2016).

The crowdsourced Open Access Workflows for Academic Librarians (OAWAL) define the facets of Open Access advocacy that libraries must focus on, including dissemination of Open Access information to other library staff, Open Access policies, Open Access benefits to the academic community, and promotion of the institutional repository (Emery & Stone, 2014). The library must engage in this multi-faceted advocacy with the full range of stakeholders who engage with Open Access: senior university staff, academics of all levels, and administrative staff in particular faculties and in marketing roles (Sharp, 2014).

Although advocacy as described by Emery & Stone (2014) is multi-faceted, the major emphasis of advocacy is on the benefits of Open Access, and on the dissemination of
information about relevant mandates. This advocacy is focused on academics. To illustrate, at Sussex, the library focuses its efforts on advocacy through education, by running workshops and producing educational resources relevant to researchers (Craig & Webb, 2017). Portsmouth has created shareable material for Open Access workshops and teaching sessions at other institutions, and Northumbria has designed an online decision-making tool for their researchers to use to direct them on the Open Access route best suited to their research output (DeGroff, 2016).

Along with advocacy through education, Aucock notes that systems also provide inbuilt advocacy opportunities. St Andrew’s University not only have a CRIS, but also have a ‘portal interface’ through which records of self-archived institutional research can be made accessible to the public, promoting research and inherently advocating for the promotional opportunities of publishing Open Access (Aucoc, 2014 p. 274).

Other Stakeholders
The academic literature on Open Access provision at universities, as previously discussed, focuses largely on the benefits of Open Access being located within the university library (Pinfield, Salter & Bath, 2016; Awre, Stainthorp & Stone, 2016; Walters, Ritchie & Kilb, 2016). Other departments and non-library individuals are not given the same emphasis, and are mentioned only in relation to their engagement with library-based Open Access services. This will be demonstrated through a discussion of other stakeholders mentioned in the literature. This discussion will be divided broadly into two strands: academic stakeholders – including students – and non-academic stakeholders.

Academics and Students
Researchers are at the heart of Open Access, as they are the ones who produce the research output covered by Open Access policies. Therefore at Glasgow, the library Open Access team attempt to work directly with subject departments in order to disseminate Open Access guidance (Ashworth, McCutcheon & Roy, 2014).

Senior academics engage more heavily with Open Access than academics less advanced in their fields, as senior academics are more likely to be the recipients of grants that have Open Access compliance requirements (Zhu, 2017). Academics in certain fields are also more likely to engage with Open Access than others: medicine and life sciences have a higher engagement rate, for example, than arts and humanities (Zhu, 2017). Nonetheless, Sharp emphasises the importance of engaging directly with not only senior academics, but the general academic staff of the university (2014), arguably in order to establish good Open Access practice early on.

Non-Academic Engagement
Non-academic stakeholders are vital for both Open Access administration and promotion. Sharp notes that that the marketing department provide support for promotion (2014); at Sussex, the Research Office help the Open Access team meet its advocacy goal (Craig & Webb, 2017). In terms of administration, some departments only engage with Open Access self-archiving and deposit work with ‘administrative support’ (Craig & Webb, 2017 p. 32), hence the need for Open Access teams to work directly with departmental administrators (Sharp, 2014). The finance department are entirely vital to the administrative task of
ensuring invoices for APCs are paid (Pontika & Rozenberga, 2015). At Royal Holloway, the Research and Enterprise team not only support compliance, but collaborate on the university’s overall strategy for compliance with the REF, and strategize on research support provision on a wider scale beyond Open Access (Pontika & Rozenberga, 2015).

Limitations of the Literature
Using the library-focused literature as a basis, it is possible to draw conclusions about who engages with Open Access within the university. It is not necessarily possible to determine how great the involvement of these stakeholders is, or how vital it is, as these stakeholders discussed solely in relation to library Open Access services (Pontika & Rozenberga, 2015; Craig & Webb, 2017; Ashworth, Mcclutcheon & Roy, 2014). This constitutes a gap in the literature, but one that will largely remain unexplored, as it is not within the scope of this dissertation.

A more pressing issue that must be taken into account is the fact that a great deal of the literature was produced before important policies that impact the Open Access landscape in the UK – particularly HEFCE’s April 2016 Open Access policy for the next REF (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2017b) – were instituted. Therefore, the literature does not provide an entirely current grounding on the Open Access landscape at universities, the Open Access activities of university libraries, or the technology and workflows currently in use for compliance. HEFCE has carried out a survey intended to map the contemporary face of Open Access workflows, technology and staffing, but the results of this are not yet available (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2017c).

Academic Librarians
What is an Academic Librarian?
The Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP) define the academic librarian by their involvement in a number of activities: liaison with academic staff, helping student and researchers with their literature searching, support for information skills development, and collection management. CILIP also suggest academic librarians may be subject specialists, have a teaching or e-learning qualification, or a library qualification (CILIP, 2014).

The traditional academic librarian role has altered significantly in recent years (Austin & Bhandol, 2013). The significance of collection management tasks – particularly cataloguing and classification – has decreased as more cataloguing has been outsourced and resources now often arrive at the library pre-prepared (Simmons & Corrall, 2010). Teaching has risen greatly in importance, particularly information literacy teaching (Simmons & Corrall, 2010; Pinfield, 2001). Many academic librarians have moved from being subject specialists to functional specialists, experts in information literacy rather than in a specific body of subject knowledge (Hardy & Corrall, 2007).

Despite the great chances the profession has face, the core of academic librarianship – a focus on liaison and relationship building - has remained consistent in its importance (Hardy & Corrall, 2007; Pinfield, 2001). Pinfield suggests that flexibility, and the ability to mould the role and its responsibilities to meet the changing needs of universities and their diverse faculties, is also now a core characteristic of academic librarianship (Pinfield, 2001).
Just as a university’s needs may mould the academic librarian role, the academic librarian’s job title may vary, depending on university staff structure and preference (Hardy & Corrall, 2007). They may be called liaison or subject librarians (Hardy & Corrall, 2007), or may be called information advisers or learning support (CILIP, 2014). Therefore it’s possible to argue that in many ways the academic librarian role is self-defined. That said, a number of skills and responsibilities have been identified as key to the role in the literature, and these will now be discussed in further detail.

Activities of Academic Librarians

Teaching & Education Support
As previously discussed, teaching has risen greatly in importance as part of the academic librarian role (Austin & Bhandol, 2013), information literacy teaching in particular (Simmons & Corrall, 2010). Universities now often require librarians to collaborate with academics to provide information literacy skills education as a cohesive part of the overall curriculum (Rees, 2005). Librarians must therefore negotiate with departments to slot into, or work around, pre-existing teaching, as their relationship with a department directly impacts their ability to provision effective information literacy support (Austin & Bhandol, 2013).

Academic librarians not only provide formal teaching to students. They also produce teaching materials, including handouts (Pinfield, 2001), and provide more tailored one-to-one support to researchers, advising on database usage and research skills (Janke & Rush, 2014).

Promotion & Advocacy
Restructuring of university and library staff structures has resulted in the erasure of traditional job titles, and at times, of academic librarians entirely (Rees, 2005). As a result, it is important for librarians to promote their own skills directly to academic departments (Janke & Rush, 2014), as the departments control teaching and determine whether the academic librarian can engage with students and researchers in a capacity beyond the typical traditional academic librarian role and demonstrate their worth (Austin & Bhandol, 2013).

Communication & Liaison
As has been previously established, liaison with students, academic and administrative staff, and subject departments as a whole, is at the heart of the academic librarian role (Hardy & Corrall, 2007; Pinfield, 2001). Universities now value user services and a focus essentially on customer services more highly than ever before (Simmons & Corrall, 2010). In order for academic librarians to establish effective relationships with a range of stakeholders, they must have excellent interpersonal skills (Simmons & Corrall, 2010).

Communication skills and liaison are not one and the same, but are certainly highly interrelated. Eldridge states that effective communication is based on strong relationships (2016); Hardy & Corral, conversely, state that positive liaison is only possible if academic librarians are effective communicators (2007). Answering queries, or providing triage for queries – while not directly connected to relationship building – is also an important element of academic librarianship (Hardy & Corrall, 2007).
Personal Development
As the role of academic librarian is in a state of constant flux (Pinfield, 2001), librarians must invest time in developing new skills and competencies in order to remain relevant. They must be willing to move beyond the traditional parameters of the academic librarian role (Janke & Rush, 2014). In particular, they must ensure they have the ICT skills necessary to support researchers and students in their use of online resources and databases (Simmons & Corrall, 2010). Austin & Bhandol note that librarians often do not have the teaching training and qualifications necessary to support the high amount of teaching they must provide, and must engage in further training (2013).

Along with developing skills to support their new focus on teaching, librarians must actively develop their skillsets in new ways, in order to proactively innovate the library services they offer (Rees, 2005). Therefore a focus on personal development is a key aspect of the academic librarian role.

Academic Librarians and Open Access
Limitations of the Literature
As has been established in the previous discussion of libraries and Open Access, the literature emphasises the importance of advocacy to researchers and other university stakeholders, and importance of teaching and educating researchers (Emery & Stone, 2014; Craig & Webb, 2017). Librarians have significant experience of advocacy (Janke & Rush, 2014; Austin & Bhandol, 2013; Rees, 2005) and teaching (Austin & Bhandol, 2013; Simmons & Corrall, 2010; Pinfield, 2001). Academic librarians also act as liaisons, and have experience establishing relationships with departments (Hardy & Corrall, 2007; Pinfield, 2001) – a task key to Open Access services (Walters, Ritchie & Kilb, 2016; Sharp, 2014). Therefore one could suggest that academic librarians are well-placed to support Open Access at UK universities.

Unfortunately the literature does not provide evidence of the ways academic librarians engage with, or support, Open Access. It is unclear whether the Open Access staff in libraries are qualified academic librarians or come from different professional backgrounds. Sharp emphasises the necessity of having user focused staff, able to clarify complex policies and systems and also simultaneously manage complex data, but does not delineate any requirement for an academic librarian qualification – or any other qualification (2014).

The pre-existing literature on the relationship between Open Access and academic librarians also fails to cover the particular UK, post-April 2016 Open Access context relevant to the scope of this dissertation. The majority of the literature is North American focused, and also heavily concerned with the concept of academic librarians as scholars themselves publishing Open Access, rather than as professional providers of Open Access service to academics (Hayman, 2016; Hughes, 2012; Mercer, 2011).

To illustrate, Hayman discusses US academic librarians as faculty, and their reluctance to engage with Open Access publishing (2016); Hughes found less than stellar self-archiving practice in the librarian-researcher community in the US (2012); and Mercer also found a lack of engagement on this front (2011). Tomaszewski, Poulin & MacDonald see
opportunities for Open Access advocacy in the role of librarian-as-scholar, suggesting librarians could publish Open Access in journals of the subject disciplines they support, in order to demonstrate the value of Open Access publishing to academics from the position of a fellow researcher (2013).

This model of the scholar librarian is clearly prevalent in US literature, but is absent from UK-focused papers on the role of academic librarians, which focus largely on librarians as a support service (Hardy & Corrall, 2007; Pinfield, 2001). Therefore a great deal of the pre-existing literature – being North American focused – is irrelevant to the research questions at hand.

The non-UK literature which does concern itself with the academic librarian as the advocate, collection manager and educator is severely out of date: Mullen’s book, a comprehensive overview of academic librarian engagement with Open Access, is from 2010 and therefore does not capture the post-2012 Open Access policy context (Finch, 2012; Mullen, 2010); furthermore, as it focuses largely on the US context, it would not cover academic librarian engagement with UK government and funder policy even if it were a more contemporary resource.

The UK Literature
The relevant literature, on academic librarian engagement with Open Access in the UK, is limited, but does provide some guidance on the manner in which librarians engage with the current Open Access landscape: via personal development, researcher support, and advocacy.

Academic librarians support every stage of the research process (Janke & Rush, 2014); in the context of the Open Access landscape, this means they not only support the curation of research, but also its creation (Sewell & Kingsley, 2017). Sewell & Kingsley suggest that academic librarians do not necessarily have the skills necessary to support academics in the ever-changing, complex world of scholarly communication today, which is why the intensive Research Ambassador Programme was instituted (2017).

Emery & Stone’s workflow for Open Access advocacy, OAWAL, was originally intended for academic librarians, suggesting librarians are seen as well-suited for an advocacy role (2014). Academic Librarians, at Leeds Beckett, have particularly supported advocacy by acting as a liaison between the library, academic and research support staff, mediating in order to ensure web pages promoting Open Access research reflected the needs of the full range of communities (Bower et al., 2017).

Conclusion
The literature review makes clear that the UK Open Access landscape is its own distinct entity, shaped by specific policies and mandates, and also delineates the gap in the research concerning academic librarian engagement. The literature also provides solid guidance on what knowledge academic librarians could have about Open Access, what activities they could potentially engage in, and the university stakeholders they could potentially support with Open Access engagement. This guidance is used in the methodology as a basis on
which to begin building a real picture of how academic librarians engage with the current policy and mandate-moulded Open Access environment.

Methodology

Research Paradigm & Methodology
This study is positioned within the realist post positivist paradigm, which can be broadly defined as follows: There is an objective reality, but the human lens into that reality is unreliable. Humans have values and experiences that make them unable to discern reality objectively (Given, 2008). Therefore in order to attempt to approach an understanding of objective truth, it is necessary to utilise triangulation of sources and methods (Given, 2008). The mixed methods approach is used within this study, as it is an eminently suitable methodology within this paradigm, as it provides multiple avenues of enquiry for the search for ‘an approximation to truth’ (Given, 2008).

The mixed methodology is ideal for a study focused on a professional practice, of limited timeframe, as it is ‘clearly a pragmatic approach’ (Pickard, 2013 p. 10). Johnson and Onwuegbuzie call the mixed method approach a ‘logical and practical alternative’ to using just one method (2004 p. 17). The mixed method approach also allows the collection of qualitative data that provides context and meaning to quantitative data (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). This study focuses on the contemporary context, and a mixed methodology allows therefore a practical approach to capturing a fuller picture of that context.

Data Collection Instrument: Online Questionnaire
An online questionnaire was used as the initial data collection instrument. A questionnaire is a popular data collection instrument, and with good reason: it is simple to disseminate digitally and therefore widely, and can reach members of the population without geographical limitations (Pickard, 2013). A questionnaire was therefore ideal for this study because the ease of online dissemination promised the possibility of a higher response rate, and was likely to produce data more representative of the population (within the limited parameters of a non-probability sample) than would be possible via another, non-digital method.

Structure of the Questionnaire
The full text of the questionnaire is available in Appendix F. The data collection instrument consisted of the usual elements of a questionnaire, including a cover letter outlining the purpose of the study and what would be expected of the participant (Denscombe, 2014). At the end of the questionnaire was a request for participants to contact the researcher via email if they wished to take part in a further interview – this will be discussed further in the section of the Methodology relating to Email Interviews.

The data collection instrument consisted largely of closed questions, in order to produce standard, comparable quantitative data. Denscombe suggests that a key factor of a good questionnaire is that it must have questions that can be answered quickly and easily (2014).
Closed questions therefore not only provide good quantitative data, but also allow for ease of quick response, potentially improving response rate.

As Pickard notes, a limitation of the questionnaire is that it does not allow for respondent-researcher interaction: therefore the researcher cannot necessarily know if they have inadvertently excluded an answer or factor that respondents would consider key to the closed questions at hand (2013). To address this issue, two open questions – Q.3 and Q.8 below – were included so that respondents could provide information on factors not directly addressed in related closed questions. Open questions were intentionally kept limited in order to keep the questionnaire short and encourage a higher response rate (Pickard, 2013).

All closed questions were marked essential, in order to ensure only completed questionnaire responses were collected, for ease of analysis.

All questions, overall, were written to produce data that would correspond directly to the objectives of the research study. Below is a table of the questions in the final questionnaire, with the corresponding objectives they were intended to address:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you an academic, liaison or subject librarian at a UK university?</td>
<td>Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What Open Access activities do you engage in? Select all the apply</td>
<td>Obj. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are there any ways you engage in Open Access that are not listed above? Please provide details.</td>
<td>Obj. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Which groups do you support or engage with in your Open Access activities? Select all the apply.</td>
<td>Obj. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How confident are you in your knowledge of the following areas of UK Open Access?</td>
<td>Obj. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How often do you engage with Open Access in your current role?</td>
<td>Obj. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How satisfied are you with your current level of engagement with Open Access?</td>
<td>Obj. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What elements of Open Access activity would you like to engage with in the future? Select all the apply.</td>
<td>Obj. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are there any elements of Open Access that you would like to engage with in the future that are not listed above? Please provide details</td>
<td>Obj. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions were formulated based on the literature review, and also on the basis of feedback from the pilot questionnaire.

The Open Access activities listed as options for Q.2 were drawn from the literature review, and were an amalgamation of the Open Access activities of UK libraries and the job responsibilities of academic librarians in general. The options for Q.2 were divided into the following broad elements: education, communication, promotion/advocacy, administration, and personal development. To ensure balance, two options of potential Open Access activities were provided for each segment. These five broad overall elements were used in Q.8, in order to allow for some limited comparison between the data from Q.2 and Q.8 at a later stage.
For Q.4, the list of groups that academic librarians potentially engaged with in their Open Access activities was drawn once again from the literature review, and consisted of a combination of Open Access stakeholders at universities, and groups generally supported by academic librarians. The literature review was also used as the basis for the breakdown of Open Access in the UK into a range of areas in Q.5.

**Pilot Questionnaire**

It is important to test a data instrument to ensure its efficacy (Pickard, 2013). Five people tested the initial pilot of the questionnaire: three academic librarians and two Open Access specialists. Question clarity and questionnaire length are both vital aspects to consider when creating an effective questionnaire (Denscombe, 2014; Pickard, 2013), so pilot questionnaire participants were asked to comment on the clarity of the questions, and estimate how long the questionnaire had taken them to complete.

The participants’ claim that the questionnaire took approximately five minutes was included in the cover letter of the final questionnaire. Questions were clarified on the basis of their feedback. For example, the options in Q.2. were altered to ensure equal weighting for each element of Open Access activity, and to avoid having too many similar options, as this appeared to cause confusion. An error in the response options for Q.5 was fixed due to feedback, and the response options for Q.7 were also altered to ensure less bias towards a positive response.

**Dissemination**

The questionnaire was created on Qualtrics, and disseminated via library-specific and librarian-specific mailing lists LIS-LINK and LIS-INFOLITERACY. The researcher’s network was also utilised, and academic librarian colleagues were asked to encourage their professional network to take part in the survey.

**Sample**

It was not possible to determine the exact size of the academic librarian population in higher education in the UK. This factor, along with limitations on time and budget for this dissertation, meant probability sampling was not possible. Probability sampling after all requires knowing the size of the population in order to have a clear criteria for inclusion (Vehovar, Toepoel & Steinmetz, 2016).

A non-probability sample was used. As discussed under ‘Dissemination’, the questionnaire was posted where the correct population were likely to see it, and they then elected whether to take part or not. The sample was therefore partly a convenience sample, and a volunteer sample (Vehovar, Toepoel & Steinmetz, 2016).

**Data Analysis**

As the data from the questionnaire is largely quantitative, it will largely be presented in graphic form, in order to provide a visual representation of patterns and trends within the results. Mathematical analysis will be limited to assessing percentages of responses, and the arithmetic average (Denscombe, 2014). The qualitative data collected will not be analysed
using a more complex methodology such as grounded theory, due to the miniscule amount of data collected, but will be presented straightforwardly.

**Data Collection Instrument: Interview**

Interviews were used in this project because they allow for the collection of detailed qualitative data (Denscombe, 2014). As Johnson & Onwuegbuzie note, qualitative data has the potential to give more meaning and context to quantitative data (2004); therefore using interviews allowed for the collection of a richer snapshot of contemporary academic librarian engagement with Open Access, the clear overall aim of this research.

Potentially, interviews also have the benefit of allowing the researcher to gain unexpected, relevant data pertaining to the research question (Denscombe, 2014). They also allow for the possibility of data triangulation, where answers from the interviews lend credence to answers received through the questionnaire, and vice versa (Denscombe, 2014). The interview was overtly intended, in this study, to act as a tool for collecting qualitative data that would provide this validation and ‘additional coverage’ (Denscombe, 2014 p. 153) for the largely quantitative data from the questionnaire.

**Face-to-Face Interviews**

Face-to-face interviews were offered as an option to potential participants, due to their benefits. A key benefit of the face-to-face interview is its ability to allow the researcher to collect data from auditory tone, visual cues and other non-verbal communication (Ratislavová & Ratislav, 2014). The way in which the face-to-face interviews were going to be conducted was outlined in the initial research proposal, available in Appendix B, alongside relevant ethical guidance and consent forms, available in Appendices C-E. Unfortunately, there were no volunteers for face-to-face interviews, so the sole focus of the methodology below will be on the email interview data collection instrument, as this was the one that was utilised.

**Email Interviews**

The email interview was utilised partly for its practicality. As it involves written correspondence, no time is needed to transcribe verbal data (Denscombe, 2014). It is easier to interview people over a larger geographic distance (Denscombe, 2014) as there are no associated need for travel or arrangement of travel costs. With email interviews, there is also no need to contend with the difficulties of arranging a time and a place for a face-to-face interview, or a specific timeslot for a phone call (Ratislavová & Ratislav, 2014).

Beyond utility, email interviews also have clear benefits. As an asynchronous data collection method, the interview allows the participant time to consider the questions and potentially provide more thoughtful responses and therefore more quality data (Ratislavová & Ratislav, 2014). The lack of in-person contact with the researcher can, in some cases, make the participant feel more anonymous and therefore allow them to be more open about their true viewpoint (Ratislavová & Ratislav, 2014).

**Structure of the Interview**

The interview was semi-structured, with some pre-determined open ended questions. Asking a set of pre-determined questions to all participants allowed for data triangulation.
between participants (Denscombe, 2014), a necessary step for establishing credibility (Pickard, 2013).

The researcher intentionally allowed for the opportunity to ask unplanned questions in response to participant response, in order to allow for the collection of new data-based insights (Denscombe, 2014). It was the responsibility of the researcher to ensure any unplanned question remained on topic, and were focused solely on collecting data pertaining to the research question at hand.

The predetermined questions used in the interviews, with the objectives the researcher intended them to broadly fulfil, are supplied in the table below. Questions below are in their order of intended sequences, with the assumption that new questions could be added between the pre-determined questions as needed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is your job title and the name of the institution you’re currently employed by?</td>
<td>Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Could you describe your main duties and responsibilities in your role?</td>
<td>Obj. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How significant a part of your job is engaging with and supporting Open Access?</td>
<td>Obj. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What do you think is the main way your support or engage with Open Access?</td>
<td>Obj. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How satisfied are you with your current level of engagement with Open Access?</td>
<td>Obj. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Can you explain why you feel the way you do?</td>
<td>Obj. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are you confident in your knowledge of Open Access?</td>
<td>Obj. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are there aspects of Open Access you would like to learn more about?</td>
<td>Obj. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How would you ideally like to support Open Access in the future?</td>
<td>Obj. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To clarify, would you ideally continue supporting Open Access in the way you currently do? Or would you, for example, like to be more involved in particular tasks e.g. teaching, or administration of the repository?

Interviews were limited to a maximum of two weeks, in order to avoid them taking up an undue amount of both the researcher and the participant’s time.

Testing the Data Instrument
The interview was not piloted, but the questions were assessed by an academic librarian and an Open Access specialist for bias and for clarity.

In response to feedback, Question 3 was modified. Originally the question asked: ‘Would you consider supporting and engaging with Open Access to be an important part of your job?’ This was changed to ‘How significant a part of your job is...’ in order not ensure more depth of detail in response, and in order not to lead the participant to a simple yes/no answer.
Question 9 was modified to add sub-questions with example responses, as the two test participants suggested the question was broad and therefore unclear, and would benefit from a sentence or two of clarification.

Dissemination
Questionnaire participants were given information about the interview at the end of the questionnaire, and asked to email the researcher directly if they wished to volunteer. A form email was provided. Although asking the sample population to actively email the researcher in order to participate was likely to have a dampening impact on the response rate, this method of solicitation was chosen over including a consent button or form within the questionnaire itself, in order to avoid associating respondents’ personal details with their questionnaire answers and breaching their anonymity.

Academic librarians known to the researcher were also asked to promote the survey to potential participants in their own professional networks, in order to potentially gain more voluntary participants.

Sample
As previously discussed, the unknown size of the UK academic librarian population and study feasibility made it impossible to utilise probability sampling. For the interview, a volunteer or self-selection sample was used, but the researcher also utilised their own professional network of peers to obtain volunteer research participants. This wasn’t strict snowball sampling, where the number of links in the network are more strictly defined, but was – rather – a form of network sampling (Vehovar, Toepoel & Steinmetz, 2016).

Data Analysis
Denscombe encourages the researcher to ‘look for themes’ in qualitative data (2014 p. 201). A popular method for analysis qualitative data is grounded theory (Pickard, 2013), but this was evaluated to be an unsuitable method of analysis for this research project. Grounded theory is a rigorous, rich method meant for hypothesising new theories (Braun & Clarke, 2006): theory creation was not the aim of this project, and would no doubt be too time-consuming for a research projected of limited scope and timeframe.

Better suited to the project’s aims was thematic analysis. Arguably an element of grounded theory, thematic analysis also acts as a data analysis tool in its own right, and allows the research to extrapolate interrelated themes from the data corpus (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Thematic analysis involved the following six steps:
1. ‘Familiarising yourself with your data’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006 p. 87): The researcher read over the data corpus and ensured familiarity with its content.
2. ‘Generating initial codes’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006 p. 87): The researcher created a set of ‘codes’ based on the data corpus.
3. ‘Searching for themes’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006 p. 87): The codes were divided into overall themes. Codes were apportioned and themes named on the basis of the ‘the
researcher’s theoretical [...] interest’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006 p. 84) – essentially on the basis of the research objectives.

4. ‘Reviewing themes’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006 p. 87): The themes were reviewed to see if they applied accurately to the codes and to the text of the interviews. The themes were amended accordingly. These themes were then used to create an initial ‘thematic map’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006 p. 87).

5. ‘Defining and naming the themes’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006 p. 87): At this point, the determined themes were condensed, renamed and reordered for greater clarity and brevity.

6. ‘Producing the report’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006 p. 87): A report describing the basic themes was produced, illustrated with anonymised or non-identifying quotes from the data corpus.

Although the interviews which constituted the data corpus were fully analysed and coded, the text of the interviews has not been included in this dissertation or in the appendix. This is due to the need to preserve participant anonymity. The inclusion of the analysis, but not the raw data, is an attempt to balance the need to display rich data with the simultaneous need to respect confidentiality. The confidentiality/transparency conundrum is often faced by researchers, and must be managed via a reliance on ethical guidance and the researcher’s own judgement (Wirth, 2016).

It is important to note here that the themes did not passively ‘emerge’ from the data corpus; the active, interpretive role of the researcher was an essential element of the analysis process (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This point is discussed in further detail under the subheading ‘Limitations of the Study’ and in the discussion of results.

Verification
Data from interviews must go through a process called verification, wherein the analysed data is shown to the research participants in order to give them the opportunity to correct or clarify the analysis of their contribution to the study (Pickard, 2013). This is vital to ensuring the dependability and credibility of qualitative data (Pickard, 2013). Therefore the analysed data from interview participants was provided to them, and amended and clarified with their guidance.

Ethics and Confidentiality
The questionnaire was completely anonymous, with a preamble outlining the purpose of the study, and what would be required of potential participants. Participants had the option of breaking anonymity by emailing the researcher at the end of the questionnaire if they wished to take part in the interview, but their email to the researcher was not associated with their questionnaire responses, maintaining questionnaire anonymity. Questionnaire data was stored securely on Qualtrics, and will be deleted once no longer required for this study or for any follow-up research.

The personal data of interview participants was stored securely on the researcher’s City University ICT account to ensure confidentiality, and will also be deleted once no longer required for research. Interview participants were provided with a participant information
sheet and signed a consent form. The consent form is included in Appendix E. The participant information sheet is available in Appendix D.

The ethics checklist for the study is available in Appendix C.

Limitations of the Study

The study must succeed on numerous fronts, due to the use of a mixed methodology: it must be qualitatively credible, dependable and transferable and also quantitatively externally valid and reliable (Pickard, 2013).

In relation to the quantitative element of the study, the use of a non-probability sample places clear limitations on the external validity of the study. A probability sample is necessary to ensure that results are representative of the population overall, and can be generalised (Vehovar, Toepoel & Steinmetz, 2016). The results of the study will therefore have limited external validity. In order for external validity to be established, further study would need to take place. Further study would also be needed to establish the reliability of the research (Pickard, 2013).

Qualitatively, efforts have been taken to ensure that the research is credible through the use of informant triangulation (Denscombe, 2014) and dependable via the establishment of an audit trail comprised of staged coding and analysis of data (Pickard, 2013). Nonetheless, the transferability of the results to other contexts will be limited due to the small scale of the study, and the need for further iterative research to establish the study’s worth.

Although ‘corroboration of findings’ (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004 p. 21) between the qualitative and quantitative research tools may allow for the establishment of limited reliability and transferability – should the results, in fact, corroborate one another – the study remains one of limited scale and significance. This is a small scale research study, a preliminary piece of research that has the potential to act as a starting point for further engagement with question of the relationship between academic librarians and Open Access.

A final factor that impacts the scope of the study is researcher bias. Pickard states that objectivity is vital in quantitative research (2013). Attempts were made to ameliorate the impact of bias through the testing of data instruments, but no doubt the researcher’s background in academic librarianship and Open Access support has nonetheless had an impact on the research itself. The perception of the researcher is also integral to the theoretical model of thematic analysis, which is ‘driven by the researcher’s theoretical or analytic interest in the area’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006 p. 84). Therefore researcher perception has an unavoidable impact on the output of the study, but one that will be discussed further throughout.
Results

Questionnaire

1. Are you an academic, liaison or subject librarian at a UK University?
   
   There were 91 respondents overall. Of these 91, 83 indicated that they fit the scope of the research.
   
   Yes: 83
   No: 8

2. What Open Access related activities do you engage in? Select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Access Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote library open access services (e.g. the institutional repository) to researchers and their departments</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer open access queries to specialised colleagues in the library or other departments</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act as a point of contact for general open access queries</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for the benefits of open access to researchers and their departments</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively train in or seek new open access skills and knowledge (e.g. by attending courses or conferences)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach university staff and students about open access through formal sessions, workshops, and/or presentations</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support researchers with compliance with HEFCE, funder or publisher open access policy</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish your own research open access</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor and/or report on compliance with open access policies</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit research output in the institutional repository, on behalf of institutional authors</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average each respondent engaged with 4.5 of the 10 listed Open Access activities. As the graph below demonstrates visually, by far the common option selected was ‘Promote library Open Access Services’, an activity with 78% of participants engage in. 67% of respondents refer queries to specialised colleagues, and 66% deal with general Open Access queries. Only 18% of respondents deposit research, and a mere 19% are involved in monitoring or reporting on compliance.
The responses can be analysed further. The activity options listed in this survey question divide equally into five broad areas of activity, as follows:

**Education**
1. Teach university staff and students about open access through formal sessions, workshops, and/or presentations
2. Support researchers with compliance with HEFCE, funder or publisher open access policy

**Communication:**
1. Refer open access queries to specialised colleagues in the library or other departments
2. Act as a point of contact for general open access queries

**Promotion:**
1. Promote library open access services (e.g. the institutional repository) to researchers and their departments
2. Advocate for the benefits of open access to researchers and their departments

**Administration**
1. Monitor and/or report on compliance with open access policies
2. Deposit research output in the institutional repository, on behalf of institutional authors

**Personal Development**
1. Actively train in or seek new open access skills and knowledge (e.g. by attending courses or conferences)
2. Publish your own research open access

As the activities can be broadly divided into categories, it is possible to present a visual of what broad types of activities the respondents engage in most heavily.
In keeping with the percentages outlined above, respondents engage most heavily with promotion and communication-related activities, which make up 61% overall of all the options selected. Only 8% of responses focused on administration-related activities.

3. Are there any ways you engage with Open Access that are not listed above?
Ten responses were received to this open question. One respondent stated they engage with Open Access because it is an explicit part of their job, as they work simultaneously in Open Access and academic librarianship. Another respondent stated that they are involved ‘validation of output into the institutional repository’, an administrative Open Access task. Another sought out ‘accessible e-formats’ of ‘OA text books’ that could ‘be used by ‘print impaired’ students’ as part of their collection development responsibilities. One response stated that the participant would ‘follow social media e.g. twitter for current awareness’ — a personal development activity.

Two respondents stated that they engage with Open Access on a strategic or ethic-driven basis:
1. Engage in national initiatives concerning OA e.g. school comms license
2. Engaging with publishers and ‘their apologists’ on social media e.g. websites

Two further responses focus on the activity of facilitating discoverability of Open Access resources:
1. Adding quality Open Access resources to the ‘Recourse Discovery Tool’
2. Open e-books available through the ‘Discovery layer’ and ensuring MARC records are in catalogue

Three responses cover education activities. Two of these responses focus on other forms of education support not covered in the previous question. One clarifies that Open Access is a ‘minor part’ of their teaching rather than the focus:
1. Raise awareness of OA resources during one-to-one library sessions
2. Included as a minor part of training sessions rather than a major one
3. ‘Cascading OA knowledge’ to less involved colleagues
4. Which groups do you support in your Open Access activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Academics</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Departments (e.g. Research Office, Finance)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff (e.g. Personal Assistants, Departmental Administrators)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Staff</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were on average 3.5 options chosen by the 83 respondents. In visual terms, the results translate thusly:

Respondents by and large support academic staff and students, with researchers, students and senior academics making up 67% overall of the selected options. Respondents engage least with non-academic staff. Administrative staff and non-academic departments make up only 18% of the options selected. In other words, 88% of respondents support researchers with Open Access; 77% support senior academics, and 71% support students. Only 27% support administrative staff.

5. How confident are you in your knowledge of the following areas of Open Access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Slightly Confident</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
<th>I do not know about this topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What Open Access Is</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Open Access</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Open Access</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Open Access</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents show greater confidence in more general topics of Open Access: what it is and its benefits, with confidence dipping significantly on more specialised topics e.g. specific policies. Where 50% of respondents are ‘very confident’ in their knowledge of what Open Access is, only 8% claim to have the same confidence in funder open access mandates. The graph below clearly illustrates the progressive dip in confidence as the areas listed become more niche.
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**Figure 4 Levels of academic librarian confidence in types of Open Access knowledge**

6. How often do you engage with Open Access in your current role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It makes up the majority of my role</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a day</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a month</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a year</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents do not engage with Open Access on a regular basis. Under 10% find Open Access takes up a majority of their role, and under 4% engage on a daily basis. In total, only
23% of respondents engage with Open Access on a daily or weekly basis, whereas 43% of respondents only engage several times a year. That said, only 2% do not engage with Open Access at all.

![Level of Academic Librarian Engagement with OA](image)

Figure 5 Frequency of academic librarian engagement with Open Access

7. How satisfied are you with your current level of engagement with Open Access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents are not extremely satisfied or unsatisfied with their Open Access engagement. Instead, 39% claim to be 'Satisfied' with their Open Access engagement, and 29% are neutral. A fairly significant number, 21%, are unsatisfied with their engagement, but the questionnaire does not give them the opportunity to explain their reasoning for this. The results do suggest a mildly positive level of feeling around the current level of Open Access engagement.
8. Which elements of Open Access activity would you like to engage with in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration of library open access services</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of open access and associated services</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of staff/students about open access</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison between researchers and open access</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specialist staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of own open access publishing and</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with Question 2, responses can be divided broadly into categories. The majority of responses show an interest in engaging more in promotion, education and communication. Of the activities available, participants are least interested in engaging in Open Access administration in the future.
9. Are there any elements of Open Access that you would like to engage with in the future that are not listed above?

Four comments were received. One comment was excluded for being unrelated to the question (a statement of how long the responder spent on Open Access activities); the other three comments were as follows:

- ‘Using OA specifically and deliberately as part of a strategy to reduce the power of academic publishers over university libraries.’
- ‘Critique of open access.’
- ‘I would like know more.’

Interviews

In accordance with stages 1-4 of Braun and Clarke’s thematic analysis methodology (2006), the data corpus was studied, and initial codes were produced and then organised into themes. These themes were then reviewed, and used to produce a draft thematic map. The codes and the themes were partially drawn from the data corpus, but were also drawn from the objectives and the literature review of the study, bringing the researcher’s perspective into the analysis process. This is an element of the theoretical model of thematic analysis, outlined in the methodology, which is ‘driven by the researcher’s theoretical or analytic interest in the area’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006 p. 84).
Stage five of thematic analysis requires the ‘defining and naming’ of themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006 p. 87). The themes in the initial draft thematic map were reviewed for relevance to the aim and objectives of the study, and for their clarity. On the basis of this review, the themes were narrowed, and their relationships delineated in a final thematic map.
For the final stage of the analysis, a report was produced (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In order to ensure the accuracy of the report, its contents was shared with the interview participants for verification (Pickard, 2013) and amended in response to their feedback.

**Final Report**

**University Structure**

**Subheading: Open Access University Stakeholders**

In the course of both interviews, it became clear that the size and staff structure of the participants’ institutions had a direct impact not only the staffing structure of Open Access support services, but also defined each academic librarian’s overall job responsibilities, and the specifics of their Open Access remit.

The impact of university staffing structure will be touched upon under every theme, and attention will be paid to its particular impact on the academic librarian role momentarily. For now, the focus will be on the initial impact of university structure on Open Access staffing.

Participant A is based at a small university. The size of their university has arguably resulted in what they refer to as a less ‘formal structure’ for Open Access provision. Although Participant A’s library has some dedicated Open Access staffing, it is very limited. On the basis that Open Access staffing is paid a salary at a ‘lower pay-grade’ than less ‘specialised’ staff, one could argue Open Access is not a priority of their institution. Participant A notes that significant elements of Open Access provision, including support for users of the
repository, are currently being supported by departments external to the library, due to a temporary lack of Open Access staffing within the library itself.

Participant B is based at a larger university with a dedicated Open Access team. Participant B notes that the Open Access team liaise with other departments to provide Open Access services, but the Open Access itself is ‘part of the library team’ overall and is not an element of an external department.

Theme: Academic Librarian Job Remit
University structure has an impact on the academic librarian job remit for both participants.

Subheading: Traditional Librarian Tasks
Participant A and B both carry out the academic librarian tasks broadly outlined in the literature review. Participants A and B teach, answers enquiries, create promotional material and carry out collection management. Both support humanities. Because Participant A is, as they state, part of a ‘very small university’, they also provide support to other subjects areas if other librarians are not available. Collaboration is implied as essential.

Subheading: Non-Traditional Responsibilities
Participant A, based in a smaller and therefore more necessarily collaborative institution, not only assists other departments but also has responsibility for supporting researchers specifically – a non-traditional addition to their straightforward subject liaison role. As Participant B is at a larger institution, with a more formal Open Access support structure, it is unsurprising that their responsibilities are also more clearly delineated, and involve more traditional support – as covered in the literature review - of staff and students.

Subheading: Supporting Students & Staff
Both A and B note that they support specific departments, and the students and staff from those departments in particular, but Participant A places repeated emphasis on their support for researchers. Participant A clarifies (via verification) that they spend the majority of their time supporting undergraduates, but focused in the interview on discussing researchers because of the clear relationship between researchers and the Open Access. Open Access, they note, is not easily made ‘relevant to undergrads’. Participant B focuses more on students and refers specifically to their support of ‘teaching staff’ rather than researchers, suggesting that it is the less straightforwardly subject-focused job remit of Participant A that allows them more researcher interaction.

Theme: Limited Open Access Remit
It is notable that Participant B and Participant A both have a limited Open Access remit. Participant A states that they engage with Open Access ‘as much as [their] job requires’; their ‘liaison role’ means they lack the time to engage with Open Access further. Participant B states clearly that Open Access is ‘not a huge part of [their] job’.

Subheading: Supporting Researchers
As Participant A explicitly has a research support role, it is unsurprising that they support ‘early career researchers’, ‘later career researchers’ and ‘research students’. Participant B,
with their more traditional role, supports ‘students’ and ‘postgraduate students’ with Open Access.

**Subheading: Advocacy and Promotion**
Participant A supports Open Access promotion and marketing, creating digital promotional content, but notes that they do so because responsibility for marketing is not explicitly under the purview of the library’s Open Access support staff. As a result of the less formal structure of Open Access staffing at their university, unfortunately, Participant A is not always entirely clear on what responsibilities fall under their purview, and professes unease about this stating they are ‘wary of treading on [OA staff’s] toes’.

Participant B focuses on advocacy as an element of overall teaching sessions, directing students on ‘raising their own profile’ through publishing Open Access.

**Basic Open Access Knowledge**
Participant B states they are ‘confident in the basics’ but not in the ‘specifics’ of Open Access. Participant A demonstrates more extensive knowledge of types of Open Access but considers policy ‘dry’ and struggles with the ‘practical implications of policy’. They suggest they would like to increase their overall current awareness of Open Access.

**Theme: Supporting Open Access in the Future**
**Subheading: Satisfied with Status Quo**
Both claim to be ‘happy’ or ‘satisfied’ with their current level of Open Access engagement. Participant B would not want Open Access to be any larger a part of their role, explicitly stating that working with a ‘repository’ or ‘full-time advocacy’ would not suit them. Participant A qualifies their satisfaction, stating they are satisfied insofar as they believe they are ‘doing what their job requires’.

**Subheading: Subject-Specific Open Access**
Participant A questions whether they as ‘a liaison librarian’ be buying copies of books for ‘future REF submission’? Participant B, like Participant A, would like to know more about Open Access monographs particularly. As humanities is ‘monograph based’, according to Participant B, one could argue that both participants have expressed an interest in knowing more elements of Open Access specifically relevant to the subjects and departments they support.

**Subheading: Teaching & Promotion**
Participant A has ideas for how they would like contribute further to the promotion of Open Access, ideas which are currently not part of their job remit, and therefore difficult to implement with ‘limited time’ and other responsibilities at play. Participant B expresses an interest in improving their Open Access advocacy, and also suggests they would like to ‘teach a bit more’ about Open Access if possible.
Discussion

Objective 1: To gain an overview of the open access activities academic librarians are currently engaged in.

Open Access activities academic librarians engage in

On the basis of the questionnaire, promotion and communication-related activities are the ones academic librarians most often engage in. The interview data also reveals that the participant librarians engage in advocacy and promotion of Open Access, but the interview data does not reveal the same focus on communication as the questionnaire data does. Via an open question, respondents to the questionnaire also reveal that they engage in education in ways the closed questions did not cover, and also engage in facilitation of discoverability, and strategic or ethic-driven Open Access. The interview responses do not cover discoverability, strategy or ethic-driven engagement, but do refer to education.

Open Access education, one free text questionnaire response states, is ‘Included as a minor part of training sessions rather than a major one’. The interviews support this clarification of the extent academic librarians engage in Open Access teaching, as Participant B notes that they include Open Access advocacy as an element in larger teaching sessions rather than as a focus.

In the interviews, Participant A has greater involvement with Open Access then Participant B, as Participant A creates digital promotional content and is involved in Open Access marketing. This is arguably because of the less formal Open Access staffing structure at Participant A’s university. Therefore, the way Open Access staffing is structured at a university has an impact on the ways an academic librarian can engage with Open Access. As show in the thematic map in Figure 9, the structure of a university and its Open Access staffing has an impact on the academic librarian Open Access remit.

Groups supported by academic librarians with Open Access

The results of the questionnaire show that participants overwhelmingly support academic staff and students with Open Access. The interviews also show that both participants largely support students and academic staff at various points in their careers with Open Access, including ‘early’ and ‘late career researchers’ and ‘research students’. This provides a good basis to suggest that academic librarians largely support faculty and students with their Open Access needs, rather than non-academic staff and departments.

How much academic librarians engage with Open Access

The questionnaire reveals a lack of engagement with Open Access, as 43% of participants only engage with Open Access several times a year. The interviews, as noted in the thematic report, show that participants only have limited engage with Open Access, which lends credence to the results from the questionnaire.

The interviews also provide a potential reason for this low engagement. Participant A only engages with Open Access ‘as much as their job requires’. Their job remit dictates their engagement. As the thematic map shows, in Figure 9, the Open Access remit of the academic librarian is shaped by the manner in which the structure of the university – its size
and its strategic concerns - dictates the staffing provision of Open Access services and the academic librarian job remit.

**Objective 2: To measure the self-assessed level of knowledge academic librarians have of open access.**

Both the quantitative data from the questionnaire and the qualitative data from the interviews support the same conclusion: Academic librarians have only basic Open Access knowledge, and lack knowledge of specific mandates and policies integral to Open Access publishing. Participant A in the interviews suggests policy is ‘dry’, suggesting academic librarians may also view the specifics of Open Access in a negative light.

**Objective 3: To gain insight into whether academic librarians feel generally positive or negative about their current engagement with open access.**

The questionnaire showed that participants had neither strong positive or negative feelings about Open Access, but generally felt either neutral (29%) or satisfied (39%). Similarly, the interview data shows that participants are satisfied with the status quo. Both participants state they are ‘happy’ or ‘satisfied’ with their Open Access engagement.

Participant A refers to their job remit – job remit being a pervasive theme throughout the interviews – and notes that they are satisfied with their engagement insofar as they are ‘doing what their job requires’. Participant B would not want to work in ‘full-time advocacy’ or with a ‘repository’ suggesting they are satisfied with the limited scope of their current Open Access remit.

**Objective 4: To suggest ways academic librarians could potentially engage with open access in the future**

The questionnaire produced comparable data of current and future engagement with Open Access. Q2 and Q8 are compared below:

![Current Engagement with OA](image-url)
On the basis of the questionnaire, academic librarians would like to engage more heavily in education in the future than they currently do, and would like to continue engaging in promotion-related activities. The questionnaire participants want to continue their low engagement with Open Access administration, and decrease their engagement with communication – although not significantly.

The data from Q2 which informed understanding of current engagement is denser and richer than the data from Q8, due to the higher number of options offered to participants in Q2. Therefore the comparison must be made with the understanding that further data is needed to verify the results. Fortunately, the results from the interviews show academic librarian interest in increasing teaching and promotion activities in the future, in line with the results from the questionnaire.

Interview participants also express an interest in gaining Open Access relevant to their responsibilities as academic librarians. Both support humanities, and want to know more about Open Access monographs, as humanities – according to Participant B – is a ‘monograph based’ subject. Academic librarians therefore potentially want to engage with aspects of Open Access, in the future, that are relevant to the subjects or functions they support.

**Conclusion**

This study has aimed to capture a snapshot of current academic librarian engagement with Open Access in the UK. The results conclusively support the assertion that academic librarians engage with Open Access in a strictly limited fashion, as part of their general remit to support, educate and communicate with academic staff and students.

As the literature review outlines, some of the key activities of academic librarians are promotion, advocacy, teaching and communication. The study has found that academic
librarians promote and advocate for Open Access, teach library users about Open Access, and provide communication support to those with Open Access queries. Their current Open Access activities, therefore, neatly elide with the activities they already partake in. Academic librarians also largely provide Open Access support to the library user groups – academic staff, researchers and students – that they already provide support for as a general responsibility of their role (CILIP, 2014)

Academic librarians do not have strong feelings about their current level of Open Access engagement, and are largely neutral or simply satisfied with their Open Access activities at this time. In the future, they would ideally want to engage more heavily with educating academic staff and students about Open Access, but are otherwise satisfied to continue engaging with Open Access in the current manner that they do so.

Currently, librarians do not engage in Open Access activities on a regular basis, with the majority only taking part in Open Access activities a few times a year. They also have limited knowledge of the specific policies and mandates that shape the contemporary face of Open Access in the UK. Their limited knowledge and engagement may potentially be the result of a limited Open Access remit, with Open Access responsibilities under the purview of different library staff or departments.

As evidenced by the interviews and the literature review, the academic librarian role is shaped by the structure and strategic goals of the university in which it is based (Hardy & Corrall, 2007; Pinfield, 2001). Open Access staffing, according to the thematic analysis of the interviews, is also shaped by university structure. Therefore, the current limited Open Access engagement of academic librarians may be the result of a university structure that places the necessity of Open Access engagement securely beyond the academic librarian purview.

That said, the question of why academic librarians engage with Open Access in the limited manner they currently do so is beyond the scope of this study. This study has only sought to capture the nature of current academic librarian engagement, and further study would need to be carried out to establish the cause of this low engagement conclusively. Ideally, further study is also needed into the question of what job remits academic librarians have in institutions across the UK, and how exactly Open Access staffing has been provisioned.

The conclusions of this study are only true within the limitations of the study’s methodology. As a small-scale study, based on non-probability sampling, the results cannot be considered externally valid, and therefore cannot truly be extrapolated to the academic librarian population in the UK as a whole. The volunteer sample used also means the data is also subject to volunteer bias (Salkind, 2010). Further, large-scale study is necessary to establish the external validity and generalisability of the conclusions of this research.
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Appendix A: Reflection

Reflection

My decision to focus on the topic of academic librarian engagement with Open Access was partly motivated by my professional history. I have worked in Open Access support, and currently work in academic librarianship. I wanted to discover how much crossover – if any – exists between my two areas of professional practice.

I also chose this topic because of its feasibility. I would have loved to explore larger questions of Open Access staffing (including how staffing is provisioned, the activities of staff, and their expected knowledge and qualifications), but that was simply not a task I could accomplish within the tight deadlines of a dissertation and the associated lack of funding. I decided the question of academic librarian engagement, with its much narrower parameters, was better suited to the limited scope of a dissertation, and I believe I was correct in this.

The aim, objectives and methodology of the final dissertation align closely with my initial proposal. When I crafted my initial proposal, I focused a great deal of my attention not only on ensuring the feasibility of the study, but on assuring that the methodology was sound and would allow me to collect the kind of data I wanted to acquire. I believed then, and still believe, that a strong methodology is at the heart of ensuring the success of a research project. I began this project with an awareness of the strengths and limitations of my approach, which gave me more confidence in my ability to analyse, present and evaluate the results of my research in a sound manner.

One aspect of the methodology that I expanded upon in the final dissertation was the use of thematic analysis for assessment of the qualitative data collected. Thematic analysis was incorporated into the dissertation when I realised I hadn’t clearly articulated how I would analyse the qualitative data, and that simply using quotes from the data corpus would not be a rigorous, rich or helpful form of analysis. I have past experience of using a more explicitly popular form of qualitative analysis in my professional work – grounded theory – and I knew it would be ill-suited to my research.

I also altered my approach to data storage in the final research project. In my proposal I stated research data would be deleted at the end of the dissertation. On the advice of my researcher, I clarified in the dissertation that data would be kept until all research and follow-on research is complete.
Having completed my dissertation, I am now in a position to consider what I would have done differently, had I possessed the knowledge I have now. In retrospect, I would have changed my objectives.

In order to answer Objective 1, I looked at a number of factors: frequency of academic librarian engagement, activities of academic librarians, and who they supported in Open Access engagement. As a result, I collected a great deal of data in response to Objective 1 and a great deal less in response to my other objectives, which were far more straightforward. I should have broken down Objective 1 into a number of explicit separate objectives. To do so, I would have had to delve deeper into ensuring I created a sound, reliable methodology, but the knowledge of how to do so is something I've only gained from engaging in this dissertation. This has given me a greater appreciation of the importance of repetition, evaluation and refinement of research to ensure the validity of results.

A serious challenge I faced in producing the dissertation came from my personal life. I faced a sudden, unexpected bereavement that made engaging with my dissertation a much more difficult task. As a result, I was not able to engage in in-person interviews, and had to modify my planned timings for questionnaire dissemination and email interviews. I am not sure I would have done this project justice without the support and generosity of my colleagues and the academic librarians who took the time to kindly participate in my research. So to them, I can only say: thank you.

Finally, if I have learned one thing from this dissertation, it is to walk in my students' shoes. I've now had direct experience of being a student under academic and personal pressure, struggling to succeed in an academic environment that privileges independent self-directed study over holistic support. I now have greater empathy for the difficulties students may have in engaging with the practicalities of their research, and a better understanding of the direct impact personal strife can have on academic practice. Liaison is key to librarianship, and I hope I will utilise the frankly difficult experience of producing research during a period of bereavement to engage with the students I support with greater empathy and understanding.

Appendix B: Dissertation Proposal

Dissertation Proposal

Working Title
'Academic librarian engagement with open access in the UK: support advocacy and education'

Introduction
The project is a small-scale research project intended to capture a preliminary overview of current academic librarian engagement with open access in UK higher education institutions. There has been significant research about the role libraries in the UK play in the open access publishing needs of academics, but there has been little if any research on the role academic librarians play in supporting open access publishing.
The project has four objectives: to map the open access activities librarians currently engage in, their self-assessed level of open access knowledge, their feelings about their current level of engagement with open access, and possibilities for how they may engage with open access in the future. A mixed methods approach will be used. The data instruments will be an electronically disseminated questionnaire and face-to-face and email interviews with academic librarians.

**Aim**
The aim of the study is to capture a snapshot of current academic librarian engagement with open access at UK higher education institutions.

**Objectives**
**Objective 1:** To gain an overview of the open access activities academic librarians are currently engaged in.

**Objective 2:** To measure the self-assessed level of knowledge academic librarians have of open access.

**Objective 3:** To gain insight into whether academic librarians feel generally positive or negative about their current engagement with open access.

**Objective 4:** To suggest ways academic librarians could potentially engage with open access in the future.

**Scope and Definitions**
The study will focus specifically on the UK, and further narrow its focus to higher education institutions only. The only participants will be academic librarians within said institutions.

**Academic Librarian:** Although many members of library staff may collaborate with faculty and students, ‘academic librarian’ in this study is defined as those librarians whose job role is specifically concerned with co-ordination and collaboration with academic communities, in a collection development, information literacy skills teaching, and liaison role (Eldridge et al., 2016). Academic librarians may have a range of job titles and their jobs may involve different levels of collection management and teaching, dependent on their institution (CILIP, 2014b).

Due to the range of titles applied to academic librarians, participants in this study will be partly self-defined: as long as they identify as an academic, subject or liaison librarian in a higher education institution, the individual will qualify.

**Open Access:** HEFCE provides guidance on how to define open access. It is the act of ‘making the products of research freely accessible to all’ (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2017). There are two forms of recognised open access: green, where peer-reviewed research is deposited in a subject or institutional repository, and gold, where research is made freely available electronically by the publisher (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2017). Both these forms of open access are relevant to this study.
**Engagement**: A broad approach will be taken to this term. ‘Engagement’ will not just cover instances of academic librarians directly publishing and archiving in repositories or supporting academics to do so, but will cover advocacy for open access, education about open access, dissemination of open access research, and any other examples that may come to the attention of the researcher as a result of the literature review and questionnaire.

**Research Context / Literature Review**
The face of open access publishing in the UK has changed rapidly in recent years. Important milestones include the Finch Report (Finch Group, 2012), which was followed by Higher Education Funding Council for England’s (HEFCE) open access policy for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2021, requiring academics to deposit a peer-reviewed version of their work in an institutional or subject repository within a specific timeframe in order for their work to be eligible for submission to the REF (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2016).

There is a significant body of literature dedicated to the role of the academic library in supporting open access. Libraries have been heavily involved in the development and maintenance of institutional repositories and tools for repository managers such as SHERPA/RoMEO (Johnson, 2007). Libraries have also administered open access funds and advocated for open access (Ashworth, Mccutcheon & Roy, 2014; Sharp, 2014).

The motivation for this research project is the gap that currently exists in the research relating specifically to academic librarian engagement with open access within the UK. The role of academic librarian is largely acknowledged to involve a great deal of liaison with the larger academic community: students, researchers and faculty (Shupe & Pung, 2011; Eldridge *et al.*, 2016). As liaisons with researchers, do academic librarians support UK academics to access publishing funds, or advise them on depositing in repositories? Do they advocate for open access to senior academics? Do they promote open access research to students? Research is needed to determine which of these activities – if any – academic librarians engage in.

Literature on the relationship does exist, but largely either focuses on a non-UK context or is out of date. For example, Mullen has written an overview of the impact of open access on the practical activities of academic librarians (Mullen, 2010), but the book was written in 2010 and therefore doesn’t engage with HEFCE’s open access policy for the post-2014 REF which only came into force in April 2016 (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2016). Therefore there is a definite space for a preliminary investigation of the current state of academic librarian engagement with open access, and one this study seeks to fill.

**Methodology**
This project approaches the task of mapping the current state of academic librarian engagement with open access by using a mixed methods approach. The main data collection instrument will be an online questionnaire made up of largely closed questions with some open questions for minimal qualitative data collection, disseminated via social media and library-specific mailing lists (e.g. LIS-LINK). The questionnaire will initially be piloted on a convenience sample of five colleagues and an open access professional, in order to assess the time it will take to complete the questionnaire, its accuracy, and the clarity of its language.
In order to avoid ethical issues, the survey will be entirely anonymous, but participants will be given the option to contact the researcher if they wish to take part in a more detailed face-to-face or email interview. Although this is likely to limit the rate of response, the potential low response rate will be mitigated through the use of snowball sampling. Academic librarian colleagues will be asked to recommend potential participants, who will be contacted directly to see if they are willing to volunteer to be interviewed.

Email will be offered as an interview option due to feasibility: the researcher works full-time and is not in a position to travel beyond the London area for face-to-face meetings, and has no equipment or funds for telephone recording. Email interaction will be capped at a maximum of two weeks to ensure the interview does not consume too much time, no matter the rate of participant response.

The study has been designed so that the qualitative method will not carry equal weight to the quantitative method, but will instead act as 'additional coverage' (Denscombe, 2014:p.153), supplementing and supporting quantitative findings. This gives the project the benefit of a more comprehensive investigation of the research question (Denscombe, 2014), although it will create the necessity of establishing both the rigour expected of quantitative research, and the trustworthiness expected of qualitative (Pickard, 2013).

In order to ensure the credibility of qualitative data in the study, triangulation will be applied: responses via open questions on the questionnaire will be compared with responses from interviews, providing methodological triangulation, and the act of interviewing multiple academic librarians should act as a form of informant triangulation (Denscombe, 2014). Dependability will be ensured through the provision of an audit trail consisting of transcripts and field notes (Pickard, 2013). Detailed analysis and presentation of qualitative data should allow for its transferability (Pickard, 2013).

Due to the small scale of the study and its limited timeframe, the quantitative element is likely to have low external validity and reliability (Pickard, 2013). It is difficult to assess the number of academic librarians in the UK; therefore assessing whether the sample is representative is not necessarily possible. It will only be feasible to use a non-probability convenience sample due to the limits of time and funds, which will of course limit the generalizability of the research findings.

It is important to acknowledge, therefore, that due to the limitations inherent in a project of limited duration with no attached funding, this will be a small-scale piece of preliminary research, intended to provide future researchers a starting point on which to develop a further investigation into the research question at hand.

**Work Plan**

*Mid-May to Mid-June: Literature Review*

*Mid-June: Pilot Questionnaire*

*July: Questionnaire*

*August: Interviews*

*September: Data Analysis & Presentation*
October - November: Discussion, Conclusion and Reflection
December: Dissertation Submission

Resources
The researcher’s employer has a Qualtrics subscription. Qualtrics will therefore be the tool used to created and disseminate the questionnaire. Recording equipment will be necessary for interviews. The researcher plans to investigate free recording software available, but will use Mac’s inherent audio recording software if necessary.

Ethics
The ethics checklist, participant information sheet and consent form are included as appendices. The survey and interview questions are not yet available, as they will be based on a more extensive literature review, but the pilot survey, final survey and interview focus will be presented to the project supervisor for approval before dissemination.

Confidentiality
Personal data of interview participants will be stored on the researcher’s City University ICT account to ensure it is secure. The personal data will be permanently deleted on the dissertation submission deadline, 5th January 2018.
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Appendix C: Ethics Checklist

Ethics Checklist

Part A: Ethics Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If your answer to any of the following questions (1 – 3) is YES, you must apply to an appropriate external ethics committee for approval:</th>
<th>Delete as appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does your project require approval from the National Research Ethics Service (NRES)? (E.g. because you are recruiting current NHS patients or staff? If you are unsure, please check at <a href="http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/before-you-apply/determine-which-review-body-approvals-are-required/">http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/before-you-apply/determine-which-review-body-approvals-are-required/</a>)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will you recruit any participants who fall under the auspices of the Mental Capacity Act? (Such research needs to be approved by an external ethics committee such as NRES or the Social Care Research Ethics Committee <a href="http://www.scie.org.uk/research/ethics-committee/">http://www.scie.org.uk/research/ethics-committee/</a>)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Will you recruit any participants who are currently under the auspices of the Criminal Justice System, for example, but not limited to, people on remand, prisoners and those on probation? (Such research needs to be</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
authorised by the ethics approval system of the National Offender Management Service.)

If your answer to any of the following questions (4 – 11) is YES, you must apply to the Senate Research Ethics Committee for approval (unless you are applying to an external ethics committee):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Does your project involve participants who are unable to give informed consent, for example, but not limited to, people who may have a degree of learning disability or mental health problem, that means they are unable to make an informed decision on their own behalf?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is there a risk that your project might lead to disclosures from participants concerning their involvement in illegal activities?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is there a risk that obscene and or illegal material may need to be accessed for your project (including online content and other material)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does your project involve participants disclosing information about sensitive subjects?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does your project involve invasive or intrusive procedures? For example, these may include, but are not limited to, electrical stimulation, heat, cold or bruising.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does your project involve animals?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Does your project involve the administration of drugs, placebos or other substances to study participants?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your answer to any of the following questions (12 – 18) is YES, you should consult your supervisor, as you may need to apply to an ethics committee for approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Does your project involve participants who are under the age of 18?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Does your project involve adults who are vulnerable because of their social, psychological or medical circumstances (vulnerable adults)? This includes adults with cognitive and / or learning disabilities, adults with physical disabilities and older people.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Does your project involve participants who are recruited because they are staff or students of City University London? For example, students studying on a particular course or module. (If yes, approval is also required from the Project Tutor.)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Does your project involve intentional deception of participants?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your project involve identifiable participants taking part without their informed consent?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your project pose a risk to participants or other individuals greater than that in normal working life?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your project pose a risk to you, the researcher, greater than that in normal working life?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your answer to the following question (19) is YES and your answer to all questions 1 – 18 is NO, you must complete part B of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your project involve human participants? For example, as interviewees, respondents to a questionnaire or participants in evaluation or testing.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part B: Ethics Proportionate Review Form
If you answered YES to question 19 and NO to all questions 1 – 18, you may use this part of the form to submit an application for a proportionate ethics review of your project. Your dissertation project supervisor will review and approve this application.

The following questions (20 – 24) must be answered fully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Will you ensure that participants taking part in your project are fully informed about the purpose of the research?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Will you ensure that participants taking part in your project are fully informed about the procedures affecting them or affecting any information collected about them, including information about how the data will be used, to whom it will be disclosed, and how long it will be kept?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>When people agree to participate in your project, will it be made clear to them that they may withdraw (i.e. not participate) at any time without any penalty?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Will consent be obtained from the participants in your project, if necessary? Consent from participants will only be necessary if you plan to gather personal data. “Personal data” means data relating to an identifiable living person, e.g. data you collect using questionnaires, observations, interviews, computer logs. The person might be identifiable if you record their name, username, student id, DNA, fingerprint, etc. If YES, attach the participant information sheet(s) and consent request form(s) that you will use. You must retain these for subsequent inspection. Failure to provide the filled consent request forms will automatically result in withdrawal of any earlier ethical approval of your project.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Have you made arrangements to ensure that material and/or private information obtained from or about the participating individuals will remain confidential? Provide details: Emails between the researcher and interview participants will be stored on a secure City email account and deleted on final submission of the dissertation. Interview data will be anonymised before inclusion in the dissertation, and original material will be stored on a secure City account and also deleted on submission. The questionnaire will be entirely anonymous.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Will the research involving participants be conducted in the participant’s home or other non-University location? 
   *If YES, provide details of how your safety will be ensured: Interviews will take place at my place of employment, another university; therefore it is a semi-public location and there will be other staff including security the area to ensure my safety.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments (these must be provided if applicable):</th>
<th>Delete as appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant information sheet(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent form(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire(s)**</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic guide(s) for interviews and focus groups**</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX D: Participant Information Sheet

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

**Title of study** ‘Academic librarian engagement with Open Access in the UK: support, advocacy and education’

We would like to invite you to take part in a research study. Before you decide whether you would like to take part it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it would involve for you. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask us if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

**What is the purpose of the study?**

The purpose of this study is to gain an insight into current academic librarian engagement with Open Access at UK higher education institutions. Data collection will take place between August 2017 and October 2017. The study will be completed by 5th January 2018. This study is undertaken as part of the requirements for obtaining an MSc Information Science from City University London.

**Why have I been invited?**

You have been invited to take part in this study because you are an academic, liaison or subject librarian at a UK university. You are one of a small sample of academic librarians who have volunteered to be interviewed.

**Do I have to take part?**
Participation in the project is voluntary, and you can choose not to participate in part or all of the project. You can withdraw at any stage of the project without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way. It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part you will be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason. Once the data has been anonymised and published participants will no longer be able to withdraw their data.

**What will happen if I take part?**
- You will enter an email exchange of a maximum of two weeks with the researcher
- The research study will last from July 2017 to 5th January 2018
- You will interact with the researcher via email for an initial two weeks; you will then receive the opportunity to review what the researcher has written and check that you have been represented correctly
- You will take part in a one-to-one semi-structured interview
- You will be asked a mix of open and closed questions
- The interview will take place remotely

**What do I have to do?**
You will be expected to answer a series of questions about how you engage with Open Access in your professional role.

**What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?**
There are no foreseeable risks of harm for the participant.

**What are the possible benefits of taking part?**
An indirect benefit of taking part in this study is its potential benefit to contribute to greater knowledge in the library and information professional field of the open access related activities of academic librarians.

**What will happen when the research study stops?**
Participant data will be stored securely on the researcher’s institutional account, and will be deleted when no longer required for the study or follow on research.

**Will my taking part in the study be kept confidential?**
- Only the researcher and their supervisor will have access to your personal data.
- Your data will be anonymised for publication.
- Your personal information will not be used for any other purpose.
- Emails between the researcher and participant will be stored securely on the researcher’s institutional email until the completion of the research and follow on study, at which point they will be permanently deleted.

**What will happen to results of the research study?**
Results of the research study will be published a dissertation for the MSc Information Science at City University London. For the dissertation and any potential future academic publications arising from the dissertation, your anonymity will be maintained.

**What will happen if I do not want to carry on with the study?**
You are free to withdraw from the study without an explanation or penalty at any time.

**What if there is a problem?**
If you have any problems, concerns or questions about this study, you should ask to speak to a member of the research team. If you remain unhappy and wish to complain formally, you can do this through City’s complaints procedure. To complain about the study, you need to phone 020 7040 3040. You can then ask to speak to the Secretary to Senate Research
Ethics Committee and inform them that the name of the project is: ‘Academic librarian engagement with Open Access in the UK: support, advocacy and education’

You could also write to the Secretary at:
Anna Ramberg Research Governance & Compliance Manager
Research & Enterprise City, University of London Northampton Square London EC1V 0HB
Email: Anna.Ramberg.1@city.ac.uk

City holds insurance policies which apply to this study. If you feel you have been harmed or injured by taking part in this study you may be eligible to claim compensation. This does not affect your legal rights to seek compensation. If you are harmed due to someone’s negligence, then you may have grounds for legal action.

Who has reviewed the study?
This study has been approved by City Computer Science and LIS Research Ethics Committee

Further information and contact details
Researcher (Student): Natasha Suri
Email: natasha.suri@city.ac.uk
Supervisor: David Bawden
Email: d.bawden@city.ac.uk

Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet.

Appendix E: Consent Form – Email Interviews

Consent Form For Email Interviews

Q1

Title of Study: ‘Academic librarian engagement with Open Access in the UK: support, advocacy and education’

You must tick your understanding and/or agreement to all the points below.

Q2 I confirm that I have had the project explained to me, and I have read the participant information sheet, which I may keep for my records. I understand this will involve:
   Being interviewed via email for a maximum of two weeks

☐ I understand (1)

Q3 This information will be held and processed for the following purpose(s): The production of qualitative research about academic librarian engagement with Open Access in the UK. I understand that any information I provide is confidential, and that no information that could lead to the identification of any individual will be disclosed in any
reports on the project, or to any other party. No identifiable personal data will be published. The identifiable data will not be shared with any other organisation.

☐ I understand (1)

Q4 I understand that my participation is voluntary, that I can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the project without being penalized or disadvantaged in any way.

☐ I understand (1)

Q5 I agree to City, University of London recording and processing this information about me. I understand that this information will be used only for the purpose(s) set out in this statement and my consent is conditional on City complying with its duties and obligations under the Data Protection Act 1998.

☐ I agree (1)

Q6 I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publication.

☐ I agree (1)

Q7 I agree to take part in the above study.

☐ I agree (1)

Q8 Please type your name here

________________________________________________________________

Q9 Please enter the date (e.g. dd/mm/yyyy)

________________________________________________________________
Appendix F: Questionnaire

Academic Liaison Librarian Engagement with Open Access

Default Question Block

Q1 SURVEY: ‘Academic librarian engagement with Open Access in the UK: support advocacy and education’ My name is Natasha Suri. I am an MSc Information Science student at City, University of London and a Senior Library Assistant at Imperial College London, involved in supporting Open Access services. I would like to invite you to take part in a research study on academic librarian engagement with Open Access. Before you decide whether you would like to take part it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it would involve for you. **What is the purpose of the survey?** The purpose of this study is to gain an insight into current academic, liaison or subject librarian engagement with Open Access at UK higher education institutions. **What do I have to do?** The procedure involves filling in a survey which will take approximately 5 minutes. You will be asked a series of 10 questions about the Open Access activities you engage in, your confidence in your level of Open Access knowledge, and how you would like to engage with Open Access in the future. Your responses will be confidential and we do not collect identifying information. Participation in the survey is voluntary, and you can choose not to participate in part or all of the survey. You can withdraw at any stage of the survey without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way. Please be aware City University of London is the responsible institution for this study. The survey will be close on 10th September 2017, and the overall study will be completed by 5th January 2018. The research is being undertaken as part of the requirements for obtaining an MSc Information Science from City University London. **For further information please contact:** Researcher (Student): Natasha Suri Email: natasha.suri@city.ac.uk Supervisor: David Bawden Email: d.bawden@city.ac.uk If you are happy to continue, please click through to begin the survey.
Q2 Are you an academic, liaison or subject librarian at a UK university?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Q3 What Open Access related activities do you engage in? Select all that apply. Do you...

☐ Act as a point of contact for general open access queries (1)

☐ Deposit research output in the institutional repository, on behalf of institutional authors (15)

☐ Publish your own research open access (3)

☐ Advocate for the benefits of open access to researchers and their departments (4)

☐ Teach university staff and students about open access through formal sessions, workshops, and/or presentations (5)

☐ Monitor and/or report on compliance with open access policies (6)

☐ Refer open access queries to specialised colleagues in the library or other departments (7)

☐ Support researchers with compliance with HEFCE, funder or publisher open access policy (16)

☐ Promote library open access services (e.g. the institutional repository) to researchers and their departments (9)

☐ Actively train in or seek new open access skills and knowledge (e.g. by attending courses or conferences) (10)
Q4 Are there any ways you engage with Open Access that are not listed above? Please provide details.


Q5 Which groups do you support or engage with in your Open Access activities? Select all that apply.

☐ Senior Academics (1)

☐ Non-Academic Departments (e.g. Research Office, Finance) (2)

☐ Researchers (3)

☐ Administrative Staff (e.g. Personal Assistants, Departmental Administrators) (4)

☐ Students (5)

☐ Library Staff (6)
Q6 How confident are you in your knowledge of the following areas of UK Open Access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very Confident (1)</th>
<th>Confident (2)</th>
<th>Slightly Confident (3)</th>
<th>Not Confident (4)</th>
<th>I do not know about this topic (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What Open Access Is (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Open Access (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Open Access (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Open Access (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA Policy for REF 2021 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher Copyright &amp; Self-Archiving Policies (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder Open Access Mandates/Policies (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7 How often do you engage with Open Access in your current role?

- It makes up the majority of my role (1)
- Several times a day (2)
- Several times a week (3)
- Several times a month (4)
- Several times a year (5)
- Never (6)
Q8 How satisfied are you with your current level of engagement with Open Access?

- Very Satisfied (1)
- Satisfied (2)
- Neutral (4)
- Unsatisfied (5)
- Very Unsatisfied (6)

Q9 What elements of Open Access activity would you like to engage with in the future? Select all that apply.

- Administration of library open access services (1)
- Education of staff/students about open access (4)
- Promotion of open access and associated services (2)
- Liaison between researchers and open access specialist staff (5)
- Development of own open access publishing and knowledge (7)

Q10 Are there any elements of Open Access that you would like to engage with in the future that are not listed above? Please provide details.