

Building Synergy between Institutional Repositories and Scholarly Communication



Emily Kilcer, Lauren Puzier, and Carol Anne Germain

University at Albany

Abstract

Institutional repositories (IRs) remain a crucial tool for promoting, displaying, and encouraging open access (OA) to scholarly research. Institutional repository webpages can help deliver pertinent information about scholarly communication (SC) to visitors and authors. Scholarly communication aims to promote a more open, equitable, and sustainable scholarly ecosystem. Building a coherent synergy between scholarly communication services and open distribution through an institution's repository benefits the user community by facilitating an efficient and effective portal. Designing the institutional repository's homepage with a clear connection to the scholarly communication presence offers a deeper investment in scholarly communication for its visitors. This study investigates the number of libraries that utilize their institutional repository to connect with the institution's scholarly communication division and vice versa. We reviewed 145 research libraries websites to see to determine the connection between institutional repositories and scholarly communication services. The poster outlines our findings and best practices for furthering the scholarly communication conversation.

Methods

- Identified 145 ARL and Carnegie R1 library websites
- Limited to English language websites
- Web review

Literature review

- Open Access and Scholarly Communication
 - “Open access (OA) literature is digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions.” (Suber, 2019a)
 - Scholarly communication systems, which includes registration (author rights), certification (peer review), awareness (distribution), and archiving (preservation) (Cullen & Chawner, 2011), evolved in the 17th century and have remained relatively

unchanged (i.e., authors writing for impact rather than profit). In the digital age, we can now both address pressing problems (e.g., journals crisis, access inequities) and take advantage of the opportunities afforded by “the power of digital technology to share knowledge and accelerate research.” (Suber, 2019b)

- Value of IR
 - In the early 2000s, advocates promoted a critical paradigm change in scholarship and scholarly communication with the implementation of IRs in academic libraries (Crow, 2002; Lynch, 2003). This looked to be a logical strategy in digital publishing with the collection, maintenance and preservation of an institution’s works.
 - Nemati-Anaraki and Tavassoli-Farahi (2018) noted that IRs promote the visibility of institutional research and publications via the open access model. They advocated the integration and facilitation of scholarly communication through the IR for increased knowledge sharing. With broader access, IRs provide maximum citability of research publications (Cullen & Chawner, 2011)
 - “For many libraries, ETDs (Electronic Theses and Dissertations) are the first targets for an institutional repository program, and represent an opportunity to engage graduate students and their faculty advisors in broader conversation about open access, intellectual property management, long-term management of digital content, and other scholarly communication issues” (Research and Scholarly Environment Committee). IRs offer wide-ranging availability of research theses (Cullen & Chawner, 2011).
 - Cullen and Chawner (2011) posit that IRs provide options to the traditional business model of scholarly publication, allowing for open access and a change in the profit driven dynamic.
- IR as OA repository
 - “[Open Access Institutional Repositories] Provide a critical component in reforming the system of scholarly communication--a component that expands access to research, reasserts control over scholarship by the academy, increases competition and reduces the monopoly power of journals, and brings economic relief and heightened relevance to the institutions and libraries that support them” (Crow, 1).
- Role of Scholarly Communication as the instructional component of IR-related topics
 - Bull and Eden advocated that instructional and service aspects of Scholarly Communication initiatives enhance and promote the robustness of IRs.
 - Zhang, Boock, and Wirth (2015) examined Oregon State University’s IR growth following the passing of the University’s OA policy and found that the policy did not increase participation in IRs. Instead, “outreach to particular colleges and departments has had a positive effect on rate of deposit for those communities of scholars.”
- Promotion of IRs
 - Sterman (2014) noted the usefulness of collaborations to promote IRs, as well as educational elements of Scholarly Communication
 - While IRs are valuable resources for the academic community, promotional efforts and outreach will help with the development of a robust collection (Bull & Eden, 2014; Foster & Gibbons, 2005).

- “[R]eference librarians, liaison librarians, and subject specialists” play a clear and important role in “communicating to faculty the features of an IR and its advantages” (Jantz & Wilson, 189)
- From Zhang, Boock, and Wirth (2015): “After an article request and deposit process was initiated to identify, request, and deposit articles from faculty, the rate of deposit at OSU climbed from 11% to 45% and has held steady since, with the passage of an institution-wide OA policy not yet showing a positive effect.”
- Promotion of ScholComm
 - Research is limited. Wu et al. (2019) looked to promote scholarly communication and outreach efforts through a cross departmental approach.
 - Malenfant (2010) suggested “mainstreaming” scholarly communication initiatives into the liaison roles.
 - ACRL (2020) provides an SC toolkit, which recommends individual action, a realignment of institutional resources, advocacy, and knowledge sharing as “ways librarians can engage” with SC efforts.

Project variables

- Scholarly communication web presence (Yes/No)
- Institutional repository (Yes/No)
- Is there a cross-link in both directions? (Follow up consideration: Are there any limits with linking because of IR software?)
- Are there common elements where the IR and SC webpages mutually crosslink?

Recommendations for cross-linking best practices

- Include a link to the SC web presence
- Include a link to information on author rights; if there is no author rights information on the library’s website, then add author rights FAQs
- For consortial or shared IRs, use a drop-down menu to link to each institution’s SC web presence (consider including data services cross-links, too, if available and if the IR supports data deposit)
- If not yet established, develop IR and SC collaboration to cross-promote services related to article processing charge funding, impact metrics, etc., where available
- Co-sponsor workshops and other instructional sessions (at institutions where the IR manager and SC librarian are staffed by different people)
- Utilize call-to-action (CTA) buttons on the IR and SC pages to effectively crosslink
 - “Users rely on clickability cues to know where on the page they can click and how they can interact with the site” (Lucaites, K., Fletcher, B., and Pyle, A., 2017, p.1).
 - Use clear language and focus: “Get Started buttons and other ambiguous calls-to-action can degrade the user experience and should be avoided” (Harley & Salazar, 2017).
 - Follow-up consideration: Create a universal icon (i.e., like open access lock) for promoting SC to use as a CTA

Results and discussion

- By the numbers
 - 145 total institutions
 - 141 institutions have IRs
 - 98 institutions have SC pages
 - 37 institutions have an IR and no SC web presence
 - 8 institutions crosslinked from the IR to SC web presence and back again
- Common threads (from the list of 8 crosslinked: who and what IR)
 - Link to general SC page
 - Link to author rights information
 - Include SC point of contact

References

- ACRL. (2020). Scholarly Communication Toolkit: Take Action: Ways Librarians Can Engage in Scholarly Communication. <https://acrl.libguides.com/scholcomm/toolkit/engagementideas>.
- Bell, S., Foster, N. F., & Gibbons, S. (2005). Reference librarians and the success of institutional repositories. *Reference Services Review*, 33(3), 283–290.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00907320510611311>
- Bull, J., & Eden, B. L. (2014). Successful scholarly communication at a small university: Integration of education, services, and an institutional repository at Valparaiso University. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 21(3–4), 263–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2014.932264>
- Crow, R. (2002, August). The case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper. ARL, no. 223, 1-7. <https://sparcopen.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/instrepo.pdf>
- Cullen, R., & Chawner, B. (2011). Institutional repositories, open access, and scholarly communication: A study of conflicting paradigms. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 37(6), 460–470.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2011.07.002>
- Harley, A., & Salazar, K. (2017). “Get started” Stops Users. Nielsen Norman Group.
<https://www.nngroup.com/articles/get-started/>
- Jantz, R., & Wilson, M. (2008). Institutional repositories: Faculty deposits, marketing, and the reform of scholarly communication. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34 (3), 186-195.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2008.03.014>
- Lucaites, K., Fletcher, B., and Pyle, A. (2017). Measuring the impact of affordance-based clickability cues. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference, Washington, DC, USA, July 2017 (Conference’17)*.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/>

Lynch, C. A. (2003). Institutional repositories: Essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age.

Portal: Libraries & the Academy, 3(2), 327. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2003.0039>

Malenfant, K. J. (2010). Leading change in the system of scholarly communication: a case study of engaging

liaison librarians for outreach to faculty. *College & Research Libraries*, 71(1), 63–76.

<https://doi.org/10.5860/0710063>

Nemati-Anaraki, L., & Tavassoli-Farahi, M. (2018). Scholarly communication through institutional repositories: Proposing a practical model. *Collection & Curation*, 37(1), 9–17.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/CC-01-2018-002>

Research and Scholarly Environment Committee. *Scholarly Communication Toolkit: Repositories*. Association of College & Research Libraries.

<https://acrl.libguides.com/scholcomm/toolkit/repositories>

Sterman, L. (2014). Institutional repositories: An analysis of trends and a proposed collaborative future. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 21(3–4), 360–376.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2014.943919>

Suber, P. (2019a). 1. What Is Open Access? In *Open Access* (1st ed.). MIT Press.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9286.001.0001>

Suber, P. (2019b). 2. Motivation. In *Open Access* (1st ed.). MIT Press.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9286.001.0001>

Wu, A., Davis-Van Atta, T., Thompson, S., Scott, B., Washington, A., & Xiping Liu. (2019). From Meow to ROAR: Expanding open access repository services at the University of Houston Libraries. *Journal of Librarianship & Scholarly Communication*, 7(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2309>

Zhang, H., Boock, M. & Wirth, A. (2015). It takes more than a mandate: Factors that contribute to increased rates of article deposit to an institutional repository. *Journal of Librarianship & Scholarly Communication*, 3(1), p.eP1208. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1208>.