abstract: In this study, researchers surveyed academic librarians about their open access publishing practices. This analysis explores approaches to journal selection, awareness of open access options, and self-archiving practices. Fifty percent of the librarians in this study considered free open access when selecting a potential journal for publication, but a journal’s fit to the topic and peer review were higher priorities. Findings indicate that, although many librarians publish in open access journals or take advantage of institutional repositories, there are still barriers to publishing in open access journals, including article processing charges, the tenure and promotion culture, and uncertainty around intellectual property rights.

Introduction

When considering potential journals for manuscript submissions, faculty may feel the need to place a higher priority on impact factors and other metrics deemed important for tenure and promotion, causing publishing in open access (OA) journals to take a back seat.1 Academic libraries are known for their promotion of the open access movement and may have entire positions dedicated to educating university faculty on the advantages of open access, providing guidance on negotiating for better access in copyright agreements and other related services.2 But do libraries practice what they preach? Additional information on academic librarian authors’ approaches to journal selection seems warranted. This exploratory study will address the following questions:

• What do academic library practitioners consider when selecting specific avenues for journal publication?
• Are academic librarians aware of their own open access options? Do they negotiate with journal publishers for enhanced intellectual property rights?
• Are academic librarians using open access options to set an example for other scholars?

Literature Review

Journal Selection

When selecting a journal appropriate for submission of a manuscript, many factors may be considered, including scope, audience, prestige, timeliness, and acceptance rate. No single consideration dominates librarians’ choice for journal submission. Like faculty in many disciplines, academic librarians often indicate their greatest concern when selecting a journal is getting published in a title that will have value for tenure, promotion, or both. Michelle Dalton adapted Bo-Christo Björk and Jonas Holmström’s journal selection model to categorize LIS author priorities into four areas: prestige, readership, performance, and infrastructure. For some, open access options are also a consideration.

Open Access

Open access in its purest form is “the free, immediate, online availability of research articles coupled with the rights to use these articles fully in the digital environment.” In addition to the philosophy of providing free access to information, choosing to publish an article as open access can provide a number of additional advantages, including greater visibility, leading to more citations; the chance to reach a broader audience; and, in some cases, the option to get published quicker.

Choosing to publish an article as open access can provide a number of additional advantages, including greater visibility, leading to more citations; the chance to reach a broader audience; and, in some cases, the option to get published quicker. Ideally, open access journals would not require payment by either authors or readers. However, because of costs for production, many open access journals cannot operate according to this model. Some publishers now provide an option for the author or their funding agency to pay an article processing charge to the publisher. This allows immediate access to all readers, even those without a paid subscription (often called gold open access). Other publishers provide options for self-archiving, whereby an author can publish a preprint or post-print of the manuscript on a personal website or an institutional or subject repository (green open access). As of February 2019, 81
percent of 2,562 publishers in the SHERPA/RoMEO (Securing a Hybrid Environment for Research Preservation and Access/Rights Metadata for Open Archiving) database allowed the self-archiving of preprints or post-prints. Unfortunately, the green option often includes an embargo period of anywhere from six months to several years before the document is freely available.

A number of research studies have analyzed how readily these green and gold open access models are being adopted by academic librarians or by researchers in other disciplines. An analysis of articles published by academic librarians in 2008 found that approximately 49 percent were available in an open access format, but 58 percent were eligible to be posted as open access in a repository and, after the normal embargo periods, 94 percent qualified for open access. Mikael Laakso conducted an extensive study of 1,150,827 multidisciplinary articles published in 2010 in an attempt to see how many would allow self-archiving if all authors took advantage of that option. This analysis showed that 65 percent of the accepted manuscripts could be uploaded immediately. This increases to 79 percent after a 12-month embargo period. In a study of more than 1,000 articles published in the top 20 LIS journals in 2013, the authors found that approximately 28 percent of the articles were available in an open access format. Of those, approximately 28 percent were in institutional repositories, though most repositories belonged to institutions outside the United States.

Gold access requiring authors to pay a fee appears slow to gain acceptance. In a large survey of authors publishing in Taylor & Francis publications, only about a third had selected the gold publishing option. A study of articles published since 2010 on the topic of open access assumed that authors would more likely select an open access journal for their publication. That analysis discovered that 32 percent of the articles were published as gold open access and 28 percent as green open access.

Although open access acceptance appears to trend upward, availability and widespread adoption of true open access journals are still limited. Research funding agencies have begun to push back on paywalled journals, contending that research sponsored by public agencies should be available to all. This philosophy was implemented as early as 2008 with the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Public Access Policy requiring all authors who received NIH funding to publish an open access version of their peer-reviewed article in PubMed Central, the institute’s archive of biomedical and life sciences articles. The NIH policy allows for up to a 12-month embargo; however, cOALition S, an open access initiative endorsed by international funding agencies including Wellcome Trust and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, will only allow publication in titles that permit immediate open access.

Article processing charges, whether paid by the authors, an institution, or a funding agency, remain a significant concern, although some universities help an author pay the fees. Almost 40 percent of North American LIS faculty listed processing charges as the reason they have not published in an open access journal. There is some question why professional associations do not provide

---

**Article processing charges, whether paid by the authors, an institution, or a funding agency, remain a significant concern, although some universities help an author pay the fees.**
free open access as a service to their members. An analysis of five American Library Association (ALA) scholarly journals illustrates the business challenges publishers see when attempting to provide an open access journal. Even with a dedicated volunteer editorial board, professional associations must find a place to house the journal and enough revenue to create a sustainable, stable platform for the future.23

There is concern over a potential lack of acceptance by promotion and tenure committees and whether open access journals are considered of equal value to traditional, fee-based titles.24 A study of LIS faculty in North America found that 44 percent felt that articles published in open access journals would be viewed less favorably by tenure committees.25 Many open access journals are relatively new and have not had time to develop a reputation within their discipline or to establish an impact factor, a measure of citations to recent articles published in that journal.26 Librarians who have tenure may be more willing to publish in open access venues. As one respondent noted in a 2012 survey, “Now that I have tenure, I’m able to target open access publishing . . . and now [sic] worry as much about the impact of my publication record on my ability to be promoted.”27

Advocating for Better Intellectual Property Rights

Scholars in some disciplines distrust a preprint or post-print version, wanting to rely on the publisher’s final version for research purposes.28 In a study of European authors from a variety of disciplines, more than two-thirds of the respondents found it difficult to determine whether they had the right to place their article in a repository. There was confusion over copyright licenses and a perception that determining authors’ rights was “tedious” and “time-consuming.”29 Scholars in some disciplines distrust a preprint or post-print version, wanting to rely on the publisher’s final version for research purposes.30

A 2005 study of academic research librarians found that only 11 of 140 respondents had tried to negotiate for better intellectual property rights, with 10 of the 11 successful.31 A 2011 survey of faculty with NIH funding found 97.8 percent sign copyright agreements “as is,” potentially causing conflict with the NIH mandatory PubMed policy.32 Questioning the standard copyright license offered by many publishers helps send the message that overall changes may be needed.

Librarians as Open Access Champions

In 2014, Chealsye Bowley and Micah Vandegrift issued a “call for librarians to practice what we preach, regardless of, or even in the face of, tenure and promotion ‘require-
ments,’ long-held professional norms, and the unnecessary fear, uncertainty and doubt that control academic publishing.”

Many scholars see personal responsibility and getting information out to researchers who lack subscription access as important reasons for adding materials to a repository. However, several studies agree that librarians, at least in North America, may “talk the talk” but not necessarily follow through with their own publications when it comes to open access. In an analysis of LIS articles published between 2003 and 2013 on open access, only 19 percent of the articles were self-archived. When the responsibility for making a publication open is left to the author, even those who are presumably knowledgeable about the process do not necessarily follow through. A study of Canadian LIS faculty found that, although 69 percent stated that the high cost of journal subscriptions was a detriment to research, only 23 percent attempted to publish their own works in affordable journals.

**Methods**

This study was an exploratory survey of awareness and behaviors of academic librarians regarding open access publishing. It was part of a larger survey of publishing productivity practices and reports only on the questions relevant to open access. The population studied here is limited to practicing academic librarians, who, for the purposes of this study, are defined as librarians holding an MLS degree and working in an academic library but who do not spend the majority of their time teaching in a graduate LIS program. This study is limited to practicing academic librarians in North America.

The researchers created an online survey using a Google Docs form and distributed it to a variety of academic librarian discussion lists, including those of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) University Libraries, state chapters for ACRL and academic libraries, and the Canadian Association of Research Libraries. Because of duplication among lists, a response rate could not be calculated, and some respondents may have taken the survey multiple times, which is a limitation of this study. The survey instrument consisted of demographic, quantitative, and Likert scale questions, with all questions including an opportunity for comment. Some questions on the survey were adopted from previous studies to allow for direct comparisons. The survey was distributed in November 2017 and remained open for three weeks. All responses were anonymous and were downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet for analysis.

It is unknown how much the opinions provided here represent the overall academic library profession. Although an attempt was made to distribute the survey to as many academic library practitioners as possible, there was no control over the self-selection of the respondents, many of whom may have responded because they were interested in the topic and had strong feelings about publishing and open access. In constructing the survey questions, the researchers attempted to list question options in a random or
categorized order; however, question order may have played a role in responses. The responses were anonymous, so there is no way to determine which institutions are represented and how well they balance with the full academic library population.

Findings and Discussion

Two hundred fifteen academic library practitioners responded to the survey. Ninety-three percent of the respondents were from the United States, 6 percent were from Canada, and one respondent was from Central America. Although the definition of faculty status often varies from one institution to another, 79 percent of the respondents were considered faculty. The survey respondents were relatively evenly divided between experienced faculty (54 percent associate or full professors and 51 percent with more than 10 years of experience) and junior faculty (45 percent assistant professor or other and 50 percent with 10 or fewer years of experience). When examining institutional composition, most respondents work in a doctoral-granting institution (80 percent) with more than 10,000 students (73 percent).

Journal Selection

Survey participants were asked to consider what criteria were important when selecting an appropriate journal for submission of a manuscript. Respondents could select more than one option. The top three choices were: (1) scope and fit to the topic, (2) whether the journal is peer-reviewed, and (3) the intended audience. This result corresponds well to Dalton’s study, where library researchers and practitioners selected peer review as the most important consideration when it comes to prestige and topical fit as the most important criterion in the readership category. In the current study, when asked to narrow their selections to the most important consideration in journal selection, nearly half the respondents (49 percent) selected scope and fit. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents are required to publish peer-reviewed articles for promotion or tenure, and an additional 31 percent have a recommendation to publish in peer-reviewed journals. Considering the importance of peer review to the careers of the majority of the respondents, it is surprising that only 21 percent chose this as the most important consideration. Peer review may be so important that many academic librarians do not even consider journals that are not peer-reviewed.

Relating to journal prestige, only 18 percent of the survey respondents in this study considered impact factors or similar rankings important. This percentage was lower than anticipated, considering that 45 percent of the respondents were from institutions belonging to the Association of Research Libraries or the Canadian Association of Research Libraries, and an additional 36 percent were from other doctoral universities, institutions that often place high value on these metrics. In a 2016 study of LIS faculty, 80 percent of the respondents considered a journal’s impact factor very important or important. Although 65 percent of the current respondents hold tenure-track positions, this survey was limited to academic librarian practitioners, whose publishing expectations may differ from those of LIS faculty researchers. Differing perspectives between LIS researchers and practitioners is supported in Dalton’s study, which found a statistical difference between these groups when asked about the importance of journal impact factors.
Table 1.
Demographics of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty status (n = 215)</th>
<th>Faculty, tenured/continuing contract</th>
<th>Faculty, tenure-track but not yet tenured</th>
<th>Faculty, promotion earning</th>
<th>Faculty, not promotion earning</th>
<th>Professional or administrative, not faculty</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39% (83)</td>
<td>26% (56)</td>
<td>13% (27)</td>
<td>2% (4)</td>
<td>19% (40)</td>
<td>2% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic rank (n = 211)</th>
<th>Full professor</th>
<th>Associate librarian/professor</th>
<th>Assistant librarian/professor</th>
<th>Instructor, visiting professor, other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18% (39)</td>
<td>36% (77)</td>
<td>33% (69)</td>
<td>12% (24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as an academic practitioner (n = 215)</th>
<th>5 years or less</th>
<th>6–10 years</th>
<th>11–20 years</th>
<th>&gt; 20 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22% (48)</td>
<td>27% (57)</td>
<td>27% (58)</td>
<td>24% (52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution type (n = 214)</th>
<th>Doctoral (Association of Research Libraries [ARL] or Canadian Association of Research Libraries [CARL])</th>
<th>Doctoral (not ARL or CARL)</th>
<th>Master’s only</th>
<th>Baccalaureate only</th>
<th>Associate or professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45% (96)</td>
<td>36% (76)</td>
<td>11% (23)</td>
<td>6% (13)</td>
<td>3% (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student head count (n = 214)</th>
<th>0–5,000 students</th>
<th>5,001–10,000 students</th>
<th>10,001–20,000 students</th>
<th>&gt; 20,000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14% (30)</td>
<td>13% (28)</td>
<td>23% (49)</td>
<td>50% (107)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is publication of peer-reviewed articles important for promotion or tenure? (n = 195)</th>
<th>Yes, required</th>
<th>Yes, recommended but considered</th>
<th>Not required but considered</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59% (116)</td>
<td>31% (60)</td>
<td>4% (8)</td>
<td>6% (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Access

In this study, 50 percent considered free open access when selecting a potential journal for publication, with 6 percent of the respondents regarding that as their top consideration. However, gold open access options appeared less acceptable, with only 10 percent of the respondents even considering that option when selecting a journal. Despite efforts by libraries and universities to help authors with funding open access fees, article processing charges seemingly remain a barrier. Three percent of the respondents in this study are at institutions that provide full funding for open access fees, and an additional 23 percent can get partial funding. However, 64 percent have no funding for article processing charges, and 10 percent of the respondents commented that they did not think anyone

Table 2.

Answers to the question “When selecting a journal for submission, what do you consider?”
(n = 213; respondents could select more than one answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope and fit to topic</td>
<td>95% (203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether the journal is peer-reviewed</td>
<td>87% (186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended audience</td>
<td>75% (160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher reputation</td>
<td>68% (143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of free open access</td>
<td>50% (106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to retain copyright</td>
<td>41% (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online availability</td>
<td>32% (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication fees</td>
<td>31% (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive prior experiences with the editor</td>
<td>29% (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated time from submission to publication</td>
<td>28% (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coauthor’s preference</td>
<td>27% (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of peer review (blind, double-blind, etc.)</td>
<td>24% (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript length allowed</td>
<td>21% (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexed in a subject-specific database</td>
<td>20% (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact factor or ranking in ScImago and similar lists</td>
<td>18% (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate</td>
<td>15% (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation style used</td>
<td>11% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of publication</td>
<td>10% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of open access rights for a fee</td>
<td>10% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of readership/number of journal subscribers</td>
<td>7% (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at their institution had even thought to apply for author fees. In addition, several commented that their institution had attempted to help with author fees, but funding was limited or had been cut off for budgetary reasons. A large (n = 11,927) international study of multidisciplinary authors in 2013 found that 19 percent of the respondents worked at institutions that always or often paid the entire open access fee, and 22 percent worked at places where they always or often received partial funding for such fees. This leads to a question of whether institutions in other countries will more likely help with publication fees or if the respondents hold positions at institutions other than universities where payment is an accepted part of the process.

Promotion and tenure concerns may play a role in open access considerations, as indicated by respondents’ comments on their conflict between philosophy and reality. One said, “At this point in my career, I’d like to consider some of these other factors when choosing a journal. But my priority right now is just getting the darn thing peer-reviewed and published.” Another commented, “I believe strongly in open access (that my success in tenure is not aligned with my personal philosophy gives me the desire

Table 3.
Answers to the question “When selecting a journal for submission, what do you consider to be the MOST IMPORTANT factor?” (n = 211)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope and fit to topic</td>
<td>49% (103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether the journal is peer-reviewed</td>
<td>21% (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher reputation</td>
<td>8% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of free open access</td>
<td>6% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact factor or ranking in SCImago and similar lists</td>
<td>4% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended audience</td>
<td>3% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to retain copyright</td>
<td>2% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online availability</td>
<td>2% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive prior experiences with the editor</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of peer review (blind, double-blind, etc.)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript length allowed</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coauthor’s preference</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexed in a subject-specific database</td>
<td>&lt;1% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate</td>
<td>&lt;1% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated time from submission to publication</td>
<td>&lt;1% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation style used</td>
<td>&lt;1% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to continue writing after continuing appointment and direct my writing at that point to open access journals.”

Advocating for Better Intellectual Property Rights

Despite many librarians’ familiarity with the scholarly publication process, confusion remains about publishers’ policies relating to self-archiving. Lack of understanding of these policies (44 percent) was second only to time constraints (46 percent) as the main reason why respondents in this study failed to self-archive. Although 81 percent of the respondents work at an institution with an institutional repository, only 29 percent knew about a formal policy on open access. Fifteen percent were not sure if there was such a policy, another indication of the lack of visibility of the open access movement even within the library profession. This lack of clarity can have a detrimental effect on the open access movement. A study of European authors from a variety of disciplines noted that, when authors are unclear about their copyright permissions, they assumed that their self-archiving rights were more restrictive than the rules really were.43

Although several large funding agencies require their sponsored publications to be added to subject repositories, only 39 percent of the respondents in this study have posted their content to repositories outside their own institution.44 Perhaps the main reason is the lack of an established subject repository specific to library and information science. A recent article mentions the LIS Scholarship Archive (LISSA), which launched in 2017, and several respondents to this survey have added content to E-LIS (Eprints in Library and Information Science), yet neither of these resources appears to have reached major visibility among librarians.45 Other survey participants commented that they participate in ResearchGate or Academia.edu; however, these organizations are not normally considered true open access repositories.46

If journal publishers are not prepared to offer stronger open access options, are library faculty attempting to negotiate for better copyright terms? The ability to retain copyright ownership was considered important by 41 percent in this study. A 2004 study had found that open access options and retaining copyright were slightly less important, being ranked between 2 and 3 on a 5-point scale.47 Many academic librarians need to publish in high impact journals for tenure and promotion but may hesitate to negotiate for fear that the manuscript will be rejected. A 2005 survey of academic librarians found that only 7 percent of the respondents had attempted to work out better intellectual rights.48 Ian Rowlands found that 55 percent of North American authors from a variety of disciplines had no interest in negotiating for better copyright permissions.49 In this study, 21 percent of the respondents had tried for better copyright terms, with 74 percent of those successful. But, for many, likelihood of publication still trumps open access.

Librarians as Open Access Champions

Many librarians practice what they preach regarding open access by adding their content to their institutional repositories. In this study, 76 percent regularly submit their
Table 4.
Answers to the question “If you have deposited publications in any IR [institutional repository], what was your incentive?”
(n = 146; respondents could select more than one answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal responsibility</td>
<td>84% (122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater exposure to my works</td>
<td>72% (105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests for my publication from researchers without access</td>
<td>27% (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague’s encouragement to deposit</td>
<td>27% (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional requirement to deposit</td>
<td>24% (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR manager’s offer to deposit on my behalf</td>
<td>12% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher’s offer to deposit on my behalf</td>
<td>4% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder requirement to deposit</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.
Answers to the question “If you decided NOT to deposit in an IR [institutional repository], what were your reasons?”
(n = 63; respondents could select more than one answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time available to engage with repositories</td>
<td>46% (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of publisher’s policy on repositories</td>
<td>44% (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of appropriate disciplinary repository available</td>
<td>22% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about the longevity of the repository</td>
<td>16% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about the discoverability of content within the repository</td>
<td>10% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of technical understanding on how to upload to a repository</td>
<td>6% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.
Open access, institutional repositories, and licensing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open access funding</th>
<th>Yes, full funding</th>
<th>Yes, partial funding</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No one has pursued it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your institution provide funding for open access? (n = 214)</td>
<td>3% (6)</td>
<td>23% (50)</td>
<td>64% (136)</td>
<td>10% (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open access policies</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your institution have a formal policy on open access? (n = 215)</td>
<td>29% (63)</td>
<td>55% (119)</td>
<td>15% (33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional repositories</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your institution have an institutional repository (IR) for faculty publications? (n = 215)</td>
<td>81% (175)</td>
<td>18% (38)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you have an IR, do you regularly add your own accepted manuscripts to it (if allowed)? (n = 173)</td>
<td>76% (132)</td>
<td>24% (41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever deposited your own work into a repository outside of your own institution? (n = 174)</td>
<td>39% (68)</td>
<td>61% (106)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocating for intellectual property rights</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever tried to negotiate for better intellectual property rights with the publisher? (n = 214)</td>
<td>21% (44)</td>
<td>79% (170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you successful in negotiating better intellectual property rights? (n = 43)</td>
<td>74% (32)</td>
<td>26% (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accepted manuscripts to their institutional repository if permitted by copyright. This is a much higher percentage than a 2018 study by Jill Emery, who reported a green open access deposit rate of only 22 percent.50 Eighty-four percent of the participants in the current study who uploaded their work to their institutional repository did so because of a feeling of responsibility, which may account for the higher participation.

If the results of this survey are any indication, however, some librarians are still not convinced that open access or self-archiving is worth the time and effort. A number of comments indicated a lack of interest or motivation: “Could add the preprints, I guess not that interested,” “I know I should care more about open access than I do,” “It’s just not a part of our institutional culture,” and “I just do not care enough to take the time to submit items to the repository.” Several others mentioned that, since they had selected open access publications, there was no need to add their scholarship to their repository. One librarian seems to have missed the philosophy of open access entirely, commenting, “I don’t care because it’s published elsewhere.”

Conclusion

In this study of academic librarians, the top criteria for journal selection were the fit or scope of the topic and whether a journal is peer-reviewed. Once those conditions are met, librarians begin to consider secondary features, such as publisher reputation and open access options. Impact factors and acceptance rates did not play a major role when selecting a journal. This was somewhat surprising considering that the large majority of respondents held tenured or tenure-track positions at doctoral universities. In addition, the respondents were primarily from the United States. It would be interesting to see if the attitudes observed here also hold true in other countries. Few studies on journal selection priorities have been conducted recently, and it might be worthwhile to replicate this study with a broader and more international audience.

Many academic librarians in North America consciously try to practice what they preach by publishing in open access journals or by adding their preprint or post-print copies to their institutional repositories. That said, there is room for expansion in open access publishing. Comments indicate great confusion over what publishers allow when it comes to archiving. More than seven years ago, Holly Mercer suggested that negotiating for better author rights might be worth adding to the LIS curriculum.51 This would be useful not only for librarians as authors but also for academic librarians to gain confidence when educating faculty about open access issues. It would be interesting to know if any library schools have taken this advice and, if so, if it will lead to greater author advocacy in the future. Once authors have published in an open access publication, they

Many academic librarians in North American consciously try to practice what they preach by publishing in open access journals or by adding their preprint or post-print copies to their institutional repositories.
are significantly more likely to publish open access again and also more likely to deposit their work in a repository. How then, do we convince librarian authors of the need to lead by example?

Tenure and promotion criteria need clarification as to whether open access publications will be considered in the same light as traditional, fee-based journals. Wilhelm Peekhaus noted that “there appears to be a disconnect between survey participants’ support for unhindered access to research and their own publishing practices, which tend to remain informed and constrained by the parameters of the academy’s traditional reward structure.” An interesting follow-up study could analyze academic library practitioners’ tenure and promotion guidelines to see if open access publications are addressed. Although there has been progress, open access options might yet become more straightforward, more visible, and a higher priority in the field of academic librarianship.
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Appendix A

Survey Questions


Do you hold an MLS from an ALA accredited library school (or equivalent)?

- Yes
- No [end survey].

Please select the option that best fits your current position:

- Academic library practitioner (For the purposes of this study, an academic library practitioner is defined as a person holding at least an MLS degree who provides reference, collection development, archival, technical services, administrative, or other student and faculty support services in a college or university library. The practitioner may teach courses as an adjunct professor but that is not the primary responsibility.)
- Library school faculty (For the purposes of this study, defined as a person who spends the majority of working hours teaching graduate MLS students.) [end survey]
- None of the above [end survey].

Approximately how long have you been an academic librarian practitioner (combined number of years if you have changed positions):

- Less than one year
- 1–2 years
- 3–5 years
- 6–10 years
• 11–20 years
• More than 20 years.

Your current faculty status (please select the best fit):
• Professional or administrative, not faculty
• Faculty, tenure-track (or continuing contract), not yet tenured
• Faculty, tenured (or continuing contract)
• Faculty, promotion earning but no options for tenure or continuing contract
• Faculty, no options for promotion within the position
• Other.

Your current academic rank (please select the best fit):
• Full librarian/Full professor (or equivalent)
• Associate librarian/Associate professor (or equivalent)
• Assistant librarian/Assistant professor (or equivalent)
• Instructor librarian (or equivalent)
• Visiting librarian (or equivalent)
• Other.

Approximately how long have you held your current rank?
• Less than one year
• One–two years
• Three–five years
• More than five years.

What is your current age?
• Younger than 18 [end survey]
• 18–21
• 22–25
• 26–30
• 31–35
• 36–40
• 41–45
• 46–50
• 51–55
• 56–60
• 61–65
• 66–70
• Over 70
• Prefer not to answer.

Location of your current institution:
• USA
• Canada
• Mexico
• Central America
• South America
• Europe
• Asia
• Africa
• Australia
• Other.

Please describe your current college or university:

• Doctoral granting, ARL [Association of Research Libraries] or CARL [Canadian Association of Research Libraries] member
• Doctoral granting, not a member of ARL or CARL
• Master’s level only (no doctoral degrees offered)
• Baccalaureate level only (no graduate degrees offered)
• Associate or professional degrees only (no baccalaureate or graduate degrees offered)
• Other.

Size of your current institution (head count):

• Less than 1,000 students
• 1,000–2,000 students
• 2,001–5,000 students
• 5,001–10,000 students
• 10,001–20,000 students
• More than 20,000 students.

Approximately how many professional librarians (holding an MLS) are there at your library? If you have multiple libraries within your institution, please provide the number in your building.

• 1–5
• 6–10
• 11–15
• 16–20
• 21–25
• More than 25.

Is publication of peer-reviewed journal articles important for promotion or tenure (or continuing contract) at your current institution?

• Yes, required
• Yes, recommended
• No, we are promotion or tenure earning, but it is not considered for librarians
• N/A, we are not promotion or tenure earning.

Is publication in peer-reviewed journals important for annual performance evaluations at your current institution?

• Yes, required
• Yes, recommended
• No, we have annual performance evaluations but peer-reviewed articles aren’t considered for librarians.
• N/A, we don’t have annual performance evaluations.

Counting those which are in press, have you published any PEER-REVIEWED journal articles within the last 10 years?

• Yes
• No [end survey].

When selecting a journal title for submission what do you consider? (Please check all that apply):

• Publisher reputation
• Positive prior experiences with the editor
• Scope and fit to topic
• Intended audience
• Indexed in a subject-specific database
• Size of readership/number of journal subscribers
• Online availability
• Impact factor or ranking in SCImago or similar lists
• Acceptance rate
• Estimated time from submission to publication
• Frequency of publication
• Whether the journal is peer-reviewed
• Type of peer review (blind, double-blind, etc.)
• Publication fees
• Ability to retain copyright
• Availability of free open access (posting of preprint, post-print, or full article after no or brief embargo)
• Availability of open access rights for a fee
• Manuscript length allowed
• Citation style used
• Coauthor’s preference.

When selecting a journal title for submission, what do you consider to be the MOST IMPORTANT factor in making your decision?

• Publisher reputation
• Positive prior experiences with the editor
• Scope and fit to topic
• Intended audience
• Indexed in a subject-specific database
• Size of readership/number of journal subscribers
• Online availability
• Impact factor or ranking in SCImago or similar lists
• Acceptance rate
• Estimated time from submission to publication
• Frequency of publication
• Whether the journal is peer-reviewed
• Type of peer review (blind, double-blind, etc.)
• Publication fees
• Ability to retain copyright
• Availability of free open access (posting of preprint, post-print, or full article after no or brief embargo
• Availability of open access rights for a fee
• Manuscript length allowed
• Citation style used
• Coauthor’s preference.

Does your institution have a formal policy on open access?
• Yes
• No
• Not sure.

Does your institution provide funding for open access?
• Yes, all funding
• Yes, partial funding
• To my knowledge, no one has ever pursued it
• No
• I’m not sure.

Does your institution have an institutional repository for faculty publications?
• Yes
• No
• Not sure.

If you have an institutional archive, do you regularly add your accepted manuscripts to the IR [institutional repository], if allowed by copyright?
• Yes
• No.

Have you ever deposited any of your work into an open access repository outside of your own institution?
• Yes
• No.

If you have deposited publications in a repository of any type, what was your incentive? (Please check all that apply):
• Personal responsibility to make my work freely available
• Provides greater exposure to my works which will aid my career
• Requests for my publication by researchers who can’t access it at their institution
An institutional requirement to deposit my publication
A publisher offer to deposit my publication on my behalf
A funder requirement to deposit my publication
A colleague’s encouragement to deposit my publication
A repository manager’s offer to deposit my publication on my behalf.

If you decided NOT to deposit your publication in a repository, what were your reasons (Please check all that apply):

- Lack of understanding about the publisher’s policy on repositories
- Lack of time available to engage with repositories
- Lack of technical understanding on how to upload to a repository
- Concerns about the discoverability of content within the repository
- Concerns about the longevity of the repository
- Lack of appropriate disciplinary repository available.

Have you ever tried to negotiate for better intellectual property rights with a publisher?

- Yes
- No.

Were you successful in negotiating better property rights?

- Yes
- No.

Notes


52. Peekhaus and Pröferes, “How Library and Information Science Faculty Perceive and Engage with Open Access,” 646, 651.