A Selected Comparison of Music Librarians’ and Musicologists’ Self-Archiving Practices

Rachel E. Scott

abstract: The importance of open access (OA) advocacy is well-documented in the literature of academic librarianship, but previous research shows that librarians’ OA behaviors are less conclusive. This article compares the self-archiving practices of music librarians and musicologists to see how librarians rank in OA adoption. Availability of articles published from 2013 to 2017 in six green OA journals in music librarianship and musicology indicates a need for continued advocacy and enhanced understanding of OA policies and opportunities.

Introduction

Authors face an increasingly complex publishing landscape. Academics expected to publish to meet tenure and promotion requirements must negotiate a scholarly communications environment that has evolved to account for digital publishing platforms, changing economic models, and demands for expanded author rights—not to mention dynamic disciplinary and institutional preferences and expectations. Open access (OA) models are diverse and range considerably in their level of copyright protections and version accessibility. Even if authors do not choose to publish in an OA journal or to pay an article processing charge to publish their individual articles OA—both practices referred to as gold OA—they may still post their work to an online repository. Although the number of OA journals continues to grow, their quality and availability across disciplines vary considerably. Many authors still choose to publish in subscription-based, rather than OA, journals.
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which is called green OA. Although the number of OA journals continues to grow, their quality and availability across disciplines vary considerably. Many authors still choose to publish in subscription-based, rather than OA, journals.

Journals funded by subscriptions increasingly support green OA. SHERPA/RoMEO (Securing a Hybrid Environment for Research Preservation and Access/Rights Metadata for Open Archiving), based at the University of Nottingham in the United Kingdom, reviews the open access policies of publishers. According to SHERPA/RoMEO, “81% of publishers on this list [its 2019 survey of publishers] formally allow some form of self-archiving.” However, research shows that many authors publishing in green OA journals do not take advantage of the opportunity to self-archive an authorized version of their work. Authors in the sciences have shown strong OA participation; in comparison, scholars in the arts and humanities have lagged.

Subject librarians, familiar with the disciplines in which they serve as liaisons and with an understanding of best practices in information science, are seemingly well-situated not only to advocate for broader adoption of OA to their disciplinary colleagues but also to lead the way through their own practices. This study asks whether a selected group of subject librarians—music librarians—take advantage of the opportunity afforded by green OA policies to make their published content freely available to the public online.

Librarians have advocated for more open policies in scholarly publishing, but such advocacy is not always reflected in their behavior. This case study evaluates five years of data for three green OA journals in music librarianship and three in musicology to determine if music librarians practice what their profession preaches. It seeks to answer the research question “When music librarians and musicologists choose to publish in a journal that supports green OA, at what rates do both groups take advantage of the opportunity to self-archive their work?”

### Literature Review

Several studies have shown a positive correlation between OA availability and the number of citations to the work in question. Stevan Harnad, a scientist who has written extensively about OA, noted that the citation advantage is not limited to gold: “The OA advantage is the OA advantage, whether Green or Gold.” Robert Heaton, Dylan Burns, and Becky Thoms surveyed faculty authors at Utah State University in Logan who had published OA in 2016 to explore their motivations for doing so. The three researchers
found that positive attitudes toward OA within one’s discipline, feelings of altruism or social responsibility, and a desire for broader reach are powerful influences. They also found that finances are important; without funding for article processing charges, many respondents place their work in journals that ask no fee.

Academic librarians are increasingly encouraged to advocate for the expansion of OA. In June 2016, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) approved the “ACRL Policy Statement on Open Access to Scholarship by Academic Librarians.” That document not only encourages academic librarians to publish in OA journals but also recommends “depositing the final accepted manuscript in a repository to make that version openly accessible.” Although the ACRL statement favors OA journals, it also provides support for green OA self-archiving.

Numerous studies have investigated the OA beliefs of information professionals and found their opinions not necessarily aligned with their practices. Howard Carter, Carolyn Snyder, and Andrea Imre’s 2007 survey finds low self-archiving rates among library faculty: only 12 percent of library faculty respondents had archived articles in an institutional repository or on a personal or departmental website. In their 2009 survey, Kristi Palmer, Emily Dill, and Charlene Christie describe the distance between academic librarians’ OA attitudes and practices by noting: “While all concepts related to education were agreed to or strongly agreed to at a level of 70% or higher . . . only 7% of respondents were involved in education campaigns.” This finding highlights the disconnect between librarians’ stated views and their behavior; however, one could argue that an individual might agree that something is good without feeling compelled to campaign for it.

In 2015, Kate Lara surveyed librarians concerning their role in the management and funding of OA. She reported a variety of perceived contributions by librarians to OA publishing, including providing access to OA content, funding article processing charges, and offering education. When asked about their role in encouraging and supporting OA, several respondents indicated that the library should lead OA initiatives: “These respondents felt that librarians were likely to be the most educated about open access and well suited for this role.”

Holly Mercer investigated the 2008 OA publishing behaviors of academic librarians and found that they engage at “slightly higher rates than peer authors, but not as often as is allowed under current publisher policies.” Importantly for the study at hand, she also noted the responsibility of liaison librarians for OA advocacy, including the expectation to “advise authors to retain enough rights to their published work to use in the classroom, to share with colleagues, and to deposit in an institutional or subject repository.” The literature conveys a strong expectation for academic librarians to advocate for OA and to facilitate the participation of others.

Positive attitudes toward OA within one’s discipline, feelings of altruism or social responsibility, and a desire for broader reach are powerful influences.
participation of others. Several institutions offer library workshops or other formalized ways to teach faculty, student authors, or both about scholarly publishing platforms, copyright, and self-archiving.\textsuperscript{12}

Jill Emery investigated the green OA deposit rates of five Taylor & Francis Library and Information Science (LIS) journals over a five-year period (2012–2016) and found that only 22 percent of articles were available in repositories. These results excluded content on social platforms, including Academia.edu and ResearchGate, an exception the author made, she says, because “there is also a question of legality as to whether [such content] is truly ‘green.’”\textsuperscript{13} Two recent articles also investigated the OA availability of research on the topic of OA.\textsuperscript{14} The OA availability of LIS literature has been studied by several authors and is not the focus of the study at hand. Instead, this paper aims to compare the OA availability of content published in selected music library and musicology journals by librarians and music researchers.

The OA availability of music research is less comprehensively documented than that of librarianship, and the state of scholarly communications in musicology is similarly harder to ascertain. Like other humanistic disciplines, musicologists have well-established and stable means of disseminating their work. There are, however, a growing number of peer-reviewed OA music journals and publishing platforms, as well as a variety of casual social platforms on which ideas about music, musical editions, and an array of musical scholarship are shared and discussed.\textsuperscript{15} Musicologists, like their peers in librarianship and other fields, increasingly have more, and more complex, choices to make when publishing. The discoverability, stability, and impact of newer platforms have yet to be determined and will influence scholars’ decisions regarding placing and self-archiving their work.

Like other humanistic disciplines, musicologists have well-established and stable means of disseminating their work. There are, however, a growing number of peer-reviewed OA music journals and publishing platforms, and it is important to ensure that content is available in a way that maximizes its discoverability and impact. As librarians, Testa and Dougan’s focus was on OA content and its discoverability. Testa reiterated the role of the subject librarian as an OA advocate: “Subject librarians can help advise authors on questions such as whether a particular OA journal is indexed in a major subject database, or whether a subscription-based journal allows self-archiving (green OA).”\textsuperscript{19} Carol Tenopir, Elizabeth Dalton, Lisa Christian, Misty Jones, Mark McCabe, MacKenzie Smith, and Allison Fish surveyed academics across diverse disciplines and emphasized the role of librarians: “The ambivalence of researchers toward OA can serve as a teachable moment for libraries. Libraries can take the opportunity to lead conversations about OA at their institutions.”\textsuperscript{20}
A study at the University of California, Berkeley on the future of scholarly communication includes music faculty perspectives on the challenges of academic publishing. Of particular concern is “an extremely small pool of society-run journals or presses that signify both prestige and the broadest possible audience. They are, consequentially, highly selective.” The author identified three such journals: the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* (JAMS), *Music Theory Spectrum*, and *Ethnomusicology*. These titles are not OA journals, though all three support green OA.

In his preface to the book *OA and the Humanities*, Peter Suber acknowledges some of the differences between the sciences and the humanities that have slowed OA participation in the humanities. He notes higher levels of public funding in the sciences and the attendant mandate to publish OA, higher rejection rates for humanities journals, the role of articles as secondary to monographs in the humanities versus their primary status in the sciences, and pervasive misunderstandings about OA in the humanities. Suber suggests that “by percentages, more humanists than scientists believe that publishing in a high-prestige non-OA journal rules out making the same work OA through an online repository.”

An incident involving the American Musicological Society Listserv (AMS-L) illustrates some music researchers’ mixed feelings regarding changes to scholarly communications. The society announced in 2017 that it would discontinue the discussion list AMS-L in favor of a forum on Humanities Commons (HC), a nonprofit open access network established by the Modern Language Association to help scholars share their work. Humanities Commons, according to its website, is “a trusted, nonprofit network where humanities scholars can create a professional profile, discuss common interests, develop new publications, and share their work.” So many members protested loss of the discussion list, however, that the AMS in 2018 replaced it with a new list called Musicology-L. Some of the reluctance to use Humanities Commons may have stemmed from conflating it with social media. To address the complaint “I don’t want to be disturbed by ads, banners, and other extraneous elements of social media platforms,” AMS leadership replied: “HC has nothing to do with Facebook or any for-profit platform. It is a non-profit organization, and so its website and the notification messages it generates have none of the distractions common to social media.”

This reluctance to abandon traditional modes of communicating and sharing one’s work appears, at least anecdotally, related to disapproval of social media. The implications for researchers who lack an institutional repository are considerable; do they post to a disciplinary or personal repository that is viewed with scorn by some peers, or do they forfeit the opportunity to share their work early and increase the opportunity for impact? This study provides some insight into this question and other realities of OA self-archiving.

**Methodology**

The author individually searched Google.com for the OA full text of all peer-reviewed articles published from 2013 to 2017 in three music librarianship and three musicology journals, *Fontes Artis Musicae*, *Music Reference Services Quarterly*, and *Notes*. 
Journal Selection

Compared to musicology, music librarianship offers few peer-reviewed journals with international reach. Accordingly, three titles were the starting point for the selection process: *Fontes Artis Musicae*, the journal of the International Association of Music Libraries, Archives, and Documentation Centres; *Music Reference Services Quarterly*; and *Notes*, the journal of the Music Library Association. *Fontes Artis Musicae* and *Notes* have no announced policy for OA, but the editors of both journals confirmed that authors may post their articles in institutional repositories following a one-year worldwide embargo.27 *Music Reference Services Quarterly* is a Taylor & Francis journal and supports both green and gold OA.28

Because music librarianship offers only three highly regarded journals to investigate, the author identified three musicology journals on the same or similar platforms and with similar OA rules. Like *Music Reference Services Quarterly*, the *Journal of Musicological Research* is a Taylor & Francis periodical that supports both green and gold OA. Like *Fontes Artis Musicae*, *Acta Musicologica* is the journal associated with the international organization representing its discipline. Like *Notes*, the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* is the official periodical of the American organization representing the field. All support green OA and allow authors to post their work in a repository. The embargo periods differ, however, with *Acta Musicologica*, *Fontes Artis Musicae*, and *Notes* requiring a year after publication before an article can be uploaded and the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* mandating six months post-publication before sending an article to funding-body archives.29

Article Searching

The author copied and pasted into a spreadsheet article citation information from the tables of contents on individual journal Web pages. Each journal contains a variety of document types, and approaching them individually allowed the author to gain familiarity with the journals’ idiosyncrasies and standard practices. Several studies have confirmed that article databases do not index all available content, and database filters often improperly include or exclude content.30 Copying the article data also allowed the author to remove content that had been grouped with, but was not actually, a full-length, peer-reviewed article, including introductory essays, reports, and other features.

The author searched article titles in quotation marks in Google’s default search. She decided against the exclusive use of Google Scholar or browser extensions such as Kopernio and Unpaywall. Margaret Markland notes that “a simple Google search” finds more comprehensive results than Google Scholar.31 For this study, comprehensive results were preferred and indeed yielded some unexpected results. When Google returned no results beyond the subscription version of the article, the author confirmed the lack of OA full text by searching Google Scholar. Investigating both databases confirmed the initial Google search findings; in no instances did Google Scholar yield OA full text when Google did not. All searches took place in December 2018 or January 2019. The author checked outside her institution’s Internet Protocol range to ensure that institutional subscription content would not be included in the search results.
Data Recording

Because librarians occasionally publish in musicology journals and music scholars frequently do so in music library journals, the profession of the first author, as indicated in either the article or the issue’s contributor information, was recorded in the spreadsheet. If a profession was not supplied, the investigator searched the affiliation or educational information. Authors who could be considered both music researchers and information professionals, as well as vendors and all others, were labeled “others.” The availability of OA full text, the type of repository (institutional, personal, or disciplinary), and the URL at which the OA full text was available were also copied in the spreadsheet. If the full text was posted or harvested in a possible violation of copyright, that URL was also recorded.

Limitations

This is a selected study and does not aim to be representative of all disciplines or otherwise generalizable. Because only three journals for music librarianship have international impact, this is a small sample. Admittedly, music librarians publish outside the selected music library journals, just as music researchers do outside the chosen musicology journals. Additionally, some flexibility was needed to assign labels because a few individuals did not share their affiliations or credentials. Finally, multiple versions of a work may be available online, and comparing them was beyond the scope of this study. The author noted, for example, that a PhD dissertation turned up when the article “John Williams: Paraphraser or Plagiarist?” was searched. Although the dissertation author had posted that document to an institutional repository, he did not separately upload the individual article published in *Journal of Musicological Research*.

Results

The sample of 361 articles was almost evenly divided, with 179 articles in musicology journals and 182 articles in music library journals. A total of 88 of these (24.4 percent) were deposited by authors in institutional, disciplinary, or personal repositories. Despite low OA deposit rates, many articles were indeed available in full text; the author found the full text of 197 articles, just over half, by searching Google. Seventy-two of 88 articles in *Fontes Artis Musicae* and 55 of 58 articles in *Notes* were freely available online. However, their availability did not result from the authors opting to self-archive the accepted version. Only 15.9 percent of articles in *Fontes Artis Musicae* and 13.8 percent of those in *Notes* had been uploaded to a personal, disciplinary, or institutional repository. In both cases, the majority of these articles were hosted on thefreelibrary.com, with the copyright statement in place: “No portion of this article can be reproduced without the express written permission from the copyright holder.” Figure 1 presents a representative example from thefreelibrary.com.

The *Journal of Musicological Research* and *Music Reference Services Quarterly* support gold OA. Taylor & Francis, the publisher of both journals, confirmed, however, that no authors had taken advantage of the paid OA option offered during the period under consideration in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Number of articles</th>
<th>Free full text</th>
<th>Deposited</th>
<th>Deposited in disciplinary repository</th>
<th>Deposited in institutional repository</th>
<th>Deposited in personal repository</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Acta Musicologica</em></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19 (36.5%)</td>
<td>18 (34.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of the American Musicological Society</em></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24 (41.4%)</td>
<td>24 (41.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Musicological Research</em></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12 (17.4%)</td>
<td>1 (15.9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fontes Artis Musicae</em></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>72 (81.8%)</td>
<td>14 (15.9%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Music Reference Services Quarterly</em></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15 (41.7%)</td>
<td>13 (36.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Notes</em></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55 (94.8%)</td>
<td>4 (13.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>361</strong></td>
<td><strong>197 (54.6%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>88 (24.4%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Music researchers comprised the largest contingent of authors at 66.2 percent, followed by librarians at 26.6 percent and “others” at 7.2 percent. Music researchers deposited 15.5 percent of the articles under consideration in a repository, librarians uploaded 28.1 percent, and “others” posted 19.2 percent. As Table 1 indicates, only two articles were deposited in a disciplinary repository, and personal repository uploads (44) closely followed institutional (47). Few authors posted their content to more than one type of depository, but some deposited the same material in both institutional and personal repositories. Although institutional and personal repository deposits remained close across the study, a comparison of uploads by librarians with those by music researchers
Table 2.
Author characteristics and deposit rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal title</th>
<th>Number of articles</th>
<th>Written by music researcher</th>
<th>Written by librarian</th>
<th>Deposited by music researcher</th>
<th>Deposited by librarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Acta Musicologica</em></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fontes Artis Musicae</em></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of the American Musicological Society</em></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Musicological Research</em></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Music Reference Services Quarterly</em></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Notes</em></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>361</strong></td>
<td><strong>239 (66.2%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>96 (26.6%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>56 (15.5%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>27 (28.1%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Percentages of articles deposited in an open access repository by music researchers, librarians, and others.
indicates different preferences. Of 27 articles from librarians, 23 were in institutional repositories. Of 56 articles from music researchers, 40 were in personal repositories.

A chi-square test was conducted in Excel to see if profession and OA deposit were related. A result of 0.94426075 indicated no evidence against the null hypothesis; that is, there was no evidence that the categorical variables of profession and OA deposit rate were linked.

Discussion

In their 2014 analysis of the openness of LIS journals, Micah Vandegrift and Chealsye Bowley identify three means of effecting change, the first of which is “exercise the right to self-archive every piece of scholarship published in LIS journals, or better yet never give those rights away in the first place.”

Given how well-established subscription journals are, the encouragement to self-archive all content in green OA journals seems an excellent start. Indeed, this was the impetus for the study at hand. As coeditor in chief of Music Reference Services Quarterly, a journal that supports green OA, the author of this study was interested in ensuring that journal authors self-archived their work. Given the findings, she began to work with her coeditor in chief to more proactively share the OA policies and opportunities to all authors whose work the journal accepted. To this end, Music Reference Services Quarterly updated its form acceptance letters to include its OA policies and to encourage authors to share their work to increase their impact.

Many scholars have questioned whether expanded green OA participation is a viable path forward. In 2017, Toby Green wrote in an opinion piece in Learned Publishing, “It is time to recognize that, in this age of digital disruption, there must be something structurally wrong with an approach that after two decades of collective effort has yet to reach base camp.” Vandegrift and Bowley also seem reluctant to accept green OA participation as the path forward. Their third recommendation for effecting change was for LIS editors to “work diligently to adapt the policies and procedures for the journals we control to align with our professional principles of access, expansive understanding of copyrights, fair use, and broad reusability.” Although a worthy endeavor, this process will likely face obstacles, especially for journal editors affiliated with commercial publishers rather than associations, societies, or university presses.

SHERPA/RoMEO statistics indicate that 81 percent of journal publishers support some form of self-archiving as of January 1, 2019. However, the RoMEO database is not infallible; three of the six journals in this study were incorrectly listed. Searching SHERPA/RoMEO for Acta Musicologica yields no results, and both Fontes Artis Musicae and Notes are listed as “ungraded” journals. The editor of Fontes Artis Musicae reported that he had “tried to register with SHERPA/RoMEO, to no avail.” Only the Journal of Musicological Research, Journal of the American Musicological Society, and Music Reference Services Quarterly are accurately listed as RoMEO green journals.
Much library literature on OA includes assumptions that academic institutions have, or should have, an institutional repository. As Tenopir and her coauthors acknowledge, the cost of implementing and maintaining an institutional repository is substantial and can serve as an OA deterrent.\textsuperscript{38} In fact, many colleges and universities have no repository, and interested authors must post content to a personal or disciplinary repository. Emery excludes Academia.edu and ResearchGate from her investigation of green OA deposit rates due to concerns about how well those websites conform to copyright laws.\textsuperscript{39} When both platforms launched, however, there were fewer disciplinary repositories, and so ResearchGate and Academia.edu were the most familiar and convenient options for some scholars.

As the Humanities Commons example suggests, the reluctance to post scholarly content to platforms perceived as social media may also serve as an OA deterrent. Related to this obstacle, perhaps, are age-related differences in OA attitudes and practices. Some evidence suggests that younger scholars perceive OA more positively and participate more actively in OA publishing.\textsuperscript{40} Future research comparing the OA archiving practices of liaison librarians and their teaching faculty colleagues might explicitly investigate author age as a contributing factor.

The author would likely not have discovered the abundant content posted to thefreelibrary.com if she had searched Google Scholar exclusively. Other sources identified in this study for full-text access that may infringe copyright include scribd.com, librarybus.com, and a university courseware platform, all of which were readily findable via the default Google search. The author did not search SciHub, a website that provides millions of scientific papers and books, often bypassing copyright rules, and some of the content studied may also be available there. Julie Arendt, Bettina Peacemaker, and Hillary Miller recently came to a similar conclusion, namely that searching “Google for free articles likely uncovered copies in violation of copyright or publication agreements.”\textsuperscript{41} This problem may not be the work of nefarious individuals or platforms; some authors may post the content they created against contractual restrictions, and others may upload their work without understanding their publication agreements.

\textbf{Conclusion}

As the first comparison of subject librarian behaviors to those of the disciplinary scholars, this study fills a gap in the knowledge about self-archiving practices of both groups and provides a snapshot of OA support among both groups. The findings suggest a need for continued advocacy and enhanced understanding of green OA policies and opportunities, as well as a continued assessment of personal repository platforms such as Academia.edu and ResearchGate. Authors who wish to self-archive their work should have stable and easily navigable options for doing so. Librarians have a role in facilitating author
participation in self-archiving, regardless of where the author chooses to post content, by promoting the practice in workshops, online guides, and one-on-one consultations.

Commercial journals are part of the current scholarly publishing landscape. Several subscription-based periodicals have expanded rights over the past decade to allow authors to post content to online repositories or to retain copyright of their work. As the findings of this study confirm, however, just because a journal allows for expanded author rights does not mean that authors will take advantage of them. Editors of such journals may lack the power to change the economic model from within, but they can provide information and encourage authors to make their content openly accessible and thus expand their impact.

Rachel E. Scott is an integrated library systems librarian; interim coordinator for cataloging, collection management, and library information systems; and associate professor in the University Libraries at the University of Memphis in Tennessee and coeditor in chief of Music Reference Services Quarterly. Her ORCID ID is https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5847-3378, and she may be reached by e-mail at: rescott3@memphis.edu.

Authors who wish to self-archive their work should have stable and easily navigable options for doing so.
Appendix

Chi-Square Test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed frequencies</th>
<th>Deposited</th>
<th>Not deposited</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musicologist</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td><strong>273</strong></td>
<td><strong>361</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected frequencies (row total × column total/N)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musicologist deposited</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian deposited</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other deposited</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicologist not deposited</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>180.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian not deposited</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other not deposited</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-squared test 0.94426075

Degrees of freedom† 2

Chi-square distribution 0.623641014

*The chi-square test is a statistical test employed to compare observed data with the results expected and to confirm association between two variables. The larger the chi-square value, the greater the probability that a significant association exists.

† The number of degrees of freedom is a measure of how many values can vary in a statistical calculation.
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